Teachers' Corrective Feedback In Female English Grammar Classes at MBI Amanatul Ummah Pacet

Feni Namora Nasution
Lilla Musyahda

English Department, Universitas Airlangga

Abstract

Any forms of expression delivered by the teachers are crucial in affecting students' proficiency in pesantren since the students are generally prudish and very obedient. The effective learning processes can be obtained through the teachers' knowledge of how and when corrective feedback should be given appropriately. In this sense, types of teachers' corrective feedback, the most frequent type provided, and teachers' preferences were the foci of this study by applying Lyster and Ranta (1997) framework. In collecting the data, the writer observed and recorded three teachers in three female English Grammar classes of 10th Grade at MBI Amanatul Ummah, Pacet. Then, the teachers were interviewed regarding the corrective feedback provision. The results showed that there were 151 utterances of corrective feedback and almost all the teachers provided all types of corrective feedback. An explicit correction was the most frequent type used in 10th Grade of female English Grammar classes, because it was clear, noticeable, extensive knowledge, and effective in correcting grammatical and lexical errors. Then, it followed by recast since it was believed on its easiness and time-saving for correcting students' errors, especially for phonological errors. In addition, all grammar teachers preferred students' errors to be corrected immediately and explicitly.

Keywords: errors, grammar teachers, oral corrective feedback, pesantren

1. Introduction

Pesantren is the oldest Islamic boarding school in Indonesia and has a huge contribution to the implementation of national education which forms a literate society and cultural literacy (Hamid 2017, p. 44). Pesantren is a type of a non-governmental institution or religion-based types of school that provides education under the supervision of a Kyai (Saifuddin 2015, p. 213). Some pesantren adjust international education system, for instance MBI Amanatul Ummah, use multiple languages actively such as Arabic, Indonesia, and English both in daily conversations and in teaching and learning processes. Thus, learning English system becomes "brand" or characteristics of these pesantren, and because of that learning English is an integral part of every activity in pesantren daily life.

Due to its importance, English should be learned by students thoroughly during learning processes even though oral errors made by the students are sometimes found in the language learning processes, especially Grammar. Since English is not the students' mother tongue, the existence of errors cannot be avoided during the learning processes (Muhsin 2016, p. 81). Therefore, corrections toward the students' ill-formed linguistic products should be provided to make sure that the students are on the right track.

However, there are still many teachers who tolerate or even ignore students' linguistic errors as long as the massages found in their utterances are still understood. As it is stated by Jing, Xiandong, and Yu (2016) that errors in students' production can be omitted. Unfortunately, the soft treatment above can bring bad impact, because they can make the same errors continually. In contrast, this phenomenon does not occur in at MBI Amanatul Ummah, Pacet. Here, the teachers mostly give more corrective feedback toward oral errors made by the students in order to prevent the same errors emersion.

The teachers definitely understand how their students need to be taught and the quality of each of their students. Therefore, they know what the appropriate method to be implemented. Indeed, the teachers more comprehend on how and what their students need to be corrected based on their students' response and reaction which can reveal teachers' preferences to the precise provision of corrective feedback in order to enhance their students quality and competency.

In consequence, these study aims are to reveal types of corrective feedback, the most frequent corrective feedback type used, and teachers' preferences in female English Grammar classes of 10th Grade at MBI Amanatul Ummah. It is because the teachers at MBI Amanatul Ummah usually provide feedback orally to students in order to increase the classroom interaction and enhance students' motivation in studying (reinforcement) and students' understanding. In that matter, students are able to self-correct in order to achieve its fluency and proficiency in using English properly.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Corrective feedback

Corrective feedback is the teacher's responses to students' incorrect utterances in order to repair errors accurately and comprehensibility (Lyster dan Ranta 1997). It is called as negative feedback, because it is an intent response concerning on students' linguistically deviant. Corrective feedback can be delivered in the form of indirect correction (implicit) and direct correction (explicit) (Saville-Troike 2006). Based on Lyster and Ranta (1997) analytic model, there are six types of corrective feedback. The explicit feedback includes Explicit Correction, Metalinguistic Feedback, and Elicitation. While implicit feedback includes Recast, Clarification Request, and Repetition.

