STUDENT PREFERENCES IN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK: JORDANIAN EFL PERSPECTIVE

Raghad Mohammad Majed Al Dakheil

Master Thesis, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan

Abstract

This study investigated Jordanian EFL students' preferences regarding oral and written corrective feedback. The study sample consisted of (368) EFL students from the 8th, 9th, and 10th grades that were chosen conveniently from the public schools in Bani Obeid Directorate of Education. The study employed the descriptive analytical design using a questionnaire. The results of the study showed that Jordanian EFL students showed a moderate agreement regarding the effectiveness of oral and written corrective feedback. In the result for the students' preferences regarding oral corrective feedback, EFL students reported that they prefer delayed grammatical corrective feedback. In contrast, in the result for the students' preferences regarding written corrective feedback they reported that they prefer immediate corrective feedback that focuses on content errors. The results also showed that EFL students prefer explicit private corrective feedback over implicit public one. In light of the results, the study recommends that EFL teachers should take into consideration students' needs and preferences when giving such feedback. In addition, oral and written corrective feedback should embedded in pre-service and in- service teacher training.

Keywords: EFL Students, Jordan, Oral Corrective Feedback, Students' Preferences, Written Corrective Feedback

INTRODUCTION | مقدمة

The article emphasizes the importance of corrective feedback in English language learning, particularly for EFL students in Jordan. Despite the widespread use of English as a first or second language, many Jordanian students face challenges in developing oral and written proficiency. The limited time dedicated to teaching English in Jordanian school's results in students having minimal exposure to the language and limited opportunities to use it outside of the classroom. To address this issue, the Jordanian government and educational institutions have made efforts to enhance the English curriculum and provide guidance on teaching strategies and teacher preparation.

Corrective feedback can be given orally or in written form, with oral feedback helping students become fluent speakers and written feedback improving their writing skills. The article highlights the need to understand student preferences for oral and written corrective feedback in the EFL classroom and contributes to existing literature and provide practical insights for teachers and policymakers in improving English language education in Jordan.

METHOD | منهج

This chapter describes the research design, population and sample, and data collection and analysis.

1. Research Design

The researcher used a descriptive analytical design. This quantitative paradigm was employed as it is one of the most common in the field of study, because quantitative instruments can collect more responses more quickly from the target population. Since the current study aimed to assess student preferences for oral vs. written corrective feedback, collecting data from as many students as possible in a specific geographical area, this design was selected as the most effective.

2. Population and Sample

The target population consisted of all EFL students attending public schools in Bani Obeid Directorate of Education, Irbid-Jordan, during the first semester of the 2022–2023 school year (n = 5000). The public schools selected for the sample were those in the Bani Obeid School District as they were near the residence of the researcher, thus saving time and effort as the instrument was delivered in person to participants. The sample consisted of 368 EFL students in the eighth, ninth, and tenth grades, chosen conveniently from the public schools as shown in Table 1. There were 123 eighth-grade students (33.4%), 124 from the ninth grade (33.7%), and 121 from the tenth grade (32.9%). In relation to gender, there were 185 female students (50.3%) and 183 male students (49.7%).

Table 1: Distribution of the Sample

Variable	Sub-Variable	Frequency	Percent
Grade Level	8	123	33.4
	9	124	33.7
	10	121	32.9
Gender	Male	183	49.7
	Female	185	50.3
	Total	368	100.0

3. Research Instrument

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, a questionnaire was developed by reviewing a set of previous studies. The questionnaire was directed to EFL students in 8th, 9th, and 10th grade in Bani Obeid District to explore their preferences regarding oral and written corrective feedback in EFL classroom. The questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first one collected demographic data, such as gender and grade level. The second part collected data related to students' preferences in regard to oral corrective feedback and the third part collected data related to students' preferences in regard to written corrective feedback. The students' preferences in the second and the third part of the questionnaire address the following aspects: Students' perceptions of corrective feedback, timing of corrective feedback, types of errors that need corrective feedback, provider of corrective feedback, explicitness of corrective feedback, language of corrective feedback, and private ness of corrective feedback. Respondents rated items on a 5- point Likert scale according to their level of agreement. For each statement, respondents were asked to select one of the following options: Strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree. A cover letter clarified the purpose of the study and the value of participants' involvement. In addition, the cover letter assured the respondents that the data

would be confidential.

