Journal of Teaching and Learning

Perceptions on Oral Corrective Feedback: The Case of Iranian EFL Teachers and Students in Face-to-Face and Virtual Learning Contexts

Narges Sardabi (iD), Amir Ghajarieh (iD), Navid Atar Sharghi (iD) et Leyla Rahmani

Citer cet article

Résumé de l'article

Oral-corrective feedback (CF) has often been a significant concern in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). This study sought to investigate teachers' and students' attitudes toward the oral CF in traditional and technology-enhanced classes. It also investigated the extent to which teachers' attitudes toward the oral CF matched their practices. A mixed-methods design was used for the study, utilizing data from questionnaires, observations, semi-structured interviews, and focus-group discussions. A sample of 162 female Iranian EFL students studying English at a private school participated in the study. The results showed that explicit correction (26%) and metalinguistic feedback (32%) were rated much more positively by the majority of students. Furthermore, the results indicated that they were more accustomed to receiving oral-feedback from the teacher in face-to-face classes than text- or audio-based feedback in technology-enhanced lessons. In addition, teachers' attitudes toward the CF were categorized into four themes: students' affective responses to CF, reasons for providing CF, timing of CF, CF in face-to-face instruction, and technology-enhanced instruction. The findings also showed that teachers' expressed beliefs about the frequency of CF provision predicted their practices, in many cases. This research has implications for EFL teachers and materials developers.

Perceptions on Oral Corrective Feedback: The Case of Iranian EFL Teachers and Students in Face-to-Face and Virtual Learning Contexts

Narges Sardabi
Ershad Damavand University

Amir Ghajarieh
Ershad Damavand University

Navid Atar Sharghi
Imam Khomeini International University

Leyla Rahmani
Ershad Damavand University

Abstract

Oral-corrective feedback (CF) has often been a significant concern in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). This study sought to investigate teachers' and students' attitudes toward the oral CF in traditional and technology-enhanced classes. It also investigated the extent to which teachers' attitudes toward the oral CF matched their practices. A mixed-methods design was used for the study, utilizing data from questionnaires, observations, semi-structured interviews, and focus-group discussions. A sample of 162 female Iranian EFL students studying English at a private school participated in the study. The results showed that explicit correction (26%) and metalinguistic feedback (32%) were rated much more positively by the majority of students. Furthermore, the results indicated that they were more accustomed to receiving oral-feedback from the teacher in face-to-face classes than text- or audio-based feedback in technology-enhanced lessons. In addition, teachers' attitudes toward the CF were categorized into four themes: students' affective responses to CF, reasons for providing CF, timing of CF, CF in face-to-face instruction, and technology-enhanced instruction. The findings also showed that teachers' expressed beliefs about the frequency of CF provision predicted their practices, in many cases. This research has implications for EFL teachers and materials developers.

1

Introduction

The issue of errors in second-language learning is a central topic in applied linguistics, and gives rise to ongoing and heated debate. Feedback plays a vital role in learning and performance, but its effects can be both positive and negative (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). While scholars, such as Krashen (1982) and Truscott (1999) advise against correcting spoken errors, a large body of research over the past two decades suggests that immediate corrective feedback has a positive and lasting effect on learners' ability to produce more accurate language (Liu & Feng, 2023; Lyster et al., 2013).

Previous studies on teachers' beliefs and practices regarding oral-corrective feedback have shown that teachers are far from knowing how to respond to learners' errors (Basturkmen et al., 2004), or that students desire such feedback, and need to be considered in terms of length, form, and type across different learning abilities (Muyashoha, 2019; Rochma, 2023). Thus, there is a need for further investigation of teachers' and students' beliefs regarding corrective feedback. Furthermore, certain aspects of oral-corrective feedback have been overlooked in previous attitudinal research. In particular, the most effective way to provide this learning tool in different educational contexts remains controversial. Researchers have differing views on the effectiveness of rephrasing or reformulating versus more explicit forms of feedback (Goo & Mackey, 2013; Lyster & Ranta, 2013), particularly in technology-enhanced classrooms. Therefore, it would be valuable to collect data on teachers' and students' views on the most effective types of oral-corrective feedback in different second-language learning contexts.

Further, there is a lack of research on students' emotional responses to oral-corrective feedback, although Harmer (2006) and Truscott (1999) associate negative emotions, such as anger or embarrassment, with the provision of corrective feedback to students. For instance, although Muyashoha (2019) reports that most students want to receive feedback, Alzubi et al. (2022) investigated teachers' oral-corrective feedback practices in online EFL classroom interactions, and found that the effects of seemingly negative comments from teachers on their students have yet to be explored in detail in the scholarship that exists on positive feedback in speaking skills. While research has investigated the effectiveness of explicit correction (EC) in language learning and learners' preferences for feedback in general, there is a significant gap in understanding how these preferences vary in different learning environments. In particular, there has been limited research on how learners prefer EC in a face-to-face environment, compared to a virtual environment. Given the different characteristics of these environments (e.g., immediacy of feedback, non-verbal cues), it is important for teachers to understand learners' preferences for the delivery of corrections to maximize the impact of their comments and improve language acquisition. Additionally, due to the importance of learners' engagement in corrective feedback to improve students' perceptions and reactions (Liu & Feng, 2023), this study investigated how teachers, along with students, perceive different types of oral-corrective feedback, and how it differs in traditional and technology-enhanced instructional settings. In addition, teachers' attitudes are assessed in relation to their actual practices.

The gap of knowledge regarding CF preferences across learning environments has become more visual after the pandemic, with virtual learning platforms, such as Zoom or other learning management systems, entering the equation. The reason for the comparison between face-to-face and online courses in terms of corrective feedback in this study is that in the latter case, technological possibilities offer teachers new opportunities to provide more feedback to students. ЛЯШЕНКО (2023) emphasized the typology of CF in such classes. In contrast, teachers in

traditional   classes   rely   on   immediate   verbal   feedback   for   corrections.

