

Teachers' Perception and Attitude in Using Corrective Feedback Associated with Character Education

Izef Puspadani Damanik, Arif Husein Lubis, Gilang Rajasa, and Dida Firman Hidayat
Department of English Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Setiabudhi 229, Bandung, Indonesia
{puspadani, husein.lubis07, rajasa7, raja.mahaputra08}@student.upi.edu

Keywords: Teacher's perception, attitude, written corrective feedback, oral corrective feedback, character education.

Abstract: Recent developments in the field of corrective feedback have managed to a renewed interest that corrective feedback might be interrelated with attitudinal development. Nonetheless, its appearance might be still vague in Indonesian educational setting which emphasizes character education as the foremost foundation of teaching and learning. This article seeks to capture Indonesian English teacher's perception and attitude on the use of corrective feedback and its association with character education. Employing a descriptive study, this paper elaborates nineteen English teachers' responses using open-ended questionnaire and interview. The findings support the idea that implicit corrective feedback is preferable to the teachers rather than the explicit one in delivering characters to their students. In addition, the study also highlighted some positive characters taken from the teachers' perspective. However, the result should be interpreted with caution since there are some limitations this study could not provide.

1 INTRODUCTION

Feedback is one of the interactions mostly used by teachers in the class. Hattie and Timperley (2007) clearly state feedback as a 'consequence of performance' that could be used explicitly or implicitly. An abundance of study has exposed that feedback implementation could improve student's cognitive (Al-Bashir, Kabir, and Rahman, 2016), affective (Grawemeyer *et al.*, 2015), and psychomotor (Milde, 1988). Even so, the study done by Karanezi and Rapti (2015) signaled some differences in teachers' perception and attitude over traditional and modern teaching method with positive and negative results at their own classes. Another study concluded by Halimi (2008) who found that most teachers employ CF as a constructive means of providing guidance for students to get them familiar with grammatical and lexical patterns of good English. However, most of the respondents prefer explicit strategy to correct the students' work by crossing out the incorrect form and giving the correct form. In contrast with Halimi, Mendez and Cruz (2012) noted that most teachers believe that implicit strategy was more preferred to use in correcting the students' errors compared to explicit one. Supported by Park (2010), the implicit error correction would likely influence student's affective skills related to

character building such as autonomy and confidence. Furthermore, Basalama and Machmud (2014) also concluded the development of character building could be facilitated by implementing corrective feedback.

Reflected from the previous studies, there seems no clear-cut evidence found regarding the concurrent relationship between the preferences and types of corrective feedback associated to the promotion of character education in the process of students' writing and speaking assignment. Under those circumstances, this study was aimed at seeking the perception and attitude of Indonesian English teachers on corrective feedback associated with character education.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Broadly speaking, corrective feedback (CF) is defined as any strategy used by the teacher to ask for, indirectly demand, students' improvement on their language awareness and language proficiency (Chaudron, 1977). Therefore, two major strategies of CF based on its form are written and oral corrective feedback.

Written corrective feedback consists of six types: direct, indirect, metalinguistic, unfocused, focused,

and reformulation. Meanwhile, oral corrective feedback consists of six types: recast, repetition, clarification, explicit, elicitation, and paralinguistic signal. The description of each type of both corrective feedbacks is provided in the following tables (Halimi, 2008).

Table 1: Types of written corrective feedback.

Corrective feedback	Type	Description
Written	Direct	Teacher provides the correct form.
	Indirect	Teacher indicates that an error exists, but no explanation. It can be indicating or plus locating the error.
	Metalinguistic	Teacher provides a clue or code as the helpful point to correct the errors.
	Unfocused	Teacher concerns to most or all of the errors identified.
	Focused	Teacher concerns to specific types of errors only.
	Reformulation	Teacher urges students to rework the content or meaning of the text.

Table 2: Types of oral corrective feedback.

Corrective feedback	Types	Description
Oral	Recast	Teacher incorporates the content words of the preceding incorrect part and changes and corrects the error directly.
	Repetition	Teacher repeats the expression and highlights the error by using emphatic stress.
	Clarification	Teacher questions back the student indicating that he/she has not understood the expression.

	Explicit	Teacher tells there has been an error and provides the correction.
	Elicitation	Teacher repeats some parts of the expression, but not the erroneous part and uses rising intonation to signal that the following part is the erroneous one.
	Paralinguistic signal	Teacher uses gesture or facial expression to indicate that there is an error.

