

## Oral Corrective Feedback Students Need: To Facilitate or to Impede?

Received date: 05/11/2022 Accepted date:11/06/2023 Published date: 20/06/2023

Fouzia Rouaghe <sup>1</sup> Yasmina Chorfi <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mohamed Lamine Debaghine Sétif2, University, Algeria

Email: [f.rouaghe@univ-setif.dz](mailto:f.rouaghe@univ-setif.dz)

<sup>2</sup> Mohamed Lamine Debaghine Sétif2, University, Algeria

Email: [yasmina.chorfi19@gmail.com](mailto:yasmina.chorfi19@gmail.com)

### Abstract:

The present paper aims at identifying third year students learning needs as regards oral corrective feedback provided during oral expression classes. A preliminary informal observation was conducted before administering a questionnaire to 76 subjects. Students' self-evaluation as a present situation showed that they are good at memorizing and comprehending vocabulary but they cannot deploy them appropriately. Upshots also revealed that the most received feedback is a recast while students prefer as learning needs delayed explicit oral feedback.

**Keywords:** Oral corrective feedback; learning needs; explicit feedback; delayed feedback; present situation.

**Corresponding Author:** Fouzia Rouaghe, Email: [f.rouaghe@univ-setif.dz](mailto:f.rouaghe@univ-setif.dz)

## **1. Introduction:**

In EFL classes both teachers and learners contribute evenly in the teaching and the learning processes. Teachers generally play more than one role inside the classroom. For instance, they can be supervisors, helpers, observers, promoters, and feedback providers. Those roles significantly impact the learning process. Therefore, teachers' feedback is an inevitable part when teaching a foreign/second language. This section will tackle the general definition of feedback, types of feedback, immediate & delayed feedback, criteria for an effective feedback, and students' reaction toward oral feedback.

## **2. Oral Feedback**

The main concern of the current investigation is teachers' oral feedback. It is primarily expressed in spoken form to help learners achieve positive outcomes. Oral feedback is an important tool inside classrooms because it acts as an obligatory and unavoidable feature when the teacher interacts with the learner (Cullen, 2002). Moreover, teachers should conceder setting, structure, and tone while offering feedback to their learners, according to Frey& Fisher (2011, p.77-78).

### **2.1. Choose the appropriate setting**

Namely, is picking out a suitable spot inside the classroom to give feedback. Frey & Fisher (2011) add that “select a place in the classroom that is physically removed from the larger group. This gives

students a place to focus on what is being said and to determine the tone in which it is delivered”. To make that point and give brief feedback, teachers need to be situated near to the student who carried out the performance.

## **2.2. Structure the response**

Teachers need to produce brief and clear oral feedback to evaluate learners' performance.

- Describes the results of learners' performance.
- Directs the learners to what is correct and what should be changed.
- Encouraging learners to keep going. (Cited in Frey & Fisher, 2011, p.78)

## **2.3. Use a supportive tone**

Using an appropriate tone is an important component of teachers' oral feedback. For this reason, teachers must opt for an encouraging and motivating tone; to not discourage learners from participating in the classroom. (Frey & Fisher, 2011, p.78).

Several studies have shown the effectiveness of oral feedback. Brookhart (2008) finds that oral feedback is a great tool to create interaction between teachers and learners in a short amount of time. Another reason is that, unlike written evaluation, spoken feedback encourages students to participate more actively in class. It is also quite instructive to assist students in practicing the target language.

Moreover, feedback can help students enhance their competence and achievement (Tunstall & Gipps, 1996).

### 3.Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

Oral feedback is term that contains different types such as oral corrective feedback. Thus, Oral corrective feedback is the support provided by the teacher to his or her students in regards to their spoken faults. According to Lyster & Ranta (1997), there are six types of oral corrective feedback: explicit correction, recast, clarification request, meta-linguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition.

**3.1. Explicit correction.** Lyster & Ranta (1997, p.46) define it as a clear indication of the student's incorrect utterances in the correct form. Additionally, it is about the direct correction of faulty production. For example – a student might say, 'John and Kathy has bought new toys'. In this case, a teacher might respond 'No, you are wrong. You have to say, 'John and Kathy have bought new toys'' (Park, 2010, p. 8).

