Structural Error Corrections in an English Conversation Class

by E S

Structural Error Corrections in an English Conversation Class

Niswi Ulfini

Universitas Lambung Mangkurat Banjarmasin, Indonesia
n.ulfini@ulm.ac.id

Abstract. This study examined the methods used to address structural errors in a beginner-level English conversation class at a private language school in Indonesia. Building on the premise that both positive and negative evidence (corrective feedback) are essential for second language acquisition, the research investigated whether all structural errors were corrected, the source of the corrections, the timing, and the strategies employed. The study observed six EFL students during an online class, focusing on their use of past tense expressions. The study implemented a qualitative research design, structured around an analytical framework, and specifically utilized a case study approach to examine the phenomenon in depth. The data were collected through classroom observations and video recordings. They were analyzed using a deductive content analysis. The results indicate that not all structural errors were corrected; the teacher and students were the primary agents of correction, with peer correction notably absent. Most corrections occurred during controlled practice activities, aligning with the class's accuracy-focused goals. Immediate correction was the predominant timing strategy, and explicit correction methods, such as metalinguistic comments and elicitation, were favored over more implicit approaches like recasting. The findings suggest the need for greater consistency in corrective feedback and highlight the potential benefits of incorporating peer correction and explicit corrective feedback in beginner-level speaking classes. However, the study's limitations include its focus on structural errors without considering student uptake of corrections or the reasons behind the teacher's selective correction approach. Further research could explore these aspects to provide a more comprehensive understanding of corrective feedback in language learning contexts.

Keywords: corrective feedback; English as a foreign language; explicit correction; implicit correction; structural errors

Abstrak. Penelitian ini mengeksplorasi koreksi kesalahan struktural dalam kelas percakapan bahasa Inggris tingkat pemula di lembaga bahasa swasta di Indonesia. Berdasarkan premis bahwa bukti positif dan negatif (umpan balik) sangat penting untuk penguasaan bahasa asing, penelitian ini menyelidiki apakah semua kesalahan struktural telah diperbaiki, sumber koreksi, waktu, dan strategi yang digunakan. Studi ini mengamati enam siswa selama kelas online, dengan fokus pada penggunaan ekspresi bentuk lampau. Studi ini menerapkan desain penelitian kualitatif yang disusun berdasarkan kerangka analitis, dengan secara khusus menggunakan pendekatan studi kasus untuk menganalisis fenomena secara mendalam. Data dikumpulkan melalui observasi kelas dan rekaman video dan dianalisis menggunakan analisis isi deduktif. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa tidak semua kesalahan struktural telah diperbaiki; guru dan siswa sendirilah yang menjadi agen utama koreksi, dan tidak ada koreksi dari teman sebaya. Sebagian besar koreksi terjadi selama aktivitas latihan terkontrol, selaras dengan tujuan kelas yang berfokus pada akurasi. Koreksi segera adalah strategi pengaturan waktu yang paling dominan, dan metode koreksi eksplisit, seperti komentar metalinguistik dan elisitasi, lebih disukai daripada pendekatan yang lebih implisit seperti penyusunan ulang. Temuan ini menunjukkan perlunya konsistensi yang lebih besar dalam umpan balik korektif dan menyoroti manfaat potensial dari menggabungkan koreksi dari rekan dan umpan balik korektif eksplisit dalam kelas berbicara tingkat pemula. Namun, keterbatasan penelitian ini mencakup fokusnya pada kesalahan struktural tanpa mempertimbangkan penerimaan siswa terhadap koreksi atau alasan di balik pendekatan koreksi selektif

yang dilakukan guru. Penelitian lebih lanjut dapat mengeksplorasi aspek-aspek ini untuk memberikan pemahaman yang lebih komprehensif tentang umpan balik korektif dalam konteks pembelajaran bahasa.

