

Exploring Teachers' Corrective Feedback on EFL Speaking Performance : A Narrative Study at Indonesian Private University

Maulidatul Khasanah^{1*}, Moh. Arif Mahbub², Fatih Al Fauzi³

¹SMK Al-Bukhori Wuluhan Jember ^{2,3}Universitas Islam Jember, Indonesia

¹maulidatulkhasanah975@gmail.com; ²rifelbarzmahbub@gmail.com; ³fatih.alfauzi16@gmail.com

E-ISSN: 2597-9744

P-ISSN: 2622-9196

Submitted: July 2024

Approved: September 2024

Published: November 2024

Keywords: *teachers' oral corrective feedback (TCF); narrative study; EFL university level.*

Abstract. An abundant of literatures on oral corrective feedback has been burgeoning in distinctive focus area in various countries around the world. However, the study that involve narrative analysis study in Indonesian university level in speaking program is tend to still infinite. This current study purposed to exploring teachers' oral corrective feedback on EFL speaking performance at Islamic private university in East Java, Indonesia. By adapting Gulnaz (2019) interview frameworks which consist of four target discussion included are teachers' beliefs, practices, effectiveness perceptions, and types of oral corrective feedback (OCF) applied in the classroom speaking activities. This narrative qualitative methods (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) employed semi-structured interviews as the instruments. A face-to-face interview consisting 4 items directed to 1 participants who licensed to take part in this study. To analyze the qualitative data, thematic analysis proposed by Widodo (2014) was applied systematically. The findings indicated that there were a lot of teachers' preferences to practiced OCF using several types of explicit correction so that it was effective for their students' speaking skills for the future.

How to cite this paper:

Khasanah, M., Mahbub, M. A., & Fauzi, F. A. (2024). Exploring Teachers' Corrective Feedback on EFL Speaking Performance : A Narrative Study at Indonesian Private University. *Linguapedia*, 8(2), 50-62.

INTRODUCTION

The term Corrective Feedback (henceforth, CF) has been operationally defined as "teacher and peer responses to learners' erroneous second language (L2) production" (Li, 2014). For Hattie & Timperley (2007) provided a great emphasis on the role of CF in improving learners' target, by saying "Feedback is one the most powerful influences on learning and achievement" (p.81). Viewed from pedagogical positive theory, it can be seen as a pedagogical strategy that can provide both affective support and boost learners' enthusiasm (R. Ellis, 2009). Further, a meta-analysis study (Li, 2010) reviewing the efficacy

of CF in SLA context revealed that this pedagogic strategy can assist L2 learners' motivations and interconnections.

Despite the crucial of CF in academic context, it has become a hotly debated issue in language pedagogy that attracts many researchers' attention around the world. The famous opinion comes from Truscott (1999), that reported CF for oral L2 language learners did not afford beneficial effort while accepting the material, or even highly endanger for their production so that it should be abandoned. That is also reinforced by Krashen (1982), which states that CF will be affecting to the natural process of language acceptance for L2 language learners. For Roy Lyster, Pasty M. Lightbown (1999), it argued that Truscott's statement was found no empirical evidence in light of the provision of feedback causing harmful effects for students' learning. They provided a refusal argument that declared CF becomes something feasible, effective, and necessary for learners' growth. In the same vein, several pieces of academic literature (e.g. Xuan Van Ha & Murray, 2020; Juan Yang, 2016; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Gooch et al., 2016) precisely tried to dig deeper and acknowledge the role of CF in developing EFL learners' language competencies. They found that learners' spoken target for pronunciation production had a significant enhancement so that it could be mastering perfectly. As well, some authors also believed that CF can build interlingual competence (Bruton, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010), evoke language sensitivity (Juan Yang, 2016), and intensify grammatical accuracy (Sippel & Jackson, 2015).

