Using Oral Corrective Feedback in English Classroom; A Case Study of Iranian EFL Students in Iranshahr

Malek Ahmed Kord
Assistant Professor, Resalat University
Zahedan (Sistan & Baluchestan) Branch, Iran

Samah Borhani*
B.A. student, Resalat University
Zahedan (Sistan & Baluchestan) Branch, Iran

ABSTRACT: *The aim of this study was to investigate the implementation of oral corrective feedback in a language classroom and its effect on students' eagerness to involve in the learning process. It was conducted in a class where the focus was not only on the written form and comprehension but also on their oral production. The study comprised 16 female students, learning English as a foreign language in a language institute in Iran. The researcher used two kinds of techniques for collecting the data, interview and observation. The findings show that there were two types of oral corrective feedback given in the class, i.e. explicit correction and clarification request. The finding also reveals that the implementation of oral corrective feedback has a positive effect on the students' learning process and their eagerness to involve in communicative activities.*

KEY WORDS: Corrective feedback, EFL students, Errors

INTRODUCTION

Findings that are related to first language acquisition have been linked to foreign language learning and it has been concluded that the process works in a parallel way, that children learning their native tongue can make many of mistakes which is a normal part of language acquisition process. When they get feedback from adults, they learn how to make acceptable sentences in their native language. foreign language learners are also functioning in the same way while they are learning the target language, which is not so different from a child acquiring his first language (ErdoÄŸan, 2005).In most cultures, errors are seen as something that can cause unfortunate events and should be avoided. To deal with them, then, is not easy. When talking about errors in language learning or language acquisition, it is important to become part of a very controversial topic, either on the theoretical or methodological side (Hernandez, E. & Reyes, 2012).

Lightbown and Spada (1999) claimed corrective feedback is useful. Swain's (1985) study also recommended that treatment of errors can help students to learn better, whether the feedback is explicit or implicit. Recasts has also drawn considerable attention, as a way to provide learners with feedback. Long (1990) believes feedback can help the process of learning a second language. The findings of other researchers are also in line

with what Long says. Some researchers have focused on the different styles of corrective feedback and tried to find out which of the different approaches of giving feedback used by the teacher is more affective (Rahimi & Vahid Dastjerdi, 2012).

Errors
According to Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics, error is0 the use of a linguistic item (e.g., a word, a grammatical item, a speech act, etc.), in a way which a fluent or native speaker of the language regards as showing faulty or incomplete learning, according to Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics (Jing et al., 2016).
In general, errors have been viewed as language learners' speech that departs from the model they are trying to master (Park, 2010).

Before the 1960's, during the dominance of the behaviouristic view upon language there existed a dominated view of language to consider learners' errors as something undesirable. Making errors was seen as a sign of mislearning and regarded as undesirable to proper processes of language learning. According to the behaviouristic point of view, the reason behind making errors lies in inadequate teaching methods which if had been "perfect" they would never be committed. This way of thinking was considered to be naive as there is nothing to be called "perfect" methodology especially with the appearance of the Universal Grammar concept proposed by Chomsky in 1965.

The latter claimed that each human being has an innate capacity that can guide him through a vast number of sentence generation possibilities. Since then, a shift by language teachers towards the cognitive approach has started. Chomsky's theory contributes in raising researcher's interests about learners' errors as a source of hypotheses formation. The importance of errors in language learning was first advocated by Corder (1967). He proved that strategies of L2 learners could be inferred through the analysis of their errors and that could be helpful for researchers of L2 learning process (Amara, 2015).

Errors vs Mistakes
While defining error many researchers often compare error and mistake. Corder (1967) stated that error is a systematic divergence made by learner who have yet grasped the use of the target language rules. He believed that the error should be distinguished from mistakes. Dulay (1982) defined errors as the divergence from a chosen model of language performance, while Chun (1982) and Richard (1992) think error are mentioned as the use of the language or a linguistic item in a way, according to native or fluent users of the language, suggested incorrect or unfinished language learning. From the explanation above, researches all believed an error is distinguished from a mistake. An error is a systematic deviation made by learner who are lacking some knowledge of the accurate rule of the chosen language. It shows an absence of language competence and it mirrors a learner's present stage of L2 progress. Therefore, a learner can scarcely self-correct an error. Whereas a mistake is produced by the lack of performance attention, exhaustion, carelessness, or some other aspects of performance (Jing et al., 2016).