Literature Review

Theoretical frameworks of corrective feedback

Corrective feedback (CF) is generally defined as "comments or other information that learners receive regarding their performance on learning tasks or tests, either from the teacher or other individuals" (Richards & Schmidt, 2015, p. 199). In the case of oral teacher feedback, a distinction was made between those that provide input and ones that prompt output, as well as those between implicit and explicit feedback. The identified strategies included explicit corrections, rephrasing, repetition, elicitation, metalinguistic cues, and requests for clarification (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). More specifically, explicit correction refers to direct feedback that clearly highlights a learner's error and shows the correct form. This method can be verbal (e.g., teacher saying, "The past tense of 'go' is 'went.'"), or written (e.g., underlining an error and writing the correction).

The conceptualization of corrective feedback (CF) in language learning can be boosted by incorporating perspectives from major learning theories. Behaviourism may consider CF as an integral part of habit formation, emphasizing immediate error correction. As Ellis (2009) notes, feedback in second-language acquisition works as a facilitator through behaviourist and cognitive lenses. Additionally, the scholar notes, "in both structural and communicative approaches to language teaching, feedback is viewed as a means of fostering learner motivation and ensuring linguistic accuracy" (p. 3). Sociocultural theory also views CF as scaffolding within the Zone of Proximal Development (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007), championing gradual remedial outcome. The Interactionist approach values CF during meaningful communication, and as Abbuhl (2021) notes, both output prompting and input-providing on the part of teachers and/or students can improve L2 learning. Each theory offers unique advantages: behaviourism provides clear error identification, cognitivism enhances conscious learning, sociocultural theory ensures developmental readiness, and interactionism maintains communicative authenticity. However, their limitations include increased   anxiety   (behaviourism),   disrupted   fluency   (cognitivism),   time   constraints (sociocultural), and facilitating feedback through communication (interactionism). In this study, the interactionist theory was adopted with references to output-prompting and input-providing feedback. The theoretical debate about the provision of CF, oral or written, revolves around the question of whether second-language learning depends solely on exposure to positive linguistic models, or if a combination of positive evidence and negative feedback on what is considered unacceptable is required. Opponents of CF (Truscott, 1996) draw on the theory of Krashen (1982) and argue that exposure to authentic language material and the use of language for communicative purposes is crucial for learning success. From this point of view, CF is seen as ineffective or even detrimental to L2 development, since it focuses only on explicit knowledge that cannot be used in real oral and written tasks. According to this view, the emphasis on oral and written tasks should be about constructing meaning, rather than on improving linguistic accuracy. On the other hand, proponents of CF (Long, 2015; Lyster, 2015) argue that while positive evidence is essential for success in the L2, a small amount of form-focused instruction is also necessary, especially for less salient and semantically redundant language features that can be easily overlooked by learners, such as French gender or third-person pronouns in English, as these features have no special meaning.

In the context of CF research, oral and written forms have been examined through similar theoretical lenses. Opposing views emphasize meaning-oriented language tasks, while proponents emphasize the importance of form-oriented instruction for certain linguistic features that learners may not acquire naturally. Some recent studies on corrective feedback include Rochma (2023), Muyashoha (2019), and Anggunsari and Mahmudah (2023). These studies focused on oral-corrective feedback as a formative assessment in teaching speaking to language learners. They mostly concluded that this feedback can be beneficial for learners, but that it needs to be systematic and consciously managed. For this method, the manner, structure, and length of feedback are of utmost importance, because learners are not only vessels to receive corrections, but also have emotions that need to be considered, especially in the case of learners with different proficiency levels or in different age groups. As Ghajarieh and Mirkazemi (2023) note, learners and their socio-cultural differences can influence learning outcomes, which also applies to the use of corrective feedback in the classroom.

Taxonomy of oral-corrective feedback

Lyster and Ranta (1997) conducted a study in which they identified six types of oral-corrective feedback used by teachers. These types include:

- Explicit correction: where the teacher directly states the correct form and clearly points out the student's error.
- Rephrasing: A form of implicit feedback that consists of two steps: The teacher repeats the learner's incorrect utterance, emphasizing the error, and then rephrases the entire utterance.
- Request for clarification: Often expressed in the form of questions with a rising tone of voice, requests for clarification are used when the learner's utterance is unintelligible and highlights an error.
- Metalinguistic feedback: This type of feedback includes comments, information or questions about the correctness of the learner's utterance without explicitly stating the correct form. Metalinguistic feedback serves to focus learners' attention on the target forms, improve their understanding of these forms through metalinguistic information, and encourage self-correction of errors (Sheen, 2004).
- Elicitation: Teachers use a variety of techniques to ask students to produce the correct form themselves directly.
- Repetition: In repetition, the teacher repeats the student's incorrect utterance, often adjusting the intonation to emphasize the error.

In their study, Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorized these types of oral-corrective feedback based on their observed use in the language classroom.

Occurrence of oral-corrective feedback

Studies have shown that repetition is the most commonly used form of corrective feedback by teachers in language teaching (Choi & Li, 2012). The preference for repetition can be attributed to its ability to maintain the flow of communication and maintain students' confidence. This finding is consistent with Roothooft's (2014) study, which found that teachers prefer rephrasing for fear of using intrusive feedback strategies that may cause anxiety in students.

Brown's (2016) meta-analysis of descriptive studies of corrective feedback supports the prevalence of reframing, particularly in adult and primary classrooms. However, in high school language classes, prompts were found to be more common than repetitions. This difference may be due to the problems this method can cause for younger learners, as their responses may differ from the intended correction. It is also possible that teachers assume that children have limited knowledge of the second language and are less responsive to self-correction. In contrast, prompts are more effective for students with a shorter attention span, because they draw attention to errors. For adult learners, teachers resort to rephrasing, possibly because adults are more sensitive to corrective feedback and can perceive implicit corrections.

An exciting finding from Brown's (2016) meta-analysis is that teachers with better second-language (L2) training tend to give more prompts and less repetition. This suggests that instructors who are better informed about the research on L2 and corrective feedback recognize the benefits of prompts. Furthermore, when they were informed that the purpose of the study was to investigate corrective feedback, they gave more prompts. This suggests that educators perceive prompts as more positive than repetition, and may adapt their feedback strategies to meet observers' expectations.

In a more recent study on oral-corrective feedback, Alzubi et al. (2022) found out that EFL teachers consistently provided it during online classroom interactions. The study did not find any significant differences in the EFL teachers' responses based on the type of oral-corrective feedback (implicit or explicit), their gender, or their years of teaching experience.

