The Practice of Immediate Correction on Students' Oral Production Errors in Tenth Graders Classes of A State High School in Sidoarjo

Ikal Malis

Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni
Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Ikalfunz@yahoo.co.id

Dosen Pembimbing:

Him'mawan A. N., S. Pd., M. Pd.

English Department, Language and Art Faculty, State University of Surabaya

Abstrak

Di dalam pengajaran bahasa Inggris, baik dalam konteks Bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa kedua maupun bahasa asing, terdapat sebuah teknik yang disebut koreksi langsung atau umpan balik-koreksi, ynag bisanya digunakan dalam mengoreksi kesalahan verbal. Banyak peneliti tidak menganjurkan penggunaan koreksi langsung disebabkan adanya beberapa kelemahan dalam teknik tersebut. Akan tetapi, dalam praktiknya, masih banyak guru bahasa Inggris yang masih menggunakan teknik ini dalam mengoreksi kesalahan verbal siswa.

Dalam penelitian ini, peneliti mencoba untuk mengungkap praktik penggunaan teknik koreksi langsung pada kesalahan verbal siswa yang terjadi di tingkatan kelas sepuluh di sebuah sekolah menengah negeri di Sidoarjo. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengungkap tipe-tipe koreksi langsung apa saja yang paling banyak digunakan oleh guru bahasa Inggris siswa kelas sepuluh di sekolah tersebut, dan alasan-alasan apa sajakah yang mendasari guru untuk menggunakan tipe-tipe tersebut. Untuk kepentingan tersebut, peneliti meneliti dua orang guru bahasa Inggris siswa kelas sepuluh di sekolah tersebut. Pertama, peneliti mengobservasi proses belajar mengajar yang dilakukan oleh masing-masing guru untuk mencari tahu tipe-tipe koreksi langsung yang paling banyak digunakan oleh guru; para guru sedang mengajar keahlian membaca ketika observasi berlangsung. Kedua, setelah tipe-tipe koreksi langsung yang paling banyak dipakai telah diketahui, peneliti menwawancarai kedua guru mengenai alasan mereka menggunakan tipe-tipe koreksi langsung tersebut.

Hasil dari penelitian ini mengungkap bahwa, pertama, tipe-tipe koreksi langsung yang paling banyak digunakan guru dalam mengoreksi kesalahan verbal siswa adalah *recasts, explicit correction, repetition,* dan *metalinguistic feedback*. Kedua, ada empat alas an guru dalam menggunakan empat tipe koreksi langsung tersebut. Alasan-alasan tersebut adalah, pertama, guru A menggunakan *recasts* dan *explicit correction* atas dasar respon otomatis terhadap kesalahan siswa. Kedua, Guru B menggunakan *recast* atas dasar kepentingan manajemen kelas atau ketika menemui kesalahan pengucapan yang tidak dapat ditoleransi. Ketiga, kedu guru menggunakan *repetition* atas dasar keyakinan bahwa *repetition* dapat membuat siswa menyadari kesalahannya sendiri. Keempat, guru B menggunakan *metalinguistic feedback* untuk menangani kesalahan yang terjadi pada hal-hal yang pernah diterangkan berulang kali atau kesalahan pada hal-hal yang dianggap masuk dalam tingkatan dasar dalam penguasaan bahasa Inggris.

Kata Kunci: Koreksi langsung, Umpan balik-koreksi, Kesalahan dalam pengucapan, EFL

Abstract

In the teaching of English both in the fields of ESL or EFL, there is a correction technique called immediate correction, or corrective feedback, which is usually used in correcting students' oral production errors. Immediate correction on students' oral production errors, however, is a correction technique which many researchers suggest not to use since they believe that immediate correction has several disadvantages. However, despite of the argument, many English teachers still use immediate correction when correcting their students' oral production errors.

In this study, the researcher tried to reveal the practice of immediate correction on students' oral production errors in tenth graders classes of a state high school in Sidoarjo. This objective covers finding out the immediate correction types which the teachers of tenth graders classes of this state high school in Sidoarjo use most frequently, and the teachers' reasons for the use of those immediate correction types. Two English teachers participated in the study. The researcher observed the teachers' performance to find

out the immediate correction types that the teachers used most frequently in correcting students' oral production error, while the teachers were teaching reading skills. Both teachers were then, also interviewed related to their reasons for having used the most frequently used immediate correction types.

