

ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENT'S WRITING IN SECONDARY EFL CLASSROOM

Dina Syarifah Rosana

English Education, English Department, Faculty of Language and Art, State University of Surabaya
dinasyarifahrosana@gmail.com

Abstract

Language teaching and learning requires to provide student an alternative to improve their learning and minimize the errors, thus it is needed for teacher to give corrective feedback to the learners in spoken or written production. The current study focused on describing corrective feedback on spoken form on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom. The researcher also described the types of oral corrective feedback that given by the teacher and student's responses towards corrective feedback orally. Basic interpretative study research design is used and the subject of the study were 36 EFL student in one of secondary Indonesian classroom. The researcher used two instruments which were field notes and video recording as the supplementary instrument to answer the first two research questions followed by two other instruments to answer the last research question, they were questionnaire and interview. The result showed that the teacher gave oral corrective feedback to correct student's error on writing using two types, namely clarification request and metalinguistic feedback. In addition, the students were also interested in receiving feedback orally to assist them to improve their learning process.

Keywords: oral corrective feedback, student's writing, secondary EFL classroom.

Abstrak

Pengajaran dan pembelajaran Bahasa mengharuskan siswa memberikan alternatif untuk meningkatkan pembelajaran mereka dan meminimalkan kesalahan, oleh karena itu diperlukan bagi guru untuk memberikan umpan balik korektif kepada pelajar dalam produksi lisan dan tulisan. Penelitian saat ini berfokus pada penggambaran umpan balik korektif lisan pada tulisan siswa di kelas menengah EFL. Peneliti juga menggambarkan jenis umpan balik korektif lisan yang diberikan oleh guru serta tanggapan siswa terhadap umpan balik korektif lisan. Desain penelitian yang digunakan peneliti adalah studi interpretatif dasar dan subjek penelitian adalah 36 siswa EFL di salah satu kelas sekolah menengah Indonesia. Peneliti menggunakan dua instrumen yaitu catatan lapangan dan rekaman video sebagai instrumen pelengkap untuk menjawab dua pertanyaan pertama diikuti oleh dua instrumen lainnya untuk menjawab pertanyaan terakhir, yaitu kuesioner dan wawancara. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa guru memberikan umpan balik korektif lisan untuk mengoreksi kesalahan siswa dalam menulis menggunakan dua jenis, yaitu permintaan klarifikasi dan umpan balik metalinguistik. Selain itu, para siswa juga tertarik untuk menerima umpan balik secara lisan untuk membantu mereka meningkatkan proses pembelajaran.

Kata Kunci: umpan balik korektif, tulisan siswa, sekolah menengah EFL.

1. INTRODUCTION

In language learning, especially English, it is common for student to make error. According to Bitchener (2007), error should be responded positively because it shows student's current performance and it assists students to improve their ability in language learning. For this reason, Bitchener believes that feedback is used as a compass to guide student's improvement of error and becomes vital element in teaching and learning process. Another statement is that feedback is a combination between information and instruction which later forms a new instruction (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). The errors which are often made by

learner are grammatical use (Liu & Brown, 2015). Liu and Brown (2015) also stated that in making errors, there are several factors. Individual learner factors include ages, student's anxiety toward language and learner's background beliefs and so on. (Ellis, 2010). Besides language teaching and learning, feedback is also used for testing learner (Lipko-Speed, Dunlosky, & Rawson, 2014). Ahangari (2011) added that feedback includes content-focused feedback and form-focused feedback.

Feedback covers two form namely written feedback and oral feedback (Sobhani & Tayebipour, 2015). Sheen (2010) explained written and oral feedback is different According to Cameron (2001), oral corrective feedback is feedback which is delivered orally. It

opposed Suryoputro (2016) who defined oral corrective feedback as a feedback to correct student's error in oral or spoken form. In addition, Ross (1991) argued that written feedback is mostly confusing since 1) teacher often gives confusing and unnecessary comments onto student's essay 2) student often misunderstand about the written comment because it is not directly explained 3) teacher's feedback on student's essay in written form is often associated with an overall better essay than the language structure, grammar and any other single aspect 4) student often ignore teacher's written feedback and lead to lack of guidelines in correcting error and 5) student primary interest lies onto the scores, not teacher's comment. Writing is the process of putting ideas into paper (Retno, 2018) and Sobhani (2015) argued that writing is the hardest skill among four language skill beside listening, reading and speaking. Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorized seven different kinds of oral corrective feedback, such as *paralinguistic signal*, *recast*, *explicit correction*, *elicitation*, *metalinguistic feedback*, *repetition and clarification request*.

