Corrective oral feedback on students' errors in speaking courses

Anis Firdatul Rochma

Yogyakarta State University; Indonesia, (586168 (0274
e-mail: afrochma@uny.ac.id ,anisfirdatul.2019@student.uny.ac.id

A B S T R A C T

It is considered essential to improve students' speaking abilities in order to communicate in English. Unfortunately, students face a variety of difficulties in acquiring their speaking skills. Despite the fact that corrective feedback is claimed to have an influence on students' performance, particularly in speaking courses, research focused explicitly on the perceptions of students and lecturers on corrective feedback in speaking courses is still rare. Employing descriptive study including observation and survey methods, the findings revealed three results: the length of oral corrective feedback given by the lecturer, the forms of oral corrective feedback offered by lecturer in speaking courses, and the types of oral corrective feedback most desired by students during speaking courses particularly students taking courses of Speaking for Social Intercultural Communication and Speaking for Academic Purposes. The present study indicates that the teachers should be able to recognize which errors to correct and which sorts of corrective feedback to employ in their speaking classes.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is essential to improve the speaking ability in order to communicate in English. The capacity to carry on a conversation in the language is the single most crucial part of learning as a second or foreign language, and the performance is judged in terms of oral communication (Nunan, 1991), including speaking. People may communicate and provide direct messages to interlocutors by speaking. Hence, in speaking, EFL students are expected to focus on their language abilities; spelling, pronunciation, vocabulary, word construction, grammatical structure, sentence structure, and language semantics are thus required (Hedge, 2000). It is also possible that learners' self-esteem influenced their speaking abilities. As a result, the higher the learners' self-esteem, the better their speaking abilities (Tripudiyana et al., 2022)

Unfortunately, students have various challenges in mastering their speaking abilities. According to Ihsan (1999), 20 students in the fifth semester are prone to commit mistakes such as misusing parts of speech, syntactical construction, lexical choice, and voice. Handoyo (2010) expanded on the accuracy explanation in another research. He conducted his research on 26 first semester accounting students. He discovered that grammar rarely benefited students in gaining the ability to activate language characteristics since, in communication activities, they learned to generate phrases. In addition, when students employed the word-to-word translation, an issue appeared since Indonesian and English arrange words differently at the phrase level. Suryanto (2014) said that tenses were causing misunderstanding among Indonesian learners. I ate rice, for example; I *have eaten rice; I had eaten rice*. In Indonesia, these lines are simply phrased as "*Saya sudah makan nasi*".

Some scholars had developed strategies to address these issues, one of them was by utilizing oral corrective feedback. Corrective feedback is considered as the teacher's response to an incorrect student speech. Corrective feedback (CF) has been described simply as response to students' utterances containing an error according to Ellis (2006). That is to say, corrective feedback is a teacher reaction to students' error, such as a statement about the error. As a result, corrective feedback refers to teacher and peer reactions to students' work. When teacher give performance task such as telling story, role play, discussion/talk show, presentation, reading poetry and drama, they corrects students' performances in order to increase their understanding of their mistakes (Rohmana,2017). Thus, when students perform and make errors, the teacher explicitly comments on the students' errors.

According to Brookhart (2008), oral feedback is a kind of participatory feedback in which the teacher may converse with the students. Oral feedback is a form of discussion between a teacher and students about how well they speak. Students may obtain specific information regarding their errors in public speaking performance and may, thus, increase their capacity to talk when performing in speaking classes. In summary, oral corrective feedback is a teacher's correction or answer to a student's utterances including any errors immediately when the student makes a mistake or error so that the teacher may offer the student with information to amend their errors. Students might increase their knowledge by having their faults corrected by the teacher. In addition, the knowledge they get from the teacher can help them enhance their speaking abilities, particularly in speaking performances.

