MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS' PREFERENCES ON THE ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN ENGLISH AS FOREIGN LANGUAGE (EFL) SPEAKING CLASSROOM

Zaky Dzulhiza Hawin Amalia[1]; Endang Fauziati[2]; Sri Marmanto[3]

[1]Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta
[3]Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Sastra Inggris, Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta
Jl. Ir. Sutami No. 36-A, Kentingan, Surakarta 57126, Indonesia
[2]Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta
Jl. Ahmad Yani, Kartasura, Surakarta 57162, Indonesia
[1]zaky.dzulhiza@gmail.com; [2]endang.fauziati@ums.ac.id; [3]marmanto@staff.uns.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research aimed at investigating the male and female students' preferences on the six types of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF). This qualitative research used observation and interview to collect data. The observation was done to know the practice of the six types of OCF in speaking class and the interview was conducted to reveal the students' preferences for OCF. The result from the observation shows that the lecturer mostly uses Explicit Correction to correct the students' error. Then, the result from the interview indicates that male students prefer to have Explicit Correction because this type is the easiest type to know the error and correction clearly. Whereas the female students prefer to have Recast and Metalinguistic Feedback because Recast does not encourage them and Metalinguistic Feedback can make them think critically under the lecturer's clue. Subsequently, both male and female students perceive Clarification Request and Repetition as the ambiguous type to grasp what the lecturer's mean. The result of this current research is expected to provide an additional information about the practice of OCF strategies in speaking classroom which is appropriate with the students' preferences.

Keywords: male students, female students, student preferences, oral corrective feedback, OCF, EFL, speaking classroom

INTRODUCTION

Making errors in learning a new language, such as English, is something unavoidable. Many researchers argue that producing some errors in language learning is a mandatory and natural process to acquire a second language (Elçin & Öztürk, 2016; Rastegar & Homayoon, 2012). An error itself demonstrates that learning is in progress, so it is an inseparable part of the learning process (Behroozi & Karimnia, 2017). As Truscott (1996) says that during language learning, errors and mistakes are definitely exist in all stages because learning the second language is a gradual process.

According to Yule (2010), the error is something that cannot hinder in the students' progress. It is probably a sign that the students are active in the learning process as they try to communicate in a new language. This becomes a challenge for a language teacher to be able to turn those errors into learning opportunities, without discouraging the student. In order to do this, some forms of feedback may be necessary. When students cannot discover errors, they need the teacher's correction. It is important for teachers to understand deeply about Corrective Feedback (CF) strategies. The strategies of CF can be provided through a written or spoken process. Here, Lightbown and Spada (1999) define CF as an indication to the students that their use of the target language contains the incorrect word. Furthermore, Russel and Spada (2006) also state that CF refers to any feedback strategies provide the students from any source that contains evidence of the students' language form.

In the speaking classroom, there are many ways to correct the students' error orally. One of the well-known research on OCF is conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997). They classify the framework of OCF into six different strategies, such as explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Those six strategies of correction should be known by the teachers or lecturers in developing their ability to give correction to their students.

The first is the explicit correction that refers to the teacher's indication of the student's error clearly and the correction immediately. For example, the student says an error word, "**He go** to school regularly." The teacher, then, corrects the student's error explicitly, "It's not **he go**, you should say **he goes**." Second is recast that refers to the teacher's reformulation of the student's incorrect word part to show them the correct form without explicitly indicating the error. For example, the student says an error word, "**I went there** two times." Then, the teacher reformulates the student's error to correct his/her error explicitly, "**You've been**. You've been there twice as a group?" The third is the clarification request that refers to the teacher's clarification that the student's words or phrases are not understood and need to be revised. For example, the student says an error word, "What do you spend with your wife?" The teacher, then, clarifies the student's error by saying, "**Pardon**?"

The fourth is metalinguistic feedback that refers to the teacher's provision of the linguistic information about the student's error technically without providing the correct form explicitly. For example, the student says an error word, "There were **many man** in the meeting." The teacher, then, gives the information to correct student's error, "You need the **plural**." The fifth is elicitation that refers to the teacher's prompting the student to do self-correction by pausing before the error part so that the student can revise the error word after the teacher's pausing. For example, the student says an error word, "I'll come if it will not rain." Then, the teacher elicits the student's error by pausing before the error word, "I'll come if it ……?" The sixth is a repetition that refers to the teacher's repetition of the student's error in order to highlight their errors to draw the student's attention to the stressed errors. For example, the student says an error word, "I **will showed** you." Then, the teacher emphasizes the student's error to warn the student, "I will '**showed**' you."

