

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a review of the literature that forms the basis of the present study. It includes some underlying theories and previous research, which are detailed below.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Oral Corrective Feedback

In the field of language teaching, corrective feedback acts as an undeniable contributor to language development. Lyster and Ranta (1997) describe corrective feedback as a means of providing learners with feedback that addresses their errors in language production. When delivered orally, it is referred to as oral corrective feedback. Nassaji and Kartchava (2021) defined oral corrective feedback as any signal that a learner's utterance may be erroneous in some way. Thus, oral corrective feedback can be defined as a form of feedback given as a response to learners' error utterances that aims to guide learners toward more accurate and appropriate language use.

The theoretical foundation of oral corrective feedback in second language acquisition is rooted in several key theories, including Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (1990), Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1996), and Swain's Output Hypothesis (1985) (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2021). The noticing hypothesis posits that learners must first notice new language forms to acquire them. Corrective feedback facilitates this process by highlighting the gaps between learners' interlanguage and correct language use. The interaction hypothesis further supports this by suggesting that language acquisition is enhanced through interaction. During the interaction, corrective feedback provides negative evidence, which enables learners to modify their language use. Furthermore, the output hypothesis, which emphasizes the importance of language production in learning, argues that corrective feedback helps learners refine their language skills by encouraging more accurate language forms. These theories underline the crucial role of corrective feedback in facilitating awareness, interaction, and accurate language production in second language learning.

Moreover, plenty of empirical research proves the effectiveness of corrective feedback. Some researchers have conducted a meta-analysis (Brown, 2016; Li, 2010; Li & Vuono, 2019; Lyster & Saito, 2010) as well as a review of the literature (Ellis, 2017; Rahman & Singh, 2020) to synthesize the results of the studies regarding corrective feedback. In general, it has been obtained that corrective feedback does have significant pedagogical implications and contributions to L2 development.

Therefore, it can be concluded that oral corrective feedback is significant in language learning for several reasons. First, it provides learners with information on what is unacceptable in the target language. Second, it gives learners the opportunity to get input and practice output in the target language. Third, it has been proven to be beneficial in target language development by the researchers. Thus, this emphasizes the need for research in the field of corrective feedback, especially the one that aims to look for a way to enhance the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback so that learners can benefit from it.

2.1.1.1 Oral Corrective Feedback Types

There are different ways to provide oral corrective feedback. Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorized oral corrective feedback strategies into six types, namely explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. In the following study, Panova and Lyster (2002) defined a new type of oral corrective feedback, which is translation. Lyster also found translation in the previous study, but because there were only a few, it was identified as recast. Further, Ranta and Lyster (2007) classified these types of oral corrective feedback into reformulation and prompt. Below are detailed descriptions for each type.

A. Reformulation

Reformulation strategies are those that rephrase the learner's erroneous utterance into a correct form. Three types of oral corrective feedback belong to this category, namely explicit correction, recast, and translation.

1) Recasts

A recast is a form of implicit corrective feedback that subtly reformulates or expands an incorrect or incomplete student's utterance.

E.g. S: The first person makes the pants up, and the second is just careful

T: Okay, the second one walks really carefully

2) Translation

Translation can be seen as a feedback move when it follows a student's spontaneous use of their first language (L1). In the previous study, Lyster & Ranta combined it with recast because of their similar function of reformulating nontarget learner utterances. However, there is a relevant difference between the two. Recast responds to an ill-formed utterance in the target language (L2), while translation responds to a well-formed utterance in the L1.

E.g. T: Why don't you like it (durian)?

S: Gak suka baunya

T: I don't like the smell

3) Explicit correction

Explicit correction clearly signals to the student that an error exists in their previous utterance. Unlike recasts and translations, explicit correction clearly indicates that the utterance was incorrect and provides the correct form.

E.g. S: Having a fat /feit/ body is a dream of a lot of women.

T: Be careful. It's not /feit/. No, /fæt/.

B. Prompt

Unlike reformulation, prompt does not provide the correct form but rather attempts to stimulate the learners to correct their original erroneous output. Metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, clarification requests, and repetition belong to this category.

4) Clarification requests.

The purpose of a clarification request is to prompt the student to reformulate or repeat their ill-formed utterance. In this type of feedback, the teacher might use phrases such as "I'm sorry?", "Pardon?" or "What do you mean by X?"

E.g. S: I /tɪŋk/ (wrong pronunciation)

T: I what?