The study revealed two findings. Firstly, four immediate correction types, namely recasts, explicit correction, repetition, and metalinguistic feedback came out as the immediate correction types, which were most frequently used by the teachers. Secondly, the teachers' reasons for using the most frequently used immediate correction types were quite various. First, teacher A used recast and explicit correction automatically without any underlying reasons. Second, teacher B had used recast because of her concern over class management issue and students' bad pronunciation. Third, both teachers used repetition because both teachers believed that repetition could make students realize their own errors. The last, teacher B used metalinguistic feedback to deal with errors over something that has been explained many times and over something that the teacher considered as very basic English.

Keywords: Immediate correction, Corrective feedback, Oral production errors, EFL

INTRODUCTION

Oral production is a term in language learning for activities in which the language user produces an oral text which is received by audiences, one or more, or listeners (Council of Europe, 2011:58). Besides speaking activities, oral reading also covers reading a written text aloud, speaking from notes or from a written text, acting out a rehearsed role, speaking spontaneously and even singing (Council of Europe, 2011:58). In oral production activities, the occurrence of errors is of course, as which happens to other English skills learning, indispensable.

In the learning of English for non-native language learners, including in oral production activities, the occurrence of errors cannot be avoided and is needed at the same time. First, as stated by Corder (1967) as cited from Park (2010:6), errors cannot be avoided because in the learning of target language there are various causes which can trigger students to produce errors such as, interference from L1, overgeneralization, the complexity of the target language, and fossilization. Second, the occurrence of errors is needed since errors made by students will lead to teachers' correction and the correction itself will help the students notice the gap between their utterances and the target forms, which elicits uptake or repair (Park, 2010:2).

In terms of error correction, there is a type of correction which is called corrective feedback, which is also referred to as immediate correction by Ancker (2000) and Park (2010:48). There are seven types of immediate correction. Six of those are explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition which are classified by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and one more type named translation is added by Lyster and Panova (2002). Those seven types of immediate correction are classified based on how the correction is delivered.

From their six types of immediate correction, Lyster and Ranta (1997:54) found that recasts, which was the least to lead to any students' uptake (i.e., responses to feedback), was in fact the most used immediate correction type. In the other hand, elicitation as the most successful technique to generate students' uptake was the second most used immediate correction type. In addition, Lyster and Panova (2002:586) also found that from the seven types of immediate correction, recasts was still the most used immediate correction type, in the other hand, elicitation, repetition, and clarification requests as those most successful in generating learners' uptake were the least used types of immediate correction. Those findings are of course surprising, since there were imbalances between the frequency of use and the effectiveness of the immediate correction types. In other words, it can be inferred that most teachers who use immediate correction do not have sufficient knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of each type of immediate correction.

Those findings also made researcher concerns whether the same fact happened with English teachers in Sidoarjo or not. Related to this matter, researcher conducted a study to find out about the practice of immediate correction on students' oral production errors in tenth graders classes of a state high school in Sidoarjo. Researcher had chosen this state high school as the setting of the study because this school was potential as a place where the practice of immediate correction could be found, since at this school English is the main language used for interactions during English classes.

Based on the research problem above, the researcher formulated the research questions as follow,

1. What types of immediate correction do the English teachers of the tenth graders use most frequently to correct students' oral production errors?

2. Why do the English teachers of the tenth graders choose to use the immediate correction types that they use most frequently?

RESEARCH METODHOLOGY

This research is classified as a qualitative study. This can be seen from two points of view, those are the nature of the study and what the researcher wants to find out from the study. First is the nature of the study. This study, as it was titled, was meant to describe what happens in the field of the study and to interpret what the teachers experienced. This is in accordance to the nature of qualitative studies, since qualitative studies describe and attempt to interpret experience and it provides rich description targeted to understanding a phenomenon, a process, or a particular point of view from the perspective of those involved (Ary et al., 2010:453).

Second is what the researcher wanted to find out by conducting this research. What the researcher wanted to find out by conducting this research were the immediate correction types which were used most frequently by the English teachers of the tenth graders in a state high school in Sidoarjo, in correcting students' oral production error, and the reasons underlying the English teachers's choice of the immediate correction types which they used most frequently. This is in accordance to what is stated by Ary, et al. (2010) about the types of questions asked in qualitative study; in which the types of questions asked in qualitative studies cover (1.) what is happening? (2.) What does something mean? (3.) How are events organized or related? (4.) What are the perspectives of the participants? (5.) How do participants interact? (6.) And what are the relationships among structure, events, and participants? From the list of questions above, it is clear that the research questions of this study match the first, the fourth and the sixth criteria. Therefore researcher believes that this research is a qualitative study.