Therefore, the current study formulates three research problems as follows 1) How is oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom 2) What kinds of oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom and 3) What are student's responses toward given by teacher on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom. The study aims 1) to describe oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom 2) to describe kinds of oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom and 3) to describe student's responses toward oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom.

The previous study which is conducted by Rassaei (2015) discovered that students with different level of proficiency are benefit from oral corrective feedback implementation toward the error in writing. Moreover, Mulliner and Tucker (2017) added that verbal feedback or face to face communication benefits student more than only writing the feedback on student's essay without any explanation. Moreover, Sheen (2010) discovered that different kinds of oral corrective feedback benefit the student in writing production. He revealed that oral recast and oral metalinguistic feedback brought positive effect toward student's output. Therefore, the current study is expected to give useful information for the researcher, the EFL teacher, the student and the future researcher.

METHODOLOGY

The current study used basic interpretative study research design. Firstly, the research intended to describe oral corrective feedback given by teacher to correct student's writing in secondary EFL classroom. Secondly, the study described the kinds of oral corrective feedback given by teacher to correct student's writing in secondary EFL classroom. Lastly, since the study also described the student's response toward oral corrective feedback given by teacher to correct student's writing in secondary EFL classroom, descriptive qualitative will be the most suitable research design for this study.

The study was conducted in one class of tenth grader in EFL setting. It was because the teacher has already used oral corrective feedback to correct student's error on writing so that it eased the researcher. The researcher started to conduct the research in the early term of 2020. One meeting stayed for 90 minutes and there was one meeting for each week.

The subject was 36 students of tenth EFL grader in one class of local school in Indonesia. Due to some absences, the participating student was only 32 students because the other 4 students were absence during the observation, questionnaire distribution and interview session. In addition, the researcher will not interview all students, but only 7 students in one class considering student's score in writing recount text and teacher's recommendation. The researcher classified 7 students into three level, they were high, middle and low student. The student who were interviewed by the researcher were two high level students, three middle level students and two low level students.

To answer the first and second research problem, the researcher observed the classroom and the instrument which the researcher used were field notes and video recording. For the next research problem, the researcher collected the data about student's response toward oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing by distributing student's questionnaire and interviewing 7 students who have been classified by the researcher previously. Thus, the instrument to answer the third research problem were questionnaire and interview.

According to the explanation above, the data which were needed by the researcher to answer the first and second research questions were sentences and oral feedback so that the source of data were field notes and video recording. Meanwhile, to answer the last research question, the data were student's answer of questionnaire and interview toward oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom. After the data were collected, the researcher analyzed the data descriptively.

The researcher analyzed the data using Ary (2010) guideline where there are 3 stages in analyzing data

descriptively, they are 1) familiarizing and organizing where the researcher read and re-read the field notes also watched and re-watched the video recording from three weeks of classroom observation 2) coding and reducing where the researcher wrote teacher and student's conversation in discussing the feedback also student's answer of questionnaire and interview, after that the researcher classified student's answer of questionnaire and interview and the last stage is 3) interpreting and representing where the researcher analyzed student's answer and replay the audio tape to write the transcription. Then, the researcher presented the data descriptively by describing oral corrective feedback on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this part, the researcher presented the data to answer the research questions which are formulated above. The research problems are (1) How is oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom (2) What are the kinds of oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom and (3) What are the student's responses toward oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom.