3.1. Content and Construct Validity

To establish content validity, the questionnaire reviewed by 13 experts in teaching English as a foreign language to assure its appropriateness for the purpose of the study (Appendix A). The experts provided thoughtful comments, suggesting adding, deleting, and modifying some items. For example, item (6) stating "I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors immediately" in oral corrective feedback was "Correcting immediately my oral errors satisfies me". Also, item (15) stating "I prefer my teacher to point out the error and give a clue about the correct form" in oral corrective feedback was "Giving clues about my errors was compelling piling for me"

The construct validity of the questionnaire was determined with a pilot sample of 50 EFL students from 8th, 9th, and 10th grades by calculating the correlation coefficients between the items and the total score. Additionally, for every item, the correlation coefficient was counted (correlation point to validity significance of every item). The correlation of items to the total score ranged from 0.69 to 0.93, and to the domain from **0.69** to 0.94, as shown in Table 2. The correlations were significant, demonstrating the construct validity of the questionnaire.

Table 2: Correlation Coefficients between Items, Total Score, and Domain

Item	Correlation to domain	Correlation to instrument	Item	Correlation to domain	Correlation to instrument
1	.94**	.93**	**8**	.87**	.81**
2	.93**	.86**	**9**	.90**	.87**
3	.91**	.80**	**10**	.90**	.87**
4	.90**	.92**	**11**	.91**	.89**
5	.73**	.51*	**12**	.91**	.88**
6	.83**	.78**	**13**	.86**	.71**
7	.64**	.71**	**14**	.76**	.76**

Note. *Significant at 0.05, **Significant at 0.01.

3.2. Reliability of the Questionnaire

Reliability is frequently used to determine whether an instrument can reach similar results in different contexts. In this context, reliability implied respondents' selection of items in the questionnaire was statistically invariant in different study conditions. To verify instrument reliability, a test-retest procedure was employed by administrating the questionnaire to a pilot sample of 50 students and then re-administrating it after two weeks. Cronbach's alpha for internal consistency was calculated for the individual domains and the total instrument, as shown in Table 3, while Pearson's correlation was calculated between responses and between scores. The resulting values were appropriate for the study objectives. Table 3 shows the internal consistency coefficient ranged between 0.71 and 0.83, while Pearson's R for test-retest ranged between 0.84 and 0.89.

Table 3: Internal Consistency for Individual Domains and Entire Instrument

Domain	Cronbach's Alpha	Test/Retest Pearson's R
Oral Corrective Feedback	0.71	0.84
Written Corrective Feedback	0.83	0.89
Total	0.86	0.88

4. Data Collection Procedures

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the following steps were followed before and during data collection:

1. Determine the population of the study which consists all EFL students attending public schools in Bani Obeid Directorate of Education based on statistics from different sources, and then define the sample of the study.

2. Develop a questionnaire by conducting a comprehensive review of related literature.

3. Ensure the validity and reliability of the questionnaire.

4. Distribute the questionnaire by hand to participants according to a schedule and collect their responses.

5. Enter data collected into SPSS for data analysis.

5. Data Analysis

To answer the research question, the study employed means and standard deviations, inferential descriptive statistics counting the number of responses on a specific domain or item to describe to what extent the respondent agrees or disagrees with an item.

RESULT | نتائج

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis. To answer the research question (What are the preferences of Jordanian EFL students regarding oral and written corrective feedback?), the researcher calculated descriptive statistics characterizing the preferences of these students, as discussed in the following sections.

