

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter will discuss some related theories to support this study. It will be used for the underlying requirement to solve the problems. It consists of the definition and theories about corrective feedback and student responses.

A. Speaking

Speaking is the ability to produce words in a language exercise. It is a critical skill for students to master because it allows us to assess their ability to produce language. Speaking is the act of expressing oneself through the use of a loud voice and is an important part of communication. When people interact with each other, it is because they want to communicate using language as a means of exchanging ideas or thoughts. Speaking is the activity of using words to communicate with others and express oneself in a way that can be understood and accepted by many people. It is an essential skill for effective communication and for expressing ideas or thoughts to others⁴³. Speaking is a way for people to transmit and share their thoughts verbally with others. If listeners are able to comprehend what someone is saying, the speaker is considered to have excellent speaking skills. This ability is important for effective communication and for expressing oneself clearly to others⁴⁴. Speaking is considered a vital part of communication, and people make an effort to learn this skill in order to be able to communicate with the global society. It is an important ability that enables people to express themselves and interact with others effectively.

Speaking is a means of communication that people use to convey their opinions, expressions, and desires through a wide variety of languages to others. According to Paramita Sari, speaking is the ability to communicate orally with other people. It is an activity that is used by people of all ages, from babies to

⁴³ Rahmawati & C. Sihombing, "The Effect Of E-Learning On Students Speaking Skill Progress: A Case Of The Seventh Grade At Smp Pencawan Medan," *Indonesian EFL Journal (IEFLJ)* 7, no.1 (2021): 70. Doi: 10.25134/ieflj.v7i1.3995

⁴⁴ Iful R. Mega & Dody Sugiarto, "Speaking Skills in Correlation with English Speaking Learning Habit and Self-Confidence of Vocational High School Students," *Journal of Foreign Language and Theaching Learning 5* ", no.2 (2020): 177. Doi: 10.18196/ftl.5253

older individuals, to express themselves and interact with others⁴⁵. Speaking is the skill that students will be judged on most in real-life situations. It is an important part of everyday interaction, and a person's ability to speak fluently and comprehensibly often forms their first impression. Therefore, teachers have a responsibility to prepare students to be able to speak effectively in the real world.

The implementation of the school-based curriculum for teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) speaking in Indonesia continues to face challenges, despite English being the first compulsory foreign language in junior and senior high schools. There are many factors that contribute to these challenges:

1. The government is not well and accurately informed about the feedback on its implementation for a limited time
2. The assessment which is not appropriate is applied to assess student's language skills creating a contra-productive in the result
3. The management of the class and teaching preparation is inadequate⁴⁶

The problem usually comes from the students. They are as follows:

1. Inhibition - Learners may be inhibited from speaking in English in the classroom due to fear of making mistakes, fear of criticism from their peers, or shyness.
2. Nothing to say - Some learners may struggle to find the motivation to speak or to formulate opinions or relevant comments, possibly due to a lack of vocabulary.
3. Lack of interest in the topic - If the teacher does not provide a suitable or interesting topic, students may become bored and lose focus in the classroom.
4. Previous learning experience - Previous learning experiences may also impact a student's ability to engage in English speaking if the material being covered is not relevant to their real life.

⁴⁵ Diah Paramita Sari, "The Effect of Using Random Picture Game Toward Student's speaking ability", *INOVISH Journal*, 3, no. 1, (2018): 73-83.

⁴⁶ Karim Mattarima, Abdul Rahim Hamdan, "Teaching Constrains Of English As A Foreign Language In Indonesia: The Context Of School Based Curriculum. *SOSIOHUMANIKA* 4, no. 2 (2011): 287-300.

5. Cultural reason - Cultural differences can also be a challenge for students trying to practice and use the language in their daily activities.
6. Low or uneven participant - In some cases, uneven participation may be caused by some learners dominating the group⁴⁷.

B. Teaching Speaking

Teaching speaking as a foreign language is a crucial aspect of mastering English. Teachers need to find effective ways to improve students' speaking skills. One way to do this is to create a strategy to make learning English enjoyable and engaging for students. When teachers have a clear plan for teaching in the classroom, students are more likely to be motivated and enthusiastic about learning the material. There are several approaches to second language instruction, including:

1. Content-based language teaching

Content-based language teaching (CBLT) is an instructional approach in which linguistic curricular content such as geography or science is taught to students through the medium of a language that they are learning as an additional language. This approach is also known as content-based instruction (CBI) or Content and Language integrated learning (CLIL). CBLT programs can be placed on a continuum with language-driven programs at one end and content-driven programs at the other end. CBLT is designed to help students develop their language skills while learning about a specific subject⁴⁸. At the language-driven end of the spectrum are foreign language classes that focus on theme-based content, with the goal of promoting target language development and helping learners develop their L2 competence within specific topic areas. These classes do not have high-stakes assessments of students' content knowledge, and the goal is to create a classroom environment where intellectually stimulating explorations are the

⁴⁷ Bessie Dendrinos, "ELT Method And Practice. Developing Speaking Skill". Edition: 1.0 Athens, Hellenic Republic, (2015): 26-28.

⁴⁸ Roy Lyster & Susan Ballinger, "Content-based language teaching: Convergent concerns across divergent contexts, 15", no.3 (2011): 280. Doi: 10.1177/1362168811401150

norm rather than the exception. The focus is on developing language skills rather than on testing content knowledge⁴⁹.

2. Task-based language teaching

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is a method of teaching a second or foreign language that focuses on engaging learners in authentic language use and promoting acquisition through the completion of communicative tasks. This approach encourages learners to view language as a means of communication rather than as a subject to be studied and practiced. TBLT aims to provide contexts in which learners can use their existing language skills to communicate and develop fluency in the second language (L2). Additionally, TBLT seeks to help learners acquire new linguistic knowledge through both the input and interactions that tasks provide, as well as through the natural focus on language form that arises from task performance. As a result, TBLT helps learners develop both linguistic and interactional competence in the L2. This teaching method emphasizes learning through the real-life use of the L2⁵⁰. A task must satisfy four criteria, they are as follows:

1. The task must involve learners in using the target language to communicate.
2. The task must be motivated by a real-life purpose.
3. The task must be achievable, but also slightly challenging to the learners.
4. The task must be appropriately supported, with the necessary resources and scaffolding provided for the learners to successfully complete it.

The primary focus should be on ‘meaning’ (i.e., learners should be concerned mainly with encoding and decoding messages, not with focusing on a linguistic form).

1. There should be some kind of gap (i.e., a need to convey information, express an opinion, or infer meaning).

⁴⁹ Brinton, D., Snow, M., & Wesche, M. *Content-based second language instruction* (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2003)

⁵⁰ Rod Ellis, "Task-Based Language Teaching", in *The Routledge Handbook of Instructed Second Language Acquisition*, Ed. Shawn Loewen and Masatoshi Sato (New York: Routledge, 2017): 108

2. Learners should rely largely on their own resources (linguistic and nonlinguistic) in order to complete the task. That is, learners are not taught the language they will need to perform a task, although they may be able to borrow from the input the task provides to help them perform.
 3. There is a clearly defined outcome other than the use of language for its own sake. Thus, when performing a task, learners are not primarily concerned with using language correctly but with achieving the goal stipulated by the task⁵¹.
3. Cognitive-interactionist approach

A cognitive-interactionist approach involves providing learners with linguistic input through various mediums and engaging them in conversation. This approach pays attention to linguistic input with some level of awareness and provides learners with corrective feedback in response to their errors. The feedback serves as negative evidence, helping learners understand what is not possible in the target language. This approach emphasizes spontaneous attention to linguistic forms during meaning-oriented activities and aims to help learners produce responses to feedback that are more target-like than their original utterances⁵². Techniques to teach speaking based on Rusdiningsih are as follows:

1. Role-playing - One method for developing speaking skills is role-playing, which involves creating a dramatic situation in the classroom or simply acting out dialogues. It can also involve re-labeling objects and people in the room to prepare for imaginative role-playing.
2. Games - Games can be a fun and motivating way to help students learn in a relaxed atmosphere.
3. Problem-solving - Materials that focus on problem-solving offer opportunities for students to work in pairs or small groups, share information and opinions on meaningful topics.

⁵¹ Rod Ellis & Shintani. *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. (London: Routledge, 2014):31

⁵² Youjin Kim, "Cognitive Interactionist Approaches to L2 Instruction", in *The Routledge Handbook of Instructed Second Language Acquisition*, Ed. Shawn Loewen and Masatoshi Sato (New York: Routledge, 2017): 126

4. Discussion - Small group discussion (three to five students) can be a valuable activity if it is introduced with a clear explanation of its purpose and used regularly.
5. Song - Using songs in the EFL classroom, particularly speaking songs, can be enjoyable and educational. Songs can also be used to help students learn vocabulary, pronunciation, structures, and sentence patterns.⁵³

In addition, when teach a speaking to students at the secondary level, it is important for the teacher to bear in mind that treating students fairly, impartially, and with respect is crucial, as students need an adult in charge of the classroom.

