Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques: An Investigation of the EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices at Taif University

Reem Alkhammash
English Language Department, University College
Taraba, Taif University, Saudi Arabia

Fahmeeda Gulnaz
English Language Centre, Deanship of Supportive Studies
Taif University, Saudi Arabia

Abstract
Recent research has shown that little attention has been paid to teachers' views regarding giving oral corrective feedback (Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2016). To fill this gap, this empirical study investigates the beliefs of Taif University's teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) about their feedback practices and their perception of the impact that these practices have on students' performance. An opinionnaire of 18 items was designed with closed-ended questions. A five-point Likert's scale was employed to measure three subscales: teachers' beliefs and practices about their corrective feedback; types of oral corrective feedback used by EFL teachers; and their perception of students' uptake. The survey was administered to fifty-seven English as foreign language (EFL) teachers at the English Language Centre (ELC), Taif University who were asked to fill in an online survey regarding their oral corrective feedback practices in the classroom. Their responses were analysed quantitatively. The findings of the study were that the participants allocated highest preferences to the techniques of elicitation, repetition and recast, and that they frequently use them in their classrooms.
Keywords: beliefs, ESL/EFL teachers, oral corrective feedback techniques, practices

1. Introduction

Corrective Feedback has been investigated primarily in the literature as an important part of classroom instructions in English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings (Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013). Instructions in second and foreign language learning are divided by many researchers and pedagogues into two categories: meaning-focused and form-focused instructions. Corrective feedback is the main concern of form-focused instructions as it emphasises accuracy in pronunciation, grammar, tone of voice and other aspects of language learning (Spada & Lightbown, 1993), while meaning-focused instruction focuses on vocabulary-learning and the communication of meaning, as well as allowing more mistakes to occur without correction (Williams, 1995). In the EFL context, Ahangari & Amirzadeh (2011) argue that teachers' awareness and understanding are important in deciding when and where meaning-focused and form-focused instructions should be applied and in what circumstances either of them would be more productive in the EFL setting. Farrokhi (2003) argues that in EFL classrooms, the best approach is to integrate both meaning-focused and form-focused methods of instructions to achieve maximum learning outcomes. He states the importance of responding to the learners' speech production and for this reason he argues that corrective feedback in foreign language learning is a significant strategy in dealing with learners' oral errors.

Mendelson (1990) describes different sub-areas of corrective feedback in the field of linguistics. He states that pronunciation, grammar, non-verbal cues and tone of voice should be given most attention by teachers when providing feedback to learners. On the one hand, Chaudron (1977) maintains that teachers' corrective feedback practices are effective in developing accurate performance and thus enhance learners' communicative competence. On the other hand, Brown (2000) notes that students sometimes use avoidance strategies in order to avoid errors, and that this causes them to regularly produce problematic structures. However, corrective feedback enhances learners' ability to understand lexical and grammatical structures in a sentence. For more than five decades, researchers and pedagogues have been advocating a learner-centred approach, as the effectiveness of corrective feedback practices depends on learners being at the heart of the teaching and learning process (Ellis, 2007; Firwana, 2011).

Researching teachers' beliefs is useful in understanding teachers' classroom decision-making (Ernest, 1989). Fang (1996), argues that beliefs tend to affect behavior. Since teachers' beliefs are complex and can be affected by many variables, such as length of teaching experiences (Richardson, 1996), the aim of this paper is to explore teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback, specifically (a) how EFL teachers generally perceive the use of corrective feedback practices in their teaching; (b) their beliefs and practices in the use of different types of oral corrective feedback techniques in an EFL context and (c) their perception of students' performance when oral corrective feedback practices are implemented.

2. Literature Review

The crucial importance of corrective feedback techniques led researchers to examine the relationship between feedback and language learning in the context of EFL/ESL teachers' teaching practices. Several studies have identified a number of feedback types and also examined what kind of effect they have on students' uptake and language learning. Scholars such as Loewen (2004)

and Lyster & Ranta (1997), state that the significant role of oral corrective feedback in the context of the EFL classroom cannot be ignored.