Recently, Indonesia has developed character education to promote their students' ability in life skill and manner because Indonesia has several diversities that should be united by tolerant behavior. In 2004, Elkind and Sweet stated that character education is a deliberate effort to help people understand, care about, and act upon core ethical values. Following Josephson's (2002) six pillars of character education, as follows trustworthiness which also concerns a variety of qualities such as honesty, integrity, reliability, and loyalty, respect in all situations, even when dealing with unpleasant people, responsibility of being in charge of our choices and being accountable for what we do and who we are, fairness which probably more subject to legitimate debate and interpretation than any other ethical value, caring which is an honest expression of benevolence, or altruism, and citizenship which includes civic virtues and duties that prescribe how we ought to behave as part of a community.

According to Indonesian Government Decree No. 20 in 2003, there are eighteen character values that teachers should teach to the learners. The characters are religious, honest, tolerant, discipline, hard work, creative, independent, democratic, curious, nationality passionate, loyalty to the nation, respect to achievement, communicative, love peace, love to read, care to the environment, social care, and responsible.

3 METHODOLOGY

This study employed descriptive qualitative design using an open- and close-ended questionnaire and an interview protocol to gain teacher's perception on and attitudes toward corrective feedback. The

questionnaire was distributed to thirty teachers purposively since they have more than five years teaching experiences. However, only nineteen teachers returned the questionnaire. They are enrolling their Master degree at one state university in Bandung, Indonesia, and at the same time teaching at schools from different levels (elementary, junior high, and senior high). Four teachers then volunteered to be interviewed to further notice the belief of the teachers.

The questionnaire is adapted from (Ellis, 2009); Halimi (2008); and Kartchava (2016), with specific adjustments to the need for the research. The interview protocol was created based on the questionnaire to obtain the respondents' supporting reasons or explanations. The former consists of four parts. Part 1 consists of four questions used to obtain information related to the personal background of the respondents. Part 2 consists of eight questions used to obtain information about their attitude toward corrective feedback in students' writing work: 4 multiple choice questions and 4 short essay questions. Part 3 consists of eight questions concerning that on using corrective feedback to students' speaking performance: 4 multiple choice questions and 4 short essay questions. Part 4 consists of three questions concerning their perception on using corrective feedback in general in the forms of Likert-scale and short-essay questions.

Meanwhile, the interview protocol was used to obtain the respondents' reasons or explanations about the preference and process of corrective feedback practice in the classroom they have provided in the questionnaire. It is intended to recognize what characters are encouraged as the costs of their preference on using a particular type of CF. The interview protocol consists of three parts. Part A consists of 5 questions used to obtain information about their general perception and attitude on students' errors and feedback. Part B and C consist of 6 questions respectively used to obtain information about their perception of and attitude towards oral and written corrective feedback.

The raw data gained were analyzed qualitatively by employing Miles and Huberman (1994) four-step data analysis model. The questionnaire results were classified into two major themes: perception on and attitudes toward corrective feedback within each oral and written feedbacks are covered. Meanwhile, the interview transcripts were firstly read and discussed by each researcher regarding the emerging codes. Then, the recurrent codes were classified into some categories, i.e., perception, belief, attitudes, preferences, and process. Lastly, these categories are

associated with the main themes, i.e., oral and written corrective feedbacks that will directly address the research question.

To gain data trustworthiness, the interview transcript was distributed to the respective participant to proofread any mistyped words. Besides, each researcher re-checked the transcript for any grammatical errors.

4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Teachers' Perception of the Use of Written and Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies

The findings were aimed at addressing the first research question, "*how are the perception and attitude of Indonesian English teacher on the use of corrective feedback regarding the students' writing work and speaking performance?*"

Furthermore, the open-ended questionnaire indicated teacher's perception on the benefits of CF implementation in English teaching and learning process. It classified 3 different benefits – students, teachers, and both – related to enhancement. In terms of student's enhancement, 5 teachers perceived that CF can help students to correct and minimize their own errors as well as their motivation and knowledge skill. In terms of teachers' enhancement, 5 teachers believed that CF eased them to measure student's achievement and progress. Eight (8) teachers believed both sides were benefited from the use of CF in classroom evaluation and teaching quality.