S: I /tɪŋk/ (still wrong)

T: /θɪŋk/

5) Metalinguistic feedback

Metalinguistic feedback consists of comments, information, or questions regarding the accuracy of the student's utterance without directly providing the correct form.

E.g. S: I took a bath around eight fifteen o'clock.

T: Okay, when you say o'clock, exactly jamnya 8 tepat. Don't put o'clock. Eight fifteen o'clock, for example. All right?

6) Elicitation

Elicitation is another corrective technique that stimulates the learner to self-correct. Lyster and Ranta (1997) identified three approaches for prompting the correct form from students. a) the teacher pauses and allows the student to complete the utterance, b) teachers ask questions to elicit the correct forms, and c) the teacher requests a reformulation of the ill-formed utterance.

E.g. T: What did you have for suhoor?

S: Nugget

T: Uhum. I had...

S: I had nugget

7) Repetition

In a repetition, the teacher repeats the incorrect part of the student's utterance. Typically, teachers adjust their intonation to emphasize the error.

E.g. S: Yesterday I visit My Grandma

T: Visit?

S: Visited

2.1.1.2 Oral Corrective Feedback Timing

Research has identified two types of oral corrective feedback timing, namely immediate and delayed feedback (Rahman & Singh, 2020). Immediate feedback refers to correcting immediately after the learner's error. This type of feedback is often used to address errors in real time to help learners correct their mistakes quickly and improve their performance. On the other hand, delayed

feedback involves waiting for a later point in the lesson or even the next lesson to correct. This type of feedback is often used to allow learners to continue speaking without interruption and then provide feedback later to help them reflect on their errors.

The effectiveness of immediate and delayed oral corrective feedback depends on various factors, including the type of error, the learner's proficiency level, and the learning context. Santamaría (2023) found that learners expect to receive immediate oral corrective feedback. They prefer immediate oral corrective feedback for all types of errors, including grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation, as they consider it important for their learning process. However, another study conducted by Öztürk (2023) found that both immediate and delayed oral corrective feedback led to a decrease in pronunciation errors. However, the mean difference and effect size were larger for the group that received delayed feedback. Thus, while immediate oral corrective feedback can be effective in some contexts, delayed oral corrective feedback can also be beneficial. The choice between immediate and delayed oral corrective feedback should be based on the learners' specific needs and learning goals.

2.1.2 Students' Perceptions and Preferences of Oral Corrective Feedback

Students' perceptions and preferences are a field of corrective feedback research that has gained much attention. A plethora of research has been conducted in recent years to investigate this issue in various settings (Gutiérrez et al., 2020; Halim et al., 2021; Laeli & Setiawan, 2019; Muslem et al., 2021; Sakiroglu, 2020; Syakira & Nur, 2022; Wiboolyasarini et al., 2020). It is believed that understanding students' perceptions and preferences is necessary for corrective feedback to be effective.

These studies revealed that, in general, students have positive attitudes towards oral corrective feedback. In Gutiérrez et al. (2020), students reported that they have seen progress in their linguistic and communicative skills because of corrective feedback. In Syakira and Nur, (2022), students acknowledged that corrective feedback significantly helped them produce accurate responses to the

teacher's utterance. Meanwhile, Halim et al. (2021) found that learners consider corrective feedback as a motivating tool in the learning process.

In terms of preferences towards corrective feedback, the studies show mixed results. Regarding the types of correction, students in Gutiérrez et al. (2020) preferred metalinguistic feedback, recasts, and explicit correction. In Laeli and Setiawan (2019), the students favored repetition and explicit correction, whereas in Wiboolyasarini et al. (2020), the students strongly preferred explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation. Concerning the timing of the correction, Sakiroglu (2020) found that most students preferred to be corrected after completing their turn, while Halim et al. (2021) reported that students were receptive to both immediate correction and correction after completing their utterances.

These studies' results indicate that the answer to how students perceive oral corrective feedback and how they want to be corrected cannot be generalized. As stated by Yu et al. (2018), student perspectives about and responses to oral feedback are influenced by individual (working memory, proficiency level, emotion, and cultural background) and contextual factors (teacher-student interpersonal relationship, interactional context, and task type). Therefore, as these individual and contextual factors will differ for each class, teachers need to try to understand their own students' perceptions and preferences of oral corrective feedback to enhance the effectiveness of their feedback practices.

2.1.3 Students Preferences and Proficiency Level

Research on oral feedback in relation to students' English proficiency levels has not been very extensive. However, past research has established that students' proficiency levels substantially determine their preferences for oral corrective feedback (Kaivanpanah et al., 2015; Kazemi et al., 2013; Yang, 2016).

