گـۆڤـاری زانـکـۆی ڕاپـەڕیــن
Journal of University of Raparin.
مجلة جامعة رابرين

E-ISSN: 2522 – 7130 P-ISSN: 2410 – 1036

DOI:10.26750/Vol(11).No(1).Paper25

Date Received: 15/10/2022
Date Accepted: 13/12/2022
Date Published: 29/02/2024

# Investigating EFL Instructors' Use of Oral Corrective Feedback Types in the Classrooms

**Pshtiwan Mustafa Qadir[1] - Niaz Muhsin Aziz[2]**

pmq540h@ena.soran.edu.iq - niaz.aziz@soran.edu.iq

[1+2]English Department, Faculty of Arts, Soran University, Soran, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

## Abstract

This study investigates EFL university instructors' understanding and conceptualization of oral corrective feedback (OCF) vis-à-vis their teaching peculiarities. Participants in the current study involve 140 EFL instructors from various colleges and faculties with various specialities in universities in Kurdistan Region, Iraq. Among them, 87 participants were males and 53 participants were females, and they aged between 23 and 60. The instrument used in this study for data collection includes questionnaires, which have been adopted from previous research (e.g., Fukuda, 2004; Park, 2010; Yüksel et al., 2021). The results show that most of the participants tend to yield OCF moderately, and a considerable number of the instructors would correct students' oral errors quite often. Moreover, the instructors tend to orient to global errors more than local errors. The instructors also would practice delayed OCF more often than immediate OCF. Furthermore, the most frequently deployed strategies involve clarification requests and recast for grammatical errors and recast and metalinguistic feedback for both phonological and lexical errors. Finally, the main source of providing feedback is the teacher.

**Key Words:** EFL instructors, Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF), OCF strategies, immediate OCF, delayed OCF

## 1. Introduction

People whose mother tongue is not English need to learn it in order to acquire the targeted information (Anasthasia & Mardijono, 2014). Undeniably, language learning comes with making errors unavoidably, a subject usually subsumed under feedback (Azizi et al., 2020). Moreover, the word feedback is derived from Weiner's (1948) cybernetic idea and describes processes by which a controlling section (i.e., the addresser) acquires information regarding the results and outcomes of its actions. Feedback has also been used in various domains, particularly in educational settings (Hashemian et al., 2016). The modes of feedback encompass oral feedback, written feedback, and non-verbal feedback (Irawan and Salija, 2017). Apparently, feedback seems to be broad, and corrective feedback, a type of feedback, includes feedback that emphasizes correction. Besides, OCF is the corrective feedback that spotlights the students' verbal expression (Fungula, 2013).

Notwithstanding, committing errors seems to be a natural part of language learning. Corrective feedback has been accentuated because correcting incorrect use of language might assist learners notice the forms that have not been acquired yet and assist teachers to hinder fossilization, which is the process of fixing incorrect utterances in the students' minds (Azizi et al., 2020; Richards & Schmidt, 2010). In this regard, Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study seems to be one of the most famous studies in the field of corrective feedback (Prasetyaningrum, 2017), who introduced six types of OCF strategies: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Furthermore, Hendrickson (1978) posits the following questions: "Should learner errors be corrected? Which learner errors should be corrected? When should learner errors be corrected? How should learner errors be corrected? and Who should correct learner errors?" (p. 389). This is considered one of the first inclusive reviews of error correction issues in the classroom (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Many studies have been managed to investigate instructors' use of OCF in classrooms in other states (e.g., Demir and Özmen, 2017; Hanif, 2021; Méndez and Cruz, 2012). As far as the researcher knows, nearly no study exhaustively has probed EFL university instructors' use of OCF types in the classrooms in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq; as a result, there is a lack of great deal regarding their understanding and conceptualization of OCF vis-a-vis their teaching peculiarities. In this respect, this study aims to investigate EFL university instructors' understanding of OCF vis-à-vis their teaching peculiarities to know whether they correct the students' spoken errors, types of errors that are corrected by them, the time of providing OCF, types of OCF strategies that are used by them, and the sources of providing feedback.

It is hoped that the results of the present study help discover the EFL instructors' understanding of OCF in relation to their teaching style, whether they correct the students' spoken errors, types of errors that are corrected by them, the time of providing OCF, types of OCF strategies that are used by them, and the sources of providing feedback. Moreover, the findings of this research are hoped to help both EFL instructors and course organizers to choose among types of OCF strategies that they find more effective based on their experiences. The analysis unveiled in the current study will impart precious information and may serve as a device for future studies that will investigate EFL instructors' use of OCF types in the classrooms.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Pedagogical Perspectives on Oral Corrective Feedback

Hendrickson (1978) raises the following questions concerning error correction: "Should learner errors be corrected? If so, which learner errors should be corrected? When should learner errors be corrected? How should learner errors be corrected? and Who should correct learner errors?" (p. 389).

Concerning whether learner errors should be corrected, researchers have investigated corrective feedback with some doubt in language pedagogy. Some methods of language teaching give the red light to corrective feedback. In the Audiolingual method, it is proposed that there should be a severe influence on the learners' performance in order to stop errors from happening, and consequently eliminate corrective feedback, which was considered as a punishment that can impede learning. The other approaches that emerged in the 1970s also opposed the idea of corrective feedback since they thought that it was a form of criticism. In the Silent Way approach, correction is rarely the teacher's job. In the Natural Approach, further, there is an unfavorable attitude towards corrective feedback, and it is believed that corrective feedback has a negative impact on the learners' desire to communicate even in the best conditions. In the initial models of Communicative Language Teaching, the main emphasis is on meaning, and error correction has little instructional role. Conversely, in the later models of Communicative Language Teaching and in Task-Based Language Teaching, corrective feedback is viewed as significant for assisting students to progress accurately (Ellis, 2017). Since the 1990s, researchers have gradually supported the notion that second language learning requires a certain amount of focus on form, and that form would be learned explicitly to some extent (DeKeyser & Sokalski, 2001). Nowadays, language learning experts have a fair perspective with respect to readdressing this question (Should learner errors be corrected?) in a way that they do not support either giving up error correction completely or correcting every single error (Mohseni & Edalat, 2012). Others argue that addressing this question depends on the nature of the ongoing activity; in fluency activities, for example, providing OCF seems to be inessential. Nishamura (2000) states that providing OCF is required if the focus is on accuracy. In contrast, there is no need to provide OCF when the emphasis is on fluency.

Previous research has also focused on EFL teachers' perceptions and practices in the classrooms pertinent to OCF. One of their objectives was to examine whether oral errors were corrected in their classrooms or not, and in this regard, Méndez and Cruz (2012) explored EFL instructors' perceptions and their practices in the classroom about OCF in a Mexican university. Their results uncovered that the

majority of the subjects preferred providing OCF as the response to the errors of the learners. Lately, Chugai and Ogienko (2021) investigated the students' and teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback at the National Technical University of Ukraine, and their findings showed that all the teachers emphasized on correcting the students' errors. Demir and Özmen (2017) scrutinized the application of OCF types by native and non-native English-speaking teachers, and their study showed that the native English-speaking teachers associated the needfulness of fixing oral errors with some factors, for instance: the emphasis of lecture, the isolated learner, and flow of communication; on the contrary, the non-native English-speaking teachers viewed correcting oral errors as an essential pedagogical instrument. It is transpired from the above studies that most of the participants either correct the learners' errors or they prefer to correct them; whereas, some of them imbued oral errors to some factors for example, the focus of the lecture, the isolated learner, and flow of communication.

Regarding which learner errors should be corrected, scholars have classified errors into many different types and many suggestions are presented. Holley and King (1971) classify errors according to their range of frequency and propose that "high–frequency" errors should take priority when correcting the errors. Others, on the other hand, proclaim that teachers need to deal with errors linguistically. For instance, Ellis (1993) propounds that teachers should correct the grammatical features or those features that make it difficult for the learners. Further, Martínez (2006) asserts that teachers should focus on lexical and phonological errors since they have a great effect on comprehending communication. In addition, Gower et al. (2005) claim that teachers should correct "serious" errors, nonetheless, it is thought that the seriousness of errors is a matter of personal view (Ellis, 2009). Some scholars consolidate this issue with communication affairs. Hedge (2008) asserts that instructors could choose those errors that hinder communication. In this categorization, he refers to two types of errors: "global" and "local" errors. Global errors interfere with communication; while local errors do not interfere with communication. Sheen and Ellis (2011) argue that teachers should correct global errors rather than local errors. Besides, correcting global and local errors has been predisposed by the type of activity. Burt (1975) claims that teachers should correct global errors if the aim of the activity is a successful conversation. However, they should not correct local errors to speak successfully. In the case that the learners' competence is near-native fluency, local errors should be fixed. Nevertheless, Kubota (1991) argues that teachers should take a balance between the correction of global and local errors into account during correcting errors. But Sheen and Ellis (2011) claim that applying these suggestions in practice is difficult. They further argue that the difference between a local and a global error is ambiguous. In short, scholars propose various types of errors to be corrected, and there is a lack of agreement among them on which type of error should be corrected owing to classifying errors into different types.

