

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Oral Corrective Feedback in Language Education: Voices from Students

In the field of language teaching, oral corrective feedback (OCF) acts as an undeniable contribution to language development. OCF occurs in ELT and supervision context. As OCF contributes in language education, students who held mis-learnt generalizations beforehand can receive corrections to achieve a positive outcome later on (Öztürk, 2016). The issue of OCF in ELT context has been discussed in the past decade. Lyster and Ranta (1997) determine six different types of OCF; recast, explicit correction, clarification request, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation.

Table 2.1. Types of OCF Lyster and Ranta (1997)

No.	Types	Description
1.	Recast	The teacher's reformulates of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error. A teacher implicitly reformulates all or part of the student's utterance when errors are found.
2.	Explicit Correction	The explicit provision of the correct form. As the teacher provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the student had made was incorrect.
3.	Clarification Request	Indicated to students either that their utterance has been misunderstood by the teacher or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way and that a repetition or a reformulation is required.
4.	Repetition	The teacher's repetition, in isolation, of the student's erroneous utterance. In most cases, teachers adjust their intonation so as to highlight the error.

5. Metalinguistic Feedback	Comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form.
6. Elicitation	Elicitation at least three techniques that teachers use to directly elicit the correct form from the student. First, teachers elicit completion of their own utterance by strategically pausing to allow students to fill in the blank as it were. Second, teachers use questions to elicit correct forms. Third, teachers occasionally ask students to reformulate their utterance

In addition, research showed that OCF in second language classrooms and the various types of OCF are first identified, and the results of research revealing OCF frequency across instructional contexts are presented and its preferences are reviewed, revealing a tendency for learners to prefer receiving OCF more than teachers feel they should provide it (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013). Manifestly, since L2 learners feel that OCF is more necessary, it is perceived as particularly valuable feedback to the students, and they can take more benefit from coded direct feedback for the optimal retrieval (Steen-Utheim & Hopfenbeck, 2018). Thus, OCF is more beneficial for students in receiving feedback in the process of learning, and distribution is also felt important for students in the context of language education because it makes students easier to receive feedback.

Another study carried out by Öztürk (2016) focuses on the types of oral corrective feedback (OCF), their distribution, and the reasons of error ignorance which were the foci in speaking class. In the study, Turkish teachers in EFL classroom sometimes ignore oral errors due to tiredness of correcting the error

or paying attention not to affect students negatively and some other reasons. Along with the issue above, the explicit correction on corrective feedback was the most widely used as it generated recasts and clarification of limitation and errors on teaching in EFL classroom. Next is a study by Panova and Lyster (2002) who examine the range and types of OCF used by the teacher and their relationship to learner uptake and immediate repair of error. In line with it, the effect of OCF is most probably focused on making autonomous learners where teacher put expectancy for student take their own perceptions of teacher feedback (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). However, sometimes the errors the students made are implicitly reformulated, teachers ought to reiterate a few times more up until the students grasp what errors they just made. Next, teachers clarify whether or not student's utterance misunderstood, and repetition is required to minimize it (Tavakoli & Zarrinabadi, 2016).

There are also a number of studies indicating that OCF gives a number of benefits in language learning. Mahmoud & Deen, (2018) pointed out that OCF has the impact to includes more than teacher's correction of students' oral errors. It involves learners' response to correction and the setting in which the process of OCF is provided. In addition, OCF has positive, durable effects on students' ability to produce more accurate language (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013). Several studies found that OCF can develop students' grammatical (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; and Park, 2012) and oral competence (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mulyani, 2009; and Park, 2012, as cited in Devi, 2014). It can also lead the students to be more engaged in the process of learning. Furthermore, OCF also help students

find solutions for their problems to enhance their research and writing competence. During sessions, students can express their concerns and ideas and get clarification of written comments they may have misunderstood (Abdulkhaleq, Hoon, Abdullah, 2013). Thus, OCF might play crucially for the students in particular students' competencies development.

The researcher acquires solutions to overcome the issues during conducting research proposal. Verily, in conducting the research, the researcher faced issues to select a prompt idea for the interest of research, the concept of research, the flow, and the proper dictions or grammar choice of academic writing. Through OCF, the researcher reflects on revisions given by the supervisor for the research proposal to be in convenient with supervisor's guidelines. This supervisory feedback can be an important input that meaningfully contributes to undergraduate students' achievement of administering and reporting their work in the form of research proposal.

Finally, the researcher finds out that the previous studies only focus on investigating the oral corrective feedback (OCF) implemented in classroom context such as in speaking class. Meanwhile, in this study, researcher discusses OCF in an undergraduate supervision context. It is given by a supervisor to a supervisee during the process of a research proposal supervision investigated. Being supervised face-to-face with supervisor gets the supervisees enlightened faster as they can directly ask where the error is, straightforwardly ask for repetition if they cannot really catch what the supervisor just implied, and by all

means they are fairly guided. Therefore, the researcher believes that the issue of OCF implemented in research proposal supervision needs to be researched.

