Students' Perception of Oral Corrective Feedback in Developing English Speaking Skills

Priti Paul
Adjunct Faculty, Institute of Modern Languages, University of Dhaka
Email: priti.tesol@gmail.com

Abdullah Al-Mamun
Lecturer, Institute of Education and Research, University of Dhaka
Email: mamun.ier@du.ac.bd

ABSTRACT

This study explores how oral corrective feedback strategies are used by the teachers for developing English language speaking skills, along with student viewpoints and expectations. Adopting a mixed-methods design, the study examines the role of oral corrective feedback in strengthening learning and improving the performance of the students, providing required scaffolding initiated by teachers and developing awareness among students. Data were collected from thirty-five students of a Junior Certificate Course in English language using a survey questionnaire. In addition, class observation was conducted with the aim of identifying the strategies used in the learners' improvement of English language speaking skills. The findings reveal that the common practices of oral corrective feedback by the teachers are positively perceived by the students. Explicit correction and elicitation were found to be two major strategies used in the class. Open-ended data from the survey indicate students' expectations and preferences regarding oral corrective feedback provided by the teachers which have implications for improving classroom practices.

Keywords: Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF); Junior Certificate Course (JCC); Student Perception; Feedback Strategies

INTRODUCTION

Effective feedback, an important component of the teaching process, has a significant role in students' skill development inside as well as outside the classroom. Therefore, the oral feedback strategies used by the teachers play a vital role in language learning. In our context, both globally

and locally, English has a deep presence everywhere because of its demand and use. Although English has co-existed with other academic subjects from the beginning of our schooling system in Bangladesh, our students lack competence in the English language. Even the students of the tertiary level face dilemmas in using English effectively as well. The students have several barriers like having difficulty in understanding the topic, feeling bored in the classroom, showing disinterest in the lesson and the technique of teaching (Alrabai, 2016). Though they encounter several barriers regarding the use of the English language, they can still be successful English Language learners if the teachers provide proper feedback with an eye on their unique needs, interests, aptitudes, and personalities (Brrokhart, 2017). However, it should be kept in mind that success is never easy for a language learner (Griffiths, 2008). Alqahtani and Al-Enzi (2011) note that meaning-focused approach is very useful in language teaching. In their study they found that oral feedback is one of the most powerful tools to help the learner to acquire knowledge and higher proficiency in English.

Corrective feedback is an important approach which plays a significant role in minimizing mistakes in language production (Méndez et al., 2010). Feedback is an integral part of the teaching process; appropriate feedback strategies will lead the students to use the approaches as instructors as well. This study explores the oral corrective feedback practices in the English classrooms and identifies the strategies mostly used by the instructors. It also analyzes suggestions from the students about how they want to get feedback.

Though English is introduced as a compulsory subject from the primary level in Bangladesh, most of the students do not achieve mastery over the English language at the end of their higher education (Rahman, 2005). Even after passing out secondary and higher secondary levels, students face dilemmas and problems to develop the skills of English language, particularly in speaking. Many teachers receive training from various institutions, but the training ideas are not always implemented in the classroom situation. Several studies on feedback practices suggest that teachers are not able to exercise proper feedback strategies to address learners' errors in written or spoken performance for various reasons such as heavy curriculum, class size, time constraints, and lack of knowledge regarding feedback strategies (Al-Faki and Siddiek, 2013; Basu, 2006). The approaches used by the teachers have an impact on the students' learning. Oral corrective feedback has a significant role in upgrading the level of mastery of oral skills among the students and creates a positive perception for learning as well. This paper examines the oral feedback strategies used by the teachers inside the classrooms and analyses learners' expectations and suggestions for improved pedagogic practices.