Kata kunci: *bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing; kesalahan struktur; koreksi eksplisit; koreksi implisit; umpan balik korektif*

INTRODUCTION

In second language learning, learners rely on positive and negative evidence to develop their linguistic competence. Positive evidence refers to the correct forms of language that learners are exposed to through input, such as teacher modeling or authentic language use, while negative evidence is the incorrect use of the target language (Gass, 2003). Research has shown that in second language acquisition, positive evidence provided to the learners alone is not enough to promote acquisition (Ellis & Shintani, 2014). Therefore, there is a need for negative evidence (i.e. corrective feedback) since the combination of both can help acquisition. Roothooft and Breeze (2016) stated that the positive effect of oral corrective feedback (hereafter CF) has been well-established in the last two decades. However, arguments are still going on about whether to provide CF in the speaking class. To answer, research has shown that it derives from the purpose of the speaking activities, either fluency or accuracy-oriented (Gumbaridze, 2013). These purposes can determine the timing for CF. Despite that, there is still an inconsistency in the timing and the type of errors (Ellis & Shintani, 2014) and strategies used for CF in different instructional settings (Fan, 2019). Furthermore, Brown (2016) has identified that structural errors are the most common errors that receive CF. Hence, the current study was conducted to explore the CF practice on structural errors in an English conversation class.

Research has revealed various strategies employed by teachers to correct student errors. Commonly used techniques include recasting, elicitation, repetition, and clarification requests, with recasting being one of the most prevalent approaches (Nuraeni & Fadhly, 2018). This strategy involves reformulating a student's erroneous utterance without explicitly pointing out the mistake, allowing the student to infer the correct form. Recast and immediate correction strategies are often favored by both students and teachers due to their effectiveness in minimizing communication breakdowns and fostering a supportive learning environment (Nadifa, 2022). Furthermore, Öztürk (2016) conducted a classroom observation study to investigate the implementation of CF in Turkish English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms. The result revealed that teachers mostly corrected students' errors, but some were ignored because of several reasons, such as unwillingness to interrupt the flow of the task/activity, limited knowledge of the target language, or reluctance to affect students negatively. The results also indicated that teachers primarily employed recast and explicit correction strategies.

Other studies also pointed out that despite the recognized benefits of corrective feedback, challenges remain regarding its timing and approach. Immediate feedback is often preferred, as it ensures that students can promptly address their errors, while delayed feedback may lead to forgetfulness or reduced effectiveness (Nuraeni & Fadhly, 2018; Rozak, Maisa, & Hartati, 2023). Additionally, teachers must strike a balance between correcting errors and fostering a positive classroom environment, ensuring that students do not feel discouraged or overwhelmed by constant correction (Nadifa, 2022). However, the previous studies mostly pointed out error correction implementation in a classroom setting by teachers, while other techniques can be used for error correction. Those are peer and self-correction (Gumbaridze, 2013). He also suggested that errors should be corrected

immediately if the speaking activities focus on accuracy, while the CF should be delayed if the focus is on fluency.

Based on the previous studies, the present study attempted to investigate the implementation of CF on students' structural errors. The investigation specifically aimed to find out if all structural errors were corrected and the source of CF. Besides, the study also explored the timing and the strategies used for CF. Therefore, the study addressed the following research questions:

1. How were structural errors corrected, and who corrected them?
2. When were the structural errors corrected and what strategies were used to correct them?

To address these questions, the methodology of the study including the context, participants, lesson, and how the data were collected and analyzed is described in the section below, followed by the results and discussion of the results corresponded to the previous studies. Finally, the pedagogical implications and the limitations of the study were also discussed.

METHOD

Research Design

The research employed a qualitative design using an analytical framework, specifically adopting a case study approach**.** This design allowed for an in-depth exploration of structural error corrections within an English conversation class, focusing on real-time interactions between instructors and students. By utilizing qualitative methods, the study aimed to analyze how errors are identified, corrected, and responded to in an authentic learning environment. In qualitative designs, an analytical framework refers to a structured approach to data interpretation, where the analysis follows a predefined structure established in existing literature (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). As a case study, the research focused on a specific classroom context, making it rich in detail but limited in generalizability, offering insights that may be applied to similar educational settings.

Data Collection

This observational study was conducted in a private language school in Indonesia. The study involved six students learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Three of them are female, and the other half are male. The learners are mixed from senior high school students, university students, and workers. Therefore, their age ranges from 17 to 30 years old. Despite the mixed profession and age range, the students share the same proficiency level. They were classified as beginners based on the results of the placement test conducted by the private language school prior to their admission. However, it should be noted that the placement test for the conversation class only measures students' ability in spoken language.

