

# Learners' Perceptions on the Use of Oral Corrective Feedback in One-to-One EFL Classroom

Sitti Syakira<sup>1</sup>, Sahril Nur<sup>2</sup>

Universitas Siliwangi, Indonesia<sup>1</sup>

Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia<sup>2</sup>

Email: sitti.syakira@unsil.ac.id<sup>1</sup>

Submitted: 04/12/2021

Revised: 24/07/2022

Accepted: 24/08/2022

E-ISSN : 2579-4574

P-ISSN : 2549-7359

**Abstract.** Learners' perception plays an important role in evaluating the teaching and learning process and has an impact to the teacher's performance during the teaching and learning process. Applying descriptive qualitative method with case study design, this study highlighted the learners' perceptions and their preference of oral corrective feedback utilized by the teachers during the teaching and learning process. By using purposive sampling, this research involved one teacher and two learners as research participants at an English course called Amsterdam Institute located in Makassar. The data, collected through semi-structured interview and observation, resulted that the learners found themselves facilitated in responding the teacher's utterances since the teacher's oral corrective feedback were helpful to lead the learners' accuracy or just to help them acknowledge their errors in terms of grammar, lexis, the use of L1, and particularly in phonology (pronunciation). Furthermore, inconsistencies between the students' preference and the teacher's feedback use in terms of the time to provide oral corrective feedback are identified. Students preferred being given time to work out their error, while teacher mostly gave feedback directly. Thus, it can be concluded that giving more time for students to provide self-repair can be a way for students to make sense of error they committed. The results further highlight a significant impact for teachers' beliefs on their corrective feedback practices, especially for those teaching using a tailor-made system. Finally, the implication of this study is discussed.

**Keywords:** *Learners' Perceptions, Oral Corrective Feedbacks, One-To-One EFL Classroom.*

<https://ojs.unm.ac.id/eralingua>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

## INTRODUCTION

For a number of decades, the phenomenon of learners' language errors has attracted the attention of a wide range of researchers from varied quarters: psychologists, psycholinguists, first and second language educationalists, applied linguists, and teachers. The study of learners' language errors was tied to prevalent thinking in the fields of psychology, linguistics, and language acquisition.

Corder (1967) who first made a distinction between errors and mistakes considers that a mistake is related to physical conditions (fatigue) or to psychological conditions (strong emotions), and an error is the result of a transitory competency in L2. Bailey in Leiter (2010) contends that a mistake is an incorrect utterance that a learner can correct her/himself and can be referred to a momentary lapse, whilst error refers to lack of competence in a particular linguistics area and a learner will require an assistance to get it correct. Moreover, Hedge (2000) suggests that teachers should respond to errors, which are due to a lack of knowledge about a linguistic item, rather than mistakes, which are non-systematic and occur as a result of factors such as fatigue. However, this is easier said than done because it is difficult for teachers to distinguish errors from mistakes in spontaneous classroom discourse. Perhaps it is easier to follow Hedge's other suggestion, that only 'global' errors (those which cause communication problems) are addressed, but not 'local' errors (those which do not). This suggestion, according to Li (2014), prioritizes the conversational function of oral corrective feedback and seems to neglect its generally recognized pedagogical importance, which is to provide opportunities for exposure to negative (as well as positive) evidence and the consolidation of L2 linguistic knowledge, and thus, this is in line with the research that is going to be conducted.

Teachers' reaction to learners' errors has been scrutinized by second language acquisition researchers. Differentiated between feedback and correction, language teaching cannot stand away from the findings of error analysis. The existence of errors has been subject for all language-teaching theories as they represent an important aspect of second language learning (Erdoğan, 2005). Language teachers and researchers cannot ignore that negative evidence may play a role in assisting learners to attend and incorporate those aspects of language not acquired through positive evidence alone (Oliver, 1995). Han (2008) suggests that error correction implies an evident and direct correction, whereas corrective feedback is a more general way of providing some clues, or eliciting some correction, besides the direct correction made by the teacher.

There are some types of error that might be made by learners in their language learning process and it is important to discuss since when correcting, teacher has to be selective to filter the learners' error as it is not the case that teacher need to correct all errors made by the learners (R Ellis & Shintani, 2013). Based on the learners' erroneous utterances to target language, error is divided into four different types of error based on the context of the language studied, in this case French, namely grammatical, phonological, and lexical error, and unsolicited use of L1 (Lyster, 1998).

According to Ölmezer-Öztürk (2016), with the emergence of communicative language teaching between students and teacher or among students themselves,

there has been increased reflection on the role of oral corrective feedback in classroom teaching. Since [Lyster and Ranta \(1997\)](#) published their influential study on the different types of corrective feedback observed in French immersion classrooms in Canada, a growing body of research has emerged attempting to measure the effects of corrective feedback on second language acquisition. Recently several meta-analyses have been published, which all indicate a positive role for corrective feedback for the acquisition of second language grammar ([Li, 2014](#); [Lyster & Saito, 2010](#); [Mackey & Goo, 2007](#); [Russel & Nina, 2006](#)). Apart from the experimental studies included in these meta-analyses, several authors have tried to observe how corrective feedback really works in classrooms and how learners respond to it. Data from different contexts including adolescent and adult students of second and foreign languages largely support [Lyster's and Ranta's \(1997\)](#) finding that recasts, which reformulate all or part of a student's utterance minus the error, are the type of feedback that is used the most by teachers, and teacher tended to regard learners' responses after corrective feedback as indications of its success. However, [Ohta \(2001\)](#) suggests that the absence of learners' responses after corrective feedback does not necessarily show a lack of attention. On the other hand, learners' responses may not always indicate that noticing has occurred.