Based on the dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (1992), Due to the absence of attention, exhaustion, carelessness, or some other aspects of performance, a learner can make a mistake. Mistakes can be self-corrected when attention is gathered, while an error is the use of linguistic point in a way that a fluent or native speaker of the language counts it as showing defective or unfinished learning. In other words, it happens because the learner does not know what is correct, and thus it cannot be self-corrected.

Errors are systematic and can give valuable vision into language acquisition because they are goofs in the learner's underlying competence .When native speakers make mistakes, they can identify and correct them directly because they have almost complete information of the linguistic construction of their mother tongue while Non-native utterers, L2 learners not only make mistakes, they also make errors and as they have only an incomplete knowledge of the target language, they are not always able to correct the errors that they make. Therefore the learners' errors mirror a lack of underlying competence in the language that they are learning (Amara, 2015).

To differentiate between an error and mistake, Ellis (1997) proposes two ways. Checking the consistency of learner's performance is the first one. If he sometimes uses the accurate form and sometimes the incorrect one, it is a mistake. However, if he always uses it wrongly, it is then an error. Asking the learner to try to correct his own wrong statement is the second one. Where he is unable to, the deviations are errors; where he is successful, they are mistakes (ErdoÄŸan, 2005).

Types of Errors
It is vital to find the type of error the learners make while correcting. Errors have been categorized by Mackey, Gass and McDonough (2000) and Nishita (2004), cited by Yoshida (2008) as:

1) *Morphosyntactic error*: Learners use the word order incorrectly, including tense, conjugation and particles. 2) *Phonological error*: Learners mispronounce words. 3) Lexical error: unfitting usage of vocabulary by learners or they code-switch to their first language due to their lack of lexical information. 4) *Semantic and pragmatic error*: The confusion of a learner's statement, even if there are no grammatical, lexical or phonological errors. When dealing with errors, language teachers have to make many decisions and one of them is the sort of error to correct. Though, sometimes some types of errors are ignored to some degree, or only the most serious errors are corrected (Hernandez, E. & Reyes, 2012).

Corrective feedback
Errors are known to be a common characteristic of language acquisition and learning and in the process of learning, everyone will make errors in, no matter they are learning the first language or the second language. Though, in second language classroom, the teacher usually wants pupils to speak as much as possible and encourage them to speak with the goal of enhancing communication competence. When students speak second language they will also make many errors, and if these errors are not modified, students will mistake them as the right form and adopt them to their interlanguage system (Wang & Zhang, 2011).

Corrective feedback (CF) refers to the response that pupils receive on the linguistic errors they make in their spoken or written production in a second language. Both spoken and written corrective feedback have attracted large attention in recent years because of their importance for the development of theories of second language acquisition and because they have held an important place in second language pedagogy (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). The term corrective feedback has been explained at different times in a very similar way. Chaudron (1977) has given one of the earliest definitions, who considers it as any response of the teacher which clearly transforms, critically mentions to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance (Hernandez, E. & Reyes, 2012).

Corrective feedback is a response which the teacher aims to correct the student's wrong utterance. The incorrect statement can involve of grammatical errors, meaning errors or inappropriate use of lexical items.

According to Ellis et al. (2006), corrective feedback is a response to a learner's wrong utterance by: i) demonstrating where the error has occurred; ii) providing the right structure of the erroneous statement; or, iii) providing metalinguistic information explaining the nature of the error, or any combination of these (Rahimi & Vahid Dastjerdi, 2012).