Student perception also plays a significant role in the utilization of the provided feedback in the classroom. They might have a positive or negative attitude towards the ways feedback is delivered, the strategies being used or even towards the teachers. Students are motivated when the teacher corrects them immediately and spontaneously, ignorance might bring about frustration. Fang and Xue-Mei (2007) stated that the students get upset due to the existing gap between the teacher and students while the whole feedback process takes place. An unhealthy and demotivating perception regarding the feedback will certainly not lead to successful enhancement of language learning and skill acquisition. Understanding the student's perception thereby bears much significance.

As the purpose of the study is to observe oral corrective feedback (OCF) strategies in use in the English language classroom to assess their role in successful acquisition of English language speaking skills, three questions were formulated for the purpose of the study. The questions are:

a)   In what manner do the students receive oral corrective feedback from their teachers in English Language classrooms?

b)   What strategies are commonly used by the teachers for learners' uptake in English speaking?

c)   How do the students expect to receive feedback in order to achieve their desired level of speaking proficiency?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Feedback commonly refers to spoken or written suggestions or recommendations to correct any mistakes or errors. According to Nilsson (2004), feedback is used to initiate more appropriate actions for the better learning progress of the learners. Ellis (1999) identified feedback as a tool used for the students to understand the language used in a teacher student learning environment. It is an integral part of the learning process inside the classroom and used as scaffolding whenever students make any mistake. There are several types of feedback used in classrooms, and oral corrective feedback has its own significance and popularity. OCF can be defined as the oral remarks provided by the teacher with the aim of indicating students' speaking errors and it aims to refine students' speaking skills (Hartono et al., 2022). OCF is provided when there is any occurrence of incorrect utterances by the students, and teachers provide constructive oral demonstrations to correct them. The key here is to encourage students by the comments and demonstrations and thus further engaging them in learning activities.

According to Lyster et al (2013), OCF provides the required scaffolding that is needed to make the acquisition of the target language error free in the class. There are several kinds of OCF strategies used in language classrooms. Lyster and Ranta (1997) have pointed out six different types of oral corrective feedback strategies by analyzing data from immersion schools. Yao (2000) added body language as another aspect and Sheen (2011) added explicit correction with meta-linguistic explanation.   This has accumulated eight different types of oral corrective feedback strategies, which have been discussed below:

i)   Explicit Correction: This method of oral corrective feedback refers to clearly indicating the error. The correct form is then provided by the teacher.

ii) Recast: In this feedback strategy, the teacher implicitly reformulates the student's error, or provides the correction, without directly indicating that the student's utterance was incorrect.

iii) Clarification request: By using phrases like 'Excuse me?' or 'I don't understand', the teacher indicates that the message has not been understood or that the student's utterance contained some kind of mistake and that a repetition or a reformulation is required.

iv) Metalinguistic clues: Without providing the correct form, the teacher poses questions or provides comments or information related to the formation of the student's utterance.

v) Elicitation: The teacher directly elicits the correct form from the student by asking questions (e.g., 'How do we say that in Arabic?'), by pausing to allow the student to complete the teacher's utterance (e.g., 'It's a..') or by asking the students to reformulate the

utterance (e.g., 'Say that again.'). Here the question differs from that defined as metalinguistic clues in that they require more than a yes/no response.

vi) Repetition: The teacher repeats the student's error and adjusts intonation to draw student's attention to it.

vii) Body language: The corrector uses either a facial expression or a body movement to indicate that what the student said is incorrect.

viii) Explicit correction with meta-linguistic explanation: The corrector provides the correct form and a meta-linguistic comment on the form.

Research studies have been conducted to identify the perceptions and understand different rubrics of feedback in different contexts across numerous institutions and classrooms. Öztürk and Öztürk (2016) surveyed the types and timings of OCF in EFL classrooms and analysed the opinion of the students. Recasts and clarification requests were perceived as less effective, whereas explicit correction, meta-linguistic cues, repetition, and elicitation were identified as output promoting strategies. Regarding timing of the feedback giving, students rejected the notion of having immediate feedback or post-delayed feedback, since they respectively make the students feel disturbed and students usually forget the circumstances under which they had produced the wrong utterance. Rather, they show alliance with the delayed feedback strategy, where the teacher lets the student finish his/her utterance and then provide the feedback.

