Teachers' Strategies and Students' Uptake on Oral Corrective Feedback

Razelle D. Genetia[1], Magdalena M. Ocbian[2], Maricel A. Dichoso[3]

Sorsogon State College, Philippines

Abstract: *It is indispensable for teachers to give feedback for every student to acknowledge error constructively with the support either from teacher, peers and students themselves. This study determined the strategies on oral corrective feedback given by teachers during their English class and how these students uptake on oral corrective feedback. It employed the descriptive-qualitative methods of research using content analysis. The identified data were classified into themes according to Lyster and Ranta's model on the types of corrective feedback, Panova and Lyster (2002) and Chu (2011) that teachers use patterned to for ESL learners. Categories were developed through coding scheme using deductive and inductive approaches from the transcriptions of audio-recorded classroom observation. Results affirmed that teachers employed various oral corrective strategies when they are engaging in class discussion while students showed uptakes in the oral corrective feedback strategies. Single and combinations of multiple oral corrective feedback strategies are being used by teachers of English in their class. There are uptakes explicitly and implicitly shown in the utterances of students after the oral corrective feedback strategy.*

Keywords: Oral Corrective Feedback; Students' Uptake; Teachers' Strategies

1. Introduction

Errors are inevitable to human. There is always a room for error in every human activity. People who are learning new skills such as language learning are mostly prone to errors especially that they are in the process of attaining the proficiency level of that skills being learned. However, to most culture, committing error is distasteful and unacceptable. As much as possible, learners never want to commit errors because of the embarrassment and the bad impressions to tag with them along with the error they committed. At this juncture, the teacher's ability to handle error commission of learners and the learner's uptake when they commit errors is put to test. For decades, there have been controversial arguments about the role of error and corrective feedback, both theoretically and empirically in the Second Language Acquisition.

As defined, error is the use of a linguistic item in a way which a fluent or native speaker of the language regards as showing faulty or incomplete learning[1]. Errors, or 'nonnative-like uses' of English, were further classified into four different types: Grammatical, phonological, lexical and unsolicited uses of the first language [2].

Initiated by early Behaviorist approaches, error is considered to be a sinful act and should be eradicated. The behaviorist view assumed that language learning was advanced when the students made repeated and active responses to the stimuli [3]. These responses were then reinforced when repeated time after time to shape and form habits that consisted of automated responses elicited by a given stimulus.

In the Monitor Model, the first general second language acquisition (SLA) theory, completely rules out the role of corrective feedback [4]. The *Monitor* hypothesis explains the relationship between acquisition and learning, and defines the influence of the latter on the former. The monitoring function is the practical result of the learned grammar.

According to Krashen, the Acquisition System is the utterance initiator, while the Learning System performs the role of 'monitor' or the 'editor'. The 'monitor' acts in a planning, editing and correcting function when three specific conditions are met: that is, the second language learner has sufficient time at his/her disposal, he/she focuses on form or thinks about correctness, and he/she knows the rule. According to him, the role of the monitor is - or should be - minor, being used only to correct deviations from normal speech and to give speech a more 'polished' appearance.

Krashen also suggests that there is individual variation among language learners with regards to 'monitor' use. He distinguishes those learners who use the 'monitor' all the time (over-users); those learners who have not learned or who prefer not to use their conscious knowledge (under-users); and those learners that use the 'monitor' appropriately (optimal users). An evaluation of the person's psychological profile can help to determine to what group they belong. Usually extroverts are under-users, while introverts and perfectionists are over-users. Lack of self-confidence is frequently related to the over-use of the monitor.

So, from this situation, it is indispensable that teacher may consider feedback for every student to acknowledge error constructively with the support either from teacher, peers and students themselves. It is a useful and timely part of any classroom discussion in either grammar or literature lesson to maintain the connection among these participants of learning because it serves in many forms: assessing student's learning, maintaining interaction and attention among students, and giving instructions of what concept or lessons should be learnt to name a few.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) have distinguished six different types of feedback: explicit correction, recasts, clarification request, metalinguistic clues, elicitation and repetition [5]. With these, once errors have been identified, a teacher needs to be knowledgeable enough of different techniques or strategies on how these errors should be corrected and

addressed accordingly. Through these types of feedback, one can respond to the erroneous utterance of students through different ways.

Following corrective feedback is the student's effort to react to the teachers' corrective feedback known as uptake. Taking Lyster and Ranta's Model into consideration, it showed that uptake moves are categorized into repair, needs-repair and no uptake. These consideration shows that reactions of students vary in the type of feedback offered to them.

Today, as stated in English K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum of 2012, teachers are challenged more to face the day-to-day classroom activities with the aim to face and meet the demands of the cited curriculum towards the achievement for 21st Filipino students. Also, the English Education or the Language Arts in Multiliteracies Curriculum and its ultimate goal is to produce graduates who apply the language conventions, principles, strategies and skills in interacting with others, understanding and learning other content areas, and fending for themselves in whatever field of endeavor they may engage in.

