



The Corrective Feedback in the Students' Speaking Ability: A Comparative Study

Selviana Napitupulu^{1*}, Fenty Debora Napitupulu², Kisno Kisno³

¹Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematang Siantar

²Universitas HKBP Nommensen Medan

³Universitas Murni Teguh

Corresponding Author: Selviana Napitupulu selviana.napitupulu@uhnp.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Corrective Feedback, Speaking Ability

Received : 29, July

Revised : 24, August

Accepted: 26, September

©2024 Napitupulu, Napitupulu, Kisno: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

This study investigated whether extensive and comprehensive oral recasting is more effective than explicit correction. The primary focus was on how feedback affects English language learning. Recasts that are intensive are defined as those that receive feedback on a single topic, whereas extensive feedback is defined as errors on multiple subjects and domains. Four groups of ten students each were formed from forty students from a Senior High School. A general English book called Think 4, a storybook, and an English grammar book called Grammar in Use were the study's instruments. In line with the study's aims, they were given feedback that was either explicit or implicit, thorough or in-depth. In accordance with the study's aims, they were given feedback that was either explicit or implicit, long or brief. The findings showed that there wasn't much of a difference between students who got implicit and explicit feedback. Additionally, it was discovered that every technique had the same effect on students' capacity to communicate.

INTRODUCTION

Numerous researches have looked into the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback (CF) within the last ten years. The collection of theories in this field necessitates a cumulative investigation that looks at the efficacy of oral CF in many research trials and identifies several factors influencing its efficacy (Mao & Lee, 2020). Making a distinction between feedback that is implicit or explicit is a common taxonomy of corrective feedback kinds. The implicitness or explicitness of the feedback is one of the most important variables that influences how effective oral corrective feedback is.

When it comes to implicit feedback, errors made are not readily identifiable, however explicit feedback kinds do have certain overt indicators (Barrot, 2023). Recasts are a common form of implicit feedback (Ha & Murray, 2021; Koltovskaia, 2020), while explicit correction is a form of explicit feedback (Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Lee, 2020). The researchers disagree on some points about the efficacy of explicit or implicit correction. For instance, even though recasts present plausible examples of a second language, the results of descriptive indicate that "recasts do not convey to learners what is unacceptable in the language," particularly when recasts are given in communicative settings (Li, 2021; Shang, 2022). Conversely, research by Kim & Emeliyanova (2021) suggest that more proficient students benefit more from explicit correction. The extensive or intensive kind of corrective feedback is a significant topic in the field of oral feedback efficacy.

A critical viewpoint on the efficacy of corrective feedback has emerged in recent years, centered on the examination of comprehensive and intense feedback. According to some researchers, there are two forms of feedback: extended feedback, which is given to a wide range of errors (Reynolds & Kao, 2021; Sarré et al., 2021), and intensive feedback, which is given to a single subject or area (Yu et al., 2020). For example, Panadero & Lipnevich (2022) suggested that recast works better on a single topic. While some empirical studies have emphasized the efficacy of intense methods, other research has indicated that extensive methods are as successful (Han & Xu, 2021; Wu & Schunn, 2020). In their research, for example, Zhang & Hyland (2022) found that students were able to review and correct the mistakes they were focusing on about 65-70% of the time one day following the interaction, which was deemed an immediate posttest, and 50% of the time two weeks later, which was deemed a delayed posttest (Zhang, 2020).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Corrective Feedback

The term "corrective feedback" covers a wide range of activities in the field of education and training. It typically refers to a student getting official or informal feedback on his work from a peer or tutor (Papi et al., 2020; Ranalli, 2021). Corrective feedback's effectiveness can usually be deduced from its negative evidence. Tian & Zhou (2020) suggested that students encounter two types of input: affirmative and negative examples. Negative evidence, which is determined by providing corrective feedback in response to the student's non-target like L2 output, acquaints students with false information about second or

foreign language structure. Positive evidence, on the other hand, introduces students to what is acceptable in the second language, which includes "the set of well-formed sentences to which learners are exposed."