2.1 What is Oral Corrective Feedback?

Corrective feedback has been defined as teacher's correction of mistakes in learners' utterances. In one of the earliest works, Chaudron (1977, p. 31) describes corrective feedback as "any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance". Ellis, Loewen & Erlam (2006) define corrective feedback as follows:

> Corrective feedback takes the form of responses to learner utterances that contain error. The responses can consist of (a) an indication that an error has been committed, (b) provision of the correct target language form, or (c) meta-linguistic information about the nature of the error, or any combination of these. (p. 340)

Furthermore, the most common definition of corrective feedback is provided by Lightbown & Spada (1999) (as cited in El Tatawy 2002:1) as the act of "indicating to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect" (p. 171). In the process of providing feedback, teachers use different techniques to draw learners' attention to their errors and/or provide different clues to develop their capacity for self-repair or uptake. Some SLA theorists, however, such as Krashen, argue that it is harmful for the acquisition and language learning process (Rezaei, Mozzaffari & Hatef, 2011), though Long (2006) explains that corrective feedback is highly beneficial for second language (L2) and foreign language learners. Many studies in second language acquisition (SLA) have shown that consistent use of oral corrective feedback can improve the noticing, acquisition and retention of language forms (Iwashita, 2003; Leeman, 2003; Macky, 1999; Mackey & Philip, 1998; Oliver & Mackey, 2003; Philip, 2003). The significant components of the above-discussed definitions are the teachers, the learners, and how providing feedback practices might result in improvements in students' spoken proficiency.

2.2 Teachers' and Learners' perception of Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques

Several studies have shown that many teachers have a positive perception of oral corrective feedback, while a few studies perceive feedback practices as having negative impact on the feelings and emotions of the learners (see in particular Méndez & Cruz, 2012). In this context, a study was undertaken by Lee (2013) at a Public University in USA to investigate teachers' and learners' preferences concerning corrective feedback. Lee conducted his study on 60 ESL graduate students with a high level of proficiency in English and four English native-speaker teachers. Data were gathered using qualitative and quantitative research tools. The results indicate great differences between teachers' and learners' preferences about the types and frequency of corrective feedback. Students expressed serious concerns about being corrected for all their errors, while the teachers were not persuaded of the value of providing corrective feedback for every error. Regarding the types of error, learners preferred explicit correction whereas teachers were more inclined to provide implicit corrective feedback (Lee, 2013, p. 8).

Brown (2009) conducted a study comparing the perceptions of 49 language teachers with 1,600 students studying in their classes. The work was specifically designed to make a direct

comparison between teachers' and learners' beliefs on oral corrective feedback. The findings of his study revealed great differences between how teachers and learners regarded the manner of grammar feedback. The teachers in Brown's study discouraged explicit grammar instructions because they perceived that such instructions undermine the communicative approach to SLA. However, students strongly favoured a focus on form. Brown (2009) suggests in his study that teachers should adapt their methods to the learners' perception if they are to enhance their spoken proficiency.

Jean & Simard performed an inquiry-based study of teachers' and students' perspectives on different aspects of grammar instruction. They investigated the beliefs of 45 teachers and 2,321 high school French as a Second Language (FSL) and ESL students in Canada. One of the findings of their study was that teachers correct only those mistakes which they feel disrupt communication and not those which negatively affect students' confidence and interrupt their speech. By contrast, learners welcomed the use of oral corrective feedback techniques by the teacher (Jean & Simard, 2011). The findings suggest that corrective feedback does not have a detrimental effect on students' motivation and that students firmly believe in the importance of error correction. Other studies have reinforced the view that learners greatly appreciate corrective feedback on their spoken errors (Katayama, 2007; Timson, Grow & Matsuoka, 1999). However, determining the differences between teachers' and learners' perspectives is tricky in the teaching and learning process. Brown (2009) and MacIntyre & Gardner (1994) believe that consensus between the teachers' and the learners' perspectives may produce effective learning outcomes, as it enables the teachers to provide corrective feedback to learners in a more informed and effective manner.

