

Received: 7 July 2023

Accepted: 28 December 2023

English Education| Full Research Article

Investigating Afghan EFL Teachers' and Students' Attitudes towards Oral Corrective Feedback

Banafshah Hakimi, Herat University

Abstract

Foreign language acquisition has never been apart from trial and error and has grabbed magnificent attention in the OCF literature. It aims to provide consistent and congruous feedback to EFL learners. In alignment with several other studies in this field, the current study aims to investigate Afghan teachers' and students' attitudes toward OCF. This study is conducted via mixed-method design; a questionnaire was distributed to 40 sophomore students of HUA (Herat University Afghanistan) to record their attitudes towards OCF. Moreover, to have a deeper understanding of the topic, five of the HUA EFL teachers were interviewed. The results indicated some matches and mismatches between the perceptions of both groups regarding the amount of OCF in terms of perceptions, amount, types, timing, and source of OCF. Because some similarities existed between teachers' and students' perceptions towards OCF, it was not void of differences. The study revealed significant differences between the Types of OCF strategies. Contrary to their teacher, students in this study were found to be in favor of 'Elicitation' and 'Meta-linguistic' OCF strategies. Although, the OCF strategy preferred by the teachers is the 'Explicit' OCF strategy. Apart from all the differences and similarities, OCF aims to highlight learners' errors, improve their spoken language, and activate good teacher-student interaction

Keywords: EFL, Oral corrective feedback, Student attitudes, Speaking skill, Teacher attitudes

Introduction

Learning a foreign language has never been distant from trial and error. Making errors is a common phenomenon among English as a foreign language (EFL) learners. The disparities between EFL learners' native language with their target language would cause them to make errors in any of the possible terms; either the level of the language, form, or meaning. This requires the teachers to step in and accomplish their responsibility of rectifying those errors (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016). Lately, teachers' and students' attitudes, opinions and views regarding CF has grabbed many researchers' attentions (Ha & Murray, 2023). According to Tabatabaei and Birjandi (2009), "Oral corrective feedback (OCF) is the information that

students receive about their language production, information that allows them to modify their output. This shows how important teachers' reaction to students' erroneous utterance is" (p. 60). Since there is not only one way of providing OCF, teachers' and students' attitudes and perceptions may differ, too. Studying the matches and mismatches between students' and teachers' attitudes towards oral corrective feedback can influence the learning and teaching process positively (Borg, 2003).

Drew (2021) indicates that teachers' OCF practices do not always seem to be matching with students' OCF preferences which may affect the learning outcomes negatively. Abundant research has been conducted during the past few decades within the context of EFL education concerning teachers' and students' beliefs in comparison with the correspondence of students' precedence for OCF with teachers' OCF practice in the class (Phipps & Borg, 2009; Borg, 2015; Calafato, 2020). However, the scarcity of research investigating EFL teachers' and students' OCF attitudes within the English department at Herat University, Afghanistan is noteworthy.

Examining the extent to which EFL learner's preferences match teachers' practice would help both EFL students and teachers which would lead to better classroom interaction and produce effective learning outcomes. This study hopes to help Students receive oral corrective feedback in a more informed and effective manner and have an opportunity for modifying their erroneous utterances without any uncertainty. It grants the teachers a stronger command over providing corrective feedback to learners through implementing different OCF strategies to find out which strategy meets their students' needs the best and would likely have better learning outcomes.

The purpose of this mixed-method study is to provide a better understanding of teachers' OCF practice and investigate to what extent it meets EFL learners' needs by determining the OCF strategies that EFL learners prefer the most. This study will involve sophomore students of English Department at Herat University, Afghanistan, considering the variety of their different English learning backgrounds, mixed proficiency levels, and being more accustomed to teachers' teaching styles and being examination-driven. The researcher has adopted Lyster and Ranta's (1997) Taxonomy model on Corrective Feedback for the theoretical framework which has been categorized into six categories, consisting: explicit correction, recast, metalinguistic clue, elicitation, repetition, and clarification request for its consensus. The current study aims to address this research gap by investigating the attitudes of EFL teachers and students regarding three aspects of OCF, namely, the OCF role, types, and timing.

This research paper tends to answer the following research questions:

1. What are Herat University EFL teachers' and students' attitudes about the role of oral corrective feedback?
2. What are HU EFL learners' preferences for OCF concerning type, timing, and source of feedback?
3. To what extent do EFL learners' OCF preferences match teachers' practice?

For the third research question, it is hypothesized that:

H₀. Teachers' OCF practices do not match students' preferences for OCF.

H₁. Teachers' OCF practice matches students' preferences for OCF.

Literature Review

In this section, the researcher attempts to elaborate on the concepts related to the current research by dividing the section into three main parts. The first part focuses on the general concept of “Feedback”. It aims to define what feedback is and its correlation with the field of learning and teaching. Once the term feedback is clarified it would move on to the main theme of the research “Oral Corrective Feedback” (OCF) by relating the term feedback with oral activity. It deals with the concept of “Speaking”. Lastly, the last part is assigned to the elucidation of the theoretical framework, the core of the study, assorted to carry out this study.

Conceptualizing Feedback

The term feedback, mostly known as comments on someone’s performance, has grabbed many researchers’ attention in the last two decades. It has been defined in several ways by different researchers through various sources. Merriam-Webster dictionary defines feedback as, “the conveyance of corrective information regarding a process in comparison to the source.” Feedback is a procedure where learners tend to enhance the quality of their performance by understanding the information provided by a teacher, peer, book, parent, etc. (Carless, 2015; Hattie & Timperely, 2007; Shute, 2008). This is to say, it is implemented for betterment in future tasks. Feedback is considered to be a crucial factor most importantly in a classroom setting, generally defined as a set of reviews, apprehensions, and recommendations mostly provided by a teacher with the intention of enhancement in the tasks being carried out by learners. Moreover, it not only helps in reducing learners’ errors but also develops better interaction between teachers and students (Sultana, 2015).

Types of Feedback

Written Feedback: As the name implies written feedback is given in the form of writing on students’ worksheets which students can refer to from time to time to get the correct form of the error or mistake. Teachers aim of providing feedback on students’ writing according to Harmer (2006) is to effect students’ language practice in the future by commenting on its use in the past as cited in (Sultana, 2015). This feedback provides students with a record of the level of their progress in writing either by stating praising remarks, such as; “Well done!”, “Excellent!”, “Good job”, etc on the well-written copies or remarks and suggestions, such as; “Redo” (asking the student to go over the problems marked in their notes without further assistance. The work is done by the students themselves), “Corrective feedback” (along with the identification of the errors students are provided with the correct forms on their worksheets) for the need of revising the points requiring improvement for the future tasks (Nassima & Dihia, 2016).

Oral Feedback: The concept of feedback applied in verbal dealing defines oral feedback. It deals with the listeners’ reactions to the speaker’s utterances. Nassima and Dihia (2016) define oral feedback in a learning process as teachers’ verbal comments on the accuracy of students’ speech right at the moment of speaking. The procedure of oral feedback can take place among individuals; teacher and student or student and student or be more group-focused, involving the mistake the student committed during the learning process. As a result of receiving oral

feedback, students get to know the areas of deficiency in their ability and the points that they need to improve more (Harmer, 2006).

Positive and Negative Feedback

Positive Feedback: For EFL Students receiving compliments, praise, and encouragement from their instructors is an essential factor to get assured about their progress in the language learning process. This is what makes positive feedback a crucial technique in foreign language acquisition and development. Rydahl (2005) defines positive feedback as praising words or compliments passed from the instructor to the learner due to their success in accomplishing the given tasks and it makes them feel more confident.

