

TEACHER'S CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' ORAL RESPONSES

Lasmi Febrianingrum

IAIN Madura

lasmi.work@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigated oral corrective feedback provided by the teacher and students' uptake following teacher's corrective feedback in accelerated class. The researcher explored how the teacher provided corrective feedback during speaking activity and how the high proficiency level students were encouraged to react to it. The observations in several meetings were done with the help of some other instruments like audio video recorder, fieldnote and interview guide. The results show that the teacher preferred to use recast in order not to interrupt the flow of students' speech and keep students' mood or feeling. On the contrary, the students preferred to be corrected using other techniques that could make them think more, encourage them to correct the utterances by themselves. Moreover, the results show that students applied repetition and incorporation uptake that let the students construct longer utterance. It can be concluded that there is a gap between teacher's choice in correcting students' error and students' expectation.

Keywords: corrective feedback, uptake, accelerated class

©Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris FKIP UM Palembang

Introduction

In the language classroom the process of negotiation involved in interaction is itself to be identified with the process of language learning. Yu (2008, p. 48) states negotiation plays a significant role in classroom interaction. While the L2 learners are given more chances to negotiate their problems in comprehension, more success will be gained. Through the peer negotiation the learners in interactive situations would learn and retain more L2 words. There are mainly two negotiated forms in classroom interaction: face-to-face peer negotiation and corrective feedback negotiation provided by the teacher. Furthermore, Ellis (1992, p. 48) states that classroom interaction provides opportunities for learners to observe the way utterances are constructed in the process of building discourse and to manipulate chunks of language in the expression of meaning. In this study, the writer concerns to corrective feedback in the process of negotiation in classroom interaction that requires the close

cooperation between learners and learners, learners and teachers.

While doing interaction, it cannot be denied that students will produce errors in delivering their responses or utterances. Learners can make errors because of some aspects, including interference, overgeneralization, markers of transitional competence, strategies of communication and assimilation and teacher induced errors (Hasyim, 2002, p. 42). Zhu (2010, p. 127) states that making error among learners further shows the sign which the development and internalization of the rules of the language are taking place. Making errors among learners might not be a direct measure of their knowledge of the language, but it could be the most important source of information for teachers to evaluate the nature of the learners' knowledge. It is through students' errors that a teacher can see what students are struggling to master, what concepts students have misunderstood and what extra work they might need. However, teacher's habits dealing with students' spoken errors

varied, reflecting different attitudes they hold toward spoken errors. Some teachers tend to correct all the errors while some tend to be tolerant and still some others do not correct them at all. By analyzing the learners' errors, teachers could identify how much they have learned and at the same time discover what need to be learned. Consequently, the students' errors will be reduced.

Related to error treatment done by the teacher in the classroom setting, there is another term which needs to identify, which is called as corrective feedback. According to Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006, p. 340) corrective feedback (CF) is 'responses to learner utterances containing an error' but also as a 'complex phenomenon with several functions' (Chaudron, 1988, p. 152). It is in line with Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 41) who state that corrective feedback is described as the provision of negative evidence or positive evidence upon erroneous utterances, which encourages learner's repair involving accuracy and precision, and not merely comprehensibility.

A major study that has significantly contributed to investigating and examining corrective feedback and uptake in second language learning is that of Lyster and Ranta (1997) which studied the different CF types used by teachers to their learners while engaged in interactive based activities. The findings indicate that teachers mainly provide learners with CF types including: recasts, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests, corrective repetition, and explicit correction. They also found that recasts technique were the most commonly used for corrective feedback, however they were the least to lead students to successful uptake. Moreover, based on Lyster and Ranta finding, the most successful type of feedback was

elicitation. Students' error found in Lyster and Ranta research is phonological errors like mispronunciation and grammatical errors such as tenses often make the lecturer use the recast technique. In particular, the teacher seems to use elicitation, clarification request, repetition and metalinguistic feedback when a lexical error occurs.