2.3 Types of Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques

Oral corrective feedback (OCF) can be defined as support given by a teacher to the learners regarding their spoken errors. Lyster & Ranta (1997) divided OCF types into 6 major categories, ranging from implicit to explicit according to the division of Sheen & Ellis (2011). These categories are: recast; elicitation; clarification request; metalinguistic feedback; explicit correction; and repetition. They incorporated OCF and its different types and investigated four communicative French immersion classes of Grades 4 and 5 students. Their study analysed OCF in 27 lessons, specifically how language errors in forms were negotiated by the teacher and L2 learners (i.e. how errors were treated by teachers and what happened after an error was pointed out). OCF types were represented in the following proportions: recasts (55%), elicitation (14%), clarification requests (11%), metalinguistic feedback (8%), explicit correction (7%) and repetition of errors (5%). To elaborate on the six types of OCF used in the classroom, Lee (2013) made a sample by implementing Lyster & Ranta's six types of OCF in L2 or foreign language classrooms. If, for example, a student says that 'he has dog', then teachers might recast it (i.e. reformulate the error by providing the correct language choice) by replying: 'a dog'; or they can explicitly correct it by pointing out the error involved in the omission of 'a', and providing instruction on the correct form by replying: "No, you should say 'a dog'"; or they can make a clarification request by replying: 'Sorry?', or 'Pardon?', or 'Say that again'; or they can give metalinguistic feedback by replying: 'You need an indefinite article'; or they can make an explicit correction, eliciting the correct form by saying: 'He has …?'; or teachers can repeat the wrong sentence by replying 'He has dog?' Other researchers have added two more categories: translation and multiple feedback to Lyster & Ranta's list of OCF types.

Yao (2000) and Sheen (2011) categorize these strategies into seven types: recasts; explicit correction; explicit correction with meta-linguistic explanation; repetition; elicitation; meta-linguistic cue; and clarification requests. Yao (2000) adds body language as an additional type. Sheen (2011) adds focused and unfocused categories to provide OCF in the classroom setting. The former signifies the "intensive corrective feedback that repeatedly targets one or a very limited number of linguistic features", and the latter refers to "extensive corrective feedback that targets a range of grammatical structures" (Sheen, 2011, p. 8). In other words, unfocused OCF checks any feature of language, including grammar, semantics, pragmatic, pronunciation, phonemes and sentence-structure, whereas focused OCF is the other way around. In addition to this, scholars divided OCF strategies into explicit and implicit strategies. Explicit OCF refers to an overt linguistic signal for the correction of errors, whilst implicit OCF indicates providing the prompts or eliciting the information without any overt linguistic signals (Méndez & Cruz, 2012). Another study explores EFL teachers' preferences for oral corrective feedback techniques at Rustaveli University and the findings suggest that they use eight strategies for identifying and correcting the errors in oral production. These strategies comprise echoing; repetition up to the error; hinting/prompting; making a note of common errors; the use of nonverbal methods; asking other students to correct errors; reformulating; and recording on a tape Gumbaridze (2013).

Ahangari & Amirzadeh (2011) offer an observational study that analyses 360 oral corrective feedback moves in an Iranian EFL classroom in a university setting and divide their observations according to three proficiency levels: elementary, intermediate and advanced. Their findings revealed that teachers use a variety of OCF techniques in the different proficiency levels, but they vary in the distribution of their uses of those techniques and in different orders of frequency. For example, at the elementary level, teachers use the following OCF techniques in descending order of frequency: recast; clarification; metalinguistic cues; repetition; explicit correction; and translation, whereas at the intermediate level, teachers used OCF techniques favouring recast over all the others, and in this hierarchy the least favoured is explicit correction. At the advanced level, teachers used the following OCF techniques in descending order of frequency; recast; clarification; metalinguistic cues; elicitation; repetition; explicit correction; translation; and multiple feedbacks. The results revealed that recast is the favourite technique with EFL teachers at all three levels of proficiency.

2.4 Learners' Uptake or Self-repair

In SLA literature, the term uptake has been defined in two different ways. What Allright (1984) meant by uptake was learners' absorption of the new content of a lesson, as reported by the students themselves. Now, however, it stands for learners' response to the teacher's correction of their errors. Suzuki (2004, p. 1) defines learners' uptake as "a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some ways to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspects of a student's initial utterance". In other words, it can be said that it is the student's immediate response to the correction of their errors by the teacher. By the same token, Lyster and Llinares (2014) explain that "uptake [is] defined as a discourse move and not as an instance of acquisition, although some researchers have suggested that uptake may be related to learners' perceptions about feedback at the time of feedback" (Llinares & Lyster, 2014, p. 182). Furthermore, Salimani (1992) (as cited in Zhao, 2009, p. 49) explains uptake as "what learners claim to have learned from a particular lesson" (p. 197). These diverse perspectives

may suggest that students' uptake clearly means their verbal reaction to a given feedback. This verbal response usually appears immediately after the teacher's corrective feedback, assuming that there is an opportunity for the students to respond to it. Slimani (1992:197) has defined uptake as "what learners claim to have learned from a particular lesson" (see also Allwright, 1984).