C. Teacher Corrective Feedback

Teachers' corrective feedback plays a role in determining students' language acquisition in the classroom. Providing verbal feedback in the classroom can help students use English well if it is given correctly. When a teacher does not give feedback on students' errors, it can negatively impact their English learning⁵⁴. Therefore, verbal feedback should be applied because it can help students improve their foreign language skills. Through oral feedback, students can gain new knowledge and become aware of their mistakes, enabling them to better use the target language. Lyster and Ranta classified the types of oral corrective feedback into six categories. They are as follows:

1. Repetition

Repetition is a type of corrective feedback in which the teacher repeats the student's mistake, changing the intonation to inform the student of any errors they have made.

2. Elicitation

Elicitation is a type of corrective feedback in which the teacher gives little explanation and asks questions to get the correct form from the students. For example: 'You mean...?', 'Can you say that again?'. This type

⁵³ Rusdiningsih, "A Study On The Techniques For Teaching Speaking To The Second Year Students Of Smpin 1 Trangkil," *Theses*, Surakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, 2020)

⁵⁴ Imroatus Sholikhah, Oral corrective feedback in speaking class of english department, *Lingua Jurnal Pembelajaran dan Pengajaran* 13, no. 1 (2016): 87

of feedback is used when students need more direction to make their utterances correct.

3. Metalinguistic feedback

Metalinguistic feedback is corrective feedback that contains information, comments, or questions related to the correct form of a student's utterance, without directly providing the correct form. The teacher provides more explanation about the student's error.

4. Clarification request

Clarification request is a type of corrective feedback in which the instructor indicates a need to understand what is meant by the speaker by using phrases such as 'Again?', 'Pardon?', or 'Excuse me?'. This allows the students to correct their own errors. This type of feedback is used when the teacher does not understand the student's utterance and needs confirmation.

5. Recast or implicit corrective feedback

Recast or implicit corrective feedback occurs when the teacher repeats the student's speaking and replaces the student's error with the correct form without directly indicating that the student's utterance is incorrect. The teacher does not need to use expressions such as 'Oh, you mean...' or 'You should say...' in a recast.

6. Explicit corrective feedback

Explicit corrective feedback occurs when the teacher provides the student with the correct form in response to an error or incorrect utterance. Unlike implicit feedback, explicit feedback involves the teacher stating expressions such as 'You should say...' or 'Oh, you mean...' before giving the correct form⁵⁵

According to Rod Ellis, teacher corrective feedback consists of several strategies. These strategies are summarized in the following table:

⁵⁵ Roy Lyster & Leila Ranta, "Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake," 20, (1997): 46. Doi: 10.1017/S0272263197001034

Table 2.1 Corrective Feedback

No	Corrective Feedback Strategy	Definition	Corrective text
1	Recast	In a recast, the corrector incorporates the content words of the immediately preceding incorrect utterance and makes changes or corrections to it in some way (e.g., phonological, syntactic, morphological, or lexical).	L: went there two times. T: You've been. You've been there twice as a group?
2	Repetition	In an explicit correction, the corrector repeats the learner's utterance, highlighting the error through the use of emphatic stress.	L: will showed you. T: will SHOWED you. L: 'll show you
3	Clarification request	In a clarification request, the corrector indicates that they have not understood what the learner said.	L: What do you spend with your wife? T: What?
4	Explicit correction	The corrector indicates an error has been committed, identifies the error and provides the correction.	L: On May. T: Not on May, in May. We say, "It will start in May."
5	Elicitation	In an elicitation, the corrector repeats part of the learner's utterance but not the erroneous part and uses rising intonation to signal that the learner should complete it.	L: 'll come if it will not rain. T: 'll come if it?
6	Paralinguistic signal	The corrector uses a gesture or facial expression to indicate that the learner has made an error.	L: Yesterday i go cinema. T: (gestures with right forefinger over left shoulder to indicate past)

The teacher must select both the specific strategy to use in response to a learner error and the specific linguistic devices to realize that strategy. This requires considerable pragmatic and pragmalinguistic competence, and it is likely that teachers respond intuitively to particular errors made by individual students rather than following a predetermined error correction policy. This may explain why teachers' error correction practices are generally imprecise and inconsistent. Imprecision is evident in the fact that teachers use the same overt behavior (e.g., repetition) both to indicate that an error has been made and to reinforce a correct response. Teacher educators have been hesitant to prescribe or proscribe the strategies that teachers should use, partly because they are uncertain about which strategies are effective, but also because they

recognize that the process of correcting errors is complex and involves a number of competing factors.⁵⁶

Elicitations are most often provided by teachers and encourage learners to self-repair, rather than relying on “other repair” as is the case of explicit correction or recasts. They may provide either explicit or implicit negative evidence that an error has occurred and encourage the learner to reformulate their own nontarget-like output, however, they do not provide a model (positive evidence) of how to do this. An elicitation, for example, does this directly by asking questions or pausing to allow the student to complete their interlocutor’s utterance. Example when student said “Well there’s a stream of perfume that doesn’t smell very nice.” Then the teacher said “So a stream of perfume, we’ll call that a ...?”. The teacher forms a question about the correct lexical items and waits for the learner to try to self-correct. This is a relatively explicit prompt⁵⁷.

Corrective feedback plays a critical role in language teaching and learning, but there has been little research on teachers' practices of corrective feedback on students' speaking performance and their uptake. One of the most dominant studies on the different types of oral corrective feedback (CF) and their effectiveness on student uptake is Lyster and Ranta's (1997) descriptive study. The study was conducted in four French immersion classrooms in Canada with the participation of four teachers and 104 primary students ranging in age from 10 to 12. Lyster and Ranta (1997) reported that teachers mainly provided learners with six types of CF: recasts (55%), elicitation (14%), clarification requests (11%), metalinguistic feedback (8%), explicit correction (7%), and repetition of error (5%). Although recasts were the most frequent type of CF used by the teachers (55% of the total feedback), they were found to be ineffective at encouraging learner uptake and repair (only 18% of total repair uptake). On the other hand, other CF types such as metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and repetition were used with lower frequency but were successful at eliciting repair uptake from the students (45%, 36%, and 31%,

⁵⁶ Rod Ellis, “Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development,” *L2 Journal* 1, (2009): 9-10. Doi: 10.5070/12.v1i1.9054

⁵⁷ McDonough, K, Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners’ responses on ESL question development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(1), (2005): 79-103.

respectively). However, explicit correction was not successful since no uptake following it accounted for half of the student uptake (50%). Therefore, elicitation and metalinguistic feedback can be considered effective CF types, while recasts and explicit correction can be considered ineffective ones⁵⁸.

The effectiveness of oral corrective feedback (CF) on student uptake has varied across different contexts, such as learners' age and language proficiency, the target language, and the teachers' experience. Therefore, the effectiveness of oral CF on student uptake may change in a particular context⁵⁹. Teacher corrective feedback in speaking classes is necessary to reduce the likelihood of incorrect target language use. It can also promote learners' language development. However, it is important that teachers deliver clear verbal corrective feedback to facilitate students' understanding of the correct target language use.

Some previous studies about corrective feedback have been conducted. One of them showed that ELT students have positive attitudes toward oral corrective feedback (OCF)⁶⁰. The findings of this study revealed that almost all of the students were willing and needed to receive OCF to improve the accuracy of their target language. Additionally, more than half of the students did not feel frustrated or embarrassed when they received OCF. However, some students did feel nervous to speak after receiving OCF, but this did not inhibit their acceptance of it. The students believed that OCF is best given to those with a high level of speaking proficiency. Almost all of the students agreed that OCF can increase their grammar knowledge. In terms of preferences, almost all of the students wanted to be corrected when they made serious erroneous utterances that impeded listeners' understanding. Correcting students' erroneous utterances should wait until they finish speaking, as many of them did not want to be interrupted while speaking. Almost all of the students preferred lecturers to correct their erroneous utterances, as they have more knowledge and experience

⁵⁸ Roy Lyster & Leila Ranta, "Corrective Feedback", 56

⁵⁹ Train Phuong & Buu Huan, "Teacher Corrective Feedback On Students' Speaking Performance And Their Uptake In Efl Classes, 3", no.3 (2018): 110. Doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1321246

⁶⁰ Oktaviantina, Agnes. The Attitude of ELT Students towards Oral Corrective Feedback On Students' Erroneous Utterances In Speaking Classes. Resipotary Universitasinegeri Malang. (2021). <http://repository.um.ac.id/id/eprint/197728>

than their classmates. The OCF type that the students preferred the most was explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation, as it helps them to understand the correction and the explanation. In summary, the students showed positive attitudes towards OCF in speaking classes.