Regarding the learning experience, major respondents (11) indicated that CF would provide students with the information about the errors that contribute to the student's language proficiency and learning achievement. Further, it could be an indicator of student's achievement in the classroom. Taken from the interview dataset, teachers clarified that CF may affect both teachers' teaching quality and students' learning motivation.

4.2 Teachers' Perception and Attitudes on Corrective Feedback Associated with Character Building

These findings were aimed to answer the second research question "*How are the teachers' perception and attitude on corrective feedback associated with character education?*". Explicitly stated before, there are 18 types of national character education in

character building development; Religious, Honest, Tolerance, Discipline, Hard work, Creative, Independent, Democracy, Curiosity, Nationality Spirit, Nationality Loyalty, Achievement Appreciation, Friendly or Communicative, Love Peace, Love Reading, Environment Caring, Social Caring, Responsibility. Other perceptions not related to the aim of the study will be included at the end of the chapter.

4.2.1 Written Corrective Feedback

Table 3: Questionnaire result.

WCF Types	Types of corrective feedback on writing	Tick (✓)
Direct	Crossing out the error and providing the correct form.	8
Indirect	Showing the error and giving a clue/editing symbol to correct it.	6
	Underlining or circling the error.	2
Indirect + verbal explanation	Putting a sign on the incorrect parts and providing oral feedback as well.	1
Focused + verbal explanation	Providing general feedback in class on common errors	2

Referring to the WCF typology, several types of WCF were detected; direct, indirect, and focused. However, the data also suggested that there is also a verbal explanation or communication between the teacher and the students in order to clarify the errors and the feedback. Besides, the aforementioned typology (Table 1) seems not clear enough to classify the types of WCF since there is a possible relationship in each type of WCF. It means, in a logical sense, while direct and direct CF focus on the procedure of providing the feedback, focused and unfocused CF deal with the frequency of errors occurrence. Meanwhile, reformulation CF concerns about the coverage of the whole content. In contrast with the literature, this article claims that there must be a preceding classification which explains the discrepancy of these types. Thus, focused, unfocused, and reformulation types were not detected on the data.

Regarding the character education, the answers expressed by the respondents were specified as *building awareness* from the students' errors. Some respondents agree that by marking or pointing out the error (indirect), the students would directly recognize

the error and the way to correct the error. Moreover, one respondent claimed, with error correction provision, students would be able to imitate the correct answer. Also mentioned by one respondent, a clue-type correction will trigger the students' to be more enthusiastic and thorough in doing their assignments. Further, Sally, who prefers clue-type written feedback, said:

"Some of the students really reflect it. I mean that high-level students will tend to correct themselves right away, but other students just neglect it. Some try to consult it with me whether the feedback is really helpful or not." (Sally, R9)

Based on Sally's explanation, there is a classification of students' reflection based on their level. According to her statement, while high-level students would use CF in leading them to find the correct answer, low-level students might ignore the CF. By looking what Sally implied, a clue-type correction will lead to a possible connection between students' types and self-understanding. R19 also suggested that 'teachers should not directly provide the correct answer but let students repair the incorrect one'. This type of CF creates a demanding situation where the clues will lead students to be curious and seeking the right answer and responsible at the same time.

Two teachers believed the best way of giving WCF is by signaling the error. They chose to provide a signal (e.g., underlines or circles) on the error without any note. To them students will be able to think critically by asking the teacher of the error, therefore teacher could provide detail feedback to the students. Ward also argued:

"...with circling or underlining to the error (the sentences or words), without providing any note, would stimulate students' curiosity to ask questions to the teacher. Lastly, I explain their errors one by one." (Ward, R13)

Logically, types of WCF could be used as a tool to promote character education in learning context consciously or unconsciously. Conscious character education means teachers would deliberately build their students' character with a demanding situation. The demanding situation then could increase students' curiosity to seek correction of their errors. An unconscious character education means teachers are actually focused on the learning content but indirectly lead the students to build their own

character. Thus, it will draw students' consideration by paying attention to the errors and the correction (*awareness*) and being responsible to correct the errors (*responsibility*). Most of the respondents in the present study agree that character education would possibly occur during their WCF implementation. However, this perception might interfere with the instruments used in this study since there is no obvious explanation whether or not character education is deliberately conducted.