Since oral corrective feedback is likely to be one important strategy to correct students' errors, it can be delivered through several ways. Ellis (2009) offers six types of oral corrective feedback that can be employed by the teachers including recast, repetition, clarification request, explicit correction, elicitation, and paralinguistic signal. Recast is one sort of corrective feedback in which the teacher gives feedback without explicitly declaring that the student's remark was wrong expressed through unobtrusive way (Lyster & Panova, 2002). That is to say, the teacher indirectly reformulates the student's error or offers the correction. Repetition occurs when the teacher repeats the student's error and either adjusts his or her tone to call the student's attention to it (Nunan, 1996) or repeats the students' ill-formed utterances without any changes (Kennedy, 2010). Meanwhile, clarification request occurs when the teacher uses language to suggest that the message is not understood or that the student's speech has some type of error and that a repetition or reformulation is necessary. The teachers are likely to utilize clarification by stating *I am sorry* (Sheen & Ellis, 2011) or *I cannot get your point* (Yoshida, 2010). Furthermore, explicit correction may happen when the teacher's tone plainly indicates that the student's speech is improper, so that the teacher supplies the right form. It can be said that the provision of the appropriate form is referred to as explicit corrective feedback. Elicitation occurs when the teacher elicits the right form from the student's error directly by asking questions, pausing to enable the student to finish the teacher's utterance (Sheen, 2004), or asking students to reformulate the utterance. Moreover, a paralinguistic signal occurs when a teacher utilizes a gesture or facial expression to convey that an error has been committed by the student. In a nutshell, it can be seen that each sort of corrective feedback corrects students' errors in an alternate manner. Some kinds are specified explicitly. In this situation, the teachers immediately provide the right form. The other categories, on the other hand, are provided implicitly. In this instance, the teachers might employ numerous methods such as providing information, asking questions, using certain intonation, and explaining what the students stated. It is anticipated that students would recognize and generate the right form of the utterances.

The utilization of corrective feedback was once suggested by Akhyak and Indramawan (2013). Corrective feedback was used as a delayed correction approach with 25 undergraduate students. It was claimed that the method improved their students' fluency, grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary as a consequence. Because the "outside" classroom does not provide feedback to students and English is not spoken in the community, students are completely reliant on the lecturer for relevant linguistic input. According to Fungula (2013), providing corrective feedback (CF) to students can be a useful method to assist students improve their target language speaking abilities.

Even though, recently, the most effective kind of corrective feedback has been the subject of corrective feedback research, there are significant disputes over sorts of CF that are more effective to EFL learning. Lyster and Saito (2010), for example, performed the most current experimental investigations, which focused solely on 15 classroom-based trials (N =827). This meta-analysis included three forms of CF: recasts, explicit correction, and prompts. They discovered that the effects were stronger for prompts than for recasts, and that they were most noticeable in measures that elicit free constructed replies. Meanwhile, according to Ellis (2006), recasts may be more successful in fostering the learning of new language traits. Ellis (2009) indicated that it may have a favorable influence on learners' CF belief, reduce anxiety, and assist learners in increasing their speaking skills. Although recast is commonly associated with the forms of feedback used by lecturers (Ellis, 2006; Yoshida, 2008; Choi and Li, 2012), other researchers (Lyster, 2010; Dilans, 2010) have shown that prompts have a stronger influence and are more noticeable in tests that elicit free constructed replies. In fact, the role of corrective feedback is also influenced by the age of the learners since according to Lyster (2010), the effects of CF may be altered by the age of the learners.

That is to say, corrective feedback may have an impact on students' performance, particularly in the speaking courses. Although the subject of the most effective corrective feedback remains unsolved, the most important element to remember is that an excellent education may occur when it is in agreement with what the students require and expect to achieve. Thus, as an expert in the classroom, the speaking courses lecturers should therefore take precautions in selecting the forms of feedback that will be provided. When the students' cognitive and affective preferences are taken into account, corrective feedback as one method of education is likely to be beneficial (Zhang, Zhang, & Ma, 2010). As a result, identifying students' preferences may be an excellent beginning point for teachers in moving closer to better education. Furthermore, it indicates that students learn better when the education is adjusted to their preferences. It indicates that the closer the lesson is to the students' expectations, the easier language acquisition will be for them. In other words, incorporating students' choices may help instructional techniques succeed.