Most recently, Liu and Feng (2023) reviewed articles on CF in EFL/ESL classrooms and found out that engagement of the learners plays an important role in improving the quality of such feedback.

Teachers' beliefs and students' attitudes

Most studies looking at beliefs on corrective feedback (CF) in language learning also consider beliefs about its other aspects, particularly grammar learning (Loewen et al., 2009). Research focusing exclusively on CF beliefs is limited (Martínez Agudo, 2013).

Li's (2018) meta-analysis and narrative review found that students generally had a positive attitude toward corrective feedback, with a high approval rate (89%). In contrast, teachers were reluctant, with a significantly lower approval rate (39%). Both teachers' and students' beliefs were influenced by their previous experiences, as students who had received more grammar instruction and error correction in the past were less optimistic about corrective feedback. Novice teachers expressed more significant concern about the potentially harmful effects of corrective feedback than experienced teachers.

Although research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback outweighs studies on attitudes, the available studies suggest a discrepancy between teachers' and students' beliefs. Students generally want more correction than teachers believe is necessary (Jean & Simard, 2011). This discrepancy can have an impact on classroom practices, as unmet student expectations can lead to lower participation or disengagement from classroom activities (Bloom, 2007; McCargar, 1993).

Another area that needs to be studied in relation to CF, particularly in Iran, is the different contexts in which it is used. For instance, how L2 teachers use CF in traditional classrooms differs from how CF is used in technology-enhanced classrooms. Therefore, this study is an attempt to investigate L2 learners' attitudes toward the oral CF in both traditional face-to-face instruction and

technology-enhanced instruction. To achieve the above objectives, the following research questions were formulated.

RQ1: What are learners' attitudes toward the oral CF in technology-enhanced and face-to-face instruction?

RQ2: What are teachers' attitudes toward the oral CF in technology-enhanced and face-to-face instruction?

RQ3: What types of CF do teachers provide when dealing with learners' errors?

RQ4: To what extent do teachers' attitudes toward the oral CF match their practice?

Method

Research Design

A mixed-methods design was employed to address the objectives of the current study, and data were collected through questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, focus-group discussions, and observations.

Context and Participants

This study was conducted in a branch of the National Organization for Development of Exceptional Talents (SAMPAD/NODET) named Farzanegan Hazrat Zainab Secondary School, where students are required to develop English-language proficiency. The participants were selected from grades 7, 8 and 9, in two classes from each level. A different teacher taught each class. The language level of the students was heterogeneous in each class. The students were taught different contents of a specific book named Prospect. The study involved 162 Iranian students studying English at a private school. They were all female, and their age ranged from 13 to 16. The participants were selected through the convenience sampling method. The students were from different proficiency levels: 39 students from grade 7 (two classes), 50 students from grade 8 (two classes) and 73 students from grade 9 (two classes).

For the qualitative phase of the study, three students from each class, who had given their consent, were asked to take part in a semi-structured interview. In addition, three teachers whose lessons were observed for the study took part in focus-group discussions. All of the teachers had a degree in TEFL. One teacher had 20 years of experience. The second teacher taught English at a private language centre and had 20 years of experience. The third teacher had three years of experience and also taught at a private language centre.

Here is the demographic information regarding the participants of the study:

Table 1: Demographic information.

Characteristic	Description
Total Participants	162
Age Range	13-19 years old
Gender	Female only
Grade Level	7, 8, 9 (2 classes each)
Number of Participants Per Grade	Grade 7 (39), Grade 8 (50), Grade 9 (73)

English Language Level	Heterogeneous within each class
Learning Environment	Private school (SAMPAD/NODET)
Teaching Materials	Prospect textbook
Sampling Method	Convenience sampling
Qualitative Interview Participants	9 students (3 from each grade level, with their consent)
Focus-Group Participants	3 teachers (whose lessons were observed)
Teacher Qualifications	All have a TEFL degree
Teacher Experience	Teacher 1: 20 years

Instruments

This study aimed to investigate the effects of the oral CF on learners' speaking performance. It also investigated students' and teachers' attitudes toward the oral CF and whether the teachers' attitudes were consistent with their practices. Four types of data collection instruments were used to achieve the objectives of the study. The individual instruments are described below:

Feedback Questionnaire To gain a deeper insight into EFL learners' views on oral-corrective feedback in face-to-face teaching compared to technology-assisted teaching, a sample of 162 learners of different levels were asked to complete the feedback questionnaire. Participants were obtained using a convenience sampling approach by selecting accessible respondents for inclusion in the study. Online questionnaires were disseminated to potential respondents via specialized EFL/ESL Telegram and WhatsApp groups. Meanwhile, paper-based questionnaires were distributed to Iranian EFL students by the researchers. The questions were adapted from Tsui and Ng (2000) and Yang et al. (2006). The questionnaires used in these studies were developed to measure written CF, thus, some modifications were made to adapt the items for the present study. In order to gain a deeper insight into the students' responses, they were also asked to explain the reasons for some of their responses. To strengthen validity, the researchers piloted the questionnaire with a smaller group to ensure that it captured relevant aspects of the oral CF. For internal consistency reliability, Cronbach's Alpha was used. A score of .80 indicated good internal consistency.

Observation Observation as a method of data collection is considered an essential tool for researching the professional actions of teachers (Vavrus, 2009). To investigate how educators use the oral CF in their practices, two sessions of face-to-face teaching and two sessions of technology-enhanced teaching were observed and recorded. One session is at the beginning of the course, and the second one is toward the end of the course. An observation checklist was used for this purpose, as well as the researcher's notes on the dynamics of teacher-student interaction and student-teacher interaction in both face-to-face and technology-assisted instruction. The rubrics for observation were inspired by Johnson et al. (2017), and feedback was observed and guided by Lyster and

Ranta's (1997) taxonomy of oral-corrective feedback. The observer noted the presence of each category of these types of corrections and evaluated its impact across three categories: implemented, partially implemented, and not implemented (Johnson et al., 2017).