CF can be delivered in the form of written and oral. Ha et al. (2021) stated that oral corrective feedback (henceforth, OCF) is learning reactions to students' spoken mistakes. In practice it was being carried out through the two modes such as peer corrective feedback (PCF) (Sato, 2013; Lyster et al., 2012; Sippel & Jackson, 2015) and teacher corrective feedback (TCF) (Couper, 2019; Rahman et al., 1983; Muhammad Rahimi, 2015), which have a benefit and harm impacts based on the academic result studies beforehand. Accordingly, the scope of this article focuses on the OCF, which has a function of guidance in managing and producing speaking performances in the EFL classroom setting (Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013). Farrokhi (2011) also emphasizes that feedback is needed to control speaking errors production towards learners' performances. OCF is highlighted as an effort that facilitates students in language acquisition (Gooch et al., 2016; Yang & Lyster, 2010) and encourages their attention to convey language learning target that being studied (Ellis, 2009).

The large of literatures above indicated CF in the context of speaking skills requires attention to be more deeply. Ahangari & Amirzadeh (2011) revealed that CF has become pivotal equipment to tackle oral learning problems by the teachers. Abundant result studies have successfully criticized several foci of OCF through the different methodological research patterns, including mix- method research design (Ha et al., 2021; Mahvelati, 2010; Juan Yang, 2016), quantitative research design (Gulnaz, 2019; Cho et al., 2021; Ellis et al., 2006; Gooch et al., 2016; Lyster et al., 2012; Muhammad Rahimi, 2015; Zhai & Gao, 2015; Zohrabi & Ehsani, 2014), large-scale survey study (Zhu & Wang, 2019) and small-scale survey study (Wang & Li, 2021). However, research that carries a focus on teachers' OCF experiences in EFL-speaking classrooms by conducting qualitative study tends to be limited.

Bearing this in mind, the researchers tried to present another empirical evidence by conducting a qualitative approach to investigate OCF in English- speaking classes in Indonesia. This research aimed to explore teachers' OCF experiences toward EFL speaking performances in one private university in Jember, Indonesia. Following the question "How are the teachers' oral corrective feedback (OCF) experiences towards EFL speaking

performances at the university level?", the result of this research expected can provided theoretical contribution to enrich knowledge within scope of OCF application in oral learning circumstances.

METHODS

This qualitative study was drawn upon a constructivist research paradigm (Creswell, 2018) that uses narrative design as a research method (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) to explore the authentic phenomenon of teachers' experiences regarding the application of corrective feedback in oral subjects. Utilized semi-structured interviews, the researchers involved one (n=1) EFL teacher in the Islamic private university that precisely located in Jember, Indonesia. It was obtained voluntarily through an ethical research by distributing a letter of consent, the participant was an English teacher who taught Speaking for Instructional Purposes course who has teaching experiences approximately 11 years old. As an English for Specific Purposes and English Education proficiency level, the participant was 35 years old.

Following Barkhuizen et. al, (2014), semi-structured interview was arranged as the research instruments for this study. All data-gathering processes were carried out through face-to-face (FCF) communication using interview guidelines adopted from Gulnaz (2019). There were 4 interview items designed to explore the participant feelings about corrective feedback practice in the speaking course application including (1) What are the beliefs of EFL university level teachers about the use of oral corrective feedback techniques in response to learners' spoken errors? (2) What are the practices of EFL university level teachers in the use of oral corrective feedback techniques in response to learners' spoken errors? (3) What types of oral corrective feedback techniques do EFL university level teachers utilize in the classroom and (4) What are the perceptions of EFL university level teachers about the effectiveness of the use of oral corrective reproducing or reconstructing interview data; and (5) building data credibility.

As a note in the preceding line, to enhance the trustworthiness of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) we employed peer debriefing technique (Janesick, 2015). techniques in the classroom?. This interviewed using Indonesian native language in 30 – 60 minutes duration. Then, all the data was analyzed using Widodo's (2014) analytical framework procedures were including (1) listening carefully and repeatedly to an audio-recorded to get accurate transcription; (2) shaping the transcriptions' layout of the data; (3) detailing and interpreting interview data; (4) reproducing or reconstructing interview data; and (5) building data credibility. As a note in the preceding line, to enhance the trustworthiness of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) we employed peer debriefing technique (Janesick, 2015).