Many theories of corrective feedback propose that not all errors should be corrected or at least not immediately. A number of techniques can be used depending on the task and the skill practiced. In the article "Reflecting on error treatment in speaking among EFL Moroccan learners," Sakale (2013) investigated forty EFL English teachers relates to error treatment. As a result, Moroccan teachers do not provide learner with a negative evidence when the learners commit mistake/errors in form and do not negotiate the errors with them including different teaching experience categories investigated. The result shows the teachers did nearly 50% ignore errors, 46% delay correction, and only 5% resort to peer. That article raises problematic query to what extent a change in teacher's type of feedback such as providing learners with a corrective negative evidence when their answer are not accurate and encouraging them to do the repair can result in improving learners' speaking. Consequently a noticeable anxiety towards errors has been retained among learners and which may also be linked to the signaled lack of form negotiation.

Empirical study on oral error correction has also been conducted by a teacher of beginner class. In his self-observation study, Coskun (2010) realized that he used explicit correction more than other types of error correction. Besides, as for the error correction

types, it would be true to suggest that contrary to Lyster and Ranta's findings mentioned earlier, recast was the least preferred type used to correct both grammar and pronunciation errors while repetition was the most common for both errors. Repetition also seems to lead to successful uptake with two self- and two peer-corrections.

Relating to Coskun's findings, there was another study conducted by Othman (2012). This study revealed the role of oral corrective feedback in the context of ESL in one Malaysian state which has observed students with average level of proficiency. This study found that explicit correction was most often used and recast was the least used type of corrective feedback. However, in previous studies, recasts were most often used to correct students' spoken errors (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Tsang, 2004; Yoshida, 2010).

Those studies recommend that teachers practice a variety of feedback techniques as different techniques might appeal to different students in terms of their needs, proficiency level, age and classroom objectives. Because these factors have an influence on whether to correct, which errors to correct and how to correct, studies done in some other settings can yield different results and thus there is a need for further research conducted with different classrooms and learners. Those previous studies seem conducting oral corrective feedback on primary level students in EFL context and secondary school students in ESL context.

To the best of my knowledge and the previous studies' recommendation, it seems that no study has discussed oral error correction on senior high school students in accelerated class who has high level of proficiency. Furthermore, there are many studies conducting on

teachers' written corrective feedback but the issues of oral corrective feedback in Indonesia is rare and no study on oral corrective feedback is conducted on accelerated students that considered as gifted students. Those are the significant reasons for this study to be conducted since this study has different subjects and setting; accelerated students in senior high school in EFL context.

The writer thinks that it is beneficial to investigate how accelerated students' uptake relate to teacher's corrective feedback since accelerated students who have higher level of proficiency are assumed to prevent correction or do not need more feedback (Amador, 2008). Furthermore, the accelerated students are assumed to be easy in maintaining interaction, responding the questions from teacher, responding and reacting to teacher's corrective feedback. It is for this reason that the present research will investigate this matter.

Considering those previous studies, it seems there is paucity of research that investigates senior high school students especially at accelerated class who have high proficiency in EFL context. Besides, this study will not only investigate the CF provided by the teacher, but also the error types and uptake made by the students of accelerated class which has different criteria of subject with the previous research. The researcher thinks that it is necessary to conduct a study about adolescence of EFL accelerated students on teacher's corrective feedback at MAN Model Bangkalan. This present study described the following research questions: (1) How does teacher provide oral corrective feedback in classroom interaction? (2) How is the students' uptake on teacher's oral corrective feedback in classroom interaction?

Methodology

The design of this study was descriptive qualitative. As it is stated by Bogdan and Biklen (2007) that the descriptive qualitative study refers to the following criteria: 1) having one natural setting as the data sources and the researcher as the key instrument, 2) focusing on the utterances or words as the analysis of the data rather than numbers, 3) concerning with process rather than simply with outcomes or products, 4) analyzing the data inductively and 5) concerning with participant perspectives.