The participants of this study were two English teachers of the tenth graders classes of a state high school in Sidoarjo. The researcher chose two English teachers because there were only two English teachers for tenth graders at this school. Choosing all of the English teachers, as researcher believed was necessary for answering the first research question. In addition, the researcher also chose tenth graders English teachers because when researcher gave the research proposal to this state high school in Sidoarjo, researcher was offered to conduct the research on tenth graders English teachers.

In this study, the teachers' real names were not mentioned as to keep their privacy. In return, the researcher referred the teachers to teacher A and teacher B. Teacher A was a male teacher who had been a teacher for 23 years, meanwhile Teacher B was a female teacher who had been a teacher for 13 years.

There were two data in this study. The first datum was the tenth graders English teachers' immediate correction towards students' oral production errors. This first datum was taken by observing the teaching and learning process in both teachers' classes, and was presented in the form of dialogue transcription. This datum was used to answer the first research question. In obtaining this datum, the researcher conducted two different observations; once in every teacher's class of one period of English class. The second datum was the transcripts of the teachers' oral statements taken by interviewing the teachers after the researcher obtained the first data. This datum was used to answer the second research question. The sources of the data in this study were the English teachers, as those who executed the immediate correction. In addition, it took five different sessions of interview to obtain the second datum; two sessions with teacher A, and three sessions with teacher B. The process of obtaining the second datum was longer than the researcher expected since, due to the researcher' lack of experience in conducting interviews, the researcher did not succeed to obtain relevant datum as efficient as possible. In total, it took five days for the researcher to complete the process of obtaining the data.

The instruments that were used to collect data in this study were videos of teaching and learning process from both teachers' classes, observation checklist and semi structured interview. Firstly, recorded videos of teaching and learning process of both teachers' classes were used so that the researcher could observe the immediate correction types used by the teachers without missing any important details. The data obtained from observing the video was written in the forms of teacher and student dialogue transcription of each immediate correction done by teachers, which was latter analyzed with an observation checklist. Secondly, observation checklist, the observation checklist which contained the characteristics of each immediate correction types, was used to help the researcher to maintain the validity of the data collected for answering the first research question. Observation checklist was very important, since by using observation checklist researcher could eliminate the chance of mistaking one immediate correction type to the others as researcher tying to observe the immediate correction types used by both teachers by watching the videos of the teaching and learning process. The last, semi structured interviews was used to collect data for the second research question. The semi structured interviews contained three questions, asked to the English teachers of the tenth graders classes, about their reasons for having

used immediate correction in general and for having used their most frequently used immediate correction types.

The analysis for the data collected in this study was divided into two. First, the analysis of the data collected for answering the first research question. The analysis for this data included the following stages;

1. Making transcription for the immediate corrections used by teachers from the recorded videos of teaching and learning process of both teachers' classes

2. Classifying the type of each immediate correction used by the teachers, as transcribed from the video, using the observation checklist

3. Counting the frequency of use of each immediate correction type by using observation checklist and picking the most frequently used ones as the answer.

Second, the analysis of the data collected from the interviews with teachers. The data collected from the interviews with the teachers were selected and only relevant data were chosen. Then, the relevant data were used to answer the second research question.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the analysis of the transcriptions of immediate corrections used by both Teacher A and Teacher B, the researcher developed a table representing the frequency of use of the immediate correction tips used by both teachers. The table can be seen below.

Table 1: The frequency of use of each immediate correction types

Immediate Correction Type	Frequency of use		
	Teacher A	Teacher B	Total
Explicit correction	2		2
Recasts	3	1	4
Repetition	1	1	2
Elicitation		1	1
Clarification requests		1	1
Metalinguistic feedback		2	2
Translation		1	1

The table shows that in terms of frequency of use, recasts was dominating. the use of recasts alone counted four times. Following recasts, there were explicit correction, repetition, and metalinguistic feedback those were all distributed evenly. Finally, at the bottom place, there were elicitation, clarification requests, and translation. Thus, the researcher decided to include recasts, explicit correction, repetition, and metalinguistic feedback as the most frequently used immediate correction types done by the English teachers of the tenth graders of a state high school in Sidoarjo.

