| **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Corrective Feedback in K-12 English: Characteristics, Purposes, and Examples

Krizia Clarisse Capili[1], Ma. Nina Jesusa Gloria[2] and Dr. Ramil Ilustre[3] ✉
[123]Bulacan State University Graduate School, Philippines
Corresponding Author: Dr. Ramil Ilustre, **E-mail**: ramil.ilustre@bulsu.edu.ph

| **ABSTRACT**

This paper synthesizes findings from qualitative and quantitative research on corrective feedback in an English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom. This paper revisited the characteristics and purposes of corrective feedback. Searches were conducted using the following research and journal databases: Google Scholar, Academia.edu, Research Gate, and Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). The results provide analyses of the four corrective feedbacks, namely, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation. The researchers also provide examples appropriate to each key stage of K-12 schooling in the Philippines. It is emphasized in this paper that learners learn best if they are aware that they are corrected and if the manner of correcting them is not obtrusive.

1. Introduction

Part of the learning process every learner will experience is receiving feedback. In the learning process, every learner can accept and acknowledge their mistakes and errors constructively. This can be done effectively through corrective feedback. Corrective feedback is defined in the study of Sulistyani & Suhartono (2014) as evaluative feedback, which can be effective in facilitating the progress of students' skills toward more accurate language use. The role of teacher reaction to learner errors in formal classroom instruction of second or foreign languages has been perceived as a genuine object of various inquiries into classroom teaching and learning (Sulistyani & Suhartono, 2014). Changes in pedagogy, particularly in second language classrooms, have influenced teacher attitudes toward error and its treatment. Less emphasis has been dealt with on formal accuracy, and more importance has been given to communicative effectiveness.

Corrective feedback performs a vital role in teaching because it focuses on the learner's errors that will empower them to progressively get rid of such errors. Teachers recognize the importance and advantages of corrective feedback and the effectiveness of instant correction of student mistakes to improve their oral skills (Unsal Sakiroglu, 2020).

2. Literature Review

A number of studies on corrective feedback have been conducted by researchers. Brookhart (2017) points out in his study that feedback is a critical component of the formative assessment process. In addition to that, feedback is a type of assessment that readily identifies what the students have improved or missed immediately after one activity or a lesson has been done (Baculi et al., 2012).

Based on Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study, there are six types of corrective feedback; they are (1) Explicit correction, referring to a clear indication of students' incorrect utterance, and provision of the correct form. (2) Recast referring to the teacher's implicit reformulation of the student's error without directly indicating that the student's utterance was incorrect. (3) Clarification request, referring to the use of phrases like "Excuse me?" or "I don't understand," indicating that the response has not been understood or that the student's response contained some mistake. (4) Metalinguistic clues referring to corrective feedback type in which the

teacher poses questions or provides comments or information related to the formation of the student's utterance without providing the correct form. (5) Elicitation referring to the teacher's direct elicitation of the correct form from the student by asking questions by pausing to allow the student to complete the teacher's utterance, or by asking students to reformulate the utterance. (6) Repetition. The teacher repeats the student's error and adjusts intonation to draw the student's attention to it.

2.1 Recast
Adult imitation of child speech is often embellished in one way or another. In fact, repetitions with minor variations to the original utterance are the hallmark of adult-child discourse. This kind of adult imitation is often referred to as a recast and was first studied by Roger Brown and his students (Brown & Bellugi, 1964; Cazden, 1965). Recasts are one sign that adults are being responsive in conversation with children, and parental responsiveness, in general, is intricately linked with language development (Tamis-LeMonda, Kuchirko & Song, 2014). Recast, by definition, is reformulating all or part of the incorrect word or phrase to show the correct form without explicitly identifying the error (Ellis & Sheen, 2006). Recast is among the most frequently utilized corrective feedback strategies by teachers and has been the focus of research (Goo, 2012).

2.2 Clarification Request
A clarification request is a communicative device used when there is vagueness and incomprehension in the communication process. Moreover, it is an interrogative expression in which the speaker asks for an explanation, affirmation, or repetition of what has been previously said but which has not been perfectly understood (Cicognani & Zani, 1988). Moreover, the teacher's use of clarification requests is guided by their knowledge and evaluation of the children's developing communicative competence. According to Rezaei et al. (2011), clarification request prompt learners to reformulate their own utterance. As another category of corrective feedback, clarification requests were operationalized as those prompts by teachers. In the study of Clarification requests, just provide learners with implicit negative evidence. In light of the evidence presented in the study of Rezaei et al. (2011), it can be argued that explicit negative evidence seems crucial for language development and is superior to positive evidence per se.