Information provided to learners concerning the faults in their L2 output has been characterized as negative feedback, which is a synonym for corrective feedback and error correction. Feedback can be offered in response to students' written or spoken work; written feedback is typically provided after the student has completed the work, whereas verbal feedback occurs immediately during an engagement (Chong, 2021). Numerous scholars argued that negative evidence can negatively impact acquisition and that both SLA and FLA are solely dependent on positive evidence (Mahvelati, 2021; Link et al., 2022). The amount of good evidence that L2 teachers help students encounter should be maximized.

Penning de Vries et al. (2020) work further highlighted CF's contribution to the noticing hypothesis. He maintained that the acquisition of a second language is entirely conscious and automatic, in contrast to the acquisition of a first language. Corrective feedback is a crucial tool for improving students' attention to linguistic item form. Furthermore, uptake, which refers to students' responses to receiving CF presentations following an error, may be used to infer the effects of feedback (Ebadijalal & Yousofi, 2023; Yüksel et al., 2021). Feedback can be given to students either verbally or in writing. Written feedback is typically given later, after the student has finished writing the material, but verbal criticism is typically given as soon as possible during a conversation (Kartchava et al., 2020). Negative feedback might hinder the acquisition of a second language, according to some academics, while only positive feedback can help (Cheng & Zhang, 2021; Shadiev & Feng, 2023).

Oral Corrective Feedback

The term "oral corrective feedback" describes the verbal reactions of teachers, students, or listeners to errors made by learners when producing a second language (L2). There are various varieties that can be classified as explicit or implicit. Ha (2022) classified corrective strategies into six categories:

1. A direct and clear revision of errors that was mentioned in an explicit correction.
2. Recast, which is the process of correcting students' errors without impeding dialogue.
3. Requests for clarification indicate that audiences (teachers and students) do not comprehend the students' work and that form or repetition adjustment is required (Wang & Li, 2021). This kind of corrective input is applied when there are issues with comprehension or accuracy. Only when certain movements, such "excuse me?" come after a student mistake is feedback coded as a request for clarification. Requesting that the learner repeat a sentence is another example.
4. Metalinguistic feedback consists of remarks, queries, or information pertaining to the proper form of students'

statements or utterances without specifically mentioning the proper form. Metalinguistic remarks (e.g., "an error occurred here," "can you recognize that?") suggest that there may be a mistake. According to (Sinha & Nassaji, 2022) metalinguistic information "generally provides either some grammatical metalanguage that refers to the nature of the error" (e.g., "It's masculine") or it can manifest as a lexical error about the definition of the word. In addition, metalinguistic inquiries like "Is it a bird?" "point to the nature of the error but attempt to elicit the information from the student." ((Sinha & Nassaji, 2022).

5. Elicitation refers to techniques used by teachers to extract the appropriate form of a sentence or utterance from students' work. In order to carry out elicitation techniques, teachers use a tactic known as pausing and waiting for the students' answer to finish the phrase (e.g., "this is..."). This helps them elicit the next sentences from the students. The elicitation technique may be preceded by some metalinguistic remarks (e.g., no, Mary is not there).
6. Repetition is the term used to describe situations in which professors mimic students' misleading statements in an effort to get their attention by altering their tone. Teachers occasionally alter their tone to highlight mistakes.

Studies on Comparing Explicit vs. Implicit Oral CF

Various research studies have questioned the role that explicit and implicit feedback play in language acquisition (Chien et al., 2020; Patra et al., 2022). Research on recast feedback has generally shown that when implicit input is more explicit, it can be beneficial. Doughty & Varela, 1998, for example. Other research made the case for the importance of explicit feedback. In their study of a group working on two different types of French suffixes (-age and -ment), (Cohen et al., 2021) discovered that the group who received specific corrective feedback fared better than the other group that did not receive any feedback.