Again, studies have explored the effectiveness of OCF through the lens of student perception in different contexts. Septiana et al. (2016) studied students' perceptions on teacher's oral feedback where they found that the students' attitudes remained positive regarding error correction by the teachers for oral language production. Calsiyao (2015) showed in a study on OCF in classroom oral errors that students are discouraged when teachers make corrections of every minor error, but they prefer corrections, even opportunities of self-corrections are appreciated. A study on Corrective Feedback in Oral Communication by Quinto (2020) showed that learners preferred three of the corrective feedback strategies in improving their oral communication skills, namely, recast, explicit correction and self-correction.

The researchers have explored the perception of teachers regarding feedback provided for English speaking errors in classroom contexts. Alqahtani and Al-Enzi (2011) observed teachers' perspectives regarding feedback to oral errors in EFL classrooms. It was identified that teachers use direct feedback due to being the canter of power relationship in the class, although this power relationship should be shared both by learners and teachers to ensure a better learning process. Also, a comparative study of native and non-native English-speaking teachers on OCF by Alhaysony (2016) shows that teachers maintained a positive stance towards OCF, but its effects and role in interlanguage development should be acknowledged by them. Repetition and implicit methods of OCF were frequently used, and the nonnative speakers provided more feedback than the native ones. Teachers also prefer to provide corrections themselves. Students' self-correction and peer correction were less favoured and less commonly used.

METHODOLOGY

This section describes the overall methodology for data collection and analysis. It describes how the researcher collected data and what methodology has been opted. For the study, a mixed-

methods design was followed for better interpretation and analysis of OCF in classroom contexts. This research design involves the narrative interpretation of the feedback strategies, along with statistical data from the student survey. To understand participants' perception, experience and behaviour, the researchers decided to collect qualitative data. On the other hand, the objective of having a wider perspective on teachers' practice of oral corrective feedback, the researchers collected quantitative data. A pilot study was conducted involving 8 students from an English Language Junior Certificate Course (JCC) run by a language institute of a public university using a survey questionnaire. The responses indicated that certain word choices required modification, and Bengali translation would be helpful for the students, since the level of proficiency largely varied. Based on the results of the piloting, the survey questionnaire was modified.

To conduct the survey, 35 students of JCC were selected. There were both male and female participants. To conduct the student survey, the researcher provided questionnaires to the students to identify the existing feedback practices. A classroom observation checklist was created through which the feedback provided in the classroom-context was collected. In total, two JCC classes were observed.

The setting of the data collection by questionnaires and classroom observation was very formal. By taking permission from the course teacher to allow the researchers to proceed and by making sure that the students were in no rush, the researchers made an approach with the questionnaires to gather the response from the students. They were surveyed in their free time and with their consent. Before giving the questionnaire, all of them were given clear instructions on how to fill it up and the researcher was present the whole time to assist for further queries. The researchers were attentive throughout the time and helped the respondents for any kind of queries. All the participants were very friendly and shared a positive attitude which helped the researcher to be carried out with authorized permission. The teachers gave their consent to the researchers to observe their class, and both the students and teachers showed an attitude of co-operation throughout the class.

The instruments used in this study were: student questionnaires and classroom observation checklist. Questionnaire is the easiest option to collect a large amount of data in a short time. Proper arrangement of questions also helps in effective data collection. Questions with scales were prioritized as they give the participants visualized options to choose. Classroom observation checklist was opted to analyse the actual scenario of the classrooms and find out the feedback strategies in use. The two classes observed had 35 students (22 and 13 respectively) and the duration of each class was approximately 2 hours. The classes were observed to understand the student-teacher interaction and context of the classrooms. And finally, after the classes were well observed, the students were surveyed using the questionnaire to find a detailed view of how the teachers motivate the learners or scaffold them.