A considerable number of experimental and classroom activities shows corrective feedback can positively affect the learners' language learning experience with evidence from classroom studies. Instructional context has been found to have an effect on learning gains (e.g. [Lan et al., 2015](#)), learner motivation (e.g. [Q. Li, 2014](#)), and learner perceptions (e.g. [Al-Osaimi & Wedell, 2014](#)). The purpose of this study was, however, not to weight in either for or against the need of a focus on form in classroom language learning. Rather, it is necessary to take account learners' attitudes towards the feedbacks, as well as the way the feedback put into the practice in the classroom. [Siriwardana and Devayalage \(2021\)](#) writes that knowing the perception of both learners and teachers toward oral corrective feedback strategies will factor into creating a healthy learning environment. Moreover, Learner perception presents a key variable influencing the role of corrective for two major reasons. First, students may construe instructional techniques in different ways than the teacher may have expected. Second, students' preferences should not be idealized because they are not necessarily more effective for being preferred. This disconnection can impair learning effectiveness ([Amrhein & Hossein, 2010](#)). Therefore, it is important for teachers to be aware of the possible incompatibility and the consequences of the students' expectations and theirs. In addition, a number of educators and researchers have pointed out that students' beliefs play an important role in motivation, selection of learning strategies, and learning in general ([Fox, 1993](#); [Green, 1993](#); [Horwitz, 1988](#); [Kern, 1995](#); [Mantle-bromley, 1995](#); [McCargar, 1993](#); [Oxford, 1989](#)). Foreign language teachers need to keep this in mind when planning classroom activities, and that teaching activities need to be perceived in the learners' minds as conducive to learning.

The above discussion indicates that the discrepancy between the corrective feedback preference and learner's perception is critical issue for understanding the efficacy of corrective feedback itself. Therefore, this study focused on one-to-one

classroom in which the class participation only involved one student and one teacher. Teacher was able to provide more feedbacks without having to worry about the learners' psychology being corrected. [Wiboolyasarini et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Ur \(2012\)](#) believe that to be corrected by peers or teachers in public may cause the students an embarrassment and lead them to be upset or afraid of speak ([de Vasconcelos Neto & de Barros Cardoso, 2021](#)).

### Oral Corrective Feedback

Feedback is divided into two types which are oral and written feedback. Specifically, in language learning, feedback, which aims to correct learners' errors, is called corrective feedback. Corrective feedback has been shown to be an important part of effective instruction ([S. Li, 2010](#); [Sheen, 2011a](#); [Lyster & Saito, 2010b](#); [Lyster et al., 2013](#)). [Li \(2014\)](#) states that corrective feedback refers to teacher and peer responses to learners' erroneous second language (L2) production. An empirical evidence suggests that corrective feedback is beneficial for second language acquisition (SLA), particularly for the acquisition of explicit knowledge ([Rod Ellis, 2002](#); [N. C. Ellis, 2005](#); [Spada & Tomita, 2010](#); [Sheen, 2011a](#));). Nonetheless, [Sheen \(2011\)](#) claims that not all-corrective feedback takes place because of a communication failure; teachers are able to apply it to attract the students' attention to form even in those circumstances where they understand each other. This means that corrective feedback can bring negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form too, not only in oral but also in written form. Therefore, corrective feedback is also known as oral corrective feedback because it is not only given feedback on learners' written work but also given in orally whether learner produces an erroneous utterance.

Types of oral corrective feedback are early proposed by [Lyster & Ranta \(1997\)](#), which they classified into six such as explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, meta-linguistic clue, elicitation, and repetition. These classifications have been categorized into two, reformulations and prompts. Recasts and explicit correction are included into reformulation as both focus on the correct way of saying a certain word or a sentence. Whereas, prompts, which is previously known as negotiation form, includes a variety of signals rather than reformations which are elicitation, meta-linguistic cue, clarification requests and repetition.

#### a. Reformulations

1. Explicit correction or explicit feedback refers to the teacher's indication of student's incorrect utterance. Teacher supplies the correct form and clearly indicates that what the student has said is incorrect.
2. Recasts are operationalized as the teacher's partial or full reformulation of the students' ill-formed utterances ([Sheen, 2007](#)). To allow for learner responses following recasts to flow naturally, the teacher was not explicitly requested to encourage repair.

## b. Prompts

1. Clarification request is when the teacher has no clear understand to learners' utterances. It typically occurs when students produce erroneous utterance and teachers use some request-phrases i.e. "sorry", "Pardon me", "excuse me" etc.
2. Meta-linguistics clue is when the teacher poses questions or provides comments or information related to the students' well-formed utterance without providing the correct form like "Do we say it like that?" "That's not how you say it in English," and "Is it feminine?".
3. Elicitation is whether the teacher directly elicits the correct form from the student by asking questions (e.g., "How do we say that in English?"), by pausing to allow the student to complete the teacher's utterance (e.g., "It's a...") or by asking students to reformulate the utterance (e.g., "Say that again.").
4. Repetition is that the teacher repeats the student's ill-formed utterance and adjusts intonation to highlight the error.

**Perceptions about Oral Corrective Feedback**

A growing body of research has examined that some forms of corrective feedback is beneficial during the classroom activities. The type of feedback, the mode of feedback, proficiency level of students, teachers' educational background, feedback setting, attitudes towards feedback, the timing of feedback and length of feedback are the most investigated sub-topics of oral corrective feedback (Kir, 2020). One area that has received considerable attention is the type of corrective feedback in which recasts or other forms of prompts are more effective. Recasts are believed to promote L2 development by providing learners with the correct form without interrupting the flow of communication (Erlam & Loewen, 2010). Loewen and Philp (2006, p. 551) continue that recasts are appropriate for classroom contexts because 'a recast is time-saving, less threatening to student confidence, and less intrusive to the flow of interaction than, for example, elicitation of self-repair'. Asari (2014) studied non-native EFL teacher ways in providing corrective feedback in the first-year university students in Japan. The findings indicate that teachers, in responding the students' error, consistently segmented recast. However, Ressaie (2013b) states that popularity of recast as the effective strategy can be constrained by number of internal and external factors such as instructional context and learners' orientation to correction and learners' proficiency and developmental readiness.