In their classrooms, Wei & Cao (2020) asserted that explicit feedback was more effective than implicit input. According to Safdari & Fathi (2020), students at higher competency levels benefit more from explicit feedback than students at lower skill levels. On the other hand, no distinction was found between the two forms of corrective feedback (explicit correction and recast) in a different study on input-processing instruction (Kartal, 2022). Further research is necessary to resolve the conflict over the efficacy of these types of feedback among researchers.

Extensive vs. Intensive CF

A distinction between extensive and intensive feedback has been made by researchers. While intensive feedback is given in response to a specific subject or region of error, extensive feedback is given in response to a separate and larger area of errors (Reynolds & Kao, 2021; Wu & Schunn, 2020; Yu et al., 2020).

Reynolds & Kao (2021), Wu & Schunn, (2020), Yu et al., (2020) looked into how writing correctness was affected by extensive (unfocused) and intensive (focused) forms of corrective feedback. They maintained that feedback given in reaction to a single error is referred to as intensive kind of feedback, whilst feedback given in response to a wide range of errors is referred to as extended type of feedback. For both forms of feedback, the outcomes from an error correction test and a narrative task were identical.

Link et al., (2022), Papi et al., (2020), Ranalli (2021) examined four groups of language learners: a practice group, a control group, a group that received extensive feedback, and a group that received intensive feedback. All the groups showed improvement, but the intensive group performed better and showed more improvement than the others. There is conflicting information regarding the relative benefits of extensive versus intensive feedback. Students are easier to understand the nature of the error and are more eager to participate in a single subject error repair activity. "Intensive CF is better suited to yield positive results if attention and understanding are important for acquisition, as cognitive theories of L2 acquisition have claimed." (Ranalli, 2021).

In a different study, Napitupulu et al., (2019, 2024), Napitupulu & Napitupulu (2019), Napitupulu & Kisno (2021) examined the effects of extensive versus intensive corrective feedback on learning unreal conditioning. The results showed that there were not many differences between the two types of feedback in terms of their effects on sentence structure accuracy, though there was a tendency for intensive feedback to be more effective. However, there is disagreement among researchers regarding the relative merits of extensive versus intensive feedback.

Studies on Effectiveness of Recast vs. Explicit Correction

Explicit feedback is more successful than recast, according to several research (Rassaei, 2020; Zhao & Ellis, 2022). For example, Yilmaz & Granena, (2021), Zhao & Ellis, (2022) examined two forms of explicit correction and implicit correction (i.e., recast) in a pre-test, post-test quasi-experimental experiment. Recast and explicit correction did not vary from one another in several additional investigations (Bryfonski & Ma, 2020; Zarei et al., 2020). Mifka-Profozic (2022), and Rassaei (2024) contended that having no room is the finest sort of cystic fibrosis for deduction. As students can find and identify clear forms of corrective feedback more easily, they are therefore more effective and these traits support the need for clear correction (Mahalingappa et al., 2022; Shahidzade et al., 2022).

Research Gap and Question

All things considered, research contrasting recast and explicit oral corrective feedback has mostly concentrated on the overall efficacy of both recast and explicit oral CF. Nevertheless, there aren't many researches that thoroughly and in-depthly compare the efficacy of explicit correction vs recast correction. The majority of the research to date has concentrated on written CF. Research that more accurately compares comprehensive and severe CF in an oral setting is

desperately needed. Consequently, this led to the investigation of the topic in the current study, and two research questions were put forth:

1. Do recasts and explicit corrections help students become more proficient speakers?
2. Which kind of corrective feedback (extensive or intensive) is more suited for students' speaking abilities?

METHODOLOGY

Participants

This study was conducted in Medan, Indonesia, at a Senior High School. Based on the results of the school placement test, the study participants were split up into four groups of 10 students, each consisting of a mix of male and female students in an intermediate level. Every class was taught by the same teacher. The students ranged in age from 12 to 16 years old.

