



People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Abbes Laghrou University- Khenchela
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English



Students' Beliefs about Oral Corrective Feedback: Types, Time, and Importance

The Case of Second Year Students at the Department of English, Abbes Laghrou - Khenchela

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of The Requirements for The Degree of Master in Language and Culture

Candidates

Rayene KRAZDI

Moufida MAOUCHE

Supervisor

Dr. Abdelghafour BEDDIAF

Board of Examiners		
President	Dr. BEDDIAF AR	Khenchela University
Supervisor	Dr. BEDDIAF AG	Khenchela University
Examiner	Dr. CHOUANA KH	Khenchela University

June, 2024

Dedication 1

I dedicate this work:

To my precious parents, dear siblings, may Allah prolong their life.

To my beloved Moufida.

To all the teachers who have guided me throughout my journey.

RAYENE

Dedication 2

I dedicate this work:

To the light of My life, To the lady who believed in me, illuminates my path and kept pushing me toward. To my angel on earth who have been more than a mother a sister, a friend and a teacher.

To my beloved Mom this work and what I have been doing along these years is for you.

To The man who revealed my hidden abilities before I recognize it myself, who was obsessed to see the best version of me, this is for you my lovely dad.

To The essential pillars of my life, my brothers who have always been my best friends. My source of power and my pride.

My precious gain, my sister, my best friend, and collaborator in this success. You are the butterfly who filled my memories with vibrant colors. This work is dedicated to you Rayane, with all my love.

To my beloved friends, Kawther, Lamia, and Rima, thank you for believing in me when I doubted myself.

To all my teachers, friends, and every single person who played a part in making this happen, am grateful for your contributions, support and help.

MOUFIDA

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, we would like to thank Allah for giving us health, strength, and patience to complete this work.

Also, our sincere appreciation to our supervisor Dr. Abdelghafour BEDDIAF for his supportive guidance and his precious feedback throughout the research process, in addition to his insightful suggestions that improved our work. Without his help we could not have been able to accomplish and complete this present study.

Special thanks are also addressed to the board of examiners who have accepted to read and evaluate this work.

Last but not the least we wish to thank all the participants who have contributed to the achievement of the present study.

Finally, we would like to thank our special friends who encouraged and supported us all along the preparation of this dissertation.

Abstract

The present study seeks to investigate EFL students' beliefs about Oral Corrective Feedback. It attempts to determine the preferred types of corrective feedback that students found most helpful and least disruptive to their learning, and to examine the appropriate timing for providing the Oral Corrective Feedback according to them, as well as explores students' overall beliefs about the importance and effectiveness of oral corrective feedback. The investigation was conducted in the department of English at Abbes Laghrour, Khenchela University. The research relied on a mixed method approach which combines quantitative and qualitative data; where, a questionnaire was administered to 60 second year students of English, followed by an online structured interview conducted with 10 of them. The findings of the present research regarding preferred types of oral corrective feedback, showed that students hold two divergent preferences. According to the questionnaire, they prioritize *elicitation and metalinguistic feedback*, signifying that they like to be corrected explicitly. However, the interview data analysis reveals that students leaned towards implicit corrections, claiming it is the best method for improving their critical thinking. In terms of feedback timing, they expressed a high preference for delayed feedback. Finally, regarding oral corrective feedback importance, all students agreed on its effectiveness in their learning journey.

Keywords: *Delayed Feedback, EFL Students, Elicitation, Explicit and Implicit Correction, Metalinguistic Feedback, Oral Corrective Feedback, Students' Beliefs.*

List of Abbreviations

CF: Corrective Feedback

EFL: English As a Foreign Language

FL: Foreign Language

ESL: English As a Second Language

LCTL: Learners whose first language shares characteristics with the target language

MSU: Michigan State University

OCF: Oral Corrective Feedback

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

List of Tables

Table 1 Students' beliefs about Recast as a corrective strategy	29
Table 2 Students' beliefs about Repetition as a corrective type.	30
Table 3 Students' beliefs about Elicitation as a corrective strategy.....	31
Table 4 Students' beliefs about Metalinguistic Feedback as a corrective type.	31
Table 5 Students' beliefs about Explicit Correction as a corrective strategy.	32
Table 6 Students' beliefs about Clarification Request as a corrective type.....	33
Table 7 Students' beliefs about all types of Oral Corrective Feedback.....	33
Table 8 Students' beliefs about Immediate Feedback.	34
Table 9 Students' beliefs about Delayed Feedback.	35
Table 10 Students' beliefs about one-on-one conversations.....	35
Table 11 Learners' beliefs about receiving OCF in all times.	36
Table 12 Students' beliefs about the correction of the teacher at the end of speaking activity (delayed feedback).	37
Table 13 Students' beliefs about correcting all their mistakes during speaking activities.	38
Table 14 Students' beliefs about the impact of OCF on their learning when it is given in front of their classmates.	39
Table 15 Students' beliefs about receiving OCF both Immediate or Delayed when they are alone	40
Table 16 Students' beliefs about the effectiveness of OCF on their speaking skills.....	41
Table 17 Students' beliefs about teacher correction, in making them feel embarrassed.	41
Table 18 Students' beliefs about the effect of OCF in making them motivated to learn.	42

Table 19 Learners’ beliefs about whether OCF is a revealing strategy for their weaknesses and strengths or not.43

Table 20 Participants beliefs about the impact of OCF in motivating them to practice speaking more outside.43

Table 21 Learners’ beliefs about the impact of OCF in creating harmony between teachers and students.....44

Table 22 Students’ beliefs about the impact of OCF in increasing anxiety or not.45

Table 23 Participants beliefs about giving correction to beginners only.....45

Table 24 Students’ beliefs about the effectiveness of OCF whenever it addresses grammatical and pronunciation errors.46

Table 25 Students’ beliefs about the necessity of receiving correction to promote accuracy and fluency.47

Table 26 Learners’ beliefs about whether OCF decreases speaking difficulties and clarifies information.48

List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Students' Questionnaire.....64

Appendix 2: Students' Interview.....66

Table Of Content

Dedication 1	i
Dedication 2	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
List of Abbreviations	v
List of Tables	vi
List of Appendices	viii
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
1. Background	2
Basic Concepts	3
Oral Corrective feedback types	3
• Explicit Correction	3
• Recast	3
• Elicitation	3
• Clarification Request	3
• Metalinguistic Feedback	3
• Repetition	4
Explicit and Implicit corrective feedback types	4
• Implicit feedback	4
• Explicit feedback	4

1. Statement of the Problem	4
2. Research Questions	5
3. Objectives of the Study	6
4. Significance of the Study	6
5. Methodology	7
6. Data Gathering Tools	7
7. Population And Sampling.....	8
8. Thesis Structure	8
CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
Introduction	10
Review of Previous Studies.....	10
Conclusion.....	24
CHAPTER TWO: METHOD, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	25
Introduction	26
Section One: Research Methodology.....	26
2.1.1. Research Method.....	26
2.1.2. Sample and Participants.....	26
2.1.3. Data Collection Tools and Instruments	27
2.1.3.1 Procedure and Description of Student’s Questionnaire.....	27
2.1.3.2 Procedure and Description of Students’ Interview.....	27
Section Two: Data Analysis and Interpretation.....	29
2.2.1 Questionnaire Results	29

2.2.1.1 Types of Oral Corrective Feedback	29
2.2.1.2 Time of Feedback	34
2.2.1.3 Importance of Feedback	41
2.2.3 Discussion and Interpretation of The Findings	53
Conclusion.....	55
Limitations	57
Further research	57
Recommendations	58
References	59
APPENDICES	63
ملخص	67

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1. Background

Needless to say, in the era of a widening globalization, English is becoming more and more in demand worldwide across all aspects of life. In line with that, international communication has been increasing, which resulted in the growing demand for an indispensable communicative competence in English. For that matter, in the realm of education, the speaking skill conquered a paramount importance, among the other language skills (listening, reading and writing). For many learners of English as a foreign language (EFL), communicating effectively might seem as a daunting endeavor, for the fact that interaction through speaking English poses a number of challenges, mainly in regard speaking-related issues such as proper pronunciation and fluency. Therefore, when it comes to oral interactive communication, learners often tend to produce errors in speaking performances due to myriad of reasons.

The issue of how to correct learners' errors has long been of interest not only to teachers but also to researchers, hence they made an immense effort to promote this skill by adapting multiple strategies and techniques. One of which is corrective feedback, that is viewed as an effective tool for fostering students' progress and develop their communicative and cognitive competences; taking into consideration the insurmountable struggles that they face during the learning process. Corrective feedback incorporated different definitions. According to Lightbown and Spada (1999) it is "any indication to the learners that their use of target language is incorrect" (cited in Eltawy, p. 1). This implies that corrective feedback is regarded as an act that displays the mistakes of the learners, with the purpose of mirroring their performance to apprise them with their misuse of the target language whether orally or in writing. In this regard two prominent ways of correction emerged, which are writing corrective feedback and oral corrective feedback, this latter is defined as the response provided by teachers or other partners to language learners when

their output is erroneous, nontarget-like, and/or not appropriate or ambiguous. It indicates to them in an oral mode, either implicitly or explicitly, that something is not right with what they have said. (Oliver & Adams, 2021, p. 188)

Basic Concepts

Oral Corrective feedback types

Lyster and Ranta (1997) classified oral corrective feedback into six types. These types are: explicit correction; recast; elicitation; clarification request; metalinguistic feedback; and repetition. Therefore, on that basis the six types of corrective feedback could be summed up as follows.

