

The Effect of Oral Corrective Feedback on Beginner and Low Intermediate Students' Speaking Achievement

Qasam Dehgani, Siros Izadpanah, Ali Shahnava

Department of English Language Teaching, Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran

Received on: 28-8-2017

Accepted on: 19-11-2017

Abstract

Oral corrective feedback (CF) and its subsequent impact on learning are main areas of current research on language learning and have attracted a lot of attention. There is a considerable amount of research investigating corrective feedback and error. What has not been researched extensively yet and is the focus of this study, is the effect of oral corrective feedback on students' speaking achievement in Iranian schools. To this end, 370 Iranian EFL learners were chosen through multistage cluster sampling. Male students in Junior high schools of Zanjan city (n= 7936) were considered as the total size of the population being studied. They were in the seventh and ninth grades of Iranzamin, Sama, and Baharestan junior high schools in Zanjan-Iran. Cambridge Proficiency Test was used in order to have homogeneous groups. In the pretest the school speaking test was employed to measure their speaking skill. After six weeks of treatment, the speaking test was administered as a posttest. According to results, there were significant differences between the speaking mean scores in the posttest compared with the pretest; therefore, it was concluded that the oral corrective feedback had a positive effect on students' speaking achievement. Pedagogical implications were extracted to assist English language instructors to be aware of the usefulness and value of the different kinds of oral corrective feedback, to effectively establish the necessary activities in the classroom, and to successfully supply the students with the appropriate kind of oral corrective feedback.

Keywords: oral corrective feedback; speaking achievement.

Introduction

One of the most discussed topics in language learning nowadays is corrective feedback (CF). CF means the feedback that students get on linguistic errors they make in their written or oral production in a foreign or second language. In recent years, both oral and written CF have drawn significant attention due to their importance for the development of theories of L2 acquisition and because they have held an essential place in L2 instruction (Ellis & Sheen, 2011).

Regarding oral corrective feedback analyses, there has been a progress from mainly descriptive researches aimed at developing classifications of CF tactics (e.g., Allwright, 1975; Chaudron, 1977; Moore, 2017; Washbourne, 2014) to experimental investigations that studied the influence of different kinds of CF tactics in L2 learning development. (e.g., Lyster, 2004; Sheen, 2007b)

Oral CF can involve both on-line efforts to make learners attentive that they have generated a speech that has an error (i.e., the feedback is presented more or less instantly following the statement that has an error) and off-line efforts (i.e., the feedback is refused until the communicative occasion the learner is contributing in, has finished). Oral CF can be input- supplying (i.e., the student is provided with the

correct form) or output-encouraging (i.e., it can try to extract a modification from the learner). Oral CF can also be indirect, as when the instructor easily demands clarification in answer to the learner's wrong statement, or direct as when the teacher explicitly corrects the learner's mistakes and/or supplies some kind of metalinguistic description of the error. A usual form of CF is a recast. Recasts can be spoken and indirect when they take the form of an approval check as a reply to a breakdown to comprehend the learner's speech, or more obvious when the learner's inaccurate statement is reformulated although it has not produced a communication difficulty (Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Sheen, 2006).

Written corrective feedback usually includes postponed or off-line corrections of the inaccuracies that students have in a written text. As with oral CF, this can contain both output-encouraging feedback (referred to as "indirect correction") and input-supplying feedback (typically referred to as "direct correction"). Direct correction includes providing learners with the correct form or reformulating the whole text; indirect correction includes showing that an error has been committed either in the margin of the text or in the text where the error appears. Both direct and indirect written CF may or may not come with metalinguistic information. In order to understand the process of foreign language learning (FLL) and to help language teachers utilize effective teaching techniques that successfully scaffold the FLL process, researchers have sought to identify the fundamental components of effective Foreign Language Teaching (FLT) the influencing factors, such as the linguistic environment (including corrective feedback) and speaking achievement. CF, also known as negative feedback or error correction, has attracted increased attention in the last two decades (Lee, 2013; Moore, 2017; Naami, & Zadeh, 2016; & Sheen, 2010, 2011). Studies have been conducted in both classroom and laboratory settings in order to comprehensively understand how teaching strategies, specifically language teachers' CF techniques, can assist language learning. Moreover, pedagogical implications have been provided for organizing effective language classes (Ellis, Erlam, & Loewen, 2006; Byrne, Fukawa-Connelly Hanusch, & Moore, 2016).