Instruments

Think 4, a general English book, was employed in this investigation. The teacher used their audios to work from a grammar book and a storybook titled Grammar in Use. Four classrooms with forty students each were created. Each class had ten students in it. Two classes were instructed using the recast method, while two classes were instructed using an explicit corrective method. One group received extensive treatment for each approach, while the other received intense treatment.

Data Collection Procedure

Students began working on three books: Grammar in Use, a storybook, and Think 4, which served as the major general English text. The intensive recast group in the first session, which focused solely on a particular subject or piece of content, only got implicit feedback on oral production problems pertaining to the main book. After the students began reading the book, the instructor urged them to have a discussion about it. If the instructor noticed any issues, he would verbally provide the students with implicit comments. In the second lesson, the instructor gave the students detailed, implicit feedback on a variety of subjects and resources. At home, students listened to the audio files and read the accompanying materials.

The teacher asked them to have an oral discussion of the subjects when they arrived at class. After that, this group was given implicit spoken feedback on all of the language items (Think 4, storybook, and Grammar in Use). Students received detailed, specific comments in the third class. After reading the main book, the teacher assigned pairs of students to have an oral discussion about the subject. During the class discussion, the instructor pointed out the mistakes the students had made and provided clear oral comments. The instructor in this class only provided them with explicit feedback on the main book. The teacher gave the students detailed, direct comments in the fourth class. All of the materials were used by the students, and they received specific instruction. The instructor assessed the students' learning with a speaking exam at the conclusion of the course.

Data Analysis

SPSS 22 was used to analyze our data set in the data analysis stage. The study variables' mean and standard deviation were assessed using the analysis of descriptive statistics. To investigate the effects of extensive/intensive and recast/explicit correction on students' speaking abilities, a two-way ANOVA between the groups was carried out.

RESEARCH RESULT

Under intensive conditions, the recast group's mean and standard deviation were 18.7 and 1.17, respectively. Under demanding settings, the explicit correction group's mean and standard deviation were 12.8 and 1.47, respectively. Under extended settings, the recast group's mean and standard deviation were 15.6 and 1.57, respectively. For explicit correction under extensive conditions, the mean and standard deviation were 1.4.8 and 2.34, respectively. Based on the method used to instruct them, participants were split into four groups (group A: recast extensive, group B: recast intensive, group C: explicit intensive, group D: explicit extensive). The interaction effect between extensive/intensive and recast/explicit correction was statistically significant (the sig. value is 0.02, which is below 0.05). Likewise, there is a significant main effect for recast/explicit (the sig. value is 0.006, which is below 0.05) and extensive/intensive (the sig. value is 0.01, which is below 0.05). It means that methods do not differ in terms of the effect on the language ability of students.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics: Dependent Variable: Scores of Speaking Ability Test

Extensive/Intensive	Recast/Explicit	Mean	SD	N
Intensive	recast	18.7000	1.17722	10
	explicit	12.8000	1.47032	10
	Total	15.7500	1.78415	20
Extensive	recast	17.8000	1.67762	10
	explicit	12.9000	2.44758	10
	Total	15.3500	1.78945	20
Total	recast	18.2500	1.90278	20
	explicit	12.8500	1.97153	20
	Total	15.5500	2.15314	40

Table 2. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Dependent Variable: Scores of Speaking Ability Test

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Extensive/intensive	774.831	15	51.655	2.521	.010
Recast/explicit	236.639	1	236.639	11.547	.006
Extensive/intensive* Recast/explicit	538.193	14	38.442	1.876	.002
Total	1594.554	40	20,493		

DISCUSSION

A comprehensive review of the literature on corrective feedback reveals a spectrum of perspectives among academics concerning the efficacy of various feedback forms on students' speaking abilities. This diversity in viewpoints underscores the complexity and multifaceted nature of feedback in language learning, particularly in enhancing speaking proficiency.