1. Oral Corrective Feedback

Table 4: Oral Corrective Feedback Items

Rank	No.	Domain	M	SD	Agreement
1	2	Timing of oral corrective feedback	3.82	1.062	High
2	5	Explicitness of oral corrective feedback	3.74	.824	High
3	6	Language of oral corrective feedback	3.66	.991	Moderate
4	4	Provider of oral corrective feedback	3.62	.896	Moderate
5	3	Types of errors that need oral corrective feedback	3.48	1.115	Moderate
6	1	Corrective feedback during oral activities	3.46	.707	Moderate
7	7	Privateness of oral corrective feedback	3.32	1.480	Moderate
Total			3.58	.548	Moderate

As shown in Table 4, the mean agreement with the domains of oral corrective feedback ranged from 3.32 to 3.82, with feedback timing ranked first (M = 3.82) and privateness ranked last (M = 3.32). The overall mean (M = 3.58) showed a moderate level of agreement. Each item in the oral corrective feedback domains is further examined in the following subsections.

1.1. Corrective Feedback During Oral Activities

Table 5: Corrective Feedback During Oral Activities

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
3	1	When my teacher corrects my speaking errors, I do not get annoyed.	3.49	1.462	Moderate
5	2	When my teacher corrects my speaking errors, I feel embarrassed.	2.67	1.384	Moderate
1	3	My teacher's oral corrective feedback improves my speaking skills.	4.02	1.162	High
2	4	I prefer my teacher to always correct my errors during speaking activities.	3.84	1.347	High
4	5	I am not worried about making errors when I speak English.	3.28	1.441	Moderate
Total			3.46	.707	Moderate

As shown in Table 5, Item 3 (My teacher's oral corrective feedback improves my speaking

skills) received the highest agreement (*M* = 4.02), while Item 2 (When my teacher corrects my speaking errors, I feel embarrassed) was ranked last (*M* = 2.67). The total score of the domain showed moderate agreement with corrective feedback during oral activities (*M* = 3.46).

1.2.   Timing of Oral Corrective Feedback

Table 6: The Timing of Oral Corrective Feedback

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
2	6	I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors immediately.	3.79	1.326	High
1	7	I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors after the class.	3.84	1.387	High
Total			3.82	1.062	High

As shown in Table 6, Item 7 (I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors after the class) received the highest agreement (*M* = 3.84), while Item 6 (I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors immediately) ranked last (*M* = 3.79). The total score showed high agreement with this domain (*M* = 3.82).

1.3.   Types of Errors That Need Oral Corrective Feedback

Table 7: Types of Errors That Need Corrective Feedback

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
1	8	I need more oral corrective feedback on my grammatical errors.	3.72	1.318	High
3	9	I need more oral corrective feedback on my pronunciation errors.	3.32	1.506	Moderate
2	10	I need more oral corrective feedback on my vocabulary errors.	3.41	1.396	Moderate
Total			3.48	1.115	Moderate

As shown in Table 7, Item 8 (I need more oral corrective feedback on my grammatical errors) received the highest agreement (*M* = 3.72), while Item 9 (I need more oral corrective feedback on my pronunciation errors) ranked last (*M* = 3.32). The total score showed moderate agreement with this domain (*M* = 3.48).

1.4.   Provider of Oral Corrective Feedback

Table 8: Provider of Oral Corrective Feedback

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
2	11	I prefer my teacher to correct my oral errors in class.	3.92	1.258	High
3	12	I prefer my classmates to correct my oral errors in class.	2.82	1.504	Moderate
1	13	I prefer my teacher to ask me to correct my oral errors myself in class.	4.11	1.189	High
Total			3.62	.896	Moderate

As shown in Table 8, Item 13 (I prefer my teacher to ask me to correct my oral errors myself in class) received the highest agreement (*M* = 4.11), while Item 12 (I prefer my classmates to correct my oral errors in class) ranked last (*M* = 2.82). The total score showed moderate agreement with this domain (*M* = 3.62).

