



**University of Zawia**

**Faculty of Arts**

**Department of English**

**Administration of Postgraduate Studies and Training**

**Investigating the Types of Oral Corrective Feedback Teachers Use  
When They Teach Speaking Classes at The University of Zawia**

**A thesis Submitted in partial Fulfilment of the Requirements of the  
Master's Degree in Applied Linguistics**

**by:**

**Raya Abd Alhafed Alshawesh**

**Supervised by:**

**Dr:Fahiema ZekrI Alagahwash**

**2025 -2024**

## **Abstract**

This study examines the types of oral corrective feedback used by teachers in teaching speaking skills at the University of Zawia. The study aims to shed light on the role of feedback in improving students' oral performance, particularly in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) environment, where many students encounter difficulties such as pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary errors, which impact their ability to express themselves confidently and effectively.

The study relies on data collection through interviews with English language teachers in the Colleges of Education and Arts, as well as classroom observations to see how teachers provide feedback and correct students' errors during class. The observation also focuses on different types of corrective feedback, such as explicit correction, rephrasing, clarification requests, metalinguistic cues, and self-stimulation.

The results shows that corrective feedback is essential for motivating students to correct their language errors and develop their oral skills. However, the timing and method of delivery significantly influence the extent to which students accept and benefit from it. The study recommends that teachers be trained to use diverse and effective feedback methods tailored to students' needs to overcome their speaking difficulties.

This study contributes to a better understanding of the relationship between oral feedback and students' language performance and highlights the importance of the teacher's active role in developing the speaking skills of English as a foreign language learners.

## **Declaration**

I hereby declare that the thesis entitled: “Investigating the Types of Oral Corrective Feedback Teachers Use When They Teach Speaking Classes at the University of Zawia”, submitted to the Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Zawia, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics, is my original work and has not previously been submitted, in part or full, for any degree or diploma at this or any other institution.

I confirm that all the work in this thesis is my own unless otherwise acknowledged and properly referenced. Where contributions of others are involved, every effort is made to indicate this clearly, with due reference to the literature and acknowledgements of collaborative work.

This thesis is a true representation of my scholarly research and findings.

## Dedication

All praise is due to Allah,  
by whose grace good deeds are completed and aspirations are fulfilled.

To the soul of my father,  
who has departed this world but is never far from my heart and prayers.  
To you, who instilled values in me and taught me patience and steadfastness.  
I ask God to make this work a part of your good deeds.

To my mother,  
the source of compassion and support in life.  
Without your prayers and support, I would not have reached this day.

To my husband,  
my companion and partner in every achievement,  
Thank you for your patience, support, and constant encouragement.

To my children,  
the source of my happiness and hope in life.  
You are the light that illuminates my path during every difficult moment.

To my acquaintances and friends,  
and everyone who has supported me,  
To all of you, my deepest gratitude and respect.

To everyone who has helped me even with a word,  
This work is the fruit of your support

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and deep appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Fahima Al-gahwash, for her valuable guidance, continuous support, and encouragement throughout the preparation of this dissertation. Her insightful comments, patience, and dedication were crucial to shaping this work. I am deeply grateful for her unwavering commitment and invaluable guidance.

I also thank the administration staff in the department of English in the collage of Arts for allowing me carry out the observation. I also extend my thank and gratitude to the staff members of the department of English in the collage of education for helping me in the interview .

Finally, I thank all my colleagues in the collage of education and the participants who played the crucial role in achievement of this Study .

## Table of Contents

Topic	Page Number
Abstract	I
الملخص	II
Dedication	III
Acknowledgments	IV
Table of Contents	V
List of Tables	VII
List of Abbreviations	VIII
<b>Chapter One: Introduction</b>	1
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 General Background	1
1.2 The Statement of the Problem	2
1.3 Research Questions	2
1.4 Objectives of the Study	3
1.5 Significance of the Study	3
1.6 Methodology	3
1.7 Scope and Limitations	4
1.8 Structure of the Thesis	4
<b>Chapter Two: Review of Literature</b>	5
2.0 Introduction	5
2.1 The Importance of Speaking Skills	5
2.2 Development of Speaking Skills	7
2.3 The Concept of Oral Corrective Feedback	11
2.4 Types of Oral Corrective Feedback	11
2.5 Errors in Spoken Language	12
2.6. Types of Errors	17

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
2.7. Error correction	19
2.8. Teacher Cognition on Error Types	20
2.9. Rationale for providing corrective feedback	20
2.10. Effectiveness of different types of corrective feedback	22
2.11. Teacher Cognition on Corrective Feedback Types	23
2.12. Timing of Giving feedback	24
2.13. Previous studies	26
2.14. Teacher Cognition on Corrective Feedback Types	27
2.15. Timing	29
2.16. Previous studies	29
2.17. Summary oh This Chapter	32
<b>Chapter Three: Methodology</b>	33
3.0 Introduction	33
3.1 Research Design	33
3.2 The Participants	34
3.3. Instruments of Data Collection	34
3.4. Validity and Reliability	36
3.5 Ethical Considerations	36
3.6 Summary of This Chapter	37
<b>Chapter Four: Data Collection and Analysis</b>	38
4.0 Introduction	38
4.1 Analysis of Teachers' Interview	38
4.2 Types of Error Correction	41
4.3. Timing of OCF	43
4.4 Key findings	43
4.5. Summary of this Chapter	44
<b>Chapter Five: Discussion</b>	45
5.0 Introduction	45
5.1. Discussion of the Interview Results	45

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
5.2. Types of OCF	49
5.3 Summary This Chapter	51
<b>Chapter Six: Conclusion and Recommendations</b>	52
6.1 Conclusion of the whole study	52
6.2 . Implications and Recommendations	53
6.3. limitations of the study	54
6.4. Suggestions for further Research	55
Summary of This Chapter	55
References	56
Appendix	
Appendix A : Corrective feedback types	
Appendix B: Interview Questions	
Appendix C: Observation checklist	

## List of Tables

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
Table 3.1 Taxonomy of Corrective Feedback	14
Table 4.1: Observations results	42
Table 4.2: Errors corrections	43

## List of Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full Term
EFL	English as a foreign language
ELLS	English language learners
ESL	English as a second language
OCF	Oral Corrective Feedback
CF	Corrective Feedback

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### **1.0 Introduction:**

This study addresses the role of feedback in language learning and teaching, a topic that has attracted much attention and sparked considerable debate among researchers. It focuses on the importance of feedback provided by teachers to students in the development of speaking skills, particularly in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) contexts, where teachers often tend to neglect correcting students' errors or providing effective feedback that could enhance their oral performance. The study aims to explore teachers' views on oral corrective feedback, the types of feedback employed, and the timing of its delivery in classroom settings. Data were collected through interviews and classroom observations at the University of Zawia. This chapter presents the background of the study, the research problem, research questions, objectives, significance, and the methodology adopted in this investigation.

### **1.1 Background of the study**

The role of feedback in language learning and teaching has gained much attention among researchers and it has become a highly controversial issue, especially with the shift of focus from language forms to language functions (Brown, 2004). Feedback is given by the teacher to the students according to the consequences of students' performance. The issue of the effectiveness of feedback has been the source of considerable controversy in the past decades. The proponents embrace the necessity of feedback that "Feedback is not a separate action in the learning process as the time spent learning. It is typically structured within the framework of the evaluation and formative evaluation" (Anne Malar Selvaraj, Hazita Azman 2020). They even advocate the idea of abandoning corrective feedback altogether in classroom interaction to avoid subsequent problems (Truscott, 1999). In Krashen's (1985) view error correction is a serious mistake because: first, it puts learners on the defensive and second, it only supports the development of learned knowledge and plays no role in acquired

knowledge. Many researchers have tackled the notion of teachers' feedback from different perspectives and have examined its influence on the acquisition of knowledge as well as the teaching of second/foreign language. Feedback can be oral or written and it actually includes various types such as positive vs. negative, corrective vs. non-corrective, immediate vs. delayed, and explicit vs. implicit.

Speaking skill is considered as an important part of teaching EFL, as well as it is commonly apparent that the academic speaking with its development is designed for students at university level. Students at this level are supposed to learn how to speak inside the classroom. In oral expression module, students try to express their ideas but they overlook the grammatical rules, the difference between the first language and the second language, and the pronunciation rules. Thus, the teacher refers in this situation and gives information about their students' performance; in other words, he or she undertakes the feedback to improve the students' performance. The question raised here is when the teacher interferes to correct the students errors or to give feedback.

## **1.2. The Statement of the Problem**

Speaking in classroom as a skill has been considered as a part of the syllabus in teaching English language. In classroom reality, one of the primary teacher's tasks is to enable their students communicate effectively through oral practice, so they should react to their students' oral production by giving feedback which will help students overcome the obstacles they face and errors they commit, among them: mispronunciation, inter-language, overgeneralization, grammatical mistakes, lack of vocabulary. However; in EFL settings, teachers do not pay attention to their learners' errors, and they do not react to them in most time; in other word, they do not use the feedback as an effective technique to correct the learners' errors. Consequently, most of EFL learners face many obstacles and make many errors during their speech that lead them to stop speaking in the classroom, and they repeat the same committed mistakes many times, as well they consider the mistake as a correct form of this language when speaking, because they are not receiving an appropriate feedback.

## **1.3. Research questions**

Through this investigation, answers will be provided to the following questions:

Q1. What are the teachers' views of using Oral Corrective Feedback in their speaking classes?

Q2. What type of feedback is provided by teachers in their speaking classrooms?

Q3. When do the teachers give oral corrective feedback?

#### **1.4. The Objectives of the Study**

The study aims at achieving these objectives:

\_To investigate teachers' views of Oral Corrective Feedback and the types of oral corrective feedback.

\_Identify the types of OCF used by the teachers .

\_Identify the time of giving oral corrective feedback that given by teachers.

#### **1.5. The Significance of the Study**

This study is intended to give some clarifications about the reality of EFL learners' oral production and their committed errors in the classroom, in addition to teacher's during the different oral tasks. This study mainly emphasizes on giving one of the most important teacher's responsibilities. This responsibility is presented in describing and marking learner's errors, and giving criticism, advice, or suggestions. It also helps the teacher to use the correct and appropriate types of oral feedback to correct the student's mistake at the appropriate time.

#### **1.6. Methodology**

This study is designed to investigate the types of oral corrective feedback teachers use when they teach speaking classes at the university of Zawia. It was carried out in the college of education and the college of arts during the academic year of 2023/ 2024. The sample consisted of teachers of speaking in the English Department/ College of Arts and College of education who were chosen randomly. The reason behind choosing those teachers is due to the fact they are supposed to know more about their students' oral proficiency and level, as well as the different errors made by them . Those teachers are aware of the importance of the feedback for their students when they commit errors or face obstacles during their speaking. The sample of the study also included about 45 students enrolled in the third/ fourth semester who were not involved to take any part in the study but they were attending the observed classes.

To answer the research questions, the researcher used an interview and classroom observation. Firstly, the interview was carried out to obtain information as well as

opinions concerning the subject under investigation. The teachers' interview items contained information about the students' oral production and the errors committed. Then; classroom observation was carried by the researcher who observed teacher feedback and how they reacted or commented on the students' produced errors. In this observation the teachers are the focus rather than students because the researcher is interested in knowing how the teacher respond to students errors in speaking and how/when the teachers give feedback on students performance.

### **1.7. Scope of limitation**

The study is limited to study oral corrective feedback in speaking. It is also limited to see teachers reaction and response to the students errors. The study was carried in the Collage of Arts and College of Education in Zawia only. Other colleges that are parts of Zawia University are not involved here , but the results of the study can be generalized on these colleges as well because of the popularity of the phenomena under investigation.

### **1.8. Structure of the thesis**

Chapter One: Introduction

Chapter Two: Literature Review.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Chapter Four: Data Analysis.

Chapter Five: Discussion

Chapter Six: Conclusion and Recommendations

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

#### **2.0. Introduction**

This chapter presents a detailed account on oral corrective feedback in speaking classroom. It sheds light on the importance of speaking skill to the students , development of Speaking Skills , the concept of oral corrective feedback , types of oral corrective feedback, error types, error correction, teacher cognition on error types, Rationale for providing corrective feedback, Effectiveness of different types of corrective feedback Teachers cognition on Corrective Feedback Types, Timing, and Previous study.

#### **2.1. The Importance of Speaking Skills**

In the present global world, communication plays a vital role in getting success in all fields. Language is used as a tool of communication. Perfect communication is not possible for people without using a language. Moreover, people cannot achieve their aims, objectives, and goals without using proper language to communicate. Therefore, there is a need for a language to communicate with others those who live all around the globe. As English is considered the international language and it is spoken all over the world, it serves the purpose of communicating with the people who live in different regions, states, countries, and continents of the world.

Speaking skill is the most important skill to acquire foreign or second language learning. Among the four key language skills, speaking is deemed to be the most important skill in learning a foreign or second language. Brown and Yuke (1983)p.13 stated, "Speaking is the skill that the students will be judged upon most in real life situations". Regardless of its importance, teaching speaking skills has been undervalued and most of the EFL/ESL teachers have been continuing their teaching of speaking skills just as memorization of dialogues or repetition of drills. Nevertheless, the modern world demands for the requirement of communication skills for the learners and the English teachers have to teach the English language learners the needed skills so that they will improve their abilities in speaking and perform well in real-life situations.

In the present EFL/ESL teaching environment, oral skills are completely neglected whereas employability depends more on communication than technology. As very less priority has been given to the important elements of language such as phonological, morphological, semantic and syntactic aspects, it has become a major impediment for the English language learners to acquire the speaking skills among the learners of English. So far, more concentration has been given to reading and writing skills. After realizing the importance of oral communication skills, more emphasis is now laid on developing the speaking skills of the learners to pursue their studies successfully and excel in their fields once they finish their education. Moreover, English is the language of getting opportunities for employment and getting success to achieve the desired goals in life.