The significance of different types of feedback can be understood from the evidence of learners' uptake and particularly when this move results in a successful repair (Tatawy, 2002). In this situation, learners' uptake would be taken as a proof of learners' observing their language errors (Choi & Li, 2012; Egi, 2010) as well as the "pushed output" concept given by Choi & Li, (2012). Furthermore, the researchers made it clear that learners' uptake provides evidence that they understood the teacher's strategy and that it helped them understand the gap between the form of target language and an interlanguage (Mackey & Oliver 2002; Sheen, 2004). Therefore, uptake has been taken by the researchers to be one of the key aspects of the effectiveness of corrective feedback (Lyster & Ranta 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004).

The findings of these studies suggest that the teacher should be aware of different types of OCF and their implementation in the classroom, namely elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests, and repetition of error. These four types, according to Lyster and Ranta, are characterized as negotiations of form and engage the learners more actively by helping them to draw on what they already know, rather than simply providing learners with correct forms.

3. Research Questions
The following questions were envisaged for the present study:
1. What are the beliefs of Taif University's EFL teachers about the use of oral corrective feedback techniques in response to learners' spoken errors?
2. What are the practices of Taif University's EFL teachers in the use of oral corrective feedback techniques in response to learners' spoken errors?
3. What types of oral corrective feedback techniques do Taif University's EFL teachers utilize in the classroom?
4. What are the perceptions of Taif University's EFL teachers about the effectiveness of the use of oral corrective techniques in the classroom?

4. Method
4.1 Research Design

An opinionnaire has been designed with closed-ended questions to probe into the complex phenomena of teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the use of oral corrective feedback techniques in the classroom. We have designed a survey that provides an opportunity for EFL teachers to reflect on their everyday classroom practices (Luft & Roehrig, 2007).

4.2 Population and Sample

The population of this study is all teachers at Taif University teaching the English courses that are a general programme requirement. A convenient sample of the study consisted of 57 female instructors teaching IEAP and ESP courses to Taif University's EFL learners. The sample contains 37 instructors who were MA holders and 20 who were BA holders with teaching qualifications. The 57 instructors have a diverse linguistic background, 43 have Arabic as their

first language, 10 instructors speak Urdu or Hindi, three teachers had English as their first language and one instructor speaks Tagalog.

4.3 Study Instrument

The study instrument for the present research was based on previous studies that used different methods: (a) observational studies that focused on analysing corrective feedback techniques (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002) and (b) survey studies that focused on teachers' beliefs and practices that analysed results quantitatively (Méndez & Cruz, 2012; Lee, 2013; Brown, 2009; Jean & Simard, 2011; Katayama, 2007; Timson, Grow & Matsuoka, 1999; MacIntyre & Gardner (1994). The quantitative research tool formulated for the study employed Likert's five-point scale and was designed on a structured pattern in order to obtain precise and useful information from Taif University's female EFL teachers.

4.4 Instrument validity and reliability

Face validity assessment was ensured by asking 3 experts (two of them native speakers of English) for language clarity, and changes were incorporated as a result. In terms of the reliability of this scale and the subscales used in the study, Cronbach's *alpha* was used to indicate its internal consistency. The score for the scale was .78.

5. Results and Discussion

This section details the results and discussion related to the data generated from the participants' responses to the four sections of the survey.

Table1. *Taif University's EFL teachers' beliefs about the use of Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques in their classrooms*

No	Statements	N	Mean	SD
1.	I think a teacher should correct "learners' spoken errors" or get them corrected by their peers.	57	4.18	.90
2.	I feel it is important to use particular techniques to correct "learners' spoken errors".	57	4.07	1.13
3.	I think that correcting EFL learners' "errors" can negatively affect their self-esteem and consequently discourage them from speaking.	57	3.04	1.24
4.	I feel students commit excessive "errors" in extempore speaking tasks (speaking without preparation).	57	3.66	1.07

The first section of the survey was meant to elicit EFL teachers' beliefs regarding the use of oral corrective feedback techniques in their classrooms. In line with previous research findings (Akiah & Zawiah, 2015; Iriarte & Alastuey, 2017), the participants of this survey assigned the highest mean value to the first item, i.e. that EFL teachers should correct "learners' spoken errors" or get them

corrected by their peers. Similarly, the second highest mean value of 4.07 was recorded for the second item, i.e. the teacher believes it important to use particular techniques to correct learners' spoken errors. Item four scored a mean value of 3.66 in relation to the excessive commission of errors by the learners in extempore tasks. Item three earned the lowest mean value, 3.04, stating that correcting learners' "errors" negatively affect their confidence and eventually their spoken proficiency. These findings are in line with previous research by Zublin (2015), who contends that teachers should not only keep in mind the type of error at the time of correcting the learners, but also know how to provide them gentle feedback to avoid discouraging them in their attempt to use the target language. The standard deviation (SD) for the least preferred items has been calculated higher than the SD for the most preferred items, which indicates that the respondents showed greater variation in their perceptions about these least preferred items.

