AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHER'S ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENT'S SPEAKING PERFORMANCE AT SMPN 1 BUKITTINGGI

Regina Henner and Aryuliva Adnan
English Department
Faculty of Languages and Arts
State University of Padang
email: reginahenner14@gmail.com

Abstract

This descriptive research aimed to find out how do English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi give oral corrective feedback on student's speaking performance, the ways of teacher giving oral corrective feedback and which types of oral corrective feedback are appropriate and inappropriate. The sample of this research was 4 English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi. The sample was taken by using total sampling. The techniques of data collection were observation and interview. The instruments used were observation checklist, field note, and audio recording. The data was analyzed based on the theory proposed by Ellis (2009). Based on the findings, it was found that English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi gave oral corrective feedback in different ways; direct and indirect. Each teacher also had different reasons about the ways they gave oral corrective feedback. Moreover, it was found that each teacher also gave different types of oral corrective feedback. After analyzing the data from the observation and the interview, the types of oral corrective feedback which are appropriate to the students are repetition, explicit correction, and paralinguistic signal. Meanwhile, the types of oral corrective feedback which are inappropriate to the students are recast and clarification request.

Key words: Oral corrective feedback, speaking performance, appropriate oral corrective feedback types, inappropriate oral corrective feedback types

A. INTRODUCTION

Speaking is one of the most important skills in English language learning. Boonkit (2010) states that speaking is one of the four macro skills that is important for successful correspondence in language especially for non-native English. This is because speaking is a way to express what we want to convey to others. In speaking, students should be able to deliver the information to the listener orally. Meanwhile, student oral production to transfer the information to the listener is called performance. Through the students' performance, teacher is able to asses their knowledge and ability in speaking.

In students speaking performance, students might not perform without producing error (Utami and Aswandi, 2017). It means that while doing their

performance, the students are not always good. They make error during the performance. According to Herwanto (2013), students are anxious and making error because of the environment (friends or teacher), fear of making mistake, student's bad perception of English. The errors they make are usually in grammar, pronunciation, and lexical.

When students perform and make errors, teacher corrected those errors. It is called corrective feedback. Ellis (2009, p.9) states that corrective feedback is feedback that a teacher provides on a student's utterance that contains an error. Lightbown and Spada (as cited in Noorezam 2015, p.1) describe corrective feedback as "an indication to a learner that his or her use of the target language is incorrect". While we know that oral has the similar meaning with spoken, so oral corrective feedback means the spoken feedback that a teacher provides on a student's utterance that contains an error. According to Noorezam (2015) there are two ways of corrective feedback that teacher can give when the students make errors namely direct and indirect. Direct corrective feedback means the teacher corrects students' utterance while they are making an error. Meanwhile, indirect corrective feedback means the teacher corrects students' utterance after the students finish the utterance. Subsequently, Ellis (2009, p.9) mentions that there are six types of oral corrective feedback; recast, repetition, clarification request, explicit correction, elicitation, and paralinguistic signal.

Based on the researcher pre-observation in English classes at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi, the researcher found several phenomena related to the teacher's oral corrective feedback. First, oral corrective feedback is given by the English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi in two ways, direct and indirect. Since the teachers gave corrective feedback in a direct or indirect ways, each teacher has different reason for giving it. The researcher observed two teachers in pre-observation session. The first teacher often gave direct feedback by correcting directly the students errors while doing speaking performance. Sometimes the teacher asked students to repeat the incorrect sentences or utterances they have made before giving feedback. On the other hand, the second teacher often gave indirect feedbacks by correcting students' errors after the students finish their speaking performance. After given feedback by the teacher, sometimes students paid attention on their errors and directly correct them and sometimes students look confused. These are some of the reasons for each teacher in providing oral corrective feedback in different ways.

Next, the teachers gave feedback to the students in different types of oral corrective feedback. The first teacher gave feedback by using recast corrective feedback. The teacher gave oral corrective feedback by changed the student's error sentences or utterances and focused on one word. The teacher also corrected student's error utterances by focusing on the grammatical modification. Unfortunately, after the teacher corrected the student's error utterance by using this type, the students look confused and there were no further responses from the students. Meanwhile, the second teacher gave feedback by using explicit correction feedback. The teacher gave oral corrective feedback by identified student's errors and provided the correction. After the teacher corrected the

student's error utterances by using this type, the students paid attention to the errors and tried to correct them.