This issue has been a subject of investigation in many previous studies. In the study by Aranguiz and Espinoza (2016), phonological errors received the greatest amount of correction, but content errors received the least amount of correction. Grammatical and lexical errors took the second and third positions, respectively, when it comes to correcting errors. As stated by Demir and Özmen's (2017) study, there was a general agreement between native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers concerning the types of errors that should be corrected. Both groups claimed that the errors which affect intelligibility should be given priority in the event of correcting errors. With regards to the types of errors that should be corrected, the native English-speaking teachers revealed that they paid greater attention to

the phonological errors as they made unintelligibility. Hanif (2021) dealt with the issue of the types of errors that are corrected. The findings exhibited that the errors that trouble communication was "always" or "often" fixed by nearly 60% of the participants, and 75% of the participants expressed that they "sometimes" rectified grammatical errors. It was also revealed that the majority of the teachers "sometimes" focused on fixing pronunciation errors. The previous researches reveal that phonological errors are fixed by most of the respondents, and those errors affect comprehension and are also rectified by many teachers.

In terms of when learner errors should be corrected, it appears that the timing of OCF plays a paramount role in achieving the desirable outcomes of feedback. Errors can be corrected either immediately (immediate OCF) or it can be deferred (delayed OCF). The immediate OCF is supplied as soon as the error is made; while the delayed OCF is given after oral interaction between the teacher and the learner is ended (Li et al., 2016). Timing of providing OCF is determined by the emphasis of the activity. In general, scholars in the field are consensus that there should be immediate OCF when the main focus of a task is on accuracy (Ellis, 2009). On the other hand, providing immediate OCF during fluency activities is controversial. Bohlke (2014) and Scrivener (2005) assert that if the main concern of the task is fluency, then there is no need to yield immediate OCF. For example, Bohlke (2014) argues that offering immediate OCF and interrupting the students during fluency activities make them be stressful; therefore, the process of learning does not occur. However, some other researchers recommend giving immediate OCF during fluency tasks (Ellis, 2009). For instance, Doughty (2001) states that teachers should provide OCF to incorrect forms immediately after the error is committed even if the main concern of the task is fluency and meaning.

Some studies have examined EFL teachers' perceptions and behaviors in terms of the timing of providing OCF. In many studies providing OCF has been linked to the focal activity; whether the activity focuses on accuracy or fluency, for example in the research of Méndez and Cruz (2012), the timing of correcting errors was associated with fluency and accuracy affairs. The teachers reported that they would correct the students' errors immediately when the main concern of the lesson is accuracy; however, they would make use of delayed OCF practice if the emphasis of the lesson is on fluency. Further, the informants of Tesnim's (2019) study exhibited different views on the timing of practising OCF. The delayed OCF technique was accepted by 55% of the contributors; however, correcting oral errors instantly was refused by 75% of the participants. Tesnim stated that the teachers might yield immediate OCF in the case of emphasizing accuracy. Whereas, they might give delayed OCF as long as the objective of the lesson is fluency. On the other side, in some studies the instructors reported that they would fix oral errors more with delayed OCF as compared to immediate OCF for instance, in the study of Nekuruhmotlagh (2019), some teachers favored yielding delayed OCF to adults in order not to hurt them. The aforementioned studies reveal that some participants use and prefer delayed OCF, and some of them state that employing immediate and delayed OCF is determined by the main concern of the activity.

With regard to how learner errors should be corrected, some strategies are proposed. The most pervasive taxonomy is the one made by Lyster and Ranta (1997). They classify OCF into six types: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. They are explained as follows. In the explicit correction, the teacher reveals that an error has happened, he/she shows the erroneous and presents the true form. Moreover, when the teacher provides feedback through

recasts, he/she reformulates all of the student's statement, or part of it and removes the error. According to them, clarification requests signal that either the teacher does not understand the students' speech, or there is an error in the students' statement in some sense; so, they have to repeat it or compose another one. In the matter of elicitation, the teachers evoke the finalization of their own utterance by deliberately stopping to permit the students to "fill in the blank" with their own words. Lastly, the teacher repeats the student's statement for the purpose of focusing on the error in the case of providing a repetition strategy of OCF. Most of the time, the intonation of the teachers is altered in order to focus attention on the error (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

In literature, studies have been carried out to probe which type of OCF strategies is mostly used. Some studies scrutinize types of OCF strategies mostly used when grammatical, lexical, and phonological errors occur. In Genç and Cengİz's (2019) paper, for the grammatical errors, the most frequently used OCF strategy was recast, and the least frequently used OCF strategy was clarification request. In addition, the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth positions were for explicit correction, no correction, metalinguistic feedback, repetition and elicitation strategies, sequentially. What is related to the vocabulary-related errors, the results were as follows: Explicit correction belonged to the most frequently employed OCF strategy, but elicitation fell within the least frequently utilized OCF strategies. Moreover, recast, no correction, metalinguistic feedback, repetition and clarification request techniques were ranked in the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth places one by one. Regarding the pronunciation errors, recast was ranked as the first most frequently used OCF strategy; at the same time elicitation and repetition were ranked as the least frequently used OCF strategy. The second, third, fourth and fifth ranks were for explicit correction, no correction, metalinguistic feedback, and clarification request types, respectively. Moreover, some studies explore types of OCF strategies mostly used accompanied by different factors that influence or orient the preference of one type over another. According to the results of Demir and Özmen's (2017) and Sepehrinia et al. (2020), recast was also the most preferred type in using since it did not interrupt the flow of communication and it did not embarrass the students. The above previous studies demonstrate that in a huge percentage of studies recast lies in the category in which OCF strategy is the most frequently used one.

Finally, in connection with the subjects of the CF interaction, the sources of providing OCF encompass *self-correction*, *peer-correction* and *teacher correction*. Self-correction happens when the learner realizes that he/she has made a mistake and then the learner corrects himself or herself. It has both advantages and disadvantages; in terms of its advantages, scholars believe that when learners notice their errors, they learn more (Hendrickson, 1978). Additionally, it is said that self-correction is more favored compared to the others since it is face-saving and it gives opportunity to the learner to have a great role in the process of correction (Méndez & Cruz, 2012). Edge (1997) argues that self-correction keeps the right form in the learner's mind. However, self-correction encounters some issues. The learners are incompetent or do not have enough linguistic input or competence to notice their own error and correct it (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). Peer-correction takes place when the right form is supplied by the learner's colleague. Similar to self-correction, peer correction has both pros and cons. It has many benefits for instance, both learners participate in the face-to-face conversation and they do not depend on their teacher too much (Edge, 1997). Peer-correction, nevertheless, has also drawbacks. When the teacher asks the student's classmates to correct the errors, the volunteer students may be repeated in most cases; the other students may not

participate. Besides, another issue with peer-correction is that the students may not want to be corrected by their peers; they also may feel that peer-correction is a kind of criticizing (Edge, 1997). However, teacher-correction occurs when the teacher corrects the learner's error; he/she knows the difficulty and the correct answer. (Méndez & Cruz, 2012). Although many educators assume that the teacher should have a great role in the process of correction; it is put forward that they should not control the whole process (Hendrickson, 1978). While teacher correction is productive with many students, it might not be a fruitful technique for all students and in all classrooms (Hendrickson, 1978).

In the previous studies, there may be a significant difference in providing OCF between teacher correction on one side and self-correction and peer-correction on the other side, the former being the dominant form, and self-correction strategy can be practised more than peer-correction strategy. In the paper of Genç and Cengİz (2019), the findings demonstrated that teacher correction was the most commonly utilized method for all types of errors. The amount of utilization of teacher correction for grammatical, lexical and phonological errors was 62.8%, 67.1%, and 73.3%, respectively; nevertheless, self-correction was used more frequently than peer-correction in both grammatical and lexical errors. According to Méndez and Cruz (2012), the university teachers revealed that their most preferred corrector was the instructor and their least preferred corrector was the students' classmates. Thus, the location of self-correction was between the other two sources as specified by the instructors. Conversely, peer-correction can be utilized more often than self-correction. In the paper of Genç and Cengİz (2019), for phonological errors peer-correction achieved a higher degree than self-correction. Lastly, these studies exhibit that teacher-correction belongs to the most frequently utilized strategy by most of the participants of the previously discussed studies. And in most of them, self-correction is employed more often than peer-correction by most of the teachers; however, in a few of the studies, it is used less frequently than peer-correction.