1. Explicit Correction: giving the explicit utterance of the correct form. E.g.: "Oh, you mean," "You should say"
2. Metalinguistic Feedback: comments or questions to well-formed without explicitly providing the correct form. E.g.: "X or Y" or "can you find the error?" or "No"
3. Elicitation
    a. Eliciting his or her utterance, such as "no, not that. It's a...."
    b. Using the question to get the correct form, such as "how do we say X in French?"
    c. Asking students to reformulate the utterance, such as "is it correct? What is the correct one?"
4. Recast: repeating and reformulating the incorrect utterance implicitly. E.g.: "Use this word" or "You mean"
5. Clarification Request: the student's utterance is ill-formed which required a repetition or a reformulation in some way. E.g.: "what do you mean by X?"
6. Repetition: repeating the error parts with a raise intonation

Since it contains a function of negotiation of form, there will be no communication breakdown during teaching and learning processes. So, it will encourage the students to self-repair. As it is claimed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) that students' proficiency can be pushed through the provision of corrective feedback. Students, eventually, are more aware of the errors emergence.

2.2. Teachers' preferences

The understanding of the learning processes occurs when both teachers and students interact with one another in discussing students' errors. Thus, they can discover how and when corrective feedback should be given correctly based on their own interests, background, experience and attitudes through teaching and learning processes. Due to those factors, teachers are able to attain the effective teaching and learning processes for further progress by selecting particular methods over others which are called as teachers' preferences (Aynalem, et al. 2015, p. 1). It can be informed that preferences are individual's best choice in considering several options of the other existing references.

According to Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 39), teachers preferred to correct students' errors frequently and explicitly in an earlier Grade of the school year than later. Since students possess a low proficiency

in using second or foreign language in this level, teachers find more errors evidence. There are several questions regarding teachers' perception in teaching and learning processes which need to be considered well based on Lyster and Ranta (1997) framework whether learners' error should be corrected or not, the timing of the correction, which errors should be corrected, how it should be corrected, and who should do the correcting.

3. Methodology

This research applied a qualitative approach. It was conducted through observation and interview by using audio materials to obtain the main data which are types of corrective feedback, the most dominant types, and teachers' preferences based on Lyster and Ranta's (1997) framework. It was held on 1st and 8th March 2018 in X-MIA8 at 08.30-10.00, X-MIA10 at 10.00-11.30, and X-MIA12 at 14.00-15.30 that consist of 24-27 students in each class at MBI Amanatul Ummah—Pacet with 3 female Grammar teachers. Here, the teachers were named as T1, T2, and T3; and some brief information about them is provided below:

T1: 28 years old, English Bachelor Degree, 6 years of experience, 573 TOEFL score

T2: 27 years old, English Master Degree, 7 years of experience, 573 TOEFL score

T3: 26 years old, English Bachelor Degree, 5 years of experience, 570 TOEFL score.

4. Discussion

Based on the transcriptions of 18 hours audio-recording, it was found that there were 151 errors of utterances made by students in female English Grammar classes of 10th Grade at MBI Amanatul Ummah. Here are types of errors that occurred.

Types of Errors	T1	T2	T3	Total
Grammatical	22	50	17	89
Phonological	6	19	5	30
Lexical	5	25	2	32
Total	33	94	24	151

Table 1. Distribution of Errors Responded with Teacher Feedback

Since it was conducted in Grammar classes, it was reasonable that there were many grammatical errors occurred which was 89 incorrect forms. Then, it was followed by lexical errors as many as 32 errors. Students sometimes chose and used the incorrect lexical term in their utterance though lexical is the important part in making a proper sentence. The last one was phonological errors with the amount of 30 errors. The teachers in this classes of modern *pesantren* actually did not really concern on their mispronunciation.