Another study showed that the students perceived lecturers' oral corrective feedback as an important part of language learning and found it very helpful in improving their speaking abilities⁶¹. It can be concluded that oral corrective feedback had positive results on the students' speaking performances. Therefore, this study was significant in highlighting the students' perceptions towards oral corrective feedback from their lecturers during the teaching and learning of speaking in their classes. Both lecturers and students would benefit from this research as it helps them realize the importance of giving and accepting oral corrective feedback. Another article from Thiri which summarized that her research discusses the role of corrective feedback in language teaching. Corrective feedback is a way for teachers to provide students with information about their errors or mistakes in order to help them improve their language skills. The authors of the article review research on the different types of corrective feedback, including explicit feedback, which involves providing a clear explanation or correction of an error, and implicit feedback, which involves providing hints or clues that help students figure out the correct form without explicitly stating it. The article also discusses the factors that influence the effectiveness of corrective feedback, such as the timing of the feedback, the type of error being corrected, and the learner's level of proficiency⁶².

Bart, Catia, and Roeland investigate The effect of corrective feedback and education level in adult L2 learning, This study investigates the impact of education level on the effectiveness of corrective feedback (CF) in second language learning using a computer assisted language learning (CALL) system. The study included 68 Dutch second language learners who were randomly

⁶¹ Muslem, Asnawi, et.all. Students' Perception Toward Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Classes: A Case at English Education Department Students International Journal of Language Education Volume 5, number 4(2021), pp. 244-259

⁶² Thiri, Soe. Corrective feedback in language teaching. *Journal of International Cultural Studies* 28, (2022): 160

assigned to either a condition with automatic grammaticality CF or a control condition with no CF. The results showed that learners with high and medium levels of education benefited from speaking practice in both conditions, while low-educated learners did not benefit from practice in either condition. There was also a trend for CF to increase practice effectiveness for medium and high educated learners. The authors conclude that education level is an important factor that influences the effectiveness of CF in second language learning⁶³.

Ha and Murray investigates the beliefs and practices of Vietnamese English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers regarding oral corrective feedback. Data were collected through classroom observations and interviews with six teachers in primary schools in Vietnam. The teachers were found to have a high level of awareness of the benefits of corrective feedback and identified pronunciation errors as the most important target for correction in the primary context. In practice, however, the frequency of feedback per error was higher for vocabulary errors. Teachers reported that prompts were more effective and preferred to reformulations, but this preference was not reflected in the observed classroom practices, which included a high number of didactic recasts. The discrepancies between beliefs and practices are discussed in relation to contextual factors and the influence of different sets of beliefs. The study also found that the teachers' feedback moves contained some inaccuracies⁶⁴.

On the other hand, Kartchava et al. based on their study found that the teachers' limited knowledge about how, when, and in what amounts to provide CF prevents them from reconciling their beliefs with classroom practices, leading them to behave more like native speakers than language teachers. The authors suggest that teacher education and additional teaching experience, as well as training that addresses specific concepts related to CF, could help bridge this gap. The study has several limitations, including the use of written questionnaires to capture the teachers' beliefs, the lack of an opportunity for the

⁶³ Penning de Vries, B. W., Cucchiaroni, C., Strik, H., & van Hout, R. Spoken grammar practice in CALL: The effect of corrective feedback and education level in adult L2 learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 24, no. 5 (2020): 714. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818819027>

⁶⁴ Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2023). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(1), 137167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820931897>

teachers to explain their beliefs or CF choices, the lack of control over tasks and teaching style, and the fact that the questionnaire probed hypothetical behaviors while the classroom interactions focused on real-life actions⁶⁵.

D. Personality Traits

Each individual person is unique, with their own distinctive personality comprised of implicit interrelations among observable behaviors, internal dispositions, and preferences for action. These interrelationships depict the individual's unchanging patterns of behavior and describe the differences within individuals. This can lead to various types of perception, thought, and behavior in different ways among different people. Furthermore, personality can be defined in two different ways: 1) as characterization and individuality, or 2) as the subjective structure that brings out the characteristics of a person⁶⁶.

Extroversion is the dimension where a person has a fundamental need to project a strong self-image for self-esteem and a sense of completeness from others⁶⁷. Additionally, according to Eysenck and Eysenck, 'the typical extrovert is friendly, has many friends, needs to get friends to speak to, likes parties, and avoids reading or studying by himself.' An extrovert person also craves excitement, takes opportunities, often takes risks, acts on a short stimulus, and is usually impetuous. They often have amusing stories to tell, can provide organized answers, and normally enjoy change. Extroverts are typically carefree, open-minded, hopeful, and confident and enjoy 'laughing and being merry'⁶⁸. Introversion is the extent to which a person can derive a sense of wholeness and fulfillment on their own without reflecting on themselves from other people. Introverts are more interested in activities like writing, reading, and drawing than in activities that require them to act in an outgoing way like speaking and gossiping. Additionally, Richards and Schmidt stated that an

⁶⁵ Kartchava, E., Gatbonton, E., Ammar, A., & Trofimovich, P. Oral corrective feedback: Pre-service English as a second language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research* 24, no.2.(2020):220. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818787546>

⁶⁶ Zainuddin, "The Impact Of Personality: Extrovert Vs. Introvert On The Ability In Syntax In Essay Writing," *Jurnal Studies in English Language and Education*, 3, no. 2, (2016): 159

⁶⁷ Brown, H. D., *Principles of language learning and teaching (4 th ed.)*, (New York: Pearson Longman, 2014): 31

⁶⁸ Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G., *Manual for the Eysenck Personality Inventory*, (San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1975): 6

introverted person prefers to avoid social contact with others and is often preoccupied with their experiences, thoughts, and feelings. The introvert is usually a quiet, withdrawn person, self-analyzing, preferring books to people, and uncommunicative except with close friends⁶⁹.

Lieberman explains that extroverts are less sensitive to punishment signals, so their insensitivity and under-arousal condition make them more stress-resistant. Meanwhile, introverts have a higher level of the neurotransmitter dopamine, which plays an important role in controlling movements, learning, working memory, cognition, and emotion. Because introverts already have a higher level of dopamine, they require less to be relaxed without stress or depression⁷⁰. Some psychologists believe that impulsive individuals are freer and perform better under highly stressful circumstances. However, Eysenck and Eysenck believe that extroverts act more quickly but less correctly when doing compound cognitive tasks, while introverts may be slower but are more precise. The introverts' apprehension of punishment makes them more cautious and careful when acting, so they are more likely to be precise when using linguistic forms⁷¹.

Extroverted students tend to learn best by talking and physically engaging with their environment, as talking helps them clarify their thoughts. On the other hand, introverted students tend to learn best in quiet situations. Therefore, extroverted students, who tend to be more outgoing and active, may be better at mastering English speaking than introverted students, who tend to be more reserved and quiet⁷². The performance of extroverts and introverts can vary depending on the task and context, with extroverts performing better on tasks requiring divided attention and resistance to interference and introverts excelling at visual vigilance, long-term memory, and problem-solving. In

⁶⁹ Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W., *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, (New York: Longman, 2002): 38

⁷⁰ Lieberman, M. D., "Intuition: A social cognitive neuroscience approach," *Psychological Bulletin* 126, no. 1 (2000): 109-137.

⁷¹ Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, M. W., *Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach*, (New York: Plenum, 1985): 59

⁷² Yuspar Uzer, "The Influence of Students' Personality Types to Their Speaking Achievement on the Tenth Grade Students of the State Senior High School 6 Palembang," *ANGLO-SAXON* 8, no. 2 (2017): 261, doi: <https://doi.org/10.33373/anglo.v8i2.1226>

addition, extraverts tend to prefer active learning while introverts prefer reflexive learning styles in internet-based learning contexts⁷³.