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1. Sampling and Participants

The sampling procedure deployed in this study is convenience sampling, which is one of the strategies of non-probability sampling and the most prevalent sampling in L2 research (Dörnyei, 2011). This research has utilized convenience sampling in which the members of the population have been chosen based on some criteria like geographical proximity, availability, reachability without great effort, and willingness (Dörnyei, 2011).

Participants in the current study involve 140 EFL instructors from various colleges and faculties with various specialities in six public universities in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. Among them, 87 participants were males and 53 participants were females, and they aged between 23 and 60. They taught different subjects, and they had either MA degrees or PhD degrees in linguistics, Literature, Applied Linguistics, TESOL, and TEFL, with teaching experience between one year and more than ten years. Selected through the use of convenience sampling, the participants were required to complete the questionnaire. Table 1 illustrates the background profile of the participants.

**Table 1**

*Descriptive Statistics for Background Profile of Participants in the Study*

| | | F | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Male | 87 | 62.1 |
| | Female | 53 | 37.9 |
| Age | 20–29 | 8 | 5.7 |
| | 30–39 | 80 | 57.1 |
| | 40 + | 52 | 37.1 |
| | (Mean) | (38) | |
| Nationality | Kurdish-Iraqi | 132 | 94.3 |
| | Arab-Iraqi | 2 | 1.4 |
| | Kurdish-Iranian | 3 | 2.1 |
| | Turkman-Iraqi | 3 | 2.1 |
| Colleges or Faculties | College of Languages | 31 | 22.1 |
| | College of Education | 22 | 15.7 |
| | College of Basic Education | 39 | 27.9 |
| | Faculty of Education | 15 | 10.7 |
| | Faculty of Arts | 10 | 7.1 |
| | College of Education and Language | 9 | 6.4 |
| | Language and Development Centre | 7 | 5.0 |
| | Faculty of Humanities and Social Science | 7 | 5.0 |
| Academic degree | Master | 97 | 69.3 |
| | PhD | 43 | 30.7 |
| Teaching experience | 1 year | 9 | 6.4 |
| | 2–5 years | 19 | 12.9 |
| | 6–9 years | 53 | 37.9 |
| | More than ten years | 59 | 42.9 |

## 3.2. Data Collection Instrument

Although the method of questionnaire is optimum in the field of second language acquisition, it can be productive in light of the exigencies of the research. The researchers can pile up a lot of data from a substantial number of participants in a small amount of time. Moreover, the data obtained through questionnaires, which appears to be concise and clear, can be statistically analyzed using means, percentages, and figures (Bartram, 2019). Therefore, the instrument used in this study includes a questionnaire. Moreover, Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010) argue that the researchers can borrow the questionnaire items from the previously created questionnaires, and they also state that most of the errors are omitted in such questionnaires because of their utilization in the pilot study. Consequently, the items of the current research have been adopted from the pre-existing questionnaires of the other studies (e.g., Fukuda, 2004; Park, 2010; Yüksel, et al., 2021).

The questionnaire of the present study consists of five parts. In the introduction part, the aim of the questionnaire and the title of the study are mentioned; it is also promised that all the information will be confidential. The first part includes two sections. Section one has just one item in which the instructors are asked to provide information about treating the students' spoken errors. Furthermore, section two involves five items, and the participants are asked to supply information about the types of errors that they treat. The second part includes just one section, containing four items. They accentuate the significance of timing pertinent to correcting students' errors. The third part encompasses three sections which provide a fabricated scenario to discover the amount of using OCF strategies concerning a particular type of error in the classrooms. Section one covers seven items about the amount of using types of OCF strategies for grammatical errors. With reference to section two, it also incorporates seven items to find the amount of utilizing types of OCF strategies in the case of committing a phonological error. Similar to the first two sections, section three has seven items, they are about the amount of utilizing on OCF strategies during making a lexical error. The fourth part involves just one section, and it has three items on the sources of yielding OCF strategies. The fifth and last part has 10 items, it is devoted to the background information of the participants of the research, and the instructors were supposed to provide information about their gender, ages, nationalities, academic degrees, name of (universities, colleges or faculties and departments), L1s, and teaching experiences.

## 3.3. Validity and Reliability

The researchers have to assure that the utilized instruments are valid. An instrument is valid when it measures its purposes and demands to measure (Cohen et al., 2018). To ensure that an instrument is valid in terms of content and face, the researchers require specialists to provide their viewpoints about the instruments (Heale & Twycross, 2015). The questionnaire of the current study was sent to five experts in order to confirm whether they precisely evaluate all the content of the construct, whether they assess the intended construct or not, and whether they have face validity. The experts annotated the questionnaire with their comments. After receiving their remarks, more amendments were made grounded on their recommendations and suggestions. The questionnaire is also tested for reliability before the results are illustrated, and it was carried out using Cronbach's alpha. Table 2 exhibits the reliability of each construct. Cronbach's high value for all formulations indicates that it is internally consistent and measures the content of the same construct.

**Table 2**

*Reliability of Measurements of the Questionnaire for the Study*

| Constructs | Number of items | Number of cases | Cronbach's alpha | Decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Part I | 6 | 140 | 0.775 | Reliable |
| Part II | 4 | 140 | 0.710 | Reliable |
| Part III 4 | 7 | 140 | 0.842 | Highly reliable |
| Part III 5 | 7 | 140 | 0.859 | Highly reliable |
| Part III 6 | 7 | 140 | 0.867 | Highly reliable |
| Part IV | 3 | 140 | 0.701 | Reliable |
| All items | 34 | 140 | 0.944 | Excellently reliable |

## 3.4. Piloting the Questionnaire

The wording of questionnaires and pre-testing are equally important to their prosperity. The reliability, validity, and practicality of the questionnaire will be improved via the pilot study (Cohen et al., 2018). Therefore, the questionnaire of this study was used in a pilot study and completed by 57 EFL university instructors from three public universities in Kurdistan Region, Iraq. They all stated that the questionnaire items were clear, did not have any difficulties and ambiguities in wording, and had been designed properly.

## 3.5. Data Collection Procedure

During the academic year of 2021-2022, the researcher visited the settings of interest whereby the instructors who had different academic rankings (i.e., MA and PhD holders in linguistics, Literature, Applied Linguistics, TESOL, and TEFL) and who taught different topics, were invited to participate in the study. They were required to provide information about their usage of OCF in the classrooms by completing hard-copy questionnaires. The researcher, first, approached the head of the departments for obtaining permission to conduct the study. The researcher then gave an official application of permission for conducting the research to the head of the English departments, which was issued by Soran University. The participants were informed that their responses would be used only for academic purposes. Some of the questionnaires were distributed to the instructors directly, and they were given 30 minutes to complete them; whereas, some others were passed to them through the chairs or coordinators in those departments after, of course, having gained their endorsement. Besides, they were provided with instructions on how to complete the questionnaires. The questionnaires given to the instructors directly were collected right after they were completed while those passed to them through the chairs or coordinators were collected in the second visit of the departments. Moreover, 150 completed questionnaires were accumulated, and 10 of them were unfinished and were not used for future analysis. It connotes that 140 completed questionnaires were deployed for the analysis procedure.

## 3.6. Research Question

This study tackles the following research question to accomplish the aims:

RQ. How do EFL university instructors conceive of OCF vis-a-vis their teaching peculiarities about the contingencies of their OCF (whether, which, when, how, and who)?

## 3.7. Data Analysis

After the questionnaires were collected, all the data were entered manually into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program, version 26. Then it was analyzed using means differences, percentages, and standard deviations in order to investigate whether the students' errors and mistakes are corrected, which types of errors are corrected most often by the instructors when the errors are corrected most often, which types of OCF strategies are utilized more frequently by the instructors to correct the students' errors, and who provide OCF more frequently.

# 4. Results and Discussions

## 4.1. Instructors' Responses to Whether the Students' Errors are Corrected

In the first question of the questionnaire, the participants were required to provide information about whether the students' spoken errors were corrected in the classrooms of EFL university instructors. The collected data was analyzed and yielded the following results.