Contrarily, a study conducted by Ha and Murray (2020) found that although prompts were reported by Vietnamese EFL teachers to be more effective and preferred of total feedback moves than reformulations, they were not reflected in the classroom observation. Edmond (2017) in a low EFL class at an education and training center in Pacoima, California, reports that although recast is the most frequently used to respond the students' error, it is still difficult to generalize, and its effectiveness in eliciting a respond depends on the quality of the recast itself provided by the teacher. Furthermore, Yoshida (2008) has similar view of this that using recast is unclear for learners to receive as feedback though it has already been applied as teaching philosophy and practical reason that time restrictions imposed by the classes prompted their provision of recasts to the learners. Regarding this,

students pointed out that for effective learning, they want to know that an error was committed and receive information from the teacher as how to correct it, with some explanations (Katayama, 2007; Baz et al., 2016; Saeb, 2017; Tasdemir & Arslan, 2018) as noted by Roberts (1995, p. 167) that ‘the efficacy of error correction is directly related to the condition that the L2 learner not only recognizes that he/she is being corrected, but understands the nature of the correction’.

Oral corrective feedback provided by the teacher cannot be separated with the learners’ standpoints. Chen, Nassaji, and Liu (2016) state that learner variable mediates the effectiveness of feedback which refers to the learners’ individual differences including their perceptions. In relation with corrective feedback use, Tomczyk (2013) in his study found four most possible reactions of the students towards the teacher’s corrective feedback. Anger, shame, contentment, and indifference are presented as the students’ reaction after being corrected by the teachers. Şakiroğlu (2020) states in his study that some students feel intimidated during the correction. However, the findings of the studies further revealed that, generally, the students admitted to be satisfied with the teacher’s feedback. The presence of learners who feel negative about the correction shows that the learners need to be informed regarding the efficiency of corrective feedback to help them developing their language skill.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

### **Research Design**

The qualitative research in this study employed a case study design which is an intensive study of an individual or social unit in a depth where researchers try to investigate all important variables in the development of the subject. Therefore, it was used to focus on promoting a deep understanding about adult learners’ errors, oral corrective feedback used by the EFL teacher, and learners’ perception on oral corrective feedback provided to correct their errors.

### **Research Context and Participants**

This research was conducted in one of the informal schools in Makassar called Amsterdam Institute. Amsterdam Institute is located on Jl. Perintis Kemerdekaan Km 10, Tamalanrea, Makassar. This informal school has some English program such as General English, English for Professional, In-Company Training, TOEFL and IELTS. English for Professional, consisting of adult learners and conducted using tailor made system in which the teacher taught the learners based on their needs in one-to-one classroom, was chosen to fulfill the criteria of the research. The teaching and learning process can be done anywhere and anytime based on the agreement of the teacher and learners.

The participant of this research was a teacher (called a tutor in the institution) and two learners from Amsterdam Institute. The teacher taught particularly only in English for Professional Program – learners with certain educational or occupational background. The teacher visited the learners in a comfortable place where the learners wanted to study. There were four teachers in the institution teaching adult learners, but the teacher was purposively determined

based on the criteria by the purpose of this study obtained through the preliminary observation and interview in the site in which she is the only one teaching in one-to-one classroom using tailor made system in English for Professional program while other teachers were teaching in a classroom consisting at least 8 students. In addition, assigning the teacher as participant was also based on the following criteria mentioned by Cross (2003, cited in [Soepriyatna, 2012](#)).

- (1) Level of education; the teacher is a master degree of English education with an excellent GPA and was the best graduate in her university in 2018.
- (2) Subject competences; with more than 10-years experience of teaching English, the teacher was assigned competent for teaching it. Moreover, she had taught in one-to-one classroom using tailor made system for 5 years in the year of this research conducted.
- (3) Professional competences; with years of teaching experience, the teacher has followed many professional trainings regarding English teaching conducted by the institutions she has worked for or other institutions.
- (4) Attitudes; the teacher has taught in Amsterdam Institute since it was established in 2017, and as the director said that she is a well-managed and prepared teacher before teaching. In addition, the learners also said that the teacher always engaged them after the learning session and sometimes freed her time to discuss about their learning process or anything related to English learning.

Regarding the learners, there were two learners assigned as participant. They were, afterward, identified as learner 1 (L<sub>1</sub>) and learner 2 (L<sub>2</sub>). They were, moreover, purposively chosen due to three reasons: (1) they had the same English proficiency level; (2) they had the same numbers of meeting; and (3) they had been taught with the same material before the research was conducted.

### **Data Collection**

Observation and semi-structured interview were used for collecting the data. According to [Couper \(2019\)](#), interviews and classroom observations are needed to more fully understand both teachers' and learners' cognition. The purpose of semi-structured interview was to see how the learners perceive oral corrective feedback provided by the teacher during the teaching and learning activity and the learners' preferences concerning the timing of corrective feedback using identical questions for both participants ([Cohen et al., 2011](#)). The language of the interview process was chosen at the participants' option in order to ensure the learners' simple and fluent expression of thoughts ([Atai & Shafiee, 2017](#)). Therefore, the interview was carried out in the language that the participants felt comfortable using (Indonesian) and recorded about 10 to 15 minutes each learner, and the participants were given chances to elaborate the reasons for their corrective feedback preferences.

Meanwhile, observation aimed to see the process of how teacher provide feedback for the learners' error during the teaching and learning process. It was conducted in two one-to-one classes and each class consisted of 3 meetings with 8 hours 38 minutes of audio recording in total. The researchers acted as complete observer ([Creswell, 2016](#)) in which they simply observed by sitting in a spot where the participants could not easily notice their existence during the interaction. Furthermore, the audio recording was placed with teacher's help since the

participants refused to be recorded using video. Finally, the data gained from this observation were used as secondary data to see whether the teacher's feedback and learners' feedback preferences were in line. According to [Creswell \(2016\)](#), observation can be a good complement to interviewing since it allows the researcher to compare the codes and themes from the observation with the interview results. This triangulation of data is crucial to ensure that the researchers' interpretations are accurate.

### **Data Analysis**

The data collected through the observation and semi-structured interview were analyzed using thematic analysis. The analysis process was adopted from [Matthews et al., \(2010\)](#) which is categorized into four steps: (1) identifying the initial themes; (2) interpreting the data; (3) looking for relationships in the data; and (4) presenting the analysis result. As for the interview data, after transcribing and identifying the initial theme, the researcher verified to the learners to gain exhaustive data before interpreting them based on the need of the research. Furthermore, the observation data were used to see whether the corrective feedback used by the teacher could help the learners to acknowledge their errors and to verify the learners' corrective feedback preference.