B. OCF in an Undergraduate Supervision

Undergraduate supervision is likely an apprenticeship, where novice supervisees delve in a span with the supervisor as an expert who provides guidance. There will be a dynamic relationship that evolves over time, moving from expert/novice to a more cooperative relationship (Morton, Storch, & Thompson, 2014). Supervisors tend to dominate the conversations with their students during supervision. The presence of supervision for undergraduate students is based on students' lack of qualitative methods teaching, the concerns about the risks of demanding qualitative projects, and fluency in the English language and that might be a heightened gap to propose a research proposal (Wiggins, Gordon-Finlayson, Becker, & Sullivan, 2015). Emilsson and Johnsson (2014) emphasized supervision as a professional activity and the development of professional knowledge centred on relations.

Undergraduate students need to perceive guidance to cope with challenging difficulties in conducting a research proposal. A challenge for supervisors is encouraging students to develop as independent learners, while simultaneously providing a tangible and situated assistance on the development of students' writing in timely completion manner (Voelkel, Mello & Varga-Atkins, 2016). Supervisors are essentially aware of and able to efficiently transfer often implicit disciplinary norms and conventions to have the students consider the points that must be followed in writing a research proposal, and of

course through a knowledge negotiation gradually (Marbouti, Garcia, Diefes-Dux, Cardella, & Cardella, 2017). In the undergraduate level, the negotiation of knowledge in supervisor-student relationship is as a bridge for students to set off broad ideas, encounter undergraduate students to level standards of writing, and then plan steps to bind with the inputs from supervisor to complete the research work (Stanford, Rocheleau, Smith, & Mohan, 2015). Hence, the supervision in undergraduate level that is at the fundamental of collaborative model informs the discussion of feedback (Abdulkhaleq, et al., 2013; Morton, et al., 2014).

Feedback is one of the important elements in learning activities. Cobbold, Kofie, Bordoh, and Eshun (2015) explained that feedback can simply be regarded as information a teacher or learner receives on how he or she is doing in his/her efforts to reach the desired goal. Additionally, feedback is negotiating and monitoring of reactions to increase commitment and motivation (Konings, Popa, Gerken, Giesbers, Rienties, Vleuten, & Merrienboer, 2015). Scholars explain that feedbacks are typed into verbal or non-verbal, formal or informal, one-shot or on-going (Morton, Storch & Thompson, 2014). For instance, verbal feedback is feedback given by the teachers orally, such as correcting ideas, giving a comment, and judgement to the supervisee and non-verbal one is the feedback given in written form. Therefore, the researcher concluded that feedback was very much needed in learning especially when the supervision process of writing research proposals is needed to improve their works, supported by the study of Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh (2016).

In the present, feedback in an undergraduate supervision refers to any information given by a supervisor to the supervisee about how the supervisee, he or she composes a research proposal. Furthermore, in supervision, oral corrective feedback (OCF) mostly happened. OCF can also be useful during the supervision process for composing research proposal because supervisees directly interact or having face to face supervising with the supervisor (Abiddin & West, 2007, as cited in Abdulkhaleq & Abdullah, 2013). Therefore, to examine this research in supervision context, OCF has been adopted from the concept theory the six types OCF framed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), which are;

Table 2.2. Types of OCF in supervision context, Lyster and Ranta (1997)

No.	Types	Description
1.	Recast	Supervisors reformulates of all or part of the supervisee errors. A supervisor implicitly reformulates all or part of the supervisee mistakes when errors (e.g. content ideas, lexical grammaring, coherence, references) are found.
2.	Explicit Correction	The explicit provision of the correct form. As the supervisor provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the student had made was incorrect.
3.	Clarification Request	Indicated to supervisee either that their errors have been misunderstood by the supervisor or that the error (e.g. content ideas, lexical grammaring, coherence, references) is ill-formed in some way and that a repetition or a reformulation is required.
4.	Repetition	The supervisor repetition, in isolation, of the supervisee errors. In most cases, teachers adjust their intonation so as to highlight the errors (e.g. content ideas, lexical grammaring, coherence, references).
5.	Metalinguistic Feedback	Comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the supervisee work, without explicitly providing the correct form.
6.	Elicitation	Elicitation at least three techniques that supervisors use to directly elicit the correct

form from the supervisee. First, supervisors elicit completion of their own errors (e.g. content ideas, lexical grammaring, coherence, references) by strategically pausing to allow supervisee to fill in the blank as it were. Second, supervisors use questions to elicit correct forms. Third, supervisors occasionally ask supervisee to reformulate their errors (e.g. content ideas, lexical grammaring, coherence, references).

OCF can be effective if the undergraduate students understand the supervisor's intentions. During supervision, the supervisor allows the students to negotiate meaning to develop ideas for research proposal. As a result, by reflecting on what the supervisors suggested, the undergraduate students can identify the strengths and the weaknesses of their research proposal. Having a good work of research proposal for the undergraduate student in the supervision process becomes a requirement to get the work accepted. It can be done by giving the undergraduate student pivotal OCF on their research proposal. Moreover, talking to supervisors help undergraduate students in resolve dilemmas and improve their ideas (Abiddin & West, 2007 as cited in Abdulkhaleq, Hoon, Abdullah, 2013). As a consequent, the undergraduate student can have a better work of a research proposal by getting the oral corrective feedback (OCF) from the supervisor.