- **Explicit Correction** Is the teacher's feedback in which she or he directly pinpoint the students erroneous and replace it with the right one.
- **Recast** Is when the teacher alters the wrong utterances wholly or partly into right ones throughout reformulating it, without making the students aware that they made the mistake.
- **Elicitation** Refers to the correct answer that is extracted by the teachers from their students, throughout posing questions, asking them to complete the teacher's partly utterance, or request the students to reformulate his or her initial utterance related to the mistake they did.
- **Clarification Request** The lecturers use words like excuse me! and pardon, as way to indicate that he did not understand what students meant by their utterances.
- **Metalinguistic Feedback** The teacher explains errors that occurred in the students' utterances, as a way to guide them towards the correct answer. This feedback can be either in the form of comments, questions or information.

- **Repetition** The sixth type of feedback in which the teacher repeats the incorrect utterances and raises her or his voice in a way that alert the speaker that there is a misuse in his language.

Explicit and Implicit corrective feedback types

Corrective feedback, in turn, was categorized into implicit and explicit according to Lyster and Saito (2010) and Ellis et al. (2006). As it is cited by (Xie and Yeung, p. 60).

- **Implicit feedback** Is feedback that follows indirect strategies to correct learner's erroneous, without drawing attention to the error itself. It encompasses: recast, repetition, and clarification Request.
- **Explicit feedback** Considered as a direct correction, which overtly informs the speaker that an error has occurred. It includes: Explicit Correction, Metalinguistic Feedback and Elicitation Feedback.

1. Statement of the Problem

Over the last few decades oral corrective feedback has received a lot of attention among second language researchers and practitioners, students are one of the main parties that can provide invaluable insights about corrective feedback since their beliefs can pave a way towards ensuring good teaching methods and facilitate the process of learning. The main aspects of corrective feedback focused on by researchers tended to be its importance, timing and types. A bulk of research looked at these issues by considering learners' views. Previous research suggests that learners' beliefs toward oral corrective feedback (OCF) tend to be positive overall. Generally, they viewed OCF as a helpful way to correct mistakes and improving their language learning. For

example, Zhu and Wang (2019) found that Chinese EFL learners have a positive view toward oral feedback. They believe it is a helpful method for enhancing their spoken English. But when it comes to time and types, they often have different beliefs. Students have mixed views on timing. Some appreciate immediate feedback to avoid continuing the error, as it was mentioned by Lee (2013), while others might prefer corrections after finishing their thoughts (delayed feedback), for smoother communication, Oztürk (2016). For the types, students' beliefs seem to vary. A study by Nhac (2022) examined teachers' and learners' perceptions of corrective feedback at a higher education institution. Their findings suggest that both teachers and learners valued the use of metalinguistic feedback, prompt feedback for grammatical and lexical errors while explicit correction and recast were preferred for phonological errors.

In a nutshell, from what was presented from previous studies, it turns out that most of such were concerned with a specific point while ignoring the other, and not giving it the same importance. For example, some studies were concerned with investigating oral corrective feedback in general without delving into its type, time, or importance, while some of them focused on the types, and neglected the other two elements. It is particularly noticeable that such studies are quite scarce in the Algerian context, especially in regard taking account of the three feedback aspects simultaneously mentioned above. Therefore, the research at hand is an endeavor to disclose learners' beliefs in respect OCF at Khenchela University, namely by addressing its types, timing and importance.

2. Research Questions

The present research work is directed by the following research questions:

1. What are second year EFL students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback types?

2. What are second year EFL students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback timing?
3. What are second year EFL students' beliefs concerning the role of oral corrective feedback?

3. Objectives of the Study

The current study was undertaken to investigate beliefs of students about types, timing, and the importance of corrective feedback in EFL oral instructions. Therefore, the following objectives are targeted:

- To determine which types are most preferred among second year students.
- To investigate what is the accurate time for providing OCF.
- To explore whether OCF is considered as a helpful method to enhance students' oral skills or not.

4. Significance of the Study

This study, focusing on students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback, types, timing, and importance holds significant value for students, teachers, and researchers.

For Students

By understanding the different types, timing, and importance of corrective feedback, students can have more informed conversations with their teachers about their learning goals and preferred feedback methods, this fosters collaboration and a sense of ownership over their learning. Moreover, this study can empower students to become more active participants within their learning classrooms. Throughout understanding their preferences and anxieties, students can work with their teachers to create a learning environment that optimizes their progress.

For Teachers

By understanding students' beliefs about OCF, teachers can create a more supportive and encouraging classroom environment where students feel comfortable, and actively participate. Which can lead to increased students' engagement and motivation. Also, the study findings can inform teachers about the types and timing of OCF that students find most beneficial. This knowledge can help teachers tailor their feedback methods to better suit their students' learning styles and preferences.

For Researchers

This study can serve as a springboard for further researchers, enlarging the researchers' knowledge by directly going to the field and provide experiences to the researchers in the field studied.

5. Methodology

To conduct this study, a mixed methods approach was adopted. In fact, the research combines quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection and data analysis.

6. Data Gathering Tools

To have significant answers about the research questions and to achieve the intended objectives, and to extract precise and valid data. The researchers collected the data by using a questionnaire, which was administered face-to-face to 60 second year students during study days. In addition to an online structured interview that was conducted with 10 students' from the two groups of second year.

7. Population And Sampling

Second year students of English at Khenchela University are 145 represent the entire population of the present study. The sample particularly comprises of 60 participants who were selected from the four groups using simple random sampling.

8. Thesis Structure

This thesis is divided into two chapters, in addition to a general introduction and general conclusion. The first chapter is about the literature review in which some concepts related to the topic were defined, in addition the theoretical framework related to the study which was about the previous studies. While the second chapter included two sections, the first comprised research methodology, sample size, the selection of the participants, and the procedures used in data collection. Whereas section two consisted of data analysis, interpretation and the discussion of the findings, followed by recommendations, limitations and suggestions for further studies.

CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Oral corrective feedback has recently been a tendency in foreign language classrooms, where it aims to consolidate the relationship between the listener and the speaker, and put higher attention on enhancing the speaking skill. This chapter will briefly browse through a number of previous research studies that elucidate types of corrective feedback, students' beliefs about time and effectiveness of OCF, in addition to the types of errors and which correction methods was preferred among learners from different backgrounds. The present chapter ultimately aims to explore the gaps that exist in previous studies that will direct the course and the objectives of this research.

Review of Previous Studies

Amidst the dynamic tapestry of language learning, classrooms filled with conversations and inevitable errors, teachers provide oral corrective feedback (OCF) within the use of different types. This feedback occurs based on learners' needs for the purpose of reigniting their enthusiasm and guiding them towards fluency. Lyster and Ranta (1997) were among the first who suggest how teachers choose to provide corrective feedback may be linked to learners' proficiency level. To reduce vagueness, they divided OCF into six types based on the implicit and explicit spectrum it encompasses: *explicit correction, recasts, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests, and repetition*. They investigated OCF and its different types while studying four French immersion classes with students in grades 4 and 5. The analysis of OCF in this study took 27 lessons, totaling 1,100 minutes (or 18.3 hours), focusing on two major areas: the way teachers treated the errors and student uptake after pointing out their errors. The data was analyzed twofold: first, the analysis focused on the frequency distribution of the different feedback types used by the

teachers; second, it focused on the relationship between feedback types and learner uptake moves. Overall, the most common type of corrective feedback given by the four teachers observed in their study was recasts, which were used as their primary method. The teachers also used prompts more often, believing that recasts were less effective than prompts at pushing learners to repair inaccurate utterances. However, the remaining feedback types including elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests, and repetition led to student-generated repair effectively.

Within these conflicting findings, a comparative study was conducted by Lyster and Mori (2006), which aimed to examine interactional feedback, uptake, and learners' repair in two separate teaching settings at the elementary level. One included 18 hours of French immersion, and the other took place in Japanese immersion classrooms for 14.8 hours. Thereof, this study investigated the effect of explicit correction, recasts, and prompts on learners' uptake and repair. The results accentuate that recasts were prominent in both classes rather than the remaining types, explicit correction and prompts. However, it appears learners' uptake and distribution of types of feedback varied based on feedback types and learning instructional settings. In French classes, they adapted prompts as an accurate strategy for fixing their errors, for the purpose of enhancing students' fluency. Meanwhile, in Japanese classes, students focused on accuracy by making corrections based on recasts. To reduce the intensity of the aforementioned contradicted results, Lyster and Mori (2006) introduced the counterbalance hypothesis. This latter suggests that instructional activities and interactional feedback serve as a counterbalance to the prevailing communicative focus of certain classroom settings. This approach, due to its effectiveness in promoting language development and improvement, will facilitate the restructuring of the interlanguage.

In 2014, Brown conducted a meta-analysis study, bringing together multiple existing studies for the purpose of getting a broader understanding of how L2 teachers provide oral

corrective feedback and what aspects of language they address while correcting. In the analysis, Brown depicted studies that shed light on the way teachers give oral corrective feedback to students' errors. Each study was characterized by its unique framework, including Lyster and Ranta's (1997) taxonomy of six types of CF (recast, explicit correction, elicitation, clarification request, metalinguistic clues, repetition). They also identified different linguistic foci that teachers focus on, such as vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar. In the synthesis stage, he explored the frequency of the used CF types and the linguistic focus of feedback. Also, he explored factors influencing teachers' CF, such as students' proficiency, teachers' experience, and the second/foreign language context (e.g., immersion vs. traditional classroom). The meta-analysis revealed that recasts were commonly used, followed by prompts with a less significant percentage, albeit it guides students effectively into self-repair. Furthermore, grammar errors were a top priority, with a significant percentage of CF targeting grammatical issues.

