

Preferred Methods of Providing Correction to EFL Students: A Case Study of Saudi Universities

Mohammed AbdAlgane¹

¹ Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English & Translation, College of Science and Arts, Ar Rass, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4782-9644>

Correspondence: Mohammed AbdAlgane, Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English & Translation, College of Science and Arts, Ar Rass, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: Mo.mohammed@qu.edu.sa

Received: July 16, 2023

Accepted: August 17, 2023

Online Published: August 29, 2023

doi:10.5430/wjel.v13n8p1

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n8p1>

Abstract

The basic objective of English language instruction is to help students achieve language competency for communicative purposes while making as few errors as feasible. Corrective feedback (CF) is essential because of how well it improves students' English language skills. The connection between language learners' and teachers' views on the forms, methods, and timing of CF has not yet received the attention it deserves from educational researchers. By examining the perspectives of both teachers and students in higher education, this study seeks to better understand the effects of constructive criticism. Three hundred sixty university sophomores took part in the mixed-method study. The data from the surveys, the students' follow-up interviews, and the discussion with ten EFL instructors were analyzed to reach several findings. The findings demonstrated that both educators and students valued the use of remedial feedback delivered verbally to improve English language skills. Metalinguistic feedback, immediate feedback on grammatical and lexical mistakes, and explicit correction and recast were all highlighted by the author as effective treatments for phonological problems. Teachers thought that students were not negatively affected by timely correction, but they did see that students preferred delayed corrective input. From a pedagogically relevant stance, these results have consequences for language teachers and students alike.

Keywords: oral corrective feedback, attitudes, verbal critiques, immediate feedback, delayed corrective input

1. Introduction

Instructions for teaching and learning FL/L2 are often broken down into two categories: those that emphasize meaning and those that emphasize form. Either method of teaching language might lead to greater precision and fluency in the target language. Educators of FL/L2 find the question of how to raise students' accuracy to be fascinating, despite the fact that the communicative teaching technique has been proved to increase students' fluency in recent years. Offering teachers the opportunity to provide immediate responses to student errors with CF is a key strategy for resolving this sort of problem (Bao, 2019). More and more academics and teachers are interested in CF, whether it is verbal or written (Bao, 2019). Over the last two decades, several empirical studies have been conducted on the usefulness and roles of CF in language acquisition. Almost all studies show that CF is useful and important for teaching and learning a second language. However, there is still debate about which kind of CF is most effective since it is affected by a wide range of variables, including as differences in learner characteristics and the techniques and settings in which feedback is provided. Even if there is still debate, it is clear that when instructors and students have the same understanding of the goals of CF, it is delivered more effectively and has a positive impact on student results. In order to maximize the efficacy of CF, educators should work to foster the positive CF types of their students (Amalia et al., 2019). What this means is that the more the CF approach is tailored to the needs of the learners, the more likely the students will be able to develop and enhance their language skills. There is some evidence from the field of language education that instructors' and students' perspectives on CF may coincide. As a consequence, students' motivation and performance in the classroom are likely to suffer. It may be important to clarify the preferences of both students and teachers with relation to the provision of CF in order to ensure the efficacy of instructional activities.

Studies on the efficacy of CF are far more numerous than those on the views of instructors or students in the context of ESL/EFL instruction, which have received a great deal of attention over the last decade. Despite the abundance of research demonstrating CF's efficacy, this remains the case (Ha & Nguyen, 2021). Furthermore, there is a continued need for academics to demonstrate a greater interest in the connection between teacher and student perspectives on CF. Very little research has been conducted on the perspectives of university faculty and students on CF. Recent research on this topic has piqued the interest of educators, whether the investigations are aimed at secondary EFL settings (Syakira & Nur, 2022) or are limited to the viewpoints of college teachers in the Mekong Delta. This research intends to add to our understanding of CF by gauging the opinions of EFL learners and teachers about the most pressing speech errors, the most effective methods for correcting them, and the optimal length of time for CF to be implemented in a university or college setting. Preliminary results suggest that the study's conclusions will have far-reaching implications for the classroom and beyond. As a result, educators will be more likely to encourage their students to achieve their language learning goals (Amalia et al., 2019).

1.1 Research Questions

There are several research questions to be handled by this study:

1. What are the types of faults that should be addressed in English lessons?
2. How and when oral corrective feedback (OCF) should be introduced to English classes?
3. what are the categories of CF?
4. What feedback and error types should be corrected?

2. Corrective Feedback in the Literature: How Students and Instructors View It?

An important part of a language teacher's job is to provide CF to students who make mistakes in their speech. According to the research, CF "may comprise either (a) a signal that a mistake has been made, (b) delivering the right target language form, (c) the error's nature as judged by metalinguistic knowledge, or (d) any combination of these" (Tavakoli and Zarrinabadi, 2018). Clarification requests, explicit corrections, recasts, metalinguistic feedback, repeats, and elicitations are the six forms of CF outlined by (Nassaji, 2020). It is well acknowledged that students greatly benefit from CF, whether it is presented formally or informally. There were six types of OCF for linguistic errors investigated in the present research (Nassaji, 2020). Interest in OCF has grown significantly among researchers focusing on second language learning. The vast majority of research indicates that OCF is beneficial and essential while learning a second language. Delivered that the effectiveness of CF relies on elements such as the uniqueness of each learner and the environment in which the feedback is given, there is much dispute over the optimal way to apply it.