The subjects of the study were the teacher and the students of accelerated class who have certain criteria. The teacher has been teaching in MAN Model Bangkalan for ten years up to now. He is a professional teacher since he got his professional certificate in 2012 and he always applies question answer technique in improving students' speaking ability. He provides corrective feedback upon his students' erroneous utterances. Meanwhile, the students were twenty students in the third semester of accelerated class at MAN Model Bangkalan. The researcher believed that the students are competent since they are gifted students who have higher achievement than regular class. The accelerated students had been selected and chosen through several steps. They were selected from the average score of the students report book of their junior high school, from the score of National Examination, from the result of academic test includes English, Mathematics and Science held by the school, from the result of psychology test and interview.

The data were collected by using non-participatory observation which meant that the researcher only sat in the class and watched the learning process. The researcher was the main instrument with the help of some other instruments

during observations such as observation sheet, field note and audio video recorder and interview guide. All this instruments were documented from the first until the last observation. The researcher was passively involved in the process of subjects' activity.

During the research, observation would be conducted for five times until the researcher got enough data and information. In particular, observation sheet was used to gain the data during the observation that could be related to the object of study. Field note was used to get information about the teaching and learning process during speaking activity. Meanwhile audio video recording would be used to record the chronological events in the forms of voices and attitudes in the field. In this case, the recordings would be transcribed especially for corrective feedbacks and the erroneous utterances preceded, and students' uptakes to the ease the analysis of teacher's error corrective feedback and students' uptakes. Observation sheet, field note and audio-video recording were used to support the data, because the researcher also had some limitations and weaknesses as follows.

First, her attention was limited. When she focused her attention on voices, her visual perception might not be perfect or other way around. Secondly, she may not remember everything in a relatively long time, therefore, she would record things she hear, experience and think in the course of data collection with the help of field note. Thirdly, when she would concentrate on students' oral responses, her observation was probably disturbed because she could not do more than one activity all together at the same time.

An interview would be done to get some clarification of teacher's utterances when giving a corrective feedback, about what types of corrective feedback that he

preferred as the most effective type in giving error corrections that students mostly prefer in the classroom activity of accelerated class. The interview also would be done to get some clarification of students' response when they had already been given corrective feedback from their teacher.

The data gained by the teacher's utterances and students' uptake in this study would be analyzed through some steps to capture the corrective feedback provided by the teacher and students when they did interaction in question answer activity. In analyzing the data, this study would apply the procedure suggested by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014, p. 31). This done through three current flows of activity: a) data condensation, b) data display and c) conclusion drawing/verification.

Data condensation refers to the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying and transforming the raw data that appear in written up field note and transcriptions. Data condensation is a form of analysis that sharpens, sorts, focuses, discards and organizes data in such way that conclusion can be drawn and verified. In this step, by considering first and second research questions, the researcher selected the data in the forms of words, phrases, or sentences of teacher-student interaction.

Aggregating the data gathered, involving all of information from the field, for instance transcription result as stepping stone for further analysis. In this case, the data obtained would be processed by transcribing the teacher's utterances gained by the result of audio-video recording during speaking time conducted.

The second component of analysis activity is data display. A display is an organized, compressed assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action. According to Miles et al. (2014), the better displays (many

types of matrices, graphs, charts and networks) are a main way to valid qualitative analysis. The researcher would display the data which had been selected and simplified in order to make it clearer and easier to be interpreted.

The third flow of analysis activity is conclusion. The conclusion was drawn after all data had been interpreted and analyzed to see the corrective feedback employed by the teacher and the uptake produced by the students based on theory of Lyster and Ranta (1997) in literature review. However, before making conclusion, the data should be validated. The result of data analysis from transcription would be crosschecked out with the data from the result of field notes and interview to validate the findings. At last, it was accomplished to draw or verify the final conclusion which would be derived in regard with the result of findings and discussion to answer research questions.