The need for OCF in learning the second language is believed to be facilitative of second language development. According to some research, CF is beneficial for correcting students' error (Alamri & Fawzi, 2016; Papangkorn, 2015; Sopin, 2015). The students want to receive the corrective feedbacks for their errors, but they have different preferences in receiving those CFs. Therefore, in order to gain the benefits of OCF in the learning process, Katayama (2007) suggests that the teachers should do a survey to find out what the students' expectation in the learning process. Sopin (2015) also claims that teachers should become sensitive to the learners' emotional state and understand their individual. Here, the students' expectation in the learning process will give impacts on their attitude. Therefore, it is important for the teachers to understand what their students want to be taught and how they want to learn in classroom activity. Those expectations from the students may be the link between OCF and the learning outcomes. From those, when the teachers know what their students exactly expect in the learning process, they can prepare and choose the appropriate strategy that will help the students to understand the lesson they learned.

For the students, the appropriate strategy of OCF may develop their motivation and effort (Harward et al., 2014). Besides OCF can help students to understand the lesson they learn in the classroom, it also helps the students to make them closer to the second language they learn, and finally, they can acquire the target language. On the contrary, Ortega (2009) states that inappropriate CF might influence the students' anxiety and make the students blanking to say some words from the target language. Therefore, Katayama (2007) argues that providing OCF for correcting the students' error should meet with their expectation. Here, the students can repair their errors and improve their language in some strategies of correction that they accept.

Many factors contribute to the choice and the tendency of CF. One of these factors is a gender that will be examined in this research. Khorshidi and Rassaei (2013) state that gender is one of the aspects of psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic mechanisms. When considering the students' gender, the students' preferences on CF might also be different. Here, a different gender between male and female students may have different preferences. They will accept and response the teachers' OCF in different ways. In this case, Havnes et al. (2012) argue that individual and situational characteristics can have a potential effect on how the students prefer those OCF strategies. Thus, in providing OCF for correcting the students' errors, the teacher needs to understand what the male and female students expected in the learning process.

Aside from it, a lot of research have examined teachers' preferences of CF in second language acquisition (Behroozi & Karimnia, 2017; Motlagh, 2015) and also students' preferences (Alamri & Fawzi, 2016; Fitriana, Suhatmady, & Setiawan, 2016; Mungungu-Shipale & Kangira, 2017; Elçin & Öztürk, 2016; Papangkorn, 2015; Park, 2010; Yoshida, 2008). Surprisingly, the results of those research show a greater difference among students' preferences. Some pieces of research reveal students prefer to explicit correction (Alamri & Fawzi, 2016; Fitriana, Suhatmady, & Setiawan, 2016; Papangkorn, 2015; Park, 2010) and some of the research reveal most of the students want to be corrected by using implicit feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Yoshida, 2008). It can be clearly seen that the students' preferences are almost different among those previous research. In order to know the cause of their differences, some detailed factors might be needed such as students' gender. Some researchers mostly ignore the factor of the students' differences in their preferences. Here, gender might be one of the factors that result in students' preferences. Knowing the male and female students' preferences for OCF can help the teachers to distinguish what the students' expectation. In order to show the detailed differences among the students' preferences, male and female students' preferences regarding CF should be investigated more. Here, when teachers understand the detailed preferences between male and female students, they can prepare the appropriate strategy that will help the students to acquire the second language. Therefore, investigating the students' gender might be useful to determine the use of OCF.

From those, this research will explore the lecturer's use of OCF and the preferences of OCF between male and female students because different gender of students might have different preferences. It will be useful to dig up the essential information to the language teachers about the students' preferences for the certain strategies of OCF and to utilize that essential information when providing those strategies of OCF to correct the students' errors effectively. The research problems are; (1) what types of OCF are used by the lecturer in the speaking classroom? (2) What are the male and female students' reasons for preferences of OCF types?

METHODS

This research uses qualitative research as a research design. Creswell (2012) argues that qualitative research is done with exploring, investigating, and understanding the individuals or groups' meaning ascribe to social or human problems. Here, this current research is intended to explore and understand about people view or give meaning toward event or situation faced by them. The participants of the research include one lecturer and 39 university students (11 male students and 28 female students) in the Indonesia context. The lecturer is a non-native speaker, and the students are enrolled at the first-year students of the English Education Department in Sebelas Maret University, Indonesia.

Data are collected through observation and interview. In the observation session, the researcher observes directly in the speaking classroom for about seven hours. The researcher acts like a complete observer, takes place in the classroom to watch, record, and take a note about everything that happens during the learning process. From it, the researcher gets the data about the use of OCF in the speaking classroom. Then, the interview is provided to reveal the male and female students' preferences towards the types of OCF.

To establish the findings, the data are analyzed qualitatively by using the Interactive Models stated by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). Those interactive models are divided into three parts, namely data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. After the data are obtained from observation and interview, the data are analyzed through those three steps of analyzing the data. The first step is data condensation. In this step, the data from the field note of observation and transcript of the interview are analyzed through the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming. After that, the researcher classifies and breakdown the data in a specific way in data display. Here, the researcher uses a narrative text to display the data. The last step, the researcher formulates the conclusion of this research and then verifies the data to the theories and previous researchers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In the observation result, the researcher directly observes the speaking class for about seven hours. The lecturer's OCF moves in the speaking class are identified under the six types of OCF, such as explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Table 1 shows the types of OCF delivered to the students.