Since observing online courses is more difficult than traditional ones, in terms of limited visibility of teachers and students, along with the technical challenges, each session was recorded, and discussions, chat transcripts or collaborative documents for each course were analyzed. One of the authors observed, for example, each instructor's feedback and student responses. If other facilities of the online platform could be used for appropriate feedback, including annotations, comments and real-time chat, these were included in the analysis. In the case of traditional classes, the data generated by student interaction was also analyzed for corrective feedback from classmates, given the opportunity for face-to-face interaction. In online courses, students did not have the opportunity to communicate spontaneously without the teacher's permission. Nonetheless, in the case of online courses, online discussions and collaborative tools were reviewed to identify instances of peer-to-peer feedback.

To reduce the observer's bias, i.e., preconceptions about what is essential and what is not, one of the authors attempted to use the following techniques: first, questions were asked about the observer's perceptions; second, emergent concepts were noted, and the audio recordings were listened to several times to capture missing data and confirm or reject preconceived notions.

Semi-structured interviews After the course, three students from each class who had given their consent were asked to participate in a semi-structured interview. Interviews were conducted in educational studies to obtain data such as motivations, feelings, attitudes, and experiences of individuals that cannot be derived from quantitative data (Borg & Gall, 1983). In this study, semi-structured interviews were conducted as a qualitative data collection tool to gain insights into students' attitudes toward the oral CF in both face-to-face and technology-enhanced classes. The feedback questionnaire was used as a framework for the interview.

All interview questions were asked in Persian to make the participants feel relaxed and answer the questions quickly. Learners' responses (i.e., their voices) were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed to determine students' attitudes toward the effects of oral-corrective feedback on their speaking performance. Additional follow-up questions were asked to obtain a more complete picture of students' attitudes toward the oral CF.

The interview questions were derived from the feedback questionnaire, ensuring that some degree of content validity aligned with the research topic. However, additional steps like member checking (verifying interpretations with participants) were done as well. The data were coded by two coders, and inter-coder reliability was established at a satisfactory level using Cohen's Kappa (Kappa=.83).

Focus Group Discussion To understand teachers' attitudes and beliefs about the oral CF in face-to-face and technology-enhanced instruction, a focus-group discussion was organized with teachers at the end of their courses. The questions in this section were designed based on the survey results. In this qualitative phase of the research, one of the authors recorded, noted, and transcribed the information obtained. To ensure credibility of data, a skilled moderator was used to guide the discussion, ensure everyone participates, and maintain a neutral stance. For the sake of ethical issues and accuracy, discussions were recorded with informed consent, allowing for more accurate transcription later. Member checking was done after the discussion by sharing key themes or quotes with participants for their feedback and verification.

Data collection procedure

The data for the current study was collected in four stages. First, the feedback questionnaire was administered to a sample of 162 students studying English at Farzanegan Hazrat Zainab School in Sampad. There were three levels: 7th grade, 8th grade and 9th grade. The feedback questionnaire was distributed to seek students' opinions on the oral CF in both face-to-face and technology-enhanced classes. Two sessions of each class were then observed. One of the authors acted as a comprehensive observer who observed, recorded and took notes of everything that happened during the learning process. The observation of each class was recorded and later transcribed.

A number of students were then interviewed, in a semi-structured format, to gain an understanding of their attitudes and experiences of CF in the two contexts. Each interview lasted approximately 30 minutes, and consent was obtained from the students prior to the interview. Participants were interviewed face-to-face, and their voices were recorded.

Finally, a focus-group discussion lasted approximately 120 minutes and was conducted with three teachers to gain a deeper understanding of their views on the oral CF in face-to-face and technology-enhanced instruction.

Data analysis procedure

In order to analyze the students' perceptions, all recorded interviews were transcribed. Content analysis was administered to analyze the data from the classroom observation, the semi-structured interviews, and the focus-group discussion. All recorded interviews were transcribed without changes to ensure the authenticity of the data. The coding and classification from the content analysis were reviewed by an expert in the field to improve the trustworthiness of the results, and to achieve adequate agreement between the coders. A thematic-coding approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006) was used to identify, analyze, and interpret patterns within the data. To enhance trustworthiness and inter-rater reliability, the coding scheme was refined through iterative processes and independently coded by two researchers. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion and consensus (Ghajarieh & Aghabozorgi, 2024).

Results

RQ1: Learners' attitudes toward the Oral CF in different instructional contexts

The results of the feedback questionnaires (both Likert scale and open-ended questions) were analyzed to find out how students rated their teachers' feedback in the two contexts of face-to-face and technology-enhanced instruction. All students in the three levels were asked if they would like to receive feedback from their teachers when they make mistakes while speaking. The majority of students answered this question positively, i.e., they had a positive attitude toward receiving CF from their teachers. A total of 79% of the 7th-grade students, 83% of 8th-grade students, and 86% of 9th-grade students preferred to be corrected by their teacher. Table 2 shows the results of the students' responses to this question.

Table 2: Students' preferences for receiving the Oral CF.

Grades	Percentage
7th grade	79 %
8th grade	83 %
9th grade	86 %

The students' responses showed that the majority wanted to be constantly corrected. Students were also asked to rate the different types of corrective feedback that they received on a scale from the most negative to the most positive.

Table 3: Frequency of students' preferences for different types of CF.

Feedback Type	Frequency			
	7th grade	8th grade	9th grade	Total
Metalinguistic	4	11	37	52
Recast	2	10	14	26
Repetition	4	7	9	20
Elicitation	2	5	4	11
Clarification Request	6	2	3	11
Explicit Correction	21	15	6	42

Table 4: Percentage of students' preferences for different types of CF.

Feedback Type	Percentage %			
	7th grade	8th grade	9th grade	Total
Metalinguistic	10 %	22 %	50 %	32 %
Recast	5 %	20 %	19 %	16 %
Repetition	10 %	14 %	12 %	12 %
Elicitation	5 %	10 %	5 %	7 %
Clarification Request	15 %	4 %	4 %	7 %
Explicit Correction	53 %	30 %	8 %	26 %

The results in Table 3 and Table 4 show that explicit correction (26%) and meta-linguistic feedback (32%) are rated much more positively by the majority of students. For instance, about 32% of the students rated metalinguistic feedback as very good. In comparison, only 7% of the students rated the request for clarification as very good, and 7% rated the elicitation of information as very good. In other words, metalinguistic feedback was the most popular type of feedback, while clarification requests and inquiries were the least popular among students. The results of the other types of feedback were as follows: 16% rated rephrasing as very good, and 12% rated repetition as very good.