The data were taken from three different meetings in three weeks on February until March 2020. The first, second and third meeting were focused on classroom observation and oral corrective feedback given by teacher. Meanwhile, the last meeting, the researcher focused on collecting data to answer the last research problem about student's response toward oral corrective feedback on student's writing using questionnaire and interview.

According to the research problems stated above, this part is divided into three sub-parts. The first sub-part presents the result of observation about oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing in X-5 MIA of SMAN 1 Boyolangu Tulungagung to the answer of the first research problem. The second part describes the result observation about the kinds of oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing in X-5 MIA of SMAN 1 Boyolangu Tulungagung to answer the second research problem and the last part presents the data about students' responses regarding oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing to answer the third research problem.

Oral Corrective Feedback on Student's Writing

The researcher presented the result of observations in secondary EFL classroom. According to the explanation above, the researcher used two instruments to answer the

first two research question which were field notes and video recording. The observation was held three times in X-5 MIA SMAN 1 Boyolangu on February 10th, February 24th and March 2nd 2020. The class was absent once due to school's anniversary on February 17th 2020. Thus, the section discussed the three parts for the first observation, second observation and third observation.

The first observation was held on February 10th 2020 in X-5 MIA SMAN 1 Boyolangu Tulungagung. The teacher greeted the student as she entered the class. The teacher reviewed the last topic on the previous meeting to recall student's memory about recount text. The teacher has explained about recount text previously dealing with the text, language features and structure of the text. The teacher also already gave the student the task to write recount text. After recalling the memory for the student, the teacher started to call the students to correct the error in the text. The teacher called the student randomly in groups and each group consists of five students. For the first observation, the teacher called 2 groups which consist of 10 students in total. The teacher and the students made a circle and started the conference session of feedback. The conference session lasted for 2 minutes for each student and 20 minutes approximately to finish 2 groups.

The second observation was held in X-5 MIA SMAN 1 Boyolangu on Monday, February 24th 2020. The class was absent on the previous week, February 17th 2020 due to school's anniversary. The class began at 8 AM and ended at 9 AM because there was no flag ceremony. The teacher gave greeting to the students and checked student's attendance. The teacher then called the students who have not received feedback. The other students who were not called were asked to look for the video in YouTube about recount text. The teacher called four groups which consist of five students each, the total number of students who received feedback was 20 students for the second observation. The teacher spent 2 minutes approximately for one student's feedback and it spent approximately 10 minutes for one group. In total, the teacher delivered the feedback in 40 minutes approximately.

The last observation was held in X-5 MIA SMAN 1 Boyolangu on Monday, March 2nd 2020. The class began at 9 AM and ended at 10 AM. The teacher gave greeting to the students and checked student's attendance. The teacher then called the rest of two students who have not received feedback. The other students who were not called were asked to continue watching the video on YouTube from the last meeting. The total number of students who received feedback was two students for the third observation. The teacher spent 2 minutes

approximately for one student's feedback and it spent approximately 4 minutes for both of students.

According to the three times of observations, it can be concluded that the teacher corrected student's error in writing recount text using different types for each meeting. For the first observation, the teacher called 2 groups for 5 students in each, in total the teacher corrected 10 students. The teacher gave the instruction in the early meeting. The students then paid attention to their own papers and focused onto the errors. The teacher started to deliver the feedback to the student one by one in group and it enabled the other students to listen to the explanation. The other students also asked or gave information to the student dealing with the error and the way they should correct the error. It allowed the students to exchange the information and led to peer correction for the next improvement of error.

Since the teacher created conducive classroom situation through the communication between the teacher and the students, it also led the students to have more depth understanding of the lesson. By communicating, the students had clear and depth knowledge dealing with the current lesson and it could be very beneficial for the next lesson.

The communication in the classroom also created a good contact between the teacher and the students. The teacher could emphasize the students onto self-correction for the next error and prevented the same error to be made twice. It could be used as student's guidelines in writing and prevented the error from themselves.