The observed lesson entitled "How was the gathering?" talked about expressions of asking and responding to past events. The lesson focused on meaning as well as form. The lesson started with warm-up activities and was followed by dialog practice, an introduction to the expressions, and a discussion of the use of 'was' and 'were'. After learning the expressions and discussing some features of the grammar focus, the students practiced using the expressions in various conversation activities, ranging from controlled to free practice. All the activities were done in pairs. Most activities occurred in the main room, where all participants gathered, while some sessions took place in the breakout room for smaller group discussions. The students had semi-controlled practice when in the breakout

rooms in the absence of the teacher. Most students were actively engaged with the activities during the lesson.

The data for this study were collected through classroom observation using observation sheets and video recordings as the instruments. The observation adapted the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) scheme from Spada and Fröhlich (1995) which consists of two observation components will take place to address the research questions, part A and part B. In Part A, the researcher mostly noted down the classroom procedures, interaction type, and correction timing in real-time, while Part B employed the transcription of the video recordings. However, the study notably only follows the scheme of COLT, but not the categories for each part, since this study only focuses on the correction of structural errors that took place in the classroom. Moreover, since the classroom was online via Zoom, the researcher could only observe in real time the interactions that occurred in the main room and one of the breakout rooms. Whereas the interaction in other breakout rooms can only be analyzed by the video recordings.

Data Analysis

The observational data and video recordings were analyzed qualitatively using deductive content analysis. It means the data were analyzed and categorized based on the previous research (Elo & Kyngäs, 2007). The first step for the analysis was the transcription of the recorded videos, and then they were analyzed to identify the structural errors made by students and the CF provided. Second, the data on the structural errors and CF were analyzed to reveal whether or not all errors were addressed. Next, the source of the correction was analyzed and grouped according to Gumbaridze's study (2013), namely self-correction, peer-correction, and teacher correction. Then, the timing for the correction was analyzed from the observation sheet and matched with the video-recording transcription, and categorized as immediate or delayed correction stated by Ellis and Shintani (2014). Finally, the CF was grouped based on six strategies of corrective feedback identified by Lyster and Ranta (1997). The six strategies are 1) recast, 2) repetition, 3) clarification request, 4) explicit correction, 5) metalinguistic comment, and 6) elicitation. Besides, other data from the observation sheet were used to complete the video analysis and helped in understanding the flow of the activity in the classroom.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section reveals the results and the discussion of the results. The results are presented in Table 1 along with the description then followed by the discussion for each research question.

The classroom activities were divided into three main stages. First, the Warm-up/Pre-stage serves as an introduction. Secondly, the While Stage consists of Controlled Practice, Breakout Room Activity, and Uncontrolled Practice. Controlled practice consisted of structured exercises conducted under the direct supervision of the instructor. Breakout room activity (semi-controlled practice) involved peer-to-peer interaction in the absence of direct instructor supervision, while in the uncontrolled practice, students engaged in spontaneous communication with minimal instructor involvement. Finally, the post-stage serves as the conclusion of the lesson. Each stage involved varying levels of learner engagement and instructor intervention, which influenced the extent to which structural errors were corrected or left unaddressed. Based on the table, it can be seen that there were 33 structural errors made by the students during the pre and while-stage. The treatments, sources, timing, and strategies varied across each stage, which will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

Table 1 Analysis Results of Transcription and Observation Notes

Procedure	Number of Errors	Result	Source	Time	Category
Warm-up/Pre-stage	3	Ignored	-	-	-
While stage/main activities Controlled practice	6	Corrected	Teacher	Immediate	2 Elicitation, 2 Explicit correction, 1 recast, and 1 metalinguistic comment
	1	Ignored	-	-	-
While Stage/Breakout room activity	5	Corrected	Self-correction	Immediate	-
Semi-controlled practice	7	Ignored	-	-	-
While stage/main activities	2	Corrected	1 Self-correction 1 Teacher	1 Immediate 1 Delayed	Metalinguistic comment
Last task: Uncontrolled practice	9	Ignored	-	-	-
Post-stage	-	-	-	-	-

Correction of Structural Errors

The data analysis results revealed that there were 33 errors made by students during the classroom activities. However, not all structural errors were corrected by the teacher and students. Only 13 errors were corrected, while the other 20 errors were left untreated. The teacher was found to only correct the students' errors in the While (main) activities, whereas other errors in the warm-up activities were left untreated. It was the same as self-correction made by the students. They mostly made corrections to their errors throughout the While activities. Concerning the topic, all corrections were related to the lesson topic, which was the use of the past tense when talking about past events.