In addition, student responses showed that 9th-grade students were more willing to receive metalinguistic feedback (50%), while 7th-grade students (10%) were less inclined when compared to the other two grade levels. This shows that students understood metalinguistic feedback better when their level was higher. In terms of explicit correction, a reverse order was observed. 7th-grade students preferred explicit correction more (53%) than eighth (30%) and ninth (8%) grade students.

The results of the semi-structured interviews and the open-ended questions in the questionnaires indicated that students were more accustomed to receiving oral-feedback from the

teacher in face-to-face classes than text- or audio-based feedback in technology-enhanced classes. For example, S2 explained why she preferred face-to-face CF:

> I understand my mistake when I can see the teacher, and it is easier to be corrected that way. In online courses, I sometimes have trouble understanding what the teacher is saying, and that makes me even more nervous.

S7 was of the same opinion:

> In face-to-face classes, it is less stressful to be corrected because the teacher can correct me individually, whereas this is not possible in online classes.

In online lessons, they received teacher MF in text-based form or audio-based form. The majority of students considered audio-based CF to be more instructive, as well as more engaging and supportive. In other words, students considered the teacher's asynchronous audio-based CF to be more empathetic than text-based feedback. For instance, S9 mentioned that:

> It feels much better to hear the teacher's voice than to communicate with a text. I know what the teacher means. I also know whether she is happy with me or not.

S8 also preferred to "hear the teacher's voice correcting me" via audio messages rather than receiving CF in text form. When asked about the effectiveness of different types of CF in face-to-face and technology-enhanced instruction, some students indicated that they preferred asynchronous text- or audio-based CF because they had more time to process and plan compared to oral CF. This means that when they receive feedback, they firstly have enough time to understand the problem, and secondly to consider what the best alternative could be.

RQ2: Teachers' Attitudes toward the Oral CF in Different Instructional Contexts

When the students' and teachers' attitudes to oral-corrective feedback were compared, it was observed that the majority of students wanted to be corrected most of the time. In contrast, most teachers thought that correction was essential, but did not believe that it was appropriate to correct their students all the time.

Teachers' attitudes toward the CF were categorized into four themes: students' affective responses to CF, the reasons for providing CF, timing of CF, and CF in face-to-face vs. technology-enhanced classes.

Table 5: Themes extracted about teachers' attitude to the Oral CF.

Themes	Affective Responses to CF
	The Reasons for Providing CF
	Timing of CF
	CF in face-to-face versus technology-enhanced classes

Students Affective Responses to CF The three teachers who participated in the focus group discussion highlighted the issue of student's emotional responses to corrective feedback as one of the critical factors that determine whether and when CF is given. When asked about students' feelings when receiving feedback, teachers had different views. They considered that it depends on some factors, such as "the way the feedback is given." One teacher felt that "it depends on the student. Some students may feel embarrassed, while others do not mind receiving feedback." Another teacher felt that "some students are frustrated because they make the same mistake again, and are, therefore, grateful when they receive CF." The teachers also mentioned that sometimes students get upset when they are interrupted, and therefore, the teacher should give feedback at the end of the conversation.

The three teachers agreed that their students generally responded positively to the feedback. For instance, one teacher stated that "students find CF very helpful," and another emphasized that "most students are happy to receive CF." Overall, the positive feelings mentioned by teachers were "grateful," "happy," and "helpful," while the negative feelings mentioned were "insecure," "embarrassed," and "frustrated."

The Reasons for Providing CF Teachers' responses to the reasons why students' spoken errors should be corrected could be categorized into three groups: a positive attitude, a negative attitude, and a mixed attitude. Among the arguments expressed in favour of CF in speaking, two aspects were repeatedly mentioned: on the one hand, it was felt that correction could help students not to make the same mistake again, while on the other hand, the importance of making students aware of their mistakes was mentioned. One teacher explained, "It is important to give CF, otherwise, students will keep making the same mistakes." Another teacher believed "if they do not get feedback, they will not realize what they are doing wrong." The teacher who did not seem to support CF gave the following reasons: "because I want students to speak fearlessly" and "I do it at the end of the lesson." In fact, this teacher was not opposed to the provision of CF, but rather to immediate feedback during the activity. The teacher, who had a mixed attitude, stated,

> I think it is essential for students to get feedback during the activity. Correcting the learners is essential. This is the only way they learn and make progress. However, the way in which the error correction is carried out is also important. It could be discouraging if it is done insensitively or in a way that makes students feel stupid.

The most commonly cited reasons for this mixed attitude to correction include, on the one hand, a belief in the importance of promoting fluency and, on the other, the potential damage CF can do to students' self-confidence.

Timing of CF The teachers also mentioned timing as one of the factors that determine the effectiveness of corrective feedback. One teacher explained that she would "look for a quiet moment to give individual feedback, when the rest of the class is busy doing something else." The other two teachers stated that they would at least sometimes consider immediate correction. However, it also became clear that this should be done carefully and, if possible, discreetly. One teacher spoke of the importance of the relationship when correcting, and the importance of allowing peer correction. The other teacher preferred to discreetly draw learners' attention to their mistakes and give them feedback when they were working in groups.

One teacher expressed her concern about damaging learners' confidence. Therefore, she would "sometimes let the students solve the problem and negotiate the meaning, rather than the

teacher interfering." All teachers agreed that they would not give feedback if it would disrupt the flow of a class discussion. For instance, one teacher said, "I do not want to interrupt everyone to focus on one student's problem." She described how she gives students feedback on their oral presentations: "I usually note down four or five key points as they speak and then give them feedback, and they seem happy with it. Another teacher expressed a similar view, and also explained that she takes time for feedback once a week.

CF in face-to-face teaching vs. technology-enhanced teaching Teachers described the differences between face-to-face and technology-enhanced interaction and CF, pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of each form of instruction. They mentioned that since communication between teachers and learners in online courses is only asynchronous, any CF provided by the teacher reaches the learners with a delay. In other words, synchronous or immediate feedback is only sometimes possible for teachers in the context of distance learning. Therefore, the teacher may send a written report or voice recording to each student with a list of errors and feedback cases.