**3.2. Recast.** Lightbown & Spada (1999, p.107) viewed that corrective recast is the correction of students' utterances as the students pay more attention to the meaning of the speech. Lightbown & Spada (1999,p.107)stated that "where the teacher repeats a student's utterance, using correct forms where the student has made an error, but does not draw attention to the error and maintains a central focus on meaning".

Taron et al (2009, p.59) suggested the following example:

Trigger: what she doing?

Recast: what is she doing? Two knocks

Recall: what is she doing? (Correct).

**3.3. Clarification requests.** According to Lightbown & Spada (1999, p.107), the teacher requests clarification when pointing out to the learner that an utterance was misunderstood or contained an error. Thus, students react by repeating or reformulating their answers. To make things clear, Panova & Lyster (2002, p. 583) cited this example:

S: I want today, today. (Grammatical error)

T: I'm sorry? (Clarification request)

**3.4. Metalinguistic feedback.** During metalinguistic feedback, the teacher asks questions or gives comments or hints to the student's related inaccurate utterances. Furthermore, Lyster & Ranta (1997, P.46) define it as "either comments information, or questions related to the well- formedness of the student utterance, without explicitly providing the correct answer".

Panova & Lyster(2002,p.584) gave an example to this sort of feedback,

S: nouvelle ecosse ..... (L1)

T: oh! But that's in French

(Metalinguistic feedback)

**3.5. Elicitation.** In this strategy, the teacher asks questions to elicit answers from his/her students. Similarly, Lightbown & Spada (1999, p.107) defined elicitation as “where the teacher uses questions to elicit completion of students’ utterances, asks questions to elicit correct forms, or asks to reformulate their utterances “. Moreover, Mendez et al (2010, p.264) provided the following example:

S: Androches and the lion become good friends.

T: become? (Emphasis)        -

S: became.                                -

**3.6. Repetition.** This type of oral corrective feedback is based on teachers’ repetition of students’ wrong utterances to correct them. Panov & Lyster (2002, p.584) add that “in a repetition, the teacher repeats the ill formed part of the student’s utterance, usually with a change in intonation”. Here, teachers raise students’ awareness about their errors by repetition. For instance – a student might say, ‘I watch a movie yesterday’. A teacher might respond ‘I WATCH a movie yesterday’. In this case, the teacher emphasized on the inappropriate utterance of that student by using his/her intonation (Mendez & Cruz, 2012, p. 66)

### **3.7. Immediate Feedback**

Ellis (2009) referred to the immediate feedback by providing the feedback immediately after the student makes an utterance that contains an error by them. Harmer (2001) distinguished between communicative and non-communicative activities. Thus, Harmer (2001) claims that the type of feedback provided on the students' oral performance is depended on the purpose of the activity and the type of error. According to specialists, if the goal of a language course is to improve accuracy, immediate feedback should be provided. Doughty (2001) suggested that teachers should treat erroneous utterances immediately. Therefore, during accuracy work, teachers on spot feedback must tackle grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. Furthermore, immediate feedback can help the learners acknowledge the gap between their current performance and their wanted level of performance (Shute, 2008, p.157). As well, feedback eliminates uncertainty which is usually unpleasant and diverts students' attention away from improving their performance (Shute, 2008, p.157). However, other studies claim that immediate feedback prevents errors from being remembered by students; and it has been discovered that giving learners immediate feedback regularly might demotivate them and possibly prohibit them from engaging in future events.

### **3.8. Delayed Feedback**

Delayed feedback happens when teachers wait for their students to finish their performance and provide feedback at the end without

interruption. Chastain (1971) suggested that errors should be corrected at the end of the learners' oral performance. In addition, Long (1997) points out that teachers have to provide oral delayed feedback to not disturb the flow of the communication. When the goal of learning a target language is to achieve fluency, teachers should postpone their interference to comment on students' errors. The delayed feedback aims to maintain the flow of the speaking activity while ensuring that the learner's self-confidence is not harmed. Delayed feedback during fluency should be about the content, the structure, and the suitable vocabulary.