Table 1 presents the total obtained data of OCF are 110 data. From the result, the most widely used of OCF moves by the lecturer is Explicit Correction which accounts for over 41,82%. The second rank of OCF used by the lecturer is Elicitation for over 31,82%. Here, the lecturer intends to know whether the students can correct the error by themselves or not. The third rank of OCF is Metalinguistic Feedback which has a proportion of about 10%. The fourth rank of OCF is Clarification Request for about 9,09% and followed by Repetition for about 4,54%. Finally, the last preferred type is Recast which accounts for 2,73%.

Concerning gender, Table 1 also shows the distribution of CF for both male and female students. The total numbers of OCF moves given to the male students

are 44 moves. From the data obtained, the researcher finds that the lecturer mostly delivers Explicit Correction for the male students (52,27%). The next favored type to be given to the male students is Elicitation which accounts for about 27,27%. However, the researcher does not find the sort data delivered to the male students. The lecturer only provides double Metalinguistic Feedback and Repetition for the male students who have the same rates for about 4,55%. In this sense, it seems like Recast, Metalinguistic Feedback, and Repetition become the last favored types to be given to the male student.

Table 1 Types of OCF Delivered to the Students

No	OCF Types	Male Students		Female Students		All Students	
		N	%	N	%	n	%
1	Explicit Correction	23	52,27	23	34,85	46	41,82
2	Recast	-	-	3	4,54	3	2,73
3	Clarification Request	5	11,36	5	7,58	10	9,09
4	Metalinguistic Feedback	2	4,55	9	13,64	11	10
5	Elicitation	12	27,27	23	34,85	35	31,82
6	Repetition	2	4,55	3	4,54	5	4,54
	Total	44	100%	66	100%	110	100%

On the contrary, the total numbers of OCF moves given to the female students are 66 data. Here, the researcher finds that lecturer mostly produces Explicit Correction and Elicitation for the female students who have the same proportion for about 34,85%. Furthermore, the researcher only finds triple moves of Recast and Repetition provided to the female students. Recast and Repetition have the same rates which account for about 4,54%. Those two types of Recast and Repetition become the last favored type to be given to female students.

For the male students' preferences for OCF, during the teaching and learning process, the Explicit Correction is found to be the most widely used of OCF by the lecturer. From the data obtained through classroom observation, the lecturer distributes 23 moves of Explicit Correction to the male students. It seems like the explicit correction is favored by the lecturer. To know whether the Explicit Correction will also be favored by the male students or not, the teacher has to find out their opinion. The finding of the interview derived from six male students shows that they want to be corrected explicitly because the Explicit Correction is the easiest type to understand and recognize. They also perceive that Explicit Correction is an effective type.

In the first-class hours, the class is talking about finding the way. The lecturer asks the male student 3 to practice how to ask the direction correctly. The polite utterance in asking the direction to the stranger is started by the word 'Excuse me'. The male student is chosen to practice the conversation. He starts the practice by uttering the incorrect pronunciation by saying 'Excuse /ˈekˈsjuːz/ me' instead of 'Excuse /ɪkˈsjuːz/ me'. The lecturer clearly indicates that the pronunciation of the word 'Excuse /ˈekˈsjuːz/ me' is incorrect and provides a clear correction for

it. The student then incorporates the correction, as follows.

MS : Excuse /ˈekˈsjuːz/ me… (the student is mistaken in pronouncing 'excuse' /ˈekˈsjuːz/)

L : Sorry. It's not 'excuse' /ˈekˈsjuːz/ me, but 'excuse' /ɪkˈsjuːz/ me. (Explicit Correction)

MS : Excuse /ɪkˈsjuːz/ me, can you help me the way to the bank, please?

In relation to the simple conversation, male student 3 comments in the interview session that explicit correction is preferred by him, "I will know the error and correction exactly. Moreover, both error and correction will be heard by the whole students in the class." (Interview/MS3)

For Recast, the lecturer does not give any Recast type for the male students; therefore, the researcher cannot provide the sample of a Recast for the male students. Even though there is no data of Recast provided to the male students, the researcher still needs to know their simple perception and preferences towards it. The finding reveals that four male students prefer to recast because it can help him to correct the error. One of them shares his opinion that he will know another variation or formulation of the sentence they produce (Interview/MS2) whereas two male students do not like to have recast because they do not know the part of the error. One of them claims that reformulating the part of error utterance by lecturer will take more times to think about the error and how to respond to the reformulation of utterance (Interview/MS6).