From the explanation, we can conclude that the teacher used oral corrective feedback to correct student's error in writing and it is in line with Cameron (2001) who defined oral corrective feedback as a feedback which is given orally. The current study enables the other students in one group to listen to student's feedback and the teacher talked to one student in purpose to implicitly address the feedback to others. It supports Bitchener's statement (2016) which claimed that oral feedback was commonly directed to individual and implicitly addressed for other students as hearer. The teacher mostly correct student's grammar since it became the most frequent error which was made by student and supported by Liu's previous study (2015). Liu cited that grammar is the most frequent error which was made by student continued with mechanical and lexical or vocabulary.

According to the result of the current study, the teacher mostly used metalinguistic feedback less often than clarification request. It is in line with the study of Ahangari & Amirzadeh which revealed that metalinguistic feedback was more frequently used for proficient and advanced level of students. (Ahangari & Amirzadeh, 2011)

The previous study has mentioned the example and it indicated that explicit correction is effective (Suryoputro, 2016). However, the result of the current study is in opposite with Suryoputro (2016) since he was exploring about oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking. Mulliner (2017) argued that it is better to have face to face meeting to deliver the feedback than only write it down to paper. On the other hand, Sheen (2010) discovered that oral metalinguistic feedback and oral recast were the most frequent kinds of oral corrective feedback which were used to correct student's error in writing. It can be assumed that oral metalinguistic feedback is effective since the current research also found out that the teacher used metalinguistic feedback to deliver the feedback to the students.

According to Nicol and Macfarlane (2016) good feedback includes:

1. Clarification of information toward good performance
2. Improvement of self-assessment
3. Information with high quality delivery toward the students dealing with their learning
4. Encouragement for teacher and peer conversation during learning
5. Motivational encouragement
6. The availability of opportunity to recognize the different between the current and target performance

From the points listed above, the first point tells about the importance of clarification of errors to students. From classroom observation it showed that the teacher often used clarification request type of oral feedback to make the students aware of the error so that the next step was that the students could do self-correction for the next errors. It also supports the second point. The teacher clarified the error such as "*Harusnya?*" "*I am?*" and any other clarification question to the students.

On the other hand, the third point demands the teacher to provide the students with high quality information dealing with the error and the way to correct the error. It is line with teacher's usage of metalinguistic feedback kind of oral corrective feedback. The teacher also addressed self-correction for the next error to the students as a purpose in doing metalinguistic feedback type of oral feedback. "*Dirubah ke bentuk lampau*", "*Setelah to harusnya V1 bukan V2*" and "*Kata kerjanya kurang tepat*".

To sum up, the teacher used different kinds of oral corrective feedback is supporting the previous studies (Ahangari & Amirzadeh, 2011; Lyster & Ranta, 2017; Pan, 2015). Clarification request and metalinguistic feedback were kinds of oral corrective feedback used by the teacher to correct student's error and it attracts student's interest.

Kinds of Oral Corrective Feedback in Student's Writing

In this part, the researcher presented the result of observations in EFL writing class. The observation was held three times in X-5 MIA SMAN 1 Boyolangu on February 10th, February 24th and March 2nd 2020. The class was absent once due to school's anniversary on February 17th 2020. Thus, this section discussed the three parts for the first observation, second observation and third observation.

Based on the first observation, the teacher corrected the student's error by asking the student to complete the sentence using appropriate linguistic signal. The teacher invited the student's awareness by saying "*Itu kata kerjanya masih bentuk satu. Recount text menggunakan kata kerja bentuk lampau atau bentuk dua*" and "*Were itu untuk subjek you, they, we. Kalau I to be nya sama dengan he, she, it*". From the explanation above it can be concluded that the teacher used **metalinguistic feedback** type to correct student's error in writing recount text for two groups which consisted of 10 students in the first observation.

Based on the second observation, the teacher corrected the student's error by asking clarification from the student about the correct answer. The teacher invited the student's awareness by asking such "*Then, apa yang betul?*" "*Go?*" "*I was very enjoyed?*" and "*Play?*". From the explanation it can be concluded that the teacher used **clarification request** type to correct student's error in writing recount text for 4 groups which consisted of 20 students in the second observation.