Explicit Correction vs. Recast

A significant portion of the literature has centered on the dichotomy between explicit correction and recast. Explicit correction involves directly pointing out errors and providing the correct form, while recast subtly reformulates the error within the learner's utterance without overtly highlighting the mistake (Zhang & Cheng, 2021; Zou et al., 2023). Proponents of explicit correction argue that it provides clear, unambiguous feedback, which can lead to immediate understanding and correction of errors (Ioannou & Tsagari, 2022; Sarandi, 2020). In contrast, advocates for recast suggest that its less intrusive nature helps maintain the flow of conversation and can be less intimidating for learners, potentially leading to a more conducive learning environment.

Comprehensive vs. Focused Feedback

Beyond the explicit correction versus recast debate, there is a growing interest in the broader implications of comprehensive versus focused feedback. Zhao & Ellis (2022) argued that for adult L2 learners, comprehensive corrective feedback, which addresses a wide range of errors, is essential for improving oral proficiency. This approach ensures that learners are made aware of multiple aspects of their speech that need improvement, promoting a more holistic development of speaking skills (Yin, 2021). However, comprehensive feedback can also be overwhelming, leading to cognitive overload and potentially discouraging learners if they perceive the feedback as excessively critical or beyond their ability to address. In contrast, focused feedback, which targets specific types of errors, may be more manageable for learners and allow for more in-depth understanding and correction of particular issues. However, this approach might neglect other persistent errors, leading to less overall improvement in speaking proficiency (Lee et al., 2021; Scherer et al., 2024). The balance between comprehensiveness and focus in corrective feedback remains a critical consideration for educators.

Impact on Fluency and Proficiency

Research on the impact of corrective feedback on fluency and proficiency provides mixed results. Some studies suggest that comprehensive corrective feedback can significantly enhance overall speaking proficiency by addressing a wide array of errors (Zhao & Ellis, 2022). This broad approach helps learners become more accurate and confident in their speech over time. However, other studies indicate that comprehensive recast, which addresses all errors within the context of conversation, does not significantly impact learners' fluency (Boud & Dawson, 2023; Molloy et al., 2020). This finding suggests that while learners may

become more accurate, their fluency (defined as the ability to speak smoothly and effortlessly) may not improve at the same rate.

This discrepancy highlights the nuanced effects of different feedback types on various aspects of speaking proficiency. Fluency and accuracy, though interrelated, can be influenced differently by the nature of the feedback (Shin, 2024; Wisniewski et al., 2020). For instance, explicit correction might improve accuracy but disrupt the flow of conversation, thereby affecting fluency (Carless & Winstone, 2023; Zare et al., 2022). Conversely, recast might preserve fluency but result in less noticeable improvements in accuracy due to its subtle nature.

Practical Implications for Language Teaching

The findings from the literature have important practical implications for language teaching. Educators must consider the goals of their feedback (whether to improve accuracy, fluency, or both) and select feedback methods accordingly. A balanced approach that combines elements of both explicit correction and recast might be most effective, providing clear guidance on errors while maintaining a supportive and engaging learning environment (Ha, 2023; Ha et al., 2021; Ha & Nguyen, 2021). Moreover, the choice between comprehensive and focused feedback should be informed by the learners' proficiency levels and individual needs (Reynolds & Teng, 2022). Beginners might benefit more from focused feedback that addresses fundamental errors, while more advanced learners might require comprehensive feedback to fine-tune their speaking skills.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The current study looked at how students' speaking proficiency was affected by extensive/intensive and explicit/implicit approaches. The study's conclusions indicate that students' speaking abilities can benefit from both explicit correction and recasting. The interaction effect was statistically significant in determining which kind of corrective feedback (extensive or intensive) was better suited for students' speaking abilities. It was discovered that all approaches (recast/explicit correction, intensive/extensive) affect students' speaking abilities nearly equally, and the results of earlier studies have been replicated.