Meanwhile, from the relevant data obtained from the interviews, the teachers' reasons for having used the

immediate correction types which they used most frequently were,

1. Teacher A used explicit correction and recasts automatically, without any underlying reason
2. Teacher B used recasts because of;
   a. Class management issue; she did not want to risk the classroom attention when waiting for a student to think about an answer
   b. The teacher's belief that good pronunciation over simple English words must be build
3. Teacher A and teacher B used repetition because they believed that repetition could make students realize their own errors
4. Teacher B used metalinguistic feedback when it came to an error over something that has been explained many times and over something that the teacher considered as very basic English.

Discussion

In this research, it was found that the immediate correction types which were used most frequently by the teachers, were recasts, and explicit correction, repetition, and metalinguistic feedback. The fact that recasts was included in the most frequently used immediate correction is in line with the findings from Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Lyster and Panova (2002)'s researches, in which they found that recasts was the immediate correction or corrective feedback type which was distributed mostly. This is also supported by the finding of Vaezi et al. (2011) in which they found that recasts was the most used immediate correction type over grammatical and phonological errors. This means, for recasts, the result of this study was in accordance with the findings from the previous studies.

Meanwhile, about explicit correction, repetition, and metalinguistic feedback; the fact that they were also found as the most frequently used immediate correction seemed to be a little surprising. Because, previously, in Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Lyster and Panova (2002)'s researches, it was found that explicit correction, repetition, and metalinguistic feedback were in the least used immediate correction types list. This means that there is a possibility that the findings of Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Lyster and Panova (2002) did not applicable in the setting of this study; the tenth graders classes of a state high school in Sidoarjo. However, a research may have to be conducted to clarify the potential that this possibility really happened. Since, there is a wide difference in the time allocation of conducting the observation between this research and the research conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Lyster and Panova (2002). However, the issue to be discussed is that, how come that these three feedback types could come out as the most frequently

immediate correction types in this research? In the researcher's point of view, there are three possible reasons for these findings.

First reason; repetition was one of the most frequently used immediate correction types by the tenth graders English teachers because the teachers already knew the potential or advantage of repetition. This reason was inferred from what both teachers stated about repetition during the interview. During the interviews, both teachers stated that repetition could make their students realize their errors. The teachers' belief that repetition was advantageous is in line with Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Lyster and Panova (2002)'s finding about repetition; that repetition is effective at eliciting students' uptake.

Second reason; explicit correction was one of the most frequently used immediate correction types by the tenth graders English teachers because teacher A (as the only teacher who used explicit correction) probably did not know the fact that explicit correction is one of the least effective immediate correction types. This is inferred from teacher A's statement about explicit correction during the interview. Teacher A stated that sometimes he did explicit correction automatically when he heard his students' errors even though he understood that giving explicit correction might reduce his students' motivation. The statement above indicated that teacher A was unaware of the ineffectiveness of explicit correction. The ineffectiveness of explicit correction is, as stated by Lyster and Ranta (1997:57), explicit correction is not an effective correction technique since it does not provide the students with the opportunity to repair their own errors because in explicit correction, the teachers already provide the correct forms of the errors.

Third reason, there were two possible reasons for the fact that metalinguistic feedback was one of the most frequently used immediate correction types by the tenth graders English teachers; even though metalinguistic feedback was only done by teacher B. Firstly, in the researcher's point of view, metalinguistic feedback became one of the most frequently used immediate correction type incidentally. There was a possibility that teacher B used metalinguistic feedback, only because the students' errors matched the criteria of the errors that teacher B usually counteracted with metalinguistic feedback. This can be inferred from teacher B's answer during the interview; teacher B only stated that she used metalinguistic feedback because the student produced certain types of errors. Secondly, there was a possibility that metalinguistic feedback became one of the most frequently used immediate correction type, because of the massive occurrence of lexical errors in teacher B's class. As found in the result of the study, all errors occurred in

teacher B's class were lexical errors, and both metalinguistic feedbacks done by teacher B were to correct lexical errors. In line with this, Lyster (2001, p. 291) found that teachers tend to use negotiation of form (metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, clarification requests and repetition) in dealing with lexical errors.

In addition to the discussion about the finding of this research above, researcher also found four other phenomena during study. Firstly is the fact that teacher B used more immediate correction types than teacher A did. Secondly is the fact that both teachers ignored some oral production errors produced by their students. Thirdly is the fact that teacher A used more recasts and explicit correction than teacher B did, and the fact that teacher B used metalinguistic feedback meanwhile teacher A did not. The last is the fact that all errors occurred in teacher B class were lexical error

First phenomenon that researcher found from the study was the fact that teacher B used more immediate correction types than teacher A did. Teacher B used six types of immediate correction, which cover recasts, clarification requests, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, repetition, and translation. Meanwhile, teacher A only used three immediate correction types, which cover explicit correction, recasts, and repetition.