**Table 3**

*Descriptive Statistics about Instructors' Responses to Whether the Students' Errors are Corrected*

| | Not at all | | Not really | | So-so | | Quite a lot | | Very much | | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | | |
| Treating students' spoken errors | 0 | 0.0 | 15 | 10.7 | 56 | 40.0 | 54 | 38.6 | 15 | 10.7 | 3.493 | 0.827 |

As seen in Table 3, most of the instructors (40.0%) chose "so-so" in response; nonetheless, none of them (0.0%) chose "not at all". Moreover, 38.6% of the instructors reported that they tend to correct the students' spoken errors "quite a lot" and 10.7% of them said that they tend to correct the students' spoken errors "very much". The same percentage (10.7%) chose "not really" in correcting the students' spoken errors.

Apparently, most of the instructors revealed that they yield OCF moderately. This notion is supported by some scholars (e.g., Edge, 1997) who claim that it is not the teacher's duty to correct all the students' wrong utterances, but their duty is to help them scaffold their language which sometimes can be done without providing OCF; what is more, if the teachers correct the students all the time, this makes the students withdraw from speaking in the language effectively. Moreover, they may have taken some factors into consideration during handling students' errors, namely the focal activity, time management, and other psychological aspects. They may not correct the errors lotto often when the aim of the activity is on fluency due to the understandability of the meaning and not to interrupt the flow of communication, the lack of sufficient time in the classroom, and the feedback affects the students' psychology negatively. Furthermore, this response could have been given mostly by instructors who teach literature (e.g., novel, drama, and poetry) and other modules that do not require feedback that much. Some of the grounds were also tackled by the participants of Öztürk (2016) when they contended that they sometimes do not yield OCF owing to their lacking of enthusiasm to interrupt the flow of communication, taking the students'

personal characteristics into account in order not to affect their flow of communication harmfully, and their fatigue to correct the repeated errors all the time.

The results also suggest that a considerable number of instructors would correct students' oral errors quite a lot. This could be due to not letting the errors be fossilized and interrupting the activities. The former is supported by some scholars (e.g., Dekeyser, 1993; Valette, 1991) when they point out that the errors will be fossilized if they are not rectified and the latter is espoused by Sa'adah et al.'s (2018) paper in which the participant asserted that providing OCF do not confuse the classroom activities; besides, the instructors may want the learners not to repeat the errors. This finding is consistent with previous research conducted by Öztürk (2016) reporting that most of the participants corrected the students' errors. However, this finding diverges from other findings concluded by Shobaha (2019) and Sawaluddin and Tajuddin (2017). These scholars report that, according to their data, the participants often ignored the errors. The inconsistency between the current study and Shobaha's may happen since the latter was conducted in a course which was informal, and it was also a grammar class; nevertheless, the current study deals with correcting all the types of oral errors committed in formal classrooms.

## 4.2. Types of Errors Corrected by EFL University Instructors

In the second question of the questionnaire, the instructors were required to provide information regarding the types of errors they correct. As illustrated by Table 4, the most frequently corrected errors by the instructors were "serious spoken errors that cause a listener to have difficulty understanding the meaning of what is being said" (M=3.971, SD=0.777 ), and they tended to be corrected "quite a lot," "very much," and "not really" by 55.0%, 23.6%, and 5% of the instructors, respectively; however, the least frequently corrected type was "infrequent spoken errors" (M=2.686, SD=0.975), and they were "not at all," "not really," and "quite a lot" corrected by 9.3%, 36.4%, and 16.4% of the instructors, respectively.

**Table 4**

*Descriptive Statistics for Each Item About Types of Errors Corrected by EFL University Instructors*

| **Types of errors treated** | Not at all | | Not really | | So-so | | Quite a lot | | Very much | | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | | |
| Serious spoken errors | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 5.0 | 23 | 16.4 | 77 | 55.0 | 33 | 23.6 | 3.971 | 0.777 |
| Less serious spoken errors | 5 | 3.6 | 40 | 28.6 | 68 | 48.6 | 24 | 17.1 | 3 | 2.1 | 2.857 | 0.819 |
| Frequent spoken errors | 3 | 2.1 | 12 | 8.6 | 48 | 34.3 | 60 | 42.9 | 17 | 12.1 | 3.543 | 0.893 |
| Infrequent spoken errors | 13 | 9.3 | 51 | 36.4 | 48 | 34.3 | 23 | 16.4 | 5 | 3.6 | 2.686 | 0.975 |
| Individual errors | 6 | 4.3 | 37 | 26.4 | 50 | 35.7 | 38 | 27.1 | 9 | 6.4 | 3.050 | 0.984 |
| Overall (Types of errors treated) | | | | | | | | | | | 3.221 | 0.567 |

Moreover, the second type was "frequent spoken errors" (M=3.543, SD=0.893), and it tended to be "quite a lot" and "not really" rectified by 42.9 % and 8.6%, consecutively. At the same time, the third type

was "individual errors made only by one student" (M=3.050, SD=0.984), and they were reported to be "quite a lot" and "not really" corrected by 27.1% and 26.4% of them, sequentially. Finally, the fourth type was "less serious spoken errors that do not cause a listener to have difficulty understanding the meaning of what is being said" (M=2.857, SD=0.819), and it tended to be corrected by 28.6% and 17.1% of them "not really" and "quite a lot," in the order given.

These numerical findings imply that the instructors tend to correct global errors more than the other types. They may suppose that expressing the message clearly is significant. The results also show that the instructors tend to correct local errors, but not with the same amount as that of global errors. This finding corresponds with the results explored by Karimi and Asadnia (2015) in which the teachers stated although that global errors seem to be more important than local errors, they do not neglect local errors. Additionally, Sheen and Ellis (2011) maintain that teachers should provide feedback on global errors before the other types of errors.

## 4.3. Timing of Error Correction by EFL University Instructors

In the third question of the questionnaire, the instructors provided their answers about the suitable time to correct the students' errors. The results show that most of the teachers believe that OCF should be given "after" the speaking process as shown in Table 5 since it acquired the highest mean (M=3.586, SD=0.982) and it was evaluated by 47.1% of them as "effective" and by 8.6% as "ineffective." On the other hand, they tended to yield OCF least frequently "as soon as errors are made even if it interrupts the student's speaking" because it obtained the least mean (M=2.793, SD=1.083) and it was responded by 22.1% of them as "effective" and by 27.1% of them as "ineffective." Further, the second and the third most frequently used times of providing OCF were "after the ongoing activity" and "at the end of class," with the mean of (M=3.264, SD=1.036) and (M=3.014, SD=1.258), sequentially.

**Table 5**

*Descriptive Statistics for Each Item About Timing of Error Correction by EFL University Instructors*

| **Times of Treating errors** | Very ineffective | | Ineffective | | Neutral | | Effective | | Very effective | | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | | |
| As soon as errors are made | 18 | 12.9 | 38 | 27.1 | 46 | 32.9 | 31 | 22.1 | 7 | 5.0 | 2.793 | 1.083 |
| After the Student finishes speaking | 6 | 4.3 | 12 | 8.6 | 36 | 25.7 | 66 | 47.1 | 20 | 14.3 | 3.586 | 0.982 |
| After the ongoing activity | 10 | 7.1 | 21 | 15.0 | 41 | 29.3 | 58 | 41.4 | 10 | 7.1 | 3.264 | 1.036 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| At the end of class | 23 | 16.4 | 24 | 17.1 | 37 | 26.4 | 40 | 28.6 | 16 | 11.4 | 3.014 | 1.258 |
| Overall (Times of treating errors) | | | | | | | | | | | 3.164 | 0.617 |

The numerical data suggests that the instructors prefer delayed OCF over immediate OCF, and this might have taken place due to not interrupting the students, not demotivating them, and not triggering their affective filters, including shyness and fearfulness. Two theories advocate the supremacy of delayed OCF over immediate OCF: Preservation-Interference Theory and Spacing Theory. As illustrated by Preservation-Interference Theory, delayed OCF is more effective than immediate OCF since the latter makes the wrong utterances to be intervened with the correct utterances; accordingly, it impedes learning. Nevertheless, the errors will be evanesced or forgotten through delayed OCF, and no intervention will be transpired as the correct responses are solely provided later. According to Spacing Theory, immediate OCF produces massed presentation; whereas, delayed OCF embodies spaced presentation. Spaced instruction is more useful than massed instruction because it presupposes less cognitive effort (Fu & Lee, 2020).