2.3 Metalinguistic Feedback
Gao and Ma (2019) stated that metalinguistic CF is defined and operationalized differently. For instance, oral metalinguistic CF is immediate and can take the shape of comments or inquiries, all of which indicate the presence of errors. It could also contain slightly more particular information about the error's nature. Written metalinguistic CF, on the other hand, is delayed and can be operationalized in a variety of ways, from detailed explanations of linguistic principles to codes indicating the type of errors (Bitchener& Knoch, 2010; Lalande, 1982).

Despite this, it can still be concluded that metalinguistic CF focuses on providing necessary information regarding the error, which serves as a clue for the learners on how they can modify their answers correctly. In fact, Lyster and Ranta (1997) in Mohammadi (2009) stated that Metalinguistic feedback consists of comments, facts, or questions on the well-formedness of the student's utterance but does not explicitly provide the right form.

Just like the other corrective feedback methods, several studies were also conducted regarding the effectiveness of metalinguistic CF. One of them is the study conducted by Moinzadeh et al. (2012), in which they indicated that recasts and metalinguistic feedback could be an effective way to enhance implicit and explicit knowledge. However, metalinguistic feedback is more significant in L2 development. This is because metalinguistic feedback is more noticeable for the learners, which enables them to easily identify their errors.

In an experimental study conducted by Roothooft (2016), he attributes the success of metalinguistic feedback to its explicit nature. He pointed out that this type of corrective feedback allows the learners to easily identify their errors because it is noticeable, and these findings agree with Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis, which states that *"… learning cannot take place without a certain degree of noticing."* Moreover, he also indicated that metalinguistic CF gives learners opportunities to transform their theoretical knowledge of the language into practice which works best for intermediate learners he described as *"…students who had not had many opportunities of putting their theoretical knowledge into practice."*

It can be concluded from the previously mentioned studies that most learners prefer metalinguistic feedback because it leads them to correct their errors by providing necessary information related to the topic.

2.4 Elicitation feedback
Méndez et al. (2010) in Fitriana et al. (2016) characterized elicitation as an implicit type of corrective feedback. He also stated that it allows the teacher to provide statements and then tactically stop midway from making the learners continue using the correct form. However, if the student still gives the incorrect answer, the teacher can say, "No, not that." It's a..." and then the correct answer.

Likewise, Lyster and Ranta (1997) stated that elicitation is a term that refers to at least three ways that teachers employ to directly elicit the correct form from their learners. First, teachers prompt completion of their own statements by purposively pausing to allow students to "fill in the blank." Second, questions are used by teachers to elicit accurate forms. And lastly, teachers may urge learners to rephrase their statements on occasion (Mohammadi, 2009).

To put it simply, elicitation CF prompts correct responses by providing learners opportunities to correct their errors. This includes leaving the error blank so that learners will know which part needs to be corrected and asking them questions to lead them to an accurate answer.

In this paper, the characteristics, purposes, and examples of each type of corrective feedback laid down by Lyster and Ranta (1997) are highlighted by the researchers.

3. Methodology
This section elaborates on the selected research design, sources of data, data collection procedure, and data analysis procedure, which are all aimed at explaining the where, how, and what data for the present study.

3.1. Research Design
The study adopts a qualitative research design, specifically, qualitative metasynthesis. Qualitative metasynthesis is a purposeful and coherent approach to analyzing data within qualitative studies. This process of analyzing data enables researchers to identify a specific research question and then search for, select, evaluate, summarize, and combine qualitative evidence to address the research question. (Sandelowski, 2007).

3.2. Sources of Data and Data Collection
The data of the study were obtained from four research databases. The researchers then searched several journals and examined relevant texts about the research topic. The search terms used were "corrective feedback", "K to 12 corrective feedbacks", "K to 12 Curriculum in the Philippines", "Grade 1 English corrective feedback", "Grade 4 English corrective feedback", and "grade 7 corrective feedback". The year published was limited from 2010 to 2022.