Excerpt 1

(Data number 1)(Warm-up Activity)

T: What did you do last weekend?

S3: I'm just staying at home. watch um, K-drama, read a novel, scrolling social media, just like usual.

Excerpt 2

(Data number 5)(While-stage)

S1: Tell me about the software training last week.

S4: Yeah. it was lousy. Everyone do was did much talk.

```
T: Sorry, everyone?

S4: Everyone did much talk

T: Oh, everyone did much talk. I see everyone talked much, but yeah, it's lousy.
That's how you pronounce it. Okay.
```

However, the teacher also ignored an error from the same task as the corrected errors. This indicated that there was still inconsistency in teachers' practice when offering CF, just like what Ellis and Shintani (2014) explained.

Excerpt 3

```
(Data number 6)

S5: S3, how was the leadership seminar last month?

S3: It was boring. We can't interact with each other because there's the committee
that watching us.

T: Okay there was committee watching you.
```

Nevertheless, these findings were consistent with findings from Öztürk (2016) that some errors were corrected, while others were ignored. The difference lay in the comparison between the corrected and untreated errors. Öztürk (2016) identified that most errors were corrected, while this study was the opposite. The ignorance of errors from the previous study was due to teachers' reluctance to interrupt the flow of the activities and affect students negatively. These can be the reasons for the present study as well. All errors in the warm-up activities, for example, were intentionally withheld to encourage student participation and confidence. Moreover, since the learners are still beginners, the teacher may avoid over-correction to make students at ease in speaking English.

The student's proficiency level can be the reason as well why some errors in semi-controlled practices from the students were left unaddressed by the students. Even though many errors were made by the students during the practice, only some students were able to self-correct their errors. It is likely that learners with low proficiency make numerous errors but are unable to correct them (Veccellotti & McCormick, 2018).

Excerpt 4

```
(Data number 12)

S4: I went to the beach, with my family and some friends of mine too. We will went
at the morning.

S5: Oh, that sounds great. I hope I can go there with my whole family.
```

Concerning the choice of error, Ellis (2009) stated that the focus of errors should be selected to make error correction easier, especially for oral correction. He suggested teachers should employ focused CF (i.e. correct only one or two types of errors). The focused approach was claimed to be effective in promoting acquisition. The efficacy was also found to be effective in hindering students' confusion (Gumbaridze, 2013). Therefore, one can argue that the observed classroom implemented a focused approach to correcting errors.

Sources of Structural Errors

The result also showed that the ones who corrected the errors were mostly the teacher (e.g. Excerpt 5). Students also corrected their own utterances on some occasions (e.g. Excerpt 6). In contrast, peer correction was absent even though learners had the opportunity to do it during student-student interaction without the presence of the teacher in the breakout room or throughout student-student interaction in the main room.

Excerpt 5

(Data number 7)(Correction by teacher)

S3: How was your golf tournament last year?

S2: It's good because I get new experience.

T: All right. Good. I got, yeah, I got new experience okay

Excerpt 6

(Data number 10) (Self-correction)

S5: I'm great. S2. What was the concert like?

S1: Well, it was extremely wonderful. Because Finally I can see Linkin park in front of my eyes.

S5: That was awesome. with whom did you watch the concert?

S1: I watch I watched the concert with my brother and my sister because we love Linkin park since we were kids.

S1: I wish I can go to watch the concert too

The results differed from Sippel and Jackson's study (2015), which recommended the use of peer correction since it can improve students' grammatical accuracy. This was due to an improvement in students' awareness of linguistics when corrected by peers. They further recommended practicing it with less proficient students. However, the students from this study were trained to give corrections, while the students in the current study were not, which can explain the nonexistence of peer correction. Therefore, the findings can be different if the teacher asks learners to give peer-correction.

Another reason for the absence can be due to issues on peer correction. Martin and Sippel (2024) conducted a study to find foreign language learners' beliefs about peer feedback and found that students felt uneasy giving feedback to their peers, even though they realized that correcting their peers their own language development. Nonetheless, Gamlo (2019) identified that learners prefer being corrected by their teachers. This was in line with the current result, for the teacher corrected most of the students' errors.

Another important point that should be noted is the self-correction from some students. Previous studies (e.g. Amara, 2015; Gumbaridze, 2013) claimed that self-correction is the most advantageous approach for correction. This signified that some students from this study were able to notice their errors even without providing any error indication, either from the teacher or from peers.