Over the history, language experts have held changing views about error correction. As an example, behaviorists, psychologists, and structural linguists believed that learners' errors must be corrected instantly and systematically by the instructor in order not to become a part of their habit system (Celce-Murcia, 1991; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Oladejo, 1993; Syarif, 2017). Humanistic psychologists put emphasis on students and their internal worlds and recommended teachers to be more patient about learners' errors (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Supporters of humanistic psychology stress that learners' emotions and thoughts are the most notable aspects of their developments (Williams & Burden, 1997). Consequently, instructors are advised to know their students' insights and preferences of language learning and error correction (Akiyama, 2017; Horwitz, 1988).

When we talk about oral CF and speaking, we deal with a kind of meaning negotiation in which the teacher and learners are trying to get the meaning through oral communication, scaffolding and other kinds of oral CF, and the aim is to encourage the learners to have a fluent and accurate speech. Therefore, oral CF is closely related to learners' speaking skill. According to Ulfia (2017), the language learner considers that speaking is so crucial that the language learner has to learn it.

Most studies in the field of corrective feedback focused only on English as a second language (e.g. Lee 2013; Jean & Simard 2011; Sheen 2007 and 2010). Research to date has tended to focus mostly on written corrective feedback rather than on oral corrective feedback (Maleki, & Eslami, 2013; Washbourne, 2014).

So far, there has been little research on the effect of oral corrective feedback on different important variables affecting the process of foreign language learning, as most previous studies just focused on very detailed elements of language learning (Sheen, 2007; Rassaei, & Moinzadeh, 2011).

Since the effect of oral CF on students' speaking achievement has not been explored, an investigation considering the study of the effect of oral corrective feedback on the fundamental elements of the foreign language learning is needed to fill in this gap. Accordingly, this study comes to explore the effect of oral CF on the students' speaking achievement.

Research Question and Hypothesis

RQ: Is oral corrective feedback effective in beginner and low intermediate students' speaking achievement?

H: Oral corrective feedback is effective in beginner and low intermediate students' speaking achievement.

Limitations of the study

There were some limitations in this study. One limitation was that all the participants who took part in this study were male. Having some females as participants may have influenced the final consequences. The second limitation was that all the participants were from junior high schools and were of the same age. The consequences could be different if students from a variety of ages and from many different schools were subjected to the tests. The last limitation was that the students were all from the same city in Iran. It was probable that participants from other cities might have created different outcomes, because school systems are different from one city to another.

Corrective Feedback

The expression corrective feedback (CF) has been explained at different times in a very similar mode. One of the initial definitions is that of Chaudron (1977, p.31) who regards it as "any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance". More recently, Ellis et al. (2006), declared that CF takes the form of replies to learner statements that have an error. The answers can contain provision of the correct target language form, a clue that an error, meta-linguistic information about the nature of the error, or any mixture of these have been committed.

Although all these explanations involve the learners' and teacher's contribution, a classroom as the situation where CF occurs, this may also take place in naturalistic settings where native or non-native speakers can arrange it. Remarkably, in the foreign language settings, Sheen (2011) states that not all CF

takes place because of a communication failure; teachers are able to apply it to attract the students' attention to form even in those circumstances where they understand each other. This means that CF can bring negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form, too.

However, the significance and role of CF in EFL instruction can be different from one teacher to another. This may depend on their previous training and education, instruction experience, and their own experience as language learners, amongst others. CF is a very controversial topic in this view. Viewpoints toward errors have gone from the maximum of rejection and evading them at all cost, to more lenient viewpoints in which errors are regarded as a feature of the language development.

Design of the study

A quasi-experimental design was used in the current research and the participants were selected through multistage cluster sampling method. The researcher selected the experimental and control groups. Experimental group had two levels: beginner and low-intermediate students. Oral CF provision was considered as the independent variable and beginner and low-intermediate students' achievement was viewed as the dependent variable. The control group was considered when studying the effect of oral CF provision on the students' speaking achievement.