FINDINGS

For preparing the detailed analysis of the data, quantitative techniques were adopted to report the results of the survey questionnaire and qualitative approach to analyse the observation checklists manually. Percentages are provided, along with tables to demonstrate the perception of students generating from the survey questionnaire for better understanding.

Findings from the survey questionnaire

There were twenty statements in the questionnaire that explicitly showed teachers' OCF practices in English language classrooms.

Table 1: Result of the student questionnaire (in percentages)

Statement	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Always
a. Teacher tries to correct the mistakes student make in the classroom.	-	-	13.6	27.3	59.1
b. Teacher uses explicit instructions to correct the mistakes of the students	-	4.5	4.5	36.4	54.5
c. Teacher uses phrases like 'oh, you mean…' (asking confirmation).	4.5		13.6	40.9	40.9
d. Teacher says, "I think you should say…" instead of correcting the students' mistake directly.		-			
e. Teacher repeats the incorrect sentence or word to help us point out the spot of error.	4.5	13.6	9.1	27.3	45.5
f. Teacher uses phrases like 'sorry?' or 'pardon me?' to make us realize that there is something that is incorrect.	13.6	9.1	27.3	31.8	18.2
g. Teacher uses fill in the blanks and asks to fill it with correct forms.	-	9.1	27.3	27.3	36.4
h. Teacher repeats the intonation of a mispronounced word to correct it.	4.5	-	31.8	22.7	40.9
i. Teacher asks questions like 'is it this, or that?' to make us say the right answer.	4.5	-	27.3	36.4	31.8
j. Teacher asks students to ensure if they have understood the feedback properly.	-	-	4.5	18.2	77.3

k. Teacher makes the student feel humiliated if he/she makes a mistake.	95.5	4.5	-	-	-
l. Teacher never assesses the learning after giving feedback.	68.2	4.5	18.2	-	9.1
m. Teacher never examines whether the learning has been permanent after providing feedback.	86.4	4.5	9.1	-	-
n. Students feel that their mistakes have been corrected properly.	-	4.5	13.6	27.3	54.5
o. Students feel that the teacher is threatening student personality while correcting the errors.	95.5	4.5	-	-	-
p. Students do not need to improvise themselves as the teacher feedback is sufficient.	-	4.5	22.7	31.8	40.9
q. Teacher is always friendly no matter student makes same mistake multiple times.	-	-	4.5	4.5	90.9
r. Teacher does not concentrate when students are speaking.	90.9	4.5	4.5	-	-
s. Teacher do not pay equal attention to every student's mistake and necessary feedback.	68.2	13.6	9.1	4.5	4.5
t. Teacher gets angry when student asks explanation of the given feedback.	95.5	4.5	-	-	-

From the collected data by the questionnaire above, we can clearly see the distinct responses of the students regarding different aspects of feedback in the classroom. 59.1% of students responded that the teacher *always* tried to correct their mistakes in the classroom. 54.5% of students agreed that teachers *always* used oral phrases and instructions to correct their mistakes. Teachers using phrases like 'oh, you mean…' or 'I think you should say…' received equal responses, that is 40.9% each on *frequently* and *always*. 45.5% respondents viewed that the teacher *always* repeated incorrect sentences or words to help point out the spot of error. 31.8% accepted the fact that teachers *frequently* used 'sorry' or 'pardon me' to make the students realize that there is something incorrect. Statement 'f' showed 36.4% response considering that teacher