Many studies have looked at ESL/EFL education from the perspectives of either teachers or students. Majority of studies have shown that OCF is an effective method for both students and instructors to adopt while learning a new language (Hassan & Arslan, 2018). It's fascinating to see that OCF has a higher approval rating among students than among teachers (Margi & Vodopija-Krstanovi, 2018). However, there are still open questions concerning how different types of errors should be addressed, what forms of OCF are most desirable, and when they should be implemented, as these concerns vary widely across students and teachers. The major question about error categories is whether or not all grammatical, lexical, and phonological errors should be corrected or just those that significantly alter the meaning of what is being communicated (Gamlo, 2019; Zhu & Wang, 2019; Wang & Li, 2021). According to (Gamlo, 2019), first-year students value frequent grammatical corrections whereas second-year students value addressing phonological flaws. Accordingly, (Zhu and Wang's, 2019) compares the viewpoints of EFL students on the types of errors that need CF. Particularly, some students like CF from teachers for their improper grammatical usage, while others favor CF for their wrong pronunciation. Previous research by (Wang and Li, 2021) indicates that there is a disparity between teachers' and students' estimates of the amount of CF that is actually delivered. Despite teachers' doubts about the method's efficacy, students are eager to earn CF for each mistake they make.

The majority of studies' conclusions are in agreement on how mistakes should be addressed by educators and their students. Teachers are more likely to use implicit correction, whereas students prefer explicit feedback (Wang & Li, 2021). Among advanced American English as a Second Language (ESL) students, specific correction is regarded as the most effective kind of OCF, as reported by Wang and Li (2020). On the other hand, metalinguistic feedback is often looked down upon. Metalinguistic feedback was shown to be the most popular kind of CF among Singaporean ESL students; however, this finding contradicts the findings of a different research (Zhang et al., 2021). Margi and Vodopija-Krstanovi (2018), for example, point out how the views of teachers and students on open and collaborative learning (OCF) diverge significantly. Despite widespread approval from students, teachers are more likely to insist on emphasis on form instructions in the classroom by providing explicit CF. According to (Hassan and Arslan, 2018), there is tension between the views of teachers and students about the implementation of OCF. It was found that teachers were wary of using explicit OCF, preferring instead to rely on implicit OCF out of concern that doing so could humiliate their students, which in turn might have a detrimental impact on their ability to learn.

Contrarily, when given clear OCF, students respond positively. Explicit OCF in the form of corrections and metalinguistic feedback is well-liked by EFL students, as shown by studies such as (Patra et al., 2022) and (Van Ha et al., 2021). However, research by Zhu and Wang (2019) in the context of Chinese EFL higher education shows that students choose implicit over explicit methods of error correction. Contradictory results from these research point to a chasm between what students want and what instructors think about different kinds of CF. kids tend to respond better to explicit CF, but instructors are wary of implementing it for fear of student backlash. What teachers and learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) in Saudi tertiary contexts, such as universities, believe about CF kinds, however, remains to be seen. When it comes to correcting learners' oral mistakes, language teachers' OCF might be delivered either immediately or afterwards. According to (Alhamami, 2018), the vast majority of both students and teachers think that errors should be addressed as quickly as possible to avoid students from expressing themselves improperly. However, (Margi and Vodopija-Krstanovi, 2018) found that students desire to acquire feedback as soon as they make errors, despite teachers' reluctance to offer early OCF. Additional research conducted in a university setting (Amalia et al., 2019; Patra et al., 2022; Sánchez Centeno & Ponce, 2019) shows that students who prefer immediate to delayed feedback report that the former is more beneficial while the latter helps them forget their faults. However, according to (Babushko & Solovei, 2020) after EFL students have finished their speaking assignment or utterance, they prefer the delayed OCF, which does not seem to interrupt them as much or make them feel as bad about themselves (Nguyen and Nguyen, 2022). Since quick CF might possibly damage their students' sentiments, Gómez Argüelles et al. (2019) report that EFL teachers prefer delayed CF, i.e., towards

the conclusion of class. Although studies on OCF have been undertaken in a wide variety of settings, the vast majority of findings suggest that there is still a need for a link between language learners' and teachers' perspectives on CF types and timing. The research is limited in its scope since it takes place at a university. This study is being conducted to learn more about how college professors and students feel about OCF.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study combined quantitative and qualitative approaches by using a survey questionnaire the researcher designed and conducted interviews. The surveys were completed by the students by clicking on a Google form active link that was supplied to them through email. The participants were also invited to participate in follow-up interviews with Microsoft representatives a week later, either in-person or through a zoom meeting. A series of questions were directed at the lecturers in an effort to better understand their thoughts. Students and instructors interacted face-to-face throughout class to help bring some clarity to the topics at hand. IBM SPSS was used to do an analysis on the raw data before it was encoded for the therapy.

3.2 Participants

The research population included 360 people, evenly split between two groups of respondents drawn using stratified sampling. This sample included 360 students and 10 faculty members from a post-secondary institution ($p = 91\%$; $r = 7\%$).

There were ten first English teachers, six women and four men. Two of them were PhD, while eleven others had master's degrees, giving them impressive credentials. Six of the 10 teachers had been in the profession for more than ten years, four had between five and ten, and the other three had been teaching for anything from two to five years.