Participants

Participants in this study were 370 junior high school male students. They were selected through multistage cluster sampling. The male students in Junior high schools of Zanjan city ($n= 7936$) were considered as the total size of the population being studied. There are two educational districts in Zanjan city and students in junior high schools of District 2 were chosen at this stage. According to Cochran formula size, 370 students were needed as the sample size of the study; therefore, because of the limitation of easy access to the state or public schools three private junior high schools were chosen as the target schools of this study (Iranzamin, Sama, and Baharestan). At this stage, the students in seventh and ninth grades were selected. There were 400 students who were enrolled in 16 classes. Since 370 participants were needed in this research and in order to have homogenous groups, Cambridge Proficiency Test was run and as a result, 20 students from the seventh and 10 students from the ninth grades were discarded from the study because of their very high language proficiency level in comparison with the other students. The participants' age ranges were 13 to 14 for the seventh graders and 15 to 16 for the ninth graders. There were about 25 students in each class. According to the administered pretest and the educational system of Iran, students who were studying in the seventh grades were classified as beginners in the foreign language learning and students in the ninth grades as low-intermediate learners.

Instruments

In order to achieve the aims of this research, the following instruments were employed.

Cambridge Proficiency Test

Since some students at school attend English language classes in the English language institutes and some of them have been to English-speaking countries for several years, the Standard Cambridge Proficiency Test was applied in order to have homogeneous groups regarding the participants' language proficiency.

Speaking Test for Prospect 1 and 3

In order to evaluate students' speaking skills, the common and suggested speaking tests which are usually used to measure students' speaking abilities in Iranian schools for seventh and ninth grades and contain interview, monologue, and role play parts, were employed. These tests were adapted from the standard complementary English books for schools (Khat-e-Sefid). The books and their tests were ratified by the Education Office of Iran. (See Appendices A and B)

Procedures

In this section, the overall process of the research including the pilot and main study is presented.

Pilot study

Since some problems and difficulties were likely to occur during the administration of the questionnaires and while dealing with the participants, a pilot study was conducted as a fundamental element of research before the main study in order to detect the unforeseen weaknesses and problems of the main research. Thus, 30 junior high school students who were similar to the participants in the main study were selected as the participants of the pilot study. The researcher piloted the speaking test and, as a result, the learners reported that they did not have any difficulty in understanding and answering the questions. Moreover, the researcher estimated the necessary time for answering the speaking test.

Main study

A sample of 370 junior high school students was chosen as the participants of the study, divided between 180 students from grade seven and 190 from grade nine. In order to have homogeneous groups in both beginner and low-intermediate groups, the Cambridge Proficiency Test was run, since some of the students had been to English-speaking countries or English language institutes. As a result, some students with very higher proficiency level in English were discarded from the study. To measure the participants' speaking ability in English, a standard speaking test from their own English book was run. The collected data via the speaking test was recorded as the participants' pretest scores. Then, for a period of six weeks, the participants' teachers were asked to provide appropriate oral corrective feedback when necessary, while the control groups had their usual English class without focusing on oral corrective feedback. After this period, the same speaking test was run again to measure the effect of the instructions. The data were collected and analyzed by SPSS software version 20.

Data Analysis

Based on the nature of data, the following statistical tests were used for analyzing data:

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test: This test was used for checking the normality assumption of the interval data to decide between parametric or non-parametric tests.

The Levene test: This test was used to check the homogeneity of the variances.

The Covariance analysis: Covariance analysis was used to compare the means of one or more groups and estimate one or more independent variables, and also to extract the effect of one or more intervening variables, covariance, or covariate from the equation.

Data Analysis of the Research Question

RQ: Is oral corrective feedback effective in beginner and low intermediate students' speaking achievement?

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the speaking scores of beginner students in the experimental and control groups in both pretest and posttest.

Table1: *Descriptive statistics of speaking scores in both the pretest and posttest for beginner students.*

Descriptive Statistics						
Group	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	
Control	PreTest	180	12.00	16.00	14.2000	1.40391
	PostTest	180	11.90	15.70	13.9900	1.33371
	Valid N (listwise)	180				
Experiment	PreTest	180	12.00	18.00	15.5000	1.86260
	PostTest	180	17.00	20.00	18.8000	1.08004
	Valid N (listwise)	180				

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of the speaking scores of low-intermediate students in experimental and control groups in both pretest and posttest.

Table2: *Descriptive statistics of speaking scores of low-intermediate students in pre and posttests.*

Descriptive Statistics						
Group	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	
Control	PreTest	190	13.50	17.50	15.7816	1.35535
	PostTest	190	13.40	17.50	15.8553	1.32051
	Valid N (listwise)	190				
Experiment	PreTest	190	14.00	19.00	16.6842	1.67309
	PostTest	190	18.00	20.00	19.2000	.75031
	Valid N (listwise)	190				

Testing the Hypothesis in the Beginner Group

To test the hypothesis, as mentioned above, the covariance analysis was used. As it could be observed, the necessary presuppositions for covariance analysis were checked and these presuppositions do exist.