Considering the data shown above, it is challenging to determine which sorts of corrective feedback are most effective for all students. There have been several research on the preferences of lecturers and students in applying oral corrective feedback across ages, genders, and settings. However, research that focuses specifically on the perspectives of students and lecturers on corrective feedback in speaking courses are still uncommon. To be precise, the present research emphasizes three focuses, namely (1) time spent by lecturers in providing corrective feedback in speaking classes, (2) sorts of corrective feedback utilized by the lecturers in speaking class, and (3) types of corrective feedback preferred by students for their speaking improvement. The descriptive analysis involving observation and survey methods were carried out to disclose various types of corrective feedback employed in speaking classes and determine

the most effective and preferred ones. Hence, the lecturers are able to select proper types of corrective feedback to assist students in improving their speaking skills.

2. METHOD

The present research employed a descriptive study involving observation and survey methods. The courses were in speaking courses offered in the even semester at one institution in Yogyakarta, namely Speaking for Social Intercultural Communication and Speaking for Academic Purposes. The researcher employed the observation technique to investigate the various sorts of oral corrective feedback offered during speaking courses. The observation took place during the speaking performance activities. The data were collected through textual transcriptions and videos. The data contained lecturer's and students' utterances during observation which focused on several sorts of corrective feedback. Moreover, the survey technique was utilized by the researcher to evaluate the most preferred kind of corrective feedback based on the students' preferences using Smith suggested questionnaires (2010). Smith (2010) investigated adult English language learners' preferences in error correction using the proposed questionnaire.

From six different speaking classes, 97 students were selected to fill out a questionnaire based on observation and survey procedures. The students chosen were from two speaking courses namely Speaking for Social Intercultural Communication and Speaking for Academic Purposes. The two speaking courses were conducted in even semester; thus, the students were considered able to carry out the courses properly since they already took previous speaking courses within the odd semester.

Following the observation sessions, the questionnaires were delivered to the students. The collected data was then descriptively evaluated. The data gained from the observation were written transcriptions of students' and lecturer' utterances. The transcriptions were then categorized according to Ellis' six forms of corrective feedback (2009). The categories of corrective feedback that had been classified were then calculated in percentage form to ascertain the quantity of feedback that occurred during observation. The data from the surveys were listed and summarized in Ms. Excel to make calculating the results simpler. The mode of rankings was then utilized to determine the high position of students' preferences for different sorts of corrective feedback.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The time of offering feedback in speaking courses, the sorts of feedback offered by lecturer in speaking courses, and the forms of corrective feedback most favored by students were the three key areas under the present research.

3.1 Time of offering feedback in speaking course

In this study, the time spent by lecturer correcting their students' errors could be divided into two categories; those are delayed and immediate feedback. In delayed corrective feedback, the correction was delivered after the students conducted a discussion, presentation, and speaking performance. The following talk discusses an example of delayed corrective feedback occurred during observations.

Example 1

Lecturer : *Is it answer your question? Any comments?*

Students : It d*oes.*

Lecturer : *Does it answer your question? See that?*

Students : *Yes.*

This feedback sequence was delivered following the presentation of the contents by the first group of presenters. This error was frequently encountered in class; thus, the lecturer underlined it and advised all students of the right form. As a result, the following round of presentations would not make the same mistakes. According to observations, providing correction for the topic or content was unnecessary because the major focus of the students' speaking performance was on presenting speech. As a result, the lecturer opted to provide correction after the students had completed their speaking performances. According to Méndez and Maria (2012), it is critical to assess when the correction should be offered. That is to say, when the lecturer concentrated on meaning education and encouraging fluency in the classroom, delayed correction was preferred. This finding is similar to the prior research results conducted by Park (2010), Tomczyk (2013), as well as Atma and Widiati (2015) in which the participants strongly agreed to get feedback only after they complete the speaking activity. One of the reasons of the students preferred delayed feedback is that delayed feedback allows students to complete the information they are trying to deliver. As a result, it does not disrupt the flow of discourse. Although students valued delayed feedback, they despised it if it was offered before the lecturers ended the class. A few students complained that the wait for the lesson to conclude was too long since they could have forgotten what they said during the speaking activity.