Three hundred sixty students responded to the follow-up survey. It's interesting to see the broad diversity of English frequency levels among the participants. There were 215 students in the B1 level and 135 in the B2 level. Only 130 male students (34.9%) responded, whereas 230 female students (65.1% of total) did. Twenty-three percent were freshmen, fifty-three percent were sophomores, and twenty-six percent were juniors among the participants. As can be seen from the data, the vast majority of respondents were of lower educational attainment.

3.3 Data Collection Instrument Survey Questionnaires

The questionnaire used in this study was developed by the researcher, however it is based on the one used by (Syakira and Nur, 2022). Students were given the questionnaire to fill out. Each of the 40 items for the youngsters comprised both fact-based and behavioral questions. The questionnaire results were examined by three experts in the field of educational assessment. The content of the survey questionnaire was approved after being pilot tested and confirmed with fifty students in order to determine their strengths and limitations. Cronbach's alpha was calculated, and the final result had values within the acceptable range (0.82 to 0.90), indicating that it is reliable.

There were now two separate questionnaires. In the initial step of the research process, demographic data was collected from the participants. Over the course of the second half of the exam, students were presented with 40 questions and asked to rate their level of agreement with statements made by the following statements: 1) extremely unfavorable, 2) unfavorable, 3) undecided, 4) favorable, and 5) extremely favorable on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. In the context of this study, the surveys query students on their thoughts on I the function of OCF (questions 1 through 7), (ii) the categories of OCF (questions 15 through 33), and (iii) the timing of OCF (Q34 – Q40).

3.4 Semi-structured Interviews

After collecting quantitative data from student surveys, the researcher performed follow-up interviews to get deeper insight. An identical set of interview questions was prepared for both the teachers and the random sample of students. The researcher asked instructors several open-ended questions to get their take on OCF, including whether or not it's necessary, what kinds of OCF they like to use, when they think OCF should be given, and what the benefits and drawbacks of OCF may be in certain situations. The interview's two sets of questions, each with their own focus, were developed and expanded after careful review of OCF's previous inquiries (Syakira & Nur, 2022; Hassan & Arslan, 2018).

3.4 Data Collection

After conducting a pilot study and revising the survey questionnaire, the researcher contacted the course instructors for several English courses offered by various universities to explain the aims of the study and secure permission to conduct the research with their students during the fall semester of the 2020-21 academic year. People that were able to participate in the survey did so as soon as the COVID-19 pandemic permitted, sending in their responses to a Google Doc through email. Once the email was sent, the respondents had one week to react. Following this, the researcher asked the students whether they would be willing to engage in an interview through Zoom meetings or Microsoft teams to discuss their perspectives on OCF. They left the door open for a follow-up interview in their replies to the survey questions.

One-on-one interviews with the teachers were conducted to learn about their thoughts on OCF and the sorts of problems that needed to be addressed in the English classes. To get further information, the researcher asked the respondents to comment on their previous statements. Then, six scenarios representing different types of errors were provided to the teachers as a means of delivering OCF. The teachers were

asked to comment on the advantages and disadvantages of four different OCF timing scenarios, including (1) immediately correcting a student for an error in speech; (2) after a student has finished speaking; (3) whenever a student has completed their speaking exercise; and (4) at the end of the lesson.

The average duration of an interview conducted in English was 11 minutes. As said before, the interviews took place through Zoom sessions as well as Microsoft teams. These discussions were all recorded on camera for analysis. Six out of ten English instructors granted permission for the study to videotape a class to observe teacher-student interactions in English. Teachers knew the researcher would be studying teacher-student interaction rather than focusing specifically on teachers' OCF before recordings of classes were taken, which helped them maintain their natural performance while delivering OCF.

3.5 Data Analysis

A strict data screening approach was used to get the desired results, with 360 students serving as the research population from a learning perspective. The encoded information might then be used for statistical purposes. IBM SPSS was utilized for descriptive statistical analysis of numerical data. Forty questions were answered using a combination of descriptive means and Likert scales ranging from (1.0-1.79) very low, (1.8-2.59) low, (2.6-3.39) neutral, (3.4-4.19) high, and (4.2-5.0) extremely high, covering topics such as the necessity of OCF, the types of errors that should be corrected, the available time for OCF, and the available OCF methods. Numbers were transformed into interview questions to address the information gathered for various topics and compare and contrast whether or not the views of teachers and students were similar. Evidence from semi-structured interviews backed up the researcher's interpretation and explanation of the student survey results, as well as the clarification of the instructors' perspectives on the supply of OCF. Please emphasize this point. Since this material was deemed qualitative, it could only be conveyed in the form of aphorisms or quotes. A convergent mixed-method strategy was used to display the data. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed independently. Research results from the two datasets were compared and evaluated for consistency.

4. Results

4.1 Opinions of Instructors and Students on OCF

After discussing the importance of OCF to their English studies, both students and teachers came to the conclusion that it was essential. Among the respondents, students were the most convinced that OCF was important (M=4.31; SD=.684), citing its positive effects on their own English-language development (M=4.18; SD=.726) and their ability to avoid repeating past errors (M=3.77; SD=.855). The vast majority of students (M=3.77; SD=.873) said that being corrected for OCF did not annoy them. However, several students (M=2.13; SD=.725) were confused by the instructor's presentation of OCF.