Here are several examples of the errors made by the students with corrective feedback provision by T1, T2, and T3. For the purpose of data analysis, the bold sentences are identified as corrective feedback:

4.1. Explicit correction

[Excerpt 1]
S: I get my friend to borrow her umbrella
T1: Yang minjem sapa?
S: Saya
*T1: **Nah you need to make sure that the meaning of borrow is meminjam bukan meminjamkan. Kalau meminjamkan itu lend. Harusnya I get my friend to lend me her umbrella***

[Excerpt 2]
S: Next day, Paul went to the river to cleaned the fish
*T2: **The correct one is to clean, because after to must verb one ya***

Based on the excerpts above, the majority of the errors occurred in this type of corrective feedback were grammatical and lexical errors. As it is claimed by Lyster (2001), explicit correction tended to correct

grammatical and lexical errors. It is believed that explicit correction helpfully can support more in the students' further progress since it provides an incorrect answer and the right answer at the same time. Since the errors and correct answers are overly contrasted, it makes this type more understandable (Lyster 2001). Thus, it was included in one of the favourable types.

4.2. Metalinguistic feedback

[Excerpt 3]
S: I gets my mother
T3: I get or I get?
    S: Ohh I get my mother take my wet clothes

[Excerpt 4]
S :D, we'll get it repaired then
T1: No
    S: A

Metalinguistic feedback is beneficial for students in Grammar classes since there is a possibility to produce more grammatical errors (Ito 2017), such as on the excerpts above. On excerpt 3, the teacher threw a question to the student. So, she would think that the answer was wrong. Metalinguistic feeback also can be used by only commenting a single word, such as on excerpt 4. Here, the student understood well that her answer was not correct, so she changed her answer to get the correct one. Metalinguistic feedback proved to potentially encourage students to correct their errors (Lyster and Ranta 1997). However, metalinguistic feedback takes so much time (Ito 2017) since it is likely to give comments and questions to students' error until the students can find the best answer by themselves.

4.3. Elicitation

[Excerpt 5]
S: I get checked her health in
    hospital
T3: Are you sure??? I get....
    S: Ughhhhh I get her health checked

[Excerpt 6]
S: Old man answer
T2: Is it correct you use verb one here?
    S: Man answered

This type of corrective feedback is usually utilized to give a chance for the students to self-correct on their error (Panova and Lyster 2002, p. 591) by giving a question and eliciting. This type of correction is usually used for grammatical errors, such as on the excerpts above. Therefore, it would likely to interrupt the communication (Rahimi and Sobhani 2015, p. 130). It is because the teacher gives a pause of her utterance in order to let the student fill in the blank of the teacher's utterance. Also, this type is a little bit confusing, because the teacher throws a question to get the right answer. This would be inappropriately used if the students really did not have prior knowledge about the lesson.

4.4. Recast

[Excerpt 7]
S: I will tell you
    T2: I will tell you

[Excerpt 8]
S: Ma'am, nomor sembilan itu re-do
    /rido/
T1: Re-do /ridu/

Recast is suitable to be conducted in correcting students' phonological errors, because mispronunciation does not necessarily need further explanation of correction. But, it can also be used for grammatical errors (Lyster 2001, p. 266). It was utilized for time-saving toward the material that had been already learned beforehand. For instance in excerpt 7, the lesson of modal had already learned on the previous meeting. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), students do not necessarily notice this type of correction. Thus, the teachers only provided this type of corrective feedback for grammatical errors if the students had prior knowledge about it.