Based on the body of research described above, the horizon of corrective feedback has noticeably extended. It now occupies an eminent role in second language acquisition. Li (2010) conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis investigating the efficacy of corrective feedback in second language acquisition (SLA). Li meticulously analyzed 33 studies, varying between published papers and dissertations, aiming to update and add knowledge to prior analyses. The findings suggest that feedback yields a fairly significant effect on SLA. The impact remains steady throughout time, and it is even stronger when implementing implicit feedback compared to explicit feedback. Moreover, the study accentuates that studies which took place in controlled laboratory settings displayed a stronger influence compared to the studies that were conducted in classrooms. Furthermore, short-term treatments generated a larger effect than longer ones. Finally, the study

exposed that corrective feedback in foreign language contexts produces more substantial results than in second language contexts.

In a similar vein, Lyster and Kazuya (2010) conducted an additional study in the same year, delving into the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback on improving students' target language in classroom settings. The study enlisted 827 participants and analyzed 15 classroom-based experiments. It aimed to see whether corrective feedback affects learners' proficiency throughout the language learning process. This latter study incorporated different factors, including: types of CF, outcome measures, instructional settings, and learners' age. The research findings imply that corrective feedback has a profound impact on boosting students' proficiency. However, the impact varies depending on each type of CF. They found that prompts were highly recommended and have a stronger influence compared to recasts. Additionally, the effects were particularly evident in measures that require free constructed responses. The types of classrooms did not have a significant effect, meaning the classroom setting itself doesn't seem to matter. Yet, longer treatments had larger effects than shorter ones. Finally, the study revealed that age is important, with younger learners having an advantage and benefiting more from corrective feedback compared to their older counterparts. In the quest to enhance grammar skills within the process of second language learning, many methods and techniques were explored.

In 2017, a study by Hossein Nassaji delved into the effectiveness of different types of feedback, particularly recasts, in improving the level of second language learners. The study compared two major types of recasts: intensive recasts, which prioritize fixing articles errors, and extensive recasts, which focus on amending any mistake learners might commit while learning. To mirror the results, the researchers selected 48 adult intermediate ESL learners and divided them into three main groups: extensive recasts group, intensive recasts group, and control group. They

were pretested and post-tested immediately and after two weeks, utilizing three distinct outcome measures. The results indicated that both recasts' groups outperformed the control group. Furthermore, they support the idea that extensive recasts yielded a more prominent effect than intensive recasts in improving students' level. This finding challenges the previously held notion that solely targeting student errors is superior in addressing errors and correcting them accurately.

Throughout the journey of foreign language learning, students and teachers often have discrepancies on how foreign languages should be taught. This has led to a growing focus on this issue. In 2009, Brown investigated the expectations of foreign language teachers and students on what makes an effective learning experience. The study revealed a surprising mismatch between both groups: students favored a grammar-based approach, while teachers preferred a communicative classroom environment, meaning they placed high importance on methods that encourage interaction between students to create a practical language-use atmosphere. However, these differences may make students unsatisfied with the classroom instruction, which can cause them to quit. Brown recommended that teachers consider students' perspectives by asking for their feedback and explaining the rationale behind the use of specific teaching methods over others. This can help improve the learning environment and bridge the gap between teacher and student perspectives.

Effective foreign language (FL) teaching goes beyond simply focusing on the actions of the teacher or learner. It requires considering the broader dynamics and interactions between them. This understanding is crucial for planning effective classroom activities. Teachers sometimes hesitate to correct student mistakes, fearing a negative reception. However, traditional ideas may not always be the best approach. Simard and Jean (2011) addressed this issue in a study investigating perceptions and beliefs of high school students and teachers about grammar

instruction. Specifically, the study focused on grammatical accuracy, corrective feedback, and different forms of grammar teaching and learning. It involved 45 teachers and 2,321 students. The researchers collected data on student attitudes towards grammar instruction, including its effectiveness, difficulty level, and interest. They also explored student receptivity to various grammar practices like exercises, rule presentations, and corrective feedback. For comparison, they gathered teacher beliefs on the same topics. The study considered student age, gender, and their beliefs and perceptions in both English and French, Canada's two official languages. The results indicated that learners appreciate the value of grammar instruction, recognizing its importance in creating accurate written and oral productions. They also valued error correction, particularly in their written work. Overall, both students and teachers agreed on the benefits of grammar instruction. However, some belief differences emerged. Students held a more positive attitude towards grammar instruction compared to teachers. Regarding gender and age, girls tended to have more positive feelings about grammar instruction. The only difference related to age was in the area of accuracy: older students placed a higher value on accurate speech compared to younger students.

Learners have different views and opinions on the most effective ways to learn or acquire a second language. This has led to some discrepancies about the importance of grammar instruction and error correction. In this context, Loewen and Al (2009) investigated the beliefs of L2 learners regarding these factors in the classroom. The study employed a mixed-methods research design, surveying 754 students at Michigan State University (MSU). Data came from two sources: a questionnaire consisting of 37 Likert-scale items and an additional survey where participants responded to four open-ended statements about grammar study. The quantitative analysis identified six factors in the learners' responses to the Likert-scale statements. The first factor, titled "Efficacy

of Grammar," emphasized the importance of grammar in achieving fluency. Here, LCTL learners (learners whose first language shares characteristics with the target language) had the highest score, while English learners had the lowest. This suggests that LCTL learners were most positive about the role of grammar in L2 learning, whereas English learners were least positive. The second factor, "Negative Attitude Toward Error Correction," was viewed separately and somewhat negatively by the participants. ESL learners (English as a Second Language learners) were less convinced about the value of error correction and more enthusiastic about improving communicative skills than foreign language learners. Another factor, "Priority of Communication over Grammatical Accuracy," showed that ESL learners were more enthusiastic about improving communicative skills. However, the fourth and fifth factors, "Importance of Learning Grammatical Rules" and "Speaking Grammatically Accurately," indicated that both sets of learners valued these aspects. The final factor, "Negative Attitude Toward Grammar Instruction," revealed that some learners have a strong aversion to explicit grammar instruction methods. The qualitative analysis found that learners generally liked studying grammar because it helped them learn the language overall, but also specifically with writing, reading, and speaking. Overall, while student beliefs varied between strong support and opposition, there was some level of agreement on the importance of both grammar instruction and error correction.

In 1996, an exploratory study raised at the University of Arizona by A. Schulz, investigating student and teacher perspectives about the value of emphasizing grammatical accuracy (focus on form) in foreign language learning. Researcher surveyed 824 students and 92 teachers across various languages. Student data were collected using a multiple-choice type questionnaire, administered to 340 students enrolled in various German language courses at the University of Arizona. A follow-up study, using identical questions, was conducted with students in Arabic,

Chinese, French, Italian, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish language classes, resulting in a total sample size of 824. For teachers, data were collected using a questionnaire distributed by email, with items similar to those contained in the student questionnaire. The study revealed a surprising trend: students generally favored a focus on form, while teacher beliefs diverged more widely. Further analysis identified discrepancies in both teacher opinions and student-teacher agreement. This can imply that teachers may not be aware of the positive attitude of students towards the benefits of grammar instruction and error correction.

Years later, in 2001, A. Schulz conducted another comparative study about student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback in foreign language (FL) learning. The study compared two universities: one in the USA and one in Colombia. A questionnaire was distributed to 607 Colombian FL students and their 122 teachers. The same procedure was followed with 824 U.S. FL students and their 94 teachers. The researcher aimed to extract the participants' perceptions about the role of explicit grammar instruction and corrective feedback in enhancing FL learning, taking into consideration their distinct cultural settings. The study revealed a strong agreement among students in both cultures: explicit grammar instruction and corrective feedback play a crucial role in FL learning. Additionally, the majority of teachers in both groups agreed that grammar instruction helps in language learning. However, they believed that real-life communication tasks also play an important role. More accurately, Colombian students and their teachers leaned towards traditional language teaching methods, indicating a strong belief in the efficacy of explicit grammar instruction and error correction. In contrast, their American counterparts were more hesitant. The article also highlights the importance for teachers to consider their students' perceptions on what would accelerate the learning process. When there

are discrepancies between teacher and student expectations, it can make learning cumbersome and ineffective.

In the realm of rehearsing oral skills, feedback has become a necessity for the English language learning journey. However, some emerging research has shown a potential divide between teachers' and students' beliefs regarding Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF). In 2016, Roothoof & Breeze conducted a study that highlighted the gap between teachers' and students' views towards OCF in language learning. They built upon previous research that revealed students' strong desire to receive more corrections, contrasting with their teachers' reluctance to provide feedback due to concerns of hindering students' learning. To add new insights, the researchers surveyed 395 students and 46 teachers to confirm the previous findings. Surprisingly, they found that students preferred explicit methods to correct their errors, whereas teachers tended to use implicit methods. This discrepancy stemmed from teachers' concerns about students' feelings and emotions. They feared providing feedback that might not meet students' expectations could demotivate them. However, the study revealed that students had a positive experience with receiving feedback. The findings suggest a need to narrow the gap between teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF. This can be achieved when teachers understand how students feel about feedback methods, ultimately creating a supportive and effective learning environment.