FINDINGS

These section details outlined the results of semi-structured interview towards the participant to explore her personal performance experiences to afford oral corrective feedback in EFL classroom activities. The data arised from the verbal partisipant's utterances that transcribed before. When the participant asked about teacher's beliefs of the use OCF techniques in their classrooms, she states:

A. Teachers' Teaching Specific Strategy

Statement (s)

"my speaking class was designed which I asked them (university's students) to speak in the context of presentation project. Every people in each group have a different job and demanding to speak, there are visiting group, text speaker, summerizer, text picker, and each student was required to be willing to speak".

B. Teachers' OCF Beliefs

Statement (s)

"the first that becomes my attention is about pronunciation errors, I give an obligation for them to direct speaking. Automatically, we can know they produce speaking naturally and make pronunciation error such as misspelling or repetition error, I explicitly give a correction because inaccurate pronounce would be affected towards the false meaning of the word".

"In my opinion the most important is how to build student's courage to speak. Consequently, at the specific condition the feedback needed to be implemented at the end of the section to explain where were the mistakes appeared. Pronunciation in speaking class have the crucial role, if I did not given them CF for their pronounce since the beginning it can be error fossilized continuously. So, I concluded that CF must be carried out by all an educators because students can not measure true or false when they produce orally."

Participant stated that her speaking classroom was designed with the different strategy through an integrated speaking activities (visiting group, text speaker, summerizer, text picker, and etc) which requires students to speak. She tried to make sure that CF actually applied and all of the students have a significance courage's degrees to speak up fluently. **(statement 1)** Based on the data, teacher give an emphasizes point about CF pronunciations that provided would be keep students from the meaning words mistaken or ambiguity. **(statement 2)**. She explained that numerous students cannot measure their speaking productivity and it would be a continuous fossilizing faults without any correction feedback. **(statement 3)**.

This current study explored beliefs, practices, perceptions and types of teachers' OCF application to give key solution difficulties faced by the students while speaking. Through one model data analysis, researchers presented discussion of the research through the following sections. The first section focused to the teacher beliefs, it was found that the teachers preferred to conduct OCF in speaking class with the aim of eliminating present pronunciation errors. This findings in line with earlier research studies (e.g. Huang & Jia, 2016; Lee et al., 2015), which regarded one of students' necessary in pronunciation problems was teachers' oral corrective feedback. More reference of teacher's beliefs about OCF was also found in a study by Rahman et al., (2020), which involved one English teachers and thirty students of public senior high school to participated in this study. The result was

shown teachers' enjoyment using CF to correct and build improvement for the students' pronunciation.

C. Classroom's Speaking Problem

Statement (s)

" I tend to give them (students) feedback directly, when they made some errors repetition for example one of them say 'gass, gass, gass'; 'thank you gass'; it happened repeatedly, so I immediately reminded at the time about how the way to pronounce it properly by saying 'Guys'. More examples like the word 'question', almost all of students in the class only 0,01% who can be able to pronounce 'question' properly with a correct emphasis"

D. OCF Practice Treatments in Speaking Class

Statement (s)

"The most of students' problem were about long loading comprehension while accepting CF. So oftenly, I have to deliver CF using a proper language. produce it through an effective sentences, and speak slowly so that they can build their understanding appropriately. Sometimes I have to repeat it more than three times to speak fluently. for grammatical errors, students usually need an explicit feedback because most of them did not understand perfectly about the concept of grammar. Start from zero explanation they got a learning classroom that integrated with another language skills"

Teacher revealed that she has her own strategies during OCF practices in the speaking course as well as in enriching the speaking fluently. The strategies executed with a great precision as the case at **(Statement 2)**, teachers as much as possible choose an effective sentences to avoid ambiguity and deliver it slowly to make students more easier understanding. Furthermore, teachers also does not hesitate to start CF from zero explanation in the case of grammatical mistakes. The empirical percentage of data also mentioned that no more than 0.01 % students in her speaking class who were can be pronounce the specific words properly. **(statement 1)**