Timing of Structural Errors

The results showed that for the corrected structural errors, the teacher provided immediate correction when students made errors and self-correction also occurred promptly after mistakes. However, delayed correction was observed only once (Excerpt 7).

Excerpt 7

(Data number 18)

S3: I heard you follow you follow a golf tournament last week?

S2: Yes.

S3: Can you tell me? How was it like?

S2: I'm, I'm very interesting. I'm very excited, Sorry. But I don't winner the tournament. I just got New experience.

S3: I will look forward for your winner for your

T: further competition

S3: for your next competition to be a winner.

T: Alright, so you have exchanged. By the way for S2, if you want to ask about how was, you need to talk about an event? Yeah, how was the golf tournament?

S2: Okay Ms.

The variation in the timing of teacher corrections may be influenced by the distinct objectives of the speaking activities. It was noted that the teacher corrected students' errors immediately when carrying out controlled practices, which may aim to focus on accuracy. On the other hand, the delayed correction was given when the students had free practice at the end of the lesson. it was highly likely that the activity emphasized fluency. This corresponded with the findings from Gumbaridze (2013). He declared that the timing to correct errors depended on the goals of the speaking activities. On-the-spot correction should be done if it is for accuracy, and postponed correction if it is a fluency activity. Ellis and Shintani (2014) also explained that educators recommended these strategies to decide when to correct the errors.

Conversely, learners felt less comfortable when their errors were being corrected immediately since it made them anxious and discouraged from speaking (Ölmezer-Öztürk & Öztürk, 2016). However, this would happen only if the immediate correction was done consecutively. This indicated that learners' speaking anxiety can still be controlled. Also, Li, Zhu, and Ellis (2016) found that immediate and delayed CF enhanced learners' grammatical judgment, with the former being more advantageous than the latter.

Strategies of Structural Errors

About the CF strategies, four strategies of CF were used to correct the structural errors. They are recast, explicit correction, metalinguistic comment, and elicitation. There were two instances for explicit correction, metalinguistic comments, and elicitation, and 1 instance for recast. Moreover, the teacher occasionally combined two strategies for correcting one student's error (e.g. Excerpt 8).

Excerpt 8

```
(Data number 4)

T: That's good that you have time to do it.

S2: S1, did everyone enjoy it?

S1: Yes, they were.

T:  Sorry. The question is did everyone enjoy it.

S1: Yeah. Everyone was enjoyed it.

T: Everyone enjoyed it without was because there is no was in the questions. So
yes, everyone enjoyed it.
```

In this excerpt, the teacher gave the student an explicit correction followed by a metalinguistic comment explaining the reason for the correction. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that recast only occurred once in the observed classroom (Excerpt 9), while other strategies were used several times (see the appendix Data number 4-8 and 18 for the complete examples). This finding is in line with the result of Nurjanah, Rahmaningtyas, and Yuniafari's (2024) study, found that metalinguistic comments, recast, and repetition were more preferred by students.

Excerpt 9

```
(Data number 5) (elicitation and recast)

S1:  Tell me about the software training last week.

S4: Yeah. it was lousy. Everyone do was did much talk.

T: Sorry, everyone?

S4: Everyone did much talk

T: Oh, everyone did much talk. I see everyone talked much, but yeah, it's lousy.
That's how you pronounce it. Okay.
```

This finding was in contrast with the findings from the previous studies (e.g. Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Öztürk, 2016) that studied the type of CF used in the speaking classes. They found that recasting was the most implemented CF strategy in the classroom. The different findings may be due to The students' proficiency level in the present study. It was noted that their proficiency level was low and recasting would not be very effective for them based on the findings from Ammar and Spada (2006). They conducted a study to investigate the benefits of CF for learners in different proficiency levels and found that recast was not effective in the low proficiency level of learners since the CF provided was implicit. They also claimed that explicit CF was more effective for these learners. Explicit correction, metalinguistic comment, and elicitation employed in this study were categorized as explicit CF (Ellis, 2012). This practice was then appropriate for the students based on the findings of Ammar and Spada's study. Amador (2008) also concluded that beginner learners preferred to be corrected explicitly rather than implicitly.

