THE EXPRESSIONS OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK
IN SECOND LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

Sulistyani

Abstract

This study aims to review the teacher's expressions which constitute teacher's corrective feedbacks (CFs) in oral production and examine the ways the teachers' expression revealing teacher's CFs. The data are in the forms of teachers' utterances obtained from four research articles. The result shows that teacher' expressions which constitute CFs cover explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic, elicitation, and repetition. While the ways which reveal teacher's CFs are found to be reduction, negation, and expansion. The area to be corrected commonly involves phonological, grammatical, and lexical errors. So, it can be concluded that in a second language classroom instruction, teacher's CFs expressions lead learners' erroneous utterances to be resolved because by saying "Sorry?" (clarification request), a teacher implicitly asks a language learner to reformulate what he has just been said which is usually called repair. Thus, it implies that the teacher's CFs expressions in a second language classroom instruction are facilitative to resolve learners' problematic linguistic accuracy. In Indonesia, where English is used as foreign language, CFs are important to be practiced. Therefore, CF's expressions are necessary to be introduced as a model to practice for the improvement of the linguistic competence especially in English speaking as it is assumed that excellence in speaking is expected to increase Indonesian human capital particularly in global competition and international communication.

Keywords: corrective feedback, second/foreign language classroom

I.   Introduction

Changes in pedagogy particularly in second language classrooms have influenced teacher's attitude towards errors and its treatment. With the emergence of the communicative approach to language teaching in Indonesia where English is a foreign language, less emphasis has been addressed on formal accuracy than was formerly the case, and more important given to the communicative effectiveness (Allwright, & Bailey, 1991). However, language learners' speech usually deviates (to some extent) from the model they are trying to master. The deviations or discrepancies in form have typically been considered as problematic. Influenced by communicative approach many teachers are often more concerned with second language learners ability to convey their ideas, get information, etc., than with their ability to produce grammatically accurate sentences [ibid]. In short, the accomplishment of the communicative goals is more important than perfect well-formed sentences.

There is a general belief, then that teachers cannot leave erroneous utterance uncorrected. CFs may be a beneficial

environment because it may provide learners with information about the ungrammaticality of their utterances (Ortega, 2009). In the second language acquisition (SLA) literature, error refers to any indications of learners' non-target-like use of the target language (Gass, 1997; Schachter, 1991). Relating with this, evaluative feedback can be useful in facilitating the progression of their skills toward more correct and coherent language use. There seems to be a general agreement that form-focused instruction is effective, at least in the short term (Ellis, 1997; Lightbown, 1998). A study also suggests that negative feedback is valuable in drawing learner's attention to some problematic aspects of their inter-language (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In fact, many learners may require help in "noticing" (Schmidt, 1990) their mistakes.

In formal classroom instruction of second or foreign languages, the role of teacher's reaction to learner's errors has been seen as a legitimate object of a number of inquiries into classroom teaching and learning. Over the past two decades, a fruitful and often controversial line of research has evolved on teacher's CFs and its impact on SLA. There are two different types of acquisition: (1) acquisition as the internalization of new forms and (2) acquisition as an increase in control over forms that have already been internalized (Ellis, 1997). Researchers (Mackey et al., 2000; Panova & Lyster, 2002) who support

self-generated repairs place an emphasis on the role of CFs which increases learners' control over already existing knowledge which corresponds to the second dimension. Thus, such repairs are considered important since learners' pushed-output (Swain, 1995) is deemed to play a role in increasing the learners' control over an already existing internal system. In contrast, it is suggested that in order for CFs to contribute to language target (L2) acquisition, the feedback should lead to the first dimension (i.e., acquisition of genuine new forms) (Long et al., 1998). In conclusion, teacher's CFs can be functional in two ways referring to both dimensions.