According to Bueno, Madrid, and McLaren (2006: p. 321), "Speaking is one of the most difficult skills language learners have to face. Speaking is considered the most important of the four language skills of English". Even the learners learn the language for so many years; they find it difficult to speak in real time situations when it is demanded. There are many reasons to overcome this. First of all, the ELLs should understand the importance of speaking skills and try to acquire them as they need them to compete in this competitive world.

Among the four basic skills of the English language, speaking seems to be difficult because the speakers have to produce sentences on the spur of the moment. It is quite difficult for foreign or second language learners to produce sentences without learning the grammatical structures and having proper knowledge of adequate vocabulary. Therefore, the English language learners of EFL/ESL face many problems in speaking grammatical sentences in English. Since speaking skills play a dominant role in communication, people try to learn these skills in order to communicate well with the entire community all around the world.

Moreover, these speaking skills are also useful for learners when they have to settle down well in their professions. In the modern world, it has become quite common to prove the candidates' talents at the time of their job interviews and many of the selections are based on the performance of the interview. The job aspirants have to participate and prove themselves in debates and group discussions where the performance or oral communication skills of the candidates are primarily measured.

Besides, the professionals have to give oral presentations as they have to promote the products of their companies or give training to the other colleagues. Furthermore, an effective speaker can inspire the audience a lot and gain the complete attention of the audience and maintain the same tempo until the end of his/her speech. So the audience involves completely in the speaker's speech and they sometimes forget the real world and put their complete concentration on the speech. So, speaking skills play a vital role as everything depends on the way how people communicate their messages with others. Speaking skills are the most essential skills for all the learners who wish to learn English to enhance their career, improve business, build confidence levels, get better job opportunities, make public speeches, attend interviews, participate in debates and group discussions, give presentations and so on.

In the present modern world, everything is linked with speaking skills. Having good communication is the passport to get better employment opportunities. In the modern interviews, the real talent of the job aspirants is tested through their performance in group discussions, debates, presentation skills and so on. Therefore, job seekers have to acquire good oral communication skills in order to grab better opportunities. Once the learners practice these speaking skills in their EFL/ESL classrooms, they get the mastery of these skills and perform well in the activities in and outside their classrooms

## **2.2. Development of Speaking Skills**

In the existing international market, there is a need to showcase the abilities of people's oral communication skills as the real success of their talent depends on how they present their speaking skills and how they convince the others in persuading them. Since everything depends on motivating and satisfying the listeners, employers, colleagues, co-learners or customers, speaking skills occupy a major place in all aspects. Therefore, the EFL/ESL teachers have to understand the present situation in the society and try to impart these speaking skills among their ELLs by applying the available latest techniques of teaching speaking skills. In this connection, the teachers have to replace the old-fashioned methods and approaches with the latest and innovative ones that grab the complete attention of for the learners to participate actively in these activities that take place in the regular English classrooms.

Moreover, the teachers' burden is reduced when they think positively about the needs and interests of the ELLs. It is also important that the teachers have to change their method

of teaching i.e. from teacher-centered environment to learner-centered environment so that the ELLs can get plenty of opportunities to participate in the teaching-learning activities that go on in the English classrooms. It also leads them to think and work on their own to complete the given tasks magnificently.

The English teachers have to adopt several techniques to develop the speaking skills of their learners because some EFL/ESL learners have a deep fear of making mistakes and some others have just plain shy and this is observed even in the native learners. At this juncture, English teachers can introduce some fun activities in the form of language games to get the learners to speak in English classrooms. Generally, most of the learners are interested in playing games in the classrooms and it is quite common that they ask for more and more games as they make them happy. When the learners practice these games in a fun environment, it is sure that they really improve their speaking skills enormously. At the preliminary stage, the teachers have to introduce fun games like guessing the item that is held in their wrists. In this connection, the teachers hold something in their wrists and keep the item as a secret one and the learners have to go on guessing it. Indeed, such types of activities certainly improve learners ELLs' speaking skills. As the learners have to just guess the unseen object and they have their own choice and freedom to express their opinions, they come out with more options and produce innumerable sentences in a learner-friendly environment.

Therefore, the teachers should introduce such activities in their regular classrooms in order to involve the learners ELLS more and improve their speaking skills. Then the teachers can introduce some activities such as "Speaking about themselves" by giving their own examples to the classroom. Thus, with the motivation they get from their teachers, the learners go on speaking about themselves since everything they speak is a fact that has been already stored in their memory. Then the teachers may extend this activity by asking the learners to say something about their parents, best books or best friends. Hence, these activities certainly give a chance to the learners to acquire speaking skills in a pleasant way. The EFL/ESL teachers can also introduce brainstorming technique in their classrooms as it encourages the learners ELLs to produce more sentences and also try to think of themselves for getting new ideas about the topic given to them. In this technique students have complete freedom to express any point that is related to the topic. As there is no hard and fast rule in expressing their ideas, automatically the students will be motivated a lot and try to produce as many ideas as

possible. Therefore, the ESL/EFL teachers should implement this brainstorming technique in their classrooms in order to involve the ELLs more in the activities and to develop their speaking skills unconsciously. Another activity that is more useful for the students English Language Learners to improve their speaking skills is introducing role-play activities in the classrooms. Role-plays are the best activities to introduce in the English classrooms to improve the learners' speaking skills in English during the second stage. The teachers have to divide the learners into pairs and give them different topics to perform in the classroom. The teachers give ten minutes time for preparation and later they can ask the students to accomplish the task. The teachers have to motivate and inspire the students while they are getting ready for the task. With proper motivation and constant encouragement, the learners try to perform the given task well and try to speak grammatical sentences. The English classrooms will be the best platforms for the students English Language Learners to improve their speaking skills through roleplays as the learners play the roles related to their daily life situations that take place in contemporary society. Activities such as pair or group work also enhance the learners' speaking skills enormously since the learners get an opportunity to share their thoughts and ideas in a congenial atmosphere. The English teachers have to think of the needs and interests of the learners while selecting topics for these activities. At this juncture, it is wise to quote Rao S. P. (2018) who asserts, "While selecting the topics, the teachers have to take into consideration of the learners' needs and interests that lead the learners to work more on the given topics with interest and enthusiasm". Therefore, the teachers have to think more positively towards learner-centered methods to involve the learners by concentrating more on the activities related to speaking skills. When students work in pairs or groups, they work independently and try to speak more and produce many sentences. This will certainly be helpful for the students English language learners to boost up their confidence levels and inspire them to practice these speaking skills whenever and wherever they get the opportunity to speak. Therefore, the teachers have to provide more opportunities for learners to participate actively in pairs or groups to enhance their speaking skills.

Another activity that the teachers can use in their English classrooms to develop their English language learners' speaking skills is a story-telling technique. Through this technique, the teachers create situations and ask the students English language learners

to continue the story. Then will students English language learners think logically and supply sentences that are relevant to the situation. As the students have their own choice in giving responses and selecting the grammatical structures, they try to produce as many sentences as possible to complete the story. Moreover, there is no hard and fast rule to eliminate any points of the children since these stories are purely imaginative, not realistic ones. This technique encourages all the English language learners contribute at least one sentence to finish the story successfully. Therefore, it is the duty of the teachers to encourage their learners to produce as many sentences as possible so that the learners' oral communication skills, as well as their power of imagination, will be immensely developed in a pleasant and enjoyable atmosphere. Another technique to improve the speaking skills of the students English language learners is to make them listen to music in English and sing along. Music is considered one of the best tools for learning intonation and pronunciation. When the song is easy to understand, then listening to and singing songs also help the learners remember the vocabulary and phrases. Moreover, music helps the learners learn to pronounce English rhythm in a more natural way. Just by imitating the singer unconsciously, the learners can learn to pronounce phrases the way the native speakers do. One of the best songs suitable for the EFL/ESL learners is the song

Tom's Diner written by Suzanne Vega where everyday scenes and actions are described by using simple language. Furthermore, movies also seem to be a much better option for the ELLs to learn speaking skills in English. By watching movies, the learners get the opportunity to learn listening, pronunciation, vocabulary, idioms, and slang. Since songs and movies develop the speaking skills of the learners, the EFL/ESL teachers have to introduce this technique in their classrooms in order to improve the ELLs' speaking skills.

To sum up speaking skills are very important for learners to sustain in this globally competitive world. Therefore, the English teachers have to introduce a variety of techniques in their classrooms by selecting simple and useful material that creates more interest and attentiveness among the ELLs towards learning speaking skills.

### **2.3. Definition of Feedback**

There are many definitions of feedback. Wolsey in Wahyu states that Feedback is communication aimed to improve all of performances. The feedback given can be a useful input for the students to improve their work. The students will obtain praises or criticisms

from the feedback. Thus, they will see what area they already understand or still need improvement. Furthermore, Ellis defined feedback in as a tool to give information to learners which they can use to comprehend their language use in teacher-student learning environment. Feedback is used in the process of learning in classroom. It is used when the teacher correct the errors which are produced by the students. Asnawi concludes in Yustia that feedback is used when the teacher check students' error. Ellis, Loewen & Erlam (2006) define corrective feedback Corrective feedback is a research field that is gaining increasing prominence in the world, But according to Shanshan (2012), it has not drawn enough attention in China. "The few issues addressed in studies in China are teachers' CF and learners' uptake in EFL classrooms in primary and middle schools" (Zhao, 2005, referenced in Shanshan, 2012: p.483).

hers to attract students' attention to erroneous parts so as to lead to modified output (Suzuki, 2004) and is defined as "responses to learner utterances containing an error" (Ellis, 2006) Russel and Spada (2006:134), corrective feedback refers to any feedback provide to a learner, from any sources, that contains evidence of learner error of language form. It means that corrective feedbacks are teachers' responses to the learner utterance that contain an error. In other word, corrective feedback as any indication to the student's that their use of the target language is incorrect. The teacher gives information to the students when students have made an error or mistakes in their performances. So, students know what their mistakes during the teacher corrects their mistakes directly. There are many ways in giving feedback to student error or mistake. Teachers should also look at the ways of giving feedback without losing the students. The teacher corrective feedback is one of the important ways to revise in speaking process, because it can be appreciation from teachers that students expect for their effort. Corrective feedback can be given in written and oral form to the students

#### **2.4. Oral Corrective Feedback**

According to Brookhart (2008 p.:4), oral feedback is interactive feedback which the teacher can talk with the students. It means that oral feedback is a conversation between teacher and students about students speaking performance. When perform, teacher gives the feedback about students mistakes. Students can get clear information about their mistake in speaking performance. With the feedback students can improve their ability in speaking when performances.

In summary, oral corrective feedback is teacher correction or response to the learner utterances containing an error directly when student have mistake or error and teacher gives information to the student to revise their mistakes or error. Students can

improve their knowledge based on teacher correction on their mistakes. The knowledge they get from the teacher can improve their ability in speaking especially in performances.

## **2.5. Types of Oral Corrective Feedback**

Oral Corrective Feedback is often explained as the response to the students' errors in utterances given by the teachers or classmates (Ha, Nguyen and Hung, 2021). Lyster and Ranta (cited in Yakisik 2021) classified OCF into two broad categories: prompts and reformulation. Prompts include elicitation, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition. It is a kind of feedback that encourages students to become an autonomy learner by doing self-repair. Meanwhile, reformulation consists of recast and explicit correction, which do not motivate students to self-correction.

Oral Corrective Feedback plays a significant role in the kind of scaffolding that teachers need to provide and to promote continuing second language growth (Lyster et al., 2013). Lyster & Ranta (1997) identify six different CF types which were classified into two CF categories: reformulations and prompts. *Reformulations* include recasts and explicit correction, because both these sorts of CF supply students with the correct way of saying a certain word or a sentence. Although recast and explicit correction are placed under reformulation, recast is considered an implicit way of giving CF to students. Oral feedback given by the teacher consists of several types of oral feedback. According to Lightbown & Spada in Rydahl (2005 p.5), four major types of corrective feedback: clarification requests, recasts, elicitation, and metalinguistic feedback. Then, Lyster and Ranta in Yoshida (2009 p.23), six types of oral feedback: explicit correction, recast, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition.

Explicit correction means the teacher explicit provision of the correct form.

Recast includes the teachers, reformulation of all or part of a students' utterance, minus the error.

Sheen and Ellis (2011, p.594), two broad corrective feedback categories: reformulations and prompts. Reformulation includes conversational recasts, didactic recasts, explicit correction, and explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation. Prompts include

clarification request, repetition, paralinguistic signal, elicitation, and metalinguistic clue. Prompts include a variety of signal other than reformulations that push learners to self-repair.

In addition, Wannemacker et al (2011 p.13), six types of oral corrective feedback. They are: first, explicit feedback, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Whereas explicit feedback is the teacher provides the correct form and clearly indicates that what the students said was incorrect. "Corrective feedback refers to utterances that indicate to the learners implicitly or more explicitly that his or her output has an error in some way". (Thiri Soe 2022). Thus it is a kind of negative evidence. (Nassaji, 2018).

Various types of corrective feedback emerged and Nassaji explained six types of corrective feedback below.

### **1. Recasts**

Recast is implicit feedback where teachers reformulate learners' errors into corrected discourse immediately. As provided in Nicholas et al. (2001, p. 721), one example of a teacher's recast or reformulation to a learner's incorrect utterance in a content-based communicative classroom is as follows.

Student: The boy \*have many flowers in the basket.