Unlike previous studies that showed an immediate CF implementation has proven facilitates the development and awareness of the L2 learners' speaking learning processes (e.g., Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010), this study demonstrated about teachers tendency to provide CF directly. Whenever students made several error's utterances, CF would be delivering explicitly. She believed that it was easier to accept than to be kept until at the end of the lesson. While, the contrary literature came from two studies that conducted by (Hunter, 2012; Rolin-Ianziti, 2010), which stated teachers in French and American were implementing delayed CF to avoid several interruptions. They utilized the book notes or audio-recording tools to memorize inaccurate speaking production temporary before conveying corrective information.

Likewise, the researchers does not layoff our curiosity only to the previous topic, we tried to deliver the question about types of CF that used in the classroom to respond students' error utterances. Participant explained in detail as follows:

E. Teacher's OCF Types

Statement

(s)

"I prefer used explicit correction, because if an implicit they dont learn and know directly what, where, and how an error condition happened. I so identified various students mentality before provided feedback such as extrovert person who just relaxed when they get a reprovded, I use the explicit types, for introvert person that has very lowm level confidence, I allow them to be brave and willing to speak first without any correction at all".

I tend to choose explicit correction, explicit correction with metalinguistic comment, and metalinnuistic clue, because my students were a newbies. They need to give a feedback to more inderstand about where they make an errors, why it was false, and how to deliver properly.

For example:

S: "I will presentation my paper, the title is"

T: "I'm going to present my paper entitled "

(Directly explained it clearly for them)

Metalinguistic comment:

Will must to followed V1

Will + presentation isn't match because

presentation is noun. It should modified to the V

Explicit OCF types has choosen as the teacher's ways to counter students' oral errorneous. She stated that this CF categorize more accessible for students directly, because they can be able to know what, where, and how were several faults condition happened. **(statement 1)** In this case, teacher utilized mostly three types of OCF such as: explicit correction, explicit correction with metalinguistic, and metalinguistic clue that choosen one or combined all of them to be customized in her speaking classroom condition. **(statement 2)**

For the following discussion, the researchers elaborated the last theme topic about types of CF that were used in the classroom when students produced several errors. Participant explained in detail through the information who her delivered as follows:

F. The effectivity of OCF Application

Statement (s)

"CF application is effective to implemented. I very upset when my students can not be able to understanding my speaking content material, further to pronounce it well. It becomes an evidence that CF did not applied properly before will have a continuous bad impact on their learning process for the future".

"Then, something crucial about CF significancies is students' self- esteem. I make sure that students involved to arrange our syllabus together. I do it with the hopefully so that my students can learn comfortably and can be able to get their learning needs without having to leave the learning objective that has be arraged.. I also give an emphasis treatment about making mistakes in learning process is a natural thing,so that no need to be ashamed or overthinking if they get any correction. Sometimes I also designed my class with a jokes or game so that my students more rilex even it they get a correction".

G. Teacher's Desire about Speaking Classroom

Statement (s)

"in addition, whenever there is a chance to deliver some opinions, I always said to put the teacher who has high qualifications to handle at the first semester. Therefore, the term of errors diagnosis can be raised at the beginning of the learning processes".

H. Students' Achievement Factors

Statement (s)

It's different case with someone who has not good background knowledge, they need several times or many corrections. But in fact it was work positively for the next meeting, and my students realize to did not repeat their mistakes".