Teacher as the facilitator of learning possesses rich corrective feedback strategies. More importantly to junior high school teachers with the responsibility to correct and improve the errors and mistakes of students in any oral or speaking activities in grammar or literature lessons in English subjects. As an area of learning, it will be a tool subject to enhance the speaking ability or skill of the students that is important to learn other subjects as well.

From this reason, teacher-researcher would like to have a grasp on the different oral corrective feedback strategies that teachers utilized in English class and on how their students show uptake to these corrective feedback strategies. In this way, strategies that are receptive, promote successful uptake and positive effect in student's learning would be analyzed and highlighted. It permits the students to comprehend completely how much they have improved in learning the target language. As a circular process, it permits the teacher to comprehend completely how much they have effectively and efficiently taught the lesson.

Therefore, this study determined the strategies on oral corrective feedback given by teachers during their English class and how these students uptake on oral corrective feedback in Bulan National High School S. Y. 2018-2019. Specifically, it answered the following questions:
1) What are the strategies on oral corrective feedback given by teachers during their English class?
2) How do students uptake the oral corrective feedback?

2. Materials And Method

Participants
The Bulan National High School in the SecondDistrict of Sorsogon was purposively selected based on their population, sections and curricula. The participants of this study were eight teachers currently teaching English subjects in Grade 7 to 10 levels, respectively. Likewise, eight classes as participants in the junior high school students belonged to the grade 7 to 9 Special Science Classes (35 each class) and

grade 7 to 10 regular classes, (50- 65 each class) took part in this study from the cited school. Special Science classes were groups of selected students with 2 sections (section A and B) with 35 students in each class. These classes also follow the K-12 curriculum program but include Science, Technology and Engineering (STE) curriculum with specialized subject which is research. On the other hand, regular classes were group of selected students who purely follow the K+12 curriculum program. All the classes were observed once with one-hour schedule using the different topics based from the given observation schedule provided by the assigned department head, master teacher and teachers in English.

Instruments
This study employed the descriptive-qualitative methods of research using content analysis. The basis for the content analysis procedure was the transcription deduced from the audio recorded classroom observations of the Special Science Classes and regular classes. The identified data were classified into themes according to Lyster and Ranta's model on the types of corrective feedback, Panova and Lyster (2002), and Chu (2011) that teachers use patterned to for ESL learners. Categories were developed through coding scheme using deductive and inductive approach. Deductive approach was used because it made use of existing theories of different researchers to interpret the results. Likewise, inductive approach was also used because it discovered new theories or strategies from the sources of information.

Interview protocol or guide was also used in the study for the eight teachers of English. Their respective classes from regular and special science classes were purposively selected in this study.

3. Results and Discussion

The strategies on OCF were based from the modelsof Lyster and Ranta's model on the types of corrective feedback, Panova and Lyster (2002) [6], and Chu (2011) [7] that teachers use patterned to for ESL learners. They were described in the circumstances observed in the transcription. These strategies were translated declarative recast, expanded declarative recast, and expanded declarative clausal recast.

Translated declarative recast
Translated declarative recast is a corrective feedback move of turning student's unsolicited use of Tagalog or Bisakol into a target language to a more complete sentence guided by a teacher. In Excerpt 1, from the transcription of the observed Grade 8 class where teacher read and presented the words and sentences with /o/ sound. (1)

Teacher : What do you notice about the sentence (the teacher shows a sentence highlighting words with /O/ sound)?
Student: Ma'am may mga O. (WITH ERROR)
Teacher : Okay! There are a lot of Os.

She gave follow up question regarding the class' observation on the sentences she exposed to the class. A student confidently gave his observation that those words with letter "O", but he answered in *Bisakol*, considered as the students' mother tongue. The teacher confirmed the student's

observation by responding with 'okay' while providing the correct translation in English of what the student said. The class did not react, so did the teacher who continued with the discussion.

Expanded declarative recast

(2)

Teacher: Who was their daughter?
Student: Alitaptap.
Teacher: Okay. And how do you describe Alitaptap?...What can you say about Alitaptap?
Student: Lovely daughter.
Teacher: She is a lovely daughter.

In this excerpt, expanded declarative recast is exemplified. It showed the effort of the teacher in applying expansion strategy to form a complete statement to the response of the student. This script started when the teacher asked for the daughter of the character being mentioned in the legend. Then, the student answered that it was Alitaptap. The teacher gave a follow up question to the same student to describe her. Then, the student gave answer 'lovely daughter'.The student's answer as shown above had a direct response to the teacher's question. But, it can be observed that teachers showed this habit of reacting to any incomplete statement of students when giving answer to their linguistic query which gave them an opportunity to use this strategy.