Analysis of data gathered from follow-up interviews revealed that all students considered OCF crucial to their success in learning English, since it enabled instructors to improve their students' language competence by guiding them to speak more accurately. Students also made it apparent they did not feel guilty and anticipated receiving OCF more often. Student 4 claims, "OCF has been really useful to me during my time spent learning English." If my teacher doesn't correct my errors, I'll keep making the same ones over and over again. In addition, I learn a lot whenever my teacher addresses the errors of my other students.

There was universal praise for OCF among the polled educators. All of the teachers said that OCF was crucial to the success of their EFL/ESL classes since it was one of the teachers' key duties. Others went so far as to say that they thought students' blunders were crucial to their development as language learners. Instructor A said, for instance, that learning is much like any other activity in that it entails making errors. There is universal agreement that teachers' OCF significantly impacts their students' ability to learn. Teachers are tasked for providing OCF so that students may self-assess their progress in English and make corrections as needed.

4.2 Types of Errors that Must Be Fixed

Both teachers and students had a same understanding of the types of faults that should be addressed in English lessons.

Table 1. The errors that students believe ought to be addressed

Items	kinds of errors to be addressed	N	Mean	SD
8.	My instructor will likely rectify any pronunciation errors I have.	360	4.26	.843
9.	My instructor will likely address my grammar mistakes.	360	3.86	1.61
10.	My instructor will likely fix any lexical mistakes I make.	360	4.07	.620
11.	My instructor would only make corrections pertinent to the covered subjects.	360	3.19	.799
12.	My instructor will likely rectify any flaws that affect the message's meaning.	360	4.36	.611
13.	I anticipate that my instructor will fix every error I make.	360	2.41	.572
14.	Not only should instructors address collective class errors but also individual errors.	360	4.25	.644

In regards of the first research question of what types of faults that should be addressed in English lessons, a large percentage of students, as seen in Table 1, agreed with points 8 through 11 and point 11. The vast majority of students (M=4.26; SD=.843) reported seeking assistance with pronunciation-related problems. This tendency drew attention to lexical and grammatical mistakes, with mean values of 4.07 and 3.26, respectively. According to the mean and standard deviation for item 11 (M=4.36; SD=.611), students preferred OCF when a mistake materially affected or changed the meaning of the message. Furthermore, they believed that teachers should handle both individual and group errors (M=4.25; SD=.644). Students' poor self-perception was on display when they claimed they expected their teachers to fix

every mistake ($M=2.41$; $SD=.572$).

Later interviews revealed the reasons why students believed that certain types of errors needed to be fixed. The majority of respondents acknowledged the significance of linguistic and utterance meaning in fostering development of fluency and accuracy in English. The opinions of Students 1 and 8 were identical:

I am quite certain in my grammatical and lexical abilities since, like many of my classmates, I was urged to prepare for grammar-focused examinations all through high school. It's true that my pronunciation may need some work. My teachers must help me improve my pronunciation.

I have a large vocabulary because of the vocabulary exercises I took in middle school and high school, but I still need assistance using terms in phrases. Simply put, I have serious difficulties with collocation. As a result, I decided to correct my grammatical errors in private rather than bother my teachers.

Though their reasoning may have differed, they all agreed that, due to time and student load constraints, teachers should only correct errors that contribute to student confusion or are fundamental to the lessons they are teaching.

There is a wide range of opinion among teachers about grammatical errors. Several interviews with teachers demonstrated that they shared the idea that OCF was crucial. However, highlighting serious faults or errors that undermine communicative objectives, CF should also be given to 50-70% of language learners' erroneous speech. In particular, lexical errors need closer inspection than pronunciation errors. For instance, learners need to practice in order to maintain correct pronunciation. It is generally up to the individual student to practice pronunciation on their own time outside of the classroom. The reasoning for this is because correcting incorrect pronunciation might eat up productive time. (Instructor B) If you correct every mistake, students may lose interest and performance in class suffers. Instructor C

Some such slip-ups occurred during English class as well. Teachers stressed the importance of context while deciding which incorrect statement to correct. When students make several mistakes during a session, teachers could decide to focus on a common classroom problem rather than addressing each individual's mistake. Therefore, it is imperative that every student get feedback and remediation.

4.3 Kinds of OCF

Students who took part in the survey were asked to provide their perspectives on OCF in light of the various types of errors that had been identified. As a whole, participants rated grammatical mistakes extremely highly ($M=4.11$; $SD=.619$), followed by recast and elicitation, which were rated identically ($M=3.97$; $SD=.06$). Strong agreement was also found when the inaccurate phrase was repeated with increasing intonation to enable students correct themselves, with a mean of 3.96. Students also demonstrated a clear preference for express correction ($M=3.74$; $SD=.799$) over requests for explanation ($M=3.18$; $SD=.721$). Follow-up interviews confirmed these hypotheses. Almost two-thirds of the respondents indicated they were able to recognize their own errors and correct them using a combination of elicitation, repetition, and metalinguistic feedback, suggesting that this method may be more effective than direct teacher correction. Confusing them more with questions of explanation was not to their liking. Students tend to get confused when asked to repeat themselves or anything else. Many students wondered whether their statements had been mispronounced or if their teachers were just asking them to repeat themselves.

From the standpoint of the teachers, nine out of ten teachers preferred the use of metalinguistic feedback and repetition when providing OCF for students' grammatical errors so that students may self-correct.