In Clarification Request, the researcher finds six moves of Clarification Request provided to the male students. The findings regarding their preferences of Clarification Request type as the implicit correction reveal that one male student prefers to it because they can realize their error. Moreover, four of the male students do not like to be corrected by using Clarification Request because that type is the ambiguous type. Moreover, Clarification Request also does not clear enough to show the part of the students' error. For instance, in the first recorded session, the students are asked to pronounce the alphabet correctly. One of them produces an error in pronouncing the alphabet of 'J'. He pronounces it by saying 'J /dʒɪ/' instead of 'J /dʒeɪ/'. The lecturer provides the clarification request by saying 'Sorry?' as feedback to invite him to do the self-repair. The student does not know that he produces an error, so he repeats the same error. Finally, the lecturer provides the correct form 'J /dʒeɪ/'. Subsequently, he makes a comment in the interview session that he does not understand well what the lecturer's mean, "I don't understand what the lecturer's exactly mean by saying 'Sorry'. It makes me confused." (Interview/MS1)

Another male student says that Clarification Request makes him think for twice. For him, it takes a long time and makes him nervous and afraid to speak more. He has said, "This type wastes time because 80% of the students will feel uncomfortable to talk in front of the class for a long time. It will make the students think for a second time, and they will get so nervous and afraid to speak more if he/she produces a different error." (Interview/MS5)

The next finding is about Metalinguistic Feedback. During the recorded classes, the lecturer distributes two moves of Metalinguistic Feedback to the male students and encourages them to do self-correction by providing them the information and linguistics clue.

MS(A) : What is your phone number?

MS(B) : 123456789

L : I think the phone number is not logical. There is no phone number 123456789. You have to make it logically. (Metalinguistic Feedback)

In the interview session, three male students prefer to have Metalinguistic Feedback because they can realize the error by the clue and correct it easily. He has said, "This type will help the student to correct the sentence independently with the clue from the lecturer." (Interview/MS4), whereas, three male students sometimes feel confused due to the terminological words provided by the lecturer when correcting the students' error by using Metalinguistic Feedback. They say they will be confused about how to correct, "If I am not informed of the error and am not given the correction, I will be confused about how to correct." (Interview/MS2)

Furthermore, the other student prefers feedback type used by the lecturer is Elicitation. The lecturer provides 12 moves of Elicitation to the male students.

L : The conversation in the practice 1 deals with....

MS : Stranger and stranger.

L : Both of them are.... (Elicitation)

MS : Stranger.

L : Strangers (Explicit Correction)

The results of the interview show that Elicitation is perceived positively by three male students. Some of them also perceive Elicitation as an effective feedback type because it gives the opportunity for the students to think deeply and explore their knowledge more. He has said, "I think this type is effective enough because the lecturer gives the student an opportunity to think critically about the correct form rather than to provide the correct form immediately after the student's error." (Interview/MS1), whereas, three of them do not like to have Elicitation. They say that they will be confused if they are not informed about the part of the error. They also think that to be corrected by using Elicitation needs a longer time to think, so this type just wastes time.

Last, the data on the recording session regarding Repetition as feedback are provided twice to the male students. During the interview session, two male students prefer to Repetition. They say that Repetition allows them to think deeply so that they can remember the correction for a long time, "When I am corrected by emphasizing the errors part, I can easily find those errors. Then, I will think about the errors part deeply and remember those for a long time." (Interview/MS5). Rest of them, four male students, also share their opinion that they will be confused to understand what the lecturer's mean by emphasizing the word, such Repetition. Moreover, another reason from the male student 2 is that he feels like the lecturer is patronizing in the learning process. The student, usually, does not like being overly patronized in the learning process (Interview/MS2).

For example, during the fourth session of classroom observation, the class is talking about expressing past regret. The male student 2 is chosen to make the sentence from the word written in the textbook. He produces an error in saying £10.000 by saying 'ten thousand Europe. The lecturer, then, exactly cuts the student's utterance and emphasizes the error word. The lecturer repeats the student's error by emphasizing the intonation. In that situation, the student is thinking hard and replies, 'Europe'. He thinks that the symbol '£' is uttered

by Europe. It remains the same error. The lecturer realizes that the student does not know the correct answer, and then she produces the explicit correction. Finally, the student knows the correct word in uttering £10.000 by saying 'ten thousand pounds'. The male student shares his opinion in the interview that he feels like the lecturer is not patient to teach, "When my error part is emphasized by the lecturer, I feel that the lecturer is not patient to teach." (Interview MS2)

In the case of female students' preferences for OCF, the lecturer distributes 23 moves of Explicit Correction to the female students. The interview session derived from six female students shows that three female students prefer to have Explicit Correction because they want to know the error and correction clearly, so that error and the correction can be understood easily. One of them says that she will be easy to remember the correction, so in the future; they will not make the same errors (Interview/FS6). However, three female students do not like to be corrected by using Explicit Correction because correcting the students' error by using it makes them shy, nervous, shocked, and afraid to speak more. One of them says, "If the lecturer corrects my errors explicitly, I will get shocked and nervous to speak more. I feel shy to be corrected in front of my friend, and I'm afraid to get bullied by others." (Interview/FS1). Another student reports that to be corrected by using Explicit Correction can mess her concentration. As she says, "When I am corrected explicitly by the lecturer, it will mess my concentration, and I will be nervous to speak more." (Interview/FS4)

In Recast, the lecturer uses Recast in her three feedback moves to the female students. Recast seems to be the least preferred type by the lecturer. To know whether recast will be the last favored type by the female students or not, the researcher has to find out their opinion. From the result of interview derived from six female students, all of them prefer to Recast because it helps the conversation go smoothly, enjoy, comfortable, and does not make them shy away to talk more.