Researchers have applied Jung's theory in the development of this theory. This theory is used as a guide so that the developed items correspond with the features contained in the subscale. Jung (1954) submitted a psychiatric theory that explains the theory of extroverts and introverts. Jung interprets extrovert as an attitude influenced by the outside world, other people and material. Introvert is an individual living conditions which are influenced by his action and reaction to his own world, thought, intuition, emotions, and feelings. Each individual usually has both types of the attitude. Individuals will tend to have an introvert or extrovert attitude. Extroverted individuals are comfortable interacting with others, enjoy communication and group activities, and are well-suited for careers in fields such as teaching, management, politics, and sales. They tend to be positive and confident, but may not be as emotionally sensitive as introverts. Introverted individuals, on the other hand, prefer solitary activities and close friendships, and may be more emotional and sensitive. They are often associated with intelligence and giftedness, and may enjoy careers as writers, composers, engineers, and artists. Both extroverts and introverts have unique characteristics and strengths, and it is important to recognize and appreciate the diversity of personality types⁷⁴. This research study also has successfully developed satisfactory and acceptable IPEI's content validity and reliability value. Thus, IPEI can measure the level of one's personality, especially among university students, school students and individuals who want to know their personality traits inclinations of either extroverted or introverted. Analysis of each item contained in IPEI has a high reliability value which indicates that IPEI can measure the inclination level of an individual's personality traits which can be used for future related studies.

Extrovert and Introvert Personality Inventory is developed with reference to the personality theory put forward by Jung (1954). IPEI has 30 items

⁷³ Kamal, A., & Radhakrishnan, S. Individual learning preferences based on personality traits in an Elearning scenario. *Education and Information Technologies*, 24, no. 1 (2019): 408.

⁷⁴ Mohammad Aziz, Nurul Hidayu, Validity and Reliability Development of Extrovert and Introvert Personality Inventory among University Students. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7, no. 9: (2017): 455

comprising of two subscales. Each subscale consists of 15 items which are all positive items. The first subscale is an extrovert personality, while the second subscale is introverted personality. This study utilizes Carl Jung's theory (1954) to classify student personalities, the indicator of this personality as follows⁷⁵:

1. Extroverted personality
 - a. I'm a friendly person
 - b. I love outdoors activities
 - c. I love to start a conversation if I meet new people
 - d. I love to attend gatherings and parties
 - e. I love to give my views in a discussion
 - f. I have many close friends
 - g. I love a festive atmosphere
 - h. I like to get involved in volunteering activities
 - i. I'm comfortable when being in a crowded group
 - j. I like to joke with friends
 - k. I'm comfortable when many guests come to my house
 - l. I like to eat together
 - m. I like to help even though they are strangers
 - n. I really appreciate the time together with people around me
 - o. I am a jolly person
2. Introverted personality
 - a. I'm more comfortable playing with pets than talking to people around me
 - b. I like to eat alone
 - c. I love to calm my mind in a quiet environment
 - d. I am a quiet person
 - e. I like to be alone
 - f. I rarely mingle with family members
 - g. I do not like to talk about myself
 - h. I prefer to indulge on my own feelings rather than talk

⁷⁵Jung, C.G. (1954). *The Development of Personality*. In Princeton University Press: U.S. Lawrence, W. K. (2013). *The Experience of Contrasting Learning Styles, Learning Preferences, And Personality Types in the Community College English Classroom*. Boston: Northeastern University.

- i. I do not like to mingle
- j. I am stressed in a noisy environment
- k. I do not have many friends
- l. I easily get bored when I am in public
- m. I listened more than talked
- n. I'm happy when alone
- o. I do not like exercising with friends

E. Personality Traits and Corrective Feedback

Different personality types of extroverted and introverted may prefer different learning styles. Extroverted individuals tend to focus on the outer world and are energized by interaction with others. They may enjoy talking, participating, organizing, and socializing, and prefer to learn by talking and physically engaging with the environment. Introverted individuals, on the other hand, tend to be more introspective and evaluate their own thoughts and feelings. They may be more reserved and cautious and prefer to learn through quiet, mental reflection. They may enjoy reading, lectures, and writing and excel at verbal reasoning. They may also prefer to work independently and need time for internal processing⁷⁶. Alina Lemak stated that introversion is a desirable trait for academic achievement and learning in general as well as language learning while others suggesting that extroversion may have an advantage in language learning⁷⁷. However most students like to receive' oral corrective feedback from their lecturer. The questionnaire analysis found that the students believed that feedback provided by their lecturer was valuable and made them learn something. The students showed almost the same feeling about the possibility of making spoken errors⁷⁸. Arief Muhsin stated if the most popular corrective feedbacks in teaching speaking are the explicit correction, elicitation, and repetition⁷⁹.

⁷⁶ Zhang, Y, "The role of personality in second language acquisition", *Asian Social Science* 4, no.5, (2008): 58-59, doi:10.5539/ass.v4n5p58

⁷⁷ Alina Lemak, "Learner Personality and Response to Oral Corrective Feedback in an English", *TESL CANADA JOURNAL* 37, no. 2 (2020): 41. DOI: 10.18806/tesl.v37i2.1334

⁷⁸ Muslem, "Students' Perception.", 245

⁷⁹ Arief Muhsin, "The Effectiveness of Positive Feedback in Teaching Speaking Skill", *Lingua Cultura* 10, no.1 (2016): 25-30

According to Teymour, his study found that extroverted individuals have a more positive attitude towards errors than introverts. Both groups, however, agree on the necessity of correction but do not prefer constant error correction as it can cause fatigue and frustration. The study also found that neither students nor teachers prefer immediate or postponed correction. The findings of the present study show that, unlike introverts, extroverts have a positive attitude toward errors. This difference may stem from the difference between them in the way they view protection of self and the importance of how others might think of them. Extroverts, contrary to introverts, are outgoing and usually do not mind being laughed at by others, which may explain why they do not adopt a negative view toward errors⁸⁰. Selvianita stated that students of their introverted personality are more silent, they only speak as necessary. The introvert students do not more to express themselves and they were afraid to share their opinions⁸¹.

Ariyanti Yusuf states that extroverted students used more language learning strategy highly frequently than introverted students with 12 items compared to introvert students with only 10 items. The strategies used by extrovert students with high frequency were: Cooperation (socio-affective), empathizing with other (socio-affective), self-monitoring (metacognitive), self-management (metacognitive), repetition (cognitive), imagery (cognitive), inferencing (cognitive), asking for clarification or verification (socioaffective), asking for correction (socio-affective), organization planning (metacognitive), keywording (cognitive), and deduction (cognitive). On the other hand, the strategies that were frequently used by introvert students were: Note-taking (cognitive), keywording (cognitive), self-evaluation (metacognitive), self-management (metacognitive), auditory representation (cognitive), recombination (cognitive), asking for correction (socio-affective), empathizing with other

⁸⁰Teymour rahmati, 'Extrovert and Introvert Learners' Attitudes and Preferences for Error Correction in Speaking. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities* 4, no. 9 (2014):268. DOI:10.5958/2249-7315.2014.00988.5

⁸¹Selvianita Rahayu, "The Extrovert and Introvert Students' in Speaking Ability of English Department at IAIN Langsa", *JADEs: Journal of Academia in English Education*, 1, no.2.(2020):13-23

(socio-affective), directed attention (metacognitive), and asking for clarification or verification (socio-affective)⁸².

Ali and Reza investigated the effect of personality type on the effectiveness of corrective feedback (CF) techniques in language learning. The study found that extroverted learners performed better than introverted learners in the prompt group, although the difference was not statistically significant. In the recast group, both introverted and extroverted learners equally benefited from recasts compared to the control group. However, there was no significant difference in the superiority of extroverts over introverts in either group. The study also found that personality did not have a significant moderating effect on the effectiveness of CF. These mixed findings and the lack of a significant interaction between personality and CF suggest that further research is needed to identify the factors that may contribute to the effectiveness of different types of CF and to examine the ways in which individual learners react to and benefit from CF in relation to their various personality types⁸³. This result also summarized by Dyah Sari and Eka Saputri that students with extrovert personality have better ways in speaking than the introvert. Their characteristics as extrovert contribute a positive effect on their speaking ability in some ways, better than the introvert ones do. In short, extrovert students are in favor in terms of speaking⁸⁴.

Yolla Gustriani conducted a study comparing the speaking ability of extroverted and introverted students. She used the Independent Sample T-test via SPSS version 22.00 to analyze the data and found that there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups, with extroverted students performing better in speaking than introverted students. The null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted. This suggests that there is a significant difference in students' speaking performance between

⁸² Ariyanti Yusuf, Nonny basalama, & Indri Wirahmi. Language Learning Strategies used by Extrovert and Introvert Students in English as a Foreign Language Speaking Classes. *Jambura Journal of English Teaching and Literature* 2, no. 2 (2021): 97.