Moreover, this finding is consistent with previous research (e.g., Chugai & Ogienko 2021; Haryanto, 2015; Ölmezer-Öztürk, 2016) which found that delayed OCF techniques were adopted more frequently than immediate OCF. Whereas, some other studies (e.g., Shoboha, 2019) found that most of the errors were corrected immediately. This contradiction may be due to the fact that in Shobaha's study, OCF was carried out against grammatical errors, which the teachers might prefer implementing immediate OCF. In the present study; however, the instructors reported their usage of errors in general. The finding of providing OCF after the students finish speaking most frequently corresponds to Mungungu-Shipale and Kangira's (2017) study in which most of the instructors maintained that they usually provide OCF either after the student finishes speaking or after the activity is finished. They also argued that they do not try to yield immediate OCF in order not to annoy the students. The results also reveal that the instructors do not tend to fix the students' errors very lately, and they may believe that if they delay the correction very late, finally, they may forget the errors and the feedback process. This view is supported by DeKeyser (2007) when he maintains that "feedback should not be delayed too much" (p.4); otherwise, the errors may be fossilized.

## 4.4. Results of OCF Strategies

## a. Results of OCF Strategies to Grammatical Errors

Question four of the questionnaire asked the instructors to reveal how much they use the provided strategies of OCF when the students commit a grammatical error. As presented in Table 6, the most frequent strategy used by the teachers was clarification request and recast strategies (M=4.043 and 4.036, SD=1.308 and 1.380, respectively) and providing no corrective feedback strategy least (M=3.121,

SD=1.500). Clarification request was reported to be deployed "quite a lot" and "very much" by 30.0% and 12.1% of the participants, respectively; meanwhile, it was noted by 10% of them that they do not really use it. Additionally, recast was reported to be used "quite a lot" and "very much" by 27.9%, and 14.3 % of them, respectively; at the same time, 10.7% of the instructors tend to use it "not really." However, no corrective feedback strategy tended to be used "quite a lot" and "very much" by 14.3% and 5.7% of them, respectively, and it is not deployed really by 17.1% of them.

Besides, Table 6 demonstrates that elicitation (M=3.921, SD=1.235), explicit correction (M=3.914, SD=1.283), repetition (M=3.871, SD=1.280), and metalinguistic feedback (M=3.864, SD=1.201) strategies record the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth ranks, respectively in the case of committing a grammatical error by the students. As uncovered, elicitation strategy was reported to be used more often than explicit correction strategy, and the latter strategy was reported to be used more often than repetition. Further, metalinguistic feedback is tended to be used less often than repetition.

**Table 6**

*Descriptive Statistics for Each Item About OCF Strategies to Grammatical Errors*

| OCF strategies | Not at all | | Not really | | So-so | | A little | | Quite a lot | | Very much | | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | | |
| Explicit correction | 5 | 3.6 | 13 | 9.3 | 38 | 27.1 | 31 | 22.1 | 39 | 27.9 | 14 | 10.0 | 3.914 | 1.283 |
| Metalinguistic feedback | 6 | 4.3 | 12 | 8.6 | 30 | 21.4 | 48 | 34.3 | 35 | 25.0 | 9 | 6.4 | 3.864 | 1.201 |
| Repetition | 5 | 3.6 | 15 | 10.7 | 34 | 24.3 | 40 | 28.6 | 31 | 22.1 | 15 | 10.7 | 3.871 | 1.280 |
| Recast | 7 | 5.0 | 15 | 10.7 | 23 | 16.4 | 36 | 25.7 | 39 | 27.9 | 20 | 14.3 | 4.036 | 1.380 |
| Elicitation | 3 | 2.1 | 14 | 10.0 | 38 | 27.1 | 35 | 25.0 | 36 | 25.7 | 14 | 10.0 | 3.921 | 1.235 |
| No corrective feedback | 27 | 19.3 | 24 | 17.1 | 30 | 21.4 | 31 | 22.1 | 20 | 14.3 | 8 | 5.7 | 3.121 | 1.500 |
| Clarification request | 5 | 3.6 | 14 | 10.0 | 27 | 19.3 | 35 | 25.0 | 42 | 30.0 | 17 | 12.1 | 4.043 | 1.308 |
| Overall | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.824 | 0.728 |

The findings suggest that most of the instructors would handle oral errors using clarification requests. This might be due to its participation in encouraging students to self-correct themselves. This idea is espoused by Skill Acquisition Theory as it favors prompts strategies of OCF since they withhold the right utterance and promote self-correction (Fu & Li, 2020). The instructors' ground for using recast as one of the most used OCF strategies may be its participation in juxtaposing the right and erroneous utterances. Fu and Li (2020) support this belief when they maintain that recast is beneficial since it collocates both the correct and wrong utterances; hence, the learners compare these two forms cognitively. Besides, it provides the correct form with the complete meaning; consequently, the learners' cognitive resources will be prepared to receive it. The result of using clarification request and recast as the most frequent strategies for grammatical errors amounts with other studies such as (Genç & Cengİz, 2019), and

it is also in line with (Fakazli, 2018; Lyster, 1998; Mackey et al., 2000) regarding recast as one of the most used strategies for grammatical errors. However, the finding of the current research is distinguished from Fakazli (2018) finding in terms of clarification requests which was one of the least used feedback strategies for grammatical errors in Fakazli's (2018) study. According to the findings, most of the instructors would handle grammatical erroneous features. This could have happened in order not to let fossilization to have occurred. Valette (1991) supports this viewpoint when he says that if the errors do not receive feedback, they will be fossilized.

The results also indicate that the instructors would fix grammatical errors using elicitation to a great extent, this could be due to its being a facilitator for self-correction. This reason is also emphasized by the participants of Hussein and Ali's (2014) study when they showed that elicitation is beneficial because it encourages self-correction and it also enhances self-esteem. Like elicitation, explicit correction has also been reported to be deployed a lot by instructors. This may have happened as a result of time management. Furthermore, some explanation is provided for this strategy, and this may have affected the students' determination to choose this strategy. Metalinguistic feedback and repetition were found to be among the least often exploited strategies. The participants may assume that metalinguistic feedback is time-consuming during correcting the grammatical erroneous features; moreover, they might also feel that repetition would embarrass the students when it is used a lot owing to its being an offensive strategy.

## b. Results of OCF Strategies to Phonological Errors

Question five of the questionnaire required the instructors to show how much they employ the provided strategies for OCF when the students make a phonological error. As revealed in Table 7, recast and metalinguistic feedback were reported to be the most frequently employed strategies (M=4.364 and 4.229, SD=1.127 and 1.219, sequentially) and no corrective feedback was the least frequently employed strategy by the instructors (M=2.386, SD=1.548). Recast and metalinguistic feedback strategies were reported to be employed "quite a lot" by 39.3% and 35.0% by the participants, and "not really" by 5.7% and 3.6% of them, sequentially; nonetheless, no corrective feedback strategy was employed "quite a lot" by 9.3% and "not really" by 20% of them.

**Table 7**

*Descriptive Statistics for Each Item About OCF Strategies to Phonological Errors*

| OCF strategies | Not at all | | Not really | | So-so | | A little | | Quite a lot | | Very much | | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | | |
| Repetition | 5 | 3.6 | 19 | 13.6 | 26 | 18.6 | 35 | 25.0 | 42 | 30.0 | 13 | 9.3 | 3.921 | 1.314 |
| Clarification request | 5 | 3.6 | 13 | 9.3 | 28 | 20.0 | 43 | 30.7 | 41 | 29.3 | 10 | 7.1 | 3.943 | 1.216 |
| No corrective feedback | 59 | 42.1 | 28 | 20.0 | 18 | 12.9 | 16 | 11.4 | 13 | 9.3 | 6 | 4.3 | 2.386 | 1.548 |
| Explicit correction | 11 | 7.9 | 15 | 10.7 | 33 | 23.6 | 31 | 22.1 | 31 | 22.1 | 19 | 13.6 | 3.807 | 1.454 |
| Metalinguistic feedback | 5 | 3.6 | 5 | 3.6 | 28 | 20.0 | 35 | 25.0 | 49 | 35.0 | 18 | 12.9 | 4.229 | 1.219 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recast | 1 | 0.7 | 8 | 5.7 | 23 | 16.4 | 34 | 24.3 | 55 | 39.3 | 19 | 13.6 | 4.364 | 1.127 |
| Elicitation | 3 | 2.1 | 14 | 10.0 | 33 | 23.6 | 39 | 27.9 | 39 | 27.9 | 12 | 8.6 | 3.950 | 1.207 |
| Overall | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.800 | 0.736 |

Further, elicitation (M=3.950, SD=1.207), clarification request (M=3.943, SD=1.216), repetition (M=3.921, SD=1.314), and explicit correction (M=3.807, SD=1.454) achieve the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth locations, sequentially in employing the OCF strategies during making a phonological error by the students. As shown in Table 7, the instructors reported that they tend to employ elicitation more frequently than clarification requests, and they also tend to employ the second one more frequently than repetition; besides, explicit correction tended to be employed less frequently than repetition.