Table 2. *Taif University's EFL teachers' general practices about the use of Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques in their classrooms*

No	Statements	N	Mean	SD
5.	I repeat the same spoken task more than once to enhance learners' comprehension and spoken proficiency.	57	4.12	1.01
6.	I give feedback to the learners about their "errors" after they complete their spoken task.	57	4.04	.87
7.	I use spoken "error correction" techniques with my EFL learners.	57	3.88	1.03
8.	I correct my EFL learners' language "errors" on the spot.	57	3.84	1.14
9.	I indicate to the learners that the message has not been understood and sometimes tell them that their utterances include some kinds of mistake.	57	3.54	1.16

The statements included in Table 2 seek to elicit the participants' general practices in their use of OCF techniques. The participants have ranked the first two items of this category with the highest mean value of 4.12 and 4.04 respectively, showing the significant role of the use of OCF techniques in EFL teachers' general practices. In the same context, the findings of the present study are similar to the results obtained by Fungula (2013) who investigated the impact of the frequent use of different types of OCF. He interviewed four university-level teachers of different ages and professional experience. One of the interviewees in his study stressed that sometimes errors should be ignored in order not to break students' flow of thoughts.

The participants of the present survey agreed that they repeat the same task to enhance learners' spoken proficiency, and prefer to give feedback after the completion of the spoken task. In this category, there are three items with a mean value of lower than 4.00. The participants allocated the third highest preference, with a mean value of 3.88, to the item which states that the EFL teachers frequently use OCF techniques with their learners. Their strong affirmation indicates that this is their usual practice. The fourth highest preference, with the mean value of 3.84, reflects the practice of teachers who correct learners' errors on the spot. The lowest scoring item is related to the English language teachers' way of letting EFL learners understand that something is erroneous in their

utterance. All the items discussed in this section indicate that participants are well equipped with different techniques to boost learners' confidence and develop their spoken proficiency.

Table 3. *Taif University's EFL Teachers' use of particular Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques in their classrooms*

No	Statements	N	Mean	SD
10.	I explicitly indicate to the learners that their utterance is incorrect by providing them with the correct form.	57	3.52	1.16
11.	I implicitly reformulate "learners' oral errors" and sometimes provide the correction without directly pointing out that their utterance was incorrect.	57	4.00	.90
12.	I pose questions to my EFL learners. For example, "do we say it like that?", and sometimes provide comments or information related to the formation of the learners' utterance without providing them with the correct form.	57	3.39	1.23
13.	I use the technique of eliciting as a prompt with my EFL learners to get them correct their "errors". **Student**: *He has dog. **Teacher**: He has .... **Student**: a dog.	57	4.36	.75
14.	I repeat "learners' oral errors" by changing intonation to draw students' attention to the errors and sometimes echo their errors in a question. **Teacher**: bark ↘ ? **Learner:** Oh sorry, I meant park.	57	4.32	.92

The third section of the survey sought responses about the use of particular OCF techniques in their classrooms. The participants assigned a higher mean value from above 4.00 to three items and less than 4.00 to two items. The practices of EFL teachers indicate quite an encouraging trend towards developing learners' spoken proficiency. The highest preference was given to item 13, with a mean value of 4.36, which strongly supports the idea that the technique of elicitation gives learners practice in correcting their own errors. These findings are in line with the results of Lyster & Ranta (1997), who argue that using elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and repetition encourage learners more effectively to draw on what they already know. Likewise, the

second highest mean value of 4.32 was recorded for item 14, i.e. that participants repeat learners' oral errors to draw their attention towards them. The third highest preference, 4.00, was allocated to item 11, i.e. that teachers implicitly reformulate learners' oral errors and sometimes provide correction without directly mentioning that their utterance was incorrect. This confirms the studies of Lyster (1998) and Panova & Lyster (2002), both of which agree that recast is an implicit type of OCF technique which may not be noticed by weak learners. Lyster (1998) and Panova & Lyster (2002) seem to suggest that the use of implicit oral error correction technique does not help learners to improve their spoken proficiency.