Teacher: Yes, the boy has many flowers in the basket.

### **2. Clarification Requests**

In clarification request feedback, teachers ask learners to clarify or to repeat the information in a correct form. This feedback does not provide learners the correction, but gives them a chance of self-correction.

### **3. Repetition**

Like clarification requests, this feedback gives learners an opportunity of self-correction by the teacher, repeating learners' incorrect language. There is no correct language form provided in this feedback. Learners are encouraged to self-correct.

#### 4. Elicitation

In this feedback, teachers elicit learners' self-correction by repeating the incorrect utterance and by leaving a gap where learners make an error. Learners are expected to fill the gap with possible corrected forms.

#### 5. Metalinguistic Cue

In this method, teachers give learners an opportunity to self-correct, providing metalinguistic information like "You need a definite article here", "The verb should be third person singular present tense" etc.

#### 6. Non-verbal Feedback

It is an implicit error correction method where teachers hint learners about their errors by using paralinguistic features such as frowning, shaking head, etc. Among these seven types of corrective feedback, direct correction feedback is performed in explicit manners for its nature.

In this study the researcher will adopt (Lyster) taxonomy of correct feedback. Shamiri and Farvardin (2016) classify feedback strategies as being either input-providing, in which the teacher provides the correct form to the student, or output-providing, in which the teacher encourages the student to self-correct. Shamiri and Farvardin (2016) also suggest that the different types of feedback can be categorised as shown in the table below (adapted from Ellis, 2012, p.139) describing how the correct form is provided:

**Table 3.1 Taxonomy of Corrective Feedback**

Implicit Feedback	Explicit Feedback
Input-Providing	Recast - Explicit/ Direct
Output-Providing	Repetition - Metalinguistic - Clarification - Elicitation

To further understand the theory behind the different methods of CF used in education as investigated by Lyster and Ranta (1997), a short description of the types is given below:

#### 'Explicit feedback'

The type of feedback that provides the learner with the correct form, while at the same time indicating that an error has been made, usually accomplished as below:

Example:

S: On May.

T: Not on May, in May. We Say, —It will start in Mayl.

### **'Recast'**

Reformulates all or part of the incorrect word or phrase to show the correct form without explicitly identifying the error. Recasts is another type of input-providing feedback, since research indicates the correction being implicit rather than explicit. The corrected mistake is not immediately given to the learner. According to Ellis (2008), recast is "an utterance that rephrases the learner's utterance by changing one or more components; for example subject, verb, object while still referring to its central meaning" (p.227).

### **Example:**

S: I have to find the answer on the book?

T: In the book.

### **'Clarification Request'**

Indicates that the student's utterance was not understood and asks the students to reformulate or repeat their answer. This type of feedback can cause problems when it comes to comprehension or accuracy. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), implicit feedback as clarification requests is applied only when it followed by a student error.

### **Example:**

S: What do you spend with your wife?

T: Excuse me? Say again? (Or sorry?)

### **'Meta-linguistic Feedback'**

Gives technical linguistic information about the error without explicitly providing the correct answer. The feedback refers to comments or questions posted by the teacher, for example using linguistic terms concerning stress and verb tense. "This kind of CF makes the learner analyse their utterance linguistically, not quite in a meaning oriented manner" (Shamiri & Farvardin, 2016, p.1068).

### **Example:**

S: There are influence person who.

T: Influence is a noun.

### **'Elicitation'**

Prompts the students to self-correct by pausing, so that the student can fill in the correct word or phrase. An example is when the teacher asks questions or pauses to directly elicit the correct form from the student. Lyster and Ranta (1997) highlight that —teachers can also use questions to elicit correct forms, such as, how can we say X in English?!. Elicitation is thought to be the least explicit output-providing form of CF since it leads to students correcting their mistakes themselves.

### **Example:**

S: This tea is very warm T:

It's very?

S: Hot.

### **'Repetition'**

Repeats the student's error while highlighting the error or mistake to draw learner's attention to it. In so doing, teachers change their intonation to emphasise the error. Shamiri and Farvardin (2016) consider repetition as an implicit form that is outputprovided, since no form is supplied to the learner.

### **Example:**

S: I will showed you.

T: I will "showed" you?

S: I will show you.

(Safari, 2013; Shamiri & Farvardin, 2016; Ölmezer-Öztürk & Öztürk, 2016).

To sum up,

These types is chosen in accordance with the mental and psychological development level of the student and the nature of the topic to be learned, as well as how and when it is presented to the student.

## **2.6. Errors in Spoken Language**

Since error correction by teachers is central to this study, it is crucial to examine what an error is. The term error has been defined purposively for different uses (Nassaji, 2015).

It has been referred to as a deviant form from different perspectives such as native speakers' perspective and learners' perspective. However, some aspects of the proposed definitions could pose a problem in real classroom scenarios.

The term 'error' is generally defined in comparison with 'mistake'. For example,

Corder (1967) differentiated between errors and mistakes and pointed out that the former results from a lack of language knowledge (errors of 'competence'); while the latter is caused by slips of the tongue, tiredness, or other external conditions (errors of 'performance'). The notions of competence and performance were based on Chomsky's (1965) concept of linguistic competence and performance. According to Chomsky, competence is knowledge of language and performance is the use of that language in concrete situations. Similar to Chomsky (1965) and Corder (1967), Norrish (1983) differentiated errors from mistakes along the lines of competence and performance. However, he also highlighted the consistency of errors, arguing that an error is "a systematic deviation that happens when a learner has not learnt something and consistently get(s) it wrong" (p.7). In contrast, a mistake is an inconsistent deviation that a learner sometimes makes although the learner knows what is right (Norrish, 1983).

Although the notion of determining what constitutes an error according to its consistency can be useful and practical, the definitions discussed above seem ambiguous as they do not provide a clear concept of 'deviation'. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) viewed deviation as integral to defining errors in the sense that deviation is "the flawed side of learner speech or writing that deviates from some selected norm of mature language performance" (p. 139). Here, it can be assumed that deviation is based on some norm. Naturally, this raises the question of 'which norm?'

Subsequently, clear-cut answers on this question were given in the work of Brown (1994) and Richards and Schmidt (2010). Both pointed out that deviation is something which is considered from native norms. According to Brown (1994), an error as "a noticeable deviation from the adult grammar of a native speaker, reflects the competence of the learner" (p. 126). Similarly, Richards and Schmidt (2010) defined an error as "the use of a linguistic item (e.g. a word, a grammatical item, a speech act, etc.) in a way which a fluent or native speaker of the language regards as showing faulty or incomplete learning" (p. 201-202). Despite these unambiguous definitions, identifying an error according to the language used by a native speaker is problematic because it

negates the varieties and diversity of natively spoken languages (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). Given that there are different varieties of a language such as British English and American English and also a diverse array of dialects within those broad varieties, an error in one context may not be considered erroneous in another context. Moreover, Edge (cited in Harmer, 2007) pointed out that a teacher should not consider native speakers of English as ideal examples of English language users since English is an international language which users acquire as a skill for international communication, something which English native speakers may in fact lack.

Possibly to deal with the shortcomings of identifying errors as deviations from the native speaker norm, Edge (1989) used the term 'mistakes' to cover all linguistic deviations. Instead of distinguishing errors from mistakes, he claims there are three broad categories of mistakes. They are slips (mistakes that learners can correct themselves when they are pointed out); errors (mistakes that learners cannot self-correct even if they are pointed out and the form they wanted to produce is recognised); and attempts (mistakes which show that learners are completely unaware of how to convey the message but at least attempt to communicate). From this, it can be seen that Edge uses a learner's ability to correct her mistakes to classify different types of mistakes, not whether they are deviant from a norm. Nonetheless, since in the actual classroom context the teacher is the most common source of feedback (Park, 2010), it would be more practical to take the teacher's judgement into account when identifying a learner's error. To reflect classroom reality, Chaudron (1986) added a criterion based on the teacher's point of view. Apart from distinguishing errors according to native speakers' norms, he claimed that an error is "any additional linguistic or other behaviour that the teachers reacted to negatively or with an indication that improvement of the response was expected" (p. 67). This definition offers a broad meaning which does not limit errors to be judged according to native speakers' language nor exclude meaning-focused errors such as the use of an utterance in an inappropriate context.

It seems that errors are defined according to their cause, the native speaker's norm, and the learners' ability to correct it.

In the present study, errors are identified following Chaudron (1986) because the focus of the research is to investigate errors from the teachers' point of view, and how they respond these errors in speaking.

## **2.7. Students' Difficulties in Speaking Skill**

Speaking is considered one of the most essential aspects in the development of English language skills, and it is a subject that students must learn. However, speaking is often more challenging compared to other skills due to several difficulties. Students usually struggle with low vocabulary mastery, pronunciation problems, confusion in arranging words, and fear of making mistakes. Other factors also contribute to speaking difficulties, including teaching strategies, curriculum, and the learning environment.

In this regard, Brown (2001) pointed out specific problems of speaking, such as clustering, redundancy, reduced forms, performance variables, colloquial language, rate of delivery, supra-segmental features, and interaction.

Similarly, N. Abdullah (2018) highlighted the general causes of students' speaking difficulties as follows:

1. Lack of an English-friendly environment.
2. Lack of motivational attitudes on the part of society toward English language learning.
3. Learners' low vocabulary count and limited use of fixed expressions, idiomatic expressions, and proverbs.
4. Timidity (shyness) in using the language and lack of spontaneity.
5. Limited enthusiasm for both traditional and technological self-study.

## **2.8. Errors VS Mistakes**

The distinction between errors and mistakes has been a central issue in second language acquisition. According to Brown (1994), it is important to differentiate between the two. A mistake refers to a performance error, such as a slip or random guess, which occurs despite having knowledge of the correct form. In contrast, an error reflects a learner's lack of underlying knowledge of the target language system.

Error: "Errors are systematic, consistent deviations in learner language, reflecting gaps in the learner's knowledge of the target language rules" (Ellis, 1997).

Mistake: "Mistakes are deviations in learner language that occur due to performance factors such as fatigue, carelessness, or lapses in attention, not because of lack of competence" (Corder, 1967).

Error: “An error occurs when the learner's output shows a gap in underlying knowledge, and it cannot be self-corrected” (Brown, 2000).

Mistake: “A mistake happens when the learner has knowledge of the correct form but fails to use it correctly in performance; it is often self-correctable” (Richards & Schmidt, 2010).

In summary, mistakes are accidental, non-systematic, and self-correctable, reflecting temporary performance problems, while errors are systematic and persistent, revealing gaps in the learner's competence and requiring external feedback.

### **.2.9. Significance of Error Correction**

Feedback and errors cannot be separated because they are related to each other. Appropriate feedback can overcome the erroneous created by the students. Thus, a discussion about the error is also needed. Errors are the disability of linguistics form or contents that dispartate from the native speaker rules. There are three points regarding the importance of errors in learning process: 1) they become a signal for the students' learning progress; 2) for language teachers as an input for them to understand deeper about how language is learnt; 3) creating an improvement for the learners.

There are various stances on from what aspect teachers should consider when deciding on what errors to correct and this issue is still a debate.

Although there are theories against error correction in language learning, such as the Natural Approach (which posits that error correction tends to negatively affect students' communication – see Nassaji & Kartchava, 2017), there is increasing support for the use of *oral corrective feedback* in language classrooms because it is said to promote students' learning by helping them notice the difference between the native language and the target language (Sheen, 2011). However, it is also recommended that teachers should be careful about *overcorrection* as it can confuse learners about 'the value of learning' (Ur, 1996, p. 255); too much feedback obstructs learners' responsiveness to learning (Ellis, 2013). Moreover, Ur (1996) pointed out that the most important reason for teaching speaking is to develop oral fluency, which consists of the ability to express oneself intelligibly, reasonably, and *without undue hesitation* as well as accurately. Therefore, it is suggested that teachers should use 'focused corrective feedback' (Sheen, 2011, p. 8) limited to selected linguistic features. There are various positions on the errors that teachers should pay attention to.

Drawing on Corder's (1967) distinction between errors of competence (errors caused by a lack of knowledge) and errors of performance (errors caused by temporary circumstances such as memory lapse and tiredness), it is recommended that error correction is more appropriate for the former (Brinton, 2014; Ellis, 2013). Another suggestion is that teachers correct only global errors because they affect communication (Burt, 1975; Hendrickson, 1980). This, however, is not accepted by some SLA experts. For example, Nassaji and Kartchava (2017) argue that a false assumption is made as to global and local errors because local errors can also cause communication problems. According to these recommendations, errors that should be corrected are regarded in terms of their communicative effects. Apart from these positions, advice is given according to the impact of correction on learners. Folse (2006) encouraged teachers to correct errors that make learners feel they are being seen as 'uneducated' when they make them. One criticism of these suggestions is that they are difficult for teachers to put into practice (Sheen, 2011) since certain error types can overlap. Moreover, there are no sound criteria for assessing which errors students feel make them feel 'uneducated' when they make them. Again, this often falls to individual perception. Possibly, this is one of the reasons for the discrepancy between the experts' recommendations and teachers' beliefs and practices as to what errors to correct.

## 2.10. Types of Errors

Similar to the concept of errors, error type is also a complex issue. Different types of errors are referred to in the studies on what errors should be corrected in the language classroom. Researchers in applied linguistics categorise errors according to effects of errors on communication, sources of errors, and linguistic components. One of the most widely referred to classifications of errors is based on how errors affect comprehensibility. From this perspective, errors are classified as 'local' and 'global'. Burt and Kiparsky (1974) defined global errors as "those that violate rules involving the overall construct of a sentence" which tends to significantly hinder communication because they are not comprehensible; while local errors are those that "cause trouble in a particular constituent", not the comprehensibility of the whole message (p. 73). They further claimed that global errors significantly hinder communication, but local errors do not. An example of local errors would be, "If I heard from him I will let you know" (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 247). As can be seen, this sentence is not grammatically correct but it *is* comprehensible. Although the distinction between global and local

errors is widely referred to in the literature, the definitions using linguistic criteria to determine the degree of communication interference is less accepted. According to the definitions, it can be assumed that errors such as lexical errors and pronunciation errors do not seriously impede communication despite those errors potentially having a significant impact on communication (Morrissey, cited in Richards, 1980).