In the third-class hours, the class is talking about expressing apologize and excuse. The female student 4 is chosen and asked to tell about the expression performed by her classmates. In expressing her opinion, she produces an error. In order to implicitly correct the error, the lecturer does the reformulation of the student's utterance. Here, the lecturer's reformulation of the student's error is provided without pointing the student's error. Finally, the student perceives the lecturer's feedback correctly, and the flow of communication is not broken, as follows.

FS   : The first expression that Reyzon says to her friends is 'I'm terribly sorry guys, I'm forgot to send email to Mr. Hasan.' She also gives an excuse by saying, 'That was my fault.' Her friends answer it and they angry ...mmmmm... (thinking)

L   : Then, are they angry? (Recast)

FS   : Oh... yes, they are angry. Her friends are angry to Reyzon. Rey says, 'How in the world you manage to forget it.' It is mmmmm showing an anger to Reyzon.

That simple conversation shows that recasting is the way of delivering feedback without breaking the flow of communication. This is in line with the comment of the female student in the interview session, "To be corrected by using this type is just like questioning to follow the flow of conversation. The lecturer seems interacting with the conversation, so the conversation runs smoothly. Even though the truly questioning from the lecturer is to correct my error, but it doesn't disturb the conversation." (Interview/FS4). Another female student also says, "If the lecturer corrects my errors naturally through this type, I will feel comfortable, and it doesn't make me shy away to talk more." (Interview/FS1)

Subsequently, the researcher finds five moves of Clarification Request given to the female students, as seen.

FS   : I can't think why I'd never listened to my husband. (The student does not use an expressive face, and she hesitates to speak)

L   : Sorry? (Clarification Request)

FS   : I can't think why I'd never listened to my husband.

L   : I can't think WHY I'd never listened to my husband. (Explicit Correction)

From the result of the interview with six female students shows that five of them do not like to be corrected but using Clarification Request. One of them says that the Clarification Request is ambiguous. She has said, "I think it is ambiguous. There is a probability that I will suppose that my utterance is not clear enough rather than containing the error words." (Interview/FS3). Another reason, one of the female students says that she does not understand what the lecturer's mean. Sometimes, what the lecturer's mean is different from the student's mean. She has said, "The truth, I do not understand what lecturer's mean. When she says "Pardon me" or "Sorry" or something like that, I will suppose it by another mean, and maybe it will be different from the lecturer's mean." (Interview/FS6)

Furthermore, there is one female student that is not minded to be corrected by using Clarification Request because it sounds polite to warn the students to be careful to use the words, so the meaning of our utterance will be clearly delivered. She has said, "I think, it sounds polite to say 'Sorry' or 'Pardon me' to warn my error." (Interview/FS1)

For Metalinguistic Feedback, the researcher also finds nine moves of this feedback given to the female students. The finding of the interview from the female students reveals that five female students prefer to Metalinguistic Feedback. They say that Metalinguistic Feedback can make them recall their knowledge and can increase their knowledge in English (Interview/FS5). Another female student also says that Metalinguistic Feedback is also challenging and lets the student thinks deeper (Interview/FS1).

As the example shows in the second session of observation, FS3 says, "Go straight this road until you find post office turn right into the...". The female student speaks without any full stop in her utterance. The lecturer warns her by asking clarification request 'Sorry', but she does not get what the lecturer's mean until she repeats the same error. The lecturer, then, provides the clue to add the full stop in her utterance by saying, "It's better for you to give a full stop." Finally, the student understands what lecturer's mean and she provides a clear part of the full stop. In this occasion, she states in the interview session that Metalinguistic Feedback is effective enough to correct her error, "It is effective enough. I can correct my error by myself without given the explicit correction by the lecturer. By only the clue, I can realize my error quickly, and I can correct it easily." (Interview/FS3). Whereas, there is one female student that does not like this type because she thinks

that delivering the comment or information in the middle of speaking is weird. She has said, "It seems too weird for me when the lecturer is giving a comment or information in the middle of speaking." (Interview/ FS2)

The next type is the lecturer uses 23 times of Elicitation to the female students during the recorded sessions. It seems that Elicitation is favored by the lecturer. To know whether Elicitation will also be favored by the female students or not, the researcher has to find out their opinion. Similar to the male students' preferences, the female students also perceive that Elicitation is effective enough because it allows them to think critically. They also prefer this type because they can find the error part easily (InterviewFS1). Moreover, female student 4 shares her idea that she is preferred Elicitation. She has said, "I think this type is the most effective one because it allows students to think deeply and critically the correct form by themselves." (Interview/FS4)