Furthermore, Holley& King (1971) reported that delayed correction permits the learners to self-correct and benefit more from the correction provided by the teacher. Also, delayed feedback gives teachers the opportunity to analyze the nature of the errors and how to decide to treat them ( Fanselow, 1977). Even though, it is believed that some teachers face problems concerning delayed feedback during fluency work; because the teachers might forget some errors that appeared in the learner's speech. Using charts to mark learners' errors or recording their speech are great techniques to enable teachers to give feedback after the event.

- a. **Present-situation analysis** (PSA) refers to English language information about the learners: what their current skills and language use are (Dudley-Evans and St.Johns 1998, p.125). A present situation analysis involves finding out not only what



students are like at the outset of their course, but also more about their teachers, teaching institution and, going further, the wider society around (Robinson, 1989, p. 404). In our context, students were asked to report their initial level at the beginning of the speaking class. What they know, what they do not know and how they rate their ability to deploy the oral feedback in their speaking activities.

### Types of needs

Two main types of needs are named by Richterich (1980) *objective needs* and *subjective needs*. On the same vein, Brindley (1989, pp.64-67) approves the existence of objective and subjective needs as he defines them as follows:

- ***Objective needs***: refers to needs which are derivable from different kinds of factual information about learners, their use of language in real-life communication situations as well as their current language proficiency and language difficulties.
- ***Subjective needs***: refers to the cognitive and affective needs of the learner in the learning situation derivable from information about affective and cognitive factors such as personality, confidence, attitudes, learners' wants and expectations with regard to the learning of English and their individual cognitive style and learning strategies.

Hutchinson and Waters (1987, p.54) provide as well two types of needs which they term "*target needs*" and "*learning needs*" (akin to objective and subjective needs). Target needs have something to do with what the learner needs to do in the target situation, whereas learning needs refer to what the learner needs to do in order to learn.

#### **4. Students' Preferences (Subjective Needs)**

Generally, learners put more trust in their teachers; they prefer to receive feedback from them concerning their oral performance (Calsiyao, 2015; Genc 2014; Zhang and Rahimi, 2014) even though learners rely on their teachers' feedback, they might react differently to it. Automatically, students develop a negative or a positive attitude toward oral corrective feedback because of the delivery way. Cowei (2005) points out that the use of OCF can impact students' feelings positively or negatively. Furthermore, OCF can generate students' positive reactions. Mackiewicz and Thompsons' study (2013) discovered the importance of providing motivational statements in increasing students' confidence and engagement. Moreover, Ganlem& Smith (2013) states that receiving approval from teachers' makes students happy and feel motivated for the next work. Uptake is also a result of a positive reaction to feedback. Thus, it is important to notice when students' uptake is successful.

Oppositely, students might develop a negative attitude toward OCF. Harmer (2006) and Truscott (1999) uphold the cintention that correcting students may provoke negative feelings like anger or

embarrassment. In addition, Asheson & Gall (1980) claims that OF can cause bad learning habits that might make students stop learning when there is no OF. Irons (2008, p. 84) states “Being overly critical serves no constructive purposes and can be very demotivating for students”. So, it would be plausible should teachers show carefulness when providing feedback in order to create a positive reaction.

## **5. Problem Statement**

Speaking skill is an essential part of communication. Therefore, teaching speaking skills in EFL classes is a vital task for teachers and a challenging activity for learners. As a part of the learning process, EFL learners might commit errors or fail to communicate because of their limited vocabulary. Here, one of the solutions is teachers' feedback which is required to help learners overcome their communication problems. Informal observations during oral expression sessions; and conducting informal discussions with some of the 3rd-year English students at Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University Setif 2 revealed that 3rd-year students face difficulties in verbal language production; they find it challenging to express themselves due to the vocabulary limitation. For this reason, it was decided to investigate what learners need and desire, from their respective teachers, as an appropriate oral corrective feedback in order to improve grammar and enrich vocabulary that will eventually be used effectively in real life situations.

## 6. Research Questions

- What type of oral feedback students get?
- Which oral feedback students are in need of to improve grammar and vocabulary?

## 7. Research Setting

The study takes place at the English department at Mohamed Lamin Debaghin, Setif 2 University, during the school year of 2021/2022. And it was directed at third-year LMD Students in the Department of English Language and Literature.