Similar to the previous study, Kartchava et al. (2018) investigated the disparity between future English language teachers' beliefs about OCF and their actual classroom performance when correcting learner errors. They surveyed 99 pre-service teachers about their beliefs regarding correcting students' oral errors. The analysis revealed numerous factors influencing these beliefs. To bridge this gap, ten teachers described how they would adjust to rectify student mistakes in a simulated classroom scenario with researcher observation and analysis. The results highlighted the

contradictions between teachers' beliefs and their actual methods. They corrected fewer errors than anticipated, yet preferred the same methods in both simulated and real situations. This discrepancy stemmed from limited teacher experience, leading them to create an unrealistic image of themselves as native speakers rather than language instructors. Therefore, developing clear and comprehensive teacher training programs is crucial. These programs can facilitate a stronger connection between teachers' beliefs and practical teaching skills.

In 2014, Kartchava and Ammar conducted a study which explored whether learners' beliefs about corrective feedback influence what they notice and learn in an English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom. The participants were 197 high-beginner college-level French speakers. The teachers, assigned to groups based on their existing feedback styles, provided feedback on past tense and past question errors. Learners completed a questionnaire gauging their beliefs about feedback (40 items). Half (n=99) then participated in an intervention. Correlations were drawn between learners' average belief scores, their reported noticing on an immediate recall measure, and their performance on picture description and error-detection tasks. The results identified four common beliefs, two of which were linked to noticing the provided feedback, but none showed a direct impact on learning outcomes.

In 2013, Lee conducted a study exploring how corrective feedback is used and viewed in advanced-level adult ESL classrooms. The study adopted a mixed-methods design, and data were collected through observations, questionnaires, and in-depth follow-up interviews. With the combination of these data tools, the research revealed that teachers primarily used recasts, prompting student self-correction in 92% of cases. However, students actually preferred immediate and specific corrections during conversations and interactions. Interestingly, despite acknowledging the benefits of feedback, teachers felt they shouldn't correct every error, potentially

explaining the gap between student preferences and observed practices. These findings highlight the complex interplay between learner expectations, teacher beliefs, and the actual implementation of corrective feedback in language classrooms.

In order to investigate how advanced and intermediate ESL learners prefer their errors to be corrected and what their expectations are within that process. Oladejo conducted research in 1993. The study compared these preferences to the approaches employed by language linguists and teachers. The research findings revealed that learners possess distinct expectations and preferences that contrast with the prevailing approaches used by linguists and teachers. Oladejo argues that to ensure the efficacy of error correction, it is important to move beyond rigid and standardized methods. Instead, error correction must be tailored to be more flexible and adaptable to meet students' needs and preferences.

Within a classroom setting, the degree of anxiety differs from one learner to another. In this regard, a study by Jun Zhang and Rahimi (2014) examined the contrasting beliefs about receiving corrective feedback (CF) between high-anxiety and low-anxiety students. The researchers recruited 160 Iranian EFL learners from three language institutions in Central Iran. To ensure an accurate comparison, they divided the participants into two groups of 80 students each. Both groups received information about the importance, purpose, and types of CF based on Ellis (2009). Data collection involved a foreign language classroom scale and a questionnaire. Interestingly, the study revealed that both groups welcomed correction regardless of their anxiety levels. They held similar views on the value of feedback, its frequency, and the teachers who provide it. This suggests that although there is a significant difference in anxiety levels between learners, it may not create discrepancies in their beliefs regarding CF.

A study by Davis in 2003 explored teachers' and students' views on language learning through a survey on methods and approaches. The findings revealed both agreement and disagreement on key aspects of learning. For instance, both groups valued the importance of vocabulary building and exposure to authentic language. However, students placed greater emphasis on starting language learning younger for better results, focusing on mastering grammar rules before moving on to new concepts, receiving immediate correction of errors to avoid bad habits, and using materials that closely aligned with pre-taught grammatical structures. In contrast, teachers might have valued a more communicative approach or a focus on developing broader language skills.

Likewise, a comprehensive study by Zhu and Wang (2019) surveyed over 2,600 EFL learners across different universities in China using a 44-item questionnaire. The study aimed to examine EFL students' attitudes towards receiving oral corrective feedback (OCF). The analysis revealed seven categories of beliefs: general attitudes towards CF, timing, output-prompting CF, uptake, input-providing CF, peer CF, and the importance of correcting different types of errors. Overall, the study found that Chinese EFL learners have a positive view toward oral feedback. They believe it is a helpful method for enhancing their spoken English. Additionally, learners favored immediate feedback over delayed feedback and appreciated opportunities to self-correct before receiving the correct answer. They also saw benefits from receiving corrections and feedback from their peers. The findings suggest a strong relationship between learners' beliefs about feedback and what previous studies have demonstrated. Finally, the study points out that these preferences can vary based on different educational backgrounds and contexts.

A few years, a comparative study appeared by Wang and Li (2020), where they investigated how teachers involved feedback while interacting with students. They also examined student

uptake, which differed across Second Language (ESL) and Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, despite some shared preferences. They studied university students learning English in US (ESL) and Chinese (EFL) contexts, dedicating 36 hours of observations throughout. By analyzing the records of classroom lessons, they found that recasts were commonly used in both settings. However, it is prevalent within EFL classes, where a higher percentage of recasts was noticed. Both classes targeted similar types of mistakes, but with distinct linguistic foci. ESL teachers put a higher interest on grammar, while EFL teachers focused on pronunciation and word choice. The overall distribution of CF by category (e.g., grammar, fluency, etc.) was comparable to some extent, but the linguistic aspects targeted differed significantly. Uptake and repair were close overall, but explicit correction was prominent in EFL classes. The total frequencies of uptake and repair were similar. However, EFL students were more likely to take up and repair feedback, especially when it was followed by explicit correction. The findings suggest that while CF practices share some common ground, the nuances of language learning contexts can considerably influence both teachers' feedback and learners' responses.

A study in 2021 was conducted by Van Ha, Murray, and Riazi, in Vietnamese high schools, investigating students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback (CF) in English classes, considering how factors like gender, motivation, and personality influence those beliefs. The study employed an explanatory sequential mixed-methods research design. Over 250 students completed questionnaires, and 15 participated in follow-up interviews. The research identified six themes in student beliefs about CF, while the analysis of the interviews showed that students were positive about CF. They liked both input-providing CF and output-prompting CF for all error types. Metalinguistic feedback was the most strongly preferred, while clarification request was the least preferred. Interestingly, the study found that females generally viewed CF more positively than

males, extraverted females preferred receiving the correct answer more than introverted females, and students motivated by exams were more receptive to CF compared to those motivated by communication. Based on these findings, the study concludes with recommendations for educators to deliver effective CF in EFL contexts.

To understand learners' preferences for corrective feedback timing, Wang and Zhu (2019) explored Chinese EFL learners' beliefs about receiving spoken corrections (oral corrective feedback) through a large survey. Over 2,600 learners from 15 universities across China participated. The 44-item survey investigated seven key areas of belief: general feelings about OCF, timing (immediate vs. delayed), prompting learners to self-correct (output-prompting), their own role in using feedback (uptake), providing correct information (input-providing), feedback from peers, and the perceived seriousness of errors. Overall, learners expressed positive views on OCF, favoring immediate corrections and prompts to self-correct over receiving the correct answer directly. They also showed some openness to feedback from peers and the benefits of actively using corrections (uptake). The findings align to some extent with existing research on effective language learning through error correction, but also suggest that learners' beliefs about OCF can vary depending on their educational background.

The effectiveness of oral corrective feedback (OCF) has been studied for a long time, with a focus on its effectiveness rather than learner perception. Öztürk & Öztürk (2016) addressed this gap by investigating how EFL learners perceive different types (e.g., recasts, clarification requests) and timings of OCF in spoken activities. Their data, gathered through focus groups, classroom observations, and reflective interviews, revealed that learners found recasts and clarification requests unclear and vague, potentially leading to confusion. Metalinguistic feedback, explaining grammar rules explicitly, was seen as difficult and caused anxiety. Learners also expressed

discomfort with immediate corrections, preferring them to be delayed to maintain fluency. Frequent corrections were perceived as discouraging and hindering participation. This study suggests that tutors should consider these learner preferences to deliver effective feedback that minimizes anxiety and promotes speaking fluency.

Conclusion

To entirety up, according to the aforementioned studies that was presented in this chapter, OCF holds different beliefs and perceptions between students and teachers when it comes to its types, and the accurate time to provide it. Therefore, some studies emphasized on its effectiveness in improving students' skills and enhance their level. Whereas, some suggest that it may hinder their confidence which could impede their communication abilities. In line with that, this research is conducted to investigate students' beliefs about the preferred types of OCF among them, which time they like to perceive OCF, and to explore whether they believe that OCF is important in their oral classes. In addition, to its effectiveness in improving their speaking skills.

CHAPTER TWO: METHOD, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the practical aspect of the research, it is divided into two sections. The first section details the methodology used to address the research questions, this includes the chosen instruments, the target population, and the sampling method. The second section dives into data analysis, exploring the findings and their interpretations.