It can be identified that different types of oral corrective feedback brought the different responds of the students. Some of the students who got the appropriate feedback, they noticed the errors and paid attention to them. Therefore, the students knew how to correct the errors. Otherwise, the students who did not get the appropriate feedback, they did not notice the errors and did not pay attention to them. So, the students had no idea how to correct the errors. Sometimes they kept making the same error. This is supported by Oliver (as cited in Lyster, Saito, and Sato, 2013) who say that there are students responses to corrective feedback such as: respond, ignore, no chance (to respond), and continue. When the students give responds by correcting the error after giving corrective feedback, it means the corrective feedback is appropriate to the students. Meanwhile, when the students ignore and continue the utterance without correcting the error, it means the corrective feedback is not appropriate to the student because the student indicate that they do not understand with the corrective feedback given.

Therefore, this study is aimed to investigate the way English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi give oral corrective feedback. Moreover, this study also aimed to investigate the types of oral corrective feedback given by the English teachers, which types are appropriate and inappropriate. In addition, the study is aimed to investigate the reasons of the ways and the types given.

B. RESEARCH METHOD
1. Research Design

The present study employed a classroom research design with qualitative data collection tools. According to Kumar (2011), descriptive research describes a situation, problem, phenomenon, service or programmed, or provides information about the current condition of the society these days, or describes the thought or perception toward the issue. Therefore, the researcher used descriptive research to describe the types of teacher's oral corrective feedback on student's speaking performance.

2. Participants

The population of this study was four English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi because the researcher found the research problem from the pre-observation of English teachers at the school. The name of the teachers are Teacher A, Teacher B, Teacher C, and Teacher D. Gay and Airasian (2000, p.281) say that selected participant must be able to provide the desire information and willing to provide it to the researcher. Those four teachers were able to provide the desire information because they teach at the same level of students.

The sample of this study had taken by using total sampling because the the number of population is small. Sugiyono (2014, p.85) says that total sampling is the technique of determining samples where the number of sample is equal with the number of population. He explains that total sampling is used when the number of population is small. Based on the explanation, the researcher took all the English teachers at SMP 1 as the sample of the study. The researcher took four English teachers at SMP 1 to get the desired data.

3. Data Collection

Technique of data collection of this study included observation and interview. Kumar (2011) said that observation is a purposeful, systematic and selective way of watching and listening to an interaction or phenomenon as it takes place. In other word, the researcher has to watch and listen systematically the interaction or phenomenon as it takes place. The researcher chose observation as the technique of data collection because the researcher had to collect the data based on the actual situation in order to observe what types of teacher's oral corrective feedback used by the English teacher at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi. In the observation, the researcher used some instruments such as observation checklist, field note, and audio recorder.

The researcher observed each teacher for three times of class hours. While observing the teachers, the researcher recorded by using the audio recorder. The researcher observed teacher's oral corrective feedback on student's speaking performance by using the indicator prepared in the observation checklist. In addition, the researcher started to write in the field note about the additional information taken in the observation. The audio recording of each observation was transcript to get the underlying data.

In the final stage, the researcher interviewed each teacher based on the data from the observation. Burns (as cited in Kumar, 2011) reveals that 'an interview is an oral interchange, often face to face, though the telephone may be used, in which an interviewer tries to elicit information, beliefs or opinions from another person'. The researcher chose to use interview as one of the technique because the researcher need the information from teacher's opinion about oral corrective feedback on student's speaking performance. In addition, Kumar (2011) mentions that interview are classified into two categories; unstructured interviews and structured interviews. In this study, the researcher used the unstructured interview. So, the researcher asked the questions based on what the researcher observe in the observation session related to the ways and the types of teacher's oral corrective feedback. In addition, the reasons of giving the ways and the types are included. Then, the researcher made the transcription of the interview to analyze the data.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Research Finding

1.1 The types of teacher's oral corrective feedback on the observation

From the observation, the researcher found the types of oral corrective feedback used by English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi. Those types of oral corrective feedback were explicit correction, clarification request, repetition, paralinguistic signal, and recast.