Regarding with the importance of CFs in classroom instructions, teachers have significant role in guiding language learners to maximize their correct use of the target language. However, many language teachers assume that accuracy can be achieved through Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) that they ignore error correction. Besides, many teachers are not familiar with the ways of correcting learners' errors that they do not make use of CFs strategies appropriately. In addition, many teachers do not give enough opportunities to repair their errors, as it is believed that correcting their own error help learners stimulate internalization. Since CFs are believed to affect the acquisition, teachers should manage the way they express their language in such a way to effectively facilitate

leaners to learn and solve their language problems. In order that the language learners enjoy learning and obtain better result language teachers are urged to skillfully make use various ways to make learners understand the input. This is because many language teachers are not familiar with the ways how to correct learners' errors so that learners' errors are untouched. In fact, teachers talk in classroom instruction occupies 60 to 70 % of classroom talks. Therefore, it is expected that teachers make use of their talks, especially in form-focused instruction, also for correcting learners' errors.

Referring to the issues, it is interesting to conduct a research on this area. The consideration of observing this area is that in a second or foreign classroom, teachers' expressions become the main source of language exposure. Teachers' expressions can be the model of oral language use and they also function as a means to get the message. Thus, teachers' expressions in second or foreign language classroom determine how learning takes place. One of the examples is that there should be comprehensible input which normally comes from negotiation of meaning between the teacher and students.

While others have focused on the impact and effectiveness of CFs, this study investigate the expressions that constitute teacher's CFs encompassing explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic, elicitation, and repetition and the ways the teachers' expressions reveal teacher's CFs. The significant contribution of this research is specifically to help EFL teachers. First, this will provide models of CFs expressions which they can use in their classrooms and consequently enhance leaners' communication ability in order that they can communicate well, not only fluent but also accurate. This is especially important because excellence in speaking can increase Indonesian human capital particularly in global competition and international communication. This can also become a means for language teachers to reflect their classroom practices.

II. Method

The data of this descriptive study are in the forms of teachers' utterances including words, phrases, and sentences which are obtained from four similar previous studies around teacher's feedbacks focusing on effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction (Lyster, 2002), the patterns of corrective feedback, and uptake in an adult ESL classroom (Panova & Lyster, 2002), the implication of error correction on classroom teaching (Tedick & Gortari,), and the comparative effectiveness of recasts and prompts in second language classrooms (Ding, 2012). This study will describe teachers' utterances in giving correction to learners' errors in phonological, lexical, and grammatical errors to answer the questions: 1)

What expressions constitute teachers' CFs? and 2) How are CFs revealed in the teachers' expressions? The data will be analyzed based on the classification of teacher's CFs type of explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic clue, elicitation, and repetition (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) as defined as follows:

1. *Explicit correction* refers to the explicit provision of the correct form by the teacher as teacher clearly indicates that students have made an incorrect form.

2. *Recast refers to* teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance minus the error.

3. *Clarification Request* are phrases such as "Pardon me" and "I don't understand" used to indicate that the student's message has either been misunderstood or ill formed.

4. *Metalinguistic feedbacks is a* type of CFs which contains metalinguistic comments, information, or questions that raise the learners' awareness of the erroneous utterances, without teacher's explicit provision of correct form.

5. *Elicitation* refers to techniques used by teachers to elicit the correct form from the students in which the teachers strategically pause to allow students to complete the utterance or "fill in the blanks" or reformulate their utterances.

6. *Repetition* is a type of CFs in which teacher repeats, in isolation, the students' errors, usually adjusting their intonations to highlight the errors.

The second focus is, then, analyzing by using model of CFs features such as emphasis, reduction, negation, and expansion or unaltered repetition (Chaudron, 1977) and explaining.

III. Result

Analysis of the teachers' utterances provides L2 teachers with insight into a range of linguistic choices represented in CFs types. In the transcripts analyzed, various strategies or types such as explicit correction, recast, clarification request metalinguistic, elicitation, and repetition are in the following table.