Rather than formally correcting students, I like to provide helpful tips or make comments that are relevant to the errors they have made. Using corrective measures allows students to learn from their errors and improve their performance without outside help. It is useful not just for students who make errors, but also for their peers. (Lecturer L)

When repeating the grammatical errors that students have made, I typically employ a rising tone to emphasize them. Students often require help improving their grammar. As a result, they were able to fix their errors on their own. In other contexts, they could count on help from their friends. (Major Q)

Some teachers have admitted that they should have been more thoughtful in how they disciplined students. Occasionally, they might reveal their OCF types by using OCF recast sorts. All of the English teachers surveyed cited recast as the most commonly utilized OCF they use when working with their students to improve the clarity, precision, and coherence of their writing. Since these OCF were rapid and let students see where they might improve, they were favored.

Since most of the secondary and high school students surveyed had been focusing on preparing for grammar-focused tests, they reported having significant difficulties with pronunciation. For phonological errors, students value explicit correction from teachers the highest ($M=4.24$; $SD=.812$), followed by recast ($M=4.14$; $SD=.726$). Despite occasional criticism of their speech errors, students awarded teachers high scores ($M=3.39$; $SD=.902$) for using metalinguistic signals.

How well I say things is something I need to work on. One of my goals is to improve my pronunciation so that I can emphasize words and phrases when necessary. When I make a phonological error, it is helpful if my teacher shows me how I am saying it wrong and then tells me how to say it right. ...(Member 14)

Pronunciation is tricky and requires practice. Contrast this with grammatical errors, which I am unable to correct. Explicitly addressing phonological errors is the best strategy. (Twelfth Grade)

Educators thought it was highly regarded when teachers were willing to tell students right away that they had a problem with their

pronunciation and then taught them how to fix it.

The most efficient strategy for correcting learners' phonological mistakes is direct instruction. Instructor J

as the dialogue unfolds, it can reformulate the erroneous section and provide students with the right form, making it a perfect tool for correcting phonological errors on the go. There is a time savings as a result of using this technique. However, this might lead to unnecessary confusion for students who are still learning the language and may not yet know the difference between the right form and another way of pronouncing the word. When dealing with phonological errors, however, I stressed the use of recasts and vocal correction. (Grade G Educator)

The average student judgment of lexical errors was a positive 3.69, with a range of 4.38. In addition to their previously high ratings, recasting and metalinguistic feedback maintained their positions as respondents' top two choices (M=4.38; SD=.628; M=4.18; SD=.726). Average (M): 4.00; Standard Deviation (SD): 0.95; Average (M): 3.87; Standard Deviation (SD): 0.649; Places of Elicitation and Repetition. Students in the same situation preferred being corrected explicitly (M=3.75; SD=.857) to being asked questions like "What did you say?/Or can you repeat it?"

The results of the subsequent interviews corroborated these ideas. The importance of words in conveying the meaning of a phrase was widely acknowledged by the students. When trying to use collocations in their written and spoken English, they ran into problems. The OCF of teachers was therefore vital, even if their choices and justifications varied.

For this reason, I often ask my teachers to help me clear up my lexical confusion by providing me with precise definitions of the terms I've misused. (Student 8) I'd like it if my teacher could give me some pointers by prompting me or providing some comments that would help me recognize and correct my mistakes. As a result, I'll be able to retain the information for a longer amount of time in my memory. (Teenager #15)

Defending the poor ratings given to the OCF's explanation request, Student 3 said that:

Whenever my classmates and I make a mistake in class, our teacher will always say, "Sorry, can you repeat?" or "Can you repeat it?" The majority of the time, we paraphrase without giving any thought to whether or not we are using the right grammar.

The teachers elaborated on it. Instructors voiced support for using metalinguistic feedback for lexical errors as a means of helping students self-reflect on and improve their performance. Learners' English proficiency and free time were two of several factors that affected how much they used online instructional materials (OCF).

I'm considering using elicitation or metalinguistic feedback for advanced learners since they have the ability to rectify their own errors in speech. Students who struggle with the English language should get direct instruction to improve their skills. (Explainer E)

Sometimes, many OCFs may be utilized in tandem. If I determine that these prompts are not useful, I will make an explicit adjustment. - (M's Lecturer)

4.4 OCF Timing

Table two displays the students' recommendations on how and when OCF should be introduced to English classes.

Table 2. Students Views on the OCF Timing

Items	OCF Timing	N	Mean	SD
34.	When I make an error, I want OCF from my instructor right away.	360	3.32	.747
35.	I anticipate my instructor providing OCF after my incorrect statement.	360	3.13	.860
36.	Following the speaking exercise, my instructor will give oral CF.	360	4.26	.632
37.	My instructor will give oral CF at the end of class.	360	3.78	.959
38.	If I make an error that confuses my classmates or instructors, my instructor must deliver OCF immediately.	360	4.02	.887
39.	My instructor needs to give OCF immediately if I make a mistake involving the lesson's grammar or vocabulary topic.	360	3.74	.656
40.	If I make a little error that is not significant, my instructor must correct me afterward.	360	4.44	.500

Regarding the second research question of how and when OCF should be introduced to English classes, according to the data, students preferred delayed OCF over real-time OCF. After the speaking activity was over, the vast majority of students asked their professors to provide OCF (M=4.26; SD=.632), (M=3.78; SD=.959), and (M=3.32; SD=.747). Off-Campus Forgiveness (OCF) was made available when students made errors. The mean reaction was just 3.13 and the standard deviation was only.860. Students, however, would rather get CF immediately in situations when their mistakes impacted the understanding of their classmates or teachers, or when the error was directly connected to the key themes of the course (M=4.02; SD=.887 and (M=3.74; SD=.656, respectively). They disputed claims that they had delayed OCF in order to fix minor problems. (M=4.44; SD=.500).