Explicit Correction

The most often type used by English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi was explicit correction. In explicit correction, teacher identifies the student's error utterance and provides correction. Based on the observation, all the English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi used this type. The teachers were teacher A, teacher B, teacher C, and teacher D. The teachers used this type for forty-nine

times. From the data of the observation, it showed that the student understood with this type of corrective feedback. It can conclude that explicit correction was appropriate to the students.

From the observation, teacher B also used explicit correction to correct the student's error utterance in speaking performance. After the teacher gave the correction by using this type, the student noticed the error and directly changed into the correct utterance. It showed that the students understood with this type of corrective feedback. It can conclude that explicit correction was appropriate to the students.

From the observation of teacher C, the teacher used explicit correction to correct the student's error utterance in speaking performance. It showed that the student understood with the feedback given by the teacher and corrected the error. It means that this type of oral corrective feedback was appropriate to the student.

Next, teacher D also used explicit correction to correct the student's error utterance in speaking performance. The students noticed and corrected the error utterance. It means the students understood with the oral corrective feedback given by the teacher. It can conclude that this type was appropriate to the students.

Clarification Request

The next type used by English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi was clarification request. In clarification request, the teacher indicates that he/she has not understood what the learner said by use word such as "excuse me", "what", "sorry", "pardon me", or "I don't understand". Based on the observation, there was only one teacher who used this type. The teacher was teacher C. The teacher used this type for nine times.

In the observation, the teacher used clarification request to correct the student's error utterance in speaking performance. It can be seen because the teacher indicated that she did not understood what the student said. The teacher used "pardon me" to request the clarification from the student. After that, the student noticed the error and directly corrected the error into the correct utterance. It showed that the student understood with the feedback given by the teacher. From the example, it can conclude that this type of oral corrective feedback was appropriate to the student.

However, when the teacher gave clarification request to another student, the student did not notice the error. From the reading aloud performance in the observation, the teacher also gave clarification request as oral corrective feedback to the student by saying "pardon me?". Unfortunately, the student did not notice the error that he/she had made. The student looked confused and kept making the error until the teacher helped the student with the correct utterance. It means that this type was not appropriate to the students because not all the students understood when the teacher gave this type of oral corrective feedback.

Repetition

The next type used by English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi was repetition. In repetition, the teacher repeats the learner utterance and adjusts intonation to highlight the error. Based on the observation, there were two teachers used repetition. They were teacher B and teacher D. The teachers used this type for four times. In the observation, teacher B used repetition to correct the student's error utterance in speaking performance. In a dialogue, the teacher asked the students how many teachers are in the classroom. Then, the student answered "There are two *teacher* in my class". Then, the teacher gave corrective feedback to the students by repeating the students' error utterance "There are two *TEACHER* in the class misalnya (for example) in front of the class". It can be seen that the teacher repeated students' error utterance and adjusted the intonation to highlight the error. The students got the clue and directly changed the error by saying "Teachers". After the teacher gave the correction, all the students noticed the error and directly changed into the correct utterance. It showed that the students understood with this type of corrective feedback. It can conclude that repetition was appropriate to the students.

Teacher D also used repetition to correct the students' error utterance on their speaking performance. From the observation, the teacher asked the students to tell how to go to the airport. When the whole students told the direction to go to the airport "Go ahead..turn right", one student told a wrong direction "turn left". Then the teacher gave correction by repeated the student's error utterance by saying "turn left?". The teacher adjusted the intonation while saying that to highlight the error. Then the students repeat the correct one by saying "turn right". It showed that the students noticed the error and directly corrected the utterance. It means the students understood with this type. It can conclude that this type was appropriate to the students.

Paralinguistic Signal

The next type used by English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi was paralinguistic signal. In paralinguistic signal, teacher uses a gesture or facial expression to indicate that the student has made an error. Based on the observation, only one teacher used paralinguistic signal. The teacher was teacher B.