Considering an important function of CF specifically in the speaking domain, the participant claimed that all of teachers must be implemented CF to create two-way communication about students' difficulties. Teacher convinced through her statements that an imperfection CF application has been inviting long adverse effects for students' oral competency. **(statement 1)** Moreover, she also indicated OCF effectiveness application integrated to the several factors such as teachers' cognition, students' previous knowledges, and students' self-esteem. She explained that those CF effectiveness elements were very

influential on how much students' development for the future learning activities. (**statement 2**)

DISCUSSION

As a continuation of the discussion section, determining OCF types for the learning activity becomes our theme topic elaboration. In the third item, data revealed that there were three types of the Explicit OCF which elected from the frequently used, namely: explicit correction, explicit correction with metalinguistic metalinguistic comment, and metalinguistic clue. The data reported that teacher tend to use an explicit correction categorize for her classroom. The consideration of her decision was about students' newbies condition so that she preferred choosing this types to provide additional correction clearly. The findings agreed with the study of EFL Thai's learners that showed their desired to use metalinguistic comment regarding the error's nature. The stastical analysis informed that it was suitable for the beginner – learners would almost less self-confident whenever to give correction in front of their peers (Wiboolyasarin et al., 2022). In addition (Park, 2010) was also strengthened about explicit corrective feedback has becomes the types of CF that used most frequently.

Moreover, other previous studies that carried out in Malaysia revealed the most CF types that used in observed students with average level of proficiency was also the explicit corrective feedback (Othman, 2012). Considering those previous explanation, the last item for our discussion was about teacher's effectiveness perceptions towards OCF distribution. Our findings showed that the participant expressed her consent of CF effectiveness, this findings confirms an empirical previous evidence from Khunaivi & Hartono, (2015), they were announced most of students faced restlessness when they got several fossilization. However, their studies succeed give a proof appropriate correction that provided by teachers could be eliminate students' errors fossilized. The interview data results also determined the kinds of OCF factors were mostly found about students' background knowledge, teachers' cognition, and students' self-esteem condition during carried out learning mechanism.

CONCLUSIONS

Speaking in English has been considered as the toughest skill to be mastered by EFL context students, as well as in Indonesia. As highlighted in the objectives of this study, it was arranged to explore teachers' oral corrective feedback (OCF) on EFL speaking performance in private university level. Anchored from Gass (1997) that acknowledge several evidences of providing OCF, students be able to notice their learning gaps, subsequent they uptake it and made better progression.

Based on previously analysis, teacher has proven impelementing OCF practices to handle several stduents' speaking difficulties. By considering types of speaking difficulties (pronunciation, repetition, grammatical and long loading comprehension) students condition and learning situation, an explicit corrective feedback categorize included of explicit correction, explicit correction with metalinguistic statements and metalinguistic clues has choosen be delivered for EFL students. Those types be trusted can be able to work effectively for students who have basic English knowledge development. Additionally, there were kinds of other factors that influenced towards effectiveness OCF administration among

them are students' background knowledge, students' self-esteem, and teachers' cognition about CF application. Finally, this current research has limitation analysis which would need attention to be considered as well. Researchers involve only small number of participant in this investigation, due to limited existence quantity of data sources around the research demographic context. It was also influenced to the result study that can not be generalized. Thus, for the further study we expected there will be research to carry out an investigation in this topic discussion with the large number of participants.

REFERENCES

- Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011). Exploring the teachers' use of spoken corrective feedback in teaching Iranian EFL learners at different levels of proficiency. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29(2010), 1859– 1868. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.435>
- Ahmed, S. (2015). Attitudes towards English Language Learning among EFL Learners at UMSKAL. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(18), 6–17.
- Akbari, Z. (2015). Current Challenges in Teaching/Learning English for EFL Learners: The Case of Junior High School and High School. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 394–401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.524>
- Alam, A., & Ashrafuzzaman, M. (2018). *Challenges of Developing Speaking Skill through Classroom Interaction of EFL Learners*. April.
- Allen, M. (2017). *Confidentiality and Anonymity of Participants* (Ik (ed.)). The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/usmmainebooks/detail.action?docID=4841518>
- Al-Roud, A. (2016). Problems of English Speaking Skill that University Students Encounter from Their Perspectives. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science*, 18(3), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.9734/bjesbs/2016/28404>
- Amoah, S., & Yeboah, J. (2021). The speaking difficulties of Chinese EFL learners and their motivation towards speaking the English language. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(1), 56–69. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.4>
- Bashir, Marriam, Muhammad Azeem, A. H. D. (2016). Factor Effecting Students' English Speaking Skills. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 2(January 2011), 35–50.
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 243–272. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.243>
- Braun, V., Clarke, V., Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Applied Qualitative Research in Psychology. *Applied Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 0887(2006). <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-35913-1>
- Bruton. (2010). Another reply to Truscott on error correction: Improved situated designs

