Pre-service EFL Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback on Students' Foreign Language Production

Nur Fadillah Nurchalis *(Corresponding Author)*
nurfadillahnurchalis@stainmajene.ac.id
Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Majene, Indonesia
Nur Zamzam
nurzamzam-10256119052@stainmajene.ac.id
Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Majene, Indonesia
Ali H
iamalihamza1406@gmail.com
Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Majene, Indonesia
Muhammad Aswad
aswad@unsulbar.ac.id
Universitas Sulawesi Barat, Indonesia

Abstract: In the context of classroom communication, offering Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) carries several advantages for enhancing students' proficiency in speaking a foreign language. It is crucial for pre-service teachers to possess the necessary skills to deliver constructive OCF to students. This research aimed to investigate the kinds of OCF provided by Pre-service EFL teachers. Two pre-service EFL teachers participated in this research. To gain data, the researchers employed recording and observation sheets to capture and document OCF within classroom settings. The data were analyzed by using descriptive analysis. The data were tabulated first. Then, each type was completed with an example of how they delivered it. After that, it was counted which type of OCF was mostly used by pre-service teachers. This research found that when providing oral comments, the two pre-service EFL teachers under observation had distinct preferences. While the other is still restricted, the first is very diversified. Nonetheless, elicitation is the OCF type that both of them employ the most frequently. This study provides benefits for different groups, the lecturer who handles teaching practicum subjects, students as foreign language learners, and pre-service EFL teachers themselves.

Keywords: Corrective feedback; EFL; oral; OCF; pre-service teacher

A. INTRODUCTION

Making errors in the process of language learning is unavoidable (Herra & Kulińska, 2018). It happens since the students have lack of knowledge about their errors (Ilani, 2016). They do not realize that they made errors when producing a foreign language. It even occurred for many times. This reality indicates that there is a gap between students' knowledge and learning objectives. If disregarded, this could lead to a potentially fatal impact. Students might become confused and unable to detect what is right and what is wrong.

As a consequence, the students need feedback to correct their errors. Feedback gives a great contribution to students' language learning and achievement. It also assists both the teacher and the students in meeting the learning objectives (Petchprasert, 2012). By having feedback, students can recognize which parts they need to correct and make efforts so that they can produce the correct language and reach the learning goals. Thus, students may become more confident in using foreign languages.

One type of feedback that is very beneficial for students' language development is Corrective Feedback (henceforth: CF). CF aims to eliminate students' errors when producing the target language (Sa'adah et al., 2018). The fewer errors students make, the better the quality of their foreign language production. Due to its importance, students from different levels argued that errors made by the students should be treated (Fadilah et al., 2017). They claim that CF is an effective tool to produce better language learning performance (Barzani et al., 2022).

CF are able to affect students' language development positively. Rummel & Bitchener (2015) in their research found that students had better performance in language accuracy after their tasks containing the simple past were corrected in written form by the teacher. Dabboub (2019) in her dissertation found that CF gives benefits for students' development in both grammatical and non-grammatical accuracy. This indicates that the foreign language teacher must have good skills in providing feedback when students make errors in their foreign language production so that it grants excellent language production.

Considering the two research above, it shows that students expect that when they make errors, the teacher as a learning facilitator is able to play a role in providing feedback in the form of corrections so that students do not keep repeating the same errors.

The majority of students also stated that they were more likely to choose the corrections made by the teacher over the corrections made by their friends as well as self-correction (Barzani et al., 2022). This shows that they really need corrective feedback from the teacher to improve their ability to use foreign languages.

As teacher candidates who will be directly dealing with students in the classroom, pre-service teachers must also have the ability to provide good corrective feedback to students in their teaching practices, so that when they will be in real classes later, they can contribute to minimize or eliminate students' errors. Pre-service teachers should experience how to be a teacher in a simulation class (Mufidah, 2019), therefore pre-service teachers have to have at least basic teaching skills, such as providing feedback to students because they are being prepared to become effective and qualified English teachers in the future.