## **RESULTS**

### **Learners' Attitude**

Based on the interview results, the adult learners found themselves facilitated in responding the teacher's utterances since the teacher's oral corrective feedback were helpful to lead the learners' accuracy or just to help them acknowledge their errors in term of grammar, pronunciation, lexis, and the use of L1. However, in contrast to those positive attitudes expressed by the learners, some research into teachers' belief misalign. They have raised concern about how corrective feedback can make their students feel bad and make them less motivated to learn (e.g. [Kaivanpanah et al., 2015](#); [Kartchava et al., 2018](#); [Mahalingappa et al., 2021](#)). [Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh \(2018\)](#) continue that teacher's preference of feedback types may have encouraged pupils to be more reserved about making mistakes and less talkative. Despite the misalignment believes between teachers and learners' positive attitude towards oral corrective feedback, it is also concerned by some previous studies (e.g. [Alsolami, 2019](#); [Asnawi et al., 2017](#); [Ergül, 2021](#); [Gamlo, 2019](#); [Kim & Mostafa, 2021](#); [S. Li & Vuono, 2019](#); [A. Mackey, 2020](#); [Van Ha et al., 2021](#)). They mention that oral corrective feedback is recorded as a significant strategy in the learning process.

First, teacher's corrective feedback was considered as the motivation and error awareness. The learners mentioned that sometimes the teacher did not correct them when they made an error. Thus, when this happened, they realized they needed to correct their own error. This finding is in line with a study conducted by [Suryoputro and Amaliah \(2016\)](#). It indicates that oral corrective feedback improved students' error awareness and their motivation to participate in the conversation during the learning process. This part of finding is further presented below.



L<sub>1</sub> : If my sentence is incorrect, Miss O (Teacher's initial name) always helps me. But, sometimes if I feel I am wrong, my teacher does not correct it, or if I remember, I will correct my own error.

(Translated from Indonesian: Learner 1, May 11)

L<sub>2</sub> : I always make mistakes when speaking, especially because I am still beginner. But, thankfully, Miss O really assists me. She sometimes stops me and directly corrects me, or just says "hhmm" which means I make mistake, and I should correct it by myself. But, sometimes, Miss O does not correct my erroneous utterances. It might be because of the frequent mistakes. I am still learning anyway, so sometimes I still forget that, especially grammar.

(Translated from Indonesian: Learner 2, May 13)

The two learners' standpoint indicates that the teacher actually gave them time to work out their ill-formed utterances by providing clues or signals. Regarding this, Couper (2019) reported in his study that some learners said that self-correction is necessary for them to promote learning autonomy and independent learning. Moreover, according to Ha et al. (2021), teachers claim that self-correction might encourage learners to think more deeply about language rules and make them consider their errors and the appropriate forms to provide themselves self-correction. However, in this case, learners' absence of mind towards the material learnt previously sometimes put them in difficulties to respond the teacher. Interestingly, the second learner, apparently, figured out why the teacher skipped some of their errors. It is in line with the observation result that is presented below.

T : Oh school. So, what about in the evening, what is your routine?

L<sub>1</sub> : In the evening **I with my family, I am with my family** and play with my son.

T : Okay

(Learner 1, April 25)

The dialogue points out that the learner made the same mistake, missing the predicate. However, at one point, she could directly provide herself correction. The teacher seemed satisfied by responding "Okay" that means she did not have to re-correct the same error. Nevertheless, the learner, in other meeting, uttered the same error, and the teacher skipped the error. The teacher confirmed by the interview that she sometimes skips the same error produced by the learners because they already acknowledge their errors and it is not possible to correct every errors that the learners committed. Additionally, Students frequently feel more comfortable speaking the target language when teachers ignore some errors rather than correcting all of them (Şakiroğlu, 2020). Therefore, the researcher took their statement into an account that they actually can figure out more about their errors if they are provided more triggers as an attraction for their intention. Weekly et al. (2022) point out that due to language policy, assessments, and student expectations, teachers believe that it is crucial to correct students while remaining sensitive to linguistic diversity. Additionally, Kartchava et al. (2018) state that frequent CF encourages modified and pushed output, which can engage students in morphosyntactic processing and encourage them to think on their output and

identify ways of altering it to better comprehensibility, appropriateness, and accuracy.

Second, teacher's corrective feedback is defined as their reminder of the previous material learnt. L<sub>1</sub> confessed that the teacher's triggers help them to recall the previous material learnt from her short-term memory.

L<sub>1</sub> : Yes, because the teacher directly corrects the pronunciation, if this letter comes with this letter, the pronunciation must be like this. If the other ones must be added, pronunciation is just corrected directly, so it's easier. Actually, all of them are understandable. But, because I usually forget, so I have to be engaged.

(Translated from Indonesian: Learner 1, May 11)

### Feedback Types

In addition to the learners' pronunciation error, [Couper \(2019\)](#) claims that very little focus has been placed on teachers' feedback on pronunciation. [Yüksel et al. \(2021\)](#) point out that pronunciation or phonological error should be corrected since students view pronunciation as a requirement for effective communication, and in that receiving oral corrective feedback in pronunciation is widely preferred ([Zare et al., 2020](#)). There are similar findings indicated in this study and in the finding of [Couper's \(2019\)](#). He found out that during the observation conducted, all the participants received immediate correction at some point of the phonological errors.

L<sub>2</sub> : What is that .. It may be pronunciation or vocabulary.

R : Why do you think so?

L<sub>2</sub> : Yeah because the pronunciation is directly corrected how it is pronounced, as well as the vocabulary. The teacher immediately corrects it.

(Translated from Indonesian: Learner 2, May 13)

Based on the conversation above, the ways the teacher provides the feedback are easy for them to understand, especially in terms of phonological error. This may in return because phonological error or mispronunciation is frequently followed with explicit correction and recast in which they just need to imitate the teacher's repair. They are not asked to provide themselves self-correction. According to [Lyster \(1998\)](#), pronunciation or phonological errors are perhaps not amenable to negotiation and instead require correct models for learners to imitate. This is in accordance with the research result found by [Suryoputro and Amaliah \(2016\)](#) that corrective feedback enhanced students' pronunciation. In addition, according to [Bao's \(2019\)](#) study, phonological errors received the most instances of corrective feedback because teachers place a high value on students' phonology accuracy. Nevertheless, indeed, the unusually high rate of repair following teachers' recasts of phonological errors suggests that students do notice the corrective intentions, underlying the teacher's recast, in that they tend to repeat it and get it right. Recasts are believed to be more obvious and conspicuous when learners place a greater emphasis on language form than on communication ([Alkhamash & Gulnaz, 2019](#); [Hanh & Tho, 2018](#); [Milla & del Pilar García Mayo, 2021](#)). In addition to this, the observation data shows the result as follow.