The results of the interview with the students corroborated the results of the survey questionnaires, which revealed how highly they valued the opportunity to avoid delayed OCF.

When I am speaking and my teacher makes a correction, I may unconsciously repeat the rephrased statement and then forget it. Forgetting what I was going to say after making a mistake when a teacher employs OCF to urge self-correction is possible. (Twelfth Grade)

I don't like getting punished on the moment, not because I'm ashamed of my mistake, but because I'm afraid the instructor's fast correction will distract me from my speaking responsibility. There are a total of 17 students.

The interviews also showed that the faults influenced the timing of OCF.

If a mistake I make in a statement fundamentally affects its meaning, my teachers have the right to correct me promptly. (Learner No. 4)

I need my teacher to correct my serious blunders after I speak so that I can take notes and understand what I said. Since the intended meaning is so important, I would want any errors to be corrected before my statement or speech is finalized. (Thirty-Second Student)

When taking into account interviews with teachers, the numbers matched up with students' impressions. Most teachers I spoke to agreed that OCF should be delivered towards the end of the speaking assignment or session since immediate intervention might have a negative impact on students' emotions and demotivate them.

It might be distracting for students if they were to get OCF at any time during a conversation. I usually wait till the student has completed the task or the lecture before making the correction. (Instructor C) I will use either immediate or delayed correction strategies, depending on the exercises, the students' English competence, and the available time. It's common for me to make a mental note of the advanced learners' weaknesses and then supply OCF once we've had a successful interaction. If a student is speaking poorly or too slowly, I may give them a quick correction or utilize the recasting method to deliver the appropriate phrase. Though I often have to correct student mistakes, the success of a teacher in providing OCF is conditional on a number of factors. There are a lot of considerations that teachers should take into account when deciding which OCF to employ and when. Instructor J.

The purpose of this research is to learn more about the attitudes of English teachers and their students on the usage of OCF in the classroom. So, classroom observation was not a part of the approach used to collect data for this study. In spite of this, as was previously noted, seven out of ten English teachers who participated in the interview allowed the researcher to record their classes to capture teacher-student interaction. The data analysis of six courses' worth of recordings showed that the OCF techniques utilized in teaching English were effective.

Table three demonstrates categories of CF overall distribution.

Table 3. Categories of CF Overall Distribution (n= 105)

			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Explicit correction	Valid	No CF	12	11.9	11.9	11.9
Elicitation	Valid	No CF	14	13.5	13.5	13.5
Repetition	Valid	No CF	19	17.9	17.9	17.9
Recast	Valid	No CF	21	19.6	19.6	19.6
Meta-linguistic feedback	Valid	No CF	32	29.9	29.9	29.9

In terms of the third research question what are the categories of CF, the most common kind of input was "meta-linguistic feedback," as seen in Table 3. This category of comments accounted for 29.9% of all instructor input turns. Recast (19.6%), repetition (17.9%), elicitation (13.5%), explicit correction (11.9%), and clarification requests (6.2%) rounded out the remaining types of feedback. Therefore, about half of the database's feedback movements are accounted for by meta-linguistic feedback and recasts, leaving just a half opportunity for other corrective procedures. Requests for more explanation received the fewest answers (five percent) of any other kind of feedback.

Table four shows the breakdown of (n = 53) repairs according to their respective feedback types and error types.

Table 4. The breakdown of (n = 53) Repairs according to their respective Feedback Types and Error Types

Feedback Types	Error types		
	Grammatical (n=21)	Phonological (n=23)	Lexical (n=17)
Recast	4 (19.1%)	9 (39.1%)	2 (11.8%)
Explicit correction	2 (9.5%)	14 (60.9%)	7 (41.2%)
Negotiation	15 (71.4%)	0	8 (47%)

In answering the fourth research question of what feedback and error types should be corrected, Table 4 displays the categorization of grammatical, phonological, and lexical mistakes. The majority of grammatical changes (71,4%), recast changes (19.1%), and explicit corrections (9,5%) all occurred after some kind of dialogue. 60% and 40% of phonological changes are the result of explicit correction and recasting, respectively. Curiously, bargaining never leads to a phonological improvement. In accordance with the instructors' beliefs, statistics showed that 40% and 45% of lexical errors were repaired after receiving verbal correction and negotiation (clarification, elicitation, and metalinguistic demands), respectively. OCF timing was used to categorize OCF types. In instance, educators often used recasting and repetition to address students' errors in real time. In practice, however, a delay in OCF was implemented, and strategies such as Metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and verbal correction were used.

5. Discussion

Since elicitation and repetition-style signals, metalinguistic feedback, and explicit correction were preferred by both instructors and students in this research, it may be concluded that their perspectives on OCF are generally in sync. This result was not consistent with previous research. From their research, Hassan and Arslan (2018) found that although students valued getting OCF, teachers were hesitant to provide it. Exam-focused learning and teaching goals (Patra et al., 2022) and the instructors' level of experience in the classroom may have

contributed to the positive outcomes regarding the instructors' attitudes toward OCF in general and explicit CF in particular (Van Ha & Murray, 2021). This need may also be greatly influenced by the traditional classroom structure, in which teachers play the roles of knowledge suppliers, decision-makers, and regulators of the learning environment, while students play the roles of passive recipients of information. Students often depend on their teachers to explicitly, rather than implicitly, impart the proper linguistic norms.