Moreover, the degree of error seriousness can be determined not only by comprehensibility, but also by their generality and frequency. As Johansson (1978) notes, irritation caused by errors may cause problems in communication as well.

In sum, local and global errors mainly involve comprehensibility judged by the listener. When adopting the concepts of local and global errors for decisions on corrective feedback in the classroom, however, a possible problem might be the lack of a clear-cut evaluation of errors since comprehensibility is subjective. Possibly due to this reason, the classification of errors according to communicative effects is not often mentioned in the findings of studies on the analysis of learner errors. Apart from this classification, there are other options to determine types of error.

## **2.11. Teacher Cognition on Error Types**

Most studies have found that teachers have a broadly positive attitude to corrective feedback (Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010; Méndez & Cruz, 2012; Jodaie, Farrokhi, & Zoghi, 2011) although the *degree* of positive feelings about this varies as a result of teachers' beliefs about language teaching and learning. Méndez and Cruz (2012) used a semi-structured interview and a questionnaire to investigate the perceptions of EFL teachers at a Mexican university about corrective feedback and its actual practice in their classrooms. They found that the teachers in their study were not overly fond of corrective feedback because they perceived corrective techniques to be a form of focus-on-form instruction, which they were not convinced was an appropriate approach to teaching language. This perception was attributable to their own teaching experience, prior knowledge and education. In contrast, when it came to error correction in writing tasks, corrective feedback was more highly valued because the teachers believed that it was beneficial for improvement of students' writing (Al shahrani & Storch, 2014; Jodaie et al., 2011). In his study exploring beliefs of teachers at University of Arizona regarding the benefit of a focus on form in language learning, Schulz (2001) reported that in different tasks teachers had

different views on whether errors should be corrected. When verbal skills are focused on instead of writing skills, there is less agreement on using corrective feedback.

Despite these mixed attitudes to corrective feedback, studies suggest that teachers in practice tend to engage quite often in corrective feedback (Chaudron, 1988; Lochtman, 2002). Regarding errors that should be corrected, most studies have found that teachers believe error correction is unimportant in all cases and should be adopted only for errors that could cause communication breakdown (Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004; Gurzynski-Weiss, 2010; Schulz, 1996) or impede intelligibility (Demir & Özmen, 2017). In accordance with teachers' beliefs, numerous studies have concluded that practices appear to focus on errors that affect the meaning, mainly pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary (Demir & Özmen, 2017; Uysal & Aydin, 2017) and morphosyntactic and high-frequency errors (Kubota, 1991).

Although this small number of studies related to teachers' beliefs and practices in terms of which errors to correct in the speaking classroom has revealed interesting aspects of teacher cognition on error correction, their focus is limited to grammatical errors (the study of Schulz, 1996), interview data (the studies of Méndez & Cruz, 2012 and Uysal & Aydin, 2017), or the non-English language classroom (the studies of Gurzynski-Weiss, 2010; Lyster, 2004). Only studies by Basturkmen, Loewen, and Ellis (2004) and Demir and Özman (2017) have explored teachers' beliefs and practices on oral error correction by integrating observational data. More importantly, these two studies reported findings based on pre-determined types of errors which are mostly categorized by their linguistic components.

Nassaji and Kartchava (2017) argue that most of the research findings relating to errors corrected by teachers do not match with the recommendations for language teachers to correct errors according to their effect on communication because those studies appear to focus on a specific linguistic component, such as that by Lyster (2004) investigating correction on the use of articles. For this reason, those studies' findings were limited to a specific and narrow aspect of language and did not extend to other classifications of errors such as errors that hinder communication. As a result, it is possible to conclude that the ambiguous and contrasting findings in relation to corrected errors can result from the specific research focus of those studies.

According to existing research on what spoken errors teachers believe should be corrected and what they actually correct in the classroom, gaps in the research in this area can be understood in terms of the research focus and methodology. It is expected that this study's triangulation of interview and observational data, as well as the inductive investigation into teachers' beliefs on feedback types, will yield a more complete understanding of this issue from teachers' perspectives.

## **2.12. Rationale for Providing Corrective Feedback**

Although error correction in meaning-focused teaching could be considered unnecessary because learners do not need error correction if they are in communicative-based instruction where language use for communication is encouraged (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2017), the need for corrective feedback in the language classroom has been supported both theoretically and empirically. Error correction is considered useful for language learning based on the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996), and the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 2005).

### **a. Noticing Hypothesis**

In the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990; 2001), language input needs to be noticed by learners. If it is not, according to Schmidt (1990), language input is not processed into learning. Noticing the gaps between input and output enables students to make a mental note, leading in turn to acquisition. Corrective feedback is a strategy which can raise learners' awareness of the mismatches between their L2 input and output. This stance has been supported by research examining the noticeability of corrective feedback (e.g. Carroll & Swain, 1993; Lyster, 1998; Sheen, 2006; McDonough & Mackey, 2006; Nassaji, 2009). Generally, these studies reported that explicit feedback tends to be better noticed by learners than implicit feedback.

### **b. Interaction Hypothesis**

Both types of feedback are acknowledged in Long's (1996) Interaction Hypothesis. Interaction Hypothesis claims that learners normally receive a linguistic input during interaction with native speakers or more competent interlocutors because interactional adjustment "connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways" (Long, 1996, p. 451-452). This negative feedback is implicitly provided during the interaction. Based on this hypothesis, modified input through interaction was reported to be beneficial for language acquisition in related

studies such as Gass and Varonis (1994), Ellis, Tanaka, and Yamazaki (1994), and Loschky (1994). For instance, Loschky (1994) conducted an experiment with learners of Japanese in three experimental groups: a group of unmodified input with no interaction, one of premodified input with no interaction, and one of unmodified input with the chance for interaction. The results showed that the group with interaction yielded the highest degree of comprehension of input. Although a large body of research supports the Interaction Hypothesis, it has been questioned. For example, Swain (1985) has argued that comprehensible input is not sufficient for second language acquisition because learners require opportunities to produce comprehensible output.

### **c. Output Hypothesis**

In Swain's (1985) Output Hypothesis, apart from noticing differences between input and output and receiving interactionally modified input, learners need to produce output through metalinguistic feedback. In doing so, learners will have opportunities to discuss language forms during communicative language use and thereby eventually improve their language accuracy. Swain and Lapkin (1995, p. 372-373) subsequently explained the relationships between the noticing stage, interactions, and modified output: In producing the L2, a learner will on occasion become aware of (i.e. notice) a linguistic problem (brought to his/her attention either by external feedback (e.g., clarification requests) or internal feedback). Noticing a problem 'pushes' the learner to modify his/her output. In doing so, the learner may sometimes be forced into a more syntactic processing mode than might occur in comprehension. Thus, output may set 'noticing' in train, triggering mental processes that lead to modified output. Confirming this hypothesis, empirical and experimental research has highlighted the importance of L2 learners' output in language learning (e.g. Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Tarone & Liu, 1995, Van den Branden, 1997). According to the hypothesis, outputprovoking types of feedback such as clarification requests and metalinguistic feedback are encouraged.

In sum, corrective feedback has been supported both by theories of second language acquisition and research evidence.

## **2.13. Effectiveness of Different Types of Corrective Feedback**

Studies have shown that teachers' corrective feedback is inconsistent and unsystematic (Sheen, 2011). For this reason, a body of research has investigated the effectiveness of corrective feedback more specifically, which type of corrective feedback most benefits

students' learning. However, the results have delivered mixed results. The findings of most studies investigating the effectiveness of different types of oral corrective feedback claim evidence in the rate of learners' uptake and repair following corrective feedback moves (e.g. Choi & Li, 2012; Lyster, 1998; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004). Uptake is a learner's immediate response after the teacher's feedback, which includes both the learner's utterance and reaction; while repair is "the correct reformulation of an error as uttered in a single student turn and not to the sequence of turns resulting in the correct reformulation; nor does it refer to self-initiated repair" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 49). According to these descriptive and empirical studies, it has been claimed that recasts effectively enhance language learning (e.g. Han, 2002; Loewen & Philp, 2006; Nassaji, 2017). For example, Han (2002) found that recast was a successful tool for improving the tense consistency of adult learners. However, comparisons between recasts and prompts or explicit corrective feedback reveal inconsistent results. Comparing recasts with prompts, some studies have found that the latter to be a more effective error treatment (e.g. Guchte et al, 2015; Jafarigohar & Gharbavi, 2014; Rahimi & Zhang, 2013). Similarly, in a study by Lyster and Ranta (1997) investigating types of corrective feedback in a French immersion classroom, recasts led to the least amount of uptake and repair; while elicitation was the most successful technique for eliciting students' uptake. In contrast, Karimi and Esfandiari (2016) reported that the effect of recasts on Iranian

EFL learners' stress patterns was stronger than that of explicit corrective feedback. The possible explanation for the conflicting findings concerns factors such as instructional context, learners' levels of proficiency, and the degree of implicitness of recast. For instance, Sheen (2011) pointed out that the learners in some studies might be more focused on form in their communication-based lessons because form-focused grammar was highlighted prior to the lesson. She added that learners of higher proficiency levels tend to better respond to recasts. In addition, a study by Loewen and Philp (2006) reported that the effectiveness of recasts can be reduced when it is provided vaguely, which makes it more implicit and more difficult for learners to notice.

There are also studies comparing recasts to specific explicit feedback. Li (2014) and Rezaei and Derakhshan (2011) investigated the effect of recasts and metalinguistic feedback and found that the latter had a greater impact than recasts. Interestingly, Li found that metalinguistic correction was more effective for low-level learners but

equally effective for advanced learners. This concurs with the argument made by Ammar and Spada (2006) and Sheen (2011) that student proficiency affects the effectiveness of recasts. According to these studies, it can be noticed that explicit correction tends to be more effective than implicit correction. Nevertheless, it should be noted that factors such as student proficiency level and instructional context can vary the results of studies. Similar to the findings on effectiveness of types of corrective feedback, research on teachers' beliefs and practices about corrective feedback types reveal that different factors can generate different findings.

#### **2.14. Teacher Cognition on Corrective Feedback Types**

Studies relating to teachers' beliefs and actual practices indicate that teachers' beliefs and their use of corrective feedback are shaped by several factors. These factors are intertwined with tensions between teachers' feedback preferences and how they are implemented.

When teachers correct errors, numerous studies have shown that the most common type of feedback was recasts (Lee, 2013; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Roothoof, 2014; Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001; Gurzynski–Weiss & Révész, 2012; Havranek, 2002; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004). Considering implicit and explicit feedback, many studies have noted that implicit feedback was more common (Gurzynski, Weiss & Révész, 2012; Yoshida, 2010). In contrast, Kubota (1991) investigated oral corrective feedback of seven Japanese EFL teachers with more than ten years of teaching at senior high school in Japan and reported that the teachers used more explicit than implicit feedback. Kubota proposed that a possible explanation for this discrepancy might be that form-focused instruction in EFL classrooms like the observed classroom in her study, tend to involve explicit feedback to clearly point out the error. It might be assumed that in a more meaning-focused classroom, implicit correction tends to be used more frequently. According to this assumption, the instructional context is likely to influence the types of corrective feedback that teachers use.

Regarding recasts and prompts, it has been found that teachers see prompts as more effective than recasts because they tend to lead to students' self-correction (Debreli & Onuk, 2016; Diab, 2007). In contrast, recasts are preferable in practice (Demir & Özmen, 2017; Kennedy, 2010). One study showed that teachers' preferences for recasts over prompts were attributable to time constraints (Yoshida, 2008).

Nevertheless, in a study by Ahangari and Amirzadeh (2011) exploring teachers' oral corrective feedback in teaching Iranian EFL learners at different levels of proficiency, it was reported that when learners become more proficient, teachers increasingly use prompts. In line with this, other studies have shown that learner proficiency affects the corrective feedback choice. For example, elicitation is considered suitable for advanced learners because of the potential for self-correction; while recast and metalinguistic feedback are better options for low-proficiency learners (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Kaivanpanah, Alavi, & Sepehrinia, 2015; Sheen, 2004; Yoshida, 2008). However, one possible problem is that sometimes teachers overestimate their students' ability because their true ability might be negatively affected by anxiety and classroom pressure (Yoshida, 2008).

Apart from time constraints and learner proficiency, teachers' beliefs and practices regarding corrective feedback also depend on institutional contexts (Kaivanpanah et al, 2015), cultural factors (Schulz, 2001), teacher education (Jafarigohar & Kheiri, 2015), teaching experience (Demir & Özmen, 2017), learning experiences (Agudo, 2014), error types (Gurzynski & Weiss, 2016), task types (Özmen & Aydin, 2015), student personality (Mori, 2011), students' preferences (Jodaie et al, 2011), and attitudes towards exams (Lee, 2008).

Overall, the findings from studies concerning teachers' choices of corrective feedback suggest that it varies as a result of the dynamic contexts of instruction. Mismatches between beliefs and practices can derive from instructional contexts, factors relating to learners, and teachers' beliefs. Other than these internal and external factors, incongruences between teachers' beliefs and practices may result from issues of research methodology such as interpretations drawn from limited data sources and teachers' unclear perceptions about corrective feedback (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2017).