There have been a number of research which discussed CF provided by pre-service teachers. Sasan & Rezaei (2010) revealed that pre-service teachers still had limited skills related to CF techniques. They needed more training so they would not make mistakes in teaching practice that could affect their future careers. Nurrina et al (2018) revealed that pre-service teachers employed different types of CF in both microteaching and teaching practice classes. Espinoza et al (2018) found that pre-service English teachers in Chile comprehensively corrected students' writing errors, using direct to indirect feedback strategies and providing correct forms in the essay to help students identify areas for improvement. Xie & Yuan's (2020) study found that over half of pre-service English teachers in Hong Kong experienced moderate to high writing anxiety, particularly in cognitive dimensions. These teachers preferred comprehensive and direct feedback, influenced by factors such as teacher credibility, conception of English writing, confidence, motivation, and teaching practicum experiences. However, few studies discuss the types of CF used by pre-service teachers orally in the subject of English as a foreign language and the reasons why they consider employing the types of OCF. Therefore, this research investigates OCF provided by pre-service English teachers in EFL classrooms and why they prefer using those types of OCF.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This research applied descriptive qualitative design to analyze the phenomenon of teaching carried out by pre-service teachers in the classroom. It aimed at gaining comprehensive description about types of OCF provided by pre-service teachers and the reasons why they considered to employ those types of OCF.

The subject of this research were the pre-service teachers from English Education Study Program (TBI) of STAIN Majene who taught the 10th grade students in MAN 1 Majene. There were two pre-service teachers who participated in this research. Both of them are from TBI.1 and TBI.2. They are representatives from each class by considering their highest GPA in their classes. Both of them have completed TEFL related theory and practical courses. They were in the final stages of graduation.

The instruments used to gain data in this research were recording interviews. The recording was used to record OCF by pre-service English teachers in the classrooms. The researchers entered the pre-service teachers' teaching practice classes for two meetings each. The researcher placed the recording device while the pre-service teachers were teaching. Thus, there were a total of four teaching recordings of two pre-service teachers. Apart from that, the interview was used to gain information from pre-service teachers regarding why they preferred using those types of OCF.

The data from the recording were analyzed by using descriptive analysis. The data regarding types of OCF provided by pre-service teachers were transcribed and classified based on Panova and Lyster's theory (2002). They divided OCF into seven types, namely OCF consists of seven types, Translation, Metalinguistic Feedback, Explicit Correction, Recast, Clarification Request, Elicitation, and Repetition.. Each type was completed with the statement of students' errors and how pre-service teachers delivered OCF. After that, the researchers identified which type of OCF was used by each pre-service teacher and which type was mostly used. In addition, the data from the interview were analyzed by using Miles and Huberman concept in which the data were reduced, displayed, and drawn.

C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

After collecting data from recording, the researchers had found the following results:

Table 1. OCF Provided by Pre-service EFL Teachers

No	Types of OCF	Pre-Service Teacher 1	Pre-Service Teacher 2	
1		-	-	**S**: If I wake up early, I will not late to go to school. **T**: Are you for sure using '*will not late*'? **T**: how do we use '*will*' in nominal sentence? **S**: will be **T**: Say that sentence again! **S**: If I wake up early, I will not be late to go to school.
	Elicitation		-	**S**: She go to school. **T**: What tense is that sentence? **S**: Present tense **T**: Is the use of '*go*' correct? **S**: No **T**: So, what kind of verb is appropriate to correct that sentence? **S**: goes
			-	**S**: If I had an Apple, I will be very happy. **T**: What type of conditional sentence is this? **S**: Type II **T**: What is the main clause of formula in conditional sentence type II? **S**: Subject + would + verb 1 **T**: Was the main clause you made correct? **S**: No **T**: How it should be? **S**: I would be very happy.
	Total	**0**	**3**	