Table 3 presents the results of covariance analysis for measuring the effect of oral CF on the beginner students' speaking achievement.

Table3: *Results of Covariance Analysis for Measuring the Effect of Oral CF on Beginner Students' Speaking Achievement.*

<i>Tests of Between-Subjects Effects</i>					
Dependent Variable: Posttest					
Source	Type IV Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2318.021 ^a	2	1159.010	1419.778	.000
Intercept	360.298	1	360.298	441.362	.000
Pretest	235.772	1	235.772	288.818	.000
Group	1353.798	1	1353.798	1658.392	.000
Error	291.430	357	.816		
Total	99376.020	360			
Corrected Total	2609.451	359			

a. R Squared =.888 (Adjusted R Squared =.888)

As seen in Table 3, the F value in covariance analysis for speaking scores in the beginner group is significant; therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the mean of the two groups (the beginner control group and beginner experimental group) in posttest after adjustment of pretest scores. According to Table 1, the mean speaking score for the control beginner group was 14.2 in pretest and 13.99 in posttest, while the mean speaking score for the experimental beginner group was 15.5 in pretest and 18.8 in posttest. Considering the significant difference between the scores in posttest for both control and experimental groups, it was concluded that by eliminating the covariance factor of the pretest, the oral corrective feedback instruction increased the speaking ability of beginner students.

Testing the Hypothesis in the Low-intermediate Group

To test the hypothesis, as mentioned above, the covariance analysis was used. As seen, the necessary presuppositions for covariance analysis were checked and these presuppositions do exist.

Table 4 presents the results of covariance analysis for measuring the effect of oral CF on low-intermediate students' speaking achievement.

Table4: *Results of Covariance Analysis for Measuring the Effect of Oral CF on the Low-Intermediate Students' Speaking Achievement.*

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
Dependent Variable: Posttest					
Source	Type IV Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1209.542 ^a	2	604.771	788.327	.000
Intercept	390.534	1	390.534	509.067	.000
Pretest	146.751	1	146.751	191.293	.000
Group	772.744	1	772.744	1007.283	.000
Error	289.218	377	.767		
Total	118241.550	380			
Corrected Total	1498.760	379			

a. R Squared =.807 (Adjusted R Squared =.806)

As can be seen in Table 4, the F value in covariance analysis for speaking scores in the low-intermediate group was significant; therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the mean of the two groups (low-intermediate control group and low-intermediate experimental group) in posttest after adjustment of pretest scores. According to Table 3, the mean speaking score for the low-intermediate control group was 15.78 in pretest and 15.85 in posttest, while the mean speaking score for the low-intermediate experimental group was 16.68 in pretest and 19.2 in posttest. Considering the significant difference between the scores in posttest for both control and experimental groups, it was concluded that by eliminating the covariance factor of the pretest, the oral corrective feedback instruction increased the speaking ability of low-intermediate students.

Discussion

RQ: Does the oral corrective feedback have an effect on the beginner and low-intermediate students' speaking achievement?

The researcher investigated the effect of oral corrective feedback on students' speaking skills. Regarding the speaking pretest and posttest in the beginner and low-intermediate group in both control and the experimental groups, the results indicated that, after providing oral corrective feedback for the students in experimental group and performing the posttest, the mean speaking scores of the students in experimental groups increased compared to the mean speaking scores of the students in the control group; therefore, it can be said that oral corrective feedback influenced the students' speaking achievement.

To discuss the effect of oral corrective feedback provision in the classroom on the students' speaking skill, it is worth mentioning that, as its name implies, oral corrective feedback is directly associated with the oral skills of listening and speaking. Since in the process of the oral error correction there is a speaker

and a listener, a kind of interaction occurs in the classroom; consequently, the more interactions between the teacher and learner there are, the more improvement in the learners' speaking skill will occur.