## 8. Research Population

Population in research is a cooperative term that Dörnyei (2007, p. 96) defines as “a group of people whom the study is about” The chosen population was 3rd-year English students at Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University Setif 2. The choice of third-year students was the appropriate one because it matches the aim of the current investigation. Usually, third-year students are familiar with the types of oral corrective feedback and they developed an attitude towards it. Furthermore, third-year English students tend to have enough vocabulary packages which fit the research interests. Moreover, oral expression teachers’ participation is also counted implicitly in the present study. Since oral expression teachers have more chances to provide their students with such feedback while they are talking or participating.

## 8.1. The Sample

A sample of 76 third-year LMD students was selected purposefully from the total population of 364 students at the English Language and Literature Department at Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University Setif 2. Furthermore, the questionnaire was randomly sent through GOOGLE form to 3<sup>rd</sup> year students' before the spring holiday. And 76 responses were collected.

## 9. Questionnaire Description

The learners' questionnaire aims to collect students' learning needs and perceptions about teachers' oral corrective feedback and to find out the most preferred feedback by students. The questionnaire is divided into four sections. The first section is about learners' general information. The second section is dedicated to the description of learners' present situation and how they self-rate themselves in the beginning of the speaking class. The third section is intended for the types of the corrective feedback provided by teachers. The last section is devoted to learners' preferences or what is called learning needs which stands for learners' affective factors. The learners' questionnaire includes a combination of multiple choices and close-ended questions. The first section is concerned with learners' general information. It contains three questions, where learners are asked to specify their gender (Male or Female) and age.

The second section is designed to analyze the students' present situation. It contains eight different questions.

The first question tackles learners' opinion about the role of teacher's feedback. Question 2 and 3 seek to answer whether learners remember vocabulary if they get corrected by the teacher and whether this motivated them to communicate more. Similar questions are 6 and 7 that investigate whether learners can comprehend what they listen to and whether they are able to deploy them effectively in real life communication. Question 4 is asked to show whether students have enough words while speaking. Finally, the purpose to ask question 8 is to know how learners feel when they are corrected immediately in the mid of their speech. This section is somehow a kind of self assessment of students' knowledge, weaknesses and strengths at the beginning of the speaking class.

Section three is about asking students to choose the type of the oral feedback provided by the teachers. Learners were allowed to choose more than one answer. This section consists of six types of oral feedback which are explicit correction, recast, clarification requests, metalinguistic, elicitation and repetition.

Lastly in section 4 students were asked to express their preferences as regards the feedback they desire to receive the most. It is a kind of a learning need situation through which the teacher and the researcher could determine which feedback could be more effective in memorizing grammar and vocabulary. Questions are a mixture of different types of feedback that were previously mentioned in section 3 in addition to other types such as immediate and delayed

feedback; explicit or implicit. Question 1, 5 and 6 are asked to know whether learners prefer explicit immediate feedback. Whereas question 7 and 8 seek to determine if a delayed feedback is more favoured. Questions 2, 3 and 4 are intended for collecting students' answers about repetition clarification and meta linguistic approach to feedback.

### **9.1. Pilot Testing**

The pilot testing was conducted to ensure the validity of the learners' questionnaire and to find any misconception or ambiguity concerning the questions formed for third -year LMD students. As well as, the pilot study was done to fix any issues concerning the vocabulary and the structure of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was given randomly to ten students. Respondents asked to add and omit some options in section3. As a result, students gave back some positive responses concerning the length and the easiness of the questionnaire. Furthermore, students stated that the time was sufficient to answer all the questions. Moreover, students commented positively about the well- structured and organized form, and they found that the vocabulary used was easy and understandable. It is worthy to mention that the ten students who participated in the pilot testing were excluded from the sample intended to answer the questionnaire.

## **10. Issues of Trustworthiness and Ethical Considerations**

All research must follow appropriate guidelines, and the following paper is no different. Initially, research ethical considerations were set to ensure that the research subjects' participation in the study is voluntary, informed, and safe. Hence, the study was guided by those general procedures. Usage of any primary or secondary data from different sources was acknowledged with references to avoid any kind of plagiarism. Moreover, the subjects were kindly asked for permission to voluntarily participate; they were, also, informed that they can opt in or out of the study at any point in time. Additionally, the participants were informed about the consent. The researchers briefly informed them about the purpose and the content of the study before any of them agreed or declined to join. In the same vein, all the personal data of the respondents were confidential and their identities will remain anonymous throughout the whole study. Thus, both students and teachers were informed that the data collected will be truthfully reported and will never be suppressed or faked. For sure, the participants were completely safe; there was no potential harm.