Considering these explanations provided by specialists, it can be understood that corrective feedback is a response given by the teacher to eliminate errors made by the students or learners in producing the target language (Sa'adah, 2019).Although all these definitions involve the learners' and teacher's presence, and thus, a classroom is considered as a setting where corrective feedback takes place, but this can also happen in naturalistic surroundings where native or non-native speakers can provide it. Amusingly, Sheen (2011) explains that not all corrective feedback occurs because of a communication breakdown; teachers can use it to draw the learners' attention to form even in those situations where they comprehend each other. This means that CF can carry negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form as well. The role and importance of CF in EFL pedagogy can vary from teacher to teacher. This may depend on their previous education and training, teaching experience, and their own experience as language learners, amongst others. CF is a very controversial issue in this regard. Perspectives toward errors have gone from the extreme of Non acceptance and preventing them at all cost, to more permissive perspectives in which errors are seen as part of the language development (Hernandez, E. & Reyes, 2012)

Oral corrective feedback
Corrective feedback, an important part of teaching and learning in various second language settings, has brought the interest of both second language teachers and researchers in linguistics and second language acquisition (SLA). It can be provided either in an oral mode (e.g., teachers' oral responses to learners' spoken errors) or a written mode (e.g., teachers' written comments on students' written assignments). Both oral corrective feedback (OCF) and written corrective feedback have been shown to be effective for learners' second language development.

OCF, defined as teachers' or peers' replies to learners' erroneous statements, which has received wide research attention for the past two decades. Most of the previous research examining the effectiveness of OCF has shown OCF to be helpful and needed for L2 learners' language development (Ha et al., 2021).
Lyster & Ranta (1997) explained six types of corrective feedback. The six types are: 1) *explicit correction*: teachers supply the correct form and clearly indicate that what the students say is incorrect; 2) *recast*: teacher implicitly reformulates all or part of the student's Utterance; 3) *elicitation*: teacher directly elicits a asking questions or by pausing to allow students to complete teacher's utterance, or asking students to reformulate their utterance; 4) metalinguistic feedback: to the well-formedness of the student's utterance; 5) clarification request: teacher's request for further information from a student about a previous utterance; 6) repetition: teacher repeats the student's ill-formed utterance, adjusting intonation to highlight the error (Wang & Zhang, 2011).

Statement of the problem
In second language classroom, teacher usually wants students to speak as much as possible and encourage them to speak with the purpose of improving communication competence. When students speak SL they will also make various errors, and if these errors are not corrected, students will mistake them for correct form and internalize them to their interlanguage system. So, the oral English will be easy to fossilize if teacher do not provide corrective feedback.But over-correction or destitute adjustment strategies can be demotivating for the

learners, particularly when verbal execution is centered, where it may lead to hesitant speakers who may never attempt out a new language or indeed to talk at all. Therefore, in this study, we would like to explore what are the types of oral corrective feedback used in the class and how is the relationship between oral corrective feedbacks toward students' eagerness to communicate.

Research question
By a focus on presented information, the following research question is characterized: To what extent OCF affects the student's eagerness to communicate?

Research hypothesis
OCF doesn't have a significant influence on students' eagerness to communicate.

METHODOLOGY

Participants
The objective of this qualitative study was to explore the implementation of Oral Corrective Feedback by the teacher, Therefor, the study was conducted in a class where the focus was not only on the written form and comprehension but also on their oral production. This study comprised 16 female students, learning English as a foreign language in a language institute in Iran. The student participants' proficiency levels varied from low-intermediate to Advanced. Their English proficiency was assessed by the institute's placement tests, which included reading, writing, grammar, and oral interview components. The ages of the students ranged from 16 to 18 years old.

Instruments
This classroom research has been conducted in a setting consisting of 16 students in a general English program with special emphasis on oral production. The researcher used two kinds of techniques for collecting the data, interview and observation. The researcher made interviews with 4 teachers who were working in the institute. The observation data were obtained through observations by the researcher by joining the English conversation class three times in a week. The researcher made field notes and voice recordings while doing observation in the class.

Procedure
Data collection
Four language instructors with ages from thirty six to fifty were interviewed. Their teaching experiences ranged from fourteen to eighteen years. The interviews were recorded and analyzed considering variables such as value and necessity of corrective feedback, which also followed up by questions including their opinion and perspectives on issues related to language teaching. To ensure and maintain a highly positive interviewing climate, the researcher listened attentively and gave the participants full opportunity to express their opinions freely without interruption or disturbance. Same conditions were given to the process of observation, where the researcher observed the classroom activities without interrupting the teaching and learning process.