Fortunately, the findings of this research are in line with the results of previous similar studies; Bitchener (2008), Chu (2013), Gholizade (2013), Lee (2014), Lourdunathan and Menon (2017), Lyster and Saito (2010), Mennim (2007), Oliver (2000), Oradee (2012), Panova and Lyster (2002), Rahimi and Dastjerdi (2012), Sheen (2007), and Tanveer (2007). For example, Chu (2013) found that corrective feedback had a positive effect on students' speaking skill. Sato and Lyster (2012) stated that corrective feedback had a positive impact on both accuracy and fluency development of students. Moreover, the findings of the current research are consistent with the findings in research by Lynch (2007) and Soler (2002), which focused on the impact of corrective feedback on students' speaking skills and proved the usefulness of the application of corrective feedback in the classroom.

Moreover, Ellis (2009) states that regarding accuracy and fluency, corrective feedback should be provided and students' errors need to be corrected when it is felt that such pedagogical intervention is necessary.

More importantly, the findings of the present study are to some extent consistent with the results of previous research, e.g. Kaivanpanah et al., 2012, Katayama, 2007, Yoshida, 2010, and Zhang 2017, who reported that Iranian and Japanese EFL learners showed very strong preferences for metalinguistic feedback and recasts.

Although, parallel with the results of previous investigations, metalinguistic feedback was ranked first in both beginner and low-intermediate groups in the posttest, the results of the present research showed that junior high school students in both beginner and low-intermediate groups did not reject the other kinds of corrective feedback, mainly repetition accompanied by highlighting their error by intonation and implicit feedback. Instead, a significant number of participants in the beginner group seemed to believe that highlighting the error by intonation was a useful kind of oral corrective feedback. In addition, a noticeable number of students in the low-intermediate group showed that implicit feedback was a helpful kind of oral corrective feedback. Therefore, it can be said that although the metalinguistic feedback was ranked first, other kinds of feedback were effective in the students' speaking achievement.

The findings of the current research were different from results by Kaivanpanah et al. (2012), which did not show any well-defined preference for one kind of corrective feedback versus other kinds. This inconsistency in the findings of the two studies is probably due to the learners' awareness of the purpose of the present research, the significance of the oral corrective feedback provision in the classroom, and different kinds of corrective feedback in the treatment period of the research. The students' preferences for the immediate corrective feedback confirm Mackey's (2007) belief that focuses on the effectiveness of corrective feedback on condition that it is offered simultaneously with the student's error.

In particular, the findings of the current research present some empirical evidence supporting Ellis's (2009) guideline that focuses on the significance and value of the oral corrective feedback provision in the classroom. Moreover, the results of the present study that revealed students' preferences for different kinds of corrective feedback and their significant effect on the students' speaking skill, can be a useful

guidance for teachers of English, particularly those in the junior high schools, to select the students' preferred kind of corrective feedback in order to achieve successful teaching.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of oral corrective feedback provision on the beginner and low-intermediate students' speaking achievement in the classroom. The results of the speaking scores showed that oral corrective feedback provision in the classroom plays a facilitative role in improving students' speaking skill.

Returning to the research questions posed at the beginning of this study, it is now possible to state that oral corrective feedback is effective in improving students' speaking skill.

The present study indicated that students in general prefer to receive corrective feedback when and wherever they make a mistake. As further evidence for the significant role of corrective feedback in previous works, the studies by Zhao, (2015), Lyster et al., (2013), Li, (2010), and Ellis, (2006) can be mentioned. The findings of this research can assist students to hold a positive attitude toward teachers' corrective feedback instead of being afraid of being corrected by the teacher in the classroom. Furthermore, they suggest to English teachers that applying corrective feedback in the classroom is usually one of the great characteristics of successful professional teachers. Moreover, this study suggests to program designers to consider the importance of corrective feedback in the yearly workshops that they hold for teachers.

تأثير التغذية الراجعة الشفوية التصحيحية في الأداء اللفظي لطلبة المرحلتين المبتدئة والمتوسطة