In the observation, the teacher used paralinguistic signal to correct the student's error utterance in speaking performance. It can be seen because the teacher used a gesture by using hand like inhaling and exhaling oxygen. After the teacher gave the correction, the student noticed the signal given and directly changed the error utterance into the correct one. It showed that the students understood with this type of corrective feedback. It can conclude that paralinguistic signal was appropriate to the students.

Recast

In recast, the teacher corrects students' error utterances by changing and correcting the utterance in some ways. Teacher focuses on one word and

grammatical modification. Based on the observation, Recast was used by one teacher in one time only. The teacher was teacher A.

In the observation, the student's utterance "weird" was directly changed by the teacher because that was not the answer that the teacher wanted the student to answer. The teacher directly changed the student's utterance "weird" into "wrong". It means that the teacher directly changed the student's utterance without directly indicated that the utterance was incorrect. The teacher also provided the correction and gave grammatical modification. After the teacher gave the correction, the student did not notice the error. The student gave no respond to the teacher's correction. It showed that the student did not understand the teacher's feedback. It can conclude that recast was not appropriate to the students.

1.2. The ways and the types of teacher's oral corrective feedback on the interview

In this study, the teachers were interviewed about the ways and the types of oral corrective feedback they used on student's speaking performance. Moreover, the researcher also interviewed the teachers about the reason of giving the ways and the types of oral corrective feedback.

For the question about ways of teachers give oral corrective feedback, teacher A said usually gives indirect feedback to the students. Teacher A thinks that if the students gave a direct corrective feedback, they will lose their motivation to speak. They will be aware to talk afterwards. On the other hand, teacher B said that she gives direct and indirect feedback depends on the classroom situation, student's ability, or sometimes material condition. For the direct feedback, the teacher said that she usually give direct feedback to the student when reading aloud performance. If the student look confused from the beginning, teacher B will give a direct feedback to help the students to correct the error. Meanwhile, teacher B said that if the purpose of the study is to comprehend a text, the teacher will give indirect feedback when the student makes some errors. The teacher will wait the student to finish the sentences before correcting the error. Teacher B said that if the direct feedback given to the student in comprehension session, sometimes the student who got the correction will be embarrassed.

Meanwhile, teacher C said that she usually gives direct feedback to the students. She usually gives direct feedback because she afraid to forget the feedback that she wants to give to the students. In fact, teacher D gave the same answer with teacher B. Teacher D said that she gives direct and indirect feedback depends on the material at the time. If the students are doing a conversation, teacher D will give indirect feedback to correct the students' error utterance on speaking performance. However, if the students make any errors on the pronunciation while on the reading performance, teacher D will give direct feedback. Teacher D said that the purpose of giving direct and indirect feedbacks are the same, to make sure the students to remember the error they have made and not repeat it.

For the question about which types of teacher's oral corrective feedback are appropriate and which types are inappropriate, the types of oral corrective feedback used by each teacher are different. Teacher A used recast and explicit correction, teacher B used repetition, explicit correction, and paralinguistic signal, teacher C used clarification request and explicit correction, and teacher D used repetition and explicit correction. However, each teacher used one similar type which is explicit correction. Teacher A said that recast is not appropriate to give to the Junior High School students because it is more appropriate to the higher level students. Meanwhile, explicit correction is appropriate because by using explicit correction the students understand about the error they have made and try to correct it. On the other hand, teacher B used repetition, explicit correction, and paralinguistic signal. Teacher B said that repetition is appropriate to the students because it seems give a clue to the students. Teacher B also said explicit correction is appropriate to the students because it doesn't make the students become afraid to speak because the teacher seems guide them to correct their error on speaking performance. Likewise paralinguistic signal, teacher B said that it is appropriate to the students because it makes the students activate their critical thinking. They will try to think first before teacher gives the answer. Besides, teacher C used clarification request and explicit correction. Teacher said clarification request is appropriate to the students because it is easy to understand by the students. Also, teacher C said explicit correction is appropriate to the students because the students will remember about the correction given by the teacher, so they would not repeat the error later. Nevertheless, the result of the observation shows that clarification request is not appropriate because some of the students did not have any idea about the errors they have made. They still made the same error even though they have been given a clarification feedback. Teacher D also used repetition and explicit correction to correct student's error utterance on speaking performance. According to teacher D, repetition is appropriate to the students because the more the teacher repeats, the more students remember. Then, teacher D said explicit correction is appropriate to the students because they get a clear explanation of their error utterances on speaking performance and it can broaden their insights.