Expanded declarative clausal recast

(3)

Teacher : What happened to that part of the story? What happened to that part of the story? Was he able to shoot the pigeons?
Class: Yes.
Teacher : Yes, because the pigeons?
Class: Fly
Teacher : Yes. Because the pigeons flew away.

In the data below, it also revealed that these teachers did not only apply expansion for the function to complete statement but also for reformulation of part or parts of a clause for a longer utterance. Like in the given script, the teacher continued giving discussion question about the selection. He was asking whether the main character was able to shoot the pigeon.The class had the unanimous 'yes' but the teacher continued throwing elicited question related to the class' previous answer. It showed that the class continued giving relevant answer but failed to give the exact correct form of it. During oral discussion, teachers gave queries to assess and strengthen the students' knowledge about the topic or concept in grammar or in literature lesson. And, even though the focus of these teachers was mainly on the discussion of the content in literature lesson, they extended their roles in teaching not just on the content of language but also on the function of it. So, in the above excerpt, the teacher extended his role in teaching by reacting through declarative clause to the tense of the word 'fly' in the student's statement when the latter failed to provide the correct tense of the verb.

Elicitation Strategy

Question elicitation

(4)

Teacher : It gives the exact words of a speaker. We just add what? Student: Quotation.
Teacher : What do you call that "She said', "Kathleen said,"? Okay, that is what?
Student: Reporting clause.
Teacher : That is the reporting clause or =the introductory part! What else? What else?
Student: The actual words are enclosed in the quotation marks
Teacher : You are much aware of this. When it is in the indirect speech, it is always quoted: the open and close.

In this study, teachers were eliciting oral responses through questions. For instance, teacher gave question about the 'direct speech' as their topic. The student gave unexpected response from the teacher. To direct student from her expected answer, she rephrased her given question. This contained information question eliciting the response of the same student. With this, the same student corrected herself or the expected response from the teacher.

In different classroom situations presented in the data, the discussion part of the lesson served as the time where most questions were directly given by teachers to students. This was also the time when students were more encouraged to ask and answer questions as well. In excerpt4, the teacher reacted to the response of the student from her previous question, not because it was an incomplete statement or violated the tense of verb in the sentence, but because it was an unsolicited or unexpected response of the teacher from the student.

Question and completion elicitation.

(5)

Teacher : What do you mean by boastful? In Tagalog that is?"
Student: *Hambog*(boastful)
Teacher : Oh, group 3, what is the meaning of boastful?
Student: *Mahangin*(boastful)
Teacher : "What is the other synonym for boastful?
Student: Confident
Teacher: Overconfident! That is another synonym for boastful.

This excerpt, a mixed strategies or combinations of different forms of elicitation is shown. In the script, the representative made use of the word 'boastful' to describe the character in the myth. The teacher started asking the student about the meaning of the word.

Instead of giving the synonymous word, the student translated it in Tagalog. The teacher called the attention of the third group in the class to see whether they knew even the synonym of it. But, another student shared another Tagalog translation of the word boastful. With these two attempts from the class, the teacher directly elicited the correct form from the student by pausing after giving the first two syllables she uttered. With this, a student formed

the expected word, by completing the remaining syllables, 'confident'. The teacher repeated the complete and expected word 'overconfident' as one of the synonyms of 'boastful' in the target language.

The elicitation, as a form of questioning and completion strategy from students, was observed flexible in its uses. In the classes observed, teachers bestowed variety of questions from low-level questions to higher level of questioning and vice-versa to stimulate the minds or thinking among their students. There were instances that teachers considered to apply the cited strategy as in a form of questioning to help students be directed into the target utterance. But in the given script, the teacher reacted by giving question about the synonym of the Tagalog word, 'mahangin'. She exhausted giving questions to elicit response among students to finally come up with her expected response since the same Bisakol or Tagalog responses were given by the students.

Interruption Request Reformulation.

(5)

Teacher :	Based on your understanding, will you differentiate direct speech from indirect speech?
Student:	Direct speech nag e-speak sa first…
Teacher:	Will you please speak in English?
Student:	Indirect speech speaks in first person point of view, while direct speech speaks in third person.
Teacher :	You are now talking about the change, the change when we convert the two speeches. So far, you can still remember the topic.

The data below revealed another form of elicitation strategy. But interrupted request reformulation alone was presented for the improvement of the student's response. Thisscript showed and started from a follow up question of the teacjher to the class asking them the differences between direct and indirect speech.

As shown below, the student attempted to answer in code mixing of Tagalog and English languages. This time, the teacher encouraged him to speak in English completely and correctly. In the student's second attempt, the student tried to speak in English and he was correct this time. The teacher agreed to the answer, gave comments and regards the class for remembering well their previous lesson.

As mentioned earlier, the classes were observed with students who are code-mixing languages to express their ideas about the topic. In this excerpt, the teacher reacted to student's unfinished reply who was code-mixing languages in the response because of the use of English terms used like 'direct speech' and 'speak' in the given statement. Likewise, it made on view the terms '*nag*' and '*sa*' which are common added syllable in *Bisakol* language.