## **11. Data Collection Procedures**

The researchers stated the fieldwork of the present investigation with a specific case study of third-year English students and their oral expression teachers. Two data collection tool was used to gather responses regarding the learners' perception of the utility of OCF and



vocabulary retention. To accomplish that, the questionnaire was administred and handed on to students. However, pilot testing took place before the actual administration of the questionnaire. Many researchers prefer to use questionnaires because they can be an efficient way of gathering data in a structured and manageable format.

**11.1.Students’ Questionnaire**

To gather information about students’ perceptions towards teachers’ OCF and to discover its’ role, a students’ questionnaire was designed. The current survey sample is 76 3rd year English students at Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University Setif 2.

**12. Data Analysis**

**12.1.Reliability Test of Students ‘Questionnaire**

**Table 1.** Reliability Statistics

Cronbach’s Alpha	N of items
0,74	22

The score of alpha above shows that the questionnaire items are reliable.

**Table 2.The Present Situation**

The upshots in table 2 above show that the highest mean score of the respondents’ answer 5.35 is for “I feel discouraged when I receive oral feedback while I am still speaking” followed by the second largest mean 5.26 which illustrated that learners depend heavily on the teacher’s feedback. A quite similar result 5.22 represents the agreement of learners that they can recognize the words they listen to; but they can’t use them while speaking. The subsequent

mean score 5.17 illustrates that the informants can remember the words that the teacher orally corrects for them and this explains that a considerable number of the students are auditory in learning style. The least mean scores 3.91 and 3.85 represent the learners' present situation of "I can comprehend the words that I listen to" and "I can remember the right words that help me express the desired meaning" respectively.

The highest SD is found in statement 4 by 1.98. The findings pinpoint the data spread out and a high variance exists. In other words, learners do face a challenge in finding enough vocabulary when they start speaking. However and unexpectedly, the least standard deviation .84 is recorded for statement 7 when learners express that "they can sometimes recognize the words they listen to; but they can't use them when they speak" although this statement got the second largest mean score. This result demonstrates that students can comprehend vocabulary but it is often not possible to exploit it immediately in their speech. This has been confirmed by the subsequent low SD .96 and .99 that correspond to "I can comprehend the words that I listen to" and "I can remember the words that my teacher orally corrects for me". The latter items confirm that most learners prefer oral over written feedback in order to memorize and comprehend the meaning.

**Table3.** Type of oral corrective feedback that learners receive the most

No	Statements	N	Mean	SD
1	Explicit correction: correcting students' errors directly	76	5.10	1.90
2.	Recast: repeating learners' incorrect Sentences with the correct answer".	76	5.09	1.63
3.	Clarification requests: ask learners for clarification when pointing out to them an utterance that contains errors	76	4.64	1.84
4.	Metalinguistic feedback: providing hints or comments to learners to show the incorrect utterance	76	4.96	1.98
5.	Elicitation: asking questions to elicit the errors	76	5.78	1.67
6.	Repeat: teachers repeat learners' incorrect utterances to correct them	76	5.81	1.08

This section is intended for illustrating the type of oral feedback that students receive very often from their teachers .In line with previous research findings (Panov & Lyster , 2002 & Mendez & Cruz, 2012), the participants reported that the highest mean value (5.81) to the last statement , i.e. "Repeat: teachers repeat learners' incorrect utterances to correct them". Similarly, the second highest mean value of 5.78 was recorded for the fifth statement "Elicitation: asking questions to elicit the errors."