Similarly, the current practice is also appropriate for the type of errors studied, structural errors. The findings from Yang (2016) supported this implementation. Yang's study showed that learners preferred to be corrected explicitly for structural errors instead of being recast. The participants of his study claimed that they were often confused about grammar rules. Accordingly, they viewed explicit CF as the most useful one to correct their errors.

CONCLUSION

The study observed the implementation of structural error correction in a speaking class. It aimed to figure out if all structural errors were corrected, the agent that dealt with the correction, the timing, and the strategies employed for correction. The results revealed that most students' errors were untreated, especially in the warm-up and the last task of the speaking activities, while the corrected errors were identified in the controlled practice. Furthermore, structural errors were corrected by both the teacher and the students themselves. No peer correction was observed throughout the lesson. The results also showed that immediate correction was frequently applied in correcting errors. Besides, four strategies were used in the classroom to correct students' errors. They are recast, explicit correction, elicitation, and metalinguistic comment.

The findings of this study demonstrated how correction of structural errors was practiced in a speaking classroom. Based on the results, some pedagogical implications can be drawn. First, teacher correction should be more consistent since the inconsistency was still found in the teacher's practice. Ellis and Shintani (2014) stated that if teachers choose to correct some errors and ignore others, they should follow certain principles to ensure consistency. This can also help in minimizing the negative effects of error correction.

Second, peer correction should be encouraged gradually in the classroom, considering the effectiveness of the technique. Besides, the study noticed that students occasionally corrected their errors. Thus, peer correction can be fostered, yet teachers still need to guide students to ensure the benefits of the practice. Finally, teachers can consider using explicit CF similar to this study, seeing it is effective, for Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006) found that explicit CF was more effective for communicative activities than implicit ones. Still, implicit CF should eventually be implemented to give more opportunities for students to notice and self-correct their errors.

However, this study has some limitations. First, it only examined students' structural errors and their correction, while the uptake of the correction provided was not evaluated. Second, the reason(s) why the teacher ignored most errors were not explored, and students' perspectives about this ignorance were also not included. Finally, teachers' and students' perceptions of the timing and strategies of CF were not considered since this study only focused on the structural errors' correction observed in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Amador, Y. A. (2008). Learner attitudes toward error correction in a beginners English class. *Revista Comunicación, 17*(1), 18-28.

Amara, N. (2015). Errors correction in foreign language teaching. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, *5*(3), 58-68.

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

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.

Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research.* Oxon: Routledge.

Ellis, R. (2012). *Language Teaching Research and Language Pedagogy.* London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal, 1*(1), 3-18.

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. doi:10.1017/S0272263106060141

Elo, S. and Kyngäs, H. (2008), The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62*, 107-115. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x

Gass, S. M. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224-255). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492

Fan, N. (2019). An Investigation of Oral Corrective Feedback in an ESL Listening and Speaking Class. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 10*(1), 197-203.

Gamlo, N. H. (2019). EFL Learners" Preferences of Corrective Feedback in Speaking Activities. *World, 9*(2), 28-37.

Gumbaridze, J. (2013). Error correction in EFL speaking classrooms. *Procedia, Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70*, 1660-1663.

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

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

Martin, I. A., & Sippel, L. (2024). Providing vs. receiving peer feedback: Learners' beliefs and experiences. *Language Teaching Research, 28*(3), 1033-1054. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211024365

Nurjanah, L., Rahmaningtyas, H., & Yaniafari, R. P. (2024). Examining students' oral corrective feedback preferences for improving speaking proficiency. *CELTIC: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics, 11*(1), 23–38. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v11i1.29020

Ölmezer-Öztürk, E., & Öztürk, G. (2016). Types and timing of oral corrective feedback in EFL classrooms: Voices from students. *Novitas-ROYAL, 10*(2), 113-133.

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

Roothooft, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness, 25*(4), 318-335.

Sippel, L., & Jackson, C. N. (2015). Teacher vs. peer oral corrective feedback in the German language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, *48*(4), 688-705.

Spada, N., & Fröhlich, M. (1995). *COLT, communicative orientation of language teaching observation scheme: Coding conventions and applications*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.

Vercellotti, M. L., & McCormick, D. E. (2018). Self-correction profiles of L2 English learners: A longitudinal multiple-case study. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, *22*(3).