2. Discussion

Based on the data analysis and findings, English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi gave oral corrective feedback in different ways; direct and indirect. Based on the observation and interview, teacher A gave indirect oral corrective feedback to the students, teacher B gave both direct and indirect oral corrective feedback, teacher C gave direct feedback, and teacher D gave oral corrective feedback in both direct and indirect. According to van Beuningen, de Jong, and Kuiken (2008), direct and indirect corrective feedback used depend on the situation of the class. It means that the way of teacher gives corrective feedback depends on the situation of the class such as the material, the characteristic of students and the respond of the students.

Thus, direct and indirect feedback are given consider to the situation of the class.

Subsequently, English teachers at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi used recast, repetition, clarification request, explicit correction, and paralinguistic signal as oral corrective feedback in correcting student's utterance in speaking performance. The result shows that two of those types of oral corrective were not appropriate to use, those types were recast and clarification request. On the other hand, the three types; repetition, explicit correction, and paralinguistic signal were appropriate to use.

Recast is the teacher changes and corrects the students' error utterance in some way. Teacher does not use phrases such as "you mean.." or "you should...". Teacher focuses on one word and grammatical modification. Nurhartanto (2015) on the result of his research said that recast is less effective for L2 student because not all the students could understand the correction. The researcher also found the similar issue in the observation. Teacher A used recast on student's speaking performance, but the students did not understand about the correction given by the teacher.

Repetition is teacher repeats the student's error utterance without reformulating the correct form. It considered to more beneficial and effective for students' learning because it can improve students' critical thinking. It means with repetition, students will think about the correct form of the utterance without telling by the teacher first. According to Büyükbay & Dabaghi (2010), when a teacher used repetition as the feedback, students were allowed to think, notice their errors, and correct their errors after noticing. It means that repetition can lead students to the self-correction. In the observation, two English teachers used repetition as the corrective feedback to correct the student's error utterance in speaking performance. Those teachers are teacher B and teacher D. From the findings, it can be seen that when the teacher gave repetition as the corrective feedback, it lead the student to the self-correction. The student corrected the sentence without given the answer by the teacher. So, it means that repetition is appropriate to the students because they understand the feedback and do self-correction.

Clarification request is the teacher indicates that he/she has not understood what the learner said. Teacher use word such as "excuse me", "what", "sorry", "pardon me", or "I don't understand". Loewen and Nabei (as cited in Rassaei and Moinzadeh, 2011, p.98) said that "clarification requests serve the function of prompting learners to attend to form and asking for clarifying the meaning". It means that clarification lead the students to clarify their error utterance while the teacher indicates that he/she does not understand the student's utterance. From the observation, teacher C used clarification request to correct the student's error utterance. When the teacher gave clarification request as the type of oral corrective feedback, some of the students understand and corrected their error. Meanwhile, Golshan (2013) in his study found that the advantageous effects of clarification request were attributed to the self-repair or self-correction. Clarification requests may result in successful self-repair of learners where they produces the correct form, or peer and teacher repair. In

fact, clarification request in his study did not give the learners the chance to find out that what the exact error in their production was. In Golshan (2013), he also found that low-skill learners can only notice there is something wrong in their production, but the clarification requests do not usually lead to successful repair on the part of learners because they are unable to re-analyze their production. The researcher found the similar issue through the observation, the students who gave clarification feedback by teacher C were beginners in English.

Explicit correction is the teacher identifies the student's error utterance and provides the correction. According to Golshan (2013), explicit correction helps the students to locate the exact problem and thus made the students think about their production. Provision of information following the explicit correction made students aware of the rule at a deep level which is referred to as "understanding". It means that explicit correction helps students to find and think about the error utterances they made. Explicit correction also made students aware of their utterances which leads them to the understanding of the utterances themselves. In the observation, all the English teachers used explicit correction as corrective feedback on student's speaking performance. When all the teachers used explicit correction to correct students' errors on speaking performance, the students understood and provided corrections.