Results and Discussion

This research came up with the results which showed difference from previous study conducted by Coskun and Othman that used explicit correction to their students' oral responses. This study showed that the teacher provided oral corrective feedback since he found the erroneous of utterance made by students during speaking activities or whilst-speaking activity. The teacher gave the students chance to express their ideas about the difficult skill of English as the first topic, the importance of English as the second topic and students' interests as the third topic. He was paying attention and listening the response from the students who shared their ideas. The teacher wanted to know how well the students spoke English. He also gave feedback to the students' utterances; positive feedback and corrective feedback. Based on the observations, there were several types of corrective

feedbacks which the teacher provided during interaction, such as recast, metalinguistics clue, clarification request and explicit correction. Those types of corrective feedback were provided by the teacher during speaking activities and recast was the most frequent corrective feedback provided. The following are the activities conducted by the teacher and in which the corrective feedbacks were provided.

Teacher's Provision of Recasts and Students' Uptakes

The teacher provided the correct form as implicitly as possible. Data found in this study were thirty recast as type of corrective feedbacks used by the teacher in correcting his students' erroneous utterances. The teacher employed recast corrective feedback in repairing the students' erroneous utterances like phonological error, grammatical error, lexical error, unsolicited uses of L1 error and content error. One of the findings of recast provision toward some students' error is presented as follows.

[1] S2 : we must know the /'wɔ:d/ we must say (phonological error)

[2] T : okay, we must know vocabulary, this /'wɜ:d/, that /'wɜ:d/, we have to combine between this verbs, to the sentence. (recast)

[3] S2 : yes, yes sir. (acknowledgment)

In the extract of interaction above, the student still presented the same topic. The student told that speaking is the most difficult skill of English. When he tried to give the reason, he mispronounced the word 'word'. In the move 2, the teacher implicitly corrected the word by reformulating it using new sentence. He clarified and made the student's idea clearer. In this situation, the student responded by saying yes toward the teacher's feedback. He

repeated saying 'yes' to show that what the teacher said as like what he really wanted to say or what he meant. This is called acknowledgment uptake.

Teacher's Provision of Clarification Requests and Students' Uptakes

The teacher provided questions showing the utterance had been ill-formed or misunderstood. It might not supply learners with any information concerning the sort and location of the error. Data found in this study were four clarification request as type of corrective feedbacks used by the teacher in correcting his students' erroneous utterances. The teacher employed clarification requests corrective feedback in repairing the students' erroneous utterances like phonological error, grammatical error, lexical error and unsolicited uses of L1 error. One of the findings of clarification requests provision toward some students' error is presented as follows.

[1] T : Do you have girlfriend? are your girlfriends become motivator?

[2] S : are your girlfriends? So many? (clarification request)

[3] S : Oh yeah, is your girlfriend to be...emmmm.. become your motivator?(self-repair)

[4] S2 : yes

In the extract of interaction above, the student was assigned to give comment to his friend related to interest. The teacher asked the student to stand in her seat, and the other students were paying attention to her comment. The student was able to come up with his comment. However, he gave comment out of topic. The teacher let him in order to he wanted his students be brave to speak. From interview, he said that he gave much time for his students to speak anything though it was out of topic. He

considered that it was training for his students to speak more and more without being interrupted. When the student gave comment, he asked using wrong sentence. He asked are your girlfriend become motivator? He thought that 'if using your, the auxiliary is are'. The teacher then asked the student by repeating student's utterance and made sure that it really what the student meant. In this case the teacher provided clarification request toward student's error since the teacher gave feedback that carries questions indicating that the utterance has been ill-formed or misunderstood and that a reformulation or a repetition is required. Then, the student at move 3 realized that his utterance was wrong, so he reformulated the question by using the singular auxiliary. This is called self-repair that refers to student's self correction as the reaction toward the teacher's feedback that does not include the correct form.

Teacher's Provision of Metalinguistic Clue and Students' Uptakes

The teacher provided comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form. Data found in this study were four metalinguistic clues as type of corrective feedbacks used by the teacher in correcting his students' erroneous utterances. The teacher employed metalinguistic clue corrective feedback in repairing the students' erroneous utterances like phonological error and unsolicited uses of L1 error. One of the findings of metalinguistic clue provision toward some students' error is presented as follows.