Despite providing answers to some issues, this study has several drawbacks. The school in Medan City provided a sample of participants first. Participants' proficiency was lower than that of university students. The results should not be applied to university students in general. Different proficiency levels could be the subject of future research. Secondly, the participants were adolescents, ranging in age from 12 to 16 years. The individuals may have been less skilled and had less prior knowledge than older students. Adult proficiency levels could be the subject of future research. Finally, as two forms of corrective input, recast and explicit correction were examined in the current study. It is important to research additional forms of corrective feedback for speaking proficiency.

REFERENCES

- Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using automated written corrective feedback in the writing classrooms: effects on L2 writing accuracy. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 36(4), 584–607. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1936071>
- Boud, D., & Dawson, P. (2023). What feedback literate teachers do: an empirically-derived competency framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48(2), 158–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1910928>
- Bryfonski, L., & Ma, X. (2020). Effects of Implicit Versus Explicit Corrective Feedback on Mandarin Tone Acquisition In a Scmc Learning Environment. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 42(1), 61–88. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263119000317>
- Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2023). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(1), 150–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372>
- Cheng, X., & Zhang, L. J. (2021). Teacher Written Feedback on English as a Foreign Language Learners' Writing: Examining Native and Nonnative English-Speaking Teachers' Practices in Feedback Provision. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.629921>
- Chien, S.-Y., Hwang, G.-J., & Jong, M. S.-Y. (2020). Effects of peer assessment within the context of spherical video-based virtual reality on EFL students' English-Speaking performance and learning perceptions. *Computers & Education*, 146, 103751. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103751>
- Chong, S. W. (2021). Reconsidering student feedback literacy from an ecological perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(1), 92–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1730765>
- Cohen, C., Bauer, E., & Minniear, J. (2021). Exploring how language exposure shapes oral narrative skills in French-English emergent bilingual first graders. *Linguistics and Education*, 63, 100905. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2021.100905>
- Ebadijalal, M., & Yousofi, N. (2023). The impact of mobile-assisted peer feedback on EFL learners' speaking performance and anxiety: does language make a difference? *The Language Learning Journal*, 51(1), 112–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2021.1957990>
- Hamed Mahvelati, E. (2021). Learners' perceptions and performance under peer versus teacher corrective feedback conditions. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 70, 100995. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.100995>
- Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2021). Student feedback literacy and engagement with feedback: a case study of Chinese undergraduate students. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 26(2), 181–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1648410>
- Ha, X. Van. (2022). Effects of a professional development program on teachers' oral corrective feedback practices. *System*, 110, 102917. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102917>

- Ha, X. Van. (2023). High school EFL teachers' oral corrective feedback beliefs and practices, and the effects of lesson focus. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 61(4), 1799–1826.
- Ioannou, S., & Tsagari, D. (2022). Effects of Recasts, Metalinguistic Feedback, and Students' Proficiency on the Acquisition of Greek Perfective Past Tense. *Languages*, 7(1), 40. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7010040>
- Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(4), 519–539. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469>
- Kartal, G. (2022). Evaluating a mobile instant messaging tool for efficient large-class speaking instruction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2074463>
- Kartchava, E., Gatbonton, E., Ammar, A., & Trofimovich, P. (2020). Oral corrective feedback: Pre-service English as a second language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(2), 220–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818787546>
- Kim, Y., & Emel'yanova, L. (2021). The effects of written corrective feedback on the accuracy of L2 writing: Comparing collaborative and individual revision behavior. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(2), 234–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819831406>
- Koltovskaia, S. (2020). Student engagement with automated written corrective feedback (AWCF) provided by Grammarly: A multiple case study. *Assessing Writing*, 44, 100450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100450>
- Lee, I. (2020). Utility of focused/comprehensive written corrective feedback research for authentic L2 writing classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 49, 100734. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100734>
- Lee, I., Luo, N., & Mak, P. (2021). Teachers' attempts at focused written corrective feedback in situ. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 54, 100809. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100809>
- Link, S., Mehrzad, M., & Rahimi, M. (2022). Impact of automated writing evaluation on teacher feedback, student revision, and writing improvement. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(4), 605–634. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1743323>
- Li, S. (2021). *Oral Corrective Feedback* (pp. 353–357). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79143-8_63
- Molloy, E., Boud, D., & Henderson, M. (2020). Developing a learning-centred framework for feedback literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(4), 527–540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1667955>
- Panadero, E., & Lipnevich, A. A. (2022). A review of feedback models and typologies: Towards an integrative model of feedback elements. *Educational Research Review*, 35, 100416. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100416>