1.5.   Explicitness of Oral Corrective Feedback

Table 9: Explicitness of Oral Corrective Feedback

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
2	14	I prefer my teacher to point out the error and provide the correct form.	4.16	1.215	High
1	15	I prefer my teacher to point out the error and give a clue about the correct form.	4.18	1.162	High
3	16	I prefer my teacher to only point out where the error occurred.	2.88	1.628	Moderate
Total			3.74	.824	High

As shown in Table 9, Item 15 (I prefer my teacher to point out the error and give a clue

about the correct form) received the highest agreement (*M* = 4.18), while Item 16 (I prefer my teacher to only point out where the error occurred) ranked last (*M* = 2.88). The total score showed high agreement with this domain (*M* = 3.74).

1.6. *Language of Oral Corrective Feedback*

Table 10: Language of Oral Corrective Feedback

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
1	17	I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors in Arabic.	4.03	1.239	High
2	18	I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors in English.	3.29	1.466	Moderate
Total			3.66	.991	Moderate

As shown in Table 10, Item 17 (I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors in Arabic) received the highest agreement (*M* = 4.03), while Item 18 (I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors in English) ranked last (*M* = 3.29). The total score showed moderate with this domain (*M* = 3.66).

1.7. *Privateness of Oral Corrective Feedback*

Table 11: The Privateness of Oral Corrective Feedback

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
1	19	I prefer my teacher to provide me with oral corrective feedback in front of my classmates.	3.32	1.480	Moderate
Total			3.32	1.480	Moderate

As shown in Table 11, Item 19 (I prefer my teacher to provide me with oral corrective feedback in front of my classmates) received a moderate level of agreement (*M* = 3.32), the same as the total score for the domain.

2. Written Corrective Feedback

Table 12: Written Corrective Feedback Items

Rank	No.	Domain	M	SD	Agreement
1	2	Timing of written corrective feedback	3.74	.954	High
2	5	Explicitness of written corrective feedback	3.70	.907	High
3	6	Language of written corrective feedback	3.67	1.067	Moderate
4	1	Corrective feedback during writing activities	3.52	.747	Moderate
5	4	Provider of written corrective feedback	3.51	.986	Moderate
6	3	Types of errors that need written corrective feedback	3.42	.937	Moderate
7	7	Privateness of written corrective feedback	3.22	1.498	Moderate
Total			3.54	.633	Moderate

As shown in Table 12, mean agreement with written corrective feedback items ranged from 3.22 to 3.74, with feedback timing ranked first (*M* = 3.74) and privateness ranked last (*M* = 3.22). The total score showed moderate agreement overall (*M* = 3.54). Each domain is explored in the following subsections.

2.1. *Corrective Feedback During Writing Activities*

Table 13: Corrective Feedback During Writing Activities

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
3	1	When my teacher corrects my writing errors, I do not get annoyed.	3.63	1.345	Moderate
5	2	When my teacher corrects my writing errors, I feel embarrassed.	2.76	1.454	Moderate
1	3	My teacher's written corrective feedback improves my writing skills.	4.09	1.116	High
2	4	I prefer my teacher to always correct my errors in writing activities.	3.68	1.321	High
4	5	I am not worried about making errors when I write in English.	3.45	1.461	Moderate
Total			3.52	.747	Moderate

As shown in Table 13, Item 3 (My teacher's oral corrective feedback improves my speaking skills) received the highest agreement (*M* = 4.09), while Item 2 (When my teacher corrects my speaking errors, I feel embarrassed) ranked last (*M* = 2.76). The total score showed moderate agreement with this domain (*M* = 3.52).

2.2. *Timing of Written Corrective Feedback*

Table 14: Timing of Written Corrective Feedback

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
1	6	I prefer my teacher to correct my writing errors immediately	3.78	1.232	High
2	7	I prefer my teacher to correct my writing errors after the class	3.69	1.236	High
Total			3.74	.954	High

As shown in Table 14, Item 6 (I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors immediately) had the highest agreement (*M* = 3.78), while Item 7 (I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors after the class) ranked second (*M* = 3.69). The total score showed high agreement with this domain (*M* = 3.74).