4.5. Clarification request

[Excerpt 9]
S: The village was messy because of
  the river overflood.
T2: Because of the river overflood?
  What do you mean by a flood?
S: Meluap
  T2: Ohh overflowed

[Excerpt 10]
S: We finally got our landlady to give
  our carom
*T1: **To give what?***
S: Eh key room
  T1: Ahh a key room. Good

Teacher 2 (T2) was obviously seen that she got a misunderstanding from the student word of *overflood* on excerpt 9, because this word did not exist in the dictionary. Hence, she asked the student by saying "*what do you mean by a flood?*". In this case, there was a lexical error on the student's utterance when she used the word of *overflood*. The student might not know how to write it, but she knew the meaning. While excerpt 10, Teacher 1 (T1) perhaps misheard of student's word of *key room*. She also did not understand the correlation between carom and landlady.

4.6. Repetition

[Excerpt 11]
S: I make my foot run to the bathroom
*T1: Okay. I make my foot, **FOOT?!***
<↑>
  S: Feet, feet

[Excerpt 12]
S: We had a professional photographer
  to take pictures of everyone who
  participated in our wedding. To
  take
*T3: **TO TAKE?!** <↑>*
Ss: Just take

On excerpt 11, the student made a lexical error. Teacher 1 (T1) repeated student's incorrect word by raising her intonation in order to make the student changed the answer. It was insisted similarly to exceprt 12. The difference was the type of error the student made in which grammatical error. Repetition can lead to ambiguity (Lyster dan Ranta 1997, p. 57) since the teacher only repeats students' incorrect utterance. The students will have a question in her mind, such as "*where did I get wrong?*" if they do not have a knowledge about the material.

According to the excerpts above, all types of corrective feedback in female Grammar classes of 10th Grade at MBI *Amanatul Ummah* occurred. Since teachers in this modern *pesantren* are required to have special teaching strategies in a more interactive and innovative way, especially in correcting students' errors, they correct the students' incorrect utterances in varied and innovative ways which depend on the context, situation, and condition as well. Hence, Teacher 1 (T1), Teacher 2 (T2) and Teacher 3 (T3) provided the correction differently as it is presented above. The distribution of each type of corrective feedback utilized by three teachers was calculated and reported in Table 2.

Types	T1	T2	T3	Total
Explicit Correction	13	35	8	56
Recast	4	25	5	34
Metalinguistic Feedback	4	12	8	24
Elicitation	7	4	2	13
Repetition	4	8	1	13
Clarification Request	1	10	0	11
Total	33	94	24	151

Table 2. Total Distribution of Corrective Feedback Types

Since teachers in this modern *pesantren* as the source of knowledge for the students due to the lack of facilities, such as books, lcd, etc. unlike other schools, it requires them to apply teachers centre learning. So, there are many explanations during teaching and learning processes as well as to the provision of corrective feedback. It was revealed that almost all teachers—T1 and T2—used explicit correction. It is intended for preventing the same error occurred in further circumstances other than the necessity to give

a correction due to its teacher-based centre learning. By providing this type, students can achieve more knowledge as well (Lyster, Saito dan Sato 2013, p. 20) since the teachers explain why it is incorrect and give the correct one.

Besides explicit correction is noticeable for students to recognize their errors. Hence, language learning can be improved (Masoumi dan Riasati 2014) since English is students' second or foreign language. Due to its necessity that students are required to use English accurately, appropriately, and meaningfully in Grammar class, teachers have to make a clear explanation of students' errors to avoid students' misunderstanding toward the concept provided by the teachers. As it is claimed by Lyster (2001) that explicit correction is the most effective technique in content-based. Thus, it is suitable to be applied at this modern *pesantren*, especially in Grammar classes since its aim is to gain a compatibility between grammar and communication (Celce-Murcia 2001). It is strengthened by table 1 above that the most frequent error occurred is grammatical then followed by lexical errors. These types of errors according to Lyster and Panova (2002) lead perfectly to the use of explicit correction.

From the data obtained of T1 above, it showed that she provided 23 corrective feedback regarding students' errors whereas Teacher 2 (T2) provided 32 corrective feedback. Due to their experience period in teaching, TOEFL score, and degree were different in which T2 was the highest amount from others, she was able to correct students' errors in a more interactive and innovative way. But, both T1 and T2 utilized corrective feedback types variously in which they used all of them.