Yang, J. (2016). Learners' oral corrective feedback preferences in relation to their cultural background, proficiency level and types of error. *System, 61*, 75-86.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

APPENDIX

Analysis Results of Transcription and Observation Notes

Procedure	Number	Excerpts	Result	Time	Category
Warm-up/Pre-stage	1	T: What did you do last weekend? S3: I'm just staying at home. watch um, K-drama, read a novel, scrolling social media, just like usual. T: That's good that you have time to do it.	Ignored		
	2	T: What did you do last weekend S2? S2: I just lying up in bed. T: Uh uh	Ignored		
	3	T: Did you also play game? S4: Refreshing. just refreshing at home. Refreshing because last Wednesday is my thesis defense. T: Last Wednesday, you have done what? Is this day you have done what? you have finished your thesis examination? S4: Yeah.	Ignored		

		T: You have finished the examination for your thesis. Oh, congratulations then.			
While stage/main activities Controlled practice	4	S2: S1, did everyone enjoy it? S1: Yes, they were. T: Sorry. The question is did everyone enjoy it. S1: Yeah. Everyone was enjoyed it. T: Everyone enjoyed it without was because there is no was in the questions. So yes, everyone enjoyed it.	Corrected	Immediate	Elicitation, Explicit correction and metalinguistic comment
	5	S1: Tell me about the software training last week. S4: Yeah. it was lousy. Everyone do was did much talk. T: Sorry, everyone? S4: Everyone did much talk T: Oh, everyone did much talk. I see everyone talked much, but yeah, it's lousy. That's how you pronounce it. Okay.	Corrected	Immediate	Elicitation and recast
	6	S5: S3, how was the leadership seminar last month? S3: It was boring. We can't interact with each other because there's the committee that watching us. T: Okay there was committee watching you.	Ignored		
	7	S3: How was your golf tournament last year? S2: It's good because I get new experience. T: All right. Good. I got, yeah, I got new experience okay	Corrected	Immediate	Explicit correction
	8	T: What should S6 say? S3: Well, I don't want to talk about it. Come on, tell me what happened. We, we, we, we didn't we weren't enjoy it at all. we weren't T: No, it's not weren't, but we didn't. We didn't enjoy it at all.	Corrected	Immediate	Explicit correction
While Stage/Breakout room activity Semi-controlled practice (Learner-learner interaction without the present of the teacher	9	**BR 1 (1st pair)** S5: I'm great. S2. What was the concert like? S1: Well, it was extremely wonderful. Because Finally I can see Linkin park in front of my eyes. S5: That was awesome. with whom did you watch the concert? S1: I watch I watched the concert with my brother and my sister because we love Linkin park since we were kids. S1: I wish I can go to watch the concert too	Ignored and corrected	Immediate	Self-correction
	10	**BR 1 (2nd pair)** S2: Morning S2. What was sorry. How was the international conference last week?	Corrected and ignored	Immediate	Self-correction

30

		`S1: morning S1. it was very exciting because` <u>`I can I can met`</u> `so many people there, talked about many things` `S2: Did you enjoy it, international conference?`			
	11	**BR 1 (3ʳᵈ pair)** `S1: Can you tell me about the beach trip last week?` `S6: So, so, I went to the Batakan beach last week with my friends, with my colleagues actually. Then it was a pretty tiring long trip, but it was fun because we sang along. When we were in car then um actually beach was so good because it was clean and` <u>`there were nobody around. There was nobody around except us.`</u>	Corrected	Immediate	Self-correction
	12	**BR 2 (2ⁿᵈ pair)** `S4: I went to the beach, with my family and some friends of mine too.` <u>`We will went at the morning.`</u> `S5: Oh, that sounds great. I hope I can go there with my whole family.`	Ignored		

	13	**BR 3 (1ˢᵗ pair)**
		`S3: So,` <u>`was the, what was the training like?`</u>
		`S2: It was really interesting.`
		`S3: Did you enjoy it?`
			Corrected	Immediate	Self-correction

	14	**BR 3 (2ⁿᵈ pair)**
		`S6: Was it good?`
		`S3: Yes. It's really good.` <u>`I very enjoy it.`</u>
		`S6: Tell me about the concert. Why did you enjoy it?`
		`. . . .`
		`S6: You are a big fan of Kangen Band?`
		`S3: Not really. I just` <u>`accompany my friend.`</u> `(end of conversation)`
			Ignored		