Section One: Research Methodology

2.1.1. Research Method

The researchers employed a mixed methods approach. This approach is defined by (Johson et al. 2007 p.123) as “ the type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combines elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (e. g., use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration ”. By integrating both quantitative and qualitative data, the study aims to uncover multifaceted dimensions of the research questions. To achieve this, the researchers adopted an explanatory mixed methods design, utilizing both interview and questionnaire. This combination provides a richer understanding of the research questions compared to a single method approach.

2.1.2. Sample and Participants

The case study of this research were second-year students of the English department at Abbes Laghrour Khenchela University, which consists of 04 classes. The sample of this study holds 60 students out of 145. Concerning the choice of this population, second-year students are intermediate learners; they can discuss and express their thoughts openly and in a critical way.

Additionally, they seek to learn and enhance their speaking skill problems, plus they have enough background and prior knowledge about the corrective feedback and how the lessons are presented.

2.1.3. Data Collection Tools and Instruments

To explore students' beliefs regarding oral corrective feedback, including its types, timing, and importance, and ultimately address the research questions, the study employed a combination of two data collection tools. The quantitative tool was in a form of questionnaire, as for the qualitative one it was in a form of structured interview.

2.1.3.1 Procedure and Description of Student's Questionnaire

Seventy (70) questionnaires were handed out manually to second-year students on March 12, 2024, and only sixty (60) questionnaires were collected. The questionnaire comprised of three sections, each utilizing a five-point Likert scale. Students indicated their level of agreement or disagreement with each statement using a range of options typically including: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree. The first section consisted of 7 statements and focused on the types of oral corrective feedback; the second comprised of 8 statements addressing the most appropriate timing for such feedback; and the final section explored the perceived importance of feedback in general with 11 statements.

2.1.3.2 Procedure and Description of Students' Interview

A structured online interview was conducted with ten (10) second-year students from two groups who were willing to participate in this experience. The interview entails nine open-ended questions divided into three sections. The sections were intitles as follow:

- The first one: "Students' Beliefs about Oral Corrective Feedback Types"

- The second: "Students' Beliefs about the Appropriate Timing of Oral Corrective Feedback"
- The last: "Students' Beliefs about the Importance of Corrective Feedback"

Each section encompassed three questions that differed from one another, aiming to attain a deep understanding and uncover multiple dimensions of the study.

Section Two: Data Analysis and Interpretation

2.2.1 Questionnaire Results

2.2.1.1 Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

This study employed a five-point Likert scale, which ranges from "Strongly Disagree" (SD) to "Strongly Agree" (SA), with intermediate options of "Disagree" (D), "Neutral" (N), and "Agree" (A). Therefore, a breakdown of the abbreviations and their corresponding meanings is as follow:

SD: Strongly Disagree

D: Disagree

N: Neutral

A: Agree

SA: Strongly Agree

Table 1

Students' beliefs about Recast as a corrective strategy.

Statement 1	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	6.66	8.33	13.33	36.66	35

As it is reported in the Table 1, which states "*I found it useful when my teacher reformulates my errors indirectly without making me feel that I was incorrect*", majority of students (71.66%) find indirect error correction from teachers helpful, this is evident from the combined percentage of those who agree (36.66%) and strongly agree (35%) with the statement. A smaller portion of students (almost 15%) have a negative view of indirect error correction, this includes those who disagree (8.33%) and strongly disagree (6.66%) with the statement.

Table 2

Students' beliefs about Repetition as a corrective type.

Statement 2	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	11.66	20	13.33	33.33	21.66

According to Table 2, which stands for "*I like when my teacher repeats my errors, to make me aware of my mistakes*", the results show that a high portion (54.99%) leans towards agreement, this is a combination of those who agree (33.33%) and strongly agree (21.66%), suggesting that students find the statement beneficial and fitting for their learning environment. However, a total of 31.66% disagree with the statement, indicating that students' opinions are divided. Additionally, a small number (13.33%) remained neutral.

Table 3*Students' beliefs about Elicitation as a corrective strategy.*

Statement 3	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	1.66	10	6.66	66.66	15

From the Table 3 which reflects the statement " *I like when my teacher poses a question related to the mistake, I made to correct them*", a high frequency went for agree (66.66%), followed by (15%) of strongly agree, this can prove that learners favored when their teachers adopted the strategy of asking questions related to the mistakes they committed. Whereas, few participants hold a reverse view, where (11.66%) did not favor this method of receiving feedback. And, a minority were objective with a percentage of (6.66%).

Table 4*Students' beliefs about Metalinguistic Feedback as a corrective type.*

Statement 4	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	3.33	10	8.33	53.33	25

The results from Table 4 which proclaims *"I benefit when my teacher offering a relevant example about the grammatical aspect which I may have missed to correct my mistake"*, demonstrated that around (53.33%) of students strongly agreed with the statement, followed by (25%) who agreed with it. Conversely, the section of disagreement encompassed those who strongly disagreed (3.33%) and disagreed (10%), this clearly indicates that relevant grammar examples help the students to learn from their mistakes. Additionally, a minority of students (8.33%) remained neutral.

Table 5

Students' beliefs about Explicit Correction as a corrective strategy.

Statement 5	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	1.66	10	18.33	50	20

From Table 5 which conveys *"I find it most useful when my teacher corrects my errors in a direct way"*, a high frequency went for agreement (70%), with a combined percentage of agree and strongly agree, means that students found it useful when the teacher directly correct their mistakes. Whereas, a small number went for the disagreement section with a total of (11.66%). To finally end up by (18.33%) students who were objective with the statement.

Table 6*Students' beliefs about Clarification Request as a corrective type.*

Statement 6	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	13.33	26.66	15	30	15

For the sixth statement *"I don't like when my teacher interrupts me by saying excuse me! what did you say for the purpose of correcting me"*, there were discrepancies between students' answers. On one hand, about (39.99%) (agree+ strongly disagree) upon the statement. On the other hand, (45%) favored the strategy and found it useful to some extent. Further there was about (15%) who were neutral and did not show any preferences towards being asked to repeat as a way to alter and correct their mistakes.

Table 7*Students' beliefs about all types of Oral Corrective Feedback.*

Statement 7	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	0	8.33	38.33	38.33	15

As for the seventh statement " *I think that all the ways that are used in OCF, both explicitly and implicitly, are useful*", the results reveals that a significant portion (38.33%) agreed and (15%) strongly agreed that all methods are useful, while a small group (8.33%) disagreed. Whereas around (38.33%) preserved neutrality.

2.2.1.2 Time of Feedback

Table 8

Students' beliefs about Immediate Feedback.

Statement 1	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	6.66	21.66	16.66	35	20

According to Table 8 which reflects the statement " *I prefer to receive oral corrective feedback immediately after I make a mistake*", the data reveals that the majority (around 55%) of respondents agree (35%) or strongly agree (20%) with immediate feedback, this could be because they want to be corrected right after committing a mistake to avoid confusion. While the minority (around 28.32%) of respondents do not prefer immediate oral corrective feedback, and around 16.66% of respondents were neutral, possibly indicating they are open to immediate feedback in some situations but not all.

Table 9*Students' beliefs about Delayed Feedback.*

Statement 2	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	8.33	15	15	33.33	28.33

The results of the statement *"I prefer to receive oral corrective feedback After I have finished speaking"*, show that over 60% (61.66%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed on receiving oral corrective feedback after finishing speaking. However, a significant portion (23.33%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, indicating a preference for immediate feedback. The remaining 15% were neutral, which could mean they are open to either the immediate or delayed feedback.

Table 10*Students' beliefs about one-on-one conversations.*

Statement 3	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	10	15	16.66	46.66	11.66

The results regarding *"I prefer to receive oral corrective feedback during a one-on-one conversation with the teacher"*, indicates that nearly half (46.66%) of respondents agreed, followed by (11.66%) who strongly agreed, this suggests that they like to receive feedback while one-on-one conversation with the teacher. However, around (25%) expressed a reverse preference, with 15% disagreeing and 10% strongly disagreeing, and the remaining 16.66% were neutral.

Table 11

Learners' beliefs about receiving OCF in all times.

Statement 4	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	5	10	40	33.33	11.66

As it is presented in the statement *"I appreciate the OCF in all times"*, around (44.99%) of respondents agreed and strongly agreed on perceiving feedback in all times, indicating they find it helpful in any situation. However, (40%) were neutral, and (15%) disagreed + strongly disagreed on the statement, this suggests that they might prefer feedback at specific times.

Table 12

Students' beliefs about the correction of the teacher at the end of speaking activity (Delayed Feedback).

Statement 5	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	1.66	10	20	40	28.33

Depending on the results of the statement "*I prefer when my teacher pinpoint my mistakes and give me the correct form at the end of the speaking activity*", over two-thirds (68.33%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they prefer their teacher to pinpoint mistakes and provide corrections at the end of a speaking activity, this suggests many students find it more beneficial to complete their thoughts before receiving feedback. There is a smaller portion (11.66%) who might prefer to receive feedback in other time, with 10% disagreeing and a very small number (1.66%) strongly disagreeing. The neutral responses (20%) could indicate openness to either immediate or delayed feedback, depending on the situation.

Table 13

Students' beliefs about correcting all their mistakes during speaking activities.

Statement 6	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	1.66	10	20	40	28.33

From the Table 13 which conveys "*It is important for my teacher to correct all of my mistakes during speaking activities*", the data reveals a range of opinions regarding teachers correcting all mistakes during speaking activities, 68.33% of respondents (agree + strongly agree) believe correcting all mistakes is important, while a significant portion (11.66%) expressed a reverse preference (disagree + strongly disagree). In addition to that, the remaining 20% were neutral.