2	Translation			-	**S**: I wake up '*buru-buru'* in the morning. **T**: Owh, you wake up in a hurry in the morning? **S**: (stay silent) **T**: Does anyone wake up in a hurry too in the morning? **Ss**: Me, sir.
				-	**T:** How do you think? **S**: That's membingungkan, Sir. **T:** Are you sure it is confusing? **S**: Yeah **T**: *Ummm…* Is it confusing, guys? **S**: Yes, sir.
	Total	**0**			**2**
3		-	**S**: If I have time, I would go to the beach with you this weekend. **T**: If I had time, not '*have time*'.	-	**S**: I would be not late. **T**: You have to say '*I would not be late'*.
		-	**S**: Maling Kundang wons the competition. **T**: Won, not wons.	-	**S**: Its mean **T:** You should say '*It means'*.
	Explicit Correction	-	**S**: He was went to the concert. **T**: It has to be '*He went to the concert'*.	-	**S**: She is present in the class right now. (Pronounced: 'Pri.zənt) **T**: Not '*Pri*', but '*Prɛ'* **T:** ˈPrɛ.zənt
		-	**S:** If we were invited (Pronounced: *invitid*) **T**: The pronunciation is 'ɪnˈvaɪtɪd'	-	**S**: What would (Pronounced: *Would*) happen if Malin Kundang's mother forgave him? **T**: It must be pronounced '*Wud*'.
				-	**S**: In the future (Pronounced: *Future*) **T**: Not 'Future', but 'ˈfjuː.tʃər'
	Total	**4**			**5**
4	Recast	-	**S**: She must be happy (Pronounced: *Must*)	-	**S**: If I diligent, I will smart

		T: She must be happy (Pronounced: *Mʌst)*	**T**: If I am diligent, I will be smart
		- **S**: I would go (Pronounced: *Wuld*) **T**: I would go (Pronounced: *Wud*)	- **S**: If I breakfast this morning, I would not be hungry at the time **T**: If I had breakfast this morning, I would not be hungry at the time
	Total	**2**	**2**
5	Clarification Request	- **S**: If I was a lady **T**: Excuse me? - **S**: If my body is hot **T**: Hm…, pardon? Do you mean '*warm*'? - **S**: Anto would become architecture. **T**: I don't understand. Do you mean '*An architect*'?	-
	Total	**3**	**0**
6	Metalinguistic Feedback	- **S**: If you have cooked (Pronounced: *Kukid*) **T**: Do we pronounce the suffix *ED* in the word '*cooked*'?	- **S**: If I eat sour fruits, I would have my Gerd. **T**: Do we use verb 1 for the main clause in conditional sentence type 2?
	Total	**1**	**1**
7	Repetition	- **S**: If you come, we will have party in night. **T**: in night? - **S**: Most of the students would pass the exam (Pronounced: *Stʌdent*) **T**: *Stʌdent?*	- **S**: Grandmother (Pronounced '*Grinmoder*') **T**: '*Grinmoder*'?
	Total	**2**	**1**
	Total	**12**	**14**

The table illustrates specific types of OCF utilized by pre-service teachers in their English classes. It is noticeable that among seven types of OCF there were only four types which were used similarly by both pre-service English teachers. They were explicit correction, recast, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition. In contrast, the other types of OCF such as elicitation, translation, and clarification request were only used by one of

them. Both pre-service English teachers did not use all types of OCF during their teaching in the classrooms. They had different preferences in giving OCF to students' errors.

Both pre-service EFL teachers mostly used explicit correction in giving feedback to students' errors. It is followed by recast, repetition and metalinguistic feedback. For explicit correction, the first English pre-service teacher employed it more often than the second one. In comparison to repetition, the second pre-service English teacher used it more often. For recast and metalinguistic feedback, the frequency of their use by both pre-service English teachers was the same. For certain types of OCF like elicitation, translation, and clarification request, some of them were used by the first pre-service English teachers, and some others were not. The first pre-service English teachers considered using clarification requests to correct students' errors, while the second one did not. On top of that, the second pre-service English teacher chose to utilize elicitation and translation, while the first did not. In a nutshell, the number of OCF given by the second pre-service English teacher was higher than the first one. Furthermore, the types used by the second one were more varied than the first one.

Based on the interview results with two pre-service teachers, the researcher found that there were several reasons related to their tendency to use those types of OCF. The first pre-service teacher most often used this type of OCF to correct students' pronunciation and grammatical errors.

> "*Students can immediately know which part of the errors they made in pronunciation and grammar and what the correct forms are.*"

According to her, by giving explicit corrections, students can directly identify what errors they made and what the correct forms look like.

For the second pre-service teacher, this type of OCF is also the most often used by him.

> "*Considering the limited time to teach English in class, explicit correction is more suitable to use. Students can immediately identify their mistakes. In addition, the corrections are also listened by all students in the classroom, not only to specific student who made the mistakes. In this way, it is expected that other students will not make the same mistakes that have been corrected.*"

He claimed that by explicitly correcting students' mistakes, he could save time and effort during the teaching and learning process. Additionally, by directly pointing out students' mistakes, all students can pay attention to good and correct sentence forms. Thus, there is no repetition of the same error from other students. This indicates that he considered time efficiency in learning, so he chose to use this type of OCF.