Aside from it, two of the female students do not like Elicitation because they will be confused and suppressed to think the correct form. For example, during the second session, female student 3 is chosen and asked to share her opinion. She produces an error in the grammatical sentence. She says, "We can got the message from the ..." then the lecturer immediately provides an elicitation and says that "We can….?" The students reply "got the message ..." The error she produces has remained. In this occasion, she comments in the interview session that Elicitation makes her confused to understand what the lecturer's mean and not all students are clever enough to correct by themselves. She has said, "To be corrected by using that way will make me confused and down because not all of the students are clever enough to correct it by themselves." (Interview/FS3)

For Repetition, one of female student perceives positively about it because the emphasizing part of error by lecturer will help her to realize the error. She has said, "Because of emphasizing the error by the lecturer, the part of my error will be clearly found and remembered." (Interview/FS5). Subsequently, six female students do not like to have Repetition. They say that to be corrected by using Repetition will make them nervous. For example, during the third recorded session of observation, the female student 1 is asked to tell about the topic today. She says, "Expressing Excuse and Apology." The lecturer corrects the error by emphasizing the error part by saying, "Apology?" She cannot correct the error and then it is corrected by another student, "Apologize". In this situation, the student looks a little nervous. She shares her opinion in the interview session, "I will get nervous. This type also makes me feel like being intimidated, especially when the lecturer is in a bad mood." (Interview/FS1). Another reason, one of the female students says that repeating and emphasizing the part of error feels like the lecturer is mocking at her error, "It seems like the lecturer is mocking at me." (Interview/FS4)

From the result of observation and interview, it can be noted that Explicit Correction becomes the most preferred type for the male students and is also favored by the lecturer. In Recast, six female students show that they are excited to be corrected by it. But from the result of observation, Recast is not favored by the lecturer. In Clarification Request, this type is not preferred by both male and female students. They claim that it is the most ambiguous type to understand what the lecturer's mean. The lecturer also uses clarification request rarely. Then, Metalinguistic Feedback becomes the second preferred type by the female students which encourages them to do self-correction under the lecturer's clue. However, male students and the lecturer do not like this type. Moreover, Elicitation becomes the second preferred type by the lecturer which provides the chance for the students to self-correct. However, male and female students do not favor this type, because some of them will be confused about how to find and correct the error. The last type, Repetition, is not favored by the lecturer. Similarly, the male and female students also do not prefer repetition because the emphasizing part of error can make them uncomfortable.

From those findings, it can be showed that the lecturer provides Explicit Correction more often. Some findings from the previous research reveal similar findings with this current research, but most of those research happen in some cases of Indonesia context. For instance, Milicev (2014) finds the dominant type of CF used in university EFL classroom is the Explicit Correction. Moreover, in Indonesia context, Suryoputro and Amaliah (2016) find that the teacher most widely uses explicit correction type to correct the students' error. Then, Liskinasih (2016) lso finds that explicit correction is the most dominant type used in speaking class. In Anggraeni's (2012) finding, she does not find any Recast and Repetition types. Jabu et al. (2017) also do not find any Recast type in their data. In fact, most of the previous research that has a similar result with the present research is conducted in Indonesia context. It can be assumed that mostly Indonesian English teacher favors Explicit Correction and does not favor the Recast type.

Concerning the students' preferences for OCF types, the current findings reveal that there are different preferences between male and female students. From the interview session, all male students prefer to have Explicit Correction. They claim that it helps them to know the error and correction clearly. They feel easy to understand and recognize it. This finding similar to Papangkorn's (2015) finding that finds that explicit correction is the most preferred strategy of CF among the male students. Alamri and Fawzi (2016) also find that the majority of the students and the teachers prefer explicit correction. Furthermore, Park (2010) also shares the findings that most of the students want to be corrected by using Explicit Correction because it can help them learn the correct revision by directly pointing out the error. In this case, because Explicit Correction perceives positively by most students, it can be assumed that it is the favored type and the easiest type.

On the contrary, female students prefer to have Recast and Metalinguistic Feedback. For Recast, the female students think that this type helps the conversation to go smoothly, enjoy, comfortable, does not make students shy away to talk more, and helps students to be more confident in developing conversation skills. They are different findings from the previous research. Zhao (2015) has conducted indepth interviews with EFL Chinese students and suggested that it is occasionally difficult for students to notice the corrections embedded in recasts. Elçin and Öztürk (2016) also find that most of the students do not perceive recast as useful CF. Most of them think that Recast is just a simple repetition of their utterance and it does not clearly give the signal that the students have produced an error word. Here, most of the students say that they do not understand if they have produced an error, so they pretend as if they understand about the CF. From those, it can be assumed that although Recast helps the conversation to go smoothly, enjoy, and comfortable, it is also difficult for students to notice the correction.