### **2.15. Timing of Giving Feedback**

Beside the strategies which the teachers must use in the correct way to help students to improve their language and motivate them to learn more, the teachers also should take care of the time they provide the oral corrective feedback and if the learner ready to accept the feedback or not. Most scholars agree that the best time of giving the Oral Corrective Feedback is immediately after the student's error or mistake. Providing immediate oral responses to questions of fact or while students is misconception is also a good timing.

She added that the purpose of immediate feedback is to keep them power up to chase the learning target while they are still mindful to it and still have time to do more on it. Effective feedback is immediate feedback. Though some other scholars stated (Doughty, 2001; Yoshida, 2008; Lee, 2013) that they were also in favor of immediate feedback

## **2.16. Previous Studies**

Many studies have been conducted on this topic. Although, the results may vary in every context, the most previous studies have reported that providing feedback in EFL classrooms is give positive effect for learners because feedback is the medium to help students improve their performance in the future. Some researcher has said that oral corrective feedback should be given in order to improve students' language learning. By providing oral corrective feedback, teachers can help the students to minimize the possibility of committing the same errors in the future. Although the discussion of corrective feedback has been around for a long time, no subtle consensus met among researchers. Among the researchers, the effectiveness of corrective feedback becomes a controversial issue, especially in the second language acquisition research (Chen & Liu, 2021).

Tomczyk (2013) agree that teachers' feedback is a way to correct students' errors and as a result, the students will avoid making the error again. Tomczyk also argue that corrective feedback should be provided in language classrooms to prevent students making the same mistakes in the future. The oral corrective feedback should be given also been examined by (Elsaghayer, 2014) As a result of this research which is a out the oral feedback strategies, the researcher decided that "Teacher should try using recast feedback in the classroom forcorrecting students because it is proved has positive impact toraise their motivation and spirit in learning(Walid Amri 2016)" "When the literature is reviewed, it can be seen that the feedback provided in accordance with the student's mental and psychological development level contributes to academic success and fortifies the relationship between the student and the teacher (Brookhart, 2008; Butler and Winne, 1995; Coşgun and Sarı, 2015; Hattie and Timperley, 2007; Kleij at al., 2011; Lee 2010; Narciss 2012 and 2013; Peker, 1992; Sadler, 1989; Schimmel, 1988; Slavin, 2012)."As mentioned in( Kaya &Yelmiz 2019) Therefore, the instructors should be informed about how to select the right type of feedback for a specific situation, and they should be professionally supported for self-assessment by realizing the feedback types that they utilize. It should be always be kept in mind that the improvement of educational quality and the acquisition of desirable behavior by

students depend on the quality of teacher behavior.( Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research "epasr"2019)

As a result of the research which done by (Reem Alkhamash &Fahmeeda Gulnaz 2019) Effective OCF on learners' spoken errors requires the use of appropriate techniques that best address particular types of error and are suitable for the type of learning activities as well as the types of learner. One type of OCF can never address the needs of all the learners equally well, because one size doesn't fit all. (Ammar & Spada 2006, p. 566)

With regard to the use of strategies, (Edith Hernández Méndez \*María del Rosario Reyes Cruz 2012) after their research they agreed that ,the implicit ones are more favored by this group of teachers. Teachers should know the effectiveness of both explicit and implicit strategies and choose the ones proven to be more effective. As a matter of variability, many possible strategies should be exploited in the classroom.

Many studies explored the types of OCF often used by teachers. One of the studies by Jabbari and Fazilatraf (2012) shows that English teachers used recast many times compared with the other types of feedback. The effectiveness of OCF types in Turkish EFL classrooms is seen through grammar tests and stimulated recall.

The findings showed that repetition is considered an effective technique to correct the students' errors, and the teacher has a positive perception of it. In addition, recast and explicit corrections are two types of OCF that EFL teachers frequently use, and there are different OCF preferences between experienced and novice teachers. Moreover, teachers ignore several students' errors for reasons such as tiredness, not wanting to bother the students' activities and lack of knowledge.

( Abid Fouad 2022) as the result of his research, found that teachers were interested in using implicit OCF to suit the different levels of their learners as focusing on one type of OCF can never fulfill the needs of all the learners equally well, because "one size doesn't fit all" (Ammar & Spada 2006, p. 566). The other research 's result showed that Recast strategy is the most usable one (Mohamed Basil Kasim AlAzzawi,

Angela Odisho Zaya AlBarwari 2017) Teaching experience played a role in teachers' preferences. In addition, teachers varied techniques intent was to seek chances for learners to achieve self-repair and develop learners' perceptions about OCF to ensure its effectiveness and create better uptake for their learners.

A study performed in content-based (focusing on meaning rather than on form) French immersion classrooms with 9-11 year-old students showed that the teachers of these classes used recasts more than the other types of feedback. It was also shown that student uptake was least likely to occur after this type of feedback and most likely to occur after clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback and repetitions (Lightbown & Spada 2006, 127). These studies have been confirmed by others, but there is also a study that has shown that recasts actually do lead to student uptake. This study was, however, conducted with adult language learners in a language-focused (focusing on grammar rather than on meaning) classroom as opposed to with children in a content-based classroom in the first study (Lightbown & Spada 2006, p. 128).

A study done in Australia with 6-12 year-olds showed that feedback seems to differ depending on the context in the classroom. Some of the things it showed were that feedback was given throughout the class in all instructional contexts, but that it was most frequent in the explicit language-focused exchanges (emphasizing grammar). The feedback method most frequently used in the explicit language-focused exchanges was explicit feedback. Although in the communication exchanges (the part of the class focusing on communication between students and teachers) there was a great opportunity for providing feedback, it was not given as frequently as in the explicit language-focused exchanges. The type of feedback most frequently given in the communication exchanges was recasts (Lightbown & Spada 2006, 129-130).

Hargreaves, McCallum and Gipps (2000) conducted a study in primary schools where twenty-three teachers took part. Most of these teachers were of the opinion that students learn by using previous knowledge, asking and being asked questions and by making connections. They also stressed that how the children felt about themselves affected their learning process, and therefore, chose to use feedback to motivate them (Hargreaves et al 2000, p.31). These teachers used both explicit feedback and clarification requests, and metalinguistic feedback throughout the classes (Hargreaves et al 2000, p. 25).

As we can see from the stages of development that Brown (1987) presents errors are natural parts of learning and cannot be avoided. However, corrective feedback is very important because fossilization can occur if students are not aware of their errors.

Several different types of corrective feedback can be used to correct the students' speech, but the most subtle one is recasts. Both Hill (2006) and Tornberg (2005) argue that

recasting is a good way of giving corrective feedback without interrupting communication and making the students feel uncomfortable. Studies show that recasting is the method most common in communicative exchanges in the classroom, but it does not necessarily lead to student uptake (Lightbown & Spada, 2006, 127, p.129). However from studies made in primary schools teachers seem to prefer to use explicit feedback, metalinguistic feedback and clarification requests (Hargreaves et al, 2000,p. 25).

In this research, the researcher seeks to conclude that all corrective oral feedback types are important and that teachers of speaking must choose the appropriate time and the appropriate type to help the students correct their mistakes and motivate them to develop conversational skills.

## **2.17. Summary of The Chapter**

Speaking skills are among the most important language skills that students need when learning English as a foreign language, as they enable them to communicate in daily life and achieve both professional and academic success. Despite their importance, these skills are often neglected in classrooms, where the focus tends to be on memorization and repetition. Speaking skills, however, should be taught through interactive teaching methods such as brainstorming games, rhythmic activities, and group work, which encourage students to participate actively and build self-confidence.

Oral corrective feedback refers to the teacher's response to students' speaking errors with the aim of improving their performance. It includes several types, such as reformulation, requests for clarification, repetition, and metalinguistic cues. The linguistic causes of errors in a given area are classified at specific levels. For this reason, oral correction serves as a means of reducing students' difficulties in this area without diminishing their motivation.

Scholars and researchers have varied in their experiences and beliefs, with greater acceptance of written correction compared to oral correction. Ultimately, the literature indicates that a sufficient number of previous studies highlight the importance of oral corrective feedback in supporting students' learning and motivating them to improve their speaking skills.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.0. Introduction**

Data collection and analysis were essential steps in this scientific research, as they formed the foundation upon which conclusions and recommendations were based. This chapter explained the methodology used in the study, which aimed to explore teachers' use of the types of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) in teaching speaking skills to English language students at Zawia University. The research relied on a qualitative approach; the qualitative method led to quantitative data, so it was mixed. The research tools were carefully selected to suit the nature of the study. These tools included direct observation and semi-structured interviews with speaking instructors.

This chapter addressed the research design, description of the participants, the tools used in data collection, and the procedures followed to ensure the validity and reliability of the results. It also discussed the ethical considerations taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of the participants. Finally, it provided a summary linking the research steps and objectives, paving the way for the presentation and discussion of the results in the following chapters.

#### **3.1. Research Design**

This research was a mixture of qualitative and quantitative methods, and the methods included observation and interview. Both of these tools were applied to English teachers, especially those who taught speaking. First, interviews were conducted with the teachers, and then their classes were attended to observe their use of oral corrective feedback types. The qualitative method adopted in this study concerned the study of the nature of phenomena, including their quality, different manifestations, the context in which they appeared, or the perspectives from which they could be perceived, while excluding their range, frequency, and place in an objectively determined chain of cause and effect (Philipsen & Vernooij-Dassen, 2007). Qualitative research is an umbrella

term for an array of attitudes and strategies for conducting inquiry aimed at discovering how human beings understand, experience, interpret, and produce the social world (Sandelowski, 2004, p. 893).

The present study employed classroom observation and interviews as data collection tools.

Lightbown (2000, p. 438) stated that classroom research helps researchers "identify and better understand the roles of the different participants in classroom interaction, the impact that certain types of instruction may have on EFL/ESL learning, and the factors which promote or inhibit learning." With this in mind, the current study investigated the perceptions of the teachers regarding the types and timing of OCF in their classroom setting when they provided feedback to their students.

### **3.2. The Participants**

The participants who took part in this study were chosen purposively, as only teachers who taught conversation were involved. To explore their opinions about oral corrective feedback and the types of OCF they used, interviews were conducted with these teachers and classroom observations were carried out. These teachers included both females and males, and their ages ranged between 39 and 45 years. They had been teaching English for about 15 years and were familiar with their students' speaking problems and evaluation preferences. The study included teachers from the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Education at Zawia University, specifically those located within Zawia city.

### **3.3. Instruments of Data Collection**

In this study, two instruments were used for the collection of data: classroom observation and interview.

#### **3.3.1. Observation**

Classroom observations were included as part of the research study to examine various aspects of teacher–student communication in the classroom. More specifically, the observations focused on the types of OCF provided by teachers compared to their own perceptions and views during the interviews. Another aim of the observations was to investigate how students reacted and responded to the OCF given to them. Observations were recorded using a checklist following a taxonomy of feedback types proposed by Lyster (1997).

Prior to the observations, two protocols were created to help the researcher stay focused on the aspects that needed to be examined. The first protocol measured the frequency of each feedback type: explicit correction, recast, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, elicitation, repetition, and others. The second protocol determined the rate of errors made by students that were corrected by teachers. For each protocol, Lyster and Ranta's (1997) classification of feedback types was used.

The data collected were later analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively to obtain an understanding of the various types of OCF provided by teachers during lessons.

The observation was conducted with four teachers; two lectures were attended for each teacher, with each lecture lasting two hours. The teachers were very cooperative and welcomed the researcher's presence. A checklist was prepared containing the main points related to OCF types, to determine whether teachers used most of these types, how they applied them, and whether OCF helped students learn from their mistakes and improve their speaking skills.

### **3.3.2. Interview**

According to Kvale (1996), "The interview is a data-collection method in which an interviewer asks questions to an interviewee with the aim of understanding opinions, behaviours, or experiences."

Types of Interview according to Kvale (1996):

**Structured Interview:** The interviewer uses a fixed set of predetermined questions, asked in the same order to all participants. Aim: to collect standardised and comparable data.

**Semi-structured Interview:** The interviewer uses an interview guide with key questions but allows flexibility in wording and order. Aim: to explore topics in depth while maintaining focus.

**Unstructured Interview:** There are no fixed questions; the interview is more like a guided conversation covering broad topics. Aim: to explore unknown aspects and gain deep insights.

Since interviews were considered the best method to extract information about teachers' thoughts and feelings concerning OCF, the semi-structured interview was used as one of the data collection methods.

Before the interviews, the questions were supplied to participants so they could prepare. The interview consisted of ten set questions constructed and categorised according to the research questions (see Appendix A).

Each interview was divided into four parts:

1. The first part established each teacher's professional background, including teaching experience and age.
2. The second part focused on the teacher's knowledge and use of OCF.
3. The third part explored the strategies teachers applied to implement OCF and the types of errors they tended to correct.
4. The fourth part investigated teachers' perceptions of students' reactions and responses to OCF.

As Alvehus (2013) suggested, an interviewer may not have sufficient time to write everything down while listening attentively, so the interviews were recorded to allow for accurate transcription and detailed analysis. The interviews were conducted prior to the classroom observations.

### **3.4. Validity and Reliability**

**\_Content Validity:** Subject-matter experts reviewed the instruments to ensure they thoroughly covered all important aspects of oral corrective feedback and related skills. Their feedback helped refine the items for completeness and relevance.

**Construct Validity:** The interview questions were aligned with established theoretical frameworks and prior research to confirm that the instrument accurately measured the intended concepts.

**\_Pilot Testing:** The interview was piloted with a small group of graduate students to identify and address ambiguities in the items.