They also emphasized the effectiveness of feedback given through text or voice recordings. They felt that feedback in the form of text or audio recordings can be ineffective, if it comes too late, as students may need to remember what the feedback refers to. That is, they argued that this approach to providing feedback may prevent learners from making practical connections between form and meaning.

RQ3: Types of CF teachers provide for learner errors

Teachers in the study consistently provided a relatively high level of corrective feedback (CF) to learners, although the frequency of corrections varied from person to person. Rephrasing was the most commonly used type of CF, and accounted for more than half of all corrections, followed by explicit corrections. While rephrasing was the most common CF strategy, teachers often combined it with other feedback types.
The frequency of other CF types was as follows: metalinguistic cues, exploration, repetition, and request for clarification, in decreasing order. Repetition was the predominant type of feedback in all classes, while prompts were rarely used.

In terms of error types, phonological errors were most frequently treated with CF, accounting for about 52% of all CF occurrences. Grammatical errors and lexical errors each accounted for 24% of CF cases, while multiple errors were rarely corrected. This suggests that teachers prioritize accuracy in learners' phonology, but are relatively tolerant of inaccuracies in non-target grammar and vocabulary.

Teachers employed a variety of CF strategies to deal with learners' errors, although the frequency of these strategies varied. Rephrasing and explicit correction were frequently used for grammatical errors, while a small number of prompts mainly targeted phonological and lexical errors. Different teachers selected different types of CF. For instance, one teacher relied exclusively on repetition and explicit correction for all types of errors, while another teacher used almost all types of feedback. It is noteworthy that the third teacher never used explicit correction.

RQ4: Alignment between teachers' attitudes and practice

Regarding the answer to the fourth research question, the comparison between the interview data and the observational data showed that the teachers' expressed beliefs about the

frequency of CF provision predicted their practices quite well. The two teachers who believed that they should provide CF frequently did so in their practices, while the teacher who did not wish to do so consistently avoided CF in her practice. Teachers' beliefs were also consistent with their practices for the least utilized type of feedback. Meta-linguistic cues and requests for clarification, which all teachers considered to be the least valuable forms of feedback, were rarely used in practice. There was also agreement regarding the emphasis on teacher-directed CF, with the exception of one teacher, who made all corrections herself, rather than allowing learner self-correction, which she thought was best, resulting in a discrepancy.

Other discrepancies were also noted. From the interview data, most teachers considered elicitation and repetition to be the learners' preferred CF types; however, in practice, these two types were rarely used. Another discrepancy was evident: the perceived frequency of CF and the actual frequency. In general, the proportion of the former was much higher than the latter. There also needed to be more consistency between the participating teachers in the most commonly used CF strategies. This was particularly the case for one teacher who used explicit correction most frequently while eliciting, which she thought she used most commonly, was very rare.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that the majority of EFL students desired constant correction. This was in line with the findings of Jean and Simard's (2011) research and those of Muyashoha (2019). They also touched on the form and length of feedback, as highlighted by Rochma (2023).

Students' and teachers' preferences regarding different types of oral-corrective feedback (CF) were investigated. It was found that students rated explicit corrections and metalinguistic feedback more positively than their teachers.

These findings are consistent with Harmer's (2006) recommendations that teachers should refrain from interrupting students who are working on fluency tasks and instead provide "gentle correction," which usually refers to reframing, the most implicit form of CF.

Nevertheless, research comparing the effectiveness of explicit and implicit CF has often shown more significant effects for more explicit forms (Yilmaz, 2012). It has also been found that recasts, the most implicit form of CF, are not always perceived as corrective by students (Kim & Han, 2007). If explicit forms of CF are more effective, and students prefer them, it is beneficial for teachers to use a broader range of CF types rather than relying solely on recasts.

The range of CF used by teachers in this study ranged from simple rephrasing and prompts to longer sequences with rephrasing, prompts and metalinguistic explanations. Repetition was the most commonly used form of CF, which is consistent with findings from other studies (Lyster et al., 2013) and was often supplemented by appropriate instructional events. Notably, recasts only sometimes lead to evidence of uptake, as noted by Yoshida (2008). However, some studies have shown that recasts can be effective when they build on prior explicit instruction (Saito & Lyster, 2012).

The success of recasts, as with all forms of CF, depends on the learners' ability to recognize and understand the specific problem area (Fraser, 2010). In this study, prompts were also frequently used by teachers, which is consistent with the findings of Gooch et al. (2016). These prompts were sometimes gestures or verbal highlighting of the problematic point, although written forms were not expected. To improve the explicitness of feedback, teachers should use systematic cues that increase learners' chances of noticing and learning from them (Loewen & Philp, 2006). Baker and Burri (2016) found that teachers generally followed such practices with prompts.

It is essential to recognize that CF is complex and dynamic, influenced by individual teachers and contextual factors, and that CF typologies may oversimplify the nuanced methods of CF in practice. Due to time constraints and concerns about holding up the whole class, or increasing learner anxiety, teachers often did not go beyond the use of repetition and listen-and-repeat techniques (Roothooft, 2014). Other studies have raised similar issues (Baker & Burri, 2016; Couper, 2016). The value of learner awareness, as highlighted by Kennedy et al. (2014), has been widely recognized. The decision to correct errors was also influenced by teachers' knowledge, confidence, and beliefs. As Anggunsari and Mahmudah (2023) note in a review study of oral-corrective feedback, it is beneficial for learners to receive such input in education.

Due to the positive attitude of teachers and students expressed in this study, it can be argued that the results contradict Krashen (1982) and Truscott (1999), who advise against correcting spoken errors. These results are in line with Liu and Feng (2023) and Lyster et al. (2013).