Discussion

The data from recordings in the classrooms showed that the pre-service English teachers frequently corrected grammatical and phonological errors made by the students. They exerted a significant influence in selecting the type of oral corrective feedback to use when addressing student errors or mistakes. In providing corrections, their approaches were quite varied, thus not monotonous, although there was still one type that they used most dominantly. Below are the orders of OCF utilized by English pre-service teachers, categorized by their frequency of use::

To begin with, explicit correction. Among those types of OCF, explicit correction was the most frequently employed by both pre-service English teachers. This type is quite popular among teachers. Teachers in Taif university also used this as the highest priority when addressing OFC to students (Alkhammash & Gulnaz, 2019). One of the main reasons for its popularity is that it saves the teachers' time and energy. As a consequence, the teacher does not need to spend additional time focusing on the students' errors constantly (Tersta & Gunawan, 2018).

Explicit correction points out a way in which teachers directly identify students' errors or mistakes and show them how to format their responses correctly (Ran & Danli, 2016). When providing it, pre-services teacher did not give any clue as stimulus. They immediately mentioned the errors or mistakes then gave the correct answer. Rahmi (2017) stated that giving feedback is done by but giving the correct answer, not a clue. By providing explicit correction, students may learn from their mistakes/ errors and understand how to improve without any further guessing or misunderstanding.

According to Sheen & Ellis (2011), explicit feedback consists of two strategies, namely explicit correction only and explicit correction with metalinguistics explanation. Explicit is giving direct correction by giving the correct answer without giving more explanation. Meanwhile, explicit correction with a metalinguistics explanation is giving direct correction but adding a clearer explanation to the answer. In this research, both pre-service English teachers utilized more the explicit correction only without metalinguistic explanation. The delivered it in a simpler way.

For both pre-service teachers, explicit correction assist students to realize that their mistakes and know the correct forms after having feedback. Smith (2010) in his research found that explicit correction plays an important role for students who have insufficient

foreign language knowledge and skills. In addition, Muwaffaqoh & Wahyuni (2023) also found that this OCF was often used by teachers because it is the easiest way to correct mistakes made by students and fix them. This shows that the tendency to use it is based on its ease of use.

Explicit correction is considered efficient to help correct student errors. Van Ha et al., (2021) explained in their research that students and teachers have a positive perception of using explicit correction because this can increase students' awareness of correcting their mistakes naturally. Siagian & Pinem (2021) in their research also found that students like this OFC because it helps find out the mistakes and the correct answers.

In addition, one of the pre-service teachers argued that one of advantages of employing explicit correction is time or saving. Tersta and Gunawan (2018) suggested that the instructor further contended that by providing clear correction, teachers may save time and energy by not having to spend additional time focusing solely on the repeated mistakes made by their students. This is especially useful for errors or mistakes that are repetitive in nature and made by many students.

Even though some research emphasizes its benefits, there are also other research found that it has drawbacks. Aydin (2015) revealed that some teachers avoid using OCF because it has the potential to make students, especially young learners, feel embarrassed when directly corrected. It is in line with what Sepehrinia et al., (2020) found. According to their research, one teacher reported that explicit corrections tend to be avoided for novice learners because this can damage student confidence. It means that, the use of explicit correction should consider its frequency and timing so that it does not make students suffer.

Next, recast. Each pre-service English teacher had used recast twice in their classes. One used it for pronunciation correction, while another employed it for grammatical correction. Recast is a type of feedback which is used by correcting students' errors/ mistakes directly without starting an introductory sentence. The pre-service teachers repeat the errors with corrected speech/ form (Ellis, 2009). Recast is a reformulation of students' utterances with the correct changes (Sahyoni, 2018). Changes made can be in the form of pronunciation, grammatical, and vocabulary corrections (Buchari, 2022).

When it comes to enhancing students' pronunciation skills, explicit corrective feedback seems to be more advantageous than recast feedback (Jalal & Alahmed, 2022).

This is because students are unable to identify recasts' corrective focus (Panova & Lyster, 2002). It means that for pronunciation, it is better for the pre-service teachers not only just directly give the correct utterances but also emphasize what is wrong as in explicit correction.