always used fill in the gaps and asked to fill them in with correct forms. 40.9% of students marked that teacher always repeated the intonation of a mispronounced word to correct it. Again, the survey assured that 36.4% participants agreed that teachers *frequently* asked questions like 'is it this, or that?' to make students say the right answer. A substantial number of respondents, that is, 77.3% agreed that teachers *always* ensured their understanding of feedback. 95.5% learners were certain that the teacher *never* made the students feel humiliated when he/she had made a mistake. On the other hand, 68.2% students showed that teacher *never* assessed the learning after giving feedback and 86.4% students marked that teacher *never* examined if the learning has been permanent or not, although 54.5% students *always* felt that their mistakes had been rectified properly. 95.5% participants reported that the teacher *never* threatened the student's personality while correcting errors. Students responded to statement 'o' by presenting 40.9% opinion agreeing to *always* regarding they did not need to improvise themselves further as the feedback provided was sufficient. 90.9% students reported that teacher was *always* friendly no matter whether the student made same mistakes multiple times, and 90.9% marked *always* to 'teacher did not concentrate when students are speaking in the classes. 68.2% marked *never* for the statement that teacher did not pay equal attention to each student for necessary feedback. Finally, 95.5% of students said that the teacher *never* got angry when a student asked for an explanation of the given feedback.

The evaluation part of the questionnaire extracted the student's opinion about the present situation in the classroom regarding feedback, along with recommendations on how to make them more effective. 83% students responded that they are satisfied with the teachers' treatment of feedback regarding oral language production inside the classroom. They said that the teacher rectified mistakes sincerely and tried enough to make the student understand and correct the errors. The teacher also reportedly tried to understand the needs of the students to provide effective correction. Moreover, additional interesting speaking activities were used by the teachers to improve the students' erroneous utterances. However, 17% of students pointed out their dissatisfaction regarding the feedback. The prominent reasons were the teacher not giving enough time to each student and lack of interesting and engaging activity inside the class. But they also indicated that modifications and other feedback types which were used were sufficient. Students also revealed that they wished to be monitored more often by the teachers, by getting extra time during the class or by scheduling extra classes if possible.

Findings from the observation

The classroom observation focused on the use of OCF strategies listed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), Yao (2000), Sheen (2011). There was evidence of explicit correction, clarification requests, elicitation, and repetition, along with affirmative body language and verbal appreciation. From the observation checklist, it is evident that the most used feedback strategy is explicit correction, where the teacher provided the correct form after the student had made a mistake.

Table 2: Classroom Observation Checklist

Types of OCF	Occurrence	Examples

Explicit correction	13 times	Correcting pronunciation, giving correct verb forms while speaking
Recasts	5 times	Teacher implicitly proving student correction
Clarification requests	3 times	T asking why after something was done wrong by a student, student then corrects him/herself
Meta-linguistic cue	2 times	T provides information related to the errors the students have made
Elicitation	5 times	T trying to elicit answers by asking questions
Repetition	Once	T repeating the pronounced text so that the student realizes where the mistake is
Body language	Positive and appreciating	Appreciating comments, No humiliation, Equal attention to everyone along with proper explanation, Friendly and not bossy at all

For example, the teacher corrected the students' pronunciation when a student mispronounced the past form of hide- 'hid'. Teacher himself demonstrated and then the student repeated and pronounced it right.

Again, students pronounced '1990' as '1919s'. The teacher initiated the correction in the following manner-
    T1- Are you sure?
    S1- Yes, sir.
    T1- So you think you are correct right?
    S1- I guess so (confused).
    T1- You can think over it again.
    S1- Oh sir. I got it. 1990s it is.

Teacher also tried to elicit the correct answers from the students by provoking them saying the wrong answer and letting them say the right one. For instance-
    T2- As I was running home, I will meet a friend.
    S2- No sir, I met a friend.
    T2- Very Good.

Again, Teacher indicates that the utterance needs correction by asking questions and indicating implicitly.
    S3- Chittagong city is my favourite town.
    T3- Are you sure?

Teacher also gave explicit corrections to the student errors, which was the most frequently used strategy in the class.
    S4- Our commissioner made a plan to make the roads clean and dirty free.
    T4- Dirt- free.

Repetition was also used by the teacher to make the students aware that he/she is making erroneous oral production.

S5- We have two mega cities in Bangladesh.
T5- Mega city?
S5- Mega cities.