4. Results and Discussion
The initial result from the Google Scholar database yielded 18,500 results. 30,507 research outputs were found on Academia.edu database. However, the DOAJ database gave 472 results, and the Research Gate database returned 120 results only. These results were further analyzed. Of these, 60 were found to be relevant articles. Following the further screening of the title and abstract, half were excluded. The remaining 30 articles were scrutinized, and 18 studies fulfilled the inclusion criteria set by the researchers.

Table 1: *Recast*

Key Stage	Learning Competency	Scenario
Key Stage 1 Kindergarten to Grade 3	recognize homonyms **EN3V-IIIe-f13.6**	**Student:** Pail and fail* homonyms, teacher? **Teacher:** Pail and pale are homonyms.
Key Stage 2 Grade 4 to 6	infer meaning of idiomatic expressions using context clues **EN6V-Ia12.3.1**	**Student:** It's raining like* cats and dogs today! I can't play outside. **Teacher:** It's raining cats and dogs.
Key Stage 3 Grade 7 to 10	use reflexive and intensive pronouns **EN10G-Ia-27**	**Student**: My sister and I bought ourself* popcorn at the mall. Teacher: …bought ourselves popcorn…

The use of recast in the different scenarios and key stages from Table 1 shows how helpful recast is in correcting the student's feedback. It helps give immediate feedback to students of different key stages. According to Braidi (2002), a response is considered as a recast if it includes the content words of the immediately preceding incorrect non-native speaker utterance as well as altered and rectified the utterance one way or another (e.g., phonological, syntactic, morphological, or lexical). Table 1 applied the principle that a corrective recast is a modification of all or part of a student's foregoing remark where one or more lexical or grammatical items are substituted by the corresponding target language form and where the focus of the speakers is on meaning, not language as an object (Long, 2006). Long's (2006) definition of recast demands that throughout the exchange, the focus of the speakers is on meaning, not on language as an object. Recast, according to Baleghizadeh & Abdi (2010), is only one of the several corrective strategies that teachers utilize to deal with learner errors. In this kind of feedback, the teacher reformulates all or part of the student's utterance but does not explicitly say that the student's utterance is wrong (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Table 1 shows several scenarios on the use of recast as corrective feedback. The corresponding key stages and learning competencies are as well indicated. The scenario in Table 1 for Key Stage 1 shows that the teacher reformulates all the student's incorrect answers. Inferring the meaning of idiomatic expressions using context clues has been the focus of the scenario for Key Stage 2. In that scenario, the student wants to say that the appropriate idiomatic expression for that context should be "raining cats and dogs" however, the student mistakenly includes the word "like" in his idiomatic expression. The teacher corrects it by repeating the student's answer without the unnecessary word "like". For Key Stage 3, the competency given focused in the scenario is the use of reflexive and intensive pronouns. In the scenario, the students use the incorrect form of the reflexive pronoun "ourselves". So, the teacher repeats the phrases with the correct form of the reflexive pronoun used in the student's sentence.

Table 2: *Clarification Request*

Key Stage	Learning Competency	Scenario
Key Stage 1 Kindergarten to Grade 3	read words with short o sounds in CVC pattern and phrases and sentences containing these words **EN3PWR-Ibd-19**	**STUDENT:** The tap* is in the box. **TEACHER:** Can you say that again? **STUDENT:** The top is in the box.
Key Stage 2 Grade 4 to 6	Analyze the characters used in print, non-print, and digital materials **EN6VC-Ii-3.3.3**	**TEACHER:** Is the boy in the story lazy or hardworking? **STUDENT:** Hardworking*. **TEACHER:** Excuse me? **STUDENT:** Oh, the boy is lazy, teacher.
Key Stage 3 Grade 7 to 10	differentiate formal from informal definitions of words **EN10V-Ia13.9**	**TEACHER:** Can you give me a formal definition for the word "freedom"? **STUDENT:** It is like we can act, speak, or think. **TEACHER:** I'm sorry? **STUDENT:** Freedom is the power or right to act, speak, or think as one wants without hindrance or restraint.

In addition to recasting which is the most frequently used feedback, teachers can utilize another corrective feedback method which is clarification request. Clarification requests have been identified by Rezaei et al. (2011) as feedback that carries questions indicating that the utterance has been ill-formed or misunderstood and that a reformulation or a repetition is required. This kind of feedback addresses "problems in either comprehension, accuracy, or both" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Contrasting to recast, clarification requests could be more reliable in generating modified output from learners since they might not provide the learners with any information about the committed error (Rezaei et al., 2011).