For the last observation, the teacher corrected the error by asking the student to complete the sentence using appropriate linguistic signal. The teacher invited the student's awareness by saying "*Setelah to harus diikuti V1 bukan V2.*" and "*Itu kata kerjanya belum bentuk lampau. Dirubah ke bentuk lampau*". From the explanation it can be concluded that the teacher used **metalinguistic feedback** type to correct student's error in writing recount text for one group which consisted the rest of 2 students.

For writing recount text in the classroom, the teacher called the students in groups which consisted of 5 students for each group and there were 7 groups in total, but the last group only consisted of the rest of two students who have not received any feedback in the previous meeting. The teacher chose the students randomly. The teacher also allowed the other students to listen to the other student's feedback from the teacher either to correct their friend's error by asking or giving information. Mostly, the teacher corrected the error about grammar because it was the error which was made the

most by the students in writing. By classifying oral corrective feedback types, the types of oral corrective feedback used in writing class shown in the following table:

Table 4.1. Kinds of Oral Corrective Feedback on Student's Writing

Kinds of oral CF	Number of group	Number of student (frequency)
Clarification request	4	20
Metalinguistic feedback	3	12
Total	7	32

From the Table 1 shown above, it can be concluded that **clarification request** and **metalinguistic feedback** were the kinds of oral corrective feedback used to correct the errors in writing recount text.

Clarification request was frequently used by the teacher to correct student's error. The teacher called the group of students and gave them the instruction. The instruction asked the student to pay attention to each error and to think dealing with the correct answer.

The teacher also used **metalinguistic feedback** to deliver the feedback to the students. **Metalinguistic feedback** has frequency for 12 in assisting the student to understand more about the errors. **Metalinguistic feedback**, as it explained above, enabled the students to complete the incorrect word or sentence by themselves.

From the result shown above, it can be summed that the teacher used two kinds of oral corrective feedback namely **clarification request** and **metalinguistic feedback**. **Clarification request** was used by the teacher more often than **metalinguistic feedback** followed by **metalinguistic feedback**.

1.1 Student's Responses towards Oral Corrective Feedback on Student's Writing

In this sub-part, the researcher presents the result of questionnaire and the result of student's interview in EFL writing class. Based on the first chapter, the researcher used questionnaire and interview to answer the third research question. The questionnaire was distributed in X-5 MIA SMAN 1 Boyolangu on March 9th 2020. Thus, the section discussed two parts for the result of questionnaire and the result of student's interview.

The number of participating students who filled up the questionnaire was 32 students. It was in accordance with the number of participating students who got oral corrective feedback from the teacher. The questionnaire was open questionnaire which focused on oral corrective

feedback on student's writing. The result of questionnaire can be classified to the table below:

Table 4.2. Questionnaire of student's response toward oral corrective feedback

Aspect	Number of student (frequency)	
	Yes	No
Difficulties in writing	14	18
Interest in writing	24	8
Difficulties in receiving feedback	7	25
Interest in receiving feedback	30	2
Effectiveness	32	0
Usefulness	32	0

From the table 2 shown above, it can be inferred that all students were beneficial and it was effective to assist student's writing in recount text. The students were also interested in receiving feedback and only 2 students were less interested even though some of them had difficulties of it. The number of students who had difficulties in writing was fewer than those who had not but still most of them were interested in writing and only one of fourth who were less interested.

The number of participating students who were interviewed was 7 students. The students were chosen from range of scores high, medium and low level considering their English scores and teacher's recommendation. The researcher analyzed the result adopted from Ary (2010). The result of interview is shown from the table below:

Table 4.3. The result of student's interview

Aspect	Sub aspect	Number of student (frequency)
Difficulties in writing	Grammar	6
	Vocabulary	3
	Looking for ideas	2
	Structure	1
	Translating process	1
Difficulties in understanding oral CF		3
Effectiveness of oral CF		7
Usefulness of oral CF		7
Interest toward oral CF		7

Based on the table shown above, all of the students were interested and assisted by oral corrective feedback even though most of them were having difficulties in grammar, vocabulary, looking for the ideas and few of them were hardly translating Indonesia into English also the structure of the sentence. Almost half of the students also mentioned that they faced difficulties in such as listening to teacher's feedback in English, understanding the instruction of feedback and receiving feedback because of other student's distraction.