- over statistics. *Elsevier*.
- Chand, G. B. (2021). Challenges Faced by Bachelor Level Students While Speaking English. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, 6(1), 45 <https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v6i1.853>
- Chaudron, C. (1977). a Descriptive Model of Discourse in the Corrective Treatment of Learners' Errors. *Language Learning*, 27(1), 29–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1977.tb00290.x>
- Cho, H., Kim, Y. J., & Park, S. (2021). Comparing students' responses to synchronous written corrective feedback during individual and collaborativewriting tasks. *Language Awareness*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2021.1937194>
- Clandinin, D. J. (2006). Narrative inquiry: A methodology for studying lived experience. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 27(1), 44–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X060270010301>
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X019005002>
- Couper, G. (2019). Teachers' cognitions of corrective feedback on pronunciation: Their beliefs, perceptions and practices. *System*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.003>
- Creswell, J. w. (2018). *Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mix Methods Approaches* (4 edition). Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
- Ellis, N. C. (2016). Implicit and Explicit Knowledge About Language. *Language Awareness and Multilingualism*, 6, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02325-0_7-2
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). *Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and The Acquisition of L2 Grammar*. 339 - 368
- Elmahdi, O. E. H., & Khan, W. A. (2015). The Pronunciation Problems Faced by Saudi EFL Learners at Secondary Schools. *Education and Linguistics Research*, 1(2), 85. <https://doi.org/10.5296/elr.v1i2.7783>
- Farrokhi, F. (2011). *The Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback on Grammatical Accuracy of Iranian EFL Learners*. 1(12), 1797– 1803. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.12.1797-1803>
- Gary Barkhuizen, Phil Benson, A. C. (2014). *Narrative Inquiry in Language Teaching and Language Research*. Routledge.
- Gooch, R., A, B, A, *, Saito, K., B, & Roy Lyster. (2016). Effects of recasts and prompts on L2 pronunciation development: Teaching English /ɹ/ to Korean adult EFL learners. *System*, 60, 117–127. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.06.007>
- Gulnaz, R. A. & F. (2019). Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques: An Investigation of the EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices at Taif University. *Arab World English Journal*.

- Gumbaridze, J. (2013). Error Correction in EFL Speaking Classrooms. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 1660–1663. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.237>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hermer, J. (2018). How to teach writing. In *Overland* (Vol. 2018-Winte, Issue 231, pp. 3–7).
- Huang, X., & Jia, X. (2016). Corrective Feedback on Pronunciation: Students' and Teachers' Perceptions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(6), 245. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n6p245>
- Hunter, J. (2012). “Small talk”: Developing fluency, accuracy, and complexity in speaking. *ELT Journal*, 66(1), 30–41. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq093>
- Janesick, V. J., & Abbas, N. (2011). “Stretching” Exercises for Qualitative Researchers. *Sociological Research Online*, 16(4), 225–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136078041101600402>
- Kartchava, E., Gatbonton, E., Ammar, A., & Trofimovich, P. (2020). Oral corrective feedback: Pre-service English as a second language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(2), 220–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818787546>
- Krashen, S. D. (1984). *Writing: Research, theory, and application*. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.
- Li, S. (2010). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta- Analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x>
- Li, S. (2014). Oral corrective feedback. *ELT Journal*, 68. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1093/elt/cct076>
- Li, S. (2017). Student and Teacher Beliefs and Attitudes about Oral Corrective Feedback. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317183150>
- Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System*, 84, 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006>
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* (Vol. 32, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520>
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., Sato, M., Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2012). *Teaching: State-of* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.100995>
- Misbah, N. H., Mohamad, M., Yunus, M. M., & Ya'acob, A. (2017). Identifying the Factors Contributing to Students' Difficulties in the English Language Learning. *Creative Education*, 08(13), 1999–2008. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2017.813136>
- Othman, W. M. (2012). *The Role of Feedback in Malaysian ESL Secondary School Classrooms*. April, 1–340.
- Park, C. L. (2010). Making Sense of the Meaning Literature: An Integrative Review of Meaning