**Consistency:** The data collection process was standardised to minimise variations and ensure consistent administration of instruments.

### **3.5. Ethical Considerations**

The study adhered to the highest ethical standards to protect participants' rights and welfare. Key measures included:

1. Confidentiality: All data were anonymised, and no personal identifiers were included in the analysis or reporting.
2. Informed Consent: Participants were fully informed about the study's purpose, procedures, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty.
3. Voluntary Participation: Participation was entirely voluntary, with no coercion or incentives.
4. Data Security: All data were securely stored and accessed only by the researcher to ensure privacy and confidentiality.

### **3.6. Summary of The Chapter**

This chapter outlined the methodology used to investigate teachers' use of OCF in the English departments at Zawia University. By employing a mixed approach to obtain both qualitative and quantitative data, it provided a comprehensive understanding of teachers' feedback practices and students' performance. The next chapter presents the findings and discusses their implications in the context of existing literature.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **DATA ANALYSIS**

#### **4.0. Introduction**

This chapter presents the results obtained from the interview and observation that were conducted with the group of teachers as described in chapter three. The results correspond to the three primary research questions, and the interview questions can be found in appendix A. A copy of the observation checklist is found in Appendix B. The researcher analysed the data obtained from both interview and observation thematically as described in coming section.

#### **4.1. Analysis of Teachers' Interview**

The analysis of teachers' interview started with the first section 'general background questions' about the participants.

##### **4.1.1 Teachers Understanding of OCF**

In all six teacher interviews, OCF was referred to as a strategy to develop and enhance students' oral English skills. The teachers interviewed all indicated that they perceived OCF as being easy to provide. Furthermore, the interviewees deemed OCF an important tool in language acquisition, claiming that OCF is frequently used in their lessons. However, they also considered OCF to affect learners both positively and negatively. This notion was emphasized by T4, who explained that this is largely dependent on learners' proficiency.

The majority of interviewees agreed that OCF is given as a matter of course without being given much thought. T2 expanded on this point by responding that OCF was implemented constantly both verbally and in writing. As students are being taught, their use of grammar and any mistakes made naturally lend themselves to OCF being implemented instantaneously.

#### **4.1.2 Types and methods of implementing OCF**

Answers to questions varied among the interviewees. However, one common factor was that they all agreed on the importance of providing OCF tactfully without offending or singling out individual students.

T1 emphasized the importance of creating a positive atmosphere in the classroom and giving students confidence. This in turn results in OCF being perceived as positive and encouraging, leading to students to actively participate in lessons and not worry about making mistakes. T2 highlighted the importance of providing positive feedback to the whole class before addressing individuals: "Let students make mistakes when in front of the whole class then correct them later when working individually". T3 argued that the correct provision of OCF depended on the context. For instance, excessive corrections are counterproductive regarding pronunciation, as repetition will address any shortcomings naturally. T4 sees great value in explicitly correcting students that struggle with difficult words. Responses to question 10 indicated that teachers generally seemed reluctant to correct students' grammar mistakes, even in discussions.

Particularly special needs or low-performing students who struggle with both written and spoken language were mentioned. The teachers believed that excessive OCF could impact their learning negatively by making them feel inadequate.

Responses to questions 11, 12, and 13 were similar. As students are at different levels of ability, they need different levels of support. Those with difficulties tend not to be corrected as much as the better performing students in order to encourage them to participate as much as possible.

T2 confirms this by choosing to always highlight the positive aspects of lower performing students' contributions and not singling out weaker students: "It is important to correct students quietly on a one-to-one basis sitting beside them and whispering in their ear." T1, T2 and T3 agreed that one should refrain from correcting weaker students' pronunciation, as discussed above. T4 believes in providing the same type of OCF, adapting the approach to the type of student one is dealing with. T5 and T6, however, modify their approach depending on the students' response, with no response meaning that the student needs to be approached differently.

The principal areas of correction were identified as pronunciation and grammar. The principle of different accents resulting in different pronunciations of the same word can be hard to grasp for year 4 students.

T3 addresses this issue by only correcting students' utterances in context, claiming that it is more important to motivate confident learners who are positive and engaged in the activities.

T2 finds it easier to correct high-performing learners, who tend to be quicker to correct their mistakes than low-performers. In addition, OCF is received better than by low performers: "When there are difficulties to pronounce certain words, I often encourage the whole class to come up with the correct pronunciation rather than singling out one student's mistakes in front of the class."

In the past, teachers focused on correcting students' written work rather than their speaking skills. Today, the emphasis is more on oral skills due to increased exposure to spoken English on TV and the Internet. Students generally have good pronunciation skills, and corrections now govern content more than pronunciation.

#### **4.1.3. Students' Reaction to OCF**

The answers to question 15 indicated clearly that OCF is received differently depending on students' age.

Younger students tend to be more open to receiving such feedback than students of year 5 and 6. The teachers' responses clearly indicated that oral corrective feedback (OCF) is received differently depending on students' age. Younger learners tend to be more open to receiving such feedback than students in higher grades. Both T2 and T4 confirmed that year 4 students consider getting feedback as something natural and do not perceive it negatively.

However, T1 and T3 pointed out that OCF is not always received positively by older students, who are more likely to take such corrections personally. As T3 explained: "Some students are not open to teachers' corrections whilst others that are motivated and driven take teachers' corrections positively." T1 referred to Carol Dweck's Mindset Theory, suggesting that students with a "static mindset" tend to struggle with accepting corrections.

In relation to students' learning behaviors, T1 emphasized the importance of allowing learners to reflect on their own mistakes, adding that withholding immediate corrections can sometimes be more effective, especially in small group settings. T3 supported this view, noting that language development can be facilitated through peer support and collaboration in such groups.

All teachers agreed on the importance of avoiding excessive OCF, as moderation helps students remain motivated and engaged rather than feeling overwhelmed or discouraged.

When discussing the emotional impact of OCF, teachers acknowledged that such feedback can sometimes make students feel uncomfortable. They suggested that this could be mitigated by working in smaller groups and offering corrections sparingly and thoughtfully. T1, in particular, was aware of this challenge, linking students' reactions to their individual mindsets. As T1 stated: "The criticism is not personal but can be interpreted as negative and personal."

Furthermore, teachers highlighted that students generally respond positively to OCF when the classroom environment is supportive. A strong teacher-student relationship and mutual trust enable learners to perceive feedback as constructive and helpful rather than critical or discouraging.

#### **4.1.4 Types of OCF Used by Teachers**

The results from the observations are presented and analysed in two tables. The classroom observations were made at College of education second and fourth semester , in two classes. The teachers who participated in the interviews were those whose classes were observed – T2\_ second semester, T4\_ Fourth semester. The observations were conducted over a period of approximately 45-50 min, covering two lecturetime. Collage B, as mentioned before is a homogeneous school and has more English teaching compared to school A. Prior to the observations, two protocols were constructed to facilitate the field studies. The first protocol was made to measure the frequency of each feedback type occurring. In the protocol corresponding box was ticked whenever there was a verbal correction of a student's utterance. The second protocol was made to determine the rate of errors made by the students and corrected by the teacher.

**Table 4.1: Observations Results**

	<b>T1</b>	<b>T2</b>	<b>T3</b>
Explicit correction	6	4	3
Recast	5	3	0
Metalinguistic FB	3	1	0
Clarification	1	1	9
Elicitation	11	7	2
Repetition	1	0	0
Others	0	0	0

Table 4.1 shows that the most frequently given corrections were elicitation and clarification request, depending on trust semester level concerned. Elicitation was, by far the most frequently given feedback type in level 4 and 5. In level 6 however, clarification request was mainly used. Clarification, however, was only provided once in level 4 and 5. On the other hand, elicitation request was found only twice in level 6. It is noteworthy that studies have shown that recast and explicit correction are generally the OCF types most commonly used by teachers in education (Shamiri & Farvardin, 2016; Ölmezer-Öztürk & Öztürk, 2016).

Likewise, it was identified during the observations that recast and explicit correction were being provided regularly but in moderation. This could be due to teachers wanting the learners to try to correct themselves before providing the correct form. During the observations OCF was provided regularly in all grades, but more frequently and differently in level 4. The reason could be the learners' different proficiency levels and teachers adapting their teaching according to the learners' different needs. Furthermore, it was discovered that in level 5 the teacher varied the use of the different OCF types, whereas in level 6 the different types of OCF were used in moderation focusing mostly on clarification request. This could be due to the learners age, or their more advanced language skills. Also, the teacher in level 6, T5, had a different approach to correct learners compared to the other two teachers. The least commonly used type of CF observed by the researchers was repetition and metalinguistic feedback. This is not surprising, as these types of CF are confirmed as being the least used in education according to research done by Shamiri and Farvardin (2016).

## 4.2 Types of Error Correction

Table 4.2 illustrates that all corrected errors focused on grammar. During the observations the teachers worked with grammar focusing on the use of tense, as well as vowels and consonants, concentrating on the applicable use of 'a' or 'an' .

Consequently, no corrections were identified regarding learners' pronunciation or use of vocabulary. During the observations, it was noticed that OCF was provided more frequently in level 4 compared to level 5 and level 6. It was also observed that the target language was not used as often in level 4.

Since younger students do not have enough vocabulary to understand and follow the instruction only in the target language, the teacher must adapt the teaching to meet the needs of all students. The amount of CF given in grade 5 and grade 6 was equal and mainly focused on the use of tense. This notice may lead other researcher to investigate the use code switching in oral corrective feedback of both interviews and observations.

**Table 4.2: Errors corrections**

<b>Errors corrected</b>	<b>Level2</b>	<b>Level3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>
Grammar	27	16	14
Vocabulary	0	0	0
Pronunciation	0	0	0

## 4.3 Timing of OCF

The data regarding the timing of OCF moves provided by the teacher were analyzed based on the categorization as immediate, delayed and post-delayed given in the data analysis section. The findings on the perceptions of the participant students regarding the timing of OCF yielded significant results with the emerging themes shown in Table 3.1

1. The findings from this research highlight a preference among teachers for recasts and explicit feedback while revealing limitations in the use of other strategies due to time constraints and class dynamics. Understanding these preferences can inform future professional development for educators in enhancing their feedback techniques in language teaching..
2. Individual Adaptation: OCF types need customization based on student personality and error type, ensuring a supportive and effective learning environment.
3. Importance of Timing: Teachers generally preferred correcting errors after students finished their responses to avoid discouraging them.

#### **4.5 Summary of The Chapter**

Chapter Four of the study analyzes data from classroom interviews and classroom observations related to the use of Oral Corrective Feedback types (OCF) in speaking classes for English language students at Zawia University. Interview results revealed that teachers consider OCF an important tool for improving speaking skills, despite its varying impact on students depending on their level and personality. The data also indicated that correction is often provided spontaneously, and that teachers prefer tactful and non-embarrassing correction, especially for low-performing students. Variations were observed in the types of correction used, with elicitation and clarification being the most common, while explicit correction and linguistic cues were less common. Corrections in classroom observations focused solely on grammatical errors; pronunciation or vocabulary errors were not corrected. The amount of correction also varied by grade level, with higher levels being more frequent. The results showed that younger students were more receptive to correction than older students. The timing of correction, however, often occurred after the student had finished speaking to avoid disruption or frustration. Teachers emphasized the importance of moderation in providing OCF, and adapting it to students' needs.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

#### **5.0. Introduction**

. This study examines the different types of oral corrective feedback (OCF) used by EFL teachers at the University of Zawia when teaching speaking skills, as well as the timing of providing such feedback. This chapter aims to discuss the results of interviews and observations conducted with teachers and students, highlighting teachers' perceptions of the importance and various forms of OCF, in addition to understanding students' reactions to these practices and the impact of feedback timing on their motivation and engagement during learning. The analysis will link both quantitative and qualitative data collected, reflecting the importance of balancing correction and encouragement to create a positive and effective learning environment.

#### **5.1. Discussion of the Interview Results**

The aim of this research study was to explore and investigate how EFL teachers at the University of Zawia provide students with oral corrective feedback (OCF) when teaching speaking classes. Furthermore, the study also aimed to examine the timing of giving such feedback.

The investigation, which primarily employed a qualitative approach, also generated some quantitative data, as the researcher presented a classification of the various types of OCF used by teachers, along with the relative frequency of each type. In addition, the qualitative aspect of the study sought to determine students' reactions and responses to OCF.

Although there are several types of OCF, not all of them were observed during classroom sessions. Moreover, the collected data revealed that teachers hold different views regarding OCF and focus on different aspects of language learning. This makes the results from the interviews and observations both comparable and insightful for analysis.

Importantly, the key role of feedback was acknowledged and recognised by all four teachers. The findings also indicate that the College of Arts teachers' knowledge and perceptions of OCF, as expressed during the interviews, were consistent with their actual feedback practices observed in the classroom.

In the following sections, the researcher discusses how the interview and observation data specifically address each of the three research questions.

### **5.1.1 Teaches' Views of OCF**

The teachers interviewed all referred to OCF as a method used to support and improve students' speaking skills in English. The interviewees considered OCF as being an important tool in language acquisition and pointed out that being easy to provide, it is used frequently throughout their lessons. Similarly, the important role of feedback has been emphasised by Ellis (2009), claiming that in both behaviourist and cognitive theories of second language (L2) learning, feedback is seen as a means of fostering learner motivation and ensuring linguistic accuracy, hence contributing to language learning. Also, when researching the effectiveness of OCF, Lyster and Sato (2010) found that OCF as a supportive strategy was especially good for young learners. None of the teachers interviewed had been given tuition covering the provision of OCF to students during their teaching training. Nor had the interviewees, except one, received guidelines or directives from their employer regarding this matter.