Data analysis
1: As an English teacher, what do you think about Oral Corrective Feedback?
Teacher A: It is a significant tool that could always be used to solve problems in any classroom, an essential skill that every classroom teacher should practice and perform properly.

Teacher B: Any language learning process involves oral errors. Oral corrective feedback has a central role in learning, as it highlights these mistakes made by a learner, enabling them to eradicate such errors in the future.

Teacher C: a person who lacks oral skills in a certain language cannot communicate effectively. Language tutors are expected to take a central role in ensuring that their classes effectively learn the oral form of different words, where they can use them to communicate.

Teacher D: It is an approach that is commonly used by language teachers to evaluate and reflect on the progress of the learners that contains utterances and pronunciations. It gives insight into how students can eradicate their oral mistakes.

Result: Oral corrective feedback is chosen as a significant tool by teachers, which has an important role in learning where it can highlight the errors or mistakes made by students.

2: What are some approaches you use to improve oral language skills of students?

Teacher A: my method involves the usage of videos, speeches, group work and discussions.

Teacher B: I do my best to encourage them to engage in conversations. The more they are willing to share their words and thoughts, the better they can practice and improve their speaking skills.

Teacher C: Real and authentic materials, such as videos, podcasts and songs. I would also ask them to give a brief presentation about a certain topic.

Teacher D: I like to mention the essential role of games that can be used to play with students in a class. And this is not just for children, but for adult learners as well. Because we all enjoy games, and they can help us learn. English games help to create an educational environment that's positive and relaxed, and when your brain associates English learning with fun, you retain new grammar points and vocabulary even better.

Result: By the usage of authentic materials, games and proper activities, teachers do their best to encourage pupils to engage in conversations. The more they are willing to share their words and thoughts, the better they can practice and improve their speaking skills.

3: Is accuracy more important than fluency in oral language production?

Teacher A: I put more emphasis in developing speaking fluency rather than accuracy during my teaching. As long as students are accurate enough to be understood, then building fluent, confident and competent communicators are more important.

Teacher B: too much focusing on accuracy would unable the student to use the language fluently. Beginning with fluency can lead the student to a good amount of accuracy and then it becomes easier to learn English language.

Teacher C: I don't believe that it is proper to choose one and neglect the other. Students need a balance of fluency and accuracy activities to learn effectively.

Teacher D: I try to plan my lessons in a way that would include both types. Sometimes, I would try accuracy activities after teaching a new lesson, and when the students are comfortable, I can move to fluency-focused activities.

Result: Both of them are important in the process of learning. Too much focusing on one and neglecting the other would enable students to use the language properly**.**

4: Do you think that oral corrective feedback has a negative influence on students' willingness to communicate?

Teacher A: It really depends on the way a teacher is using these strategies. If it is used properly, it wouldn't be an obstacle for students' communicative desires.

@ECRTD-UK: https://www.eajournals.org/

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development -UK

Teacher B: On the contrary, it would give a positive effect. Corrective feedback has a beneficial effect on students' ability in speaking activity. It can develop students' critical thinking and social interaction among students.

Teacher C: students who get corrective feedback from their teacher perform better in the examination. It can enhance students' confidence, self-esteem and also improves their communication skills. I also have to mention that, if the strategies are not used effectively, it can play as an obstacle in the process of learning.

Teacher D: If the students' mistakes or errors are not well addressed by the teacher, those errors will lead to fossilization which can cause damages for future language learning development. This damage has a negative influence on their communicative willingness, as they would feel like they are not ready for it.

Result: The willingness of students to communicate depends on the way a teacher is using oral corrective feedback strategies. If it is used effectively, it can give a positive effect as it has a beneficial effect on students' ability in speaking activity.

In this study the researcher found that in the conversation class, the teacher often used explicit correction as a feedback for the students. Explicit correction happened when the teacher gave both the proper frame and pointed out that the student's expressions were incorrect and in this case, she gave them the right shapes of the errors. At other times, the teacher implicitly reformulated the student's error, or provided the correction, without directly indicating that the student's utterance was incorrect. Clarification request feedback was also used by the teacher in order to correct student's mistakes. In this way, the teacher does not directly correct the students by giving detailed modification, but by questioning them.