In this section, there are two items with a mean value of lower than 4.00. The respondents assigned the fourth highest preference to item 11, i.e. that participants explicitly indicate the learners' errors by providing them the correct forms, with a mean value of 3.52. Item 12, indicating that participants pose questions to learners on their oral errors without providing them with the correct form, scored the lowest mean value of 3.39. The results presented in this section show that participants are well equipped with effective OCF techniques that enable learners to understand their errors and draw on their own linguistic resources for self-repair.

Table 4. *Taif University's EFL Teachers' Perceptions about the Effectiveness of the use of Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques in their classrooms*

No	Statements	N	Mean	SD
15.	I have seen change(s) in my EFL learners' spoken ability after implementing oral error corrective techniques in my teaching practice.	57	4.04	.86
16.	I have observed development in my students speaking skill; namely some of my students can self-repair "their oral errors".	57	4.13	.79
17.	I have found that self-repair, if done under the supervision of the teacher, can help improve learners' spoken ability.	57	4.31	.92

The statements included in Table 4 above seek to elicit the participants' responses about the effectiveness of the use of OCF techniques. All the items of this category have been allocated a mean value of higher than 4.00 which indicates that participants give high significance to the use of OCF and recognise its effectiveness. Item 17, which concerned the effectiveness of self-repair if it is done under the supervision of the teacher, was assigned the highest mean value of 4.31. This is similar to the findings of studies by McDonough (2005) and Loewen (2005), who conclude that learners' uptake plays a significant role in the development of their second language. The results are also in line with the findings of Schunk & Zimmerman (1997) who claim that language learning and self-efficacy are easily achievable if learners' errors are corrected by the teacher. Lasagabaster & Sierra (2005, p. 124), on the other hand, believe that "simply providing the correction of the error may not be enough to make the student repair the error".

The second highest preference mean value, 4.13, was allocated to item 16, showing that the frequent use of OCF techniques certainly develops learners' ability to self-repair "their oral errors". Sheen (2007) reports that learners who receive explicit linguistic explanations along with error correction benefit more from the feedback than those learners who only receive corrective

feedback. Item 15 was assigned the third highest mean value in this category and builds on teachers' personal experiences; they confidently stated that the use of OCF techniques has a strong influence on the spoken proficiency of their learners. In line with the findings of the present study, Nassaji & Swain (2000) argue that the effectiveness of the OCF depends entirely on when learners are explicitly made aware of their errors.

Table 5. *Summary of previous studies on Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of the use of Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques*

Study	Target Language	Learners' L1	Instructional Settings	Assessment Method	Spoken Proficiency
Algarawi (2010)	English EFL	Arabic	EAP	Types of OCF	Achieved/Yes
Méndez & Cruz (2012)	ESL	Spanish	EFL	Ditto	Positive impacts
Ammar & Spada (2006)	English	French	ESL	Ditto	Positive impacts
Jimenez, J. (2006).	English	Italian	ESL	Ditto	Positive impacts
Lyster and Ranta (1997)	French	English	ESL	Ditto	Positive impacts

Table 5 indicates differences and similarities among the variables in several studies measuring teachers' beliefs and practices, and the impact of OCF techniques in the language classroom. Most studies examined the effects of OCF on the learners in classroom scenarios and have shown a positive impact of OCF on the spoken proficiency of the EFL learners (Algarawi, 2010; Ammar & Spada, 2006; Jimenez, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Méndez & Cruz 2012). Methodological differences can, however, be observed in the different variables observed in these studies, for instance learners' L1; instructional settings; learners' competence and level; the number of the participants; the context in which survey was conducted; and variation in the use of OCF. Algarawi's 2010 study was conducted in an entirely different context, namely the French immersion context, and involved adult EFL students in form-oriented courses on English for Academic Purposes (EAP) at a university in Saudi Arabia. Similarly, Suzuki (2004) examined ESL classes with intermediate level adult learners and three teachers. Furthermore, Yoshida (2010) applied OCF techniques to language students in their Second Year at a Japanese university. His results coincide with the present study and show the highest results in the use of recast with the learners. The results of the present study and the previous studies cannot, however, be compared with each other to develop a strong conclusion because of their methodological differences.