Table 2 shows how clarification requests can be used to give corrective feedback to students in different key stages. Key Stage 1 with a learning competency that the student must recognize the sound of short vowel o in a consonant-vowel-consonant pattern. The scenario shows that the student mispronounces the sound of the short vowel o in reading the word "top". The teacher requested for a repetition of the student's answer. The student then has a chance to modify his answer. In analyzing the characters used in texts for Key Stage 2, the student mistakenly chose the wrong answer, so the teacher offered a clarification by saying, "Excuse me?" The student then gave his modified answer. Another scenario that shows the usage of clarification request is in differentiating formal from informal definitions of words in Key Stage 3. In this scenario, the student gives the informal definition for the word "freedom" instead of a formal definition that is originally asked of him. To correct the student, the teacher utilized a clarification request by saying, "I'm sorry?"

Table 3: *Metalinguistic Feedback*

Key Stage	Learning Competency	Scenario
Key Stage 1 Kindergarten to Grade 3	recognize rhyming words in nursery rhymes, poems, songs heard **EN1PA-IIIa-e-2.2**	**Teacher:** Which pair of words have rhyming sounds? Car – far or Car – fair? **Student:** Car and fair **Teacher:** Do "car," and "fair" have the same final sound?
Key Stage 2 Grade 4 to 6	Use adjectives (degrees of comparison, order) in sentences **EN4G-IIIa-13**	**Student:** This is the baddest food that I ever tried. **Teacher:** Do we say "baddest"?

Key Stage	Learning Competency	Scenario
Key Stage 3 Grade 7 to 10	Formulate a statement of opinion or assertion	Remember, the word "bad" is an irregular adjective, therefore, we must change the spelling/word itself when it comes to its comparative and superlative degree. What should be the comparative and superlative form of the word "bad"? **Student:** Worse and worst This is the worst food that I ever tried. **Teacher:** "The popularity of Sampaguita flowers is most evident in places of worship." What type of assertion is this? **Student:** It is an example of Assertion of fact. **Teacher:** Is it a fact? Is the statement based on research or studies? Or is it scientifically proven? **Student:** No. **Teacher:** So, what type is it? **Student:** Opinion **Teacher:** Right. Yes, we know that many might agree with the statement; however, there is not enough evidence that can defend or prove it.

The first scenario is for grade 1 learners and is based on the Learning Competency, *"recognize rhyming words in nursery rhymes, poems, songs heard (*EN1PA-IIIa-e-2.2*)"*. In this scenario, the learner gave an incorrect answer, and as a response, the teacher stated, *"Do car and fair have the same final sound?"* This response implicitly informed the learner that his answer was incorrect and, at the same time, gave him a clue to help him choose the correct answer.

The second example is for grade 4 learning competency, "Use adjectives (degrees of comparison, order) in sentences (EN4G-IIIa-13)". In this example, the response given by the teacher is, *"Do we say baddest? Remember, the word bad is an irregular adjective; therefore, we must change the spelling/word itself when it comes to its comparative and superlative degree. What should be the comparative and superlative form of the word bad?"* This response is intended to activate the learner's knowledge of the topic, which will eventually lead him to give the correct answer.

The last scenario for metalinguistic feedback is based on grade 10 learning competency indicating *"formulate a statement of opinion or assertion"*. In this scenario, the teacher corrected the learner by giving a definition or explanation of what their answer was. This way, the learner will be given a chance to analyze his answer and check, on his own, whether it is correct or not.

Overall, the feedback is given on the sample scenarios simply suggests or leads the learners to an accurate answer. The teacher does not directly give the correct answer but gives them clues that can help them produce the correct one, which is the notion of metalinguistic feedback.