Table 3.1

Feedback Types and Features in the Teacher's Expressions

Feedback types	Examples of teacher expressions	Features of teacher corrective feedback
Explicit Correction	*"not beer. Pear" "No, the day before yesterday" "And the crane. We say crane."*	Negation, reduction
Recast	*"You stood in the first row?" "Yeah, good. Dangerous. You remember? Safe and dangerous. "In the book, yes. Both . . . in the book" "Maple sap. Good"*	Expansion

Clarification Request	*"Pardon?"* *"I'm sorry?"* *"Now?"*	
Metalinguistics	*"Use past tense consistently" "Oh, but that's in French" "Do we say the elephant?" "Not her card".*	Expansion, negation
Elicitation	*"Once upon a time, there... , New Ecosse. I like that"* *"I'm sure they'd love that. Nova . . .?"* *"What's the word?", "It's very . . .?"* *"Attention. In . . . ? "* *"So a stream of perfume, we'll call that a...?".*	Expansion, reduction
Repetition	*"Mrs Jones travel a lot last year?",* *"Comma?"* *"Chocolate?"* *"The giraffe?"*	Reduction

1. Teachers' Expressions constituting CFs

During the teaching learning process, teachers are expected to pay attention to the learners' oral production and give necessary guidance on error correction in sufficient way. The following expressions are conveyed by teachers when correcting learners' errors:

a. Explicit correction. In the expressions, teachers provide correct forms explicitly when ill-formed utterances are produced by a learner. This encourages learners to notice that there is something wrong with their utterances. (see Ding, 2012: 84 -85)

b. Recast. In the expressions, teachers reformulate learners' utterances which are considered incorrect without repeating the errors. Through this reformulation technique learners will realize that there is a difference between what they have uttered and what their teachers uttered. [ibid]

c. Clarification request. In the expressions, the teachers also request a clarification to the learners on what they have just said showing that the learners' utterances need to be repaired. (see Lyster, 2002: 405)

d. Metalinguistic feedback. When the teachers found that the learners' utterances are not the targetlike, the teachers give information, question, or comment on it to lead the leaners reformulate their utterances by themselves. [ibid]

e. Elicitation. Teachers often repeat the learners' sentences with incomplete sentences expecting the learners to complete them with the words or may be phrases which have been reformulated themselves. Teachers are also found to ask questions that lead the learners to express something in a correct form. (see Panova & Lyster, 2002: 584)

f. Repetition. In the teachers' expressions, repetitions of learners' utterances also occur in the form of question directing learners to repeat their utterances with the correct form. (see Panova & Lyster, 2002: 484 - 485)

The teachers' expressions described above obviously direct the learners to repair or modify what is deviant form the target norms into the correct forms.

2. The Ways Teachers' Expressions Reveal Corrective Feedback.

Teacher expressions in classroom instruction should show some features in a way teachers facilitate language learners to resolve their problematic utterances. Learners should be guided to notice the gap and understand how to be correct. Repair should be reached either by teachers or learners themselves. The followings are the description of the ways teachers lead their learners to correct their errors. Among four models of feedback features, this study only describes three of them which are mostly used in the data.

a. Reduction. The way teachers express CF among other ways is through reducing a learner's utterance for example when the teacher says "And the crane" instead of repeating the learner's whole utterance "[...] the coyote, the bison and the cr...crane." (see (Tedick & Gortari,), p.3)

b. Expansion. In the expressions, a teacher is also found to expand his speech such as "Yeah, good. Dangerous. You remember? Safe and dangerous. If you walk in the streets, you . . . ". These expressions can ensure the leaner to use the correct form that matches the context as well. (see Panova & Lyster, 2002: 583)

c. Negation. In the expressions, disapproving what a leaner has said in terms of his pronunciation errors by saying is another (e.g. "Not beer. Pear) when the learner makes a pronunciation error. The teacher uses the same way to correct a leaner's error on vocabulary. (see Ding, 2012: 84, Panova & Lyster, 2002: 584)

The way teacher expresses corrective feedback can also be realized through emphasis that is when the teacher give emphasis on a certain words which is not found in the study. Thus, based on the data, a teacher reduction is found in explicit correction, elicitation, and repetition, expansion is found in recast, clarification request, metalinguistic, and elicitation, and negation is found in explicit correction as well as metalinguistic.

IV. Discussion

To discuss the results about the teacher expressions of CFs, the two research questions are restated. The first research question asks what teacher expressions constitute corrective feedbacks. It is found that there are various

expressions which are used by teachers to correct learners' errors. These expressions represent the six types of CF (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) namely explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic, elicitation, and repetition.