6. Conclusion

Effective OCF on learners' spoken errors requires the use of appropriate techniques that best address particular types of error and are suitable for the type of learning activities as well as the types of learner. One type of OCF can never address the needs of all the learners equally well, because "one size doesn't fit all" (Ammar & Spada 2006, p. 566). Some scholars argue that focusing on one effective type of corrective feedback in different classroom scenarios is not feasible, as

classes include learners from a variety of cultural and educational backgrounds as well as diverse instructional settings (Lyster & Mori 2006: Seedhouse 2004). We are therefore inclined to believe that the average scores of the teachers with different variables secured similar results. In addition to this, based on the results of this study, it can be concluded that the technique of elicitation, repetition/echoing learners' errors in question, and recast attracted the highest preference among the participants. The findings of several other studies discussed in the previous sections have also shown that these are the most common and applicable types of OCF techniques frequently used by the pedagogues to help develop learners' spoken proficiency.

About the Authors:

Reem Alkhammash is an assistant professor of linguistics and the Vice-Director of the English Language Centre at Taif University. She obtained her PhD from Queen Mary University of London. She is a Cambridge certified teacher trainer. She is interested in discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, metaphor research and applied linguistics.

Fahmeedah Gulnaz is an assistant professor of applied linguistics and has been working in the English Language Centre at Taif University since 2016. She earned her MA and PhD from Pakistan. Her fields of interests are: action research, teacher training courses, professional development and learner centered approach. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2727-0572

References

Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011). Exploring the teachers' use of spoken corrective feedback in teaching Iranian EFL learners at different levels of proficiency. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1859–1868.

Akiah, S. A., & Ghazali, Z. (2015). The effects of teacher and peer corrective feedback on the grammatical accuracy in writing among the L2 learners. *The Royale Bintang Resort & Spa, Seremban,* 2, 19-20.

Algarawi, B. S. (2010). The effects of repair techniques on L2 learning as a product and as process: A CA-for-SLA investigation of classroom interaction. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne.

Allwright, D. (1984). Why don't learners learn what teachers teach? - The interaction hypothesis. In D.M. Singleton, and D.G. Little (Eds.), *Language learning in formal and informal contexts*. Dublin: Irish Association for Applied Linguistics, 3-18.

Ammar, A. & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 28, (4), 543–574.

Brown, A. V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: a comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93, (1), 46-60.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. 4th ed. NY: Longman.

Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors 1. *Language Learning*, 27, (1), 29-46.

Choi, S. Y., & Li, S. (2012). Corrective feedback and learners' uptake in a child ESOL classroom. *RELC Journal*, 43, (3), 331–351.

Egi, T. (2010). Uptake, modified output, and learner perceptions of recasts: learner responses

as language awareness. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, (1), 1-21.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies of Second Language Acquisition*, *28,* 339-368.

El Tatawy, M. (2002). Corrective feedback in second language acquisition. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics [online]*, 2, (2), 1-19.

Ernest, P. (1989). The knowledge, beliefs, and attitude of the mathematics teacher: A model. *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 15, (1), 13-33.

Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practice. *Educational Research,* 38, (1), 47-65.

Farrokhi, F. (2003). *A context-based study of varieties of corrective feedback in EFL classrooms.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom.

Firwana, S. (2011). A comparison between Palestinian EFL teachers' and students' attitudes toward oral error and their correction. *The Journal of the Islamic University of Gaza (Humanities Research Series)*, 19, (2), 1527-1558.

Fungula, B. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in the Chinese EFL Classroom: Methods employed by teachers to give feedback to their students. Independent thesis Advanced level (professional degree). Retrieved from: http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:693017

Gumbaridze, J. (2013). Error Correction in EFL Speaking Classrooms, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 1660-1663. ISSN 1877-0428, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.237.

Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction: Differential effects of L2 development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 1–36.

Iriarte, M.G., & Alastuey, C.B., (2017). Peer vs. Teacher corrective feedback and its effect on grammar. Máster En Formación Del Profesorado De Educación Secundaria. Universidad Publica de Navarra. Retrieved from: https://academica-e.unavarra.es/handle/2454/25311

Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). Grammar learning in English and French L2: students' and teachers' beliefs and perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 44 (3), 465–492.

Jimenez, J. (2006). Corrective feedback in EFL university classrooms: A case study at an Italian university. *Linguistica e Filologia*, 23, 45-89.

