TECHNIQUES FOR CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON SPOKEN LANGUAGE

Feedback is any response to a student's work from a teacher, external expert, or colleague. However, feedback can often be a complex, and sometimes unpleasant, process that, when misinterpreted, contributes to conflict. First of all, feedback should be accessible and understandable. It is also important to make sure that the teacher's response is fair and honest, not too positive or negative. Corrective feedback is the most common type of feedback given by most teachers in most classrooms, because it focuses on learners’ errors. Feedback is a good opportunity to point out a student's gaps.

Corrective feedback can be harmful to language acquisition, that it leads to no demonstrable gains in grammatical accuracy and that it can impact negatively on learners’ feelings [3; 6; 7; 11; 12]. Assessment will therefore continue to be a major concern for teachers. However, an educational process is interposed between the performance assessment and the performance evaluation (grading). The performance assessment must counter the greatest demands on objectivity, reliability and validity. The pedagogically responsible process of assessment will always be accompanied by a degree of subjectivity and individuality [1].

The principle of the feedback-burger has often proven itself to provide helpful feedback:

- A burger consists of two bun halves: The bread represents praise and recognition. First, positive things should be emphasized, whereby something should be saved for the second (thicker) half.
- Meat patties: This is about perception / observation. No general statements (e.g., “You are speaking too quickly”) should be made; rather, the statement should relate to the person giving feedback (e.g. "You spoke too quickly for me").
- Cheese: What was the effect of the perception / observation (e.g. "I could hardly follow and felt overwhelmed.")?
- Lettuce leaf: What is the wish for the next time (e.g. “I wish that you would take more breaks so that I have time to think”)?
- Now comes the second half of the roll. In this way, it is easier for many people to accept feedback because the person giving feedback makes it clear that this is their subjective view and that they do not intend to judge anything [1].

Learners will also bring different sets of beliefs and attitudes to feedback. They often come to associate good speaking or writing with good grammar [4]. And most students expect and want to be corrected (comprehensively, directly and by the teacher) and that they are more interested in grades than they are in formative comments [9].

Teachers use and choose different techniques for feedback, which may be broadly categorized by the degree of directness. Here is an example of more or less direct techniques for giving corrective feedback on speaking tasks:
• The teacher says that they do not understand the learner’s utterance.
• The teacher uses rising intonation to repeat the phrase and stresses the error it contains.
• The teacher repeats the beginning of the phrase which contained the error, but stops before the error in order to elicit the correction.
• The teacher gives a short clue to the way an error needs to be corrected (e.g. ‘Past tense?’ or ‘Article?’) • The teacher provides the corrected form and stresses the correction.
• The teacher gives a short explanation of why an error needs to be corrected and provides the correct form [2].

To sum up, a majority of learners, however seem to prefer more direct, explicit feedback to more indirect approaches, but research is divided on the issue. [8, 10, 13]. It is possible that students like the idea of direct correction more than the reality of it: for example, when direct correction is too negative and too public, they might in fact prefer something more indirect [5]. It is unlikely that researchers will ever be able to state that one kind of feedback is always better than another [9].

And most importantly - remember that feedback will remain only feedback, if it does not lead to action.
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