The interviewees all highlighted the importance of timing. Mohd Noor, Aman, Mustaffa and Teo (2010) claim that providing feedback at appropriate times and providing appropriate OCF in accordance with learners' individual needs helps to facilitate student learning and has equal importance based on instructional activities. The teachers interviewed also claimed that they preferred to provide OCF individually. Likewise, Hernández Méndez and Reyes Cruz (2012) emphasised that individual correction seems to be more effective, as the learners addressed become aware of their errors, notice the error, and correct it accordingly.

During the interviews, all teachers claimed that they provide a varying amount of OCF to students at varying frequency. The teachers stated that because students need different kinds of support, one often chooses not to correct students with difficulties with the same focus or approach, as the more talented students. During the observations the authors found that statement to be correct. Also, Mohd Noor, Aman, Mustaffa and Teo (2010)

emphasised the importance of providing quality rather than quantity CF since excess CF can be disadvantageous to students' learning. Mohd Noor et al (2010) also stated that students struggling with language acquisition often have low self-confidence and find it hard to speak in front of others. Consequently, it is important to motivate these students and let them make mistakes. Hernández Méndez and Reyes Cruz (2012) however claimed that shyness or low motivation should not be factors to consider in the provision of CF. Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013) stated that teachers usually focus on grammatical errors when providing OCF to students. This phenomenon was identified in the interviews as well as during the observations. In the interviews the teachers also reflected upon their strategies to correct students' pronunciation, but they all agreed upon correction of students' pronunciation being a minor issue. Hernández Méndez and Reyes Cruz (2012), on the contrary however, emphasise that generally pronunciation is corrected frequently, although students' age and proficiency have an impact on how much OCF is provided regarding learners' pronunciation. During the interviews it was also revealed that teachers often combined giving praise with OCF in their teaching. The value of providing positive feedback (giving praise) was pointed out by all teachers. Likewise, in the observations it was noticed that providing positive feedback, such as praise created a positive atmosphere and increased learner's engagement and motivation.

However, according to Waring and Wong (2009), corrections are not a key consideration when the teacher praises a student and could consequently result in students receiving praise for both correct and incorrect answers. Also praising could sometimes be perceived as vague and unclear since the students may not understand what it referred to. Combining OCF with praise should therefore be provided in moderation in order not to confuse learners. Furthermore, the observations made showed that the less experience teachers have, the more engagement they showed when providing OCF.

The classroom observations at College of arts revealed that both implicit and explicit feedback were used during teaching. Likewise, it was noted that similar types of OCF strategies were applied by all teachers except one. The types of OCF types used during the observations were explicit correction, elicitation and clarification request. Studies have shown that these types of OCF have shown the most successful results regarding student generated repair as well as increased student learning (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Safari, 2013). The conclusions drawn from the interviews with the teachers at school A

however revealed that they tend to use recast and explicit correction instead. According to Russell (2009) recast is the strategy that is generally used when correcting students, whereas explicit correction results in giving students a clear understanding of the error made and helps them become aware of and understand their mistake.

### **5.1.2. Students Attitudes Towards The Timing of OCF Provided by Teachers**

Lyster et al (2013) claimed that students' preferences are crucial for two reasons: firstly they can influence learning behaviours and secondly, there could be an confusion between teachers' intentions and students' interpretations. This may have a negative effect on language learning. Furthermore, as stated by most of the teachers interviewed, Lyster et al (2013) claim that students tend to prefer receiving CF in most contexts, but factors such as students' cultural backgrounds, previous and current language experiences and proficiency level need to be considered. Also, since learners have different attitudes towards OCF, teachers should be aware of this and decide whether to consider it for the provision of CF. Because OCF can cause emotional issues and discourage learners' language acquisition, the teachers emphasised the importance of letting students make mistakes. Consequently, students should not be corrected on all occasions since OCF can be understood differently depending on students' individual needs (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012).

The teachers that were interviewed believed that most students interpret OCF as positive. Hernández Méndez and Reyes Cruz (2012) claim that teachers in general think that students do not get annoyed or feel bothered when provided with OCF which backs up the results from the interview. However, the interviewees also stated that students' perceptions of the OCF provided to some extent depended on what grade they attended. According to the interviewed teachers, younger students respond positively and are more open minded to receive OCF compared to older learners. The interviewees revealed that older students tend to perceive OCF as a personal attack and therefore do not respond to the OCF given. Likewise, Dweck (2018) stated that students nowadays avoid challenges, give up easily and ignore criticism – referred to as having a 'static mindset', resulting in having learners that are not open to OCF. The importance of letting learners reflect on their mistakes and correct their utterance afterwards rather than straightaway was also emphasised in the interviews. Lyster et al. (2013) confirm this by stating: Learners are likely to benefit more from being pushed to self-repair by means of prompting, especially in cases where recast could be perceived as approving

their use of non-target forms and where learners have reached a developmental stage in their use of the non-target forms (p.30). In this case, during the observations the authors noticed that this was effective on learners when elicitation, explicit and clarification corrections was provided.

Overall, the interviews revealed students' general attitudes when receiving feedback as being positive. The same phenomenon was identified during the observations. The comments made by the interviewees emphasised the importance of knowing your students well, having a positive atmosphere, not singling out individuals, as well as providing OCF in moderation. Also, according to Hernández Méndez and Reyes Cruz (2012), it is important to know students very well in order to know if OCF can be used or not.

## **5.2. Types of OCF**

The classroom observations at the college of Arts revealed that both implicit and explicit feedback were used during teaching. Likewise, it was noted that similar types of OCF strategies were applied by all teachers except one. The types of OCF used during the observations were explicit correction, elicitation and clarification request. Studies have shown that these types of OCF have shown the most successful results regarding student generated repair as well as increased student learning (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Safari, 2013). The conclusions drawn from the interviews with the teachers at college of education however revealed that they tend to use recast and explicit correction instead. According to Russell (2009), recast is the strategy that is generally used when correcting students, whereas explicit correction results in giving students a clear understanding of the error made and helps them become aware of and understand their mistake. Lyster et al (2013) claimed that students' preferences are crucial for two reasons: firstly they can influence learning behaviours and secondly, there could be an confusion between teachers' intentions and students' interpretations. This may have a negative effect on language learning.

Furthermore, as stated by most of the teachers interviewed, Lyster et al (2013) claim that students tend to prefer receiving CF in most contexts, but factors such as students' cultural backgrounds, previous and current language experiences and proficiency level need to be considered. Also, since learners have different attitudes towards OCF, teachers should be aware of this and decide whether to consider it for the provision of

CF. Because OCF can cause emotional issues and discourage learners' language acquisition, the teachers emphasised the importance of letting students make mistakes. Consequently, students should not be corrected on all occasions since OCF can be understood differently depending on students' individual needs (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012).

The timing of OCF has been a controversial topic in the literature, and different approaches have been put forward by different scholars. For instance, Long (1997) argues that teachers should give delayed feedback not to hinder the flow of communication whereas Doughty (2001) maintains that teachers should provide feedback immediately so that learners can have the opportunity to compare the erroneous form with the correct one. However, such studies do not focus on this topic from the perspective of learners to identify their tendencies in terms of timing.

Based on the classification as immediate and delayed, the study examines students' perceptions in terms of the timing of OCF. First of all, the results show that students perceive immediate feedback negatively since they are, in general, disturbed by the teacher's interruption. Moreover, it is found that consecutive usage of immediate feedback might demotivate students and even discourage them from participating in further activities. Unlike the findings of the study conducted by Lee (2013), who concludes that learners want to get immediate feedback while the communication is maintained, the findings of the current study posit that immediate feedback might lead to negative feelings in students because of the interruption of their sentences and should not be used consecutively by teachers.

. As for the timing of OCF, the students in this study are found to show a very strong preference to delayed feedback in which teachers waited until students finish their utterance and then provide feedback. All the students believe that not being interrupted while speaking and feeling more comfortable when they finish sentence makes delayed feedback a distinctively positive feedback strategy in terms of timing. These are also the underlying reasons why they prefer it as the best timing for feedback in this study. This finding shows parallelism with Zhang and Rahimi's (2014) which showed that learners highly prefer receiving feedback when they finish their utterances. Based on this study and the perceptions of students revealed in this study, it can be said that waiting until students finish their sentences and then providing the right corrective feedback move seems to be the ideal strategy in terms of the timing of OCF.

### **5.3 Summary of This Chapter**

This study aimed to explore the types of oral corrective feedback (OCF) used by EFL teachers at Zawiya University while teaching speaking skills, as well as the timing of this feedback. The study used a quantitative approach to analyze the types and frequency of feedback, and a qualitative approach to understand students' reactions to this feedback.

Furthermore, teachers often used multiple types of correction, such as explicit correction, elicitation, and requests for clarification. These methods are used to help students identify their mistakes and motivate them to correct them themselves. Regarding feedback delivery, the study showed that students prefer to receive feedback at the end, i.e., after they have finished speaking, as this avoids interrupting the flow of the conversation and maintains student psychological comfort, unlike immediate feedback, which can lead to frustration or withdrawal among participants later. Positive feedback such as praise should be given with a label that has a positive contribution to the student's level of motivation, but you should be careful not to create ambiguity or curiosity that may arise from unclear praise.

## CHAPTER SIX

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 6.1. Conclusion of the whole study

Oral Corrective feedback is essential in language learning, promoting improved linguistic competency and motivating learners. All oral corrective feedback strategies are effective when applied appropriately, and in certain time, considering learners' developmental levels and emotional well-being. Teachers' and attitudes play a pivotal role in the successful implementation of CF, influencing the strategies used and the outcomes achieved. The analysis of this study on Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) reveals its critical role in conversation classes. All teachers affirmed the importance of OCF strategies, stating they consistently use them to enhance students' speaking skills. They noted that OCF helps students learn from their mistakes and improve their language proficiency. While most teachers prefer to provide feedback after student responses, one argued for immediate correction to reinforce learning. Additionally, teachers acknowledged the need to adapt OCF strategies based on individual student differences.

In this research study the authors explored and investigated how Libyan EFL teachers provide students with OCF and examined teachers' and students' perceptions and opinions towards OCF. During the study, it was revealed that teachers have different thoughts regarding OCF and focus on various parts of language learning, making the results comparable and interesting to analyse. The important role of OCF was identified and recognised by all teachers. Also, the importance of teacher-student communication to find the type of OCF that will benefit both was noted. The answers the teachers provided during the interviews corresponded to the observations made in the classroom studies. The teachers, however, had different views regarding which OCF strategies to use.

All interviewees however emphasised the significance of knowing their students well and the importance of providing OCF in moderation. Also, the interviewed teachers all stressed that OCF should be provided correctly according to students' needs, and that

care must be taken not to single out individuals. During the observations it was seen that the way in which the OCF was given to a student varied according to the learners' different needs, proficiency level and age. It was also noted that the different OCF strategies that were applied during the observations did not correspond to those most commonly used by EFL teachers worldwide, one such example being recast. The teachers however, pointed out the importance of being constructive and positive when giving OCF. The importance of providing a combination of OCF and praising was emphasised, with the interviewees considering this to be motivating and encouraging for the students. This therefore makes it beneficial to the learners' language acquisition. Throughout the process it was observed by the authors that the type of OCF strategy used had a major impact on how students interpret and accept teachers' corrections. Likewise, all teachers that were interviewed considered the correct use of OCF to have a positive effect on learners' language development. OCF needs to be applied with care since the students are young children wanting to learn and can respond to corrections in a negative way. Also, the interviews revealed that the teachers that were interviewed noticed that their use of OCF had changed over time and they could all identify differences in the way they provided OCF in the past compared to the present.

## **6.2. Implications and Recommendations**

Additionally, based on the findings derived from students' narrations, the study also puts forward the suggestions below that would guide teachers or help teachers reconsider their implications while providing oral feedback in their classroom interaction:

1. Students perceive elicitation, as an OCF type, quite positively. Thus, teachers should utilize this feedback type more in their classes.
2. Teacher should be careful about the terms while providing meta-linguistic feedback and try to choose simpler ones to make the feedback more comprehensible. Since clarification requests might be perceived as ambiguous when the erroneous utterance is long, teacher should make use of this type for giving feedback to short erroneous utterances.
3. Teachers should avoid using immediate feedback consecutively since it might discourage students from participating in the lesson.

4. It is very possible that students might perceive a recast as a simple repetition. For this reason, teachers should make a recast very clear while using it as feedback type.
5. In terms of the timing of oral feedback, teachers should make use of delayed feedback by listening to the students until they finish their sentences and then providing feedback.
6. Responding to this need for research, this study also recommends that examining learners' perceptions regarding OCF in various educational and cultural settings will contribute to the understanding of scholars and practitioners in the field.

### **6.3. Limitation of The Study**

There are some limitations associated with the survey. Firstly, the data is gathered from a small number of participants, and it is based on a limited number of classroom observations. For this reason, it might not be generalized in other contexts. Furthermore, the results obtained from the interviews only reveal what the teachers believe to be working in educational contexts, factual evidence such as assignments or students' thoughts were not investigated.

The observations only involved three lessons at two colleges and they had been carried out for an extended period this would enable observations of several lessons, and not just at two colleges only. Observations at different colleges would probably result in having more valid data. As a suggestion for further research, the study should also take the limitations that were discussed into account, be provided to students, and the importance to fulfill the students' individual needs. As future teachers, the researcher have learned that OCF has a major impact on students' language acquisition. The knowledge gained during this research study will unquestionably influence their future teaching strategies – being aware of the limitations that some forms of OCF provide will mean that the focus will be put on using a variation of OCF strategies. As the study confirms, the key to success in delivering OCF lies in adapting its use to best suit the individual student's needs, and future teaching will be influenced by a customised approach for the individual learner.