Paralinguistic signal is the teacher uses a gesture or facial expression to indicate that the learner has made an error. Teacher use facial expression, body positioning, movements, and hand gesture. In the observation, only one of the English teacher at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi used paralinguistic signal to correct the student's error utterance on speaking performance. It can be seen that the students understood the signal given by the teachers. Based on the interview, the teacher also said that paralinguistic signal can helps student to remember the moment they made errors. So that if they are asked the same things someday, they would remember the moment they were given paralinguistic signal as corrective feedback by the teacher.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Oral corrective feedback is the spoken responds given by the corrector or the teacher to correct any errors that the learner or the student has made. Teacher can correct students' error utterance in some ways and some types of oral corrective feedback. Based on the research questions "How do English teachers give corrective feedback at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi?" and "What are the types of English teacher's oral corrective feedback on students' speaking performance at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi?", the researcher formulated the conclusion that each English teacher at SMPN 1 Bukittinggi gave oral corrective feedback in different ways and also with different reason. It depended on the class settings.

Each teacher also used different types of oral corrective feedback on student's speaking performance. Unfortunately, not all the teachers used the appropriate types of oral corrective feedback. One of the teacher realized that the students did not understand with the oral corrective feedback given.

However another teacher did not realized that the students did not understand with the oral corrective feedback given, it made the students kept making the same error. From the reasons of each teacher about using the types of oral corrective feedback, it can be seen that not all the teachers gave the appropriate and inappropriate oral corrective feedback to their students. In addition, not all the teachers knew which oral corrective feedback was appropriate and inappropriate to the students.

After doing the observation and interview in the field and analyzing the collected data, the researcher states insightful suggestions at this point. The researcher suggests all of English teachers to know about the characteristic and the ability of the students. It is important to identify the kind of errors that usually made by the students. Subsequently, the researcher also suggests all of English teachers to understand the types of corrective feedback so that the teachers can use the appropriate corrective feedback to correct student's error utterance on speaking performance. With oral corrective feedback, student's speaking performance may be better than with no oral corrective given.

Then, for the reader and the next researcher, this research can give the advantages to do a new research. After reading this research, the next researcher can find a new idea and this research can be a reference to the next research.

REFERENCES

Boonkit, K. (2010). Enhancing the development of speaking skills for non-native speakers of English. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 1305–1309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.191

Büyükbay, S., & Dabaghi, A. (2010). The Effectiveness of Repetition as Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *1*(3), 181–193. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.181-193

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, *1*(1), 2–18. https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054

Gay, L. R and Airasian p. Educational Research Competences for Analysis and Application. New Jersey: Prentice hall Inc. (2000). Print.

Golshan, M. (2013). Corrective Feedback During Communicate Tasks : Do Recasts , Clarification Requests and Explicit Correction Affect EFL Learners ' Second Language Acquisition Equally ? *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, *2*(2), 559–571.

Herwanto, R. (2013). *Factors That Cause Language Anxiety in the English*. Yogyakarta State University.

Kumar, R. (2011) . Research Methodology (Third Edition). London. SAGE

Publication.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, *46*(1), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365

Noorezam, M., Teknologi, U., Cawangan, M., & Gudang, K. P. (2015). *Verbal Corrective Feedback : Students*. (2003), 1–11.

Nurhartanto, A. (2015). The Effect of Recast on Students' Speaking Skill Based on Their Learning Strategies. *Language and Language Teaching Journal*, *18*(02), 91–97. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2015.180202

Rassaei, E., & Moinzadeh, A. (2011). Investigating the Effects of Three Types of Corrective Feedback on the Acquisition of English Wh-question Forms by Iranian EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching*, *4*(2), 97. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p97

Sugiyono. 2014. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Utami, A. N. S. L., & Aswandi. (2017). Error Analysis Of Students' Speaking Performance In English Speaking Community. *RETAIN*, *5*(3). Retrieved from https://jurnalmahasiswa.unesa.ac.id/index.php/retain/article/view/20668

van Beuningen, C., de Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on L2 Learners' Written Accuracy. *ITL - International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *156*(November 2014), 279–296. https://doi.org/10.2143/itl.156.0.2034439https://jurnalmahasiswa.unesa.ac.id/index.php/retain/article/view/20668