Explicit correction strategy

(7)

Teacher:	Did you get it? Okay number 7 (pointing the student to read the written note on the board).
Student:	Names of pole… (mispronounces the second syllable of the word, 'political'*)*
Teacher:	'Political, not 'poletecal', Lyka.(calm and sweet)
Student:	Names of political parties. Example: The Nacionalista Party won. (reads the word and the whole phrases correctly)
Teacher:	Very good. What are the other parties that do you know?

Explicit correction strategy refers to the strategy in which the teacher supplies the correct form and clearly indicates that what the students say is incorrect (Chu, 2011). Some teachers wanted to give oral corrective feedback directly.

In Excerpt 7, the teacher began asking student to read the written political parties on the board as part of her discussion on capitalization. The student volunteered immediately. Unfinished reading the word, she mispronounced the second syllable of the word 'political'. The teacher supplied the correct way to correct or pronounce clearly the word and to indicate that the student's utterance was incorrect. Then, the same student continued reading the line correctly after the correction

In the interview, the teacher mentioned that the student was not hurt instead she was laughing at her own mistake, too. When teacher said, "Lyka, it should be like this, not 'poletecal', but 'political', okay?" the student did not feel offended because the statement was motivating in a manner in which the statement was said. In this data, the teacher used explicit correction in treating the pronunciation error of student and not on any ill-formed utterance concerning the form of the target language. From the name itself, it appeared on point in telling student that one committed an error. Despite its directness in telling student's incorrect answer, this helps students to successfully correct one's error in utterance. The calm and soft voice of teacher, when giving explicit correction, creates a positive and encouraging tone to student. It shows that students successfully learned the correction when they are directed immediately to the error happened and after they are provided with the correct pronunciation since no explanations are given to students.

Self-correction strategy

This refers to a feedback produced by the student who made the initial error, in response to the teacher's feedback when the latter does not already provide the correct form (Lyster&Ranta, 1997). The data below showed that some teachers allowed students themselves to perform self-correction to their own error.

(8)

Teacher:	Try to give the differences of Beowulf and Grendel as characters in that excerpt. How will you differentiate them? And try to have your answer in complete sentence. Think of the best description, the difference between them and try to …(*some students are raising their hands resulting to the short interruption of the teacher's instruction*)
Student:	~~Grendel~~ is selfless while ~~Beowulf~~ is selfish. (WITH ERROR)
Student:	Beowulf is selfless while Grendel is selfish. (*She utters the correct names including the*

sentences while writing sentence on the board and changes the name 'Grendel' into 'Beowulf')' (UPTAKE: REPAIR-SELF-REPAIR)

Teacher: Okay! You corrected yourself. Instead of Grendel, it's Beowulf. 'Beowulf is selfless while Grendel is selfish'.

As part of the review of the past lesson, the teacher instructed the class in the earlier part of the lesson to write on the board the comparison and contrast between Beowulf and Grendel using Venn diagram. A student volunteered immediately to share her answer on the board. Realizing that she interchanged the name 'Grendel' instead of 'Beowulf', she erased and changed her answer to make her differentiation correct. Seeing that her student corrected herself, the teacher acknowledged the student's self-correction and even read the student's answer to confirm that it was correct.In the follow up interview, the teacher believed thatthis self-correction strategy will not give an opportunity to the whole class to be influenced of erroneous answer given by the classmate. It is better because the students can analyze more their own utterance.

Repetition strategy

(9)

Teacher: So, what made Bulanhari angry with her daughter? Remember that Alitaptap was a lovely maiden, but her father became angry with her? Why do you think the father got angry? Yes, Bella.

Student: Because Alitaptap doesn't want to marry ~~all~~ the young men.

Teacher: All?

Student : Because she doesn't want to marry any young men.

Teacher: Okay. Because she doesn't want to marry any young men at their place.

In oral corrective feedback, teachers made use of repetition to alert students on the error committed. The teacher asked question and the student gave an answer. Some students, when given question, were fond of giving immediate responses without giving critical analysis of what they would respond in the question. Situations like these resulted to more errors commission by some students in their utterance although they were familiar with the use of the target language. In the given excerpt, the teacher reacted only to the mistake found in the immediate response of student in the use of pronoun 'all'. It is so obvious that student committed a wrong choice of pronoun because of giving an immediate response.

Multiple corrective feedback strategy

In this study, multiple corrective feedback strategy is a corrective feedback which refers to two or more combinations of oral or written feedback used by teachers to correct students' error. One of this is the repetition, peer correction.

Repetition, Peer Correction.

(10)

Teacher A: Okay. The correct answer is withered. Now, can you guess the meaning of this word 'withered'. =For if there were no rains for months, the rice stalks slowly withered. = Yes Ashron.