However, if students consistently made the same errors in class, it was preferable to provide both delayed and immediate feedback. This viewpoint was aligned with Méndez and Maria's (2012) study, which showed that if the lecturer intended to enhance students' accuracy, immediate and delayed correction were suggested. The findings of this study justified this assertion. The data suggested that the dialogue between lecturer and the students below focused on grammatical usage, which might increase students' correctness awareness.

Example 2

Students : *The moderator is someone who actually leading the presentation.*

Lecturer : *Once more.*

Students : *Someone who actually leads the presentation.*

Example 2 above is an immediate correction that displays the lecturer immediately clarify toward the student's error of employing grammatical pattern by saying *once more.* During observations, the following immediate feedback occurred: recast, repeat, clarification request, explicit correction, elicitation, and metalinguistic clue. Only explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation was not identified during observation as a sort of corrective feedback.

3.2 Types of corrective feedback in speaking courses

In terms of the frequency of different sorts of corrective feedback used during observations, the lecturer chose recast as the type of corrective feedback that was most commonly employed among other types of corrective feedback during learning activity. Recast was noticed in 42.2% of the 19 cases of the Speaking courses examined. Ellis and Sheen also discovered that recast was the most common sort of feedback (2006). They noted that, while

numerous sorts of feedback had piqued the interest of academics, none had attracted the same level of attention as recast. Furthermore, Yoshida (2008) stated that recast helped students avoid social embarrassment when they were unable to deliver an appropriate answer.

As recast was the most commonly employed corrective feedback by lecturers to correct students' errors utterances, it could be classified as a natural response from lecturers in providing corrections. According to Fungula (2013), the reason why recast was the most commonly utilized corrective feedback among the six forms of corrective feedback was because it came effortlessly to most lecturers. The present study also discovered that there was an aspect to ponder in recast. The example is presented as follows.

Example 3
Student : *Any questions?*
Lecturer : *Any other questions?*
Students : *Any other questions?*

In the preceding case, the student lacked uptake, which meant that the student did not detect the incorrect utterances and realize that the lecturer had corrected it. It was in line with several research conducted previously showing that adult learners who are more conscious of and receptive to recast should be provided with it (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Sheen, 2004; Yoshida, 2010). The finding of the present study is also in line with prior research conducted by Rahmi (2017). The findings of the observations and interviews showed that, among the seven forms of corrective feedback used by the four teachers on students' speaking performance, recast feedback was the most commonly employed. That is to say, the college students who were taking the speaking courses were suggested to be provided with recast as corrective feedback as they were considered as conscious and adaptive learners.

However, according to Lyster and Ranta (1997), recast only becomes short-term memory for the students. It means only after receiving corrective criticism can students remember the words or phrases that the teachers modified. When students come across similar words or sentences, they are likely to make the same errors. Subsequently Ellis (2009) also disagrees with the efficacy of recast since it does not force the student to identify the problem. Then, recast is also considered not a useful sort of corrective feedback (Rahmi, 2017) if teachers intend to increase student acquisition. That is to say, even though recast is found to be the most occurred feedback provided by the teachers and is considered to be effective corrective feedback (Ammar & Ahlem, 2003), it can be denoted that recast cannot help the students to locate their errors and, thus, should be employed along with any other types of corrective feedback.

On the other hand, repetition was seldom employed as a sort of corrective feedback (5.2%) in this study. This outcome was consistent with Yoshida's earlier research (2008). Yoshida (2008) discovered that, compared to recast, which occurred in more than half of the feedback sessions, repetition was only counted 1% of the time. The instance is provided as follows.

Example 4
Student : *They ask them to introduce each other.*
Lecturer : *Each other?*
Students : *They ask them to introduce ourselves.*

In this study, it was observed that students realized their errors when the lecturer highlighted their incorrect statements. This finding was in accordance with the results of Buyukbay and Dabaghi (2010), who showed that the use of repetition led to students' own repair. They also proposed that repetition should be employed more frequently since it is beneficial when it comes to advancement. Although repetition is considered as essential corrective feedback for students' own repair yet the present study found that it was rarely employed in the speaking courses. It happened due to the fact that, based on the observation, the lecturer tends to immediately correct the students' errors by presenting the correct forms rather than highlighting the students' errors. Thus, Rahmi (2017) suggested that the use of repetition can be accompanied by other types of corrective feedback such as recast. Thus, the teacher is able to correct the students' errors by emphasizing the incorrect phrases and directly providing the correct forms.