While Teacher 3 (T3) inclined to use metalinguistic feedback as the most frequent type to correct students' errors. Since Teacher 3 (T3) has the lowest TOEFL score and experience period in teaching, the total distribution of corrective feedback that she provided was indicated in the lowest amount which was 11 corrective feedback. Here, she tended to have questions to a well-formed without explicitly providing the correct form to her students, such as "*X* or *Y*?". Metalinguistic feedback itself, actually, has an ability to enhance cognitive process while acquiring the lessons, especially in grammar (Ito, THE EFFICACY OF TRANSLATION AND ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN PROMOTING LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY DEVELOPMENT 2017). In other words, it is potentially used in examining a student's second or foreign language to produce the correct form. Teacher 3 (T3) tended to provide metalinguistic feedback to response students' incorrect form, because she introduced new material of grammar in these meetings. According to Ito (2017), this type of feedback is decent to be utilized in this kind of situation even though it is more time-consuming. Therefore, she did not produce corrective feedback as many as T1 and T2.

Clarification request did not occur in teaching and learning processes led by T3, because it is more implicit than the other types (Ellis 2009). The teacher feasibility did not provide this type of corrective feedback to hinder miscommunication. Moreover, she often had a misunderstanding with students' errors. Mostly, she understood well on the errors that her students made. In addition, she was likely to ask her students by using Bahasa Indonesia in delivering their intent of statements if she got a misunderstanding toward the students' utterances. In this regard, this type of corrective feedback does not quite demand in T3 classroom interaction.

The second most frequent type provided by the total amount of corrective feedback is recast. Both explicit correction and recast are almost similar, because they virtually give correct forms of the errors made by students. Recast for the teachers there, as it is claimed by Lyster (2001) that might be the most efficient, fastest, and easiest way in correcting students' errors recast is reasonably given for enhancing the lesson although it possesses gaps in second or foreign language proficiency, especially for phonological errors. Hence, it was found during the observation that teachers tended to provide recast after phonological and grammatical errors (Lyster 2001). This type of corrective feedback, indeed, can keep students' attention focused on the content of errors. They even could get the well-formed directly. In addition, senior high school students can comprehend the implicit corrective feedback provided by teachers, because they are included in advanced learners.

Elicitation is quite different from explicit correction and recasts in providing the correct form. Elicitation only gives a clue toward students' incorrect form, for instance on excerpt 5 and 6 above. Here, the students demanded to think by themselves toward the correct forms. Since this *pesantren* does not

apply student centre learning, this type of corrective feedback does not quite utilize due to the situation and condition. While repetition often used in order to merely signal the students that there is an error made by them, so that there is an urge or impulse for them to give correction or improvement on their utterances.

According to Aynalem, Abebe, Guadie, and Bires (2015) that teachers are able to attain the effective teaching and learning processes for further progress by selecting particular methods over others. Also, types of error corrections may be chosen particularly depending on students' characteristics, such as their types of errors made, their motivation, and curiosity. Hence, teachers' preferences need to be discovered by delivering some questions. Their preferences based on the questions in Lyster and Ranta (1997) can be seen on table 3 below.

Questions	T1	T2	T3
Should an error be corrected	Yes	Yes	Yes
When errors should be corrected	Immediately	Immediately	Immediately
Who should do the correction	Teacher	Student	Student
Which errors should be corrected	Grammar	Grammar	Grammar

Table 3. Teachers' preferences of Corrective Feedback

Errors are obligatorily corrected, because it was included in "*a serious mistake*" (Ellis 2009) that can affect students' ability and proficiency on their second or foreign language. As it is claimed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) that teachers inclined to correct students' errors prior to the senior year. Thus, 10th Grade students should be given more corrective feedback than senior students. Then, they preferred to correct students' errors immediately as soon as they made an error so that the students did not forget which error they had made. According to Nakata (2014), it was effective to enhance students' competency and motivation and decrease misconception. According to Ellis (2009), errors that are given immediate feedback can gain an accuracy preferable.