- L<sub>1</sub> : I.. fun, **laugh** /laug/ with him.  
 T : /la:f/ /la:f/, jadi 'g' sama 'h' dibaca /f/.  
 (/la:f/ /la:f/, so 'g' and 'h' is uttered /f/.)  
 L<sub>1</sub> : Dibaca /f/ , /la:f/  
 (It's uttered /f/ , /la:f/)

(Learner 1, May 3)

The learning conversation shows the use of feedback to respond the learners' inappropriate pronunciation. The first learner's mispronunciation was followed with recast where the error was directly indicated by the teacher. Meanwhile, the teacher emphasized the learner's error by using explicit feedback. After all, in omitting the learners' errors, the teacher succeeded leading the learners' accuracy in pronunciation. The two types of corrective feedback – explicit feedback and recast were the most frequently used by the teacher to lead the learners' accurate response. In addition to this finding, [Saeb \(2017\)](#) discovered that in order to learn something effectively and long-term, students must have their mistakes clearly defined, receive thorough justification, and have the correct form given to them by the teacher. By encouraging students to identify their own mistakes and select the appropriate form, teachers expressed the opposing viewpoint that they were eager to foster learner autonomy.

### **Feedback Time Preference**

In order to assess teachers' corrective feedback's effectiveness for L2 development, there has been an increase in study interest over the past three decades in investigating learners' preferences toward it ([Hamed Mahvelati, 2021](#)). The timing of correction is separated in the current study into immediate feedback, which is given as soon as errors are made even though it obstructs communication, and delayed feedback, which is provided after the students have finished communicating their message or before the teacher concludes class. In this context, the teacher used both immediate and delayed corrective feedback. However, the learners mentioned that immediate correctives were more frequently used during the learning process.

The following excerpts describe the learners' answer to the question about the learners' preference of the corrective feedback used by the teacher. The researcher asked "Do you prefer receiving immediate feedback with correct answer or receiving clues or hints indicating your erroneous utterances?"

- L<sub>1</sub>: I prefer being directly corrected if I have no idea about it because I always forget. Actually, it is better not to be corrected directly, like what I said before that it is good for me, so that I can remember the previous materials learnt.

(Translated from Indonesian: Learner 1, May 11)

- L<sub>2</sub>: Actually, if I wanted to choose, I would rather be corrected directly. However, if it continues, I will not be able to be independent learner. I will not be able to speak without any help from the teacher. Moreover, I am forgetful. So, I must be encouraged and provoked.

(Translated from Indonesian: Learner 2, May 13)

Based on the interview, the learners' preference of corrective feedback is clear that they would likely to be corrected immediately. [Van Ha et al. \(2021b\)](#) also reported in his study that most of the students who participated in the interviews stated that they would want to receive immediate feedback and went into greater detail about their preferred timing for input. Generally speaking, all of the students thought that immediate feedback was beneficial since it may help them recognize their errors right away. However, in the context of this study, although the learners preferred being corrected directly, they realized that it inhibited her learning process. They considered that being given time to work out her erroneous utterances could help them to be an independent learner in the future. This is line with [Yoshida's \(2008\)](#) finding that finding out correct answers on learners' own was more effective for their learning than being provided the answers by the teachers. Moreover, self-corrections may also give the learners a sense of achievement and confidence during their language learning process.

L<sub>1</sub> : She immediately corrects it, or I am asked to remember first, engaged to remember, and if I forget, the teacher directly corrects it.

R : So, sometimes you're just given clues?

L<sub>1</sub> : Yes

(Translated from Indonesian: Learner 1, May 11)

L<sub>2</sub> : Most are immediately repaired, especially if the material hasn't been taught before, or if I mispronounce a word, or mix it with Indonesian. Sometimes, Miss knows when I don't know a word, so she just directly corrects it.

(Translated from Indonesian: Learner 2, May 13)

In the excerpt above, the learners clearly conveyed that the teacher used both immediate and delayed feedback. The first learner commented that the teacher, even though, mostly used immediate corrective feedback, she did not directly provide the learner the correct form of the learner's ill-formed utterance. The teacher drove her to acknowledge their error and provide herself correction by triggering them. [Agudo \(2014\)](#) show that teachers highly valued students' self-correction rather than teacher's correction. Meanwhile, since the second learner is more fluent in speaking than the first learner, apparently, not only did the teacher focus on the learner's error, but also the mistake she made during the learning interaction. Thus, although immediate corrective feedback was frequently used, the teacher still gave the students time to provide self-correction.

## DISCUSSION

According to the learners, corrective feedbacks provided by the teacher are helpful. Not only does the teacher explicitly correct them, but also give them clues or prompts them to recall their memory. [Lemak and Valeo \(2020\)](#) shows in their study that positive attitude towards corrective feedback allowed some learners to see corrective feedback as a conscious awareness-raising activity and prevented them to repeating errors ([Saeb, 2017](#)). This positive attitude toward the use of corrective feedback, moreover, confirms the study conducted by [Zhu and Wang \(2019\)](#) that students were generally in favor having their errors corrected and express a desire to be corrected ([Roothoof & Breeze, 2016](#)). [Zhu and Wang \(2019\)](#) continue that learners

belief that corrective feedback is not only beneficial for students who receive correction, but also beneficial for those who are exposed to the corrective feedback.