Negative Feedback: Negative feedback refers to the instructor's reaction toward the learner's inaccurate performance, which might come along with the instructions about rectifying the errors (Bower, 2005). Negative feedback is classified into two types by Veliz (2008); preemptive feedback (preventing learners from making mistakes by providing the necessary instructions beforehand) and reactive feedback (correcting learners after the mistakes have been made by them). All in all, this feedback is aimed to correct the errors made by foreign language learners during the language learning process.

Corrective Feedback

Since there is no one specific strategy for correcting the errors made by EFL learners, scholars have defined the term corrective feedback (CF) in multiple ways. Calafato, 2013 describes corrective feedback as "Teacher's behavior after an error that at least attempts to inform students of the truth of the error to make a substantial effort to solicit a revised student response." Corrective feedback is considered to be a form of negative feedback. It is the opposite of positive feedback because it is not an appraisal of the learner's accurate performance, but rather a reaction to the inaccurate performance (Ellis, 2009). The author also added that a teacher's reaction toward a learner's inaccurate performance can take several forms.

Explicit vs. Implicit Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback is applied by instructors in a language learning setting to grab students' attention towards their erroneous output (Suzuki, 2004). Lyster and Ranta, (1997); Bower and Kawaguchi (2011); Ellis et al. (2009) classified the term corrective feedback into two types; explicit and implicit corrective feedback. Explicit corrective feedback refers to the learners' immediate correction. While implicit corrective feedback refers to indirect error correction where instructors provide learners with some hints to move them towards correcting their errors by themselves.

Formative and Summative Feedback

Formative and summative feedback contribute in different ways to the larger goals of language acquisition. Formative assessment identifies learners' learning level during the course while summative assessment is considered as learners' learning level evaluation at the end of the course (Zook, 2021). This indicates that formative feedback provides strategies and resources

for development during the period of language acquisition on improving learners' future performance. On the other hand, summative feedback is the evaluation of learners' past errors which determines their capabilities (Alpine, 2004).

Errors and Mistakes

Errors and mistakes which are mostly taken as synonyms of each other have quite different definitions. However both refer to the erroneous output of the target language {English}, errors are made due to not knowing the rules, being unaware of the correct form, and to fail in using the right system of the target language that cannot be self-corrected and require instructions on being corrected though mistakes are made due to temporary lapses or memory, hesitation, slips of the tongue or confusion that can be self-corrected once the learners pay more attention and be more careful (Novianti, 2013 & Erdogan,2005).

Importance of Identifying Errors

Since the target language is different from the native language it is common for language learners to come across difficulties and make mistakes or even errors while acquiring the target language because making mistakes and errors are part of the language learning process. This makes the identification of errors identical. Huang, (2012) indicates that "errors serve as an important means for teachers and researchers to observe the learner's learning process and learning strategies" (p. 31). It is a helpful source for evaluating learners' learning process and lets the teachers identify their student's weaknesses in the target language acquisition.

Oral Corrective Feedback

According to Ellis et al. (2006), Oral corrective feedback (OCF) refers to the reaction toward a learner's inaccurate utterance which might include an indication, provision, or meta-linguistic information about the error. OCF is an essential factor in second or foreign language acquisition (Lyster et al., 2013; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Nassaji, 2016, 2017). OCF can take different forms and it is generally classified into six main forms namely: explicit corrections, recasts, elicitation, repetition, clarification requests, and metalinguistic feedback (Brown, 2016; Ha & Nguyen 2021; Sheen, 2007). Learners' preferences differ considering the different types of OCF. OCF can either be delayed (once students finish their speaking, mostly form-focused) or immediate (interrupting the student right at the moment of speaking, mostly meaning or fluency- focused) (Yoshida, 2010; Ellis, 2009). Along with the type and timing the source of feedback is also noteworthy. OCF can come from the instructor, or peer students themselves. Whilst different sources might help out in different contexts teachers are more often preferred as sources of OCF (Martin & Alvarez, 2017; Tasedemir & Arslan, 2018). However, some researchers have shown self-correction more effective in developing the target language (Lyster, 2004; Ferris, 2006).

Students' and Teachers' Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback

There are some mixed findings in terms of teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF types. For instance, elucidating some of the results from the studies conducted in ESL and EFL classes; research by Lee (2013) showed that explicit error correction was the most

preferred type of OCF in US advanced ESL classes whilst the meta-linguistic type of OCF was the least preferred one. On the other hand, the findings of a study conducted in Singapore revealed something completely opposing Lee’s study. It indicated that the meta-linguistic type of OCF was the highly preferred type of error correction among secondary and tertiary ESL classes (Oladejo, 1993). Researchers conducted research implementing the same criterion in EFL classes. To point out some of the findings; the research conducted by Roothood and Breeze (2016) in EFL classes showed that explicit OCF including the meta-linguistic type of OCF was preferred by learners. The study conducted by Brown (2009) points out a major mismatch in teachers' and students’ perceptions of OCF. The teacher according to his study tended to avoid the explicit type of OCF due to his conception that this type of OCF may undermine the communicative process on the contrary students highly preferred those form-based error corrections.

OCF timing is also considered to be a contradictory issue, as Ha et al. (2021) reports that Vietnamese students preferred on-spot correction while teachers considered this type of CF as a disruption on students’ fluency and as a means of demotivation. In addition, preferences regarding the source of correction also varies among students and teachers as Yoshida (2008) spotted that Japanese EFL learners preferred self-correction strategy more than other strategies. Therefore, as Brown (2009) suggests OCF methods should be adapted as per students’ perceptions if the aim is to enhance students’ oral proficiency otherwise such mismatches may end up having negative effects on the target language learning process.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of oral corrective feedback is indicated by Lyster and Ranta (1997). It has been classified into six types each elucidated through details and examples within the Table 1 provided below:

Table 1

Lyster and Ranta Corrective Feedback Types

OCF type	Details	Example
Explicit	Instructor indicates student’s utterance was not correct and provides the correct form.	S: He didn’t studied for exam. T: It’s not “he didn’t studied” but “he didn’t <u>study</u> ”.
Recast	Instructor repeats a student’s incorrect utterance without pointing it out provides the correction.	S: Can I give the test? T: What? S: Can I give the test? T: You mean; can I take the test?
Clarification Requests (CR)	Refers to the Instructor’s indication towards student’s erroneous utterance. The student is asked to repeat what they just said.	T: How often do you go to library? S: Once for a week. T: Pardon me? (CR) S: Once for a week. T: Once in a week.

Meta-linguistic cue	The instructor provides information and explanation regarding students' erroneous utterances instead of directly correcting them.	S: He work part time. T: You need to use s/es/ies with third person singular in present tense.
Elicitation	The instructor elicits the correct answer from the student by asking questions, asking the student for reformulation, and pausing to allow them to fill in the given blank.	S: My sister washes the dish. T: Excuse me, she washes the.....?? S: Dishes?
Repetition	The instructor repeats the student's error with a change in intonation.	S: They was..... T: THEY WAS....? Was is used with singular pronouns, isn't it? You see the error? With plural pronouns we use WERE.