[1] S17 : speaking is difficult because in speaking I feelsakit perut(unsolicited uses of L1)

[2] T : huh??how to say sakit perut in English?(metalinguistic clue)

[3] T+Ss : stomachache (peer repair)

In the extract of interaction above, the student was assigned to deliver an opinion about the most difficult skill in learning English. The teacher asked the student to stand in front of the class and the other students were paying attention to his presentation. The student was able to come up with his speech, however he got confused the English of sakit perut. Therefore, he used his L1 to fulfill his sentences. The teacher asked him and the other students to make the student learned from his friends about the English of the word. This move is called metalinguistic clue since the teacher provided comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form. Unfortunately, it seemed the student had no idea, therefore at move 3, the other students gave the right term for sakit perut.

Teacher's Provision of Explicit Correction and Students' Uptakes

The teacher provided the correct form and clearly indicated that student's utterance is incorrect. Data found in this study were two clarification request as type of corrective feedbacks used by the teacher in correcting his students' erroneous utterances. The teacher employed explicit correction corrective feedback in repairing the students' erroneous utterances like unsolicited uses of L1 error and content error. One of the findings of explicit correction provision toward some students' error is presented as follows.

[1] S : Why are you like Ayu?(singer)

[2] T : do you

[3] S4 : because
she is beautiful (content error)

[4] T : do you
mean voice?(explicit correction)

[5] S4 : yes, and
her voice is very good (self-repair)

In the extract of interaction above, the student was assigned to give comment to his friend related to interest. The teacher asked the student to stand in her seat, and the other students were paying attention to her comment. The student was able to come up with his comment, however she misused the word beautiful for voice. She could not make a good sentence if she wanted to talk about voice. The teacher provided the correct form of the word and he clearly indicated that what the student had said was incorrect by asking do you mean voice? In this case, the teacher used explicit correction which indicates the explicit provision of the correct form and stated the student's error clearly. Then, the student admitted the teacher's feedback and made new sentence by using the utterance that teacher provided. The student at move 4 responded the appropriate or the right form after the student got feedback from the teacher without the correct form explicitly. This move is called self-uptake since it refers to student's self correction as the reaction toward the teacher's feedback that does not include the correct form.

Discussion

This study found teacher's corrective feedback employed to accelerated students in discussing three topics, such as the most difficult skill of English, the importance of English and students' interest. It is contrast to assumption which stated that accelerated students did not need to be corrected since they have high level proficiency in learning English. They would have high ability to produce the correct words or utterances. However, in this study, it is

found that the teacher provided more to recast corrective feedback on students' error and the students could react toward teacher's corrective feedback. It is in line with the findings of Safari (2013) who investigated adolescent EFL class at the low-intermediate level, that recast is the most frequent type of teacher's feedback which is over half of the total corrective feedback types used by the teacher. Moreover, this study has the same findings with the study of Lyster and Ranta (1997) which has different subject of study that is immersion class at primary level. This finding shows that the teacher more often prefers to use recasts in response to learners' errors.

Oral corrective feedback that occurred in the process of classroom interaction will be beneficial if there is uptake from the students since oral corrective feedback is used to improve and correct the students' utterance. This study not only found corrective feedback provided by the teacher but also uptake responded by the students. Uptake refers to different types of student responses following the feedback, including responses with repair of the non-target items as well as utterances still in need of repair. There are two types of students' uptake: a) uptake that results in "repair" of the error on which the feedback focused and b) uptake that results in an utterance that still needs repair.

In this study, it is found that many students could do repairs towards corrective feedback given by the teacher. Recast corrective feedback which most provided by the teacher in this study is the most likely to lead uptake and do account for any repairs. It means that teacher's recast would be more effective way to lead the students' uptake which can maintain interaction. On the contrary, in the previous studies, Safari (2013), Lyster and Ranta (1997) found

that recasts do not lead any uptake and do not account for any repairs.