2.3. *Types of Errors That Need Written Corrective Feedback*

Table 15: Types of Errors That Need Written Corrective Feedback

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
2	8	I need more written corrective feedback on my grammatical errors.	3.59	1.400	Moderate
5	9	I need more written corrective feedback on my spelling errors.	3.29	1.360	Moderate
3	10	I need more written corrective feedback on my punctuation errors.	3.43	1.319	Moderate
4	11	I need more written corrective feedback on my vocabulary errors.	3.30	1.357	Moderate
6	12	I need more written corrective feedback on my organization errors.	3.26	1.493	Moderate
1	13	I need more written corrective feedback on my writing content errors.	3.65	1.328	Moderate
Total			3.42	.937	Moderate

As shown in Table 15, Item 13 (I need more written corrective feedback on my writing content errors) received the highest agreement (*M* = 3.65), while Item 12 (I need more written corrective feedback on my organization errors) ranked last (*M* = 3.26). The total score showed moderate agreement with this domain (*M* = 3.42).

2.4. *Provider of Written Corrective Feedback*

Table 16: Provider of Written Corrective Feedback

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
2	14	I prefer my teacher to correct my writing errors in class.	3.66	1.313	Moderate
3	15	I prefer my classmates to correct my writing errors in class.	2.95	1.418	Moderate
1	16	I prefer my teacher to ask me to correct my writing errors myself in class.	3.92	1.334	High
Total			3.51	.986	Moderate

As shown in Table 16, Item 16 (I prefer my teacher to ask me to correct my writing errors myself in class) received the highest agreement (*M* = 3.92), while Item 15 (I prefer my classmates to correct my writing errors in class) ranked last (*M* = 2.95). The total score showed moderate agreement with this domain (*M* = 3.51).

2.5. *Explicitness of Written Corrective Feedback*

Table 17: Explicitness of Written Corrective Feedback

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
1	17	I prefer my teacher to point out the error and provide the correct form.	3.92	1.311	High
1	18	I prefer my teacher to point out the error and give me a hint about the correct form.	3.92	1.247	High
2	19	I prefer my teacher to only point out where the error occurred.	3.26	1.457	Moderate
Total			3.70	.907	High

As shown in Table 17, Item 17 (I prefer my teacher to point out the error and give a clue about the correct form) and Item 18 (I prefer my teacher to point out the error and give me a hint about the correct form) together received the highest agreement (M = 3.92), while Item 19 (I prefer my teacher to only point out where the error occurred) ranked last (M = 3.26). The total score showed high agreement with this domain (M = 3.70).

2.6. *Language of Written Corrective Feedback*

Table 18: Language of Written Corrective Feedback

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
1	20	I prefer my teacher to correct my writing errors in Arabic.	3.85	1.341	High
2	21	I prefer my teacher to correct my writing errors in English.	3.50	1.377	Moderate
Total			3.67	1.067	Moderate

As shown in Table 18, Item 20 (I prefer my teacher to correct my writing errors in Arabic) received the highest agreement (M = 3.85), while Item 21 (I prefer my teacher to correct my writing errors in English) ranked last (M = 3.50). The total score showed moderate agreement with this domain (M = 3.67).

2.7. *Privateness of Written Corrective Feedback*

Table 19: Privateness of Written Corrective Feedback

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Agreement
1	22	I prefer my teacher to provide me with written corrective feedback in front of my classmates.	3.22	1.498	Moderate
Total			3.22	1.498	Moderate

As shown in Table 19, Item 22 (I prefer my teacher to provide me with written corrective feedback in front of my classmates) received moderate agreement (M =3.22), the same as the total score for the domain.