(Adapted from Ellis, 2009: p 8-9; Sheen & Ellis 2011: p. 594; Lyster et al, 2013: p. 5; examples provided by the researcher)

Oral corrective feedback had been classified into 16 types by Fanselow (1997) which included traits such as vocal emphasis, gestures, etc. However based on Lyster and Ranta taxonomy (1997) OCF is divided into six types, namely: Explicit, recast, clarification request, meta-linguistic clue, Elicitation and repetition, which has been used as a guide in considering oral corrective feedback. OCF types as explained by Ananda, et al. (2017) are:

1. Explicit correction refers to the instructors' indication towards students' erroneous utterance and the explicit provision of the correct form. In this type of OCF lecturer explicitly indicates that the students' utterance was incorrect and provides the correct form.
For example:
S: He didn't studied for exam.
T: It's not "he didn't studied" but "he didn't study."
2. Recast is more of an implicit type of feedback. In this type of feedback instructors' do not repeat the erroneous utterance by using phrases like "Oh, you mean...", "you should say..." Instead, they replace the error with the correct form without pointing it out.
For example:
S: Can I give the test?
T: You can take the test.
3. Clarification request, in this type if OCF students are asked to repeat what they just said by using phrases like "Pardon me? Excuse me?, Again?". This is an indication towards whether students' utterance has been misunderstood by the instructor.
For Example:
T: How often do you go to library?

S: Once for a week.

T: Pardon me? (CR)

S: Once for a week.

T: Once in a week.

4. Meta-linguistic clue, instructor provides information and explanation regarding students' erroneous utterances instead of directly correcting them. It includes comments, explanations, information or questions related to the students' erroneous utterance without explicitly correcting the error.

For example:

S: He work part time.

T: You need to use s/es/ies with third person singular in present tense.

5. Elicitation, in this type of OCF technique instructor elicits the correct form from the students by asking questions related to the error. As mentioned by Ananda, et al. (2017) there are at least three ways lecturers use to elicit the correct form from the student. First, asking questions like "What do we say to someone who help us?" Second, Elicit completion, pausing to allow the student complete the utterance "She washes the" lastly, asking the student to reformulate the utterance "Can you say that again?"

For example:

S: My sister washes the dish.

T: Excuse me, she washes the.....?

6. Repetition, in this type of OCF lectures draw students' attention towards their error to indicate there is a problem. Instructor repeats student's error with a change in intonation in order to make them aware of their erroneous utterance.

For example:

S: They was.....

T: THEY WAS....?

S: They were

To summarize, the previous studies have provided some preliminary findings on the opinions of teachers and students regarding different aspects of OCF. However, there is limited research on their beliefs regarding feedback types, timings and the source of feedback. Moreover, there is lack of exploration on this topic in EFL settings. Therefore, there is a need for more research in this regard to gain a deeper understanding of teachers' and students' beliefs about OCF in a wider range of context. The current study aims to address this gap in knowledge.

Methodology

In this section, the researcher aims to provide a detailed explanation of the approaches and techniques applied while conducting this study. This section is divided into four main parts. The first part focuses on the context of the research and explains where the study is conducted. After establishing a clear research context, the second part delves into explaining the research design which elucidates the methods used to carry out the research. The third part of the study provides a clear insight into the

background and number of the participants who participated in this study. Lastly, this section probes into the instruments used to implement this study.

Research Context

This study was conducted in the English department at Herat University, Afghanistan. The context for the research is selected through the convenience sampling, since the author studied and taught at Herat University, Afghanistan where English is taught as a foreign language at different proficiency levels in separate classes ranging from low-level ‘Freshman’ to the high level ‘Senior’. Since the current study is mainly focused on the OCF, speaking classes and teachers have been investigated to conduct the study.

Research Design

This research paper intends to investigate EFL teachers’ and students’ attitudes toward oral corrective feedback. Since the theme is concerned with investigating the perception of both groups the researcher employed a mixed method design that combines the qualitative and quantitative data collection tools to gain an in-depth understanding of their perceptions, ensure its credibility in reporting, and guarantee its flexibility. Mixed-method design is known to minimize the weaknesses and maximize the strengths of qualitative and quantitative data alone for a better understanding of the phenomena (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010; Riazi & Candlin, 2014; Creswell & Clark, 2017) as cited in (Ha & Nguyen, 2021). In addition, the data comprised a questionnaire (set of closed-ended questions) with 40 EFL students and a semi-structured interview (a set of open-ended questions) with 5 of the EFL teachers after obtaining consent from all the participants.

Participants

The participants of this study were 40 female sophomore students and 5 EFL teachers of the English department of Herat University. Purposive sampling was used to collect the data from the participants. Purposive sampling allows researchers to gather a significant amount of information focusing on particular characteristics of a population that are of interest and describes the effects their findings have on the participants (Rai & Thapa, 2015). Sophomore students were chosen as the participants of this study due to their English learning backgrounds, mixed proficiency levels, being accustomed to teachers’ teaching styles and having passed the basic level of speaking (as freshmen). For more information, see Table 2.

Table 2

Student Participants’ Demographics

No.	Participants	Gender	Age	Years of English language instruction	School Year
1.	40	Female	18-24	4-6 years	Sophomore

Moreover, for the interview purpose, the researcher chose teachers who have been taking speaking classes, with an experience range of 5 to 15 years, and are more acquainted with the oral corrective feedback strategies and are referred to as; Teacher 1 to Teacher 5 in this study (See Table 3).

Table 3

Teacher Participants' Demographics

No.	Participants	Gender	Years of Teaching experience	Degree
1	Teacher 1	Male	10 years	MA in TESL*
2	Teacher 2	Female	9 years	MA in TESL
3	Teacher 3	Male	10 years	MA in TESL
4	Teacher 4	Female	8 years	MA in TESOL**
5	Teacher 5	Female	6 years	MA in TESL

*TESL= Teaching English as a Second language

**TESOL=Teaching English to Speakers of Other languages

Instruments

The data in this mixed-method study was collected through two instruments; a questionnaire for the students which was partly adapted from Saeb (2014) and partly organized by the researcher per the research questions of the study. Participants were assured about their confidentiality by not asking privacy related questions. It contained 19 items categorized into 5 categories to determine students' preferences of the amount of receiving oral corrective feedback (OCF), their perception about being corrected, the type of OCF strategy preferred by them the most, the timing of OCF, and the source of feedback. The questionnaires were handed to one of the teachers to check for the validity of the items. Moreover, the questionnaire was piloted before further analysis to check its reliability. The pilot study's findings revealed that the questionnaire items had high internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.88$), which can be used for subsequent research. Moreover; the reliability statistics indicated that the questionnaire had high internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.89$).

The second instrument, a semi-structured interview (open-ended questions) adapted and adopted from Sultana (2015) concerning teachers' perceptions and attitudes towards OCF in general and specifically at the levels of (fluency and accuracy) via 13 interview questions with the option of eliciting opinions, where the teachers could dwell upon their responses and provide a deeper insight of their opinions, was provided. Participants were assured about their privacy by not mentioning any names or personal information. Instead, labelling them (as Teacher 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). After being granted the permission, the forms were sent online to the teachers to be worked out as per their schedule timing and were received online in written forms within 4 days.

Data Analysis

This mixed-method study combines the quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection and analysis. The quantitative data were processed using Microsoft Excel worksheet. Descriptive statistics for the obtained data were analysed to find out the mean, standard deviation, and variance to evaluate students' perceptions regarding the OCF strategies used by their teachers in speaking classes. Moreover, the qualitative data obtained from the interview questions asked from the teachers were qualitatively analyzed using thematic analysis and coding to categorize the data into major themes to point out the matches and mismatches,

varied perceptions, and attitudes of the EFL learners and teachers regarding oral corrective feedback. The results and findings are presented in the following sections.