In general, most teachers in the present study have a similar perception that CF is used to avoid students' confusion and create a motivational learning atmosphere. It is because some students may lack understanding of what should be done with the errors (R17) or feeling demotivated to join the cause. Therefore, these perceptions may result in building students' awareness. The awareness will then lead the students to be more careful and pay attention to their next performance. In other words, judging from teachers' perspective, while students' awareness of their error is already maintained, it might probably lead them to be responsible for their later performance.

Regarding the approach used in the process of providing corrective feedback on the students' written works, explicit explanation and direct error corrections were the most preferred ways represented by 10 respondents. Two (2) respondents did not provide any explanation about the rationale of their using in which it becomes quite ambiguous to reflect on whether character education is asserted in the learning process. On the other hand, 7 other respondents argued that they preferred to employ strategies emphasizing student-centeredness. They mostly concerned to the students' responsibility in which direct guidance and guided clues were employed.

It is in line with the interview results suggesting that by providing notes on the correction would encourage the students to figure out how to correct the errors under their guidance. In contrast, providing clues (e.g., circles or underlines), without any notes, would stimulate their curiosity. These perspectives, eventually, have a similar result in nature. It reflects that even though the participants are different in ways of addressing their feedback, however, the expected result is actually to take over students' awareness and curiosity in the learning process.

"...I provide the feedback by writing it down on each student's paper. After that, I invite all students to discuss it together focusing only on the repeated errors." (Eddie, R19: L44, 45)

Additionally, related to the teacher's attitude towards the same context, the datasets deduced the use of WCF would trigger to be autonomous and responsible at the same time. However, teachers' holistic correction such as clues, editing symbols, direct correction, explicit correction still become the major reasons for such attitudes. By far, according to the teachers, students are still dependent on it.

4.2.2 Oral Corrective Feedback

Before elaborating the data, the article would underline the context of speaking performance. Since the performance might be, to some extent, interpreted as a daily interaction between the teacher and the students, the activities emphasized in this article are students' interaction e.g. telling stories, debating, transactional and interpersonal dialogue.

Table 4: While-perform corrective feedback.

OCF Types	Types of corrective feedback on speaking	Tick (✓)
Clarification	By directly interrupting and asking for clarification what has the student said	3
Explicit	By directly interrupting, telling the incorrect part(s), and giving the correct form	4
Elicitation	By directly interrupting and repeating some parts of the utterance before the incorrect part(s) by rising the intonation on the last word before the incorrect part(s)	2
Sign paralinguistic	By directly interrupting through the use of gestures or fingers to show the incorrect part(s)	1

The data also disclosed another possibility in providing the feedback. Nine respondents would imply that feedback should be given at the end of the performance (post-perform), while the others in the middle of the performance (while-perform).

Table 5: Post-perform corrective feedback.

OCF Types	Types of corrective feedback on speaking	Tick (✓)
Waiting (Without notes)	Feedback provided at the end of the performance	3
Waiting (without notes + reward)	Give reward and provide feedback at the end of the performance.	1
Waiting + with notes	Make a note of the errors and provide feedback at the end of the performance.	4
Unclassified (Indecisive)	Collect the students' errors and provide feedback at the end of the lesson.	1

Four of nine respondents preferred taking notes of the errors before providing the feedback. The other three respondents would give feedback at the end of the performance without preparing any notes. In a similar way, the other one would firstly give rewards before feedback is given. However, one indecisive response was detected since there was no clear explanation whether the notes were prepared.

Seeing the perspective of the teacher, there are two types of oral corrective feedback; while-perform type and post-perform type. While the former is given in the middle of speaking performance, the latter is given at the end of student's speaking performance.

To some respondents, the perception of the use of post-perform type correction would not distract the students' concentration span and maintain students' motivation in generating ideas of their talking. Suggested by interview datasets, some interviewees believe post-perform type would maintain students' confidence, carefulness, and precision. Moreover, as a respondent noticed, giving correction after the students' speaking performance would initiate students' acceptance towards the correction.

On the contrary, a different perception was gained. The interruption in while-perform type is a short-intervention feedback which is more positive than a long-intervention feedback. Within this type, the respondents believed students being accustomed to critical thinking and thoroughness could be maintained. To some other proponents, awareness could be perceived as soon as students commit errors while they perform.

Towards the attitude on the use of oral corrective feedback, some teachers were positively

(consciously) slipping character education while they used corrective feedback. The intention of it was to make the students responsible and autonomy of their errors. To the others, teachers negatively (unconsciously) slipping character education on their correction. However, the teachers agreed on interruption on students' speaking performance will lead to losing concentration and decrease in terms of motivation; therefore, taking notes was preferable to do.