Regarding the feedback time reference, this finding shows different finding from [Sanafi and Nemati \(2014\)](#) who reports that corrective feedback should be delayed in order to enable learners to understand their errors naturally leading to self-repair. In an experimental study conducted by [Bulbula and Areda \(2020\)](#), they report that some teacher class there is a mismatch between teachers' practice and learners' preferences on the time of correction. Learners always prefer to be corrected at the end of their spoken tasks, while some teachers are observed while giving correction immediately as soon as errors are committed. However, this finding show similar findings with a large-scale survey study by [Brown \(2009\)](#) and [Lee \(2013\)](#). Including students of various target languages at an American university, [Brown \(2009\)](#) concludes that teachers tend to be reluctant to provide immediate error correction, whereas students appear to be more positive about this practice. Another finding of [Zhu and Wang \(2019\)](#) indicates learners had negative feedback towards the delayed corrective feedback. They claim that the students in educational contexts of mainland China and Macao seemed to not prefer delayed error correction form. It might be due to the English learning process in somewhat 'text-centered and input-based' context ([Wen, 2018, p. 527](#)). This 'students' less favorable attitude toward delayed correction' study is in line with [S. Li et al. \(2016\)](#) quasi-experimental study reporting a tentative advantage of immediate over delayed corrective feedback in Chinese classrooms.

Between recast and explicit correction as part of prompts feedback, recast happened most often as a number of previous studies have shown that recasts are the most frequently used type of corrective feedback in classroom interaction ([Braidj, 2002](#); [Lyster, 1998](#); [Lyster & Ranta, 1997](#); [Oliver, 1995](#); [Sheen, 2004](#); [Ölmezer-Öztürk, 2016](#); [Roothoof & Breeze, 2016](#); [de Vasconcelos Neto & de Barros Cardoso, 2020](#); [Milla & Mayo, 2021](#); [Wang & Li, 2021](#)) One of the reasons of this over occurrence is that the teacher feared that the learners would be unable to correct their own errors, and if it continues, the learner will inhibit their language learning process. Moreover, the teachers believed that when learners perform frequent and serious errors, corrective feedback should be addressed more often ([Tasdemir & Arslan, 2018](#)). Another reason of the recast over occurrence is that the time restrictions imposed by the classes prompted does not allow the teacher to correct each of the learners' error ([Kir, 2020](#)). According to [Rassaei \(2013a\)](#) a major difference between explicit correction and recasts is that explicit correction is self-evidently corrective and therefore enables learners to easily recognize the corrective intention of feedback and possibly the source of their error while recast utility to serve communicative and meaning-focused classrooms by correcting learners' errors without disrupting the flow of communication. However, there has been different view about the effectiveness of explicit feedback discovered by [Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh \(2018\)](#). They claim that students may have been less open to speaking in class and more wary of committing errors as a result of explicit correction.

Another finding of this study which is not addressed as the main focus of the study is that learners' uptake towards corrective feedback provided by the teacher

are mostly shown after other types of corrective feedback such as explicit correction, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation. This study is related to the observational and experimental studies conducted previously by [Lyster and Ranta \(1997\)](#), [Panova and Lyster \(2002\)](#), [Sheen \(2004, 2006\)](#), and [Llinares and Lyster \(2014\)](#). These studies result that although recast is the dominant type of oral feedback, especially in adult EFL and ESL classrooms, other types of feedback such as elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, clarification requests and repetition have been found to be less preferred by teachers. However, the results of both studies reveal that recasts produce the lowest rate of uptake in learners, while the more explicit forms of correction such as explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback and especially elicitation lead to a higher level of uptake ([Lyster & Ranta, 2013](#)). This underscores that learners could more accurately identify their mismatch between their erroneous utterances and the target correct forms when they are given more explanation after the correction. Hence, the corrective feedback can be tailored to its awareness raising function and its output triggering capacity which redirects and prompts learners to produce self-correction of their erroneous utterance.

## CONCLUSION

This paper has discussed learners' errors during the teaching and learning process in one-to-one EFL classroom interaction. Based on the findings and discussion, it can be concluded that corrective feedbacks provided by the teacher were helpful for the learners to respond the teacher's utterance accurately. The learners admitted that their absent-mindedness towards the material learnt before made them in trouble when they needed to respond the teacher's utterance. Hence, they concurred that the teacher's corrective feedback either by explicitly eliciting or by giving clue highly assisted them in responding the teacher's utterance. In addition, they confessed that the way teacher corrected them contributed to their English improvement generally.

There are a few things to keep in mind with the current study. First, the number of participants were only two that restrict and limit the data and result interpretation. The further research can involve more participants in an one-to-one classroom interaction that apply the same teaching system. Second, as the learners often produced the same error, especially in grammar, the researchers drew conclusion that the feedbacks provided by the teacher are contemporary monitor for the learners. In other words, the feedback is only stored in their short-term memory. Therefore, the next researchers are expected to explore further teacher's corrective feedbacks that can become permanent monitor or self-correction for learners in order that teacher does not need to correct the same error, and learners can become independent learners, and to dig more deeply about teacher's preference of corrective feedback use with more students as participant receiving feedback.

## REFERENCES

- Agudo, J. de D. M. (2014). Beliefs in learning to teach: EFL student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. In J. de D. M. Agudo (Ed.), *English as a foreign language teacher education* (pp. 209–230). Brill. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401210485\\_013](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401210485_013)

- Al-Osaimi, S., & Wedell, M. (2014). Beliefs about second language learning: The influence of learning context and learning purpose. *Language Learning Journal*, 42(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2012.661753>
- Alkhamash, R., & Gulnaz, F. (2019). Oral corrective feedback techniques: An investigation of the EFL teachers' belief and practices at Taif University. *Paper Knowledge . Toward a Media History of Documents*, 10(2), 40–54. <https://doi.org/10.24093/aweij/vol10no2.4>
- Alsolami, R. (2019). Effect of oral corrective feedback on language skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(6), 672–677. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpsl.0906.09>
- Amrhein, H. R., & Hossein, N. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers prefer and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 95–127. <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19886/21712>
- Asari, Y. (2014). Non-native speakers as EFL teacher: Their corrective feedback and its limitation. In M. H. Abdullah, T. B. Hoon, F. Idrus, A. B. M. Razali, & S. Sivapalan (Eds.), *Proceeding of 12th ASIA TEFL and 23rd MELTA International Conference*, 28–30 August 2014 (pp. 1070–1079).
- Asnawi, Zulfikar, T., & Astila, I. (2017). Students' perception of oral corrective feedback in speaking classes. *English Education Journal*, 8(3), 275–291.
- Atai, M. R., & Shafiee, Z. (2017). Pedagogical knowledge base underlying EFL teachers' provision of oral corrective feedback in grammar instruction. *Teacher Development*, 21(4), 580–596. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2016.1277257>
- Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes: Teachers' beliefs versus their practices. *System*, 82, 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.004>
- Baz, E., Balçıkanlı, C., & Cephe, P. (2016). Perception of English instructors and learners about corrective feedback. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1(1), 54–68. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.166782>
- Braidi, S. M. (2002). Reexamining the role of recasts in native-speaker/nonnative-speaker interactions. *Language Learning*, 52(1), 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00176>
- Brown, A. V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00827.x>
- Bulbula, D. A., & Areda, D. B. (2020). EFL teachers' practice and learners preferences for oral error corrective feedback in EFL speaking class. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 66, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.7176/jlll/66-01>
- Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: A case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 1(5), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(4), 161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161>
- Couper, G. (2019). Teachers' cognitions of corrective feedback on pronunciation: Their beliefs, perceptions and practices. *System*, 84, 41–52.

- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.003>
- Creswell, F. J. W. (2016). *30 essential skills for qualitative researcher*. Sage.
- De Vasconcelos Neto, J. J., & de Barros Cardoso, L. A. (2021). Student teachers' beliefs on oral corrective feedback in English language teaching. *Letras Escreve*, 10(1), 169. <https://doi.org/10.18468/letras.2020v10n1.p169-180>
- De Vasconcelos Neto, J. J., & De Barros Cardoso, L. A. (2020). Student teachers' beliefs on oral corrective feedback in English language teaching. *Letras Escreve*, 10(1), 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.18468/letras.2020v10n1.p169-180>
- Edmond, J. P. (2017). *Oral corrective feedback and learner uptake: A case partial recasts in the adult ESL classroom* [Graduate Thesis, California State University, Northridge. ScholarWorks Open Access Repository]. <http://hdl.handle.net/10211.3/198940>
- Ellis, N. C. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(2), 305–352. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310505014X>
- Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2013). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203796580>
- Ellis, Rod. (2002). Does Form-Focused Instruction Affect the Acquisition of Implicit Knowledge? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(2), 223–236. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263102002073>
- Erdoğan, V. (2005). Contribution of error analysis to foreign language teaching. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 1(2), 261–270. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/161018>
- Ergül, H. (2021). Mitigating oral corrective feedback through linguistic strategies and smiling. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 183, 142–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.07.018>
- Erlam, R., & Loewen, S. (2010). Implicit and explicit recasts in L2 oral French interaction. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66(6), 877–905. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.66.6.877>
- Fox, C. A. (1993). Communicative competence and beliefs about language among graduate teaching assistants in French. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(3), 313–324. <https://doi.org/10.2307/329100>
- Gamlo, N. H. (2019). EFL learners' preferences of corrective feedback in speaking activities. *World Journal of English Language*, 9(2), 28–37. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v9n2p28>
- Green, J. M. (1993). Student attitudes toward communicative and non-communicative activities: Do enjoyment and effectiveness go together? *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.2307/329552>
- Ha, X. Van, & Murray, J. C. (2020). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820931897>
- Ha, X. Van, Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: A teaching and learning perspective. *Heliyon*, 7(7), e07550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550>
- Hamed Mahvelati, E. (2021). Learners' perceptions and performance under peer



- versus teacher corrective feedback conditions. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 70, 100995. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.100995>
- Han, Z. H. (2008). Error correction: Towards a differential approach. [Paper Presentation]. *The Fourth QCC Colloquium on Second Language Acquisition*. <http://www.tc.columbia.edu/>
- Hanh, P. T., & Tho, P. X. (2018). Oral corrective feedback in EFL/ESL classrooms: Classification models. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 34(5), 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.25073/2525-2445/vnufs.4301>
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford University Press.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72, 283–294. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1988.tb04190.x>
- Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & Sepehrinia, S. (2015). Preferences for interactional feedback: Differences between learners and teachers. *Language Learning Journal*, 43(1), 74–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2012.705571>
- Kartchava, E., Gatbonton, E., Ammar, A., & Trofimovich, P. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: Pre-service English as a second language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(2), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818787546>
- Katayama, A. (2007). Learners' perceptions toward oral error correction. In K. Bradford-Watts (Ed.), *JALT2006 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 284–299). Tokyo: JALT. <https://jalt-publications.org/archive/proceedings/2006/E117.pdf>
- Kern, R. G. (1995). Students' and teachers' beliefs about language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28(1), 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1995.tb00770.x>
- Kim, Y., & Mostafa, T. (2021). Teachers' and students' beliefs and perspectives about corrective feedback. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 561–580). Cambridge University Press.
- Kir, P. (2020). Exploring the relationship between the beliefs and practices of instructors about oral corrective feedback in EFL classes: A case study from Turkey. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 7(2), 567–583. <http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/632>
- Lan, Y. J., Fang, S. Y., Legault, J., & Li, P. (2015). Second language acquisition of Mandarin Chinese vocabulary: context of learning effects. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 63(5), 671–690. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9380-y>
- Lee, E. E. J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41(2), 217–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.022>
- Leiter, J. (2010). *Corrective feedback and uptake in the advanced learner classroom* [Graduate Thesis, University of Vienna, Wien]. <https://doi.org/10.25365/thesis.12519>
- Lemak, A., & Valeo, A. (2020). Learner Personality and Response to Oral Corrective Feedback in an English for Academic Purposes Context. *TESL Canada Journal*, 37(2), 23–50. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v37i2.1334>