Results

This section presents descriptive statistics about teachers' and students' attitudes towards OCF. The result section is divided into two parts. The first part focuses on explaining the results of the students' questionnaire focusing on the amount, perception, types, timings and source of the OCF. The second part elucidates the results of the teachers' interview pinpointing the importance, preferences and strategies to employ OCF in EFL context.

Results of the Students' Questionnaire

The researcher gathered the data for this section using a questionnaire (close-ended questions) to investigate EFL learners' attitudes toward OCF strategies. Participants of the study completed a questionnaire, divided into 5 categories, to record their responses concerning their preferences and attitudes towards oral corrective feedback, its amount, strategies, timing, and source.

Table 4 presents the participants' responses regarding the amount of oral corrective feedback (OCF) provided by their teachers. The items in this category of the questionnaire included 'When my teacher corrects all my speaking errors, I do not repeat them anymore,' 'I want my teacher to correct all my major errors but not the minor ones when I am speaking,' 'I want my teacher to correct only the errors that interfere with communicating ideas,' and 'I do not want my teacher to correct my speaking errors and answer only to the ideas and content.'

The statistics for participants' perceptions towards different amounts of oral corrective feedback display that for the item '*Correction of all speaking Errors*' the mean was $M=4.52$ with the variance of $Var. = 1.025$ and a standard deviation of $SD=1.01$ For the item '*Correction of major errors not minor ones*' the mean value was $M=3.5$ with the Variance of $Var = 1.89$ and a standard deviation of $SD = 1.37$. However, for the item '*No error correction only responds ideas and content*' the mean value was $M=1.85$ with the variance of $Var. = 1.36$ and the standard deviation of $SD = 1.16$. Hence, the results show that correction avoids repetition of the error in students though the students want their teachers to correct their major errors more than the minor ones and they expect their teachers to notice their speaking errors too besides answering the ideas and the content.

Table 4

Different Amounts of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) Preferred by EFL Learners

Descriptive statistics	Correction of all speaking Errors	Correction of major errors not minor ones	No error correction only respond ideas and content
Mean	4.525	3.5	1.85
Var.	1.025	1.89	1.36
SD	1.012	1.37	1.16

Furthermore, the questionnaire provides insight into ‘Students’ perceptions about receiving OCF.’ Table 5 analyses students’ perceptions related to the amount of OCF they receive from their teachers.

The statistics for participants’ perceptions about receiving OCF’ display that for the item ‘Getting all errors corrected helps remembering the correct form’ the mean was M=3.77 with the variance of Var. = 2.17 and a standard deviation of SD=1.47. For the item ‘Excessive correction causes diffidence’ the mean value was M=2.675 with the Variance of Var = 2.63 and a standard deviation of SD = 1.62. For the item ‘Error correction helps avoiding errors’ the mean value was M=3.85 with the variance of Var. = 1.56 and the standard deviation of SD = 1.25. In addition, for the item ‘Self-correction preferences’ the mean value was M=3.2 with the variance of Var. = 2.52 and the standard deviation of SD = 1.58. Thus, the results show that students remember the correct form once corrected by their teachers although constant correction makes them diffident. It also reveals that students seldom repeat the mistakes once being corrected and they also want their teachers to give them a chance to find out the mistakes they have committed by themselves and let themselves correct those mistakes.

Table 5

Students’ Perceptions of Receiving OCF

Descriptive statistics	Getting all errors corrected helps remembering the correct form	Excessive correction causes diffidence	Error correction helps avoiding errors	Self-correction preferences
Mean	3.77	2.67	3.85	3.2
Var.	2.17	2.63	1.56	2.52
SD	1.47	1.62	1.25	1.58

Furthermore, the questionnaire expands on the learners' preferences for the types of oral corrective feedback strategies used by their teachers. Table 6 points out the most preferred types of OCF to the least preferred types of OCF methods.

The statistics for ‘types of OCF preferred by EFL learners demonstrate that for the item ‘Explicit correction’ the mean was M=3.9 with the variance of Var. = 1.63 and a standard deviation of SD=1.27. For the item ‘Recast’ the mean value was M=3.425 with the Variance of Var = 1.94 and a standard deviation of SD = 1.39. For the item ‘Clarification Request’ the mean value was M=3.7 with the variance of Var. = 1.49 and the standard deviation of SD = 1.22. In addition, for the item ‘Meta-linguistic clue’ the mean value was M=4.075 with the variance of Var. = 1.25 and the standard deviation of SD = 1.11.

Table 6

Types of OCF Preferred by EFL Learners

	Explicit OCF	Recast	Clarification Request	Meta-linguistic clue
Mean	3.9	3.425	3.7	4.075
Var.	1.63	1.94	1.49	1.25
SD	1.27	1.39	1.22	1.11

For the item ‘*Elicitation*’ the mean value was $M=4.42$ with the variance of $Var. = 0.71$ and the standard deviation of $SD = 0.84$. Moreover, for the item ‘*Repetition*’ the mean value was $M=3.3$ with the variance of $Var. = 2.36$ and the standard deviation of $SD = 1.53$. Therefore, the results represent that students prefer being corrected while making mistakes in speaking but the level of their preference for each type of Oral corrective feedback differs from the most preferred type of OCF to the least. Results show that ‘*Elicitation*’ is the first and most preferred type of OCF preferred by the students, ‘*Meta-linguistic cue*’ the second, ‘*Explicit corrective feedback*’ the third, ‘*Clarification requests*’ the fourth, ‘*Repetition*’ the fifth, and ‘*Recast*’ is the sixth and the least preferred type of OCF preferred by the students (See Table 7).

Table 7

Types of OCF Preferred by EFL Learners

Descriptive statistics	Elicitation	Repetition
Mean	4.42	3.3
Var.	0.71	2.36
SD	0.84	1.53

Moving forth, the questionnaire defines the timing of OCF preferred by EFL learners’ and Table 9 describes the statistics related to the timing of OCF. Analysis of Table 8 is given as follows.

The statistics for ‘*Timing of OCF preferred by EFL learners*’ describes that for the item ‘*on the spot*’ the mean was $M=2.45$ with the variance of $Var. 1.89$ and a standard deviation of $SD=1.37$. For the item ‘*Immediate correction causes interruption and nervousness*’ the mean value was $M=4.075$ with the Variance of $Var = 1.35$ and a standard deviation of $SD = 1.16$. Moreover, for the item ‘*Delayed*’ the mean value was $M=3.37$ with the variance of $Var. = 2.65$ and the standard deviation of $SD = 1.62$. On this account, the statistics prove that students do not prefer spot correction because it interrupts them and makes them nervous. However, the majority agree upon being corrected once they finish speaking.

Table 8

Timing of OCF preferred by EFL learners

Descriptive statistics	On-spot error correction	Immediate correction causes interruption and nervousness	Delayed error correction
Mean	2.45	4.07	3.37
Var.	1.89	1.35	2.65
SD	1.37	1.16	1.62

The last section of the questionnaire indicates ‘the source of oral corrective feedback.’ It explains what source is preferred by the students as the source of being corrected. Table 9 clarifies students’ attitudes toward different sources of OCF.

The statistics for 'Source of oral corrective feedback' points out that for the item 'Self-correction.' the mean was M=3.45 with the variance of Var. 2.1 and a standard deviation of SD=1.44. For the item 'Instructor correcting student's errors' the mean value was M=2.82 with the Variance of Var. = 2.50 and a standard deviation of SD = 1.58. As well as for the item 'Classmates correcting each other's' errors' the mean value was M= 2.6 with the variance of Var. = 2.91 and the standard deviation of SD = 1.70. The result from the statistics analysis justifies that they learn better if provided the self-correction chances and they also prefer being corrected by the teacher rather than their classmates.