After that, elicitation. Elicitation feedback is feedback that allows students to do self-correction toward the given answers. The pre-service teacher encourages students to pay attention to the knowledge that is raised instead of students immediately giving the correct answer (Pratama & Scarlatos, 2020). In addition, the feedback can also be done by asking questions to students (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). By doing this, students will be encouraged to correct the answers given with the correct answers.

Elicitation allows the teacher to encourage students to give information rather than simply providing it to them. It was considered to improve students' speaking ability since it built interaction between students and teachers (Nova, 2019). The use this technique may be a little bit more challenging for both parties. However, to improve students' oral English skills it will be more effective to provide it since it helps students increase their participation and interaction in classroom.

Then, Clarification request. This type of feedback has several expressions used in giving corrections, such as sorry, what do you mean, and how do you say (Rahmi, 2017). This feedback is used where the pre-service teacher does not understand what the student is saying, whether the pronunciation is wrong or the meaning to be conveyed is not clear. It does not mean to blame students. It is supported by Maizola (2016) who states that this clarification feedback is used when the pre-service teacher does not understand what the students are saying or some parts required to be repeated or reformulated. Therefore, the pre-service teacher asks questions to clarify what was said.

For teachers, the use of clarification request aims to determine whether the students were confident in their constructed sentences or utterances. Their facial expressions sometimes offered a hint if the students construct incorrect sentences or mispronunciation (Sa'adah et al., 2018b). Clarification is a sign from the teacher that there is something that needs to be clarified from what students convey.

According to students in a survey, by Nurharjanto (2023) the explanation request appears to help advanced learners when compared to novices. Beginner-level learners lack the information required to discover and correct the error if feedback is just in the

form of a clarification request. Advanced learners, on the other hand, find it simpler since they may depend on previous language experience or information they have to follow up on the mistake they made. Therefore, the use of clarification requests must consider students' background knowledge.

The next, repetition. Repetition feedback is the feedback that is used because of errors made by students when mentioning sentences or words. This correction is done by repeating the student's mistake using a different intonation for the wrong word so that the student can find out where the mistake was (Fu & Nassaji, 2016). Furthermore, according to Amalia et al. (2019) providing this correction can make students think more deeply. As a result, students will remember the correction of errors made.

According to research result conducted by Büyükbay & Dabaghi (2010), it was found that although explicit feedback was the most often employed kind of feedback by the teacher, repetition resulted in the greatest number of uptakes moves. When compared to other sources of feedback, repetition led to more accurate responses in the grammatical exam, demonstrating that it contributes more to acquisition. It means that repetition may be rarely used by the teachers, but empirically it has been proven to be effective in improving students' ability, particularly in grammar.

Then, metalinguistic feedback. This feedback occurs when a teacher asks a question, makes a comment, or offers information about the construction of a student's utterances without supplying the right form (Siska et al., 2018). Thus, students will think of the correct answer based on the information provided by the pre-service teacher. Metalinguistic feedback is beneficial for students. It has been proved by an empirical study by Amoli (2020) which found that it had a positive impact on the pronoun development of Iranian EFL students. It informs students about their mistakes, allowing them to think critically about sentence constructions.

The last, translation. When a learner makes an uninvited use of the L1, translation might be viewed as a feedback action (Panova & Lyster, 2002). Due to the comparable purpose of reformulating non-target learner utterances, Lyster & Ranta (1997) categorized translations as recasts since they discovered relatively few of these movements in their database. However, there is a distinction to be made between a recast (a reaction to an ill-formed speech in the L2) and a translation (a response to a well-formed utterance in the L1) (Panova & Lyster, 2002).

Anasthasia & Mardijono (2014) discovered that among seven types of OCF, no translation feedback from the teacher after witnessing four sessions of class interaction. In this study, the second pre-service teacher also did not provide translation feedback in two meetings. The only ones who did that were the first pre-service teachers. This shows that translation feedback is not really a preference for teachers or pre-service teachers.