Table 4: *Elicitation Feedback*

Key Stage	Learning Competency	Scenario
Key Stage 1 Kindergarten to Grade 3	Respond appropriately to polite expressions: greetings, leave-takings, expressing gratitude and apology, asking permission, offering help **EN1OL-IIIa-e-1.5**	**Student:** Excuse me, Ma'am. Can I go to the bathroom? **Teacher:** Can I go to the bathroom, or May I go to the bathroom? **Student:** May I go to the bathroom, Ma'am?
Key Stage 2 Grade 4 to 6	Compose clear and coherent sentences using appropriate grammatical structures (verb tenses, conjunctions, adverbs) **EN6G-Ig-4.4.1**	**Teacher:** Give me a sentence in the past progressive form of the verb. **Student:** Last Sunday, I am playing my guitar when you texted me. **Teacher:** Last Sunday, I ___ playing my guitar when you texted me? **Student:**

Key Stage 3
Grade 7 to 10
	Critique a literary selection based on the following approaches:
	
	• structuralist/formalist
	    • moralist
	    • Marxist
	    • feminist
	    • historical
	  • -reader-response
		WAS. Last Sunday, I <u>WAS</u> playing my guitar when you texted me.
		Student:
		Critics consider outside elements such as the historical background of the text and the author's biography in the formalist approach.
		Teacher: Do formalist critics consider outside elements?
		Student: Yes
		Teacher: Nice try. But they don't. Because their focus is on the text or content itself only. Therefore, it should be?
		Student: Formalist critics don't consider outside elements because they focus solely on the content itself.

The first row is a sample scenario for Grade 1 with the learning competency, *"Respond appropriately to polite expressions: greetings, leave-takings, expressing gratitude and apology, asking permission, offering help (EN1OL-IIIa-e-1.5)"*. In this example, the teacher's response was through a question. This question also contains options that give learners an opportunity to correct their errors.

The second example was from the Grade 6 learning competency, *"Compose clear and coherent sentences using appropriate grammatical structures: verb tenses, conjunctions, adverbs (EN6G-Ig-4.4.1)"*. In this scenario, the teacher corrected the learner's error by restating the learner's answer but leaving the specific error "blank" to indicate that it needs to be corrected.

Lastly, the third and last scenario is based on grade 10 learning competency, "Critique a literary selection based on the following approaches: structuralist/formalist, moralist, Marxist, feminist, historical and reader-response. In this example, the teacher activated the learner's knowledge about the topic to help him correct his error.

In general, all the sample responses gave the learners opportunities to discover their own errors and correct them on their own.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

It can be concluded that all the above-mentioned corrective feedback methods could be utilized for every key stage. This suggests that all this corrective feedback works for different ages. However, in some cases, explicit corrective feedback is more effective for low-level learners, while implicit corrective feedback works best for higher-level learners. Similarly, Aljaafreh & Lantolf (1994) and Ammar & Spada (2006) in Roothoft (2016) agreed that explicit cues are more useful for low-proficiency learners, whereas higher-level learners may be better able to regulate their performance in the target language, therefore more implicit CF may be enough for them.

On the other hand, other than what is mentioned above, some other factors such as learners' individual needs should also be considered in choosing which corrective feedback should be used. This highlighted the role of the teachers in choosing the best method suited to them. Aside from that, the topic or context or context of the error where it will be used should also be counted.

Regardless of the varied factors to be considered in choosing the most appropriate method to be used, it is emphasized in this paper that learners learn best if they are aware that they are corrected and if the manner of correcting them is not obtrusive. As Tasdemir (2018) suggested, teachers should avoid interrupting their learners' speaking for the purpose of correcting errors and instead allow them to finish their sentences, as they do not appreciate being interrupted.

The present study highlighted the role of teachers in providing appropriate corrective feedback to their learners; therefore, they should be given constant training on the execution of these methods. Aside from this, the researchers of the present study made the following suggestions:

• As seen in the findings and discussion of this paper, the present study focuses on the use of corrective feedback in terms of English subjects only; that is why it is recommended for future researchers to conduct studies on the use of corrective feedback on other subjects areas as well such as Mathematics and Science.
• Future researchers may also conduct experimental research focusing on a specific key stage for a thorough understanding of the learners' needs in terms of corrective feedback.

- It is also identified that aside from the corrective feedback mentioned above, there are some other methods present that could be a possible focus of future research.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1] Baculi, A., Balatbat, R., Mendiola, J. & Vizconde, C. (2012). The practice of written corrective feedback among ESL teachers in the Philippines. *Academia*. http://ustedu.academia.edu.