The instructors may have chosen recast as the most utilized OCF strategy in order to avoid potential disturbance, via using an indirect way of correction. Lyster (2002) contends that recasts facilitate the process of conveying complicated subject matter, and they provide supportive scaffolding that assists learners to participate in lectures if they lack adequate capacity to overcome the difficulties. Besides, the result of employing recast as the most used strategy for phonological errors echoes the ones acquired by (Centeno & Ponce, 2019; Genç & Cengİz, 2019; Fakazli, 2018; Lyster, 1998). Moreover, the instructors reported that they would correct the phonological oral errors of the students by exploiting metalinguistic feedback to a great extent. The grounds behind exploiting this strategy could be stimulating self-correction and supporting them to learn some rules of the language. I assume that it seems to be crucial to show the students rules of language in order to make them apprehend the error, especially during the occurrence of phonological errors. The findings are also similar to other studies (e.g., Haryanto, 2015) in employing recast and metalinguistic feedback as the two most frequently employed strategies. In addition, the majority of the instructors do not tend to skip phonological errors since they might be fossilized, and afterwards, it requires strenuous efforts to overcome the issue. Wei (2008) supports this idea when he points out that as long as phonological errors are committed in the absence of providing OCF, phonological fossilization eventuates.

The results also signify that the instructors tend to correct phonological oral errors of the students with elicitation. This may be owing to becoming aware of the position of the error, and potentially it looks to be difficult for the students to figure out the location of the phonological errors. Moreover, clarification request has also achieved a high rank according to the results, and probably when the learners attempt to pronounce a word, the instructor may not acquire the pronunciation well; for that reason, he/she may ask the student to repeat it. Likewise, the result of not obtaining a high degree by repetition in comparison to other strategies could have occurred as a result of embarrassing the students by repeating the same phonological error. As compared to the other types of OCF strategies, explicit correction tended to be deployed the least frequently, and this could be due to being spoon-feeding and embarrassing the students. Lyster (2002) claims that explicit correction does not provide opportunities for discussions as the teacher gives the correct version; therefore, the learners restate the correct form.

## c. Results of OCF Strategies to Lexical Errors

Question six of the questionnaire requested the instructors to present how much they utilize the provided strategies of OCF when the students commit a lexical error. As exhibited in Table 8, the strategies utilized most frequently by the participants were recast and metalinguistic feedback (M=4.286 and 4.014,

SD= 1.061 and 1.319, consecutively); nevertheless, the least utilized strategy was no corrective feedback (M=2.871, SD=1.497). Recast and metalinguistic feedback were reported to be utilized "quite a lot" by 36.4% and 30.0% of the participants, consecutively and "not rally" by 3.6% and 10% of them, in the order given; whereas, no corrective feedback was utilized "quite a lot" by 15.0% of them, and it was "not really" and "not at all" used by 20% and 25% of them, respectively.

**Table 8**

*Descriptive Statistics for Each Item About OCF Strategies to Lexical Errors*

| OCF strategies | Not at all | | Not really | | So-so | | A little | | Quite a lot | | Very much | | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | | |
| Clarification request | 8 | 5.7 | 16 | 11.4 | 35 | 25.0 | 36 | 25.7 | 34 | 24.3 | 11 | 7.9 | 3.750 | 1.315 |
| Recast | 2 | 1.4 | 5 | 3.6 | 23 | 16.4 | 45 | 32.1 | 51 | 36.4 | 14 | 10.0 | 4.286 | 1.061 |
| Elicitation | 6 | 4.3 | 14 | 10.0 | 41 | 29.3 | 40 | 28.6 | 35 | 25.0 | 4 | 2.9 | 3.686 | 1.164 |
| Explicit correction | 17 | 12.1 | 19 | 13.6 | 30 | 21.4 | 32 | 22.9 | 30 | 21.4 | 12 | 8.6 | 3.536 | 1.486 |
| No corrective feedback | 35 | 25.0 | 28 | 20.0 | 26 | 18.6 | 26 | 18.6 | 21 | 15.0 | 4 | 2.9 | 2.871 | 1.497 |
| Repetition | 9 | 6.4 | 17 | 12.1 | 29 | 20.7 | 39 | 27.9 | 38 | 27.1 | 8 | 5.7 | 3.743 | 1.311 |
| Metalinguistic feedback | 7 | 5.0 | 14 | 10.0 | 21 | 15.0 | 41 | 29.3 | 42 | 30.0 | 15 | 10.7 | 4.014 | 1.319 |
| Overall | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.698 | 0.758 |

Moreover, Table 8 shows that clarification request (M=3.750, SD=1.315), repetition (M=3.743, SD=1.311), elicitation (M=3.686, SD=1.164), and explicit correction (M=3.536, SD=1.486) achieve the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth positions, consecutively in utilizing the OCF strategies when the students commit a lexical error. As displayed, the instructors reported that they utilize clarification requests more frequently than repetition, and they also utilize the latter more than elicitation; in addition, explicit correction is utilized less frequently than elicitation.

The finding of reporting recast to be the most frequently exploited OCF strategy can result from not interrupting the students and considerations of time management. In this respect, Lyster et al. (2013) state that recasts can be employed even in fluency activities because they do not interrupt the flow of communication. Furthermore, Panova and Lyster (2002) point out that recast sounds be a fast and riskless OCF strategy to correct oral errors. Although the finding of utilizing recast as the most frequently utilized strategy as the response to committing lexical errors is consistent with (Genç & Cengİz, 2019; Fakazli, 2018); however, the finding of the present study is in contrast to them regarding the utilization of no corrective feedback which did not belong to the least utilized strategy in those studies. In addition, the results of the questionnaire reveal that metalinguistic feedback tends to be used as the second OCF strategy in the case of eventuating lexical errors. This may have taken place since metalinguistic feedback fosters self-correction, and at the same time, it helps the students by yielding some clues. In Hussein and Ali's (2014) study, some of the participants favored metalinguistic feedback because it encourages self-correction and contributes to the flow of interaction. Besides, the quantitative data suggests that most of

the lexical errors are corrected by EFL university instructors orally as they might be inattentive to the fact that these errors will be fossilized in the case of not receiving OCF, and they also might be willing to improve the students' language through giving OCF. Dekeyser (1993) proclaims that unless the errors receive feedback, they will be fossilized.

It can also be inferred from the results that both clarification requests and repetition tend to be used considerably, and that is to indirectly encourage a self-correction and due to using an informal way of giving feedback by the former and enabling them to be conscious about the wrong utterance by the latter. Nonetheless, elicitation and explicit correction tend to be exploited less as compared to the aforementioned OCF strategies. This might be owing to putting the students in undesirable situations and forgetting the correct utterance easily by using the elicitation and explicit correction, in the order given in the case of occurring lexical errors.

## 4.5. The Sources of Providing OCF

Question seven of the questionnaire was about the sources of OCF practiced by EFL university instructors. As illustrated in Table 9, the results show that "myself" owns the highest mean (M=3.807, SD=0.738), followed by "students themselves" (M=3.721, SD=0.866) and "classmates" (M=2.979, SD=0.963), respectively. The findings reveal that the instructors tend to provide OCF most frequently (i.e., the instructors practice teacher-correction method most frequently). Although self-correction method came second, it was still adopted more frequently than peer-correction.

**Table 9**

*Descriptive Statistics for Each Item About the Sources of Providing OCF*

| The sources of OCF | Strongly disagree | | Disagree | | Neutral | | Agree | | Strongly agree | | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | | |
| Classmates | 11 | 7.9 | 29 | 20.7 | 56 | 40.0 | 40 | 28.6 | 4 | 2.9 | 2.979 | 0.963 |
| Students themselves | 2 | 1.4 | 13 | 9.3 | 26 | 18.6 | 80 | 57.1 | 19 | 13.6 | 3.721 | 0.866 |
| Myself | 1 | 0.7 | 5 | 3.6 | 33 | 23.6 | 82 | 58.6 | 19 | 13.6 | 3.807 | 0.738 |
| Overall | | | | | | | | | | | 3.502 | 0.531 |

Furthermore, the findings also exhibit that most of the participants (58.6%) agreed that the instructor provides OCF in their classrooms. Most of the participants (57.1%) also agreed that the students who make errors correct themselves in the classroom. Finally, 28.6% of the participants agreed and 20.7% of them disagreed that the classmates of the students yield OCF in the classrooms.