Furthermore, the female student also prefers to have

Metalinguistic Feedback. They say that this type lets the students think critically and do the self-correction by the clue from the lecturer. Similarly, Jabu et al. (2017) find that providing the guiding information or clue about the error will give the students new insight. Zhu (2010) also demonstrates that students prefer to get a hint of the error source rather than having the correct answer told to them directly. Fitriana, Suhatmady, and Setiawan (2016) find that the students prefer Metalinguistic Feedback because it can help the students recall their background knowledge, think deeper, and become capable in their learning. This can be assumed that female students prefer to think critically under the lecturer's guidance. This assumption is supported by Carvalho et al. (2014). They claim in their research that the female students are believed to be more critical than male students concerning the quality of CF received.

However, male and female students have differences in perceiving Explicit Correction. All male students exactly agree to be corrected explicitly, directly, and clearly. On the contrary, few of female students perceive it negatively because they think that blaming the students' error exactly in front of other friends can make them a shock, shy, nervous, afraid, and it can disturb the students' concentration. Those male and female students' think is supported by Lakoff's (1975) theory about men and women language. Lakoff (1975) has claimed that men's language is direct, adult, and assertive, while women's language is hyper-polite or hyperformal, immature, and non-assertive. Walt (1969) has also stated that women show a greater sensitivity. Therefore, it can be assumed that female students are getting more sensitive and worries about making errors and being corrected exactly and directly in front of their friends.

Subsequently, as a result of the interview with the female students, most of them demonstrate a few worries about making errors or being corrected exactly in front of their friends. Therefore, they prefer Recast because it is not alerting them so that they will enjoy and comfortable to speak up and not too embarrassed to be corrected by using it. It can be noted that female students are more sensitive to produce mistakes or errors in front of others. Therefore, they will be more sensitive and worries in every situation that makes them uncomfortable. As Xia (2013) has said that women show more sensitivity than men.

Moreover, most of the male and female students do not like the type of implicit feedback such as Clarification Request and Repetition. They say in the interview session that those two types make them confused, especially Clarification Request because it is the most ambiguous type to understand what the lecturer's means. Actually, those two types take more time to think of the position of error and the correction. In this sense, Fitriana, Suhatmady, and Setiawan (2016) have conducted research about students' preferences in a vocational school in Indonesia. The finding reveals that students do not like to have Clarification Request and Repetition because those types make them confused and just waste time waiting for students' responses. Moreover, Elçin and Öztürk's (2016) finding also shows in the interview session with their students that Clarification Request is the most ambiguous type. They also demonstrate that the students get difficult in comprehending their error part. From those, it can be assumed that the implicit feedback types, like Repetition and Clarification Request are difficult and ambiguous for the students.

From the result and findings, male and female students have their own preferences and perceptions. In this sense, the students' preferences for OCF strategies can

be influenced by gender. Therefore, it can be assumed that the students' preferences, perceptions, and choice about the oral corrective feedback strategy will be varied as the contribution of gender.

CONCLUSIONS

This research reveals that the most widely used of OCF strategy is Explicit Correction. It can be noted that the lecturer indicates the students' error part clearly and provides the correction form directly. The second favored type used by the lecturer is Elicitation. Here, the lecturer wants to know that students can correct the error by themselves. From the date of the interview, the male students prefer to have explicit correction because they want the lecturer to correct their errors immediately and provide the correction clearly. They claim that explicit correction is the easiest. The result of the interview from the female students shows that they prefer to have Recast that does not discourage them and Metalinguistic Feedback that encourages them to do self-correction under the clue.

The most negative comments among those types of OCF are Clarification Request and Repetition. For them, those two types can take more times to think, especially for Clarification Request. This type is the most ambiguous type to understand what the lecturer's mean. When the lecturer uses clarification request word such as "Pardon me?" or "Sorry?" the students will think that they produce an error, but the lecture will have a different meaning.

Furthermore, in order to gain the benefits of OCF in the learning process, the teachers and lecturers should consider the students' preferences especially when the teachers or lecturers have to correct the students' error. By doing a survey on the students' preferences, it will make the teachers and lecturers easy to find the students' expectation. Hopefully, the appropriate feedback as what the students expected can help them do the right corrections to their errors so that they can have the meaningful learning which can also be very beneficial for them to acquire the target language.

For further research, besides investigating OCF types, investigating the appropriate time of delivering OCF to correct the students' error may also be the factor that influences the successful feedback and learning process. As stated by Elçin and Öztürk (2016), some students may prefer to be corrected by interrupting directly after the students' error (immediate corrective feedback) or waiting until the students finish the utterance (delayed corrective feedback) or may be recording the students' error and then telling them later (post-delayed corrective feedback). Therefore, it will be interesting for further research to investigate the students' preferences for the time of delivering CF. Moreover, it will also be interesting to reveal other possible factors that possibly affect the students' preferences in order to gain a successful correction for the students without discouraging them.

of Sebelas Maret University for their willingness to become the participant for this research.