⁸³ Ali Mohammadi, & Reza Abdi, Corrective feedback and personality types: An investigation of their effect on grammatical accuracy. *TELL* 6, no. 2 (2012): 103

⁸⁴ Dyah Sari, Eka Saputri, Extrovert and introvert students in speaking ability of English department at IAIN Palangka Raya. *Proceedings of the 1st INACELT (International Conference on English Language Teaching)*. (State Islamic Institute Palangka Raya: Indonesia, 2017): 10

extroverts and introverts, with extroverts performing better⁸⁵. On the other hand, Nooshin conducted a study which showed that more extroverted learners prefer explicit and immediate feedback while more introverted ones prefer implicit and non-immediate feedback. Moreover, introverts preferred recasts for lexical and grammatical errors while extroverts preferred explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback the most. A follow-up content analysis of interview data revealed learners' reasons regarding their preferences for receiving corrective feedback. Interviewed extroverts mentioned that explicit correction eliminated ambiguities of peer correction and metalinguistic feedback helped to feel independent. However, recasts were disliked by extroverts because they could not notice the correction, whereas welcomed by introverts due to their least obtrusive nature⁸⁶.

Putri Septianah based on her research stated that The students' personality and speaking score were correlated by using Pearson Product Moment and Multiple Correlation formula. The result of this research show the correlation between extrovert-introvert personality in speaking performance is 0.5206 that indicate moderate correlation between these variables. The result for the sub-correlation between extrovert and speaking performance is 0.4183, introvert and speaking performance is 0.4096 which both also shows moderate correlation. From this research, the researcher had conclusion that extrovert-introvert personality has the effect to the speaking performance⁸⁷. Meanwhile Lee stated found that learners appreciated to receive explicit and immediate corrections during their conversations and teacher-student interactions. Further research by Yang (2015) showed that learners opted for receiving metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction and recasts on all error types. With the exception of few studies, substantial research has focused on teachers' beliefs on CF and there is little information of this kind which focuses on personality trait of learners when investigating their CF preferences. Based on the personality of learners'

⁸⁵ Yolla Gustriani. Perbandingan antara Siswa Ekstrovert dan Introvert terhadap Penampilan Berbicara di Sekolah Menengah Atas 4 Pekanbaru. *Theses*. (UIN SUKA: Riau: 2020), 74

⁸⁶ Nooshin N., & Zhila Mohammadnia, Customized oral corrective feedback : learners preferences and personality. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 14, no. 29. (2022): 155

⁸⁷ Putri Septianah, Endang S, Extrovert-introvert students and their english speaking performance, *Jurnal Pendidikan dan pembelajaran*, 8, no. 6. (2019): 1. Doi: 10.26418/jppk.v8i6.33415

teachers can make instruction more effective if personality traits can predict individuals' tendency and beliefs toward receiving CF. With this aim, this study will take a step further to investigate extroverted and introverted learners' preferences for receiving oral corrective feedback and their beliefs and reasons regarding the efficacy of different kinds of feedback⁸⁸.

Error correction is an effective way of helping learners eliminate persistent errors in the pronunciation of problematic words and it contributed to item-learning of phonetic features. The study found that explicit corrective feedback produced greater gains than implicit feedback⁸⁹. Primardiana stated if the strategies of giving feedback which can enhance learners' critical thinking skills are throwing questions to learners, giving comments, output-prompting, and giving praises. Questions test the students' grammar knowledge and evaluates if they have truly mastered the material they have learned. Comments lead them to evaluate their work and their understanding. Output-prompting encourages them to keep learning and increase their skills. Praises improve students' performance in the classroom and motivate them to talk in the class⁹⁰. Endang stated if in this strategy the teachers did not pronounced parts of errors and they just elicit the students to pronounce parts of error. The teachers used it when the errors were not significant. In the situation the teacher used the strategy to make sure the level of errors for correction considerations⁹¹.

Corrective feedback improves learning skills of learners through error correction⁹². Nalini stated if there are a relationship between the level of proficiency and the student's perspective on whether they want their teachers or lecturers to correct their errors when speaking English. This study has also

⁸⁸ Lee, E. J. Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41, no. 2. (2013): 1

⁸⁹ Pawlak, M. "The Effect of Explicit and Implicit Corrective Feedback on Eliminating Pronunciation Errors", *Teaching and Researching English Accents in Native and Non-Native Speakers*. (2012): 85–101. DOI:10.1007/978-3-642-24019-5_7

⁹⁰ Primardiana Hermilia Wijayati, "Feedback Strategies: An Effort To Enhance The Critical Thinking Skills Of Daf-Learners In Indonesia", *International journal of education*. 15, no. 2. (2022): 78-84

⁹¹ Endang Haryanto, "Teachers' Corrective Feedback on Students' Pronunciation at the Daffodils English Course Kampung Inggris Pare Indonesia", *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*. 2, no. 2. (2015): 1-8

⁹² Ahmad, Iqbal, Muhammad Saeed, and Muhammad salam, "Effects of Corrective Feedback on Academic Achievement of Students : Case of Government Secondary Schools in Pakistan." *International Journal of Science and Research*. 2, no. 1. (2013): 1

shown that different language proficiency resulted in different views on using OCF in the classroom. Students with advanced proficiency would prefer not to use OCF in the classroom⁹³. Feedback is extensively used as an evaluative approach that indicates the effectiveness of teaching strategies as well as the level of understanding of the students. Corrective feedback is used as a support strategy that improves the learning process especially in languages. Corrective feedback is essential as it helps teachers and learners to identify and focus on the common errors made in languages⁹⁴.

Basen on those opinion above, it can be concluded that the strategies for giving feedback that enhance learners' critical thinking skills include asking questions, giving comments, output-prompting, and giving praise. These strategies test students' grammar knowledge, encourage them to evaluate their work and understanding, and motivate them to participate in class. Teachers may also use a strategy of not pronouncing errors, but instead eliciting the students to pronounce them, when the errors are not significant. The study also found that there is a relationship between the level of proficiency and students' perspective on whether they want teachers to correct their errors when speaking English. Advanced proficiency students prefer not to use OCF in the classroom. Feedback is an essential evaluative approach that indicates the effectiveness of teaching strategies and students' level of understanding. Corrective feedback is a support strategy that improves the learning process, especially in languages.

F. Previous Study

The use of corrective feedback is crucial for effective language instruction and student learning, however, there is limited research available on the specific strategies teachers use to provide feedback on students' speaking abilities and how well students are able to incorporate that feedback. While some studies have been conducted on the topic of corrective feedback, more research is needed to better understand the practices used by teachers and the effectiveness of those practices. The researcher describes previous research to provide an

⁹³ Nalini Arumugam, "The Effectiveness of Oral Corrective Feedback: Students' Perspectives", *IJARPED*, 11, no. 3 (2022): 1846

⁹⁴ Radiah Alsolami, "Effect of Oral Corrective Feedback on Language Skills", *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9, no. 6 (2019): 672-677

overview of the research position among the discussions that have been carried out.

Two studies were conducted, one by Toyyibah and another by Nurul, both related to language teaching and learning. Toyyibah's study aimed to develop materials for teaching English Phonetics and Phonology for the English Language Teaching (ELT) Departments at Islamic higher education institutions (PTKIs) in order to implement science integration. The study used the System Approach of Dick and Carey and involved various stages such as need analysis, expert validation, field testing, and revisions to create the final product. The final product is a book entitled "english phonetics and phonology for language teachers" that includes three parts, materials for 14 meetings, a section on technical suggestions for improving students' pronunciation and a bibliography⁹⁵. Nurul's study aimed to improve fifth-grade students' speaking skills at SDN Sidorejo 1 Mojokerto by using the Hello English application. The study followed four steps of planning, implementing, observing, and reflecting. The results showed that the Hello English application improved students' speaking skills by 88.23%. The advantages of the Hello English app were its ability to help students practice speaking English, its user-friendly interface, and its interesting and simple material. The study concluded that using the Hello English application as a medium of learning from home can improve students' speaking skills⁹⁶.

Oral Corrective Feedback refers to a teacher or peer's response to a learner's erroneous utterance. Teachers can choose to correct an error immediately after it occurs or make a note of the error and delay correction until later. The first study suggests that pre-service language teachers have beliefs about corrective feedback (CF) that they bring from their own learning into their teaching, but their limited knowledge about when, how, and how much to provide feedback

⁹⁵ Toyyibah, "Developing Materials Of English Phonetics And Phonology For Elt Departments At Islamic Higher Education Institutions Based On Integration Paradigm", *Didaktika Religia: Journal of Islamic Education*, 9, no.2, (2021): 359. DOI: 10.30762/didaktika.v9i2.3286

⁹⁶ Nurul Aini, Firdausi Amalia, & Ary Setya Budhi Ningrum, "Improving Students' Speaking Skill Using Hello English Application as a Medium of Learning from Home", *IDEAS (Journal on English Language Teaching & Learning Linguistics Literature)* 10, No.1 (2022): 730-745. DOI: 10.24256/ideas.v10i1.2533

prevents them from reconciling their beliefs with classroom practices. The study recommends teacher education and additional teaching experience, as well as training that addresses specific concepts of CF, to bridge this gap⁹⁷. The second study examines any associations among learners' errors with formulaic vs. non-formulaic forms, types of CF, uptake, and successful uptake rate. The study found that while learners made slightly more errors with formulaic forms than non-formulaic forms, teachers provided CF more often for learners' non-formulaic errors than formulaic ones. However, learners were more likely to produce successful uptake following CF directed at formulaic errors. The study recommends a balanced CF provision for non-formulaic and formulaic errors by teachers. Both studies have limitations, such as small sample size and the context being EFL, and suggest further research in different contexts and with learners from different proficiency levels⁹⁸.