قاسم دهجاني، سيروس ايزادبانه وعلي شهنافاز

قسم تدريس اللغة الإنكليزية، جامعة آزاد الإسلامية - فرزنجان، إيران

الملخص

تعدّ التغذية الراجعة الشفوية وأثرها في تعلم اللغة من أبرز مجالات البحث اللغوي التي جذبت انتباه الكثيرين، وهناك العديد من الأبحاث التي تتناول بالدراسة التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية وأخطأ. أما المجالات التي لم يتم البحث فيها بصورة معمقة فهي تأثير التغذية الراجعة الشفوية في الأداء اللفظي للطلبة الإيرانيين. لذلك تم التركيز في هذا البحث على هذا الموضوع، ومن أجل تحقيق هذا الهدف تم اختيار عينة مكوّنة من 370 طالبا يتعلمون اللغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية من أصل 7936 طالبا هم كامل الطلبة المعنيين في ثلاث مدارس في مدينة زنجان، وكل هؤلاء الطلبة من الذكور، وكانوا منتظمين في الصفين السابع (الابتدائي) والتاسع (المتوسط) في ثلاث مدارس مختلفة. وبعد إجراء الاختبارات اللازمة من حيث الأختبار الأولي والاختبار النهائي طبقا لاختبار كيمبردج لفحص الأداء، فقد ثبت وجود فروقات ذات دلالة بين نتائج الاختبارين لصالح الاختبار النهائي بعد استخدام التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية الشفوية من المدرسين لمدة ستة أسابيع، مما يبين الأثر الإيجابي لهذه التغذية، ويوصي البحث باستخدام هذا الأسلوب لتحسين أداء الطلبة داخل غرفة الصف واختيار المناسب منه في كل حالة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التغذية الراجعة للمحادثة الشفوية، الإنجاز بالمحادثة.

References

- Akiyama, Y. (2017). Learner beliefs and corrective feedback in telecollaboration: A longitudinal investigation. *System*, 64, 58-73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.12.007>
- Allwright, R. (1975). *Working papers: Language teaching classroom research*. Department of Language and Linguistics, University of Essex, England.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102-118. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004
- Celce-Murcia, M., & McIntosh, L. (1991). Teaching English as a second or foreign language.
- Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning*, 27(1), 29-46.
- Chu, R. X. (2013). Effects of peer feedback on Taiwanese adolescents' English speaking practices and development.
- Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(04), 575-600.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 339-368. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060141>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1). 3-18 <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2504d6w3>
- Gholizade, R. (2013). The Investigation of Differential Effects of Recast and Metalinguistic Feedback on Accuracy, Fluency, and Complexity of Speaking Performance of Male and Female EFL Learners. *Journal of Novel Applied Sciences*, 2(9), 417-428.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72(3), 283-294.
- Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). Grammar teaching and learning in L2: necessary, but boring?. *Foreign Language Annals*, 44(3), 467-494.
- Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & Sephehrinia, S. (2012). Preferences for interactional feedback: differences between learners and teachers. *The Language Learning Journal*, 1(1), 1-20.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, E. J. E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41(2), 217-230.
- Lee, L. (2014). Digital news stories: building language learners' content knowledge and speaking skills. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(2), 338-356. DOI: 10.1111/flan.12084

- Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 309-365.
- Lourdunathan, J., & Menon, S. (2017). Developing speaking skills through interaction strategy training. *The English Teacher, 34*, 1-18.
- Lynch, T. (2007). Learning from the transcripts of an oral communication task. *ELT Journal, 61*(4), 311-320.
- Lyster, R. (2002). Negotiation in immersion teacher–student interaction. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37*(3), 237-253.
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(02), 269-300.
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(03), 399-432.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46* (1), 1-40.
- Mackey, A., Al-Khalil, M., Atanassova, G., Hama, M., Logan-Terry, A., and Nakatsukasa, K. (2007). Teachers' intentions and learners' perceptions about corrective feedback in the L2 classroom. *International Journal of Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 1*(1), 129-152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2167/illt047.0>
- Maleki, A., & Eslami, E. (2013). The effects of written corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' control over grammatical construction of their written English. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(7), 1250 – 1257.
- Mennim, P. (2007). Long-term effects of noticing on oral output. *Language Teaching Research, 11*(3), 265-280.
- Moore, M. J. (2017). The Vocabulary of Feedback. http://repository.stcloudstate.edu/im_etds/11
- Moore, R. C., Byrne, M., Hanusch, S., and Fukawa-Connelly, T. (2016). When we grade students' proofs, do they understand our feedback?. <http://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/pubs/422>
- Naami, L., & Zadeh, H. N. (2016). Teacher's feedback in task-based language teaching classes among intermediate Iranian EFL students vs. non task-based classes.
- Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error correction in ESL: Learner's preferences. *TESL Canada Journal, 10*(2), 71-89.
- Oliver, R. (2000). Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pair work. *Language learning, 50*(1), 119-151.
- Oradee, T. (2012). Developing speaking skills using three communicative activities (discussion, problem-solving, and role-playing). *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 2*(6), 533-535. DOI: 10.7763/IJSSH.2012.V2.164

- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573-595.
- Rahimi, A., & Dastjerdi, H. V. (2012). Impact of immediate and delayed error correction on EFL learners' oral production:CAF. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(1), 45-54. Doi: 10.5901/mjss.2012.03.01.45
- Rassaei, E., & Moinsadeh, A. (2011). Investigating the effects of three types of corrective feedback on the acquisition of English Wh-question forms by Iranian EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 97-106. doi:10.5539/elt.v4n2p97
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approach and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255-283.
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, 2, 593-610.
- Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(4), 361-392.
- Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(02), 203-234.
- Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*. New York: Springer.
- Soler, E. A. (2002). Relationship between teacher-led versus learners' interaction and the development of pragmatics in the EFL classroom. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3), 359-377.
- Syarif, A. (2017, June). Corrective feedback in EFL classrooms. In *Seminar Nasional Mahasiswa Kerjasama Direktorat Jenderal Guru dan Tenaga Kependidikan Kemendikbud, 2016*.
- Tanveer, M. (2007). *Investigation of the factors that cause language anxiety for ESL/EFL learners in learning speaking skills and the influence it casts on communication in the target language* (Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of Education, University of Glasgow).
- Ulfia, N. (2017). Solving the students' speaking problem in delivering English presentation through 3-P technique. *Jurnal Pendidikan Edutama*, 4(1), 36-48.
- Washbourne, K. (2014). Beyond error marking: written corrective feedback for a dialogic pedagogy in translator training. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 8(2), 240-256.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers* (Vol. 67). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94 (2), 293-314.
- Zhao, W. (2015). *Learners' preferences for oral corrective feedback and their effects on second* (Doctoral dissertation, McGill University).

Zhang, X. (2017). Reading–writing integrated tasks, comprehensive corrective feedback, and EFL writing development. *Language Teaching Research*, 21(2), 217-240.

Appendix A

Oral questions for measuring students' speaking achievement in grade 7

A: Interview

1. What's your first name and last name?
2. How old are you?
3. When is your birthday?
4. What's your father, mother... 's name and job?
5. How old is your (father, mother)?
6. Where is he now?
7. What is he wearing?
8. What's your address?
9. What's your telephone number?
10. What's your favorite food and drink?

B: Monologue

11. Talk about yourself, your name, age, family, house, address, phone or cell phone number, and favorite food and drink.
12. Talk about one of your friends or classmates, his name, age, family, house, address, phone or cell phone number, and favorite food and drink.

C: Role play

13. Play the role of two friends asking and answering about their first and last name.
14. Play the role of two friends asking and answering about their age, birthday and month of birth.
15. Play the role of two friends asking and answering about their family members' name, age, and job.
16. Play the role of two friends asking and answering about their teachers, classmates, and family members' appearance. (Height, clothes)
17. Play the role of two friends asking and answering about their houses and different rooms in their houses.
18. Play the role of two friends asking and answering about their address, telephone or cellphone number.
19. Play the role of two friends asking and answering about their favorite food and drink.

Appendix B

Oral questions for measuring students' speaking achievement in grade 9

A: Interview

1. What's your (friend, father, mother, teacher...) like?
2. Is your brother (talkative)?
3. What is your (father, mother...) doing now?
4. What's your father, mother... 's job?
5. What does a (nurse) do?
6. Does a (nurse take care of patients)?
7. How do you usually go to school?
8. Do you use internet?
9. Did you participate in (HelaleAhmar first aid classes) last summer?
10. What did you learn?

B: Monologue

11. Talk about yourself, name, school, family, relatives, classmates, friends, your favorite TV show, movie, cartoon, your cell phone, tablet or PC, downloaded or installed program or game.
12. Talk about your father, mother... his or her personality, job. What does he/she do? Where does he/she work? When does he/she go to work? How does he/she usually go to work?
13. Talk about your own or one of your relatives or friends' last accident and injuries

C: Role play

14. Play the role of two friends talking about the personality of their friends/classmates/teachers/relatives.
15. Play the role of two friends talking about the media they usually use.
16. Play the role of two friends talking about their last injuries.
17. Play the role of a tourist and a receptionist with one of your classmates.
18. Talk with your friends about national and international festivals.
19. Talk with your classmates about services in your city.