The reason for this phenomenon can be inferred from teacher B' answer during the interviews, as she was asked about her background knowledge about immediate correction. During the interview, teacher B stated that she often used immediate correction automatically because she could not hold to tell the students as she found the students produced errors, even though she was aware that immediate correction was not supposed to be used to make students will to speak English bravely. This automatic instinct was perhaps the cause of the use of so many immediate corrections, which also then probably lead to the exploration of so many immediate correction types. Related to this phenomenon, Ancker (2000) also found that there was a teacher among the teachers he surveyed who believed that if students' mistakes are not taken care at the moment it is made, then the students will keep on making the same mistakes again. This belief could probably also underlined the use of so many immediate corrections by teacher B.

The second phenomenon that researcher found during the study was that, during the observations, both teachers ignored some oral production errors produced by their student. During the observations, the researcher found that the teachers did not handle all oral production errors the students produced. In the researcher's point of view, there are two possible reasons of why the errors were unhandled. First, the teachers did not notice the

errors. Second. The teachers noticed the errors, but purposefully ignored the errors.

However, regardless of which of the possibilities above underlined teacher A and teacher B' acts of ignoring the students' errors, the phenomenon of teachers ignoring their students' errors is quite common in the teaching of English. This is proven by Ancker (2000) who surveyed the answers of teachers, teacher trainees and students in 15 countries for the question of "Should teachers correct every error students make when using English?" In that study, Ancker (2000) found that 75 % of the teachers answered that teachers should not correct every error the students made. The frequent reasons from the teachers of why the teachers should not correct every error were;

1. Correction may develop a barrier, and the students will be afraid of making mistakes and will not speak or study English with pleasure
2. It is tiring for both the teacher and the student
3. It is impossible to correct every error
4. The student cannot process all of those corrections
5. Students will forget the corrections
6. The correction of each mistake will confuse a student.

Therefore, one or some of those reasons above, as well as the two possibilities the researcher mentioned before, probably also underlined teacher A and teacher B's acts of ignoring their students' errors during the observations.

The third phenomenon was about the comparison of both teachers' most frequently used immediate correction types. This phenomenon could be simplified into three parts. Firstly, the fact that teacher A used recasts more than teacher B did. Secondly, the fact that teacher A used explicit correction twice meanwhile teacher B did not. The last, the fact that teacher B used metalinguistic feedback twice, meanwhile teacher A did not.

The first fact was that teacher A used more recasts than teacher B did. From the finding, it was found that teacher A used recasts three times, two of which were over phonological errors and the other one over grammatical error. Meanwhile teacher B used recasts only once, over a lexical error. Those patterns of the use of recast seemed to tell that the cause of teacher A's using of more recasts was the result of the occurrence of phonological errors and grammatical error in teacher A class. As shown in the result of the study, teacher A had to deal with all types of errors, which cover phonological errors, grammatical errors, and lexical errors, meanwhile teacher A only had to deal with lexical errors. This is in accordance with the finding of Vaezi et al. (2011), who found that recasts was the most used immediate correction type over grammatical and phonological errors.

The second fact was that teacher A used explicit correction twice meanwhile teacher B did not. As shown in the result of the study, teacher A used explicit correction twice and both were used over phonological and lexical errors, and teacher B did not use any explicit correction. The absence of explicit correction in teacher B class was in accordance with the finding of Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Lyster and Panova (2002). Both studies found that explicit correction was, indeed, a quite rarely used immediate correction type. Meanwhile, for teacher A's choice of explicit correction; it could be the result of teacher A's random use of immediate correction type. This is as inferred from the result of this study, in which teacher A had no reasons for using recasts and explicit correction but only used them based on automatic response to hearing an oral production error.