Table 9

Source of oral corrective feedback

Descriptive statistics	Self-correction	Instructor correcting student's errors	Classmates correcting each other's' errors
Mean	3.45	2.825	2.6
Var.	2.1	2.507051	2.912821
SD	1.449138	1.583367	1.706699

Results of the Teachers' Interview

The researcher used the interview as the second data collection tool. EFL teachers were interviewed who have had enough experience teaching English especially taking speaking classes. The interview was built upon a set of open-ended questions that helped the researcher to gain a deeper understanding of the central phenomena (OCF) and bring up more details to answer the research questions.

The interview questions spotlighted three main themes regarding the implementation of OCF. The first theme concentrates on the importance of feedback in general. The second theme focuses on the preferences regarding different types of OCF. Lastly, the third theme reflects on different strategies in terms of implementing OCF (See Table 10).

Table 10

Themes and codes

No	Themes	Codes
1.	Importance of feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improves speaking skill - helps in identifying problem areas - help students in the language learning process
2.	Preferred mode of feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - explicit - Clarification request - Elucidating - Repetition
3.	Strategies to employ OCF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Providing both on-the-spot and delayed feedback - Explicit corrections - recast and clarification

As per the classification of feedback into oral feedback and written feedback, it is indicated that there is a strong bond tied between the teaching/learning process and providing feedback whether in the form of writing or speaking. It is indicated that teachers believe feedback is very important. None of the teachers denied the importance of oral corrective feedback; they all consider it very important and provided different reasons, as follows;

According to T1, T2 and T3 Oral corrective feedback enabled students to notice their mistakes and identify the areas of improvement while speaking. Furthermore, according to T1, it helped them avoid repeating the same mistakes over and over, "Since class is the place to learn, it is better to provide the students with what they miss or lack, give them the feedback they need so they do not make the same mistake or try to correct themselves." The author also considered OCF to have a vital role in students' development in the language learning process. In addition, T2 and T5 mentioned that OCF which the teacher provides should sound supportive rather than critical to maintain the motivation and confidence among the students. Based on T2's response, "It is very important for the teacher to provide just the right amount of corrective feedback to maintain motivation and also help the learner realize their mistakes." As mentioned by T5, "Oral corrective Feedback should sound supportive in order to correct students' errors and it is very important how the teacher uses OCF to motivate students improve their confidence."

Considering different approaches to OCF, the researcher figured out that teachers used different approaches to correct their students' erroneous utterances. However, 'explicit correction' was the strategy used by the teachers more often. T1, "I prefer to point out the error. This will help the speaker, and of course the other students to understand the error and learn the reasons why it was an error." T3, "I use the correct form instead of their mistakes." and T4, "I use approaches that meet the needs of my students' during learning, I use explicit method and sometimes implicit one." Based on the records from the participants they preferred explicit correction due to the following reasons:

*Direct correction helped the speaker and other students to understand the error

* Explicit correction helped them know why it was an error.

Moreover, OCF strategies were considered to be situational by T2, T4, and T5. T2 preferred to use different OCF strategies although the participant pointed towards the 'clarification request' strategy because according to her it not only helped the speaker notice the error but the whole class and the participant emphasized giving general feedback rather than individual. According to T4 and T5, the OCF strategies were situational and they said, "There is no 'one' specific strategy to be used." Based on the outcomes of responses to this question besides other corrective methods used by the teachers 'Explicit corrective feedback' was used the most followed by 'Clarification request' and 'Elicitation.'

Grammar known as the system of a language that deals with accuracy more than fluency (Bui & Skehan, 2018). Learners' grammatical errors were preferred to be corrected by the teachers in different ways. 4 teachers (T1, T3, T4, and T5) out of 5 teachers preferred using 'explicit correction' which is 'Instructor indicates student's utterance which is not correct and provides the correct form.' While T2 indicated the importance of 'recast' as a form of correcting grammatical errors, "I use recast and request for clarification when it comes to grammatical mistakes." In this form of correction 'Instructor repeats a student's incorrect

utterance without pointing it out provides the correction.’ Hence, ‘Explicit Oral corrective feedback’ was preferred more than other forms of correction.

Moreover, pronunciation deals with fluency rather than accuracy (Bui & Skehan, 2018). Learners’ pronunciation errors were corrected through different types of OCF strategies. Elucidating the responses recorded from the participants, the approaches used for correcting students’ erroneous utterances dealing with fluency rather than accuracy are using the strategies; namely, ‘explicit correction; preferred by T1’, ‘repetition; preferred by T2’, ‘elicitation; preferred by T3 and T5’, and ‘clarification; preferred by T4.’ As a result, for erroneous utterances dealing with pronunciation ‘elicitation’ is preferred more than the other types of OCF types. In this type of oral correction, ‘Instructor elicits the correct answer from the student by asking questions, asking the student for reformulation and pausing to allow them to fill in the given blank.’

The Phrases such as *“sorry”, “pardon me”, and “excuse me”* are mostly related to ‘clarification request’, ‘recast’ and ‘elicitation’ forms of oral correction. Based on the teachers’ responses T1, T3, and T4 stated that they ‘sometimes’ used these strategies which shows the lack of using ‘clarification request’, ‘recast’, and ‘elicitation while correcting students speaking mistakes. As a response to this question, T5 replied ‘No’ and added, “I do not use these phrases because it increases teachers’ talking time.” On the other hand, T2 mentioned the uses of these phrases mostly ‘recast’ to allow students to take a second chance to rethink their sentences and notice the mistakes in the sentence they have produced. Thus, the responses recorded for this question show these phrases are not used quite often by EFL teachers which leads to the inference that they mostly used direct or explicit correction.

The phrases *“It’s not X but Y”, “You should say”, “We say, X, not Y”, and “Oh, you mean...”* are mostly related to ‘explicit correction.’ Based on the teachers’ responses, T1, T2, and T3 stated that they used these strategies. Although, T4 stated the use of these phrases as ‘sometimes’; whereas, T5 replied to this question as, “No” and added, “I do not use these phrases because it increases teachers’ talking time”, the majority agreed upon using these phrases. All in all, ‘explicit’ correction is preferred by most teachers as a useful correcting strategy. On the other hand, repetition is when the ‘Instructor repeats student’s error with a change in intonation and explains the correct form.’ T1, T2, T3, and T4 use repetition as a form of correction most often. This proves that ‘Repetition OCF strategy’ is considered useful and is used by EFL teachers in their classes

The researcher intended to evaluate the usage of the ‘explicit’ OCF strategy which seems to be preferred by the majority of the EFL teachers as a useful OCF method that they used to correct their students’ speaking mistakes. T1, T2, T3, and T4 stated that they highly value the explicit OCF strategy; according to them, this method of Oral corrective feedback is preferred and implemented more than any other method. In comparison to other oral corrective feedback types ‘explicit’ OCF strategy seems to be used more often. As T3 states, “I use the correct form instead of their mistakes” which determines the preference of using direct correction or ‘explicit correction’ more than other OCF types.

Teacher participants indicated that the use of instant and delayed feedback is situational-based. However, they mentioned some pros and cons related to both ‘delayed correction’ and ‘on-spot correction’. T1 considered both timing strategies useful according to him on-spot correction helped students correct their errors right at the moment they occurred although it may lead to disappointment and anxiety. However, delayed correction he said, “It does not interfere with speakers’ fluency” According to the points explained above ‘delayed’ correction is inferred to be preferred more. T2 and T4 consider both timings useful based on

the situation as T2 elucidated, “On-spot correction helps the speakers correct their mistakes while they still remember it. While delayed feedback provides the teacher with the opportunity to provide more examples and details which can end up having long-lasting results.” In addition, T3 and T5 considered the OCF timing situational although T3 mentioned, “On-spot correction can ruin the fluency of the students if it happens all the time.” This analysis implied the preference for ‘delayed feedback’ more than ‘on-spot feedback.’