Student 1: Die and slowly corrupt.?

Teacher A: Die and slowly corrupt (pointing other student to help/ give the expected vocabulary choice)?

Student2: Dried up?

Teacher A: Okay. 'Dried up or dry'. Thank you Patrick. The meaning of 'withered' is 'dry'. Okay.

To possibly correct the errors, teachers were not limiting themselves in using single strategy, they combined several strategies for students to produce the expected output in their utterances. In the first form of multiple corrective feedback strategy, the given script below showed a combination of repetition and peer correction as implicit nonverbal signal from the teacher. The data given originated from the part of lesson during the unlocking of the meaning of an unfamiliar vocabulary words.

The teacher asked the class to determine the meaning of the word 'withered' which was used in the sentence and was read by the teacher. Guessing the meaning of the word from the given choices, a student gave an unsure answer given the sign of the rising intonation he produced. The student's utterance was incorrect according to the meaning of the chosen words. It is paired with extending hand gestures to signal other students to speak and help the former student of the correct response.Giving another guess, this peer tried to suggest another answer from the provided choices on the board. This time, the teacher acknowledged the correct choice of vocabulary of student as a peer through the word 'okay' and repetition of the student's complete answer.

In Excerpt10, the teacher asked the students to unlock the meaning of unfamiliar words through context clues as part of the pre-reading stage. In this situation, the teacher reacted to the incorrect choice of vocabulary word chosen by the student. The teacher stated that instead that she will tell the students that one's answer is, she repeats the error [the wrong answer of the student] just to remind students that they are wrong and that she needs the right answer. It is a clue to make them realize the mistake that they committed.

Repetition, elicitation, peer-correction

In the following excerpt, multiple corrective feedback as strategy involved repetition, elicitation and peer correction.Unlike the use of repetition strategy in the previous script, the instance below maximizes the use of repetition which comprises of both spoken and written feedback with changed in intonation in the utterance of student containing error in pronunciation. The second is elicitation in which teacher asked the student to reformulate the previous utterance. And, the third is peer correction in which the teacher asked the help of other peer to correct the previous erroneous utterance of the former student.

(11)

Teacher :	Kindly recall what was taken, or what we had taken up last meeting. What is the title of that essay?
Student:	'Aggressive Driving Should Be Avoided' (mispronounces the word, 'should' into /shuld/)
Teacher :	Aggressive driving…Hmmm? Should be…? (asking the class to continue repeating his previous utterance)
Student:	'Should Be Avoided (*still the student mispronounces the word, 'should')*?
Teacher :	Somebody said that Aggressive Driving Should Be Avoided(writing the title of an essay that was discussed on the board) How will you say this word? (underlining and highlighting the word and letter 'l' of the word, 'should' in the recited title)? How will you read this one? (Anybody who will read this one?Anybody?
Class:	Should…should…should pronouncing the word 'should' many times correctly)
Teacher:	'Anybody'(emphasizing that she is looking for someone to read the word and not the whole class to answer in chorus)
Student:	'Should' (reading the word being pointed by the teacher)
Teacher:	Okay! Very good.Silent 'l'.

The teacher started the lesson asking the class to recapitulate the previous lesson about an essay. A student recited the title of the essay that was discussed, but he mispronounced the word 'should'. The teacher repeated the response by spoken and written repetition of the parts of student's utterance highlighting the error by writing it on the board. But, the same student repeated the part of his previous utterance and he still uttered the same erroneous pronunciation. The teacher used repetition strategy by repeating completely the student's utterance, highlighting and underlining specifically the word and the letter that the student mispronounced to isolate the error.

Repetition, metalinguistic, peer-correction
(12)

Teacher:	And of course there is another one. Raise your answer. *(pointing the next sentence on the board with underlined word, 'forecasting').*
Student:	Ma'am,"Educated Guess".
Teacher:	Educated guess? (nodding and smiling) Is there any other answer?
Class:	(Uttering different incorrect answers)
Teacher:	It begins with letter 'P'.
Student:	Prophesy.
Teacher:	Yes! You got the correct answer."
Teacher:	And of course there is another one. Raise your answer.

This excerpt used the combination of repetition, metalinguistic, peer-correction strategies. The teacher asked and invited the class to unlock the meaning of another word that she presented which can be found in the selection. The student suggested that she would give a hypothetical answer. The teacher agreed and repeated the student's utterance

while continuously inviting others from the class to bestow the answer. Despite the invitation of the teacher, the class were uttering unsure and different answers to themselves. For the class to form the correct answer, the teacher posed information related to the utterance. Successfully, a student provided the target answer because of it. The teacher agreed with the answer by recognizing it.