- Making and Its Effects on Adjustment to Stressful Life Events. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(2), 257–301. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018301>
- Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2015). Exploring non-native English-speaking and performance under peer versus teacher corrective feedback conditions. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 70(2021), 100995. teachers' cognitions about corrective feedback in teaching English oral communication. *System*, 55(Jlt L), 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.09.006>
- Rahman, F. A., 1, Kahfi, E. H., 1, Dalimunthe, R. N. R.-P., & 1. (2020). Exploring the Implementation of Teacher's Corrective Feedback on Students' Pronunciation: A Case Study in an 1 Indonesian Public High School. *Science and Technology Publications*, 477–485. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0008220804770485>
- Rolin-Ianziti, J. (2010). The organization of delayed second language correction. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(2), 183–206. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168809353874>
- Roothoof, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System*, 46(1), 65–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.012>
- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, 25(4), 318–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580>
- Roy Lyster, Pasty M. Lightbown, and N. S. (1999). A Respon to Truscott's "What's Wrong with Oral Grammar Correction". *The Canadian Modern Language Review*.
- SATO, M. (2013). Beliefs About Peer Interaction and Peer Corrective Feedback: Efficacy of Classroom Intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97, 611–633. <https://doi.org/DOI:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12035>
- Sippel, L., & Jackson, C. N. (2015). Teacher vs. Peer Oral Corrective Feedback in the German Language Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(4), 688–705. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12164>
- Sokip. (2020). Overcoming the problem of learning foreign language skills in the classroom. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(2), 723–729. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080246>
- Truscott, J. (1999). *The Case for "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes": A Response to Ferris*. 122(2), 111–122.
- Ünsal Şakiroğlu, H. (2020). Oral corrective feedback preferences of university students in english communication classes. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 6(1), 172–178.
- Ur, P. (2014). Exploring Indonesian Graduates' English Language Skills and Companies' English Language Skills Requirements in East Kalimantan, Indonesia. In *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science* (Vol. 19, Issue 6, pp. 44–56). <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-19664456>
- Wang, W., & Li, S. (2021). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in American ESL and

- Chinese EFL classrooms: A comparative study. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 34(1), 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1767124>
- Wiboolyasarini, K., Wiboolyasarini, W., Jinowati, N., & Kamonsawadi, R. (2022). EFL Learners' Preference for Corrective Feedback Strategies in Relation to Their Self-Perceived Levels of Proficiency. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 5(1), 32–47. <http://journal2.uad.ac.id/index.php/eltej/article/view/4403>
- Widodo, H. P. (2014). Methodological consideration in interview data transcription. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 101–107.
- Xuan Van Ha & Murray, J. C. (2020). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820931897>
- Yang, Y., & Lyster, R. (2010). Effects of form-focused practice and feedback on Chinese EFL learners acquisition of regular and irregular past tense forms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 235–263. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990519>
- Zhai, K., & Gao, X. (2018b). Effects of corrective feedback on EFL speaking task complexity in China's university classroom. *Cogent Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1485472>
- Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: a large-scale survey. *Language Awareness*, 28(2), 139–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755>
- Zohrabi, K., & Ehsani, F. (2014). The Role of Implicit & Explicit Corrective Feedback in Persian-speaking EFL Learners' Awareness of and Accuracy in English Grammar. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 2018–2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014>