DISCUSSION | مناقشة

Oral corrective feedback: A study in Jordanian public schools found that students are moderately aware of the importance of oral corrective feedback in evaluating performance and improving speaking skills. However, they don't feel annoyed or embarrassed. Students preferred delayed feedback for language self-esteem and grammatical errors over vocabulary and pronunciation errors. Most respondents preferred their teacher to correct their errors. Future research should explore this in Jordanian private schools and older students.

Written corrective feedback

The study found that students prefer written corrective feedback, similar to oral feedback, for immediate interaction with teachers and addressing writing problems. They prefer explicit feedback for clearer communication and performance improvement. However, some students find written feedback personal and embarrassing, and the study suggests that written feedback is more effective for EFL students.

Recommendations

The study recommends EFL teachers consider students' needs and preferences when providing feedback, embedding corrective feedback in pre-service and in-service training, allowing students to express preferences, and conducting future research.

خاتمة | CONCLUSSION

Based on the findings, this study offers the following recommendations: 1) EFL teachers should take into consideration students' needs and preferences when giving feedback; 2) Oral and written corrective feedback should be embedded in pre-service and in- service teacher training; 3) Students should be given the chance to express their preferences regarding corrective feedback; 40 Future research should examine corrective feedback preferences among other populations, such as secondary school students.

مراجع | BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alhabahba, M., Pandian, A., & Mahfoodh, O. (2016). English language education in Jordan: Some recent trends and challenges. *Cogent Education*, *3*(1), 1156809.

Aljasir, N. (2021). Matches or mismatches? Exploring shifts in individuals' beliefs about written corrective feedback as students and teachers-to-be. *Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education*, *9*(1), 1–10.

Alkhammash, R., & Gulnaz, D. (2019). Oral corrective feedback techniques: An investigation of the EFL teachers' beliefs and practices at Taif University. *Arab World English Journal*, *10*(2), 40–54.

Alsolami, R. (2019). Effect of oral corrective feedback on language skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *9*(6), 672–677.

Amalia, Z., Fauziati, E., & Marmanto, S. (2019). Male and female students' uptake in responding to oral corrective feedback. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *9*(1), 107–126.

Apuke, O. (2017). Quantitative research methods: A synopsis approach. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (Kuwait Chapter)*, *6*, 40–49.

Astia, M. (2018). Corrective feedback in English classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Language Teaching and Linguistics*, *3*(3), 111–122.

Balachandran, A. (2017). *Perspectives and practices regarding written corrective feedback in Swedish context: A case study* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Stockholm University, Sweden.

Baniabdelrahman, T. (2017). *The effect of the use of paper-rater on the Jordanian tenth grade students' performance in grammar in writing*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Yarmouk University, Yarmouk University.

Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes: Teachers' beliefs versus their practices. *System*, *82*, 140–150.

Black, D., & Nanni, A. (2016). Written corrective feedback: Preferences and justifications of teachers and students in a Thai context. *Journal of Language Studies*, *16*(3), 99–114.

Bozorgian, H., & Yazdani, A. (2021). Direct written corrective feedback with metalinguistic explanation: Investigating language analytic ability. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *9*(1), 65–85.

Brookhart, S. (2017). *How to give effective feedback to your students* (Vol. 2). ASCD.

Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: A case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *1*(1), 1–17.

Chu, R. (2011). Effects of teacher's corrective feedback on accuracy in the oral English of English-majors college students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *1*(5), 454–459.

Drew, F. (2021). To what extent do student preferences for oral corrective feedback match teacher practice in the Chinese high school EFL classroom? A case study. *Lessons from Global Classrooms*, *1*, 34–57.

EF EPI. (2014). *EF English proficiency index.* http://media.ef.com

Elfiyanto, S., & Fukazawa, S. (2021). Three written corrective feedback sources in improving Indonesian and Japanese students' writing achievement. *International Journal of Instruction*, *14*(3), 433–450.

Fadilah, A., Anugerahwati, M., & Prayogo, J. (2017). EFL students' preferences for oral corrective feedback in speaking instruction. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, *5*(2), 76–87.

Fan, N., & Ma, Y. (2018). The role of written corrective feedback in second language writing practice. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *8*(12), 1629–1635.