#### **6.4. Suggestions for Further Research**

In addition to the above-mentioned proposal, a suggestion for further research is to expand this study to a larger scale. Since this research study involves perceptions from a small sample – six teachers and observations from three classrooms, the results may have a certain bias. A study conducted over a longer period of time, such as one year, would have provided a more valid and reliable result concerning the effectiveness of OCF. This would have given the opportunity to both observe and teach a class to investigate which type of OCF is most beneficial to learners' uptake through the authors' own teaching. Conducting student interviews could also have revealed how students feel about OCF to support language learning. Do they learn from it? Do they feel offended when provided OCF? Exploring this area exceeded the scope of this particular research study.

#### **6.5. Summary of This Chapter**

The study focused on the role of oral corrective feedback (OCF) in language learning, demonstrating its significant importance in developing speaking skills and motivating students. Research findings revealed that Libyan teachers recognize the importance of using various OCF strategies, with the need to adapt them to students' needs, levels, and emotional abilities. Interviews and classroom observations emphasized the importance of communication between teacher and student in selecting the appropriate type of feedback, with an emphasis on providing corrections in a constructive and positive manner, accompanied by praise to motivate students. The study also demonstrated the need to use strategies such as elicitation and delayed correction to avoid student frustration, while avoiding excessive repetition of immediate correction. On the other hand, the study highlighted the limited sample size and small observations, which limit the generalizability of the findings. Future research suggests expanding the scope and duration of the study, as well as surveying students' opinions on feedback

## References

- Abdallaha, n. S. (2018). Speaking difficulties that face libyan efl university students: a case study of first year students at faculty of arts and science – al kufra. *Human and community studies journal*, 6, 1–15.
- Abid, F. (2022). Teachers' preferences for implicit oral corrective feedback.
- Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011). Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback in Teaching Iranian EFL Learners at Different Levels of Proficiency. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(5), 1025-1034.
- AlAzzawi, M. B. K., & AlBarwari, A. O. Z. (2017). The effects of recast strategy and teaching experience on learners' uptake.
- Alkhamash, R., & Gulnaz, F. (2019). Effective oral corrective feedback in EFL classrooms: A case study.
- Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(4), 543–574.
- Anne Malar Selvaraj, & Hazita Azman. (2020). The role of feedback in teaching and learning: A systematic review. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(12), 7129–7136.
- 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.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. ASCD.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the spoken language: An approach based on the analysis of conversational English*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). Longman.

- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Brown, D. H. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. Pearson Education.
- Bueno, A., Madrid, D., & McLaren, N. (2006). *TEFL in secondary education*. Editorial Universidad de Granada.
- Burt, M., & Kiparsky, C. (1974). Global and local linguistic interference in second language acquisition. In J. P. B. Allen & S. P. Corder (Eds.), *The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics* (Vol. 2, pp. 75-84). Oxford University Press.
- Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Research on noticeability of corrective feedback.
- Chaudron, C. (1986). Teachers' Priorities in Correcting Learners' Errors in French Immersion Classes. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to Learn* (pp. 64–84). Newbury House.
- Chen, X., & Liu, Q. (2021). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(1–4), 161–170.
- Demir, Y., & Özmen, K. S. (2017). Teachers' preferences for recasts in practice.
- Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206–257). Cambridge University Press.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*. Oxford University Press.
- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.
- Dweck, C. S. (2018). *Mindset: Changing the way you think to fulfil your potential*. Little, Brown Book Group.
- Edge, J. (1989). *Mistakes and correction*. Longman.
- Edith Hernández Méndez & María del Rosario Reyes Cruz (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 14(2), 63–75.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA Review*, 19, 18–41.

- Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3–18.
- Ellis, R. (2013). Corrective Feedback in Teacher Guides and SLA. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(2), 421–430.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner Uptake in Communicative ESL Lessons. *Language Learning*, 51(2), 281–318.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 339–368.
- Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analyzing Learner Language*. Oxford University Press.
- Folse, K. (2006). The Effect of Type of Written Feedback on ESL Student Writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 47–67.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1994). Research on interaction and modified input.
- Gurzynski-Weiss, L. (2010). Teacher Beliefs about Error Correction and Second Language Acquisition. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(1), 1–14.
- Ha, X. V., Nguyen, L. T. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback in Vietnamese High School EFL Classrooms. *Asian EFL Journal*, 28(1), 90–109.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman.
- Hargreaves, E., McCallum, B., & Gipps, C. (2000). Study on Primary School Teachers' Use of Feedback.
- Hernández Méndez, E., & Reyes Cruz, M. R. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 14(2), 63–75.
- Hill, J. (2006). Classroom Interaction and Error Correction.

- Jabbari, A. A., & Fazilatfar, A. M. (2012). The Role of Prompts and Recasts in the ESL Classroom. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(4), 113–122.
- Jafarigohar, M., & Gharbavi, A. (2014). Comparison of Recasts and Prompts Effectiveness.
- Jafarigohar, M., & Kheiri, M. (2015). Teacher Education and Corrective Feedback.
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Longman.
- Jodaie, E., Farrokhi, F., & Zoghi, M. (2011). EFL Teachers' Preferences for Error Correction Techniques. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(3), 234–241.
- Johansson, S. (1978). *Language Variation and Linguistic Theory*. Basil Blackwell.
- Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S., & Sepehrinia, S. (2015). Influence of Proficiency on Feedback Choice.
- Karimi, L., & Esfandiari, M. (2016). Effect of Recasts on EFL Learners' Stress Patterns.
- Kaya, E., & Yelmiz, D. (2019). The Relationship Between Feedback and Students' Motivation. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 14(1), 99–110.
- Kennedy, M. (2010). Teachers' Preferences for Recasts Over Prompts.
- Kleij, F., et al. (2011). Research on Feedback and Academic Success.
- Kubota, R. (1991). Classroom Language Learning: Focus on Grammar. *Language Teaching*, 24(2), 82–95.
- Lee, I. (2008). Attitudes Towards Exams and Feedback.
- Lee, I. (2010). Writing Teacher Education and Teacher Learning: Testimonies of Four EFL Teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(3), 143–157.
- Lee, I. (2013). Teachers' Use of Recasts.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How Languages are Learned* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages are Learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

- Lyster, R. (1998). Differential Effects of Prompts and Recasts In Form-Focused Instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(3), 399-432.
- 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.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in Second Language Classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1–40.
- Lyster, R., & Sato, M. (2010). Oral Feedback in Classroom SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265–302.
- Méndez, G., & Cruz, M. (2012). EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Corrective Feedback. *TESOL Journal*, 3(1), 54–75.
- Mohd Noor, M., Aman, I., Mustafa, R., & Teo, A. C. (2010). Teacher's Verbal Feedback on Students' Responses: A Malaysian ESL Classroom Discourse Analysis. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 7, 398–405.
- Nassaji, H. (2015). *Qualitative and Descriptive Analysis of Errors in Second Language Acquisition*. Routledge.
- Nassaji, H. (2018). Error Correction in L2 Learning: Recent Theory, Research, and Practice. In M. Sato & S. G. Loewen (Eds.), *Evidence-Based Second Language Pedagogy* (pp. 117–133). Routledge.
- Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2017). *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning: Research, Theory, Applications, Implications*. Routledge.
- Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2001). *Recasts in Content-Based Communicative Classrooms*.
- Norrish, J. (1983). *Language Learners and Their Errors*. Macmillan.
- Özmen, K., & Aydin, S. (2015). *Task Types and Feedback*.
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, E., & Öztürk, G. (2016). Oral Corrective Feedback in Turkish EFL Classrooms: Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(2), 22–38.

- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573–595.
- Park, M. (2010). Teacher Feedback and Student Uptake in L2 Speaking Classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(3), 343–364.
- Peker, M. (1992). Feedback and Academic Achievement.
- Philipsen, H., & Vernooij-Dassen, M. (2007). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology*.
- Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. (2013). Comparison of Prompts and Recasts.
- Rao, S. P. (2018). Developing Speaking Skills in ESL or EFL Settings. *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 1–8.
- Reem Alkhamash & Fahmeeda Gulnaz (2019). Effective OCF techniques for learner types and errors.
- Rezaei, S., & Derakhshan, A. (2011). Investigating the Effects of Oral Recast and Metalinguistic Feedback on the Grammar Development of EFL Learners. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 1, 135–152.
- Richards, J. C. (1980). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Longman.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Roothoof, H. (2014). Teachers' Use of Recasts.
- Russell, J. (2009). Corrective Feedback, Over a Decade of Research Since Lyster and Ranta (1997): Where Do We Stand Today? *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 6(1), 21–31.
- Safari, P. (2013). Effects of Different Types of Oral Corrective Feedback on Learners' Oral Accuracy. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 1064–1070.
- Sandelowski, M. (2004). Using Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(8), 894–923.
- Selvaraj, A. M., & Azman, H. (2020). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in ESL Classrooms. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 16(3), 234–245.

- Shamiri, A., & Farvardin, M. (2016). Classification of Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies in EFL Classes. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(5), 1065–1073.
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on Form in the Foreign Language Classroom: Teachers' and Students' Preferences. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 307-318.
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback: USA, Taiwan, and Germany. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 244–258.
- Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective Feedback, Individual Differences and Second Language Learning*. Springer.
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Reformulations and Prompts in Corrective Feedback.
- Shanshan, L. (2012). *Corrective Feedback in Chinese EFL Classrooms*.
- Shamiri, A., & Farvardin, M. T. (2016). A Study of Iranian EFL Teachers' Use of Oral Corrective Feedback and Learners' Attitudes. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 8(2), 101–126.
- Swain, M. (1985, 2005). Output Hypothesis.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Noticing and Output in SLA.
- Tarone, E., & Liu, H. (1995). Research on Output and Feedback.
- Thiri Soe (2022). Types and Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback.
- Tomczyk, E. (2013). Role of Teachers' Feedback in Preventing Repeated Errors.
- Tornberg, U. (2005). Recasting as Feedback Method.
- Truscott, J. (1999). The Case for “The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes”: A Response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 111–122.
- Uysal, H. H., & Aydin, S. (2017). Teachers' and Students' Beliefs About Oral Corrective Feedback. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10(4), 49–64.
- Van den Branden, K. (1997). Output and Feedback Research.
- Walid Amri (2016). Positive Impact of Recast Feedback on Motivation.

- Waring, H. Z., & Wong, J. (2009). Displaying Stance in Classroom Discourse: Student Initiation in an ESL Class. *Language and Education*, 23(1), 1–17.
- Wannemacker, N., Van de Gucht, B., & Verschaeren, L. (2011). Types of Oral Corrective Feedback..
- Yostia, S. (Year not specified). Feedback and Error Checking in Language Learning.
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' Choice and Learners' Preference of Corrective Feedback Types. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 78–93.
- Yoshida, R. (2010). How Do Teachers and Learners View Corrective Feedback in Language Classrooms? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 293–314.
- Zhang, L. J., & Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL Learners' Anxiety Level and Their Beliefs About Corrective Feedback in Oral Communication. *System*, 42, 429–439.

## *Appendix A : Corrective feedback types*

CF types	Definitions	Example
Recast	Repetition of the error in a corrected form, or translation in response to a student's use of the L1	St: She have long hair. TC: She has long hair.
Repetition	Repetition of the error, generally with adjusted intonation to highlight the error	ST: Tom likes spaghetti. She has it every week. TC: SHE has it every week.
Clarification request	Phrases indicating that the students' utterance has not been clear or that contains some kind of errors and that repetition or a reformulation is required.	ST: What will you have picnic this weekend? TC: What do you want to say?
Explicit correction	Explicit provision of the correct form and clearly indication of the incorrect form.	ST: The best month to visit Korea is on March TR: in March not on March.
.Elicitation	Direct Elicitation of the correct form from the student by pushing to allow students to complete the teachers attendance, by asking students to reformulate the utterance.	St: I do not like History /histeri/ Tr: How do we pronounce the last word? Say it again.
Metalinguistic feedback	Comments, questions, or information related to the students ' utterance, without providing the correct form.	St: I go to the beach yesterday. Tr: It happened yesterday, so you need to use the past tense.

## *Appendix B*

### **Interview Questions:**

#### Background of Participants:

1. How old are you?
2. What's your education?
3. For how long have you been teaching?
4. What grades do you teach?

#### What do Teachers Know About OCF?

5. What's your understanding of OCF?
6. Have you been explicitly instructed in how to provide OCF as part of your education?

#### What types do Teachers enlist for implementing OCF in the Classroom, Why and When Do They Implement Them, and How has their Approaches changed over Time?

7. According to you, what is the most important thing to focus on when providing students with OCF?
8. Do you sometimes choose not to correct students ' errors? If so, why and in what context do you not correct students ' errors?
9. When do you provide students with OCF?
10. Do you provide all students with the same type of OCF, and with the same frequency?
11. What types of errors do you tend to target? Example pronunciation vs grammar

#### How do Teachers perceive their Students ' Reaction and Responses to the OCF provided?

12. What is your impression of student reactions to the OCF they perceived? How do you think that they interpret the feedback?
13. According to you, what kind of OCF do you think is the most effective on students ' language development?
14. Do you think that there might be situations in which students can feel uncomfortable or offended when you provide them with OCF? If so, why and can it be avoided?
15. What do you think students ' general attitude is towards receiving feedback positive or negative?

***Appendix C:***

*Observation checklist:*

1. Are Teachers Use the Types of OCF?
2. Are the Teachers Using more than One Type of OCF?
3. What's the Most Type that used by the teachers in the classroom?
4. When the Teacher Use the OCF Types?
5. Are the OCF Types effective on students' performance?