3.3 Types of corrective feedback mostly preferred by student

The third research focus was related to the forms of feedback that students preferred during speaking classes. According to students' perceptions and preferences of corrective feedback given during speaking courses, forms of corrective feedback were ranked in terms of usefulness. According to the mode rankings from all 97 students, recast earned the highest score as the most valuable feedback from various sorts of corrective feedback. In recast, lecturers directly delivered the right form to students without providing them the option to self-repair.

Nonetheless, Han (2002) claimed that recasts were tricky because they may have a detrimental impact by directing students' attention away from the issue of ambiguity. As a result, Han (2002) proposed that recasts would be more advantageous for linguistic forms that were already being internalized than for forms that were unfamiliar to students. The example is presented in the following.

Example 5
Student : *Some of Japan*
Lecturer : *Japanese*
Students : *Some of Japanese.*

The lecturer did not teach a new term in this instance, but rather increased the student's awareness of the word "Japanese" as a suitable usage on the speech form. Furthermore, Lyster (2004) observed that recasts were employed as corrective movements in a communicative classroom. It was also utilized to provide supportive and scaffolding aid to take the lesson forward when the goal forms were not accessible in the students' existing production capabilities. According to the findings, recast allowed students to remedy their errors, as illustrated in the following example.

Example 6
Student : *The researchers have conducted /konˈdʌktid/.*
Lecturer : *Conducted /kənˈdʌktid/*
Students : *Yes, Conducted /kənˈdʌktid/*

This evidence occurred at the end of the speaking class. As a result, in order to keep the discussion on track, the lecturer corrected the student's mispronunciation immediately. It can be

said that when it came to the students' preferences for corrective feedback from the lecturer, their desire to receive it was evident. In this study, practically all students felt comfortable being corrected when they committed an error. It contradicted Truscott's (1999) study, which found that corrective feedback had a detrimental impact on learning because it made students feel humiliated, irritated, and inadequate. It was discovered that ten students were uncomfortable after being corrected by their lecturers during speaking courses; nevertheless, feeling embarrassed did not imply that the students did not want to be corrected. In fact, none of the students were irritated when the lecturers corrected their mistakes.

In response to students' preferences for timing and method of providing corrective feedback during speaking activities, the timing of types of corrective feedback provided revealed that more than half of students in speaking classes disagreed with the statement that a lecturer should only correct errors considered to be significant. It indicated that students expect to be corrected whenever they commit an error. This finding was consistent with Tomcyzk (2013)'s research on teachers' and students' perceptions of corrective feedback. Tomcyzk (2013) discovered that the majority of teachers (81.4%) and students (92.8%) agreed that all errors had to be addressed.

Additionally, although some studies claimed that immediate feedback disrupted the flow of students' performances, interactionists argued that corrective feedback was most effective when given in context at the time the student committed the error (Ellis, 2009). This study discovered that students favored quick feedback over delayed input. The researcher concluded that the interactionist concept was supported by this study, which discovered that students accepted to be corrected immediately when they committed errors.

Also, during class, lecturers corrected students in various ways. The study's findings demonstrated that students clearly preferred to be corrected in a group or class setting rather than in private. This conclusion was also consistent with Hillary (2010)'s current study, which found that 96% of students accepted to be corrected in class. The scenario was particularly different when lecturers explicitly displayed students' faults and named their names, since these evidences might amplify the unfavorable impact on the students. By providing correction to all students and indirectly in the classroom, it is possible to lessen students' fear and improve students' positive influence.