- Papi, M., Bondarenko, A. V., Wawire, B., Jiang, C., & Zhou, S. (2020). Feedback-seeking behavior in second language writing: motivational mechanisms. *Reading and Writing, 33*(2), 485–505. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-019-09971-6>
- Patra, I., Alazemi, A., Al-Jamal, D., & Gheisari, A. (2022). The effectiveness of teachers' written and verbal corrective feedback (CF) during formative assessment (FA) on male language learners' academic anxiety (AA), academic performance (AP), and attitude toward learning (ATL). *Language Testing in Asia, 12*(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00169-2>
- Penning de Vries, B. W., Cucchiarini, C., Strik, H., & van Hout, R. (2020). Spoken grammar practice in CALL: The effect of corrective feedback and education level in adult L2 learning. *Language Teaching Research, 24*(5), 714–735. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818819027>
- Ranalli, J. (2021). L2 student engagement with automated feedback on writing: Potential for learning and issues of trust. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 52*, 100816. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100816>
- Rassaei, E. (2020). The separate and combined effects of recasts and textual enhancement as two focus on form techniques on L2 development. *System, 89*, 102193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102193>
- Rassaei, E. (2024). The effects of recasts on L2 grammar: a meta-analysis. *The Language Learning Journal, 52*(1), 16–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2022.2097298>
- Reynolds, B. L., & Kao, C.-W. (2021). The effects of digital game-based instruction, teacher instruction, and direct focused written corrective feedback on the grammatical accuracy of English articles. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 34*(4), 462–482. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1617747>
- Reynolds, B. L., & Teng, M. F. (2022). Involving native speakers in oral corrective focused grammar feedback while conversing: an activity theory perspective. *The Language Learning Journal, 50*(5), 569–585. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2020.1845225>
- Safdari, M., & Fathi, J. (2020). Investigating the role of dynamic assessment on speaking accuracy and fluency of pre-intermediate EFL learners. *Cogent Education, 7*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1818924>
- Sarandi, H. (2020). Mixed corrective feedback and the acquisition of third person '-s.' *The Language Learning Journal, 48*(4), 402–413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2017.1400579>
- Sarré, C., Grosbois, M., & Brudermann, C. (2021). Fostering accuracy in L2 writing: impact of different types of corrective feedback in an experimental blended learning EFL course. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 34*(5–6), 707–729. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1635164>
- Scherer, S., Graham, S., & Busse, V. (2024). How effective is feedback for L1, L2, and FL learners' writing? A meta-analysis. *Learning and Instruction, 93*, 101961. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101961>