Several strategies of oral corrective feedback used by the teachers in English language classrooms have been identified in this study. These findings will show a path to the teachers by which they can provide feedback orally in order to correct the errors made by the students.

DISCUSSION

The findings show that OCF is evident in the context inside the classroom. According to Syakira and Sahril (2022), OCF can create a healthy learning environment. The findings show that explicit correction is used in the highest frequency, although other techniques are also in practice. This proves that the OCF strategies are being practiced in the JCC classrooms and the students are getting the opportunity to get benefits from them. The classroom observations have demonstrated that the explicit correction is the most used technique in the classroom, along with recasts and elicitation holding satisfying positions. In a study on OCF, Li (2010) has shown that the effect of implicit feedback is more sustainable than that of explicit feedback. Recasts have also been identified as an effective strategy of OCF by Rahman and Singh (2023).

Teacher attitudes have also been judged by viewing the student perception through the questionnaire, and the results have shown that the teachers of JCC have successfully carried out their role as the major source as correctors with positive attitude and friendliness. Studies like Roothooft and Breeze (2016) and Suryoputro and Amaliah (2016) also report that students consider OCF an effective help from their teachers. Most of the responses are on the positive sides of the line, showing that they ensure the understanding of the students; being friendly no matter how many times the students make a mistake. Assessing the learning, paying equal attention and concentration prove that the teachers are aware of the feedback strategies and thus have successfully managed to play the role of effective correctors. Han (2002), in his study, also report that having awareness of corrective feedback strategy, the teachers play an active role in improving learners' English.

Students' evaluation of OCF in this study indicates that the students were very satisfied with the circumstances and ways of OCF they receive in the class. Study like Kamiya (2016) also report similar findings. But the students have recommended some tasks and phenomena to be added to ensure better feedback and mitigate the existing limitations. Grammatical feedback, along with proper discussion and examples, needs to be ensured by the teachers while giving corrective feedback. Ellis et al. (2006) also advocated for grammatical feedback that provides metalinguistic explanations to the students. Besides, students demand more time while giving and receiving feedback, which shows the need for extra class or extra monitoring time. Just as Zheng and Borg (2014) suggest, this study also advocates for contextualized and more interesting contents. It means that the teachers need to facilitate some real-life speaking activities instead of the bookish ones to engage the learners properly.

CONCLUSION

Oral corrective feedback has become an important part of teaching strategies in language teaching and learning. It has been an effective component to facilitate learning in class and acts as an active scaffolding technique to achieve accuracy in oral skills. This study intended to investigate the oral corrective feedback in JCC classrooms and to evaluate how they are being generated and perceived for effective development of English Language speaking skills. The strategies of OCF mostly used in the English language classroom have been identified. Most of the students have reported that they are satisfied with the current scenario, although some recommendations have been suggested for innovation in providing feedback. Future research studies may consider observing a larger number of classes with a more substantial number of teachers for a longer period to have a more holistic view. We realize that findings derived from observing one or two classes just provide a very generic insight of classroom contexts, and the scenario may vary from class to class. Every classroom is different since every teacher function and performs differently. Evaluating the strategies based on a continuous observation process will yield better insights and will be useful in improving OCF practices.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Priti Paul is an adjunct faculty at the Institute of Modern Languages, University of Dhaka. She obtained her BA in ESOL and MA in TESOL degrees from the Institute of Modern Languages, University of Dhaka. Paul has also an MBA degree from the Institute of Business Administration, University of Dhaka. Her areas of interest are materials development, testing and evaluation, business communication, linguistic entrepreneurship etc.

Abdullah Al-Mamun is a Lecturer at the Institute of Education and Research, University of Dhaka. He is an MPhil Research Scholar at the Institute of Modern Languages, University of Dhaka. He is the Editorial Manager of *Teacher's World: Journal of Education and Research; TESOL Bangladesh Journal*. His research interests include critical pedagogy, politics of scholarship, teacher identity, postmodernist curriculum, green ELT, translanguaging, and raciolinguistics.