In general, excessive corrective feedback may demotivate students from learning and discourage them from engaging in the classroom since they will not say anything unless they think they have right utterances to create (Martinez, 2006). The need for correcting all errors might be connected to the importance of corrective feedback in raising students' linguistic awareness. This viewpoint is consistent with the findings of the observation, in which students state that they want their teacher to correct any errors since it allows them to learn from their mistakes and avoid repeating them in the future. Although the students desire that all errors be addressed, particular domains require greater attention. In this instance, grammar and phonology are seen as more important, and errors in these two areas should always be corrected. In other words, teachers should be thoughtful in selecting which errors to correct and which sorts of corrective feedback to employ in their speaking classes.

4. CONCLUSION

There are certain conclusions that can be drawn from the current study's findings and discussion. The first is the greatest chance to provide oral corrective feedback to students concerning their errors, and the second is the most favored sorts of oral corrective feedback to

students regarding their errors in speaking courses. There are two methods to describe the time spent providing oral corrective feedback to students' errors. They are corrective feedback, both immediate and delayed. In terms of grammatical use, both immediate and delayed corrections are preferable for students' errors. It could be observed from the fact that when lecturers desire to enhance students' accuracy, they encourage both immediate and delayed correction.

Making errors is regarded as a sign or natural progression of students' speaking development. Furthermore, providing spoken corrective feedback might be a serious approach for assisting students in improving their target language competence. As a result, selecting the most desired sorts of oral corrective feedback is regarded as the greatest technique to develop students' abilities. Because the data demonstrate that students prefer recast, the lecturer might utilize recast to address the students' errors. Furthermore, in communicative classrooms, recast is utilized as a supporting aid to carry the lesson forward when the goal forms are not available in the students' existing production capacity.

The results of the types of corrective feedback observed during speaking courses and the students' preferences for forms of corrective feedback demonstrate the implication of the present study. It is encouraged that English Speaking lecturers utilize recast. When the goal forms are not accessible in the students' existing production ability, the English-Speaking lecturer might employ recast as supporting, scaffolding aid to carry the course forward although the lecturers should also consider to employ other types of corrective feedback as well to accompany recast. It should be noted that the lecturers should be able to recognize which errors to correct and which sorts of corrective feedback to employ in their speaking classes. Furthermore, the findings of the study should provide valuable references and comparison findings for future researchers who are interested in the same topic. Nonetheless, the duration and frequency of the observations are the study's weaknesses. It was done for a brief amount of time. As a result, future researchers with a similar interest in studying a comparable issue should conduct longer and more frequent observations so that forms of corrective feedback are more firmly established since the observation can approach data redundancy.

REFERENCES

Akhyak, M., & Indramawan, I. (2013). Improving the students english speaking competence Storytelling (Study in Pengeran Diponegoro Islamic College (STAI) of Nganjuk, East Java, Indonesia. *International Journal of language and Literature. 1*(2).

Ammar, A. (2003). *Corrective feedback and L2 learning: Elicitation and recast.* Unpublised Thesis. Montreal : Montreal. Mc Gill University.

Atma, N., & Widiati, U. (2015). EFL students' preferences for corrective feedback in speaking instruction across speaking course levels. *Bahasa dan Seni. 43*(2). 183-195.

Bogdan, C., & Sari K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Allyn & Bacon.

Bogdan, C., & Sari K. (2003). *Qualitative Research for Education: an Introduction to Theory and Methods*, (Online), (http://n.ereserve.fiu.edu/010013009-1.pdf), on 25th November 2022.

Brookhart, S. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students.* ASCB.

Buyukbay, S. and Dabaghi, A. (2010). The effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3), 181–193.

Choi, S., & Shaofeng L. (2012). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in a child. *TESOL Quarterly*. 43(3): 331-351.

Dilans, G. (2010). Corrective feedback and L2 vocabulary development: Prompt and recasts in the adult ESL classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*. 787-815.

Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA Review,* 19, 18-41.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*. 1(1), 3- 18.

Ellis, R., & Younghee S. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 28, 576-600.

Fungula, B. (2013). *Oral corrective feedback in the Chinese EFL classroom*. Karlstads Universitet: Unpublished Thesis.