In addition, participants expressed different opinions about different learning abilities depending on the length, form, and type of feedback. Rochma, (2023) and Muyashoha (2019) have also alluded to the aspects in these cases. The differences between online and face-to-face feedback were also highlighted in this study, which included more interaction time for corrections and follow-ups. The results of this study provided further insights into online teaching, and are among the few recent studies, such as Alzubi et al. (2022), in online interactions in EFL teaching. Some categories from the typology of corrective feedback in online classes given by ЛЯШЕНКО (2023) were also observed. The importance of learners engaging with corrective feedback was also emphasized in the interviews. This is in line with Liu and Feng (2023).

The divergence between teachers' and students' preferences regarding CF types reflects the fundamental tension in interactionist theory between maintaining communicative flow and ensuring linguistic accuracy. The teachers' emphasis on fluency, while providing CF aligns with the interactionist balance between form and meaning. The results support the interactionist view in that effective corrective feedback requires a more holistic perspective that integrates form and meaning in the pursuit of communicative aims. The results imply that the implementation of correct and feasible CF practices is based on the L2 class discourses of negotiation that can be either input-providing or output-promoting (Abbuhl, 2021), and, as such, they are adaptable to the challenges of different settings such as the online environment and traditional classroom settings. The variations observed in this study between face-to-face and technology-enhanced contexts demonstrate the difficulty in sustaining the patterns of effective interactions in the virtual environments, while performing the interactions and providing the CF.

Conclusion

The main findings of this study on teachers' and students' attitudes toward oral-corrective feedback (CF) can be summarized as follows. In line with previous research, a divergence was found between teachers' and students' beliefs regarding the correction of spoken errors. In addition, discrepancies were found between the two groups regarding the effectiveness of different types of CF and their emotional responses to it. The students were more positive toward explicit forms of CF, such as metalinguistic feedback, than the teachers. In addition, students indicated that they would welcome immediate CF on their oral performance, contradicting teachers' concerns about possible adverse reactions to CF.

However, due to the nature of self-reported beliefs and the possibility of acquiescence bias, where participants echo what they think the researcher wants to hear, caution should be exercised (Wagner, 2010). Furthermore, research has shown that stated beliefs about the oral CF do not

always match actual practice (Basturkmen et al., 2004). Even when teachers express their belief in the efficacy of a particular type of CF, they do not necessarily implement it in their teaching (Roothooft, 2014). The same discrepancy applies to students' reported emotional responses to the oral CF, which may not accurately reflect their actual feelings when corrected. Nonetheless, exploring teachers' and students' perspectives on CF is a first step toward developing a program that takes into account the complexities of dealing with learners' spoken errors and raises teachers' awareness of their students' expectations regarding this facet of language learning. It is hoped that this line of research will lead to emphasizing the importance of formative assessment practices and using corrective feedback as a tool for learning, rather than relying solely on prevailing summative assessment practices in the educational system in Iran, as well as in similar developing countries' educational contexts. In this regard, corrective feedback through the lens of interactionist theory would develop L2 learning.

Acknowledgments

Author Bio

Dr. Narges Sardabi is Assistant Professor of TEFL at Ershad Damavand University in Iran. She has published several academic articles in issues on Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Amir Ghajarieh is Associate Professor of TEFL at Ershad Damavand University (EDU) and a certified English Translator to the IRI Judiciary. He heads EDU's Translation Studies Department and serves as adjunct professor at UCSI University. Ghajarieh served as a Research fellow at the Languages and Linguistics Faculty, University of Malaya in Malaysia. He was selected as the best researcher at EDU in 2022 and 2023. His research interest encompasses language education issues in second and foreign language teaching contexts and translation studies, with particular emphasis on language education methods, teacherpreneur identity, translanguaging, CALL, educational psychology and English for Specific purposes. He has extensively published in Q1 Scopus and ISI-cited journals themed on language teaching and translation studies.

Navid Atar Sharghi holds a PhD in language Sciences and is Assistant Professor at Imam Khomeini International University's Persian Language Teaching Center in Qazvin, Iran. His expertise lies in Persian language instruction to international students, teaching the French language to Iranians. He serves as the director-in-charge of Journal of Teaching Persian to Speakers of Other Languages (JTPSOL) and has worked on comparative linguistics and translated academic and literary works. He can be reached at navid_atar.sharghi@PLC.ikiu.ac.ir.

Leyla Rahmani is affiliated with the TEFL Department in the Social Sciences Faculty at Ershad Damavand University, Iran. Her research interests include English-language teaching and feedback.

References

Abbuhl, R. (2021). Interactionist approach to corrective feedback in second language acquisition.

In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 44–64). Cambridge University Press.

Alzubi, A., A., Nazim, F. M., & Al-Mwzaiji, K. N. A. (2022). Learning through correction: Oral corrective feedback in online EFL interactions. *World Journal of English Language*, 12 (8), 382-389. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n8p382

Anggunsari, P., & Mahmudah, S. (2023). Oral corrective feedback as a formative assessment in teaching speaking skills. *Journal of Research on English and Language Learning,* 4(1), 18-25. https://doi.org/10.33474/j-reall.v4i1.19432

Baker, A., & Burri, M. (2016). Feedback on second language pronunciation: A case study of EAP teachers' beliefs and practices. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(6). Retrieved from http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol41/iss6/1

Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics, 25*(2), 243–272.

Bloom, M (2007). Tension in a non-traditional Spanish classroom. *Language Teaching Research,* 11(1), 85–102. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168806072468

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1983). *Educational research: An introduction*. Longman Inc.

Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(4), 436–458.

Choi, S. Y., & Li, S. (2012). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in a child ESOL classroom. *RELC Journal*, *43*(3), 331–351.

Couper, G. (2016). Teacher cognition of pronunciation teaching amongst English language teachers in Uruguay. *Journal of Second Language Pronunciation, 2*(1), 29–55.

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

Fraser, H. (2010). Cognitive theory as a tool for teaching second language pronunciation. In S. de Knop, F. Boers, & T. de Rycker (Eds.), *Fostering language teaching efficiency through cognitive linguistics* (pp. 357–379). Mouton de Gruyter.

Ghajarieh, A. and Mirkazemi, F.S. (2023). The impact of neoliberal discourse and the socio-economic status of parents on TEFL young learners' achievement: Parental beliefs and behaviors in the spotlight. *Forum for Linguistic Studies* 5(1): 234–249. https://doi.org/10.18063/fls.v5i1.1536

Ghajarieh, A. and Aghabozorgi, A. (2024), "Translanguaging approaches and perceptions of Iranian EGP teachers in bi/multilingual educational spaces: A qualitative inquiry." *Qualitative Research Journal*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-07-2023-0108

Goo, J., & Mackey, A. (2013). The case against the case against recasts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *35*(1), 127–165.