D. CONCLUSION

In classroom interaction, oral corrective feedback brings a number of benefits for development of students' spoken foreign language. Pre-service teachers should have the skills to provide oral corrective feedback to students. The results of this research show that of the two pre-service teachers observed, both showed different preferences when giving oral feedback. One is quite varied, and the other is still limited. However, there is one type of OCF that is most often used by both of them, namely elicitation. This research, however, has several limitations. To begin with, the frequency of pre-service teaching was still limited in two meetings. The many more meetings, the more comprehensive the results. As a result, it could not be used to generalize other contexts. The second, this study did not ask students' perception based on the OCF employed by those pre-service teachers, so that we could not claim that what pre-service teacher preferred was good for students. Nevertheless, this study provides phenomenon of feedback given by pre-service teachers to foreign language learners. It brings advantages for some parties, such as the lecturer who handles teaching practicum subject, students as foreign language learner and pre-service teachers themselves. Future research can conduct comparative analysis to compare the effectiveness of different types of oral corrective feedback strategies used by pre-service teachers and their impact on student learning outcomes. This would provide valuable insights into which strategies are most effective in promoting language development.

REFERENCES

Alkhammash, R., & Gulnaz, F. (2019). Oral corrective feedback techniques: An investigation of the EFL teachers' beliefs and practices at Taif University. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, *10*(2), 40–54. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.4

Amalia, Z. D. H., Fauziati, E., & Marmanto, S. (2019). Male and female students' preferences on the oral corrective feedback in English as foreign language (EFL) speaking classroom. *Humaniora*, *10*(1), 25–33. https://doi.org/10.21512/humaniora.v10i1.5248

Amoli, F. A. (2020). The effect of oral metalinguistic corrective feedback on learners' knowledge of pronoun among Iranian EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *10*(6), 672–677. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1006.07

Anasthasia, R., & Mardijono, J. J. (2014). Oral corrective feedback and learners' uptake in the 5th grade of an elementary school in Surabaya. *Kata Kita: Journal of Language, Literature and Teaching*, *2*(3), 47–52. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.9744/katakita.2.3.47-52

Aydin, H. Ü. (2015). *Student Teachers'beliefs about Oral Corrective Feedback*.

Barzani, S. H. H., Aslam, M. Z., & Ali, H. F. (2022). Oral corrective feedback: Kurdish EFL students' preferences and attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Educational and Social Studies*, *2*(5), 96–110. https://doi.org/10.53103/cjess.v2i5.71

Buchari, K. (2022). Teacher's recast and corrective feedback in classroom interaction. *Journal of English Teaching and Linguistics*, *3*(2), 87–97. https://ejournal.unida-aceh.ac.id/index.php/jetli

Büyükbay, S., & Dabaghi, A. (2010). The effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *1*(3). https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.181-193

Dabboub, A. E. (2019). *The Effectiveness of Comprehensive Corrective Feedback-Direct and Indirect-on EFL learners' Language Accuracy, Structural Complexity and Lexical Diversity* (Issue April). Nottingham Trent University.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, *1*(1).

Espinoza, A. Q., Medina, S. K., & Lagos, P. S. (2018). How do Chilean pre-service teachers correct errors in writing? TT - Como os professores chilenos em formação corrigem os erros na escrita? *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, *18*(3), 561–579. https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-6398201812447

Fadilah, A. E., Anugerahwati, M., & Prayogo, J. A. (2017). Efl Students' Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Instruction. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, *5*(2), 76–87. https://doi.org/10.17977/um030v5i22017p076

Fu, T., & Nassaji, H. (2016). Corrective feedback, learner uptake, and feedback perception in a chinese as a foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *6*(1), 159–181. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.1.8

Herra, A., & Kulińska, A. (2018). The Role of Feedback in the Process of Learning English as a Foreign Language. *Forum Filologiczne Ateneum*, *1*(6), 127–143. https://doi.org/10.36575/2353-2912/1(6)2018.127

Ilani, R. (2016). Linguistic error analysis in learning a foreign language. *2nd International Conference on Behavorial Science and Social Studies*, *March*, 1–9. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311102984_Linguistic_errors_analysis_in_learning_a_foreign_language

Jalal, B. R., & Alahmed, K. I. (2022). The effect of using recast and explicit corrective feedback on improving English pronunciation of Iraqi intermediate school students. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, *6*(2), 1264–1272. http://journalppw.com

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(1), 37–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034

Maizola, S. (2016). Teachers' oral corrective feedback on students' dialogue performance at Senior High School PGRI 1 Padang. (Undergraduate Thesis, PGRI Sumarta Barat).