However, the result of student's interview, based on the analysis of interview and audio recording, highlighted that oral corrective feedback was successful to assist student's writing in some points:

- Oral corrective feedback is more understandable than the written one
- Oral corrective feedback gives more information to students about the errors and the way they should correct the error
- Oral corrective feedback is assisting students and used as a guideline in writing
- Oral corrective feedback is more attracting than the written one because it created a less anxiety student's classroom

According to the first chapter, the researcher used questionnaire and interview to answer the third research problem. The questionnaire distribution and the interview session was held in X-5 MIA SMAN 1 Boyolangu on March 9th, 2020.

First, the result of student's response from the questionnaire and interview indicated that most of students were prefer to have oral corrective feedback to correct their errors in writing. It was only two among the students who felt less satisfied toward oral feedback and they stated that it was because of friend's distraction and the unclear instruction from the teacher. The student mentioned "*Awalnya suka gak paham sama instruksinya tapi lama-lama jadi paham kak*". Still, they admitted that they were interested in receiving feedback orally and said "*Menarik kak, seru*" and "*Asik gitu kak bareng temen-temen koreksinya*". All of the students from high to low score range confessed that they were benefit from oral corrective feedback implementation and it strengthen the study of Rassaei (2015) which revealed that both high to low student are benefit from oral corrective feedback.

Although the number of student who were interested in writing was much more than those who were not, one another student from low score students stated that written if often confusing and it was also stated previously by Ross. (Ross, 1991) The student mentioned "*Ya, kayak lebih paham kayak orangnya langsung bilanganya ke saya salahnya itu apa kan kalo menyeluruh belum tentu salahku sama seperti anak yang dimaksud bu*

Dwi". It could be caused by the written feedback contained many language features and that was why it was easier to communicate the error orally (Li, 2014). Bitchener (2014) added that written might cause different student's interpretation of the feedback. Sheen (2010) also argued that different types will have different impact for student's written production.

Ross (1991) explained the reality in giving written feedback that 1) teacher often delivers misunderstanding comments 2) students often got misunderstanding about feedback as it's not explained directly by the deliver 3) teachers' feedback about content of the text is often linked only to the better quality of writing than the feedback about language usage and grammar to enable a better input 4) students often ignore teachers' written feedback and it resulted to student's lack of guideline 5) students' primary concern is their marks on a given composition and not teacher comments.

Second, they thought that the feedback was effective enough to assist them in writing, especially recount text. The learner said that oral feedback was effective in the way it could be as a guideline to compare the target linguistic performance with the current linguistic performance (Cameron, 2001). It was in opposite with Roothoof (2014) who stated that oral corrective feedback was ineffective and less attentive. The learner said "*Ya kan jadi tahu yang bener gimana terus "oh iya kemarin aku salah yang bagian ini" jadi bisa dibenerin gitu*" as Liu and Brown (2015) have claimed before that oral feedback brought more positive effects to students and led them to correct the errors effectively. Cameron (2001) mentioned that giving constructive feedback to learner is helpful. The target implementation process is learner understand target performance after that the learner see the different between current and target performance. Then, learner reaches the gap between target and current performance.

Third, the current research highlighted that oral feedback provided more information about the error and how should student correct the error. It assisted the students who had less background knowledge in writing and the difficulty to write even though still there were more students who did not. They revealed such "*Susah cari idenya trus vocabnya kak*", "*Paling sulitnya pas nata katanya kak*" and "*Ngerubah dari bahasa indonesia ke inggris itu kak sulit*". It was also in line with Bitchener's study (2016) who mentioned that oral feedback gave more information than the written feedback.

CONCLUSION

According to the results and the discussion that are presented in chapter four, it can be concluded that the

teacher corrected error on student's writing orally in X-5 MIA SMAN 1 Boyolangu. The teacher used two different kind of oral corrective feedback namely clarification request and metalinguistic feedback as it is proven by the result of three times of observation in X-5 MIA SMAN 1 Boyolangu.