There were some students who were nervous to join the conversation at first, as long as the teaching and learning continued, all of them became active in the conversation class. The use of oral corrective feedback did not distract the student's activity or the willingness of the communication in the class. All students stayed active in the class despite the fact that the teacher kept giving corrective feedback in pronunciation, grammar, etc.

DISCUSSION

There were two types of oral corrective feedback frequently used by the teacher in the conversation class, they are: explicit correction and clarification request. Some studies showed that all types of oral corrective feedback were believed to be applied to an equal degree in the class, Dilans (2015) considered recasts to be the most common type used in class. However, in this current study, no recast was found.

It is also found that the teacher's oral corrective feedback gave a positive effect on the students' eagerness to communicate. The teacher insisted that Oral corrective feedback is a significant tool, which has a crucial role in learning, that it can highlight the errors or mistakes made by students. The usage of oral corrective feedback did not disturb the students' activities in the class. In line with this, Eini et al. (2013) says that teacher corrective feedback and peer corrective feedback have a good effect on students' ability in post speaking activity. It can enhance students' critical thinking, learner autonomy and social interaction among students. Ahmad et al. (2013) find that corrective feedback improve students' learning. In the same way, students who get corrective feedback from their teacher perform better in the examination. It can enhance students' self-reliance, confidence and also improves their communication and writing skills.

Techers preferred to use many authentic materials in order to engage students in the learning process, also to involve them in learning the English language skills and to demonstrate their skills in and outside the classrooms. They are frequently adopted in teaching the English language using real life situations. This goes in line with what Tajibayev (2016) explained about authentic materials, where the teachers can use them as additional material to develop the overall skills of the learners' learning.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of oral corrective feedback has a positive effect on the students' eagerness to communicate. The findings show that, teachers used two sorts of oral corrective feedback: Explicit correction and clarification request were the types of oral corrective feedback found in this study. The most dominant type of oral corrective feedback used by the teacher in the conversation class was explicit correction. The study also reveals that by the usage of authentic materials, games and proper activities, teachers can encourage pupils to engage in conversations. The more pupils are willing to share their words and thoughts, the better they can practice and improve their speaking skills, and when the teacher's oral corrective feedback was given to these utterances it did not cause students' refusal to communicate in the conversation class.

Conclusion as a closing, it can be inferred that oral corrective feedback is vital for learning process and should be applied in the class. It is an approach that can be used by language teachers to evaluate and reflect on the progress of the learners that contains utterances and pronunciations. It gives insight into how students can eradicate their oral mistakes and errors, can also be useful for students' linguistic enhancement.

References

Amara, N. (2015). Exploring the use of WordPress in a literature lesson based on ASSURE Model. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, *5*(3), 79–90. https://www.tojned.net/journals/tojned/volumes/tojned-volume06-i01.pdf#page=54

ErdoÄŸan, V. (2005). Contribution of error analysis to foreign language teaching. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğiitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *1*(2), 261–270. http://research.iaun.ac.ir/pd/shafiee-nahrkhalaji/pdfs/HomeWork_5173.pdf

Ha, X. Van, Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: A teaching and learning perspective. *Heliyon*, *7*(7), e07550. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550

Hernandez, E. & Reyes, M. (2012). Teachers ' Perceptions About Oral Corrective Feedback and Their Practice in EFL Classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 14*(2), 63–75. http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=169224635005

Jing, H., Xiaodong, H., & Yu, L. (2016). Error Correction in Oral Classroom English Teaching. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(12), 98. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n12p98

Park, H. (2010). Teachers ' and Learners ' Preferences for Error Correction. *Seoul Women's University*.

Rahimi, A., & Vahid Dastjerdi, H. (2012). Impact of immediate and delayed error correction on EFL learners' oral production: CAF. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *3*(1), 45–54. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2012.03.01.45

Sa'adah, L. (2019). Oral Corrective Feedback: Exploring The Relationship Between Teacher's Strategy and Student's Willingness to Communicate. *JSSH (Jurnal Sains Sosial Dan Humaniora)*, *2*(2), 251. https://doi.org/10.30595/jssh.v2i2.2953

Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2). https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203836507.ch36

Wang, B., & Zhang, F. (2011). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. *1*(5).