In conclusion, recast corrective feedback provided by the teacher could lead students' uptake in maintaining interaction. The teacher employed recast corrective feedback in order to not to interrupt the flow of interaction quite long since while doing interaction, the teacher should know that the learners need to do most of talk to activate their speaking (Khadidja, 2009). In addition to, when using recasts, the teacher provides the learners with the correct form and that learners make an immediate cognitive comparison between their own utterance and that of the teacher (Doughty & Varela, 1998). Furthermore, based on the interview, the teacher actually did not really want to correct all the time. He thought that the most important of speaking activity is how to make the students more comfortable and easily to express their ideas by using English. Moreover, the teacher argued that since the accelerated students are still children, junior high school age, actually, there is no need to correct the students' error in speaking frequently. Besides, the teacher thought that the students are still young to think the complicated way in correcting error. Therefore, he did not provide elicitation and repetition corrective feedback that force students to think a lot about the correctness. The students are still learning about grammar in the next semester. Therefore, the teacher thinks that the appropriate time for giving the corrective feedback to his students in the forth semester of acceleration program because they lack of having speaking practice, lack of grammar knowledge and they do not get used to have conversation by using English. Furthermore, they are in the third semester of accelerated class that they never had speaking program like in this

accelerated class when they were at their junior high school.

From the result of interview to the teacher, the teacher did not want to make his students stressful or afraid continuing their speaking when the teacher explicitly mentioned the error made by his students. This is in line with Naidu (2007) who states that giving feedback in a thoughtless manner is destructive criticism which may distress the person on the receiving end or leave them with feeling worthless. Moreover, too much interruption for correcting the error will affect the students' fluency and sometimes they take decision not to participate again (Khadidja, 2009). He thought that his accelerated students are younger than regular class. The teacher thought that different ages would influence their psychology that makes them down or afraid to speak English anymore.

In teacher's opinion about his accelerated class is to arouse accelerated students to speak is by giving punishment. Punishment for accelerated students is doing many tasks from the teacher. Therefore, the students are forced to speak. The other reason why the teacher applied recast corrective feedback is he did not want to break the flow of students' speech or communication. Khadidja (2009) insisted teachers should make decisions when and how to react to the students' errors so that the interactive activity will not break down each time. He tended to let the students explore their ideas, using English as much as possible. On the contrary, from the interview to students, most of the students were willing to be corrected by their teacher since they were aware that they made error in their production in English. They even wanted to have their teacher to correct by using other ways that let them think more and get the correctness by themselves. They wanted that their teacher give clue when

the teacher helped giving the correction. This means that the students care more to their errors and the correction of those errors, and they were more responsive to teacher's feedback. This is because accelerated students have curiosity characteristics as gifted students (Daniels (1997) in Shaunessy, 2005, p. 6).

Therefore, it is likely the case that teachers are reluctant to encourage self-repair more consistently let the flow of communication be broken. However, classroom observations as well as the data analysis revealed that none of the feedback types stopped the flow of classroom interaction and that uptake—that is, the student's turn in the error treatment sequence—clearly does not break the communicative flow either.

From those explanations above, the teacher made use of varied range of corrective feedback types rather than being dependent on one form of corrective feedback. In fact, in conformity with other studies, this study reveals that recast is the type of feedback which is mostly used by the teacher and so efficient to lead to the high rates of repair. This finding of using recast is in line with the finding of Lyster and Ranta (1997), however, it was not efficient to lead uptake. Moreover, most of corrective feedbacks; recast, clarification request, metalinguistic clue and explicit correction, provided by the teacher in this study could lead and encourage the students to repair. Since accelerated students have high curiosity and high proficiency, the more they accepted the challenge to get the right or appropriate utterance from the teacher's corrective feedback and the more they maintain interaction.