Statements one and two scored a quite similar mean value of 5.10 and 5.09 in relation to "Explicit correction: correcting students' errors directly" and "Recast: repeating learners' incorrect Sentences with the correct answer" respectively. The lowest mean values, 4.64 and 4.96 represented the statement "Clarification requests: ask learners for clarification when pointing out to them an utterance that contains errors" and "Metalinguistic feedback: providing hints or comments to

learners to show the incorrect utterance” respectively. These findings are in line with previous research by Panova & Lyster (2002), who confirmed the standard deviation (SD) scores for the least used oral feedback which has been calculated higher than the SD for the most used feedback, which indicates that the informants showed that there is a lot of variance as regards the least used types of feedback and this may explain that teachers resort to less complicated feedback that leads to immediate correction rather than a feedback that requires a thought provoking and might take more time and effort

**Table 4.** Students’ subjective Needs

Statements	N	Mean	SD
1. I prefer my teacher explicitly (directly) corrects my errors.	76	5.13	.81
2.I prefer that the teacher repeats my incorrect answer using the correct form	76	5.34	.86
3.I prefer that my teacher asks me to clarify my answer	76	5.31	.98
4.I prefer that my teacher questions my errors to draw my attention	76	5.44	.95
5.I prefer to be corrected immediately when I make an error	76	4.25	.66
6. I prefer that my teacher stops me and corrects my grammar and pronunciation errors immediately.	76	4.62	.78
7.I prefer my teacher correct my errors after I finish speaking	76	5.02	.96
8.I feel at ease when my teacher comments on my fluency and vocabulary after I finish speaking	76	5.12	1.01

Table 4 above shows that the participants have ranked the fourth statement of this category “I prefer that my teacher questions my

errors to draw my attention” with the highest mean value of 5.44. The second highest mean value was the score of the second and the third statement 5.34 and 5.31 respectively. It demonstrates that students prefer that the teacher asks them to elaborate and repeat the incorrect answer followed by a correction.

Statement 1 and 8 reported the participants’ answers about the preference of getting an explicit feedback about fluency in the end of the speech (explicit delayed feedback). The last least percentages are enjoyed by the fifth and the sixth statements of 4.25 and 4.62 respectively. Respondents preferred that the teachers correct them immediately in case of errors as regards grammar and pronunciation.

In the same context, the findings of the present study are similar to the viewpoints stated by Chastain (1971) and Long (1997). The highest SD was recorded for statement 8 which may imply that students show a great variation when it comes to delayed feedback as regards vocabulary. Similarly, statement, 3, 4, 7 had the second highest SD. However; respondents seem to agree about the preference of the immediate feedback and this was shown by the lowest SD .66 in statement 5

### **13. Discussion and Interpretation of the results**

The students’ questionnaire has revealed many interesting results. Demographic findings have shown that the majority of the learners are young, females, and always attend oral expression sessions. As regards the students’ present situation, it has been found

out that most learners at the beginning stage of the speaking class feel shattered in case they are interrupted in the mid of their speech. Additionally, the respondents' answers revolved around their ability to memorize and comprehend the words they listen to but they very often find it challenging to deploy them while speaking.

For the central part of this section, learners have displayed the type of oral feedback they receive often from their teacher. The first ranking was repitition and elicitation. The second classification was for asking questions and clarification requests. While meta-linguistic correction was the least chosen. This indicates that teachers would prefer candid feedback over the type of feedback that might provoke thinking skills which might lead learners to think and learn better.

Section two was intended for collecting students' preferences and needs as regards the appropriate feedback. It was revealed that there are errors committed; therefore, teachers' feedback is something required. The fundamental part of this section was measuring third-year learners' agreement and disagreement about the preferred feedback. As it was illustrated in (table 2) students selected their favorite types of oral corrective feedback. Unexpectedly, they preferred recast first, and for most, then explicit correction and providing hints were the second; and finally, asking questions and clarification requests were the third and the fourth choices. It is obvious that learners' chose different types according to their preferences. However, learners' generally agreed that the delayed

explicit feedback is their most liked one as previously highlighted in the PSA. According to them, they feel at ease when they receive feedback after they finish speaking (as regards grammar and vocabulary correction). Finally, learners' strongly agreed that teachers' OCF is essential and helpful. To draw this to a close, along this analysis one can say that the research questions have been successfully answered. It is clear, now, that teachers' oral corrective feedback plays a crucial role in helping students retain vocabulary and grammar. Additionally, it was found that learners favour delayed explicit feedback more than immediate feedback during the speaking class which is considered unusual in the oral performance. The upshots disagree to some extent with what was found in the literature. Here, third year students fancy delayed feedback may be due to not cutting off their train of thoughts.

## **14. Pedagogical Implications**

This section will present some implications and recommendations for further research based on the aforementioned findings of this investigation and the findings gathered from students' questionnaires and informal observations.