As per the analysis of the participants’ responses ‘Explicit correction’ receives 2 votes. T1 and T4 prefer to provide explicit oral corrective feedback. On the other hand, T2 relates it to the proficiency level of the learners, “For lower levels, there might be a need to use repetition more often than other forms of feedback; however, for intermediate and advanced learners teachers can use strategies such as asking for clarification and recast more often,” T3 states the OCF strategies ‘Situational’ while T5 denoted ‘Elicitation’ to be the best strategy as explained, “ I prefer elicitation strategy because it helps students find their errors by themselves.” To sum up, ‘Explicit corrective feedback’ was the first and most preferred OCF, ‘Repetition’ the second, and ‘elicitation’ the third. Least used OCF strategies were determined to be ‘recast and clarification’ whereas the form that was not mentioned to be used by any of the teachers was ‘Meta-linguistic OCF.’

Discussion

The term ‘Feedback’ in general is referred to ‘comments on someone’s performance’ when applied in verbal dealing it defines the oral feedback. Nassima and Dihia (2016) define oral feedback in a learning process as teachers’ verbal comments on the accuracy of students’ speech. In line with the hundreds of studies conducted in this field, the current study intended to investigate the EFL teachers’ and students’ attitudes toward oral corrective feedback. Investigating the attitudes of two different groups; students’ and teachers’ the study figured out some matches and mismatches among the type, amount, timing, and source of OCF.

The first research question focused on examining teachers’ and students’ attitudes towards OCF. One of the significant findings of the current study referred to the positive attitudes of both groups towards OCF. It found out that 90% of the participants are willing to receive oral corrective feedback based on the participants’ agreement to the statement, “when my teacher corrects all my speaking errors I do not repeat them anymore.” 75% strongly agreed and 15 % agreed all in all 90% of the participants expressed a positive attitude towards getting their errors corrected. Furthermore, none of the teachers denied the importance of oral corrective feedback; they all consider it very important by choosing the option “Yes” to the question, ‘Do you think that feedback is very important for the students?’ This finding is aligned to the previous studies conducted earlier (e.g., Ha et al., 2021; Kim & Mostafa, 2021; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). Schulz (1996), for example, investigated and compared students’ and teachers’ beliefs regarding the benefits of corrective feedback in eight American language classes and found out that 90% percent of the students in her study expressed their desire to have their errors corrected. The current study revealed that both groups; teachers and students, have generally expressed positive attitudes towards OCF.

The second research question focused on students’ preferences for OCF concerning type, timing, and source of feedback. The current study points out a major mismatch between teachers’ and students’ preferences regarding the type of OCF. The results from the students’ questionnaire resulted; ‘Elicitation’ as the first most preferred type of OCF preferred by (92.5%) of the students, ‘Meta-linguistic cue’ as the second (85%), ‘Explicit corrective feedback’ the

third (77.5%), 'Clarification request' the fourth (65%), 'Repetition' the fifth (60%) and 'Recast' is the sixth (57%) least preferred type of OCF preferred by the students. However, the findings of the teachers' interview questions revealed; 'Explicit correction' as the first most preferred OCF strategy, 'Clarification request' as the second, and 'Elicitation' as the third. This indicates that students not only preferred to be told about the area of mistake but also were willing to receive explanations regarding their erroneous utterances in order not to repeat those errors later. Whereas, the findings from teachers' questionnaire proved that teachers do not use 'Meta-linguistic' correction in their classes which is the second most preferred type of correction (85%) based on the findings from students' questionnaire. Whilst, the finding from this study contradicts the studies conducted in ESL and EFL classes; by Lee (2013) which showed that explicit error correction was the most preferred type of OCF in US advanced ESL classes whereas the meta-linguistic type of OCF was the least preferred one. The findings in this study state that while the teachers may prefer going for less-time consuming OCF types, students prefer being provided with details and explanations.

Despite the mismatches discovered in terms of types of OCF the findings of the current study revealed a similar perception of both groups regarding the timing of the OCF. The current study pointed out that the majority of students prefer delayed correction more than on-spot correction which is proved by the disagreement of 70% of the participants to the term, "I believe my teacher should correct my speaking mistakes immediately (on the spot)." This finding is aligned with the findings of (Li et al, 2016) who pointed out some disadvantages to immediate feedback like, effecting students confident and causing anxiety as found by Ölmezer-Öztürk and Öztürk (2016).

Teachers however revealed a mixed opinion concerning OCF timing and called it 'situational-based'. They also pointed delayed feedback as a more useful strategy to avoid the sense of demotivation, diffidence, and anxiety in students. This finding contradicts the study conducted by (Brown, 2009; Davis, 2003). As explained by them; most of the students in the interviews were not concerned about the possible negative effects of immediate feedback and Ancker's results (2000), revealed that most students favor immediate correction. Instead, this study is consistent with the findings of the study conducted by Sanavi and Nematı (2014) who declared that, "Corrective feedback should be delayed to enable learners to understand their errors naturally leading to self-repair."

The third research question focused on the extent of correspondence among EFL students' OCF preferences to their teachers' OCF practice in the class. The results indicated some matches and mismatches between the perceptions of both groups regarding the amount of OCF in terms of amount, types, timing, and source of OCF. Because some similarities existed between teachers' and students' perceptions towards OCF, it was not void of differences. The study revealed significant differences between the types of OCF strategies preferred by students and practiced by teachers. Contrary to their teacher, students in this study were found to be in favour of 'Elicitation' and 'Meta-linguistic' OCF strategies the most. Although, the highly preferred OCF strategy by teachers is the 'Explicit' OCF strategy and none of the teachers mentioned using 'Meta-linguistic' OCF type.

Lastly, another finding of this study was related to the source of OCF. The current study stated self-correction as the most preferred source of correction. Majority of the students (62.5%) expressed their willingness of being provided the chance of self-correction which is linked to the elicitation type of OCF which may lead to better retention and long-lasting results. The second most proffered source of correction is stated to be 'teacher', preferred by (47.5%) of the students because commonly teachers are considered to be the

main source of correction as stated by the findings of researches conducted by Ölmezer-Öztürk and Öztürk (2016), Park (2010), Zhang and Rahimi (2014). Peer correction is the least preferred source may be due to uncertainty about the appropriate correction or embarrassment. The findings in this regard are also partly similar to the study conducted by Lee (2013) who found that participants preferred teacher over peer however the current study revealed self-correction preference among the students preferred more than any other source.

Conclusion

This study investigated Afghan EFL teachers' and students' attitudes towards OCF in the English department of Herat University, setting, revealing some matches and mismatches between teachers' and students' attitudes regarding OCF. Both groups considered OCF very important in the teaching/learning process. Though according to the students, continuous and constant feedback can end up making them nervous and demotivated. Moreover, teachers also insisted on the OCF being supportive and motivating. Both groups agreed upon the amount of OCF. However, a major discrepancy was noted between teachers' and students' attitudes regarding the types of OCF.