Clarification model
(13)

Teacher :	How about the long /0/ sound. Let us ask. Hazelle. Please read the words under the long/0/sound.
Class:	(Trying to murmur the answers)
Student:	Role, Whole
Teacher :	Again, again? 'Role' (the teacher alerts the learner that she incorrectly reads the word. She repeats and reads the first word again showing the proper way of pronouncing it).
Student:	Role, Whole, Hope, Boat, Know (with hand gestures pronouncing the words correctly).

From here revealed that there was another error on pronunciation. This situation made the teacher to maximize multiple feedback strategy to student who committed error in pronunciation. In this data, clarification functions both in interrupting student from uttering longer or complete utterances when student has already committed the error and in requesting to repeat ill-formed utterance of the correct one. Similarly, model was maximized by the teacher to treat the pronunciation error already uttered by the student. One of the observed classes involved lesson in reading the words with proper pronunciation of the assigned vowel sound in a day. When the teacher assigned student to read the words given, the student committed mispronunciation in the word 'role'. The error in this scenario was the one reacted by the teacher.

Elicitation, peer correction
(14)

Teacher :	*Tama*? Is there a difference between a God and a god? What is the difference between the two? John Paul? Nathaniel? *<Sa section 5 ngaalamagadnilaangsagot.>*
Student :	*<Ma'am, Tagalog nalangpo.>*
Teacher:	Try to speak in English Lyka. Oh, yes? Gwyneth? (pointing the student). You know class, every time you recite, I always give you additional points for that.
Student :	For 'respect' po
Teacher :	*Saan?*
Student :	*Sa big letter G.*
Teacher :	How about in small letter G?
Student 2:	Parangsa small letter G
Teacher :	You try to speak in English. (interrupting the student)…Sssshh… quiet.
Student 2:	There is no respect in small letter 'g'.
Teacher:	Great! Thank You Gwyneth.But, ahhmmm… I am still looking for another answer (pointing other student)
Student 3:	Sa small letter g… In the capital 'G', we give the highest respect. But in the god, small letter 'g', it's like god and goddesses.

Teacher: Exactly! Correct! That is why class when you see the word God in a sentence automatic that is referring to the Supreme Being, our Heavenly Father. While when god is written in small letter 'g', it pertains to gods and goddesses (enriching the answer given). Did you get it?

The excerpt presented below shared the part of the lesson of teacher participants when multiple feedback mixed with elicitation and peer correction strategies were combined. In this excerpt, Teacher asked rules on Capitalization regarding the differences between the words 'God' and 'goddesses'. Student 1 hesitated to answer in English and asked the teacher that she would speak in 'Tagalog'. But the teacher instead encouraged student 1 to speak in the target language as she was giving points to the class recitation. Then she proceeded asking another student to give the expected answer. Student 2 shared her answer that capital letter 'G' for the word 'God' was used mainly for 'respect'. While answering, Student 2 was encouraged continuously by the teacher to speak in English by eliciting response on the use of small letter 'G' in 'God' which was again given by another unfinished answer from student.

Then, another form of elicitation was asked from the teacher to the same student. As continuation to her previous utterance, the student proceeded explaining to the teacher about the use of small letter 'g'. The teacher was unsatisfied to the previous answer of the students. Without any clues for the right answer, the teacher asked another peer or classmate of previous students as her strategy to correct the student 1s' previous incomplete utterance. Consequently, the teacher generated the target answer from the peer and acknowledged her student's utterance as correct.

Metalinguistic, self-correction
This multiple feedback is combined with metalinguistic and self-correction. In the subsequent script, the teacher was discussing the rules on Capitalization.

(15)

Teacher:	Great. What do you mean class by pronoun? Anyone? Who can tell me the meaning of it? *(*walking at the center of the classroom)
Student:	He, she, her…
Teacher:	But those are just examples, Lyka. I am asking for the meaning. Okay, Lyka, again?
Student:	Ay mam! Pronoun substitutes the noun.
Teacher:	Very good! Pronoun is a part of speech that substitutes or takes the place of a noun. For example, the word Piolo. (reads the line on the board)

In this instance, the teacher asked the class on the meaning of pronoun based on what the class could remember in their previous discussion. The student enumerated some examples of it as her answer. But it was not the target utterance on teacher's question.Teacher posed comment or information related to the utterance and asked the same student to improve her utterance. With this correction, the student herself corrected her previous answer and the teacher agreed

to student's response with reinforcement and enrichment to the given answer.

Elicitation, peer-correction, metalinguistic
(16)

Teacher E:	Yes? Any comment, any observation that you have on the fourth sentence?
Student1:	*Ano ma'am, dapat* destroys since…
Teacher E:	Why should it be 'destroys' and, why should it be 'saves'? (using hand gestures to acknowledge answer from another student).
Student 2:	Singular *poan* subject.
Teacher E:	Do you agree with Kurstine?
Class:	Yes! (UPTAKE: REPAIR-PARTIAL)

The excerpt showed the combination of elicitation, peer-correction, metalinguistic corrective feedback. The teacher used the written sentence given by the student earlier in the lesson. Using this written statement on the board, the teacher asked the class for any observation they had in the sentence by giving comments or explanation.