REFERENCES

Alamri, B., & Fawzi, H. (2016). Students' preferences and attitude toward oral error correction techniques at Yanbu University College, Saudi Arabia. *English Language Teaching, 9*(11), 59–66. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n11p59.

Anggraeni, W. (2012). *The characteristics of teacher's feedback in the speaking activities of the grade nine students of SMP N 2 Depok* (Undergraduate Thesis). Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University.

Behroozi, B., & Karimnia, A. (2017). Educational context and ELT teachers' corrective feedback preference: Public and private school teachers in focus. *International Journal of Research in English Education, 2*(2), 10–15. https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.2.10.

Carvalho, C., Santos, J., Conboy, J., & Martins, D. (2014). Teachers' feedback: Exploring differences in students' perceptions. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 159,* 169–173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.351.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. California: SAGE Publications.

Elçin, Ö., & Öztürk, G. (2016). Types and timing of oral corrective feedback in EFL classrooms: Voices from students. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 113–133.

Fitriana, R., Suhatmady, B., & Setiawan, I. (2016). Students' preferences toward corrective feedbacks on students' oral production. *Script Journal: Journal of Linguistic and English Teaching, 1*(1), 46-60. https://doi.org/10.24903/sj.v1i1.17.

Harward, S., Peterson, N., Korth, B., Wimmer, J., Wilcox, B., Morrison, T. G., Black, S., Simmerman, S., & Pierce, L. (2014). Writing instruction in elementary classrooms: Why teachers engage or do not engage students in writing. *Literary Research and Instruction, 53*(3), 205–224.

Havnes, A., Simth, K., Dysthe, O., & Ludvisgen, K. (2012). Formative assessment and feedback: Making learning visible. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 38*(1), 21–27.

Jabu, B., Noni, N., Talib, A., & Syam, A. (2017). Lecturers' use of corrective feedback and students' uptake in an Indonesian EFL context. *Global Journal of Engineering Education, 19*(1), 82–87.

Katayama, A. (2007). Japanese EFL students' preferences toward correction of classroom oral errors. *Asian EFL Journal, 9*(4), 289–305.

Khorshidi, E., & Rassaei, E. (2013). The effects of learners' gender on their preferences for corrective feedback. *Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English, 1*(4), 71–83.

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and women's place*. New York: Harper & Row.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liskinasih, A. (2016). Corrective feedbacks interaction in CLT-adopted classrooms. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 6*(1), 60–69. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v6i1.2662.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(1), 37–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (Third Edition). California: SAGE Publications.

Milicev, J. (2014). Correct me if i'm wrong, but do it right: Error correction and learner uptake in university-level EFL classrooms. *Athens Journal of Philology, 1*(4), 259–271.

Motlagh, L. N. (2015). Iranian EFL teachers' preferences for corrective feedback types, implicit vs explicit. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 192,* 364–370. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.052.

Mungungu-Shipale, S. S., & Kangira, J. (2017). Lecturers' and students' perceptions and preferences about ESL corrective feedback in Namibia: Towards an intervention model. *World Journal of English Language, 7*(1), 11-19. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v7n1p11.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Hodder Education.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 573–595. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588241.

Papangkorn, P. (2015). SSRUIC students' attitude and preference toward error corrections. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 197,* 1841–1846. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.244.

Park, G. (2010). Preference of corrective feedback approaches perceived by native English teachers and students. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 7*(4), 29–52.

Rastegar, M., & Homayoon, H. (2012). EFL learners' preferences for error correction and its relationship with demotivation and language proficiency in the Iranian context. *Issues in Language Teaching, 1*(2), 323-341.

Russel, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar: A meta-analysis of the research. In *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 131–164). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Sopin, G. (2015). Perceptions and preferences of ESL students regarding the effectiveness of corrective feedback in Libyan secondary schools. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education, 5*(4), 71–77.

Suryoputro, G., & Amaliah, A. (2016). EFL students' responses on oral corrective feedbacks and uptakes in speaking class. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 3*(5), 73–80.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, A Journal of Research in Language Studies, 46*(2), 327–369. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x.

Walt, W. (1969). *A sociolinguistic description of Detroit micro speech*. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistic.

Xia, X. (2013). Gender differences in using language. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(8), 1485–1489. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.8.1485-1489.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference

of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness, 17*(1), 78–93. https://doi.org/10.2167/la429.0.

Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language* (Fourth Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zhao, W. (2015). *Learners' preferences for oral corrective feedback and their effects on second language noticing and learning motivation* (Master Thesis). Montreal: McGill University.

Zhu, H. (2010). An analysis of college students' attitudes towards error correction in EFL context. *English Language Teaching, 3*(4), 127–131. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n4p127.