Mufidah, N. (2019). The development of pre-service teachers' teaching performance in the teaching practice program at English Department of State Islamic University of Antasari Banjarmasin. *Dinamika Ilmu*, *19*(1), 97–114. https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1469

Muwaffaqoh, S. A., & Wahyuni, S. (2023). Oral corrective feedback in the perception of Islamic junior high school English teachers and students. *Loquen: English Studies Journal*, *16*(1), 1–18.https://doi.org/10.32678/loquen.v16i1.7256

Nova, F. (2019). An analysis of elicitation technique used by the English teacher in teaching speaking skill. *Research in English and Education (READ)*, *4*(3), 129–137. Retrieved from: http://www.jim.unsyiah.ac.id/READ/article/view/14117

Nurharjanto, A. A. (2023). EFL students' preferences for classroom feedbacks. *Edulingua: Jurnal Linguistiks Terapan Dan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, *10*(1). https://ejournal.unisnu.ac.id/JE/article/view/4060/2202

Nurrina, Helmie, J., & Halimah. (2018). Pre-service teachers' corrective feedback in oral interaction: A comparison of microteaching and teaching practicum. *International Seminar on Education and Development of Asia*, 143–154. https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/psn12012010/article/view/3623

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *36*(4), 573. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588241

Petchprasert, A. (2012). Feedback in second language teaching and learning. *US-China Foreign Language*, *10*(4), 1112–1120.

Pratama, A.-H. Q. U. (2020). *A pre-service teacher's oral corrective feedback strategies in an efl vocational school: an observational study*. (Undergraduate Thesis, UII).

Rahmi, S. (2017). PES of corrective feedback used by four lecturers on students'speaking performance. *Inovish Journal*, *2*(2), 79–95. https://doi.org/10.35314/inovish.v2i2.235

Ran, Q., & Danli, L. (2016). Teachers' feedback on students' performance in a secondary EFL classroom. *Proceedings of CLaSIC*, 242–254. https://fass.nus.edu.sg/cls/wp-content/uploads/sites/32/2020/10/qin_ran.pdf

Rummel, S., & Bitchener, J. (2015). The effectiveness of written corrective feedback and the impact lao learners' beliefs have on uptake. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *38*(1), 64–82. https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.38.1.04rum

Sa'adah, L., Nurkamto, J., & Suparno. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: exploring the relationship between teacher's strategy and student's willingness to communicate. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *5*(2), 240–252. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v5i2.11532

Sahyoni, S. (2018). Corrective feedback and classroom interaction at SMA 1 Payakumbuh Sumatera Barat. *Ta'dib*, *21*(1), 9–20.https://doi.org/10.31958/jt.v21i1.1027

Sasan, B., & Rezaei, S. (2010). Pre-service teacher cognition on corrective feedback: A case study. *Journal of Technology and Education*, *4*(4), 321–327.

Sepehrinia, S., Fallah, N., & Torfi, S. (2020). English language teachers' oral corrective preferences and practices across proficiency groups. *Profile Issues in TeachersProfessional Development*, *22*(2), 163–177. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v22n2.82369

Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 593–610). Routledge.

Siagian, C. E. M., & Pinem, S. H. (2021). Persepsi mahasiswa terhadap umpan balik korektif dosen pada mata kuliah speaking. *Jurnal Darma Agung*, *29*(2), 287–297. https://doi.org/10.46930/ojsuda.v29i2.1087

Siska, W., Mukhaiyar, & Ratmanida. (2018). English Teachers' Strategies in Giving Oral Corrective Feedback on Students' Speaking Performance. *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on English Language and Teaching (ICOELT-6)*, 158–168.

Smith, H. (2010). *Correct me if I am wrong: Investigating the preferences in error correction among adult English language learners*. (Master Thesis, University of Central Florida) Retrieved from: https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/

Tersta, F. W., & Gunawan, W. (2018). *Explicit correction in scaffolding students: A Case of learning spoken English*. 153–159. https://doi.org/10.5220/0007163701530159

Van Ha, X., Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: A teaching and learning perspective. *Heliyon*, *7*(7). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550

Xie, Q., & Yuan, J. (2020). English writing anxiety and preservice teacher's written corrective feedback. *Language Education and Assessment*, *3*(2), 58–84. https://doi.org/10.29140/lea.v3n2.357