Table 14

Students' beliefs about the impact of OCF on their learning when it is given in front of their classmates.

Statement 7	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	23.33	25	16.66	23.33	11.66

A noticeable number of participants nearly half of them (48.33%) disagreed with the statement "*OCF can negatively affect my learning when it is given in front of my classmates*", this indicates that they might not find public OCF detrimental to their learning. However, a significant portion (34.99%) fell into agree (23.33%) and strongly agree (11.66%) category, indicating that some students might be apprehensive about being corrected in front of others. This could be due to fear of embarrassment or a loss of confidence.

Table 15

Students' beliefs about receiving OCF both Immediate or Delayed when they are alone.

Statement 8	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	6.66	8.33	25	23.33	36.33

The results revealed that around (59.66%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed (36.33%+ 23.33%) with the statement "*I like when my teacher pinpoints my mistakes and correct them when I'm alone*", this suggests that a significant portion of students find private feedback more beneficial for their learning. There was a smaller portion (25%) who might be open to either public or private, and (14.99%) who might prefer public correction in some situations (disagree + strongly disagree). Which highlights the importance of offering students choices or tailoring the feedback time based on their individual preferences.

2.2.1.3 Importance of Feedback

Table 16

Students' beliefs about the effectiveness of OCF on their speaking skills.

Statement 1	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	0	6.66	10	33.33	50

The data towards the statement "*Receiving oral corrective feedback helps me improve my speaking skills*", shows that over 83.33% of respondents (strongly agree + agree) found it helpful. Disagreement was minimal, this indicates that corrective feedback is generally viewed as a valuable tool for developing speaking skill.

Table 17

Students' beliefs about teacher correction, in making them feel embarrassed.

Statement 2	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	10	23.33	20	26.66	20

For the second statement *"I feel embarrassed when my teacher corrects my mistakes while I am speaking"*, the data reveals a mixed reaction; where over a third of respondents (agree + strongly agree = 46.66%) experience some embarrassment, while around (33.33%) (disagree + strongly disagree) do not. This suggests some students may find corrective feedback less embarrassing than others.

Table 18

Students' beliefs about the effect of OCF in making them motivated to learn.

Statement 3	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	3.33	11.66	8.33	41.66	35

The data of the statement 3 *"Getting oral corrective feedback makes me feel more motivated to learn English"*, show that oral corrective feedback can be a motivational factor for language learning. 76.66% of respondents (agree + strongly agree) reported feeling more motivated by it. While some respondents (disagree + strongly disagree = 14.99%) did not find it motivating.

The positive response is significantly higher, this suggests that corrective feedback can be a valuable tool to boost language learning motivation.

Table 19

Learners' beliefs about whether OCF is a revealing strategy for their weaknesses and strengths or not.

Statement 4	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	0	3.33	15	51.66	30

The great majority of respondents (81.66%) agreed with the statement "*OCF helps me identify my strengths and weaknesses in speaking*", this suggests that OCF is generally perceived as a useful tool for self-assessment.

Table 20

Participants beliefs about the impact of OCF in motivating them to practice speaking more outside.

Statement 5	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	3.33	0	16.66	46.66	33.33

" Receiving OCF motivates me to practice speaking more outside of class". The results from the table above indicate that receiving OCF motivates 79.99% of people to practice speaking more outside of class. However, (3.33%) are not motivated by OCF to practice speaking. Overall, the results show that OCF is a positive motivator for speaking practice for most people.

Table 21

Learners' beliefs about the impact of OCF in creating harmony between teachers and students.

Statement 6	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	3.33	16.66	0	46.66	33.33

A high percentage of participants (over 70%) believe that *" The presence of OCF in EFL classes creates harmony between teacher and students"*. However, a significant portion (almost 20%) disagreed and strongly disagreed, indicating that OCF might not always lead to harmony. Overall, the data suggests that OCF can be a positive influence in EFL classrooms.

Table 22*Students' beliefs about the impact of OCF in increasing anxiety or not.*

Statement 7	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	18.33	25	26.66	21.66	8.33

Based on the 7 statement "*Correcting speaking errors increases the tension of anxiety*", the majority of respondents (43.33%) agreed that correcting speaking errors can actually decrease anxiety. While some (26.66%) expressed a neutral interest in this statement. A minority (29.99% agreeing and strongly agreeing) felt that corrective feedback would increase anxiety, potentially hindering their progress and their ability to speak freely.

Table 23*Participants beliefs about giving corrections to beginners only.*

Statement 8	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	43.33	30	15	11.66	0

The data indicates that most respondents disagree about "*Correction must be devoted to beginners only*", where a high frequency (73.33%) opted for disagreement, with 43.33% strongly disagreeing and 30% disagreeing. This suggests a preference for providing OCF to learners of all levels. Conversely, only around 11.66% agreed with the statement, viewing OCF as primarily helpful for beginners. While the remaining 15% expressed a neutral stance.

Table 24

Students' beliefs about the effectiveness of OCF whenever it addresses grammatical and pronunciation errors.

Statement 9	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	0	8.33	28.33	45	18.33

The results demonstrate that a significant number of participants (63.33%) agreed with the statement "*OCF effectiveness reaches its highest level when it targets grammatical and pronunciation errors*", this suggests that they believe Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) is most effective when it focuses on grammatical and pronunciation errors. However, a small portion of participants (8.33%) disagreed with this statement, and around 28.33% remained neutral.

Table 25

Students' beliefs about the necessity of receiving correction to promote Accuracy and Fluency.

Statement 10	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage %	0	10	21.66	51.66	16.66

From Table 25 which stands for "*As English language is a foreign language, correction must be there to promote accuracy and fluency*", the results show that majority of students favor Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) in speaking classes. Notably, none of the participants strongly disagreed, and only a small portion (10%) expressed a dissenting view. Conversely, a considerable number of participants viewed OCF positively 51.66% agreed and 16.66% strongly agreed. This suggests that students consider OCF as a vital tool for improving their speaking accuracy and fluency. The remaining (21.66%) remain a neutral stance.

Table 26

Learners' beliefs about whether OCF decreases speaking difficulties and clarifies information.

Statement 11	SD	D	N	A	SA
Percentage%	5	8.33	15	45	26.66

The results reveal that the majority of participants (71.66%) agree that "*OCF reduces the degree of speaking difficulty and clarifies information to learners*", this suggests most students appreciate Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) and view it as an effective tool for clarifying information and reducing speaking difficulties. However, a small portion of participants (13.66%) disagree, considering OCF unnecessary for achieving clarity. The remaining 15% expressed a more neutral stance.

2.2.2 Results of The Interview

An online structured interview was conducted with 10 second-year students. It was divided into three sections, each consisting of three questions. The purpose was to harvest their beliefs about the preferable type of corrective feedback, the appropriate time for providing it, and its importance in their learning journey.

2.2.1 Students' beliefs about Oral Corrective Feedback Types

As for the first question: **Are there certain types of mistakes you prefer your teacher to correct during speaking activities (Grammatical, Vocabulary, Pronunciation)? Why?**

When students were asked about the types of mistakes they preferred their teacher to correct during speaking activities, the majority valued both grammar and pronunciation corrections, believing that it improves communication as well as their level, and prevents them from making mistakes again. For instance, one of the participants said that "I prefer my teacher to correct my grammatical mistakes and pronunciation in order to not repeat the same mistake again, and to improve my level in English." Whereas a few participants prefer to receive the OCF constantly on grammatical errors, more precisely irregular verbs, tenses, and word order within a sentence. Additionally, two participants were open to all types and did not belong to a specific preference, because they appreciated any correction and did not care about the different types and forms of the oral corrective feedback.

Moving to the second question: **When making errors, do you like your teacher to correct you directly or indirectly? Justify your answer?**

There were diverse views when it comes to the best ways for addressing mistakes. Some students prefer when the teacher indirectly pinpoint their mistakes, which seemed, according to them, the best technique for deeper understanding and avoid being embarrassed in front of their classmates. As one of the students pointed out: "I would love from my teacher to give me an indirect correction because it will be more helpful and not embarrassing". However, some students favored direct corrections because it assists them to learn more effectively. Besides, one participant

acknowledged the situational value of both approaches, with direct correction being useful for preventing further mistakes and indirect guidance helping to manage students' stress.

And for the last question which was about: **Do you find it more helpful when the teacher corrects your mistakes explicitly or when they try to guide you towards the correct answer without directly pointing out the error?**

All the interviewees prefer teachers who guide them towards the correct answer instead of directly pointing out their mistakes. This strategy as they claimed it helps them develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills by encouraging them to analyze their work, identify errors, and ultimately learn from them more effectively.

2.2.2 Students' beliefs about the appropriate time of oral corrective Feedback

For the first question that was delivered to students, **according to you what is the best time for providing oral corrective feedback (OCF), while speaking (as soon as an error occurs) or (at the end of the speaking)?**

Students' preferences for oral corrective feedback (OCF) timing varied. The majority preferred receiving feedback after they finish speaking, they worried that immediate corrections might confuse them and lead them to forget their train of thoughts. For example, one of the participants responded saying "The best time for providing OCF is after I finish my speech. I think this is more appropriate for me because interrupting me in the middle or while I am speaking will make me more confused, and make me forget my ideas." Others advocated for a balanced approach. So, they suggested that the teachers should prioritize correcting "fatal" errors immediately, while letting minor ones wait. Additionally, some students believed the timing should depend on the learner's level, beginners might benefit from immediate feedback on fluency errors, while advanced

learners could handle delayed feedback on grammar. Finally, there was only one student who does not mind the timing of OCF, as long as they receive feedback.