As mentioned above, teachers intended to use 'Explicit' OCF more than other types of OCF followed by 'Clarification request' and lastly, 'Elicitation' whereas students' preference was completely different. Students state; 'Elicitation' is the first most preferred OCF type, 'Meta linguistic cue' the second, and, 'Explicit' OCF the third preferred strategy. This shows what teachers consider on the first level is the third-degree correction for students. In addition, teachers did not even name; 'Meta-linguistic' OCF while for students it is the second most preferred type of OCF. No significant difference was noted in the timing of OCF between the teacher and the students.

While teachers expressed mixed feelings regarding the timing majority of them emphasized the usage of delayed feedback as a useful OCF strategy which was consistent with students' perception of OCF timing. Students also stated self-correction as the first most preferred OCF strategy and Teacher feedback as the second. Although the minority agreed upon the factor of peer feedback which seems to be related to uncertainty in terms of providing feedback.

Findings of both the result of the questionnaire and the interview questions have provided the researcher with the answers to the research questions which dealt with HU EFL teachers' and students' attitudes towards OCF, their preferences concerning type, time, and source of feedback, and also the matches and mismatches of students' OCF preferences with teachers' OCF practice. In addition to this, it confirms the null hypothesis, 'Teachers' OCF practice does not match students' preferences for OCF' and rejects the alternate hypothesis, 'Teachers' OCF practice matches students' preferences for OCF.'

All in all, OCF is an important factor in the teaching/learning process and plays a vital role in students' language learning process and in improving their performance. However, it is considered an important factor teachers need to be careful in using OCF amounts; in order not to demotivate and embarrass students, OCF types; as per students' requirements and preferences, and consider the types that best fit each individual's needs, OCF timing, not to interrupt students flow of speech and its source preference.

Pedagogical Implications

The current study proposes several pedagogical implications for both groups; teachers and students. An understanding of the current study focused on OCF can lead to better classroom interaction since teachers can provide OCF in more informed and effective ways. It can improve students' learning outcomes by elucidating the mismatches between teachers' and students' attitudes toward the types, amount, timing, and sources of OCF. It also introduces the teacher to a variety of OCF strategies to implement in the class as per students' preferences that could fulfil their needs and see the outcomes. Students can get to know different types of OCF and students can benefit from their teachers' plan justification and explanation. The implication suggested for future teachers is the current study provides them with a variation of OCF strategies. As mentioned by Knutsson and Köster (2020), "the key to success in delivering OCF lies in adapting its use to best suit the individual student's needs, and future teaching will be influenced by a customized approach for the individual learner."

Suggestions for the Future Research

In addition to the limitations mentioned above, some suggestions for the future researchers that can assure the accuracy of the study more are; firstly, in order to receive more valid and reliable results further research is needed to be conducted over a longer period of time which can help the researcher implement different OCF strategies in different classes with different levels and find out the most effective ones. Secondly, expanding this study over a larger scale can assure its validity and provide more promising results to be generalized over a larger population. Thirdly, in order to gain a better insight researcher can go for an interview from the students too to have a deeper understanding of the central phenomena and know about their feelings regarding OCF to support language learning. The researcher can also go for class observations and the implementations of different OCF strategies to find out the first hand data as a results. Further studies could also include; proficiency levels and individual learning styles.

Research Limitations

In spite of the contributions mentioned above the current study encountered several limitations that need to be mentioned. Firstly, the current study needed to be conducted in a short period of time that's why it doesn't include all the major areas of OCF and has tried to focus on some of the major themes. Secondly, this study is focused on a small number of participants. 40 sophomore students and 5 EFL teachers were selected which doesn't make the findings too promising to be implemented on a larger population. Increase in the number of the participants could have assured more accurate results. Thirdly, the current study is based on a questionnaire from the students and an interview from the teacher may not serve the requirements and complexities of this dynamic topic (Kim & Mostafa, 2021; Leontjev, 2016). The last but not the least, the researcher had no control over the interpretations and responses provided by the participants

Reference

- Ananda, D. R., Febriyanti, E. R., Yamin, M., & Mu'in, F. (2017). Students' preferences toward oral corrective feedback in speaking class at English department of Lambung Mangkurat university academic year 2015/2016. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(3), 176.
- Ancker, W. (2000). Errors and Corrective Feedback: Updated Theory and Classroom Practice. [In:] *English Teaching Forum*, 38 (4), 20-24
- Brown, A. (2009). Students and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: comparison of ideals. *Modern Language Journal*, 93, 46-60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00827.x>
- Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 436-458.
- Bui, G., & Skehan, P. (2018). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency. *The TESOL Encyclopaedia of English Language Teaching*, 1-7.
- Bower, J., & Kawagushi, S. (2011). Negotiation of Meaning and Corrective Feedback in Japanese. *English Modern Language Learning & Technology*.
- BESSAD, N., & SAIDANI, D. (2016). Teachers' Use and students' Attitudes toward Oral Corrective Feedback in Developing the Speaking Skill: The Case of Third Year Students of English at Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou (Doctoral dissertation, University Mouloud Mammeri of Tizi-Ouzou).
- Birjandi, P., & Tabatabaei, O. (2009). The impact of Gender on the incidence and quality of form-focused Episodes in task-based conversational feedback among EFL learners. *Asian EFL Journal*, 11(4), 220-240.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81–109.
- Borg, S. (2015). Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice. *Bloomsbury Publishing*.
- Carless, D. (2015). Exploring learning-oriented assessment processes. *Higher Education*, 69, 963-976.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. *Sage Publications*.
- Calafato, R. (2020). Evaluating teacher multilingualism across contexts and multiple languages: Validation and insights. *Heliyon*, 6(8).
- Calafato, R. (2023). Literature in language education: exploring teachers' beliefs, practices, creativity, and literary competence. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2022.2164500>
- Drew, F. L. To What Extent Do Student Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback Match Teacher Practice in the Chinese High School EFL Classroom? A Case Study.
- Davis, H. A. (2003). Conceptualizing the role and influence of student-teacher relationships on children's social and cognitive development. *Educational Psychologist*, 38(4), 207-234.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 339-368.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1).
- Erdoğan, V. (2005). Contribution of error analysis to foreign language teaching. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(2).

- Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short-and long-term effects of written error correction. *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*, 81104.
- Fanselow, J. F. (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. *Foreign Language Annals*, 10(5), 583-593.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2007). *Data elicitation for second and foreign language research*. Psychology Press.
- Harmer, J. (2006). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). London: Longman.
- Ha, X. V., and Murray, J. C. (2023). Corrective feedback: beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Lang. Teach. Res.* 27, 137–167. doi: 10.1177/1362168820931897
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Huang, J. (2012). *Error Analysis in English Teaching: A review of Studies*
- Ha, X. V., & Nguyen, L. T. (2021). Targets and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned?. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 697160.
- Knutsson, M., & Köster, S. (2020). Oral Corrective Feedback in Swedish Primary Schools.
- Kim, Y., & Mostafa, T. (2021). Teachers' and students' beliefs and perspectives about corrective feedback. *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 561-580.
- Lee, E. J. (2013) Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41, 217-230. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.022>
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(3), 399-432.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 1, 1-40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365>
- Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). L2 learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 91–104.
- Mcalpine, L. (2004). Designing learning as well as teaching: A research-based model for instruction that emphasizes learner practice. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 5(2), 119-134.
- Marzano, M. (2012). Informed Consent. In: 1.F. Gubrium, J.A. Holstein. A. B. Marvasti. K.D. McKinney (ecs). *The SAGE handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (2nd Edition). Newbury Park: SAGE Publications, p. 443-456.
- Nassaji, H. (2016). Anniversary article Interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: *A synthesis and analysis of current research*. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 535-562.
- Novianti, S. (2013). *An Analysis on Students' Grammatical Errors in Writing Descriptive Paragraph*.
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, E. Öztürk, G. 2016. Types and Timing of Oral corrective Feedback in EFL Classrooms: Voices From Students. *NovitasRoyal (Research on Youth and Language)*. 10 (2). p. 113-133
- Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error correction in ESL: Learner's preferences. *TESL Canada Journal*, 71-89.
- Park, H. S. 2010. *Teachers' and Learners' Preferences for Error Correction*. MA Thesis. California State University

- Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, 37(3), 380-390.
- Riazi, A. M., & Candlin, C. N. (2014). Mixed-methods research in language teaching and learning: Opportunities, issues and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 47(2), 135-173.
- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, 25(4), 318-335.
- Rai, N., & Thapa, B., 2015. A study on purposive sampling method in research. *Kathmandu: Kathmandu School of Law*, 5.
- Rydahl, S. (2005). Oral Feedback in The English Classroom Lecturer's Thought and Awareness. *Karlstads: Karlstads University*.
- Saeb, F. (2014). The Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback on the Grammatical Accuracy of Beginner EFL Learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature* 3, 22-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.2p.22>
- Suzuki, M. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classrooms.
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on Form in the Foreign Language Classroom: Students' and Teachers' Views on Error Correction and the Role of Grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 343-364. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1996.tb01247.x>
- Sultana, R. (2015). The survey on using oral corrective feedback in ESL classroom in Bangladeshi context (Doctoral dissertation, BRAC University).
- Sanavi, R. V., & Nemati, M. (2014). The effect of six different corrective feedback strategies on Iranian English language learners' IELTS writing task 2. *Sage Open*, 4(2), 2158244014538271
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153-189.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255-284. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x>
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning (pp. 593-610). *Routledge*.
- Teddle, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2010). Overview of contemporary issues in mixed methods research. *Sage handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research*, 2, 1-44.
- Tasdemir, M. S. Arslan, F. Y. 2018. Feedback Preferences of EFL Learners with Respect to Their Learning Styles. *Cogent Education*. 5 (1), p. 1-17
- Véliz, C. (2008). Corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Literaturay Lingüística*, (19), 283-292.
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective-feedback types. *Lang. Aware*. 17, 78-93. doi: 10.2167/la429.0
- Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 293-314.
- Zook, C.(2021). formative, vs, summative, assessment. <https://www.aeseducation.com/blog/topic/assessment>
- Zhang, L. J., & Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes. *System*, 42, 429-439.

Appendix 1

Students Questionnaire

An Investigation of Afghan EFL Teachers' and Students' Attitudes towards Oral Corrective Feedback

Your participation in this survey which is part of a research project regarding “An investigation of Afghan EFL teachers’ and students’ attitudes towards oral corrective feedback” Specifically designed for sophomore students of English Department at Herat University, is highly appreciated. It is noteworthy to mention that there is no “right” or “wrong” answer and there is no need for you to provide your personal information. It will take approximately 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire. For each statement in the survey, please indicate how much you agree or disagree by putting a check in the boxes provided below. Only your sincere answers can guarantee the success of this investigation. Thank you in advance for your time and help.

Scale: 5 – Strongly Agree, 4 – Agree, 3 – Neutral, 2 – Disagree, 1 – Strongly Disagree

NO.	Statements	(5) Strongly Agree	(4) Agree	(3) Neutral	(2) Disagree	(1) Strongly Disagree
A. Different amounts of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) preferred by EFL learners						
1.	When my teacher corrects all my speaking mistakes I do not repeat them anymore.					
2.	I want my teacher to correct all my major errors but not the minor ones when I am speaking.					
3.	I do not want my teacher to correct my speaking errors and answer only to the ideas and content.					
B. Students’ perceptions about receiving OCF						
4.	When my teacher corrects all my speaking errors I remember the correct forms.					
5.	I feel unconfident when my teacher corrects my speaking mistakes too much.					
6.	I do not repeat the same mistake again when I am corrected once.					
7.	I want my teacher to give me the chance to find out and correct my speaking mistakes by myself.					
C. Types of OCF preferred by EFL learners.						
8	I remember the correct form better if my teacher tells me clearly that there is an error and gives me the correct form (Explicit).					

9	If I make an error when I am speaking, I want my teacher to directly correct my mistake (Recast).					
10	I learn better when I am asked these questions if I make a mistake while speaking 'What? / What did you say? /Or can you say it again?' and then corrected (Clarification Request).					
11	I want my teacher to give me comments or language rules so that I can correct my mistakes by myself (Meta-linguistic cue).					
12	If I make an error, I want my teacher to repeat what I said and wait for me to correct it myself (Elicitation).					
13	If I make an error, I want my teacher to repeat my error with a change in intonation so that I can recognise the error and correct it by myself (Repetition).					
NO.	Statements D. Timing of OCF preferred by EFL learners	(5) Strongly Agree	(4) Agree	(3) Neutral	(2) Disagree	(1) Strongly Disagree
14	I believe my teacher should correct my speaking mistakes immediately (on the spot).					
15	When my teacher corrects my mistakes immediately it interrupts me and makes me nervous.					
16	I would like my teacher to correct my speaking error once I finish speaking (delayed)					
NO.	Statements E. Source of feedback	(5) Strongly Agree	(4) Agree	(3) Neutral	(2) Disagree	(1) Strongly Disagree
17	I learn better when I am allowed to correct my speaking errors by myself.					
18	Only my teacher should point out my errors and correct me.					
19	I feel comfortable when my classmates correct my errors when I am speaking.					

Appendix 2

Teachers interview questions

Name:

Gender:

Choose the alternative which you prefer most:

1. How many years have you been teaching?

- Less than 5 years
 - 6 to 10 years
 - 11 to 15 years
 - More than 15 years
2. Do you think that feedback is very important for the students?
- Yes
 - No
3. Which types of feedback do you prefer most?
- Oral feedback
 - Written feedback
 - Both of them
4. What is the importance of oral feedback? Why?
- Very important
 - Less important
 - Rather important
 - Not important
- Opinion:
.....
5. Which approach do you prefer in your class while giving oral feedback in your class?
- Explicit correction
 - Recasts
 - Clarification requests
 - Meta-linguistic
 - Elicitation
 - Repetition
- Opinion:
.....
6. For grammatical mistake (tense, conjugation and articles etc.), which approach do you use?
- Explicit correction
 - Recasts
 - Clarification requests
 - Meta-linguistic
 - Elicitation
 - Repetition
- Opinion:
.....
- For mispronunciation, which approach do you use?
- Explicit correction
 - Recasts
 - Clarification requests
 - Meta-linguistic
 - Elicitation
 - Repetition
7. Do you use any request-phrases e.g. “sorry”, “pardon me”, “and excuse me” etc. while providing feedback?
- Yes
 - No
 - Sometimes
8. Do you use any phrase i.e. “It’s not X but Y”, “You should say”, “We say X not Y”, “oh, you mean...” while providing feedback?

- Yes
- No
- Sometimes

9. Would you like to repeat student's utterance by using correct form while providing feedback?

- Yes
- No
- Sometimes

10. Do you clearly indicate student's errors while giving feedback?

- Yes
- No
- Sometimes

11. What do you think is more effective; on spot correction or delayed correction?

- On spot
- Delayed
- Both

Opinion:

.....

12. What do you think is the most useful strategy to be used while providing oral corrective feedback?

- Explicit correction
- Recasts
- Clarification requests
- Meta-linguistic
- Elicitation
- Repetition

Opinion:

.....