The results reveal that both teachers and students feel that the beginning of the semester is the best time to distribute CF. It was suggested that teachers and students get feedback either after the speaking activity or at the end of the course. If a student made a major error in what they said, they were to correct themselves at the end of their sentences. The findings are consistent with those of studies by Babushko and Solovei (2020) and Nguyen and Nguyen (2022), who found that students favored using delayed OCF near the conclusion of an utterance or after finishing an oral task. Students in this study favored receiving OCF right after making errors, which contradicts the findings of previous research (Amalia et al., 2019; Syakira & Nur, 2022; Patra et al., 2022; Sánchez Centeno & Ponce, 2019; etc.). This finding is consistent with other studies that found EFL teachers preferred to offer delayed OCF, i.e. towards the end of class, since they worried that delivering immediate CF may harm their students' emotions (Margi & Vodopija-Krstanovi, 2018; Gómez Argüelles et al., 2019; Syakira & Nur, 2022). The vast majority of students who responded to the survey claimed they would rather get CF after they had completed speaking rather than immediately after. If they were interrupted in the middle of their conversation, it's likely that they'd lose track of what they were saying because of the disruption.

As an added bonus, when teachers either explicitly or implicitly corrected their students after a speaking exercise, the students were less likely to repeat the same error in the future. Teachers with different points of view agreed that correcting students' errors immediately may be disruptive and, in some cases, demotivating. It's possible they picked up this assumption from widely used textbooks and carried it forward into their own classrooms. As Bao (2019) points out, there is still some debate among SLA researchers and L2 methodologists about the optimal time to include CF into classroom instruction. In addition, Bao argues that, in light of recent findings from SLA research, L2 methodologists should revise and update their how-to guides.

Both teachers and students had positive sentiments of OCF, praising its importance and usefulness in facilitating language learning. Though the level of acceptance may differ due to differences in teaching and learning situations, this finding is consistent with previous research (Syakira & Nur, 2022; Ha & Nguyen, 2021; Hassan & Arslan, 2018; Patra et al., 2022). Hassan and Arslan's (2018) study was done specifically with an ESL audience in mind. The emphasis in the classroom was on helping students become better communicators rather than on helping them become better writers. While some research faculty were enthusiastic about offering OCF, many others were wary of doing so out of worry for their students' language skills and self-esteem. However, secondary schools were utilized as the classroom environment since that is where the study's exam-oriented curriculum was implemented (Syakira & Nur, 2022). As a result, teachers could rest certain that they had favorable opinions of OCF and that linguistic accuracy was a top priority. The classrooms used in the current research were a mix of communicative and exam-oriented settings at the university level, with a focus on accuracy and fluency. The ability to communicate effectively in English was evaluated alongside students' other academic performance in both summative and formative assessments. While both teachers and students acknowledged the need of paying close attention to the techniques of providing OCF to promote learners' fluency, they also had positive things to say about OCF overall. Providing OCF for learners' errors was viewed as a significant job by the respondents, which is in line with other studies (Van Ha & Murray, 2021; Syakira & Nur, 2022). When comparing teachers with two years of experience and those with fifteen years, there is no correlation between years of teaching and opinions on OCF. Researchers found that teachers with more experience had a more positive outlook on OCF, although this finding contradicted the findings of two other research (Ha and Nguyen, 2021) and one (Van Ha and Murray, 2021).

Instructors and students had similar views on the types of mistakes that needed to be corrected, and both groups thought that offering OCF for common errors related to linguistics units and communicative aims was a good idea (Gamlo, 2019; Zhu & Wang, 2019). (Wang & Li, 2021). Teachers believe that feedback is crucial, but they also recognize that overcorrecting may have a negative impact on student motivation by making them feel humiliated. Inconsistencies between this study's findings and those of others have been previously documented (Patra et al., 2022). In contrast to the results of (Wang and Li, 2021), this study revealed that the opinions of both teachers and students were quite comparable. Teachers and students have different tastes in the types and amounts of CF they get, as reported by (Wang and Li, 2021). Students, in particular, favored receiving CF for inappropriate behavior, but teachers did not.

Both teachers and students shared and diverged in their perspectives on various forms of feedback. Both teachers and students preferred metalinguistic feedback for grammatical and lexical mistakes as an explicit form of OCF because they recognized its usefulness. While consistent with prior research (Van Ha et al., 2021; Syakira & Nur, 2022; Patra et al., 2022; Sánchez Centeno & Ponce, 2019), these results differ from those of Wang and Li (2021), who found that meta-linguistic feedback was the least preferred type among advanced-level English as a second language (ESL) students in the United States. Both students and teachers put a premium on teachers' explanations of grammatical concepts because they felt that doing so would help students become more proficient in the target language. This proved to be a major factor in gauging students' English proficiency (Van Ha & Murray, 2021). This might be because instructors and students alike placed a premium on CF that was both targeted and informative, allowing students to learn from their errors even as they were corrected. Student and teacher preferences for eliciting and repeating the implicit CF were shown to be similar in (Sánchez Centeno and Ponce's, 2019) research. Everybody who took part in the focus groups liked the idea of utilizing CF types to spark peer or self-correction since it may lead to rephrasing the language used in the classroom. Clarification inquiries were not highly preferred since they were likely to cause uncertainty among students, who were unable to tell whether their teachers wanted them to repeat what they said or if their assertion was

inaccurate. Both teachers and students appreciated the efficiency and effectiveness of the explicit correction and recast for phonological errors. Their findings backed up their argument that vocal correction is the sole method for addressing phonological mistakes.