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

REFERENCES

Al-Faki, I. M. & Siddiek, A. G. (2013). The effect of timely interference of English language teachers on the improvement of learners' oral performance. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 2*(6), 222-235.

Alqahtani, A. A., & Al-Enzi, E. K. (2011). EFL teachers' feedback to oral errors in EFL classroom: Teachers' perspectives. *Arab World English Journal*, *2*(1), 214-232.

Alrabai, F. (2016). Factors underlying low achievement of Saudi EFL learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *6*(3), 21-37.

Basu, B. L. (2006). Providing feedback on EFL students' written assignments: Nature and implications. *Spectrum: Journal of the Department of English, 4*(1), 164-180.

Bell, E. & Bryman, A. (2007). The ethics of management research: An exploratory content analysis. *British Journal of Management, 18*(1), 63-77.

Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to give effective feedback to your students*. USA: ASCD.

Calsiyao, I. S. (2015). Corrective feedback in classroom oral errors among Kalinga-Apayao State College students. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, *3*(1), 394-400.

Cresswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods.* CA: SAGE.

Ellis, R. (1999). *Second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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.

Fang, X. & Xue-Mei, J. (2007). Error analysis and EFL classroom teaching. *US-China Education Review, 4*(9), 10-14.

Griffiths, C. (Ed.). (2008). *Lessons from good language learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Han, Z. H. (2002). Rethinking the role of corrective feedback in communicative language teaching. *RELC Journal*, *33*(1), 1-34.

Hartono, D., Basthomi, Y., Widiastuti, O., & Prastiyowati, S. (2022) The impact of teachers'oral corrective feedback to students' psychological domain: A study on EFL speech production. *Cogent Education, 9*(1).

Quinto, J. B. (2020). Corrective feedback in oral communication. *Journal of International Education*, *2*, 1-19.

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language learning*, *60*(2), 309-365.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, *46*(1), 1-40.

Kamiya, N. (2016). The relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *10*(3), 206-219.

Mendez, E., Argulles, L. & Castro, A. (2010). Oral corrective feedback: Some ways to goabout it. *FEL International, 33*(1), 254-270.

Nilsson, E (2004). *Feedback. Varfor, Hur och till Vad?* Varnamo: Falt and Hassler.

Öztürk, E., & Öztürk, G. (2016). Types and timing of oral corrective feedback in

EFL classrooms: Voices from students. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *10*(2), 113-133.

Rahman, M. M., & Singh, M. K. M. (2023). The relationship between oral corrective feedback beliefs, practices, and influence of prior language learning experience of EFL Teachers: Multiple case studies. *Education Research International*, *2023*.

Rahman, S. (2005). Orientations and motivation in English language learning: A study of Bangladeshi students at undergraduate level. *Asian EFL Journal*, *7*(1), 29-55.

Roothooft, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, *25*(4), 318-335.

Septiana, Y., Daud, B., & Heriansyah, H. (2016). Students' Perceptions on Teacher's OralFeedback. *Research in English and Education Journal*, *1*(1), 18-25.

Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual difference and language learning.* New York: Springer.

Suryoputro, G., & Amaliah, A. (2016). EFL students' responses on oral corrective feedbacks and uptakes in speaking class. *International Journal of language and linguistics*, *3*(5), 73-80

Syakira, S., & Sahril, S. (2022). Learners' perceptions on the use of oral corrective feedback in one-to-one EFL classroom. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan   Sastra*, *6*(2), 286-306.

Williams, C. (2007). Research methods. *Journal of Business & Economics Research (JBER)*, *5*(3).

Yao, S. S. (2000). *Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: EFL college learners' attitudes toward error correction.* Buffalo: State University of New York Press.

Zheng, X., & Borg, S. (2014). Task-based learning and teaching in China: Secondary school teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language teaching research*, *18*(2), 205-221.