It was quite different on the preference of who should do the correction from T1, T2, and T3. Teacher 1 (T1) preferred to correct it by herself since the students could not understand as a whole in relation to their errors. She conducted this, because she wanted the students really understood their errors, why this can be errors, and how it should be corrected. From the interview result, she stated as follows:

"If there is no explanation of it, the students will be confused"

Since grammatical errors were the most frequent type occurred on four different meetings, she needed to state the errors part and give more explanation toward it. It was conducted in order to avoid ambiguity and ease the students in using English appropriately. Thus, her class tended to use teacher-based and explicit correction.

Even though Teacher 2 (T2) and Teacher 3 (T3) applied teacher center learning, they still wanted the students to be active in participating. It can be seen from the distribution of corrective feedback type that both of them are concerned on the student center learning, because the target language potentially can be a mediatory for language acquisition (Atma and Widiati 2015, p. 184). Here, the teachers were given an opportunity to their students to self-correct. In addition, it was insisted to enhance their ability well to its target language.

Those three teachers agreed that it should be focused more on the students' grammar utilization since it was conducted in Grammar classes. It can be seen from table 1 in which grammatical errors were the highest type of errors occurred than others. Thus, correcting the students' grammatical errors was preferred by those teachers. As the goal of Grammar class itself that there should be conformity in the grammar and meaningful communication (Celce-Murcia 2001). Hopefully, the grammar teachers were enthusiastic that their students comprehend well on the use of the appropriate grammar to be meaningfully utterances.

All Grammar teachers preferred to provide correction explicitly in order to prevent the same errors emersion which compatible with the total distribution of corrective feedback types.

> "Itu karena anak-anak lumayan susah pahamnya. Mereka belum familiar dengan hal itu jadi perlu dijelaskan lagi"

It was strengthened by Lyster and Ranta (1997) notion that an earlier Grade is suitable to be corrected explicitly. Furthermore, grammatical errors are better to give explicit correction in order to hinder ambiguity, and it was comprehensibility. Indeed, it was reasonable as well to choose this type of corrective feedback since MBI *Amanatul Ummah* applied teacher center learning. In addition, Grammar is not an easy lesson if it is students' second or even foreign language. Unlike other English skills, grammar needs more explanation by using explicit correction to assist the students to comprehend it well (Ok and Ustacı 2013), such as Teacher 2 stated on the interview.

> "Dengan memberikan penjelasan membuat mereka bisa jadi lebih paham sih. Karena ini skill nya grammar cocoknya memang diberi feedback yang ini, karena grammar itu tidak luput dari kealphaan anak-anak banyak rules nya kan gak tau pake yang ini atau yang mana jadi perlu diberi penjelasan lebih dalam untuk mengingatkan kembali. Tidak seperti recast yang hanya sebagai selingan dari explicit ini"

In this regard, correcting grammatical errors of the students has become a liability for Grammar teachers as explicit and immediate as possible.

5. Conclusion

Teacher 1 (T1) and Teacher 2 (T2) in Grammar classes provided all types of corrective feedback proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997). It is affected by their experience period in teaching, TOEFL score, and degree that were higher than T3. There was an absence of clarification request in T3 Grammar class due to the amount of its implicitness and miscommunication. Hence, this type of corrective feedback does not quite demand in T3 classroom interaction. It was found that explicit correction was the most frequent type from four different meetings. It was clear, noticeable, extensive knowledge, effective in correcting grammatical and lexical errors, and suitable in content-based learning. Then, it was followed by recast in the number of 34 due to its efficiency, fastest, and easiest way in correcting students' errors for the teachers in enhancing the lesson, especially for phonological errors. In addition, the number of grammatical errors was the highest errors followed by lexical and phonological since the focus of the class is grammar.