Gooch, R., Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2016). Effects of recasts and prompts on L2 pronunciation development: Teaching English/r/to Korean adult EFL learners. *System, 60*, 117–127.

Harmer, J. (2006). *The practice of English language teaching (3rd ed.).* Longman.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81–112.

Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). Grammar teaching and learning in L2: Necessary but boring?

Foreign Language Annals, 44(3), 467–494.

Johnson, E. S., Crawford, A. R., Moylan, L. A., & Zheng, Y. (2017). *Explicit instruction rubric manual*. Boise State University.

Kennedy, S., Blanchet, J., & Trofimovich, P. (2014). Learner pronunciation, awareness, and instruction in French as a second language. *Foreign Language Annals, 47*(1), 79-96. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12066

Kim, J., & Han, Z. (2007). Recasts in communicative EFL classes: Do teacher intent and learner interpretation overlap? In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 269–297). Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2007). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. In. B. van Patten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 201-224). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Li, S. (2018). Corrective feedback in L2 speech production. In J. Liontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–9). John Wiley & Sons.

Liu, H., & Feng, M. (2023). The role of learner engagement with corrective feedback in EFL/ESL classrooms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1118467. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1118467

Loewen, S., & Philp, U. (2006). Recasts in the adult English L2 classroom: Characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*, 536-556.

Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *Modern Language Journal*, *93*(1), 91-104.

Long, M. H. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Wiley Blackwell.

Lyster, R. (2015). Using form-focused tasks to integrate language across the immersion curriculum. *System, 54*, 4–13.

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

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (2013). Counterpoint piece: The case for variety in corrective feedback research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 35*(1), 167-184.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language teaching, 46*, 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365

Martínez Agudo, J. D. (2013). An investigation into how EFL learners emotionally respond to teachers' oral corrective feedback. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 15*(2), 265-278.

McCargar, D. F. (1993). Teacher and student role expectations: Cross-cultural differences and implications. *The Modern Language Journal*, *77*(2), 192-207.

Muyashoha, A. B. (2019). *The students' perception toward oral corrective feedback in speaking class at the English department of IAIN Palangka Raya* (Unpublished master's thesis). State Islamic Institute of Palangka Raya.

Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2015). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics. (4th Ed)*. Pearson Education

Roothooft, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral-feedback practices and their beliefs. *System, 46*, 65-79.

Rochma, A. F. (2023). Corrective oral-feedback on students' errors in speaking courses. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning,* 4(2), 125-135. https://doi.org/10.18860/jetle.v4i2.20442

Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2012). Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of/r/by Japanese learners of English. *Language Learning, 62*, 595-683.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research, 8,* 263–300.

Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning (Educational Linguistics series)*. Springer.

Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 593-610). Routledge.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*(2), 327–369.

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for ''the case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes'': A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing 8 (2)*, 111–122.

Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*, 147–70.

Vavrus, F. K. (2009). The cultural politics of constructivist pedagogies: Teacher education reform in the United Republic of Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Development, 29* (3), 303–11.

Wagner, E. (2010). Survey research. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti, *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 22–38). Continuum International Publishing Group.

Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*, 179–200.

Yilmaz, Y. (2012). The relative effects of explicit correction and recasts on two target structures via two communication modes. *Language Learning, 62*(4), 1134–1169.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, *17*(1), 78–93. https://doi.org/10.2167/la429.0

Ляшенко. Т.В., (2023). Corrective feedback strategies in an online RFL class. *Russkij âzyk za rubežom*, https://doi.org/10.37632/pi.2023.296.1.009

Appendix 1 Interview Questions

1. How good are your language skills? Do you attend a language school? (Indicate your language level)
2. Is the teacher's feedback to students more effective in face-to-face and online courses than in face-to-face or online courses?
3. In terms of learning success, do you prefer face-to-face or online courses?
4. How was the teacher's feedback in your face-to-face classes? (Consider the four skills: Writing, Reading, Speaking and Listening)

5. How was the teacher's feedback in your online course? (Consider the four skills: writing, reading, speaking and listening)
6. Did the Prospect book "focus on the skill of speaking? Did the teacher focus on speaking in class? Did you have a free discussion session?
7. How did the teacher give you feedback when you discussed a topic in class (during a lecture)? Was it immediate or delayed?
8. What types of feedback did the teacher usually use in face-to-face classes?
9. How was the teacher's feedback in online classes? What types of feedback were given?
10. Which environment (face-to-face or online teaching) caused you more stress?
11. Do you prefer feedback from the teacher or classmates in face-to-face classes? And why?
12. Do you prefer feedback from the teacher or classmates in online classes? And why?
13. Has teacher feedback in face-to-face or online classes ever affected your feelings?
14. Have teachers ever refrained from giving you feedback in face-to-face or online lessons? Under what circumstances?
15. Compare the workload and stress between face-to-face and online classes.
16. In which of the two environments has teacher feedback led to more challenging discussions and higher student motivation?
17. What do you think about face-to-face and online language courses in the age of technology for language learning?
18. In what areas (grammar, vocabulary, fluency and pronunciation) has teacher feedback contributed to your progress in class?
19. Would you like the teacher to give you feedback when you make mistakes?
20. If you were a language teacher in the future, how would you handle student feedback in the language classroom? What strategies would you use to improve students' speaking skills?

Appendix 2: Focus-Group Discussion

1. Have you ever refrained from giving feedback to students in both face-to-face and online environments?
2. What are students' perceptions of oral-corrective feedback (OCF)? How do their views differ from yours?
3. To what extent do your behaviors and beliefs match or differ from classroom practices?
4. What factors contribute to the effectiveness of teacher feedback? (For example, the quality of the teaching materials)
5. Have you ever received feedback from someone? Please tell us your thoughts and feelings about it.
6. Please share your suggestions for improving teacher feedback to enhance learning and progress.
7. To what extent do you think technology affects the learning process?