### **14.1. Implications for Teachers**

Teachers hold a part of the responsibility in helping their learners learn and retain vocabulary. Along with taking into account students' demands, wants, and needs to discover what fascinates them and use it to develop a successful learning environment. Initially, it is the

teachers' job to provide learners with corrective feedback and help them progress.

#### **14.2. Implications for Students**

Lexis is the foundation of language learning. In a nutshell, vocabulary is the raw building block that one can use to express their ideas, share information, understand others, and grow academically. Initially, students must be aware of their weaknesses in vocabulary to take control of their language learning in general. Learners are supposed to develop their vocabulary. They are in charge of learning and retaining such items; it is up to them. Also, learners in class are more receptive; hence they have to pay attention to their teachers' feedback; it is important to receive feedback and use it. Students must take the initiative of practicing communication inside and outside the classrooms.

#### **15. Limitations and suggestions for future research**

The current study involves several limitations that provided some recommendations and implications for future studies that investigate the relationship between teachers' OCF and learners' vocabulary and grammar improvement. First, due to COVID-19 circumstances, the researchers couldn't conduct an experimental study. Therefore, additional papers might be experimental with a larger population, and real applications, since the questionnaire is designed to collect the participants' preferences and opinions only and not their real abilities. Second, the sample of the study included only third-year students at



the English department of Mohamed Lamine Debaghine Setif-02-university. Thus, other investigations can conduct full scrutiny with different levels and different departments. Third, this study employs one primary data collection. Hence, other research may utilize other research tools such as interviews, focus group discussions, and observation checklists. Fourth, future studies could be suggested to investigate the effect of using recast or prompts on enhancing students' vocabulary and grammar uptake. Other researchers' can create a new context in terms of focusing on OCF timing only. Additionally, it might be interesting to focus on the connection between teachers 'feedback and learners' willingness to communicate. Finally, the researchers faced an unbalanced gender distribution; other studies can try to bypass this limitation.

## **16. CONCLUSION**

To conclude, this chapter represented the practical version of the methodology section. It contained the analysis, discussion, and interpretation of the research data. Those data were collected through the use of two research tools and they were analyzed following a quantitative approach. To analyze the finding obtained from students' questionnaire, the researchers relied on objective interpretation. Over and above that, the last section cast the light on answering the research questions and assuring the research assumptions. Finally, the researchers suggested some implications and recommendations for future research.

## **Bibliography:**

1. ASHESON, K. A., & Gall, M. D.). (1980). *Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers: Perspectives and In-service Applications*. Longman: New York
2. BRINDLEY, G. (1989). *The Role of Needs Analysis in Adult ESL Program Design*. In Johnson. R. K. *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
3. BROOKHART, S. M. (2008). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. ASCD: USA.
4. CALSIYAO, I. S. (2015). *Corrective feedback in classroom oral errors among Kalinga-Apayao State College Students*. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research* 3(1) pp(394-400)
5. CHASTAIN, K. (1971). *The development of modern language skills: Theory to practice*. The Center for Curriculum Development, Inc .Philadelphia.
6. COWIE, B. (2005). *Pupil Commentary on Assessment for Learning*. *The Curriculum Journal* 16(2) (pp. 137-151)
7. CULLEN, R. (2002). Supportive Teacher Talk: The Importance of the F-Move. *ELT Journal* 56(2), (pp 117-127)

8. DÖRNYEI , Z. (2007).*Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
9. DOUGHTY, C. (2001).*Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form*. In ROBINSON. P. (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. (pp. 206-57)
10. DUDLEY-EVANS, T & ST. JOHN, M. (1998).*Developments in ESP: a Multi-Disciplinary Approach*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
11. ELLIS, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, (1), (pp.3-18)
12. FANSELOW, J. (1977). *The treatment of error in oral work*. *Foreign Language Annals*. (10). (pp.583-593)
13. FREY, N., & FISHER, D. (2011).*The Formative Assessment Action Plan: Practical steps to more successful teaching and learning*. VA: ASCD: Alexandria.
14. GAMLEM, S. M. & Smith, K. (2013).*Student Perceptions of Classroom Feedback*. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(2) (pp.150-169)
15. GENC, Z. S. (2014). *Correcting spoken errors in English language teaching*: Preferences of Turkish EFL Learners at