Mostafa examined the relationship between oral conversational feedback (OCF) and language learners' Willingness to Communicate (WTC) in an EFL context. It found that OCF and the learners' proficiency level affect L2 WTC, and that explicit and immediate types of OCF, particularly in pronunciation and grammar, were highly preferred by learners and were perceived to have the greatest contribution to L2 WTC. The study suggests that EFL teachers should tailor their OCF to the learners' proficiency level to promote L2 WTC and highlights the importance of considering the views of the learners about OCF. However, the study has some limitations, including sample being only female participants and repeated measures⁹⁹. While Bart conduct a research about spoken practice, his article presents a language learning experiment using GREET, a CALL system for spoken practice of Dutch word order with automatic corrective feedback and logging capabilities. The study focuses on

⁹⁷ Kartchava, E., Gatbonton, E., Ammar, A., & Trofimovich, P. Oral corrective feedback: Pre-service English as a second language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research* 24, no.2.(2020):220–249. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818787546>

⁹⁸ Gholami, L. Oral corrective feedback and learner uptake in L2 classrooms: Non-formulaic vs. formulaic errors. *Language Teaching Research*, 0, No.0. (2021). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211021560>

⁹⁹ Zare, M., Shoostari, Z. G., & Jalilifar, A. The interplay of oral corrective feedback and L2 willingness to communicate across proficiency levels. *Language Teaching Research* 26, No.6. (2022):1158–1178. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820928967>

the effect of speaking practice on adult L2 production, with a specific focus on the influence of education level on the effectiveness of the practice, with and without corrective feedback. The results suggest that speaking practice was more effective for higher-educated learners than for low-educated learners. The study has several limitations, such as a limited number of low-educated participants and the proficiency level of the participants being A1 or A2. Future studies should include more low-educated learners and control for L1 and age to investigate the effects of education more closely. Additionally, it is important to report and analyze the education level in future studies, in addition to current practice of reporting L1 and age¹⁰⁰.

The studies by Kartchava and Gholami examine the effects of oral corrective feedback (CF) on language learners in an EFL context. Kartchava's study found that pre-service language teachers have beliefs about CF that they bring from their own learning into their teaching, but their limited knowledge about when, how, and how much to provide feedback prevents them from reconciling their beliefs with classroom practices. Gholami's study found that learners were more likely to produce successful uptake following CF directed at formulaic errors. Both studies recommend teacher education and additional teaching experience, as well as training that addresses specific concepts of CF, to bridge this gap. Another study by Mostafa found that explicit and immediate types of OCF, particularly in pronunciation and grammar, were highly preferred by learners and were perceived to have the greatest contribution to L2 WTC. Bart's study found that speaking practice was more effective for higher-educated learners than for low-educated learners. All studies suggest further research in different contexts and with learners from different proficiency levels.

Xuan's study aimed to examine the beliefs and practices of a sample of Vietnamese primary English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers regarding corrective feedback (CF). The study found that there was neither complete congruence nor incongruence between the teachers' beliefs and practices, which

¹⁰⁰ Penning de Vries, B. W., Cucchiarini, C., Strik, H., & Hout, R. Spoken grammar practice in CALL: The effect of corrective feedback and education level in adult L2 learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 24, no.5 (2020): 714-735.

is a phenomenon observed in previous studies and supports the conclusion that there tends to be less congruence between teachers' beliefs and practices in unplanned aspects of teaching such as CF. The study found that the teachers used a large number of didactic and explicit recasts, which do not differ significantly from explicit correction. This suggests that the distinction between didactic recasts and conversational recasts should be clearly made when researching CF types, particularly in EFL contexts where the classroom instruction is more form-focused. The study also highlights the importance of considering the teachers' perspectives when researching beliefs and practices, and suggests that future research could incorporate a more "emic" perspective. The findings of this study have implications for teacher training course designers and workshop organizers, and may provide food for thought for teachers in diverse primary contexts¹⁰¹.

Susan's study examines the effectiveness of written corrective feedback (CF) on grammatical errors among English as a Second Language (ESL) learners. The study compared two groups of learners, one receiving direct feedback (DF) and the other receiving metalinguistic feedback (MF) and a control group that received no feedback. The results of the study showed that both feedback groups showed improvements in accuracy compared to the control group. The study found a clear relationship between Language aptitude and Direct Feedback. However, unlike previous studies, MF was not found to be beneficial for learners with higher language aptitude. The study suggests that written CF is effective for a mixed-level population of ESL learners. The study also discusses the limitations of this study, like the large standard deviations, and the fact that individuals will vary in their starting level, in how they react to feedback, and in their ability to improve over time¹⁰².

Eva's study provide important insights into how language teaching in different subjects can vary, even within the same educational context. The

¹⁰¹ Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research* 27, No.1. (2023): 137–167. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820931897>

¹⁰² Benson, S., & DeKeyser, R. Effects of written corrective feedback and language aptitude on verb tense accuracy. *Language Teaching Research* 23, No.6. (2019): 702–726. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818770921>

difference in the amount and type of learner output, as well as the teacher's response to that output, suggests that L2 English and L3 French instruction are being conducted in different interactional patterns, with the English classes focusing more on meaning and fluency, while the French classes focus more on grammar and form. The results also indicate that the English teachers focused on providing non-evaluative feedback, while the French teachers provided more corrective feedback. These findings imply that language teachers should be aware of the potential differences in teaching methods and adapt their approach accordingly, with more attention to the nature and objective of the subject, in order to provide learners with optimal learning opportunities¹⁰³.

Bo's study examines student engagement with feedback in second language learning, specifically focusing on oral feedback given during classroom presentations. The study found that students had positive attitudes towards feedback given as compliments and suggestions, but negative emotions towards error treatment through explicit correction. It also found that the immediate attention paid by students is critical to their understanding and processing of feedback, and that engagement with content-focused feedback may require more effortful engagement. The study also highlights the importance of linguistic and rhetorical knowledge in understanding and processing feedback, and that the face-to-face classroom environment adds complexity to cognitive engagement. The study suggests that future research could explore how to support students in increasing their cognitive engagement with feedback and how to enhance aspects of language learning that require more deliberate processing¹⁰⁴.

Xuan's study examines beliefs and practices of Vietnamese EFL teachers regarding corrective feedback. It found a lack of congruence between beliefs and practices and a preference for didactic recasts. Susan's study compares the effectiveness of direct and metalinguistic feedback on ESL learners, finding

¹⁰³ Vold, E. T. Learner spoken output and teacher response in second versus foreign language classrooms. *Language Teaching Research* 0, no. 0 (2022). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211068610>

¹⁰⁴ Wang, B., Yu, S., Zheng, Y., & Teo, T. Student engagement with teacher oral feedback in EFL university classrooms. *Language Teaching Research* 0, no. 0 (2022). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168821105772>

improvements in accuracy for both feedback groups but a stronger relationship with aptitude for direct feedback. Eva's study highlights differences in teaching methods and feedback between L2 English and L3 French classes, suggesting teachers should adapt their approach based on subject focus. Bo's study focuses on student engagement with oral feedback during presentations, finding positive attitudes towards compliments and suggestions, but negative emotions towards explicit correction. It also highlights the importance of linguistic and rhetorical knowledge and immediate attention in understanding feedback.

Weiqing's study looked at the nonverbal behavior teachers use during corrective feedback, and found that they use a variety of nonverbal cues such as nodding, shaking their head, and pointing. The frequency of different types of nonverbal behavior varied, but the most common ones were nodding, shaking head, pointing at an artifact, and pointing at a person. The study emphasizes that nonverbal behavior is an important aspect of teaching and should be studied alongside verbal input to fully understand the teaching act. However, the study also acknowledged some limitations, such as it being conducted in a large mix of courses, and the participating teachers being quite different in terms of teaching experience. It also only focused on the more observable nonverbal behaviors and did not examine the connection between teachers' nonverbal feedback and learners' subsequent learning. It suggests that future research could investigate teachers' awareness of their nonverbal behavior, how it can be changed, and the connection between nonverbal feedback and learners' subsequent learning¹⁰⁵.