Moving to the second question which stated: **In your opinion, are there situations where it is more beneficial for a teacher to address mistakes right away during speaking, or to wait and provide feedback later?**

According to the participants, the best time for providing OCF during speaking can be seen through different ways. The answers disclosed that most students hold onto one idea, that the right time for providing OCF based on certain situations and student's needs. They claim that it is better for the teacher to give immediate feedback during presentation or oral speaking; whenever the students commit an error related to pronunciation which constantly would alter the meaning of the word and the idea as well, or when students make grammatical mistakes that would disrupt the structure of the sentence. However, few members argue against the immediate OCF claiming that it is not beneficial during oral presentations or speaking activities, because it may decrease their confidence and disturb the flow of their thoughts.

As for the last one: **Do you think that when your teacher provides you with immediate feedback would affect the flow of your conversation? Justify?**

For the last question, students' opinions on the impact of immediate teacher feedback during conversation were mixed. Some students value it for improving learning and language correction, others worry that continuous interruptions can disrupt the flow and cause nervousness. They find immediate corrections distracting and pressuring, plus it hinders their ability to think and speak fluently. For example, one of them said: "It will affect my speaking, because I like to speak without interruption. So, if the teacher talks when I am speaking, I will totally be confused and I

will lose words ". Overall, students seem to value feedback, but prefer if it is delivered strategically; perhaps at pauses or after completing their thoughts.

2.2.3 Students' Beliefs about the Importance of Corrective Feedback

Initially the participants were asked as follows: **Imagine a class where there was no oral corrective feedback provided. How would this affect your learning?**

For the first question students overwhelmingly expressed that lack of oral corrective feedback (OCF) in class would significantly impede their learning. The main concern was the difficulty in identifying and rectifying errors. Without feedback, students worried they would continue making the same mistakes. Leading to slower progress, incomplete knowledge, and even learning an inaccurate way. Overall, the students viewed OCF as a crucial method for effective language learning.

For the second question which holds that: **Would it be difficult for you to identify and correct your speaking errors without your teacher?**

The majority of students agreed that it is a difficult and challenging task without the guidance of their teacher. Especially when they do not realize their own mistakes; taking into consideration that they still intermediate learners. So, they valued the teacher's intervention to pinpoint errors they miss themselves, and appreciated the feedback and guidance that helps them improve their speaking skills. Interestingly, a few students mentioned the possibility of using technology and self-recordings to find errors, but even the most self-aware learners acknowledged the limitations of self-correction and the importance of the teacher in identifying and rectifying speaking errors.

Ending up by the last question which was: **Do the presence of oral corrective feedback hinder your confidence while speaking up in class?**

Most interviewees express a high disagreement towards this question, for some students, they found OCF to be a confidence booster that helped them overcome shyness and participate more, while others, expressed concern that being corrected in front of classmates could be discouraging. The key seems to lie in both the student's personality and the teacher's approach. Shy students might be more apprehensive about OCF, while outgoing students might welcome it. A teacher's supportive and constructive delivery can make OCF a positive learning tool, while harsh corrections could be counterproductive.

2.2.3 Discussion and Interpretation of The Findings

This section delves into the findings of the study, which explored the preferences and beliefs of EFL students regarding Types, Timing and Importance of Oral Corrective Feedback. Which set out to answer the three research questions.

To answer the first research question which was about the students' preferred types of corrective feedback, the results showed an interesting contrast between students' stated perceptions on the questionnaire and their expressed preferences during the interview.

According to the results obtained from students' questionnaire, it demonstrates a significant discrepancy in rankings for the six types with a notable percentage. Elicitation was the most preferable and appreciable type with (81.66%), Followed by metalinguistic feedback with (78.33%). This indicates that the participants prefer the teachers to correct their mistakes using explicit strategies. This latter came in congruence with a previous study done by Roothoof & Breeze (2016) who found that students preferred explicit methods to correct their errors.

However, the interview results revealed that students favored the implicit methods rather than explicit ones, claiming that it draws their attention to mistakes, pushing them to figure out the correct answer themselves. This latter according to interviewees would constantly improve their critical thinking and make them more comfortable whenever they receive feedback. Furthermore, grammar and pronunciation corrections were a top priority for them.

This difference in results may have occurred because students might have felt pressured to choose the option perceived as more desirable in a formal setting (questionnaire). While the interview allowed them to express their preferences for implicit methods freely.

For the second research question of the study, in terms of the accurate timing for providing OCF. The results of the two data instruments indicate a high preference for delayed feedback. This result aligns with Ozturk (2016) study, who found that students feel uncomfortable with immediate feedback and prefer the delayed type for maintaining fluency. Students' greater preference for delayed feedback is due to several reasons, one prominent factor is that they seek for sustaining fluency, and the constant interruption would hinder their progress of learning and reduces their interaction within classroom settings. Also, immediate feedback may disrupt the flow of their thoughts, and frustrate them so they cannot express their ideas clearly. Furthermore, delayed feedback allows them to process their ideas, fix the errors and make it easier for them to remember. All in all, delayed feedback can be a motivational factor for students to keep learning without being afraid of receiving corrective feedback.

The results that pertain to last research question, concerning students' perceptions about the OCF and if they considered it as a helpful method to enhance their oral skills or not, reveal that second year students are aware of how beneficial is the oral corrective feedback for the improvement of their proficiency level. Teachers' CF affects students positively when it increases

their motivation and reduces their fear and anxiety. For that matter, the students viewed OCF as a crucial method for effective language learning, since it helps to improve speaking skills, and makes them feel more motivated to learn English. Generally, it is perceived as a useful tool for self-assessment so they can avoid making the same mistakes again. This result is supported by Zhu and Wang (2019) who found that Chinese EFL learners have a positive view of oral feedback. They believe that it is a helpful method for enhancing their spoken English.

Conclusion

The interpretation and discussion of the findings were addressed in this chapter, throughout the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data as was previously mentioned. Besides, the results were compared to the literature reviewed in the initial chapters. Therefore, this chapter discusses the research design and methods of data analyses, the population, and research tools. Moreover, it contains some recommendations and suggestions for teachers, students and future research.

General Conclusion

In language learning journey, developing fluency and accuracy is a crucial goal for students. However, the journey towards proficiency can be riddled with errors. This is where corrective feedback (OCF) emerged as a helpful tool to bridge the gap between current ability and desired fluency. The aim of this study was to explore EFL Learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback types, timing and importance.

This research is composed of two chapters, the first one was devoted to the theoretical part that showed the review of precedent studies, plus the definition of certain concepts related to the

topic. While the second chapter sought to answer the research questions as it was suggested in the general introduction, accordingly, the researchers relied on a mixed method approach, combining both qualitative and quantitative methods in order to analyze and interpret the collected data. The data are gathered from two research instruments. The quantitative tool was a questionnaire distributed to 60 second year students at Abbas Laghrour Khenchela University. As for the qualitative tool, it was an online structured interview which was conducted with 10 students emerging from the same group to who the questionnaire was administered.

The discussion of results from both questionnaire and the interview has shown that there was a discrepancy in students' preferences for oral corrective feedback (OCF) types. The questionnaire results indicated that students preferred explicit methods like elicitation and metalinguistic feedback, the interview data revealed a contrasting belief, where students expressed a preference for implicit corrections. This seeming contradiction might be explained by a desire for both clear guidance and the space to develop independent problem-solving. Additionally, students overwhelmingly favored delayed OCF, suggesting a preference for processing information before receiving corrective input. Ultimately, all students believed in the importance and effectiveness of OCF in enhancing their oral skills.

To conclude, the results researched through this investigation probably may help in opening a new perspective for further researches in this area of study.

Limitations

Like any researchers, this study faced some challenges and obstacles.

In terms of sample

- Found difficulties in sample selection in both questionnaire and interview.
- Second year students were not willing to answer the questionnaire.
- Some participants selected randomly the questionnaire options.
- Many students were afraid to do the interview.
- In the interview some interviewees gave more details than the question required.

In terms of time

- The questionnaire was distributed in Ramadan which was difficult for researchers to gather answers due to the absence of students.
- The interview was conducted in the period of the TD exams, which led to the unavailability of participants to answer in time.
- The answers of the interview required to be responded in a voice message format, which was difficult for some participants who have chosen to give the answer whether in written format or in Arabic language.

Further research

- More studies should be conducted with different levels.
- Further studies should investigate the reasons behind the preference for delayed OCF.

- Deeper studies should be done about the psychological aspects that settle behind students choosing a specific type of corrective feedback.
- The study suggests investigating the students and teachers' beliefs towards oral corrective feedback: types, time, importance across different cultural contexts. (comparative study).

Recommendations

Depending on what the study has reached as findings, a few recommendations are suggested:

- As for teachers, they should use a combination of explicit and implicit OCF while correcting students' errors.
- Teachers should offer students the option to signal when they would like a correction during a conversation.
- Teachers should encourage students to express their preferred OCF timing, types in order the teachers can tailor their approach based on student preferences.
- Teachers may give chance for students to correct each other under which is known as peer corrective feedback.
- As for students, they can use artificial intelligence applications as an alternative for teacher OCF.
- Is better for teachers to distribute a questionnaire to their students for the sake of being aware about their preferred type and time, in order to decrease the anxiety and create a collaborative and a motivational atmosphere for learning.