[2] Baleghizadeh, S., & Abdi, H. (2010). Recast and its impact on second language acquisition. *International Journal of Language Studies*, *4*(4), 57–68. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/49593237_Recast_and_Its_Impact_on_Second_Language_Acquisition

[3] Braidi, S. (2002). Reexamining the role of recasts in native speaker/nonnative-speaker interactions. *Language Learning, 52*, 1-42.

[4] Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students, Second Edition*. ASCD. https://files.ascd.org/staticfiles/ascd/pdf/siteASCD/publications/books/How-to-Give-Effective-Feedback-to-Your-Students-2nd-Edition-sample-chapters.pdf

[5] Brown, R. & Bellugi, U. (1964). Three processes in the child's acquisition of syntax. *Harvard Educational Review, 34*, 133–151.

[6] Cicognani, E., & Zani, B. (1988). The clarification request in the teacher-child conversation. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *3*(3), 303–315. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03172736

[7] Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. SSLA, 28, 575-600

[8] Fitriana R. (2016). Students' Preferences Toward Corrective Feedbacks on Students' Oral Production. *Script Journal: Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching*, *1*(1), 46-60. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.24903/sj.v1i1.17

[9] Gao, J & Ma, S. (2019). The Effect of Two Forms of computer-automated Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback. Language Learning & Technology, 23(2), 65-83. Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/reader/211328456

[10] Goo, J. (2012). Recasts in the acquisition of English relative clauses: Positive or negative evidence? Studies in English Education, 17(2), 203-220.

[11] Long, M. (2006). *Problems in SLA*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315089447/problems-sla-michael-long

[12] Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND LEARNER UPTAKE. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(1), 37–66. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/252160472_Corrective_feedback_and_learner_uptake

[13] Lyster, R., & Ranta, L.(1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37-66.

[14] Mežek, P., McGrath, L., Negretti, R., & Berggren, J. (2021). Scaffolding L2 academic reading and Self-Regulation through task and feedback. *TESOL Quarterly*, *56*(1), 41–67. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3018

[15] Mohammadi, M. (2009). Recast and Metalinguistic Feedback in Teaching and Learning L2 Writing: A Comparative Study. *The Journal of Asia TEFL. 6*. 227-244. 10.13140/2.1.2517.0561. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264208264_Recast_and_Metalinguistic_Feedback_in_Teaching_and_Learning_L2_Writing_A_Comparative_Study

[16] Moinzadeh, A., Rassaei, E., & Youhanaee, M. (2019). The Effect of Corrective Feedback on the Acquisition of Implicit and Explicit L2 Knowledge. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, *2*(1), 59-75. Retrieved from https://jltl.com.tr/index.php/jltl/article/view/91

[17] Rezaei, S., Mozaffari, F., & Hatef, A. (2011). Corrective feedback in SLA: Classroom practice and future directions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v1n1p21

[18] Roothooft, H. (2016). Comparing the Effects of two Types of Output-Pushing Feedback on Adult EFL Students' Oral Accuracy. Elia. 16. 49-78. 10.12795/elia.2016.i16.03. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312074368_Comparing_the_Effects_of_two_Types_of_Output-Pushing_Feedback_on_Adult_EFL_Students'_Oral_Accuracy

[19] Sandelowski, M., & Barroso, J. (2007). *Handbook for synthesizing qualitative research*. Springer Publishing. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/239326789_Handbook_for_Synthesizing_Qualitative_Research?msclkid=196f7eb8b20911ec82fe960481e38050

[20] Sulistyani, S., & Suhartono, S. (2014). Corrective feedback and repair strategies in meaning-focused language Classroom. *Nusantara of Research*, *1*(2), 116–124. https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/154480-EN-corrective-feedback-and-repair-strategie.pdf

[21] Tamis-LeMonda, C.S., Kuchirko, Y. & Song, L. (2014). Why is infant language learning facilitated by parental responsiveness? Current Directions in Psychological Science, 23(2), 121–126.

[22] Taşdemir, M & Yalcin A, F. (2018). Feedback preferences of EFL learners with respect to their learning styles. Cogent Education. 5. 10.1080/2331186X.2018.1481560. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325427876_Feedback_preferences_of_EFL_learners_with_respect_to_their_learning_styles

[23] Unsal-Sakiroglu, H. (2020). Oral corrective feedback preferences of university students in English communication classes. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES), 6*(1), 172-178.