	15	**BR 3 (3ʳᵈ pair)**
		`S5: And then what did you do there?`
		`S3: I just` <u>`look around and take some`</u> `pictures.`
		`S5: No way you don't have much money. And you are a rich girl.`
		`S3:` <u>`I didn't. I didn't interested. I wasn't`</u> `interested with a stuff that's out there.`
		`S5: Okay. I hope I can go there with my whole family. And` <u>`then it can be was incredible`</u> `time with our family.`
			Ignored and corrected	Immediate	Self-correction

While stage/main activities Last task:	16	**1ˢᵗ pair** `S1: You were on the OSPEK (orientation) orientation in your university?` <u>`How was the orientation like? What was the orientation like?`</u> `S5: It was awesome. I had some many friends there. . . .`	Corrected and Ignored	Immediate	Self-correction

Uncontroll ed practice		S5: And how about you? tell me about your orient your orientation S1: My orientation in my university was a little bit far off because the senior was a little bit mean. My friends <u>were being punished because she wear sunblock on her face.</u>			
	17	**2ⁿᵈ pair** S6: So tell me about the competition S4: <u>we big won last time. we big won last time. I kick the ball and get three</u> scores. Well, my friend got two and the audience <u>is cheering</u> with spirit S6: <u>Who is you</u> know your battle, your enemy? Who is that? S4: Oh, my <u>competition is from</u> senior high school. Senior High School 6 Banjarmasin. Yeah, what about? What about you? I heard you won a competition too. Tell me about it S6: Okay. Last last week, I won a poetry competition. So, I made a poetry and I won the competition on it. So, it was pretty fun because I didn't expect that I that <u>I was going to that I that I would won that I would win the competition.</u> So yes, it was pretty fun. I think	Ignored		
	18	**3ʳᵈ pair** S3: I heard <u>you follow you follow</u> a golf tournament last week? S2: Yes. S3: Can you tell me? <u>How was it like?</u> S2: I'm, <u>I'm very interesting. I'm very excited,</u> Sorry. But I <u>don't winner</u> the tournament. I just got New experience. S3: I will look forward for <u>your winner for your</u> T: further competition S3: <u>for your next competition to be a winner.</u> T: Alright, so you have exchanged. By the way <u>for S2, if you want to ask about how was, you need to talk about an event? Yeah, how was the golf tournament?</u> S2: Okay Ms.	Ignored and corrected	Delayed	Metalingui stic comment

Structural Error Corrections in an English Conversation Class

11   pdfs.semanticscholar.org
      Internet Source   <1%

12   etda.libraries.psu.edu
      Internet Source   <1%

13   core.ac.uk
      Internet Source   <1%

14   etheses.dur.ac.uk
      Internet Source   <1%

15   www.tandfonline.com
      Internet Source   <1%

16   Qiuyan Yan, Chen Tang. "Student Engagement   <1%
      With Peer Feedback in L2 Writing: A Multiple
      Case Study of Chinese Secondary School
      Students", Chinese Journal of Applied
      Linguistics, 2023
      Publication

17   files.eric.ed.gov
      Internet Source   <1%

18   www.researchgate.net
      Internet Source   <1%

19   Nadia Mifka-Profozic. "Recasts versus   <1%
      clarification requests: The relevance of
      linguistic target, proficiency, and
      communicative ability", International Review
      of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching,
      2020
      Publication

20   acikbilim.yok.gov.tr
      Internet Source   <1%

21   centaur.reading.ac.uk
      Internet Source   <1%

22   dspace.utpl.edu.ec
      Internet Source

<1 %

23 flex.flinders.edu.au
Internet Source
<1 %

24 ijssrr.com
Internet Source
<1 %

25 mail.mjltm.org
Internet Source
<1 %

26 openaccess.uoc.edu
Internet Source
<1 %

27 repositorio.uta.edu.ec
Internet Source
<1 %

28 revistas.uvigo.es
Internet Source
<1 %

29 ses.library.usyd.edu.au
Internet Source
<1 %

30 wrap.warwick.ac.uk
Internet Source
<1 %

31 www.ccsenet.org
Internet Source
<1 %

32 www.sciencegate.app
Internet Source
<1 %

33 www.scss.tcd.ie
Internet Source
<1 %

34 O'Keeffe Anne, McCarthy Michael. "The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics", Routledge, 2010
Publication
<1 %

35 Xuan Van Ha, Loc Tan Nguyen, Bui Phu Hung. "Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: A teaching and learning perspective", Heliyon, 2021
<1 %