Kazemi et al., (2013) and Kaivanpanah et al. (2015) explored the relationship between students' proficiency levels and their preferences for oral corrective feedback in Iranian EFL classrooms using questionnaires. Kazemi et al., (2013) found that while all students strongly supported constant teacher correction,

there was a notable preference for peer correction among elementary (86.7%), intermediate (60%), and advanced (43.4%) students. Kaivanpanah et al. (2015) reported similar proficiency-related differences in feedback preferences, with advanced students favoring various elicitation types of oral corrective feedback and self-correction more than their peers at lower levels. Additionally, Yang (2016) found that while metalinguistic comments were positively received by students at all proficiency levels, intermediate students specifically preferred clarification questions.

The results of these studies revealed that EFL learners of varying proficiency levels demonstrated a strong tendency to have a variety of preferences. Therefore, it is important to conduct the present study to reveal each level of proficiency students' preference for oral corrective feedback. The result will then become a guideline for the teacher to address students' oral errors in the multilevel English conversation class.

2.2 Study of Relevant Research

Some recent studies have examined students' perceptions toward teachers' corrective feedback in EFL classes. Muslem et al. (2021) conducted a study in an English Education Department to investigate students' perceptions of their lecturers' oral corrective feedback in their speaking classes. They used both qualitative and quantitative methods to analyze the data collected by questionnaire and interview. The results showed that the students perceived lecturers' oral corrective feedback as an important part of language learning and it helped improve their speaking abilities. Syakira and Nur (2022) also conducted a similar study but with a different context. The study was conducted in a one-to-one class in an informal education setting. Involving two learners and one teacher as participants, the data was collected through semi-structured interviews and observation. The findings indicated that the learners felt facilitated in responding to the teacher's utterances, as the teacher's oral corrective feedback was effective in guiding them toward greater accuracy or helping them recognize their errors. Furthermore, Gutiérrez et al. (2020) conducted the study in an EFL pedagogy program at a private

university. This study was a mixed design study and thus employed two instruments of data collection, namely questionnaire and focus group discussion. The result indicated that students have a positive perception of the corrective feedback provision practice for their learning goals. Concerning its effectiveness, students mentioned progress in their linguistic and communicative skills.

In terms of investigating students' preferences concerning their English proficiency level, two recent studies (Wiboolyasarin et al., 2022; Wiboolyasarin et al., 2023) have shed light on this area. Wiboolyasarin et al., (2022) conducted a quantitative study to examine how EFL Thai learners preferred corrective feedback strategies and whether there were any significant differences in preferences across learners' language proficiency levels. A closed-ended questionnaire was given to 418 Thai EFL learners and the study found significant differences in students' preferences. It was found that advanced learners were less likely to favor metalinguistic feedback compared to beginner or intermediate learners. Similarly, students with lower proficiency levels generally viewed public feedback positively, but not the advanced level group. Moreover, Wiboolyasarin et al. (2023) conducted a study to investigate learners' preferences regarding ten commonly used types of oral corrective feedback. Specifically, it examined whether learners' preferences are influenced by four learner variables including proficiency level, first language, foreign language classroom anxiety, and foreign language enjoyment. This study employed quantitative method and collected the data through a questionnaire that was filled out by 288 university students from various settings. The results indicated that four oral corrective feedback techniques (disregard, peer correction, recast, and private feedback) had significant interactions with their proficiency level. Advanced-level students favored more oral corrective feedback approaches than intermediate- and beginner-level students.

As displayed above, there is a limited number of studies exploring students' perceptions in multilevel English conversation class settings. Therefore, the present study was conducted to address this gap. Since most studies on students' perceptions employed interview techniques to collect data, given their effectiveness in exploring participants' views, this study also used this technique.

Furthermore, studies about students' preferences across proficiency levels are also very limited. Thus, more studies are needed to prove if proficiency level could be a mediating factor in preferences for oral corrective feedback. Moreover, most studies in this field rely on quantitative approaches like questionnaires, which makes it difficult to fully understand the reasons behind students' preferences. This limitation was also noted by Wiboolyasarin et al., (2022) who recommended further research to incorporate additional methods, particularly interviews, to gain a deeper insight into learners' true thoughts and underlying reasons regarding their preferences for certain oral corrective feedback strategies. Thus, addressing these gaps will enhance our understanding of how proficiency levels affect students' preferences for oral corrective feedback and improve feedback practices in multilevel English conversation classes.