The last fact was that teacher B used metalinguistic feedback twice, meanwhile teacher A did not. It was found that teacher B used both metalinguistic feedbacks on lexical errors. In accordance with this fact, Lyster (2001) found that teachers tend to use negotiation of form (metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, clarification requests and repetition) in dealing with lexical errors. The finding of Lyster (2001) above could probably also explain the absence of metalinguistic feedback in teacher A's class, because as seen in the result of this study, teacher A only had the opportunity in dealing with lexical error once, meanwhile, all errors that teacher B had to deal with were lexical errors. In addition, this occurrence of so many lexical errors in teacher B's class could also be the potential cause of why teacher B used all negotiation of form (metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, clarification requests and repetition) meanwhile teacher A only used one negotiation of form; repetition. This is inferred after considering the finding of Lyster (2001) about the tendency of teachers in using negotiation of form to deal with lexical errors.

Finally, the last phenomenon is about the fact that all errors occurred in teacher B's class were lexical errors. As shown in the result of this study, even though teacher B used more various immediate correction types than teacher A did, the oral production errors type in teacher B's class were homogeneous; all were lexical errors, meanwhile all types of oral production errors occurred in teacher A's class. In the researcher's point of view, this could be related to the different teaching materials being used in both teacher A and teacher B's class.

The materials used in teacher B's class during the observation, were Indonesian newspapers. In the researcher's point of views, this could be the source of the domination of lexical errors happened in teacher B's class. The reason is simple; it was because the student had to

read Indonesian newspaper meanwhile they had to answer teacher B's questions in English, so that there occurred the possibility of students having difficulties in translating L1 words into L2 words.

Different situation was found in teacher A's class, in which the teaching material being used during the observation was an English narrative text. In that case, the student read English texts and they had to answer teacher A's questions in English. Thus, the challenge for the students was not only limited in translating L1 into L2, but also exploring the grammatical and phonological elements of English; which at the same time also explained the occurrence of all three types of oral production errors in teacher A's class.

CONCLUSION

The result and discussion in chapter four brought the researcher to two conclusions, which answered the two research questions. First, the immediate correction types those the tenth graders English teachers of a state high school in Sidoarjo used most frequently in correcting students' oral production errors were recasts, explicit correction, repetition, and metalinguistic feedback. This first finding, clarified that if it came to the frequency of distribution of all seven immediate correction types, recasts was still the dominant. Second, there were various reasons underlying both the tenth graders English teachers' choice of using recasts, explicit correction, repetition, and metalinguistic feedback. Those reasons were, first, teacher A had used recasts and explicit correction when correcting his students' oral production errors automatically without any interference from personal motivation. Second, teacher B had used recast because of her concern over class management issue and students' bad pronunciation. Third, both teachers used repetition because both teachers believed that repetition could make students realize their own errors. The last, teacher B used metalinguistic feedback to deal with errors over something that has been explained many times and over something that the teacher considered as very basic English. In addition to the finding, it also appeared in the discussion that there was a possibility that the use of different teaching and learning materials may results in the occurrence of different types of oral production errors which latter, may also trigger the use of different types of immediate corrections.

SUGGESTION

As the result of the study is revealed, researcher would like to give suggestions both to English teachers who have participated in this study and to the students of English Education study program. Firstly, for both English teachers who have participated in this study,

better understanding about the types of immediate correction should be gained. This is important, since by having sufficient knowledge about the types of immediate correction, teachers can avoid the chance of using immediate correction randomly without knowing what the effects for the students are. Secondly, for the students of English education study program, this study still does not cover all aspects of the use of immediate correction in EFL environments and there still are few, if exists, studies over this field in Indonesia. Therefore, the opportunity to conduct research over the field of the use of immediate correction is still wide open.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Ancker, W. 2000. Errors and Corrective Feedback: Updated Theory and Classroom Practice. *Forum , 38*, 20-25.

Ary, D., Jacob, L. C., and Sorensen, C. K. 2010. *Introduction to Research in Education* (8th Edition ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth.

Corder, S. 1967. The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics , 5*, 161-167.

Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment.* New York: Cambidge University Press.

Lyster, R. 2001. Negotiation of Form, Recasts, and Explicit Correction in Relation to Error Types and Learner Repair in Immersion Classrooms. *Language Learning , 51*, 265-301.

Lyster, R., and Panova, I. 2002. Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom. *TESOL QUARTERLY , 36, 573-595*.

Lyster, R., and Ranta, L. 1997. Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition , 20*, 37-66.

Park, H. 2010. *Teachers' and Learners' Preferences for Error Correction.* Sacramento: California State University.

Vaezi, S., Zand-Vakili, E., and Kashani, A. F. 2011. Patterns of Corrective Feedback in Relation to Error Types in Iranian Adult EFL Learners' Classes. *European Journal of Scientific Research , 66*, 517-531.