5 CONCLUSION

This article has reached the conclusion that there were several types of WCF and OCF. Regarding the former, there is a limitation of a theory that could explain all types of WCF mentioned by the respondents. It would likely happen since there is an overlapping feature of each type that could not be properly interpreted on the result of the study. Regarding the latter, there should be an additional classification which explains how the feedback is given (whether in the middle or at the end of the performance). Therefore, this article would eagerly suggest that the existing literature should be expanded in terms of the classification of types of WCF and OCF.

Based on the finding, there are three types of character education displayed in implementing corrective feedback; curiosity, responsibility, and achievement appreciation. However, more positive affection such as motivation, awareness, critical thinking, and confidence are also presented in corrective feedback.

Driving from WCF and OCF, there are types of correction that could promote positive character learning directly or indirectly and conscious and unconsciously. Further, teacher's perception may influence the result of character learning in correction feedback. Those lead to the process of accommodating character education itself in using either written or oral corrective feedback strategies. Regarding the former, explicit CF strategy strongly tends not to trigger students' involvement from which neglect and dependency were mostly indicated. On the other hand, the teachers emphasizing student-centeredness through implicit CF strategy conforms to the promotion of character education, which comprise; curiosity, autonomy, and carefulness. Regarding the latter, the majority also confirmed similar consideration that students' involvement in the process of providing the feedback becomes the basis of their choosing implicit CF strategy. As a

result, self-confidence, bravery, and competence of the students were majorly accommodated. Thus, the choice of a particular strategy fundamentally influences the students' attitude toward the feedback in which a revisit on the actual practices of providing the feedback and actualizing sensitivity upon the students' circumstances might contribute to the better quality of character education accommodation through either written or oral CF strategies.

REFERENCES

- Al-Bashir, M., Kabir, R. & Rahman, I., 2016, 'The value and effectiveness of feedback in improving students' learning and professionalizing teaching in higher education', *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(16), pp. 38–41.
- Basalama, N. & Machmud, K., 2014, *Peran Role Model dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris pada Konteks 'Foreign Language': Suatu Penelitian Kualitatif Tentang Identitas & Budaya dalam Pembangunan Karakter Bangsa*. Universitas Negeri Gorontalo. Available at: <http://repository.ung.ac.id>
- Chaudron, C., 1977, 'A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors', *Language Learning*, 27(1), pp. 29–46.
- Elkind, D. H. & Sweet, F., 2004, 'How to do character education', *Live Wire Media*. Available at: http://www.goodcharacter.com/Article_4.html.
- Ellis, R., 2009, 'A typology of written corrective feedback types', *ELT Journal*, 63(2), pp. 97–107.
- Grawemeyer, B. *et al.*, 2015, 'The impact of feedback on students' affective states', *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, 1432, pp. 4–13.
- Halimi, S. S., 2008, 'Indonesian teachers' and students' preferences for error correction.', *WACANA*, 10(1), pp. 50–71.
- Hattie, J. & Timperley, H., 2007, 'The power of feedback', *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), pp. 81–112.
- Josephson, M. S., 2002, *Making Ethical Decisions*. Los Angeles: The Josephson Institute of Ethics.
- Karanezi, X. & Rapti, E., 2015, 'Teachers' attitudes and perceptions: Association of teachers' attitudes toward traditional and modern teaching methodology according to RWCT as well as teachers' perceptions for teaching as a profession', *Creative Education*, 6, pp. 623–630.
- Kartchava, E., 2016, 'Learners' beliefs about corrective feedback in the language classroom: Perspectives from two international contexts', *TESL Canada Journal*, 33(2), pp. 19–45.
- Mendez, E. H. & Cruz, M. del R. R., 2012, 'Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms', *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 14(2), pp. 63–75.
- Milde, F. K., 1988, 'The function of feedback in psychomotor-skill learning', *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 10(4), pp. 425–434.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M., 1994, *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Park, G., 2010, 'Preference of corrective feedback approaches perceived by native English teachers and students', *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 7(4), pp. 29–52.
- Presiden Republik Indonesia, 2003, *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia no 20 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional, Direktorat Pendidikan Menengah Umum*. Indonesia. Available at: <http://www.kelembagaan.ristekdikti.go.id>.