Ines' study aimed to understand the relationship between learners' beliefs about peer feedback and their improvement in L2 pronunciation. The results showed that learners who had more positive beliefs about peer feedback tended to show greater improvement in comprehensibility. The study also found that the role of learners, whether they were providing or receiving feedback, did not affect the relationship between their beliefs and learning gains. These findings suggest that it may be possible to improve learning outcomes by influencing learners' beliefs about peer feedback, and that more research should be done to

¹⁰⁵ Wang, W., & Loewen, S. (2016). Nonverbal behavior and corrective feedback in nine ESL university-level classrooms. *Language Teaching Research* 20, no.4. (2016): 459–478. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815577239>

investigate this in other domains of L2 instruction, such as grammatical accuracy and oral proficiency more broadly. The limitation that the study only examined pronunciation at the level of individual words and sentences, rather than free speech, and that it focused on beginner level learners are noted for future studies¹⁰⁶.

Mostafa's study aimed to examine the role of language mindsets and achievement goals in relation to learners' CF preferences. The results showed that learners with a growth language mindset preferred to receive any type of corrective feedback, whereas those with a fixed mindset preferred to receive either low-cost conversational recasts or no feedback at all. Additionally, the results showed that learners with a development-approach goal preferred to receive more explicit types of feedback, while those with a development-avoidance goal preferred more implicit types. Learners with a demonstration-approach goal and those with a demonstration-avoidance goal preferred not to be corrected at all for different reasons. The study suggests that the effectiveness of corrective feedback cannot be understood without considering the learners' quality of motivation, and the internal cost-value analyses that learners make in relation to different feedback types. It highlights the importance of understanding learners as agents who proactively and selectively seek, attend to, and learn from feedback, and the need to take into account learners' belief and motive systems when designing corrective feedback¹⁰⁷.

Yongbin's study aimed to investigate the relative effects of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on L2 learners' acquisition of a difficult-to-acquire grammatical structure. The results of the study indicated that in a form-focused instructional context, explicit CF provided few additional advantages over implicit CF and that exposure to correct forms through recasts was sufficient for learning to take place. However, it also acknowledged some limitations in the study such as the lack of equivalence in the knowledge of the target structure, the

¹⁰⁶ Martin, J. A., & Sippel, L. Do beliefs matter? The relationship between beliefs about peer feedback and peer feedback outcomes on pronunciation. *Language Teaching Research* 0, no.0 (2022). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221097307>

¹⁰⁷ Papi, M., Wolff, D., Nakatsukasa, K., & Bellwoar, E. Motivational factors underlying learner preferences for corrective feedback: Language mindsets and achievement goals. *Language Teaching Research*.25.no.6.(2021): 858–877. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211018808>

focus on accuracy over stages of development, and not examining the effect of feedback on recipients and overhearers. The study suggests that further research is needed in this area, specifically in fine-grained developmental analysis and in learners' response to feedback, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the effects of different types of corrective feedback¹⁰⁸.

Weiqing's study found that teachers use a variety of nonverbal cues during corrective feedback, with nodding, shaking their head, and pointing being the most common. The study emphasizes the importance of studying nonverbal behavior in teaching, but also notes limitations such as the variety of courses and teaching experience of the participating teachers. Ines' study found that learners with positive beliefs about peer feedback tended to show greater improvement in pronunciation comprehensibility. The study suggests that learners' beliefs about feedback can impact learning outcomes and that more research is needed in other domains of L2 instruction. Mostafa's study found that learners with a growth mindset preferred to receive any type of corrective feedback, while those with a fixed mindset preferred low-cost recasts or no feedback at all. The study suggests that the effectiveness of corrective feedback is influenced by learners' motivation and internal cost-value analyses. Yongbin's study found that in a form-focused context, explicit CF provided few additional advantages over implicit CF and that exposure to correct forms through recasts was sufficient for learning. The study highlights the need for further research in fine-grained developmental analysis and learners' response to feedback.

Azar's study looked at the role of patterns of interaction in peer feedback and its effect on L2 writing development. The study found that learners who adopted collaborative or expert/novice patterns of interaction were more successful in creating mutual zones of proximal development and participating within them, which led to more learning taking place as evident in the writings of collaborative and novice peers. The study supports the argument that participation in social, cultural, and linguistic settings such as peer interaction is necessary for individual developmental processes to take place. However, the

¹⁰⁸ Zhao, Y., & Ellis, R. The relative effects of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on the acquisition of 3rd person -s by Chinese university students: A classroom-based study. *Language Teaching Research*, 26, no. 3. (2022): 361–381. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820903343>

study also acknowledged some limitations, such as not accounting for perceptions and attitudes that the interactants have towards each other and the task at hand during an interaction. Future studies should consider the affective dimension of peer interaction, and examine the possibility that an expert learner can form different types of interaction when paired with different peers, which may influence their L2 writing development¹⁰⁹.

Lieselotte's study found that providing students with form-focused instruction and peer feedback training before engaging in peer interaction can lead to an increase in grammatical accuracy. These findings have important implications for language teaching, such as the importance of providing feedback training, even if it is not extensive, and the fact that peer feedback can be effective for learners at various levels of proficiency. The study also highlighted the importance of considering the unique context of peer interaction, as well as the need for future research to investigate unfocused peer feedback and compare it with focused peer feedback¹¹⁰.

Kimi's study attempted to examine whether gesture-incorporated recasts are more effective in helping beginning-level ESL learners acquire the regular past tense than verbal-only recasts. However, the study found that there was no significant difference between the two recast conditions or the control group. This could be due to a variety of factors such as the nature of the grammatical structure being taught, the type of feedback provided, or the length of the treatment. The study also had several limitations, including only providing recasts for the target structures, lack of a long-delayed post-test, short treatment time, and conducting the stimulated recall interview in English rather than the learners' L1. The study suggests that more research is needed to fully understand

¹⁰⁹ Tajabadi, A., Ahmadian, M., Dowlatabadi, H., & Yazdani, H. EFL learners' peer negotiated feedback, revision outcomes, and short-term writing development: The effect of patterns of interaction. *Language Teaching Research*, 0, no. 0 (2020). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820951207>

¹¹⁰ Sippel, L. Maximizing the benefits of peer interaction: Form-focused instruction and peer feedback training. *Language Teaching Research* 0, no. 0. (2021). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211004638>

the efficacy of gestures in L2 development, specifically for different types of linguistic items, and to consider factors such as feedback type and timing¹¹¹.

Nobuhiro summarized that whole recasts and deictic gestures (pointing at the erroneous word in the target sentence) can facilitate the comparison between the original utterance and the recast for true beginners who are positioned as auditors. The study also found that whole recasts are more likely to be perceived correctly by true beginners while segmented recasts are more likely to be perceived correctly by more advanced learners. However, providing whole recasts can become difficult when the erroneous sentence is relatively long, in that case, the use of deictic cues may be useful as it can help the teacher to visually present the target word and point to it, which can help learners understand the correction even if the recast is segmented. The study highlights the importance of being mindful of the different conditions that may affect the ability of learners to compare and perceive recasts, and the need for teachers to cater the type of feedback to reach each learner effectively¹¹².

Azar's study found that collaborative or expert/novice patterns of interaction in peer feedback lead to more learning in L2 writing development. Lieselotte's study found that form-focused instruction and peer feedback training can increase grammatical accuracy. Kimi's study found no significant difference between gesture-incorporated recasts and verbal-only recasts in helping ESL learners acquire the regular past tense. Nobuhiro's study found that whole recasts and deictic gestures can facilitate comparison between original utterance and recast for true beginners, but segmented recasts are better for more advanced learners. These studies highlight the importance of providing feedback training, considering unique contexts of peer interaction, and catering feedback to individual learners.

Corrective feedback is not only important for speaking, but also for writing, which relates to students' ability to form sentences when speaking. Sri's study aimed to investigate the effect of different feedback provision on the writing

¹¹¹ Nakatsukasa, K. (2021). Gesture-enhanced recasts have limited effects: A case of the regular past tense. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(4), 587–612. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819870283>

¹¹² Kamiya, N. What characteristics of recasts facilitate accurate perception when overheard by true beginners? *Language Teaching Research* 0, no. 0 (2021) DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211057529>

quality of students with different cognitive styles. The research was conducted on 55 fourth-semester English students from STAIN Kediri, using a factorial experimental design. Data was analyzed using a two-way ANOVA. The findings revealed that the effect of different feedback on writing quality does not depend on students' cognitive styles, and there was no significant difference in writing quality between students receiving direct corrective feedback and those receiving indirect corrective feedback. The study concluded that feedback provision does not depend on students' cognitive styles, and that no matter the type of feedback given, students' writing quality improves when they receive feedback. The findings can assist in understanding the importance of feedback in improving writing in foreign language education¹¹³.