- Selviana Napitupulu, & F.D. Napitupulu. (2019). *Research Methodology In Linguistics And Education*. Deepublish.
- Selviana Napitupulu, Fenty Debora Napitupulu, & Kisno Kisno. (2019). *Professional Development For Teachers Of English (Prodevet) In 4.0 Era*. Deepublish.
https://play.google.com/store/books/details/Selviana_Napitupulu_Professional_Development_For_T?id=qrC-DwAAQBAJ
- Selviana Napitupulu, & Kisno Kisno. (2021). *LITERACYCLOUD: ALTERNATIF MEDIA PEMBELAJARAN MENUJU ERA 5.0*. 1-13.
- Selviana Napitupulu, Kisno Kisno, & Fenty Debora Napitupulu. (2024). The ESP Scenario in EFL Economics Courses. *International Journal of Educational Research Excellence (IJERE)*, 3(1), 30-34.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.55299/ijere.v3i1.728>
- Shadiev, R., & Feng, Y. (2023). Using automated corrective feedback tools in language learning: a review study. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2153145>
- Shahidzade, F., Razmi, M. H., & Tilwani, S. A. (2022). A Critical Appraisal of the Correspondence between Students' Attitudes towards the Use of Corrective Feedback Strategies and How They Are Implemented by Teachers in EFL Classroom Interactions. *Education Research International*, 2022, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/2003247>
- Shang, H.-F. (2022). Exploring online peer feedback and automated corrective feedback on EFL writing performance. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 30(1), 4-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1629601>
- Shin, H. W. (2024). Comparative analysis of written corrective feedback strategies: a linear growth modeling approach. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 62(2), 599-621. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2021-0174>
- Sinha, T. S., & Nassaji, H. (2022). ESL learners' perception and its relationship with the efficacy of written corrective feedback. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 41-56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12378>
- Tian, L., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Learner engagement with automated feedback, peer feedback and teacher feedback in an online EFL writing context. *System*, 91, 102247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102247>
- Wang, W., & Li, S. (2021). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in American ESL and Chinese EFL classrooms: A comparative study. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 34(1), 35-50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1767124>
- Wei, W., & Cao, Y. (Katherine). (2020). Written Corrective Feedback Strategies Employed by University English Lecturers: A Teacher Cognition Perspective. *SAGE Open*, 10(3), 215824402093488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020934886>
- Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The Power of Feedback Revisited: A Meta-Analysis of Educational Feedback Research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087>

- Wu, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2020). From feedback to revisions: Effects of feedback features and perceptions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 60*, 101826. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101826>
- Yilmaz, Y., & Granena, G. (2021). Implicitness and Explicitness in Cognitive Abilities and Corrective Feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 43*(3), 523–550. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263120000601>
- Yin, X. (2021). How Effective are Recasts in Providing Corrective Feedback? - An Analysis of Recent Perspectives. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 10*(1), 33. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v10n.1p.33>
- Yüksel, D., Soruç, A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in university EFL classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 31*(3), 362–382. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12336>
- Yu, S., Jiang, L., & Zhou, N. (2020). Investigating what feedback practices contribute to students' writing motivation and engagement in Chinese EFL context: A large scale study. *Assessing Writing, 44*, 100451. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100451>
- Zarei, M., Ahour, T., & Seifoori, Z. (2020). Impacts of implicit, explicit, and emergent feedback strategies on EFL learners' motivation, attitude and perception. *Cogent Education, 7*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1727130>
- Zare, M., Shooshtari, Z. G., & Jalilifar, A. (2022). The interplay of oral corrective feedback and L2 willingness to communicate across proficiency levels. *Language Teaching Research, 26*(6), 1158–1178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820928967>
- Zhang, L. J., & Cheng, X. (2021). Examining the effects of comprehensive written corrective feedback on L2 EAP students' linguistic performance: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 54*, 101043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101043>
- Zhang, Z. (Victor). (2020). Engaging with automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback on L2 writing: Student perceptions and revisions. *Assessing Writing, 43*, 100439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2019.100439>
- Zhang, Z. (Victor), & Hyland, K. (2022). Fostering student engagement with feedback: An integrated approach. *Assessing Writing, 51*, 100586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100586>
- Zhao, Y., & Ellis, R. (2022). The relative effects of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on the acquisition of 3rd person -s by Chinese university students: A classroom-based study. *Language Teaching Research, 26*(3), 361–381. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820903343>