Conclusion

According to the results of the discussions in the previous chapter, there are some conclusions that are obtained

based on the research questions. The provision of recast corrective feedback in repairing students' erroneous utterances was very effective to lead students' response or uptake. Recast corrective feedback that the most type used by the teacher is very essential to help students to be more aware to the error that they make during speaking activity. Besides, recast corrective feedback do account for any repairs or uptakes. These repairs involved repetition and incorporation of the teacher's recast. On the other hand, the other five corrective feedbacks were not found significantly. Moreover, in this study, the teacher did not employ elicitation and repetition corrective feedback at all. From those four corrective feedback applied by the teacher, clarification request and explicit correction were the type which effectively prompt a student reaction and invite students to self-correct. Self-correct would encourage students to think and learn more in order to make what they learn to be more long lasting. The interaction in the classroom could be maintained by giving the appropriate ways in repairing students' erroneous utterances based on the students' proficiency level and characteristics or personality.

Some of the previous researchers with their result of the study have revealed that learners' responses to corrective feedbacks seem helpful in language learning, meanwhile the next level of error treatment study should be explored to gain a better insight about the relationship between learners' uptakes and the contribution of the uptakes to second or foreign language acquisition, since it is important for language pedagogy, especially in developing a good pattern of corrective feedbacks that will construct students' self-esteem in language learning. Moreover, this study does not

distinguish between 'error' and 'mistake'. The further research could investigate about it.

References

- Amador, Yohanna Abarca. (2008). Learner Attitudes Toward Error Correction in A Beginner English Class. *Comunicacion*, 17(1), 18-28.
- Bogdan, Robert C., & Biklen, Sari Knopp. (2007). *Qualitative Research for Education. An Introduction to Theory and Methods* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education group.
- Chaudron, Craig. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coskun, Abdullah. (2010). A Classroom Research Study on Oral Error Correction. *Humanizing Language Teaching*, 12(3).
- Doughty, Catherine, & Varela, Elizabeth. (1998). Communicative Focus on Form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 114-138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, Rod. (1992). *Second Language Acquisition and Language Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Ellis, Rod, Loewen, Shawn, & Erlam, Rosemary. (2006). Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 339-368.
- Hasyim, Sunardi. (2002). Error Analysis in the Teaching of English. *Journal of Kata*, 4(1), 42-50.
- Khadija, Kouicem. (2009). The Effect of Classroom Interaction on Developing the Learner's Speaking Skill. (Master Degree), Mentouri University, Constantine.
- Lyster, Roy, & Ranta, Leila. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.
- Miles, Matthew B., Huberman, A. Michael, & Saldana, Johnny. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (2nd ed.). USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Naidu, Dr. P. Ch. Appala. (2007). *Feedback Methods and Student Performance*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.
- Othman, Wan Mazlini. (2012). The Role of Feedback in Malaysian ESL Secondary School Classrooms. University of Tasmania Malay.
- Panova, Iliana, & Lyster, Roy. (2002). Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom. *TESOL QUARTERLY* 36(4).
- Safari, Parvin. (2013). A Descriptive Study on Corrective Feedback and Learners' Uptake during Interactions in a Communicative EFL Class *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(7), 1165-1175.
- Sakale, Sana. (2013). Reflecting on Error Treatment in Speaking Among EFL Moroccan Learners. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 12(1), 24-28.
- Shaunessy, Elizabeth. (2005). *Questioning Strategies for Teaching the Gifted*. Texas: Prufrock Press, Inc.

- Tsang, Wai King. (2004). Feedback and Uptake in Teacher-Student Interaction: An Analysis of 18 English Lessons in Hong Kong Secondary Classrooms. *RELC Journal*, 35(2), 187-209.
- Yoshida, Reiko. (2010). How Do Teachers and Learners Perceive Corrective Feedback in the Japanese Language Classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 293-314.
- Yu, Runmei. (2008). Interaction in EFL Classes. *Asian Social Science*, 4(4), 48-50.
- Zhu, Honglin. (2010). An Analysis of College Students' Attitudes Towards Error Correction in EFL Context. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 127-130.