Katayama, A. (2007). Learners' perception toward oral error correction. In: K. Bradford-Watts (Ed.). JALT2006 Conference Proceedings. *Tokyo: JALT*, 284-299.

Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J.M. (2005). Error correction: students' versus teachers' perceptions. *Language Awareness* 14 (2&3), 112-127.

Lee, E.J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 4, (1), 217-230.

Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and L2 development: Beyond negative evidence. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 37–63.

Llinares, A. & Lyster, R. (2014). The influence of context on patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake: A comparison of CLIL and immersion classrooms. *The Language Learning Journal, 42*(2), 181-194.

Loewen, S. (2004). Uptake in incidental focus on form in meaning-focused ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 54, (1), 153-188.

Loewen, S. (2005). Incidental focus on form and second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 27 (3), 361-386.

Long, M. (2006). Problems in SLA. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Luft, J. A., & Roehrig, G. H. (2007). Capturing Science Teachers' Epistemological Beliefs: The Development of the Teacher Beliefs Interview. *Electronic Journal of Science Education*, 11, 38-63.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46, (1), 1-40.

Lyster, R. & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 28, (2), 269–300.

Lyster, R. (1998). From immersion classroom discourse: In or out of focus? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 1, (1-2), 53-82.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, (1), 37-66.

McDonough, K. (2005). Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners' responses On ESL questions development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 27, (1), 79-103.

MacIntyre, P., & Gardner, R. (1994). The subtle effects of induced anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning,* 44, 283–305.

Mackey, A. & Philip, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 338–356.

Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development: An empirical study of question formation in ESL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 21, 557-587.

Mackey, A., & Oliver, R. (2002). Interactional feedback and children's L2 development. *System*, 30, (4), 459–477.

Mendelson, D. (1990). How to correct errors in the communicative language talking class. *Prospect*, 5, (1), 67–83.

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

Nassaji, H. & Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: the effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness,* 9, (1), 34-51

Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2003). Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal,* 87, (4), 519-533.

Panova, I. & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 36, (4), 573-595.

Philip, J. (2003). Constraints on "noticing the gap": Non-native speakers' noticing of recasts In NS-NNS interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 99–126.

Rezaei, S., Mozzaffari, F., & Hatef, A. (2011) Corrective feedback in SLA: Classroom practice and future directions. *International Journal of English Linguistics,* 1, (1), 21- 29.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, New York: Macmillan, 102-119.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective. *Oxford: Blackwell.*

Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1997). Social origins of self-regulatory competence. *Educational psychologist*, 32, (4), 195-208.

Sepehrinia, S., & Mehdizadeh, M. (2016). Oral Corrective Feedback: Teachers' Concerns and Researchers' Orientation. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46, (4), 483–500.

Slimani, A. (1992). Evaluation of classroom interaction. In J. C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), Evaluating second language education (p. 197-221). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (1993). Instruction and the Development of Questions in L2 Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 15, (2), 205-224.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (2002). L1 and L2 in the education of Inuit children in northern Quebec: Abilities and perceptions. *Language and Education*, 16, (3), 212-240.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8, 263–300.

Sheen Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, (2), 255-283.

Sheen, Y. (2011). Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning. *New York: Springer Verlag*.

Sheen, Y. & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In Hinkel, E. (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning,* New York: Routledge, 2, 593–610.

Suzuki, M. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classrooms. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics,* 4, (2), 1-21. Retrieved on 14th February, 2019, from the World Wide Web: http://www.tc.columbia. edu/tesolalwebjournal/MikikoSuzuki2004.pdf

Timson, S., Grow, A., & Matsuoka, M. (1999). Error correction preferences of second language learners: A Japanese perspective. *JACET Bulletin,* 30, 135-148.

Williams, J. (1995). Focus on form in communicative language teaching: Research findings and the classroom teacher. *TESOL Journal,* 4, (4), 12–16.

Xu, S. (2012). An investigation into teachers' corrective feedback in Chinese EFL classrooms. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 35, (4), 480-505.

Yao, S. (2000). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: EFL college learners' attitudes toward error correction. Thesis (Ph.D.), State University of New York at Buffalo. Retrieved from: https://trove.nla.gov.au/version/13938624

Zhao, B. (2009). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in primary school EFL classrooms in China. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 6*(3), 45-72

Zublin, R. B. (2015). Error correction techniques in the EFL class, Universidad FASTA, Mar Del Plata, Argentina. Retrieved from: URI: http://redi.ufasta.edu.ar:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/877.