Moreover, it is revealed from the result from student's questionnaire and interview that the students in X-5 MIA SMAN 1 Boyolangu were also satisfied toward the oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing. The reason was because it provided clear information to the students about the errors and how the students should correct the error as it is stated in Chapter II that oral corrective feedback allowed the communication between the students and the teacher. It also created less anxiety student's classroom situation and led to attract student's interest in receiving feedback. It can be found from student's answer in questionnaire and student's interview that showed in result section and mentioned that all students from low to high score level were benefit from oral corrective feedback.

All in all, it is proven that oral corrective feedback can be used as an alternative way to correct student's error on student's writing. It is because delivering feedback orally could assist student's improvement toward error and allow better communication between the teacher and the students. Also, the students were interested in receiving feedback to assist them in writing another text.

SUGGESTION

Since the results of the current study was focusing on the oral corrective feedback provided by teacher on student's writing in secondary EFL classroom, there are several suggestions that the researcher wants to explain to the future researchers and to the EFL teachers and senior high school students.

First, it is better for the future researchers to explore more and compare about the oral corrective feedback in speaking and writing and use the current study as basic guideline to conduct the research. Moreover, since this study only focused onto the oral corrective feedback, kinds of oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing and the student responses toward oral corrective feedback given by teacher on student's writing, future researchers can explore more detailed research focusing on the other text which is corrected using oral corrective feedback.

Secondly, the other EFL teachers from both senior and junior high school are suggested to start considering oral corrective feedback to correct EFL writing besides only EFL speaking as the alternative way. From the outcome of the third research problems, it is

indicated that students were more interested in receiving feedback orally and in groups with the other students. Thus, the other EFL teachers should start to consider oral corrective feedback to attract student's interest to correct error on student's writing.

Thirdly, according to the result of the study, since the teacher discussed the feedback in spoken, the researcher suggests all EFL students to start studying about listening to people speaking in English as the basic skill in receiving feedback from the teacher. It is because there were some students revealed that they faced difficulties in receiving feedback because of the vocabulary

REFERENCES

- Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011). Exploring the teachers' use of spoken corrective feedback in teaching Iranian EFL learners at different levels of proficiency. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1859–1868.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.435>
- Ary, D., Jacob, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education*.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, R. D. (2007). *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000250>
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching Language to Young Learners.pdf*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 335–349.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990544>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Lipko-Speed, A., Dunlosky, J., & Rawson, K. A. (2014). ARTICLE IN PRESS G Model Does testing with feedback help grade-school children learn key concepts in science? *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2014.04.002>
- Liu, Q., & Brown, D. (2015). Methodological synthesis of research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 66–81.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.011>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms, 37–66.
- Mulliner, E., & Tucker, M. (2017). Feedback on feedback practice: perceptions of students and academics. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(2), 266–288.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1103365>
- Rassaei, E. (2015). Oral corrective feedback, foreign language anxiety and L2 development. *System*, 49, 98–109.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.01.002>
- Retno, D. (2018). Jurnal Dampak Mengajar Menulis Melalui Corrective Feedback pada Kelas Sebelas di MA Arrahmah Kediri Tahun Ajaran 2016 / 2017 The Effect of Teaching Writing Through Corrective Feedback at the Eleven Grade Students of MA Arrahmah Kediri in Academic Year 201, 02(08).
- Ross, B. (1991). Developmental Students' Processing of Teacher Feedback in Composition Instruction. *RESEAIChIn Developmental Educationdir*, 8(5).
- Sheen, Y. (2010). Introduction: The role of oral and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 169–179.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990489>
- Sobhani, M., & Tayebipour, F. (2015). 12.The Effects of Oral vs. Written Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' Essay Writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(8), 1601–1611.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0508.09>
- Suryoputro, G. (2016). EFL Students' Responses on Oral Corrective Feedbacks and Uptakes in Speaking Class. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(5), 73–80.