All teachers in 10th Grade of female English Grammar classes agreed that errors, especially grammatical errors should be corrected since it was conducted in Grammar classes. Hopefully, the students can comprehend well to produce a meaningful utterance. According to them, those errors were perfectly corrected by using explicit correction to avoid ambiguity. It was in accordance with Lyster and Ranta (1997) that errors in an earlier Grade better fitted in by utilizing explicit correction. Grammar teachers preferred to give correction immediately since the students are able to remember which part of the error. According to Nakata (2014), immediate corrective feedback can enhance students' motivation in learning the language. The preference on who should do the correction was quite diverse. Teacher 1 preferred the teacher itself to do the correction in which she followed the teacher center learning. Whereas Teacher 2 and Teacher 3 preferred the students to self-correct even though they still applied teacher centre learning due to the situation and condition at this *pesantren* required them to provide more explicit correction.

6. References

Atma, Nurul, and Utami Widiati. 2015. "EFL Students' Preferences for Corrective Feedback in Speaking Instruction Across Speaking Course Levels." *Bahasa dan Seni* 183-195.

Atma, Nurul, and Utami Widiati. 2015. "EFL STUDENTS' PREFERENCES FOR CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN SPEAKING INSTRUCTION ACROSS SPEAKING COURSE LEVELS." *BAHASA DAN SENI* 183-195.

Aynalem, Abebe F., Guadie Z., and Bires Z. 2015. "Students' Preference for the Various Teaching Methods in Tourism Courses: A Case of Tourism Management Department, Madawalabu University." *Tourism & Hospitality* 4 (4): 1-5.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne. 2001. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language.* Los Angeles: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Ellis, Rod. 2009. "Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development." *L2 Journal* 1 (1): 3-18.

Ito, Kinji. 2017. *THE EFFICACY OF TRANSLATION AND ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN PROMOTING LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY DEVELOPMENT.* Dissertation, New York: Binghamton University.

Ito, Kinji. 2017. *THE EFFICACY OF TRANSLATION AND ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN PROMOTING LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY DEVELOPMENT.* Dissertation, New York: Binghamton University.

Lyster, Roy. 2001. "Negotiation of Form, Recasts, and Explicit Correction in Relation to Error Types and Learner Repair in Immersion Classrooms." *Language learning* 265-301.

Lyster, Roy. 2001. "Negotiation of Form, Recasts, and Explicit Correction in Relation to Error Types and Learner Repair in Immersion Classrooms." *Language Learning* 265-301.

Lyster, Roy. 2001. "Negotiation of Form, Recasts, and Explicit Correction in Relation to Error Types and Learner Repair in Immersion Classrooms." *Language Learning* 265-301.

Lyster, Roy, and Iliana Panova. 2002. "Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom." *TESOL QUARTERLY* 573-595.

Lyster, Roy, and Leila Ranta. 1997. "Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake." *SSLA* 37-66.

Lyster, Roy, Kazuya Saito, and Masatoshi Sato. 2013. "Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms." *Lang. Teach* 1–40.

Masoumi, Sarah, and Mohammad Javad Riasati. 2014. "THE EFFECT OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK STRATEGIES ON IRANIAN EFL LEARNERS' LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT." *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)* 1-8.

Ok, Asst. Prof. Dr. Selami, and Hale Yayla Ustacı. 2013. "Preferences of ELT Students on the Strategies Instructors Use in the Correction of Oral Grammar Errors." *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 244-254.

Panova, Iliana, and Roy Lyster. 2002. "Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom." *TESOL QUARTERLY* 573-595.

Rahimi, Mohammad, and Arezoo Sobhani. 2015. "Teachers' Different Types of Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' Speaking Errors and Their Impact on the Students' Uptake of the Correct Forms." *Research Papers in Languange Teaching and Learning* 121-133.