Ganapathy, M., Lin, D., & Phan, J. (2020). Students' perceptions of teachers' written corrective feedback in the Malaysian ESL classroom. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, *17*(2), 103–136.

Ha, X., & Nguyen, L. (2021). Targets and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: Are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned? *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697160

Ha, X., & Nguyen, L. (2021). Targets and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classroom: Are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned? *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697160

Huwari, I. (2019). Problems faced by Jordanian undergraduate students in speaking English. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, *8*(9), 203–217.

Ibnian, S. (2017). Writing difficulties encountered by Jordanian EFL learners. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, *5*(3), 197–206.

Kepner, C. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, *75*(3), 305–313.

Khodadadi, S. (2021). The effect of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' grammatical accuracy in sentence completion exercises. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *17*(1), 315–326.

Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Springer Singapore.

Li, H., & He, Q. (2017). Chinese secondary EFL learners' and teachers' preferences for types of written corrective feedback. *English Language Teaching*, *10*(3), 63–73.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus on form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effect on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *12*(1), 429–448.

Lopez, M. (2020). An updated typology of written corrective feedback: Resolving terminology issues. *Revista Educación*, *45*(2), 1–14.

Mahmood, R. (2021). Kurdish EFL learners' perceptions towards written corrective feedback and its types: An investigative study. *Arab World English Journal*, *12*(4), 103–117.

Nagode, G., Pizorn, K., & Jurisevic, M. (2014). The role of written corrective feedback in developing writing in L2. *English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, *11*(2), 89–98.

Nassaji, H. (2016). Interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: A synthesis and analysis of current research. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(4), 535–562.

Öztürk, G. (2016). An investigation on the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *12*(2), 22–37.

Purnomo, W., Basthomi, Y., & Prayogo, J. (2021). EFL university teachers' perspectives in written corrective feedback and their actual applications. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *10*(3), 1089–1099.

Rajagopal, N. (2015). *A teacher's written corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Malaya, Malaysia.

Rao, P. (2019). The role of English as a global language. *Research Journal of English*, *4*(10), 65–79.

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

Saragih, N. A., Madya, S., Siregar, R. A., & Saragih, W. (2021). Written Corrective Feedback: Students' Perception and Preferences. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, *8*(2), 676-690.

Şakiroğlu, H. (2020). Oral corrective feedback preferences of university students in English communication classes. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, *6*(1), 172–178.

Semke, H. (1984). The effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, *17*(3), 195–202.

Septiana, A., Sulistyo, G., & Kadarisman, A. (2016). Corrective feedback and writing accuracy of students across different levels of grammatical sensitivity. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *6*(1), 1–11.

Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal*, *23*(1), 103–110.

Sherpa, S. (2021). Effects of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on Bhutanese learners' grammatical accuracy over time. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *14*(1), 574–603.

Suerni, S., Fani, S., Asnawi, A., & Wariyati, W. (2020). EFL learners perception of written corrective feedback. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, *488*, 50–53.

Tayebipour, F. (2019). The impact of written vs. oral corrective feedback on Omani part-time vs. full-time college students' accurate use and retention of the passive voice. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *10*(1), 150–160.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, *46*, 327–369.

Van Ha, X., Nguyen, L., & Hung, B. (2021). Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: A teaching and learning perspective. *Heliyon*, *7*(7), e07550.

Winstone, N., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Heron, M. (2022). From feedback-as-information to feedback-as-process: A linguistic analysis of the feedback literature. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *47*(2), 213–230.

Yüksel, D., Soruç, A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in university EFL classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *31*(3), 362–382.

Yunus, W. (2020). Written corrective feedback in English compositions: Teachers' practices and students' expectations. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, *3*(2), 95–107.

Zohra, R., & Fatiha, H. (2022). Exploring learners' and teachers' preferences regarding written corrective feedback types in improving learners' writing skill. *Arab World English Journal*, *13*(1), 117–128.