The result of utilizing teacher-correction method most frequently might have happened owing to the assured feeling of the students, lacking of sufficient time, accepting the feedback by the students, and being more knowledgeable and source of information. Some of the grounds may be confirmed by Ahangari (2014) as she maintains that teacher feedback is faster, more beneficial, and more precise; notwithstanding, she argues that teacher-correction participation in students' language evolution is contentious. This finding is consistent with the finding (Shoboha, 2019) that most of the errors were rectified by the teacher, and the second and third frequently practised feedback givers involve self-

correction and peer-correction, in the order. It also goes in harmony with the findings of (Centeno and Ponce, 2019) that most of the errors were corrected by the teacher.

The findings also uncover that correcting the errors by the students who commit them is also practised a lot by the EFL instructors. This could be a result of its contribution to stimulating the students to be independent learners, making the students not forget the errors and the feedback, and intensifying their self-confidence. Ahangari (2014) also confirms that self-correction enhances the students' self-reliance and assists them to be the evaluator of their own productions. Fu and Li (2020) promote self-correction as they assert that it initiates the practice of linguistic knowledge accumulated in long term-memory and expedites the proceduralization and automatization of second language knowledge.

Lastly, it can be inferred from the results presented in Table 9 that the instructors do not let the oral errors be rectified by colleagues that much. This may be owing to the students' reluctance to be corrected by their peers and their making fun of each other. Peer-correction sounds to be time-consuming for the teachers. Moreover, it might affect the students (i.e., those who are rectified) psychologically and ask themselves "Why I do not know the answer but my friend does?!"; thus, they will be demotivated. This notion is also supported by Harmer (2010) as he maintains that students sometimes feel embarrassed when their classmates fix their errors. Furthermore, Sultana (2009) claims that some students are unwilling to correct their peers' errors as they may affect their relationships negatively.

## 5. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to scrutinize EFL university instructors' understanding and conceptualization of OCF vis-à-vis their teaching peculiarities. The instrument used in this study for data collection included questionnaires, and some findings have been achieved after analyzing and interpreting the data. Most of the instructors would moderately correct students' oral errors, and a considerable number of them provide feedback quite a lot. In terms of types of errors, global errors are tended to be corrected more than the other types of errors, and the instructors would also yield OCF to local errors but with less amount as compared to global errors. The instructors tend to provide delayed OCF more often than immediate OCF. Besides, they handle grammatical errors most frequently through exploiting clarification requests and recast strategies, and the phonological and lexical errors are corrected most often using recast and metalinguistic feedback. Lastly, the main source of feedback in the classroom was found to be the teacher among the other sources. Based on the findings, the research makes the following recommendations for future work. Pedagogy course organizers should choose among types of OCF strategies that the EFL instructors find more effective based on their experiences. And, EFL university instructors should provide OCF in a way that helps learners to acquire the target language successfully. The research also proposes the following suggestions. Prospective work may tropicalize learners' preferences of types of OCF the instructors' practices to figure out if they correspond with each other. Another potential argument is how some factors, such as teaching experience and gender influence teachers' use of OCF types not only in public universities but also in private ones.

# لێکۆڵینەوەیەک دەربارەی بەکارهێنانی جۆرەکانی فیدباکی هەڵە ڕاستکردنەوەی زارەکیی لەنێو پۆل، لەلایەن ئەو مامۆستایانەی زانکۆ کە زمانی ئینگلیزیی وەکو زمانی بیانیی دەڵێنەوە

**پشتیوان مصطفی قادر[1] - نیاز محسن عزیز[2]**

[1+2] بەشی ئینگلیزیی، فاکەڵتی ئاداب، زانکۆی سۆران، سۆران، هەرێمی کوردستان، عێراق.

**پوختە**

ئەم توێژینەوەیە لە چۆنیەتیی تێگەیشتنی فیدباکی هەڵە ڕاستکردنەوەی زارەکیی دەکۆڵێتەوە، لەلایەن ئەو مامۆستایانەی زانکۆ، کە زمانی ئینگلیزیی وەکو زمانی بیانیی دەڵێنەوە، بەگوێرەی تایبەتمەندی وانەگوتنەوەیان. بەشداربووانی ئەم توێژینەوەیە بریتین لە (١٤٠) مامۆستای پسپۆڕیی جیاوازی زانکۆ، کە لە کۆلێج و فاکەڵتییە جۆراوجۆرەکانی زانکۆکانی هەرێمی کوردستانی عێراق، زمانی ئینگلیزیی وەکو زمانی بیانیی دەڵێنەوە. لەنێو ئەو بەشداربووانەدا، (٨٧) یان لە ڕەگەزی نێر و (٥٣) یان لەڕەگەزی مێ بوون، تەمەنیشیان لە نێوان (٢٣–٦٠)ساڵدا بوو. ئەو ئامڕازەی لەم توێژینەوەیەدا بۆ کۆکردنەوەی داتا بەکارهاتوە، بریتی بوو لە پرسیارنامە، کە لە توێژینەوەکانی پێشتر وەرگیراون (بۆنموونە فوکودا، ٢٠٠٤؛ پاک، ٢٠١٠؛ یوکسەل و هی تر، ٢٠٢١). دەرەنجامەکان ئەوە دەخەنە ڕوو، کەوا زۆرینەی بەشداربووەکان بەشێوەیەکی مامناوەند فیدباکی هەڵە ڕاستکردنەوەی زارەکیی دەبەخشن، هەروەها بەشێکی زۆریشیان تا ڕادەیەکی زۆر هەڵەی زارەکیی ڕاست دەکەنەوە. سەرباری ئەوەش، ئەوان هەڵە گلۆبالییەکان (ئەو هەڵانەی دەبنە هۆی تێنەگەیشتن لە کاتی گفتوگۆدا) زیاتر لە هەڵە لۆکالییەکان (ئەو هەڵانەی نابنە هۆی تێنەگیشتن لە کاتی گفتوگۆدا) ڕاست دەکەنەوە. مامۆستاکان زیاتر فیدباکی هەڵە ڕاستکردنەوەی زارەکیی دەستبەجێ نابەخشن، بەڵکو دوای دەخەن. هەروەها ئەو ستراتیژانەی زۆرترین جار لە کاتی پێدانی فیدباکی هەڵە ڕاستکردنەوەی زارەکی بەکاردێن، بریتین لە کلاریفیکەیشن ڕیکوێست (داوای ڕوونکردنەوە بەهۆی بوونی هەڵە)و، ڕیکاست (ڕاستەوخۆ پێدانی وەڵامی ڕاست) لەکاتی ئەنجامدانی هەڵەی ڕێزمانیی، ڕیکاست و مێتالنگویستیک فیدباک (پێدانی تێبینی و زانیاریی و یاسا، بەبێ ئاماژەکردن بۆ وەڵامی راست) لە کاتی ئەنجامدانی هەڵەی فۆنۆلۆجیی و وشەکاریدا. لە کۆتاییدا، ئەوە دەرکەوت کەوا مامۆستا سەرچاوەی سەرەکیی پێدانی فیدباکی هەڵە ڕاستکردنەوەی زارەکییە.

**کلیلە وشەکان:** مامۆستایانی زانکۆ کە زمانی ئینگلیزیی وەکو زمانی بیانیی دەڵێنەوە، فیدباکی هەڵە ڕاستکردنەوەی زارەکیی، ستراتیژەکانی فیدباکی هەڵە ڕاستکردنەوەی زارەکیی، فیدباکی هەڵە ڕاستکردنەوەی زارەکیی دەستبەجێ، فیدباکی هەڵە ڕاستکردنەوەی زارەکیی دواخراو

## References


Ahangari, S. (2014). The effect of self, peer and teacher correction on the pronunciation improvement of Iranian EFL learners. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 5(1), 81–88. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.5n.1p.81

Anasthasia, R., & Mardijono, J. J. (2014). Oral corrective feedback and learners' uptake in the 5th grade of an elementary school in surabaya. *Ka ta Kita*, 2(3), 47–52.