Nguyen's study argues that current practice of L2 writing conferencing does not provide enough support or scaffolding for students to engage with written corrective feedback (WCF). To address this issue, the study proposed a three-step writing conference in which L2 students, under the support of their writing instructor, focus on a specific form-related error, analyze a collection of standard L2 samples, and plan for error correction and future learning of related knowledge. The study found that this writing conference helped students to be more mentally engaged with WCF and that this engagement led to better error correction and L2 language uptake. The study has several limitations, such as a small sample size, lack of data on behavioral engagement, and failure to measure long-term effects. The study suggests that future research should focus on larger populations, studying the behavioral engagement of L2 students and long-term effects of the proposed writing conference, and investigating the process of inductive/implicit learning that is triggered by the suggested writing conference¹¹⁴.

Jianwu's study investigates whether drills (exercise in repetitive practice) give rise to more intensive feedback than free writing, and whether feedback provided in drills and on free writing transferred to subsequent written

¹¹³ Sri Wahyuni, "The Effect of Different Feedback on Writing Quality of College Students with Different Cognitive Styles", *DINAMIKA ILMU*, 17, No.1 (2017): 40, DOI: 10.21093/di.v17i1.649

¹¹⁴ Nguyen, C.-D. Scaffolding student engagement with written corrective feedback: Transforming feedback sessions into learning affordances. *Language Teaching Research*, 0, no.0. (2021) DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211040904>

production. The study found that drills do result in more intensive feedback than free writing, but the feedback given in drills did not transfer to subsequent written production. Whereas the feedback on free writing did. The study also found that learners who received metalinguistic feedback on free writing adopted a subtler form of the 'safety first' strategy, which is avoiding the use of verb items to which feedback was given, which the researchers warned should be viewed with caution. The study cautions against optimism about incorporating automated CF in L2 writing instruction, particularly when the target structure is partially acquired and the assessment is based on free production. The study also calls for a more careful examination of learner productions to differentiate increased deployment of 'safety-first' strategies from increased linguistic knowledge. The study advises that computer-automated CF in drills is not effective when the target structure is partially acquired and when feedback is provided after task completion rather than concurrently, and to enhance the CF transferability, instructors are advised to diversify the tasks for treatment to optimize the effect and combine metalinguistic explanations with other means to ensure depth of understanding of the feedback¹¹⁵.

Khaled's study found that both direct and indirect comprehensive written corrective feedback (WCF) can improve learners' accuracy during revisions of the same texts. The study also found that direct WCF showed consistent positive effects on revision accuracy across all tasks. The study supports the argument that direct forms of WCF are superior to indirect WCF as it may help learners to better notice their interlanguage problems and present them with clearer information about the mismatch between the target and non-target forms. The study also shows that the effectiveness of feedback may vary depending on the nature of the task and the distinction between treatable and untreatable errors. Treatable errors, those that follow a set of syntactic and morphosyntactic rules, were found to be more responsive to feedback than those that do not, such as

¹¹⁵ Gao, J., & Ma, S. Instructor feedback on free writing and automated corrective feedback in drills: Intensity and efficacy. *Language Teaching Research* 26, No.5. (2022): 986–1009. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820915337>

word choice¹¹⁶. While Bo-Ram examines whether think-alouds (i.e. concurrent verbal reports) can be employed as a research method to measure learners' internal processes without altering the very constructs they set out to reflect in an L2 learning setting. The study uses written corrective feedback on writing task for adult intermediate learners of English and found that thinking aloud did not negatively or positively affect their L2 development. The study also has several limitations, such as lack of data on time on task or reaction time, lack of generalizability to other contexts or instructional settings, and not controlling for various factors such as proficiency level, feedback explicitness, cognitive demands of task etc. Future research should investigate these limitations to get a more fine-grained understanding of reactivity in L2 learning¹¹⁷.

Nguyen's study suggests that current L2 writing conferencing practices do not provide enough support for students to engage with written corrective feedback. A proposed three-step writing conference that focuses on form-related errors, analyzes standard L2 samples, and plans for error correction and future learning is suggested to improve engagement and language uptake. Jianwu's study finds that drills result in more intensive feedback than free writing, but the feedback given in drills does not transfer to subsequent written production. Khaled's study supports the argument that direct forms of WCF are superior to indirect WCF and vary depending on the nature of the task and treatable errors. Sri's study finds that feedback provision does not depend on students' cognitive styles, and that students' writing quality improves when they receive feedback. Bo-Ram's study finds that think-alouds can be used as a research method to measure learners' internal processes in an L2 learning setting without affecting their development.

Based on previous research, it can be summarized that Kartchava and Gholami examine the effects of oral corrective feedback (CF) on language learners in an EFL context. Kartchava's study found that pre-service language teachers have beliefs about CF that they bring from their own learning into their

¹¹⁶ Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 24, no.4. (2020): 519–539. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469>

¹¹⁷ Suh, B.-R. Are think-alouds reactive? Evidence from an L2 written corrective feedback study. *Language Teaching Research*, 0, No. 0. (2020). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820967166>

teaching, but their limited knowledge about when, how, and how much to provide feedback prevents them from reconciling their beliefs with classroom practices. Gholami's study found that learners were more likely to produce successful uptake following CF directed at formulaic errors. Both studies recommend teacher education and additional teaching experience, as well as training that addresses specific concepts of CF, to bridge this gap. Another study by Mostafa found that explicit and immediate types of OCF, particularly in pronunciation and grammar, were highly preferred by learners and were perceived to have the greatest contribution to L2 WTC. Bart's study found that speaking practice was more effective for higher-educated learners than for low-educated learners. All studies suggest further research in different contexts and with learners from different proficiency levels.

Xuan's study examines beliefs and practices of Vietnamese EFL teachers regarding corrective feedback. It found a lack of congruence between beliefs and practices and a preference for didactic recasts. Susan's study compares the effectiveness of direct and metalinguistic feedback on ESL learners, finding improvements in accuracy for both feedback groups but a stronger relationship with aptitude for direct feedback. Eva's study highlights differences in teaching methods and feedback between L2 English and L3 French classes, suggesting teachers should adapt their approach based on subject focus. Bo's study focuses on student engagement with oral feedback during presentations, finding positive attitudes towards compliments and suggestions, but negative emotions towards explicit correction. It also highlights the importance of linguistic and rhetorical knowledge and immediate attention in understanding feedback. Weiqing's study found that teachers use a variety of nonverbal cues during corrective feedback, with nodding, shaking their head, and pointing being the most common. The study emphasizes the importance of studying nonverbal behavior in teaching, but also notes limitations such as the variety of courses and teaching experience of the participating teachers. Ines' study found that learners with positive beliefs about peer feedback tended to show greater improvement in pronunciation comprehensibility. The study suggests that learners' beliefs about feedback can impact learning outcomes and that more research is needed

in other domains of L2 instruction. Mostafa's study found that learners with a growth mindset preferred to receive any type of corrective feedback, while those with a fixed mindset preferred low-cost recasts or no feedback at all. The study suggests that the effectiveness of corrective feedback is influenced by learners' motivation and internal cost-value analyses. Yongbin's study found that in a form-focused context, explicit CF provided few additional advantages over implicit CF and that exposure to correct forms through recasts was sufficient for learning.

Azar's study found that collaborative or expert/novice patterns of interaction in peer feedback lead to more learning in L2 writing development. Lieselotte's study found that form-focused instruction and peer feedback training can increase grammatical accuracy. Kimi's study found no significant difference between gesture-incorporated recasts and verbal-only recasts in helping ESL learners acquire the regular past tense. Nobuhiro's study found that whole recasts and deictic gestures can facilitate comparison between original utterance and recast for true beginners, but segmented recasts are better for more advanced learners. These studies highlight the importance of providing feedback training, considering unique contexts of peer interaction, and catering feedback to individual learners. Nguyen's study suggests current L2 writing conferencing practices lack support for students to engage with written corrective feedback. A three-step process is proposed to improve engagement. Jianwu's study finds that drills provide more intensive feedback, but it does not transfer to subsequent writing. Khaled's study supports direct forms of WCF being superior to indirect forms and varying with task and errors. Sri's study finds that feedback provision does not depend on cognitive styles and improves writing quality. Bo-Ram's study finds that think-alouds can be used to measure internal processes in L2 learning without affecting development. Based on that summarize, there are few studies that have examined the connection between personality traits and corrective feedback for speaking. This makes it important to conduct this research in order to broaden our understanding of this topic about corrective feedback. So, this research is important to be carried out to add to existing studies.