Teachers' expressions in the data are found to guide learners or constituting CFs toward the construction of well-formed utterances. Explicit correction for example is used by teachers to correct grammar, pronunciation as well as vocabulary. They are used when the teachers notice the learners' ill-formed utterances by providing the correct forms. The expressions conveyed by the teachers in the data cover both explicit and implicit error corrections. In the data analysis of classroom transcripts it is also found that teachers can use each type of CF to correct pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. Thus, any errors of those three aspects can be corrected through various types of feedbacks. In conclusion, CF can be considered as the single most relevant way for L2 learners to figure out what is not possible in the target language (Ortega, 2009). It is supported by the idea from the cognitive-interactionist researchers that CF is beneficial for learning.

The second research question asks about ways the teacher expressions reveal CF. The data reveal that teachers correct learners' errors through some ways such as: reduction, negation, and expansion. In the teacher expressions those features help teachers to guide learners to reach the correction of errors.

Through reduction for example learners are able to notice the gap existing in their utterances because the expression of reduction indicates part of the learner utterances which need repair. The CF features in the teachers' expressions are useful to show learners that they have made errors. Overall, through such kind of process, language learners will benefit from CFs as they make them retrieve the target language form especially in implicit correction and at least they know what is correct and what is not. In other words, CFs in a classroom as a learning environment is obviously beneficial as it may provide learners with information about the ungrammaticality of their utterances (Ortega, 2009).

V. Conclusion

From what has been discussed above, it is demonstrated that teachers use various expressions of corrective feedbacks to facilitate learners to use language accurately during meaning and form negotiation. These expressions constitute teachers' effort to manage learners to get opportunities learn and experience a correct form of a target language use. Therefore, CF can be considered as the heart of teaching learning process in a second or foreign language classroom. The ways the teachers handle their learners' verbal behavior in order that learners can notice the gap between the target form and the non-target forms also vary such as reduction, negation, and expansion. These all are meant to be a tool to let learners to produce the accurate language forms.

With this study language teachers can take advantage of understanding the importance of CF in second or foreign language classrooms. This study may provide teachers in L2 classrooms with pedagogical advice to use corrective feedbacks which maximize language learning based on the learners' characteristics. They can also benefit from the model of the expressions obtained from the data which shows the way how various expressions work in helping learners to cope with language problems. However, this research is only a base research and not comprehensive which must be deepened through further research. This study is relatively limited to certain corrective feedback expressions with limited data. Further studies with similar topic are suggested to observe the teacher/student cooperation to deal with face saving strategies which is not under this study.

References

Allwright, D., Bailey, K.M. 1991. *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chaudron, C. 1977. A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors, *Language Learning, 27,* 29-46.

Ding, T. 2012. The comparative effectiveness of recast and prompts in second language classrooms. *Journal of Cambridge Studies,* 7, 2.

Ellis, R. 1997. *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gass, S. 1997. Input, interaction, and the second language learner. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lightbown, P. 1998. The importance of timing in focus on form, In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.). Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition, *Cambridge University Press,* 177196.

Long, M.H., S. Inagaki, L. Ortega. 1998. The Role of Implicit Negative Feedback in SLA: Models and Recasts in Japanese and Spanish, *The Modern Language Journal,* 82, 357-371.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. 1997. Corrective feedback and learner uptake, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 19, 37-66.

Lyster, R. 2002. Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction, *Cambridge University Press,* 26, 399-432.

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. 2000. How do learners perceive interactional feedback?, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 22, 471-497.

Ortega, D. 2009. Understanding Second language acquisition. London: Hodder Education.

Panova, I., Lyster, R. 2002. Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly,* 36, 4, 573 - 595.

Schachter, J. 1991. Corrective feedback in historical perspective, *Second Language Research,7,* 89102.

Schmidt, R. W. 1990. The role of consciousness in second language learning, *Applied Linguistics,* 11, 128-158.

Swain, M. 1995. Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), Principles and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson, *Oxford University Pres,* (pp.125-144).

Tedick, D & Gortari, B. (1998). Research on error Correction and Implications for Classroom Teaching, *ACIE Newsletter*, Center for advanced research on language acquisition, 1.