Aranguiz, M. F., & Espinoza, A. Q. (2016). Oral corrective feedback strategies in EFL. A pilot study in Chilean classrooms. *Elia*, (16), 103–132. https://doi.org/10.12795/elia.2016.i16.05

Azizi, M., Pavlikova, M., & Masalimova, A. (2020). Exploring literature reading classes in terms of types of feedback provided by EFL teachers: Does teaching experience play a determining role? *Education & Self Development*, 15(3), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.26907/esd15.3.02

Bartram, B. (2019). Using questionnaires. In *Practical Research Methods in Education*, 1–11. New York and London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Bohlke, D. (2014). Fluency-oriented second language teaching. In *teaching English as a second or foreign language*, (4th ed), 121–135. Boston, MA.: Heinle Cengage.

Burt, M. K. (1975). Error analysis in the adult EFL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *9*(1), 53–63. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586012

Centeno, A., & Ponce, S. (2019). Beliefs about oral corrective feedback in an Argentinean EFL university classroom. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 13(3), 35–58. https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201907063591

Chugai, O., & Ogienko, O. (2021). Teaching technical english: Corrective feedback based on students' and teachers' beliefs. *Multidisciplinary Journal for Education, Social and Technological Sciences*, 8(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.4995/muse.2021.14016

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education*. (8th ed.) New York and London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

DeKeyser, R. M. (1993). The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(4), 501–514. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1993.tb01999.x

DeKeyser, R. (Ed.). (2007). *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeKeyser, R. M., & Sokalski, K. J. (2001). The differential role of comprehension and production practice. *Language Learning*, 51(S1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.2001.tb00015.x

Demir, Y., & Özmen, K. S. (2017). Exploring native and non-native EFL teachers' oral corrective feedback practices: An observational study. *Brock Education Journal*, 26(2), 111–129. https://doi.org/10.26522/brocked.v26i2.609

Dörnyei, Z. (2011). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. (10th ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. (2nd ed.) New York and London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*, 206–257. (3rd ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edge, J. (1997). *Mistakes and correction*. (7th ed.) London: Longman.

Ellis, R. (1993). The structural syllabus and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 91–113. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586953

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054

Ellis, R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in L2 classrooms. In *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (1st ed.) 3–18. New York and London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Fakazli, Ö. (2018). Exploring the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms: A case study at a state university. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 26(6), 2177-2187. https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.2971

Fu, M., & Li, S. (2020). The effects of immediate and delayed corrective feedback on L2 development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 44(1), 2–34. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263120000388

Fukuda, Y. (2004). *T*reatment of spoken errors in Japanese high school oral communication classes (Unpublished master's thesis). *California State University, San Francisco, United States*.

Fungula, B. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in the Chinese EFL classroom: Methods employed by teachers to give feedback to their students. (Degree project). *Department of Language, Literature, and Intercultural Studies, Karlstads Universitet, Karlstad, Sweden*.

Genç, Z. S. & CengİZ, Ö. (2019). Pre- service EFL teachers' beliefs and behaviours on oral corrective feedback strategies. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 7(2), 19–39.

Gower, R., Phillips, D., & Walters, S. (2005). *Teaching practice handbook*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Hanif, H. (2021). Spoken error correction practices and beliefs of EFL university teachers in Saudi Arabia. *Indonesian TESOL Journal*, 3(1), 68–75. https://doi.org/10.24256/itj.v3i1.1739

Harmer, J. (2010). *How to teach English*. (6th ed.). Aviagen. Stenton Associates, Safron Walden, Essex, UK.

Haryanto, E. (2015). Teachers' corrective feedback on students' pronunciation at the Daffodils English course Kampung Inggris Pare Indonesia. *Linguists : Journal Of Linguistics and LanguageTeaching*, 2(2). https://ejournal.iainbengkulu.ac.id/index.php/linguists/article/view/115

Hashemian, M., Mirzaei, A., & Mostaghasi, H. (2016). Exploring different oral corrective feedback preferences: Role of intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 140–159.

Heale, R., & Twycross, A. (2015). Validity and reliability in quantitative studies. *Evidence Based Nursing*, 18(3), 66–67. https://doi.org/10.1136/eb-2015-102129

Hedge, T. (2008). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. (10th ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 62(8), 387–398. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1978.tb02409.x

Holley, F. M., & King, J. K. (1971). Imitation and correction in foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 55(8), 494–498. https://doi.org/10.2307/323789

Hussein, B. A. E., & Ali, H. I. H. (2014). Rationalizing oral corrective feedback in Sudanese EFL classrooms. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(3), 217–231. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.3p.217

Irawan, E., & Salija, K. (2017). Teachers' oral feedback in EFL classroom interaction (A descriptive study of senior high school in Indonesia). *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 138–152. https://doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v4i2.4496

Karimi, M. N., & Asadnia, F. (2015). EFL teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback and their feedback-providing practices across learners'proficiency levels. *Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)*, 34(2), 39–68.

Kubota, M. (1991). Corrective feedback by experienced Japanese EFL teachers. *Institute for Research in Language Teaching Bulletin*, 5(1), 1–25.

Li, S., Zhu, Y., & Ellis, R. (2016). The effects of the timing of corrective feedback on the acquisition of a new linguistic structure. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(1), 276–295. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12315

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48(2), 183–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00039

Lyster, R. (2002). Negotiation in immersion teacher–student interaction. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3–4), 237–253. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0883-0355(03)00003-x

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. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263197001034

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444812000365

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22(4), 471–497. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100004010

Martínez, S. G. (2006). Should we correct our students' errors in L2 learning. *Journal of Research and Innovation in the Language Classroom*, *16*, 1–7.

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

Mohseni, A., & Edalat, P. L. (2012). Iranian EFL learners and their teachers' preferences for oral error correction. *Journal of Language and Translation*, 3(1), 9–16.

Mungungu-Shipale, S. S., & Kangira, J. (2017). Lecturers' and students' perceptions and preferences about ESL corrective feedback in Namibia: Towards an intervention model. *World Journal of English Language*, 7(1), 11–19. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v7n1p11

Nekuruhmotlagh, L. (2019). Most common type of corrective feedback in Iranian classrooms. *Proceedings of The International Conference on Applied Research in Education*, 2–8. https://doi.org/10.33422/areconf.2019.07.347

Nishimura, K. (2000). Effective ways of communicative instruction in the Japanese EFL classroom: Balancing fluency and accuracy. *ERIC*. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED442297.pdf

Ölmezer-Öztürk, E. (2016). Beliefs and practices of Turkish EFL teachers regarding oral corrective feedback: A small-scale classroom research study. *The Language Learning Journal*, 47(2), 219–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1263360

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

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573–595. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588241

Park, H. S. (2010). Teachers' and learners' preferences for error correction (Master's thesis). *California State University, Sacramento, Los Angeles, United States*.

Prasetyaningrum, A. (2017). Teachers corrective feedback on students' error on oral and written performances: A case of high schools English teachers in Purwodadi. In *Unnes-Teflin National Seminar, 2*(1), 56–68. Retrieved from http://utns.proceedings.id/index.php/utns/article/view/16

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. (4th ed.) UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Sa'adah, L., Nurkamto, J., & Suparno, S. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: Exploring the relationship between teacher's strategy and students' willingness to communicate. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(2), 240–252. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v5i2.11532

Sawaluddin, S., & Tajuddin, A. J. A. (2017). Oral corrective feedback: Teacher's selection in actual practices. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(5), 377–390. https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v7-i5/2976

Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning teaching* (2nd ed.) Oxford: Macmillan.

Sepehrinia, S., Fallah, N., & Torfi, S. (2020). English language teachers' oral corrective preferences and practices across proficiency groups. *Profile: Issues in Teachers´ Professional Development*, 22(2), 163–177. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v22n2.82369

Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, 593–610. New York and London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Shobaha, S. (2019). The Implementation of oral corrective feedback in EFL Classroom. *LangEdu Journal*, 9(1).

Sultana, A. (2009). Peer correction in ESL classrooms. *BRAC University Journal*, 1(1), 11–19.

Tesnim, O. (2019). Tunisian EFL teachers' beliefs and perceptions about oral corrective feedback. *Communication and Linguistics Studies*, *5*(2), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.cls.20190502.12

Valette, R. M. (1991). Proficiency and the prevention of fossilization-An editorial. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(3), 325–328. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1991.tb05363.x

Wei, X. (2008). Implication of IL fossilization in second language acquisition. *English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 127–131. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v1n1p127

Yüksel, D., Soruç, A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in University EFL Classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics (United Kingdom)*, 31(3), 362–382. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12336