6. Conclusion

This study's findings corroborate those of other studies (Syakira & Nur, 2022; Ha & Nguyen, (2021); Hassan & Arslan, 2018; Patra et al., 2022) that shown the benefits of OCF in the context of English language instruction for both students and educators. In identifying elements of CF, such as error categories to be addressed, OCF kinds, and time for OCF, the current findings have both differences and parallels with earlier studies carried out in a variety of contexts. For instance, the time spent on OCF is proportional to the number of error types that must be addressed. This result runs counter to those of other research (Amalia et al., 2019; Syakira & Nur, 2022; Patra et al., 2022; S á nchez Centeno & Ponce, 2019) which show that teachers and learners have similar perspectives on delayed OCF. Teachers and students both put a premium on metalinguistic feedback as a means of helping learners improve their own grammatical and lexical errors. Despite this, there is still considerable weight behind explicit rewriting and editing. Elicitation is utilized at the highest possible rank to provide metalinguistic information in the form of delayed open-close feedback. Quick open-close feedback is achieved by recasting and repetition. One important consideration when deciding on an OCF is how much time can be given to the format.

7. Limitations

Due to time constraints, the current study has a number of flaws. As a first limitation, this research only looks at a tiny subset of university-level English faculties and students. It is advised that more studies be conducted on a bigger scale, with individuals coming from a wide range of educational contexts and experiences. This will allow for a more complete assessment of faculty and student perspectives on OCF in higher education settings. Second, this study has not yet focused on comparing and contrasting the experiences of students with varied levels of English proficiency. Therefore, the investigation must be conducted to establish the consistency between distinct language competences to guarantee the validity of the total findings.

References

- Alhamami, M. (2018). Beliefs about and intention to learn a foreign language in face-to-face and online settings. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(1-2), 90-113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1387154>
- 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>
- Babushko, S. R., & Solovei, L. S. (2020). Linguistic and Non-Linguistic University Students' Attitude towards Error Correction in EFL Learning. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 12(4), 72-86. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/12.4/334>
- Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes: Teachers' beliefs versus their practices. *System*, 82, 140-150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.004>
- Gamlo, N. H. (2019). EFL Learners' Preferences of Corrective Feedback in Speaking Activities. *World*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v9n2p28>
- Gómez Argüelles, L., Hernández Méndez, E., & Perales Escudero, M. D. (2019). EFL teachers' attitudes towards oral corrective feedback: A case study. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 21(1), 107-120. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v21n1.69508>
- Ha, X. V., & Nguyen, L. T. (2021). Targets and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2479. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697160>
- Hassan, A. W., & Arslan, F. Y. (2018). A comparative study on Iraqi EFL teachers' and learners' preferences of corrective feedback in oral communication. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 7(3), 765-785. <https://doi.org/10.14686/buefad.378117>
- Margić, B. D., & Vodopija-Krstanović, I. (2018). Language development for English-medium instruction: Teachers' perceptions, reflections and learning. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 35, 31-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.06.005>
- Nassaji, H. (2020). Assessing the effectiveness of interactional feedback for L2 acquisition: Issues and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 53(1), 3-28. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000375>
- Nguyen, U. T. P., & Nguyen, U. P. T. (2022). Pre-Service Teacher Performance and High-School Student Uptake of Oral Corrective Feedback in EFL Classes in Da Nang. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 2(2), 119-141. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.22227>
- Patra, I., Alazemi, A., Al-Jamal, D., & Gheisari, A. (2022). The effectiveness of teachers' written and verbal corrective feedback (CF) during formative assessment (FA) on male language learners' academic anxiety (AA), academic performance (AP), and attitude toward learning (ATL). *Language Testing in Asia*, 12(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00169-2>
- S á nchez Centeno, A., & Ponce, S. Y. (2019). Beliefs about oral corrective feedback in an Argentinean EFL university classroom: Their impact on a teacher's classroom actions. *Apples: Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201907063591>
- Syakira, S., & Nur, 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. <https://doi.org/10.26858/eralingua.v6i2.26177>

- Tavakoli, M., & Zarrinabadi, N. (2018). Differential effects of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *Innovation in Language learning and teaching*, 12(3), 247-259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2016.1195391>
- Van Ha, X., & Murray, J. C. (2021). The impact of a professional development program on EFL teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. *System*, 96, 102405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102405>
- Van Ha, X., Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classroom: A teaching and learning perspective. *Heliyon*, 7(7), e07550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550>
- Wang, W., & Li, S. (2021). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in American ESL and Chinese EFL classrooms: A comparative study. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 34(1), 35-50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1767124>
- Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., & Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL students' preferences for written corrective feedback: do error types, language proficiency, and foreign language enjoyment matter? *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, 660564. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660564>
- Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: a large-scale survey. *Language awareness*, 28(2), 139-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).