- Li, Q. (2014). Differences in the motivation of Chinese learners of English in a foreign and second language context. *System*, 42(1), 451–461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.01.011>
- 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(2), 196–198. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct076>
- 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>
- Li, S., Zhu, Y., & Ellis, R. (2016). The Effects of the Timing of Corrective Feedback on the Acquisition of a New Linguistic Structure. *Modern Language Journal*, 100(1), 276–295. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12315>
- Llinares, A., & Lyster, R. (2014). The influence of context on patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake: A comparison of CLIL and immersion classrooms. *Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 181–194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.889509>
- Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult English L2 classroom: Characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), 536–556. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2006.00465.x>
- Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48(2), 183–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00039>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (2013). Counterpoint piece: The case for variety in corrective feedback research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 35(1), 167–184. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226311200071X>
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010a). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 265–302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520>
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010b). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* (Vol. 32, Issue 2). Kean University. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520>
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., Sato, M., Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365>
- Mackey, A. (2020). *Interaction, feedback and task research in language learning: Methods and design*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mackey, Alison, & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. In Alison Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 407–453). Oxford University Press.
- Mahalingappa, L., Polat, N., & Wang, R. (2021). A cross-cultural comparison in pedagogical beliefs about oral corrective feedback: The case of English language

- teachers in China versus the U.S. *Language Awareness*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2021.1900211>
- Mantle-bromley, C. (1995). Positive Attitudes and realistic beliefs : Links to proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(3), 371–386. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1995.tb01114.x>
- Matthews, B., Ross, L., & Ellison, N. (2010). *Research method : A practical guide for the social sciences*. Pearson Education Limited. [www.pearsoned.co.uk/matthews](http://www.pearsoned.co.uk/matthews)
- McCargar, D. F. (1993). Teacher and student role expectations: Differences and implications. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(2), 192–207. <https://doi.org/10.2307/328943>
- Milla, R., & del Pilar García Mayo, M. (2021). Teachers' oral corrective feedback and learners' uptake in high school CLIL and EFL classrooms. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 149–176. <https://doi.org/10.35869/VIAL.Vol18.3368>
- Milla, R., & Mayo, M. del P. G. (2021). Teachers' oral corrective feedback and learners' uptake in high school CLIL and EFL classrooms. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 149–176. <https://doi.org/10.35869/VIAL.Vol18.3368>
- Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition process in the classroom, learning Japanese*. Rotledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410604712>
- Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17, 459–481. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100014418>
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, E. (2016). Beliefs and practices of Turkish EFL teachers regarding oral corrective feedback: a small-scale classroom research study. *Language Learning Journal*, 47(2), 219–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1263360>
- Oxford, R. L. (1989). Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System*, 17(2), 235–247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(89\)90036-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(89)90036-5)
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588241>
- Rassaei, E. (2013a). Corrective feedback, learners' perceptions, and second language development. *System*, 41(2), 472–483. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.05.002>
- Rassaei, E. (2013b). The effects of foreign language anxiety on EFL learners' perceptions of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 00(00), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2013.837912>
- Roberts, M. A. (1995). Awareness and the efficacy of error correction. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *In Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 162–182). Universiti of Hawai'i: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Centre.
- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, 25(4)(October), 318–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580>
- Russel, J., & Nina, S. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar: A meta-analysis of the research. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 133–162). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Saeb, F. (2017). Students' and teachers' perceptions and preferences for oral corrective feedback: Do they match? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 6(4), 32–44. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.4p.32>
- Şakiroğlu, H. Ü. (2020). Oral corrective feedback preferences of university students in english communication classes. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 6(1), 172–178. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.v6i1.806>
- Sanafi, R. V., & Nemati, M. (2014). The effect of six different corrective feedback strategies on Iranian english language learners' IELTS writing task 2. *SAGE Open*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014538271>
- Sepehrinia, S., & Mehdizadeh, M. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: Teachers' concerns and researchers' orientation. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(4), 483–500. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1172328>
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 263–300. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168804lr1460a>
- Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recast and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(4), 361–392. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168806lr2030a>
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255–283.
- Sheen, Y. (2011a). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*. Springer Science+Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0548-7>
- Sheen, Y. (2011b). Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language acquisition. In J. A. Coleman (Ed.), *System* (pp. 880–893). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.07.003>
- Siriwardana, G., & Devayalage, R. (2021). Literature survey on teachers' and students' perceptions of oral error correction in the EFL / ESL classroom. *Journal of English as Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 25–36. <http://journals.researchsynergypress.com/index.php/jefltr/index>
- Soepriyatna. (2012). Investigating and assessing competence of high school teachers of English in Indonesia. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 8(2), 38–49. <https://journals.melta.org.my/index.php/majer/article/view/147/62>
- Spada, N., & Tomita, Y. (2010). Interactions Between Type of Instruction and Type of Language Feature: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 263–308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00562.x>
- Suryoputro, G., & Amaliah, A. (2016). EFL students' responses on oral corrective feedbacks and uptakes in speaking class. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(5), 73–80.
- Tasdemir, M. S., & Arslan, F. Y. (2018). Feedback preferences of EFL learners with respect to their learning styles. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1481560>
- Tomczyk, E. (2013). Perceptions of oral errors and their corrective feedback: Teachers vs. students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(5), 924–931. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.5.924-931>
- Ur, P. (2012). *A course in English language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University

Press.

- Van Ha, X., Murray, J. C., & Mehdi Riazi, A. (2021a). High school efl students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: The role of gender, motivation and extraversion. In *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* (Vol. 11, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.2.4>
- Van Ha, X., Murray, J. C., & Mehdi Riazi, A. (2021b). High school efl students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: The role of gender, motivation and extraversion. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 11(2), 235–264. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.2.4>
- 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>
- Weekly, R., Pollard, A., & Macpherson, J. (2022). Journal of English for Academic Purposes EAP corrective feedback in an EMI setting: Student and teacher beliefs. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 59(July), 101157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2022.101157>
- Wen, Q. (2018). The production-oriented approach to teaching university students English in China. *Language Teaching*, 51(4), 526–540. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144481600001X>
- Wiboolyasarini, W., Wiboolyasarini, K., & Jinowati, N. (2020). Learners' oral corrective feedback perceptions and preferences in Thai as a foreign language tertiary setting. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(2), 912–929. <https://doi.org/10.17263/JLLS.759344>
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types teachers' choice and learners'. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 78–93. <https://doi.org/10.2167/la429.0>
- Yüksel, D., Soruç, A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in university EFL classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12336>
- Zare, M., Shooshtari, Z. G., & Jalilifar, A. (2020). The interplay of oral corrective feedback and L2 willingness to communicate across proficiency levels. *Language Teaching Research*, 0(0), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820928967>
- 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>