The student gave an incomplete answer with a mixture of English and Tagalog language phrase as answer to the teacher. It could be observed that the answer of the student wanted to be uttered was focusing on subject-verb agreement in the sentence. However, he failed to give short explanation for his answer. As a review of the previous lesson, the teacher was giving question without explicitly providing the correct form why would the verbs 'destroys' and 'saves' be grammatically correct in the given sentence. Because Student 1 failed to give the correct and complete explanation of the subject-verb agreement rule/s, the teacher called another peer to explain. The student2 answered and shortly explained. For the answer to be corrected or checked, the teacher asked confirmation from the class about Student 2's utterance and the students agreed.

Students' uptake on the oral corrective feedback
Students' uptakerefers to student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance (Lyster&Ranta 1997). Consequently, this study used students' uptake to mean to the reactions of students to the teachers' oral corrective feedback strategies which include either no uptake, repair uptake, needs repair.

No Uptake
Using the same scripts of data presented earlier, it showed that students showed 'no uptake'as an uptake in the different strategies under 'translated declarative recast' (17), 'expanded declarative recast' (2), and 'expanded clausal recast' (3). The follow up semi-structured interview for focus group discussions and individual interviews to students as participants from different grade levels and sections revealed their viewpoints as to how preferable those strategies are in their lessons.

(17)

Teacher D:	What do you notice about the sentence (the teacher shows a sentence highlighting words with /*o*/ sound)?

Student:	*Ma'am may mga O.*
Teacher D:	Okay! There are a lot of Os.
Teacher:	(Looking for the next slides)

In group interview for Excerpt 17, the participant responded that they did not show any uptake strategy because they realized their mistakes at once. They did not mind being emotional at that point because they admitted they were wrong and they are glad they were corrected by their teacher in a very subtle manner without hurting their emotions. One participant also shared that other oral corrective feedback strategies are offensive but it is up to the teacher how they will handle such mistake so that students will not be offended.

In an individual interview, one participant shared that her fellow students should speak in English as a target language because when they used to answer in their local language, they will not learn to speak English as a second language. The same idea was said by another student who shared that she was confident with the knowledge from her teacher because it could improve their existing knowledge in English to make them better English speakers and writers. It was right for them to accept corrections as a means of improving their skills in English.

Moreover, during the focus group discussion, another participant responded that the feedback given by their teacher enhances their learning. When they were asked why they did not show uptake, they simply shared that no opportunity for uptake because they are satisfied

During the individual discussion, the participants' responses showed different preferences. Participant A stated that for him, he preferred recast, declarative causal recast because they would not realize their mistakes unless their teacher told them so.

In Excerpt 3, another participant stated that it was good that teachers did corrections during the class discussion so that students would be able to know where they specifically committed mistake. Through that they could be able to say or do the right thing next time. With the right manner of stating teacher's OCF, students would be more confident to answer even they were doubtful whether their answer was correct or wrong. They would still be active in the class discussion.

Repair Uptake
Repair Uptakerefers to uptake moves when uptake leads to the correct form of students (Lyster&Ranta, 1997). In this study, it refers to an uptake moves when students are led to the correct form of the target utterances such as peer-repair, self-repair, and incorporation. Instances to highlight this type of uptake are discussed accordingly.

Peer-repair
(18)

Teacher :	Okay. The correct answer is withered. Now, can you guess the meaning of this word 'withered'. For if there were no rains for months, the rice stalks slowly withered. Yes Ashron.

Student 1:	Die and slowly corrupt.?
Teacher :	Die and slowly corrupt (pointing other student to help/ give the expected vocabulary choice)?
Student2:	Dried up?
Teacher :	Okay. 'Dried up or dry'. Thank you Patrick. The meaning of 'withered' is 'dry'. Okay.

In the succeeding scripts, the participants showed a successful repair uptake through peer-repair presented in the following data using multiple feedback strategy mixed with 'repetition and peer correction' (see 18), multiple feedback strategy including 'repetition, elicitation, and peer-correction' (see 11), multiple feedback strategy using 'repetition, metalinguistic, and peer-correction' (see 12), and multiple feedback strategy containing 'elicitation, and peer correction' (see 14).

During the students' interview to confirm students' uptake, the participants gave different reasons why they do not prefer this repetition strategy when Student 2 provides peer uptake by correcting another Student 1's error. Participant F responded that for him, if one student was wrong, he would get offended especially when another student got the correct answer. He would be frustrated and would have less confidence when answering for his thoughts of being wrong again given the prior experience. Aside from that, this strategy could give and correct the utterance of Student 1. One participant shared that they could be disappointed because other students got the correct answer.