- Different Proficiency Levels. *Education and Science*. (39) (pp.259- 273)
16. HARMER, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching: Mistakes and feedback* Longman: London
17. HARMER, J. (2006). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). Longman: London.
18. HOLLEY, F. M., & King, J. K. 1971. Imitation and correction in foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal* 55(8). (pp.494-498)
19. HUTCHINSON, T. & WATERS, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning Centered Approach*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
20. IRONS, (2008). *A. Enhancing Learning through Formative Assessment and Feedback*. Routledge
21. LIGHTBOWN, P.M., & SPADA, N. (1999). *How languages are learned* (2nd Ed). Oxford University Press: Oxford.
22. LONG, M. H. (1997). *The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition*. In. RITCHIE W. C & BHATIA. T. K. (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition CA*: Academic Press .San Diego. (pp. 413-468).
23. LYSTER, R., & RANTA, L. (1997). *Corrective feedback and learner uptake*: Negotiation of form in communicative

- classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, (pp.37-66)
24. MACKIEWICZ, J. & THOMPSON, I. (2013). *Motivational Scaffolding, Politeness, and Writing Center Tutoring*. *The Writing Center Journal*, 33(1), (pp.38-73)
25. MENDEZ, E. H., & CRUZ, M. R. R. (2012). *Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms*. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 14(2). (pp.63-75.)
26. MENDEZ, E.H, ARGUELLES ,L.G.,& CASTRO, A.B.J. (2010). *Oral corrective feedback*: Some ways to go about it. *FEL* 2(1), (pp. 25–38)
27. PANOVA, I., & LYSTER, R. (2002). *Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom*. *TESOL Quarterly* 36, (pp.573-595)..
28. RICHTERICH, L., & CHANCEREL, J. (1980). *Identifying the Needs of Adults Learning a Foreign Language*. Pergamon. Oxford.
29. ROBINSON, P. C. (1989). *An Overview of English for Specific Purposes*. In COLEMAN, H. *Working with Language: a multidisciplinary consideration of language use in work contexts*. Walter de Gruyter (pp.395-427).

30. SHUTE, V. J. (2008). *Focus on Formative Feedback.. Review of Educational Research*, 78 (pp.153-189).
31. TARONE, E., BIGELOW, M., & HANSEN, K. (2009). *Literacy and second language oracy* (1st Ed). Oxford University Press: Oxford.
32. TRUSCOTT, J. (1999). *What's wrong with oral grammar correction?. The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55, (pp.437-455).
33. TUNSTALL, P. & GIPPS, C. (1996). *Teacher Feedback to Young Children in Formative Assessment: A Typology. British Educational Research Journal* 22 (4), (pp.389-404)
34. ZHANG, L. J., & RAHIMI, M. (2014). *EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes*. 42. System. (pp. 429-439). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system>. consulted on 12/01/2014.



6. I can comprehend the words that I listen to.

7. Sometimes I can recognize the words that I listen to; but I can't use them when I speak.

8. I feel discouraged when I receive oral feedback while I am still speaking.

## **2. What type of oral corrective feedback do you receive the most?**

**You can tick more than one option.**

- a. Explicit correction: correcting students' errors directly.
- b. Recast: repeating learners' incorrect Sentences with the correct answer.
- c. Clarification requests: ask learners for clarification when pointing out to them an utterance that contains errors.
- d. Metalinguistic feedback: providing hints or comments to learners to show the incorrect utterance.
- e. Elicitation: asking questions to elicit the errors.
- f. Repetition: repeat learners' incorrect utterances to correct them.

## **3. What type of feedback you prefer the most? (Learning Needs)**

- 1. I prefer my teacher explicitly (directly) corrects my errors.
- 2. I prefer that the teacher repeats my incorrect answer using the correct form.
- 3. I prefer that my teacher asks me to clarify my answer.
- 4. I prefer that my teacher questions my errors to draw my attention
- 5. I prefer to be corrected immediately when I make an error
- 6. I prefer that my teacher stops me and corrects my grammar and pronunciation errors immediately.



7. I prefer my teacher correct my errors after I finish speaking.
8. I feel at ease when my teacher comments on my fluency and vocabulary after I finish speaking.