References

- Brown, A. V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A Comparison of Ideals. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(i), 46–60
- Dan, B. (2014). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *SAGEpub*, 20(4), 436–458. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814563200>
- Davis, A. (2003). Teachers' and Students' Beliefs Regarding Aspects of Language Learning. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 17(4), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500790308668303>
- El Tatawy, M. (n.d.). Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition. Corrective Feedback in *SLA*, 1–19.
- Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). Grammar Teaching and Learning in L2: Necessary, but Boring? *FOREIGN LANGUAGE ANNALS*, 44(3), 467–494.
- Johnson, R. Burke, Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie, and Lisa A. Turner. 2007. Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 112–133.
- Jun Zhang, L., & Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes. *System*, 42, 429–439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.01.012>
- Kartchava, E., & Ammar, A. (2014). Learners' Beliefs as Mediators of What Is Noticed and Learned in the Language Classroom. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, 48(1), 86–109. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.101>

- Kartchava, E., Gatbonton, E., Ammar, A., & Trofimovich, P. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: Pre-service English as a second language teachers' beliefs and practices. *LANGUAGE TEACHING RESEARCH SAGE*, 00(0), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818787546>
- Lee, E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41, 217–230.
- Li, S. (2010). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning Research Club*, 60(2), 309–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x>
- Li, S., Thompson, A., & Nakatsukasa, K. (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 91–104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00830.x>
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Intereactional Feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Cambridge University Press*, 28, 269–300. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060128>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative classrooms. *Cambridge University Press*, 20, 37–66.
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral corrective feedback in classroom SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 265–302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520>
- Nassaji, H. (2017). The effectiveness of extensive versus intensive recasts for learning L2 grammar. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(2), 353–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12387>
- Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2020). Corrective Feedback and Good Language Teachers. *Cambridge Core Terms of Use*, 12, 151–163. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108774390.015>

- Nhac, T. -H. (2022). Oral corrective feedback preferences in English lessons: Learners' and teachers' perspectives. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 11(3), 1643–1655. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.11.3.1643>
- Oladejo, J. (1993). Error Correction in FSL: Learners' Preferences. *TESL Canada Journal*, 10(2), 71–89.
- Oliver, R., & Adams, R. (2021). Oral Corrective Feedback. *Cambridge University Press*, 187–206. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789.010>
- Öztürk, E., & Ölmezer-Öztürk, G.-Ö. (2016). types and timing of oral corrective feedback in EFL classrooms: voices from students. *Novitas ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 10(2), 113–133.
- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, 25(4), 318–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580>
- Schulz, R. (2001). Cultural differences in student and Teacher perceptions Concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-COLOMBIA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(1), 244–258.
- Schulz, RA. S. (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.
- Van Ha, X., Murry, J., & Riaz, A. (2021). High school EFL students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: The role of gender, motivation and extraversion. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* , 11(2), 235–264. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.2.4>

Wang, W. W., & Li, S. (2020). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in American ESL and Chinese EFL classrooms: A comparative study. *Language Culture and Curriculum*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1767124>

Wiyati, R., & Padzilah Nur, R. (2020). Students' attitude towards corrective feedback in EFL classroom . *The Journal of English Language Teaching, Literature, and Applied Linguistics [JELA]*, 2(2), 26–32.

Xie, Q., & Yeung, C. (2018). An Investigation of Implicit vs. Explicit Oral Corrective Feedback on Chinese Pupils' Use of Past Tense. *Language Education & Assessment*, 1(2), 59–75. <https://doi.org/10.29140/lea.v1n2.69>

Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: a large-scale survey. *Language Awareness*, 28(2), 139–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755>

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Students' Questionnaire

This questionnaire aims to understand your beliefs about oral corrective feedback (OCF) in your learning process. You are kindly requested to answer this proportions honestly because your answer will be taken into consideration.

THANK YOU.

Instructions: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).					
	1. Strongly Disagree	2. Disagree	3. Neutral	4. Agree.	5. Strongly Agree.
Section 1.					
1. I found it useful when my teacher corrects, reformulates my errors without making me feel that I was incorrect.					
2. I like when my teacher repeats my errors, to make me aware of my mistakes.					
3. I like when my teacher poses a question related to the mistake I made to correct them.					
4. I benefit when my teacher offering a relevant example about the grammatical aspect which I may have missed to correct my mistake.					
5. I find it most useful when my teacher corrects my errors in a direct way.					
6. I don't like when my teacher interrupts me by saying "excuse me! what did you say " for the purpose of correcting me.					
7. I think that all the ways that are used in OCF, both direct and indirect, are useful.					
SECTION 2.					
Please indicate how much you prefer to receive oral corrective feedback at the following situations:					
1. Immediately after I make a mistake.					
2. After I have finished speaking.					
3. During a one-on-one conversation with the teacher.					
4. I appreciate the OCF in all times.					
5. I prefer when my teacher pinpoint my mistakes and give me the correct form at the end of the speaking activity.					

6. It is important for my teacher to correct all of my mistakes during speaking activities.					
7.OCF can negatively affect my learning when it is given in front of my classmates.					
8. I like when my teacher pinpoints my mistakes and correct them when I'm alone.					

SECTION 3.

1. Receiving oral corrective feedback helps me improve my speaking skills.					
2. I feel embarrassed when my teacher corrects my mistakes while I am speaking.					
3. Getting oral corrective feedback makes me feel more motivated to learn English.					
4. OCF helps me identify my strengths and weaknesses in speaking.					
5. Receiving OCF motivates me to practice speaking more outside of class.					
6. The presence of OCF in EFL classes creates harmony between teacher and students.					
7. Correcting speaking errors increases the tension of anxiety.					
8. Correction must be devoted to beginners only.					
9. OCF effectiveness reaches its highest level when it targets grammatical and pronunciation errors.					
10. As English language is a foreign language correction must be there to promote accuracy and fluency.					
11. OCF reduces the degree of difficulty in speaking and clarifies information to learners.					

WE APPRECIATE YOUR HELP.

Appendix 2: Students' Interview

Section one: Students' Beliefs about Oral Corrective Feedback Types

- 1.1 Are there certain types of mistakes you prefer your teacher to correct during speaking activities (Grammatical, Vocabulary, Pronunciation)? Why?
- 1.2 When making errors, do you like your teacher gives you: direct correction or indirect correction? Justify your answer?
- 1.3 Do you find it more helpful when the teacher directly corrects your mistakes or when they try to guide you towards the correct answer without explicitly pointing out the error?

Section two: Students' Beliefs about the Appropriate Timing of Oral Corrective Feedback

- 2.1 According to you what is the best time for providing oral corrective feedback, while speaking (as soon as an error occurs) or (at the end of the speaking)?
- 2.2 In your opinion, are there situations where it is more beneficial for a teacher to address mistakes right away during speaking, or to wait and provide feedback later?
- 2.3 Do you think that when your teacher provides you with immediate feedback would affect the flow of your conversation? Justify?

Section Three: Students' Beliefs about the Importance of Corrective Feedback''

- 3.1 Imagine a class where there was no oral corrective feedback provided. How would this affect your learning?
- 3.2 would it be difficult for you to identify and correct your speaking errors without your teacher?
- 3.3 Do the presence of oral corrective feedback hinder your confidence while speaking up in class?

ملخص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى التحقق من معتقدات الطلاب حول التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية الشفهية. حيث حاولت تحديد أنواع الملاحظات التصحيحية التي يجدها الطلاب أكثر فائدة وأقل إزعاجاً لتعلمهم. وفحص التوقيت المناسب لتقديمها وفقاً لهم. وفي النهاية استكشاف معتقدات الطلاب بشكل عام حول أهمية وفعالية التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية الشفهية وما إذا كانوا يعتبرونها طريقة مفيدة لتعزيز مهاراتهم الشفهية أم لا. تم إجراء هذا البحث في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بجامعة عباس لغرور خنشلة. حيث اعتمد بحثنا على منهج مختلط يجمع بين البيانات الكمية والكيفية. تم توزيع استبيان واحد على 60 طالباً من طلبة السنة الثانية لغة إنجليزية، تلتها مقابلة منظمة عبر الانترنت أجريت مع 10. أظهرت نتائج البحث، فيما يتعلق بالنوع المفضل من التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية الشفهية، أن الطلاب لديهم تفضيلين متباينين؛ فوفقاً للاستبيان، فإنهم يفضلون الاستنباط والتغذية الراجعة اللغوية، مما يكشف عن رغبتهم في التصحيح بشكل صريح. ومع ذلك، خلال المقابلة، مالوا نحو التصحيحات الضمنية، زاعمين أنها أفضل طريقة لتحسين تفكيرهم النقدي. علاوة على ذلك، بالنسبة للتوقيت المناسب لتقديم الملاحظات التصحيحية الشفهية، فقد أعربوا عن تفضيلهم للتعليقات المتأخرة. أخيراً، فيما يتعلق بأهمية التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية الشفهية، فقد اتفق جميع الطلاب على فعاليتها في رحلتهم التعليمية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التغذية الراجعة المتأخرة، متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة اجنبية، الاستنباط، التصحيح الصريح والضمني، الأدلة اللغوية، التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية الشفهية، معتقدات الطلاب.