The participants added that when giving this repetition strategy, it is still preferable if the same student is addressed so that one can give the expected utterance as a second chance for that student. During the individual interview, the three participants uttered different preferences. One participant in an interview shared that he had a positive feeling towards the peer-repair.

Self-repair
The participants produced a self-repair uptake under self-correction strategy (see 8) and multiple feedback strategy mixed with self-correction (see 15). Likewise, the participants revealed a Self-repair Uptake in the use of interrupted request for reformulation under Elicitation Strategy (see 5), Repetition Strategy (see 9) and Question Elicitation under Elicitation Strategy (see 4).

Some students have different reasons for their preferences in this revealed strategy. Some of them felt shy and hesitant to use self-correction when they do not exactly know the correct answer. But some of them were positive because it helped them remember better the lesson, gained confidence in participating in the class discussion, and maintains attention and motivation during classroom discussion. It helped them attain clearer understanding of the error they committed and better understanding of the teacher's lesson. They also motivated to keep their focus on listening well during the discussion, challenged them in acquiring new knowledge, motivated them to learn, enhanced their thinking, and even promoted independent learning. Likewise, students are affirmed of their participation in the class which added to their worth and confidence.

Incorporation: The following data revealed some corrective feedback strategies employed by teachers produced a repair uptake under incorporation to the part of students. These included explicit correction strategy (see 7) and multiple feedback strategy under clarification model (see 13).

Some students are sharing different preferences towards the cited strategy. Some preferences of students will be dependent on how the teacher executes it. To some, it might be offensive to the student who commits an error. However, others see it as an experience where one can learn from the discussion. When correcting their mispronunciation, some of them might feel embarrass, although some of them expressed positive reactions when the teachers utilize them in class. From these results, it can be suggested that teachers may continue to devise ways on how students can be corrected in their pronunciation error that continue build their confidence.

Needs-repair

It is an uptake which refers to a situation where the learner responds to the corrective feedback but the learner's utterance does not result in repairing the original erroneous utterance (Lyster & Ranta 1997). As used in this study, it refers to uptake move by the student after the teacher gives the corrective feedback strategy in partial-repair.

Partial-repair: From the solicited data, strategies like qestioned completion elicitation (see 5), and elicitation, peer-correction, metalinguistic (see 15) provided repair uptake under partial repair to the part of the students.

The current results from these different responses of students from group or individual semi-structured interviews connote that these students prefer them not because it gives them clue but because it makes their oral discussion and expression easy. This also gives them an appropriate amount of time to process questions well, improve their knowledge, and develops their critical thinking skill. Some students find it as way as well to boost their confidence by informing their teachers how knowledgeable they are in the class, and how deep their ideas are about the topic. This showed that they don't prefer dependent or spoon-feeding way of learning too.

In terms of uptake, it revealed that 'questioned completion elicitation', and multiple feedback strategies like 'elicitation, metalinguistic, together with 'elicitation, peer-correction, metalinguistic' provided a repair under partial repair when teacher asked only the student to complete the first part of his or her utterance like the first two syllables of the word and did not ask the student to repeat the complete correct utterance. It can be seen as well that partial repair is created when teacher proceed with giving ye/no questions only and making oneself as the one to enrich the discussion after the student provided their partial answers.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation

Single and combinations of multiple oral corrective feedback strategies are being used by teachers of English in their class.There are uptakes explicitly and implicitly shown in the utterances of students after the oral corrective feedback strategy.

Teachers or English subjects may apply variety of effective oral corrective feedback strategies when directing, improving and highlighting errors/ mistakes of students in the utterance. These are strategies that give clear indication of effectiveness in students' learning in forms of uptake.They may utilize strategies on oral classroom discussion that gives thrill, adds excitement, promotes critical thinking, meets the individual differences among students and most importantly promotes language acquisition in the second language. DepEd personnel may consider trainings and seminars in pedagogy that enriches the knowledge of teachers in terms of different feedbacks which can be applied in different objectives and target competencies among students.Future researchers may consider research topics on oral corrective feedback which effectively show repair uptake on the target language in treating specific errors like grammatical errors, lexical errors, and phonological errors.

References

[1] Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2013). Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics (4th ed.). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group: London and New York.

[2] Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 20, 51-81.Gardner. 2009. *How administrators can empower teachers*. Webb University. http://www.teachhub.com/working-together-administrators-role-empowering-teachers

[3] Corpuz, V. (2011). Error Correction in Second Language Writing: Teachers' Beliefs, Practices and Students' Preferences. Queensland University of Technology Faculty of Education.

[4] Krashen, S. (1985). The Input Hypothesis: Issues and implication. London and New York.

[5] Lyster, R., &Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 19, 37- 66.

[6] Panova, L., &Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 36 (4), 576-596.

[7] Chu, R. (2011). Effects of teacher's corrective feedback on accuracy in the oral English of English-majors college students. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1(5), 454-459.