Han, Z. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on tense consistency in L2 output. *TESOL Quarterly*. 36(4), 543-572.

Handoyo, F. (2010). Improving English implicit grammar knowledge using semantic syntactic translation practice. *TEFLIN Journal*, 21(2), 186-201.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th Edition). Pearson Longman.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the classroom*. Oxford University Press.

Hendrickson, J. (1978). Correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. A historical perspective of learner errors. *The Modern Language Journal*, 62(8), 387-398.

Hillary, S. (2002). *Correct me if I'm wrong: Investigating the preferences in error correction among adult English language learners*. University of Central Florida: Unpublished Thesis.

Ihsan, D. (1999). Speaking and writing errors made by students of English Education. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 6(3), 222-234.

Kennedy, S. (2010). Corrective feedback for learners of varied proficiency levels: A teacher's choices. *Spring TESL Canada Journal*, 27.

Lyster, R., Kazuya S., & Masatoshi S. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in Second Language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1-40.

Lyster, R., & Kazuya S. (2010). Oral corrective feedback in classroom SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 265-302.

Lyster, R., & Panova, L. (2002). Pattern of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly Journal* , 36, 573-595.

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *SSLA*, 26, 399-432.

Martinez, G. (2006). Should we correct our students errors in L2 learning?. *Encuantro*, 16, 1-7.

Méndez, E., & Cruz, M. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 14(2), 63-75.

Moedjito, M., & Harumi, I. (2008). Perceptions of the seriousness of mispronunciations of English speech sounds. *TEFLIN Journal*, 19(1), 70-93.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Prentice-Hall.

Nunan, D. (1996). The self directed teacher managing the learning process. Cambridge University Press

Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical english language teaching*. McGraw Hill.

Park, H. (2010). *Teachers' and learners' preferences for error correction*. Unpublished master's thesis. California State University, Sacramento, USA.

Rahmi, S. (2017). Types of corrective feedback used by four lecturers on students' speaking performance. *INOVISH Journal*, 2(2), 79-95.

Roberts, R. (2012). *Task repetition: Helping students to improve accuracy, repertoire and fluency*. (Online), (https://elt-resourceful.com/2012/11/14/task-repetition-helpingstudents-to-improve-accuracyrepertoire-and-fluency/, on 30th October 2022.

Serra, R. (2014). *The importance of giving feedback*, (Online), (http://www.richmondshare.com.br/the-importance-of-giving-feedback/), on 5th February 2022.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classroom across instructional setting. *Language Teaching Research*, *8*(3), 263-300.

Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*. American University: Department of Language and Foreign Studies.

Sheen,Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp.593-607). Routledge.

Suryanto, S. (2014). Issues in teaching English in a cultural context: A case of Indonesia. *Journal of English Literacy Education*, 1(2), 75-83.

Tomcyzk, E. (2013). Perceptions of oral errors and their corrective feedback: Teachers vs. students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(5), 924-931.

Tripudiyana, T., Sartika, D., & Nery, R. (2022). A Correlation between Students' Self-Esteem and Speaking Skill. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning (JETLE)*, 3(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.18860/jetle.v3i2.15610

Truscott. (1999). The case for "The cast against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(20), 111-122.

Rohmana, W. I. M. (2017). The Implementation of Performance Assessment in Curriculum 2013 (A Case Study at the Eleventh Grade of SMAN 1 Magetan in the Academic Year of 2016/2017) [Universitas Sebelas Maret]. https://digilib.uns.ac.id/dokumen/detail/65955/The-Implementation-of-Performance-Assessment-in-Curriculum-2013-A-Case-Study-at-the-Eleventh-Grade-of-SMAN-1-Magetan-in-the-Academic-Year-of-20162017

Rolin-Ianziti, J. (2010). The organization of delayed second language correction. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(2), 183-206.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teacher's choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 78-93.

Yoshida, R. (2010). Teachers' choice and learners' preferences of corrective feedback types. Sidney: University of New South Wales

Zhang, Y., Zhang, L. & Ma, L. (2010). A brief analysis of corrective feedback in oral interaction. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1 (3), 306-308.