

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF POSITIVE FEEDBACK IN TEACHING SPEAKING SKILL

Muh. Arief Muhsin

Department of English, Muhammadiyah University of Makassar
Jl. Sultan Alauddin No. 259 Makassar, Sulawesi Selatan 90221
arief.m@unismuh.ac.id

Received: 27th February 2016/ **Revised:** 1st April 2016/ **Accepted:** 14th April 2016

How to Cite: Muhsin, M. A. (2016). The Effectiveness of Positive Feedback in Teaching Speaking Skill. *Lingua Cultura*, 10(1), 25-30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21512/lc.v10i1.873>

ABSTRACT

The research was aimed at finding out the students' responses and perceptions toward the corrective feedback given in teaching speaking activity. The research applied quantitative methods by sending questionnaires to 70 students. The students' responses and perceptions for teacher's corrective feedback indicated that students think their spoken error should be corrected. In addition, the students want their teacher focus more on. They also agree if their friends should correct their error. The most popular corrective feedbacks in teaching speaking are the explicit correction, elicitation, and repetition. They have an effective function in detecting the students' mispronunciation and low accuracy and fluency. The other corrective feedback like implicit correction, recast, clarification request, and metalinguistic feedback are not favored because the percentage is lower than other corrective feedback. It indicates that not all of corrective feedback is effectively used in speaking.

Keywords: effectiveness, positive feedback, teaching, speaking skill

INTRODUCTION

Although a great deal of EFL learning takes place through exposure to comprehensible input, students may need feedback on errors when they are not able to discover the differences between their interlanguage and the target language. In other words, form-focused instruction induces students to pay conscious attention to form the input and aid interlanguage development.

Many studies have investigated teacher's preference for and the effectiveness feedback in EFL. Pan (2015) has concentrated in investigating the effect of teacher's corrective feedback on the accuracy of EFL student writing. Moreover, Kazem (2005) has been interested in studying the effect of teachers' feedback on the students' ability to self-edit in L2 writing classes. Meanwhile, Abedi, Latifi, and Moinzadeh (2010) have chosen to research the effect of error correction versus error direction on Iranian pre-Intermediate EFL students writing achievement. Then, Saeed (2010) has studied the effect of error correction types on grammatical accuracy in student essay revision. All researchers investigate in giving corrective feedback to the students in writing class

Although many studies have investigated teachers' preferences and the effectiveness of corrective feedback in EFL, relatively few studies have ever investigated the difference among teachers' and students' preferences for error correction. Also, to the researcher's knowledge, there

are no studies that have been explored regarding whether students' individual characteristics, especially anxiety, influence their preferences for corrective feedback or not. Besides that, when the researcher read the positive feedback in articles, none of them took speaking skill as the subject of the research. Because of that true reason, the researcher does the investigation on the corrective feedback of EFL speaking skill.

Although the students' errors are natural phenomena in the language classroom, it is quite difficult to figure out if the teachers should ignore or treat them. If the teachers decided to correct the errors, there should be at least two questions to answer: which errors should be corrected? And how can teachers help the students to make the errors work for them? The answers to these questions are as complex as learning the language itself. It is even generally accepted that for the last two decades, the language practitioners have had different opinions on how to deal with the students' errors.

This assumption leads some people (such as Krashen and Truscott) to believe that the negative feedback is unnecessary in language classrooms. Moreover, Dekeyser in Alghazo, Abdelrahman, and Qbeitah (2009) has stated that error treatment does not improve the students' oral proficiency. The opposing view, on the other hand, believes that error correction is essential in language classroom because some studies have shown that if the is given in the right way, it can improve the students' language skills.

By providing the correction to the students, the students can learn which language item they need to work on and which feature they have made progress.

Knowing the function of feedback, the researcher is interested in investigating the effectiveness of feedback in teaching and learning process. In the investigation, the researcher does an observation to find out the student's responses and perceptions toward the corrective feedback given in teaching speaking activity.

Many researchers have investigated about the feedback in teaching. They did the research about the soft skills in English like writing, reading, listening and oral. Pan (2015) has studied the teacher feedback on the accuracy of EFL student writing. He draws the conclusion in his research if teacher feedback has advanced the students in better linguistic knowledge and it will improve the accuracy of students in writing with a higher degree after receiving teacher's corrective feedback. On the other hand, according to him, teacher's corrective feedback is facilitated or harmful the students' ability to write accurately.

The next researcher who does research about teachers' feedback is Keizer et.al (2007). He has drawn a conclusion regarding the effect of different types of feedback on second language writing over the course of a year but has found no significant difference on student's essays concerning linguistic accuracy. He also notes that to be effective, systematic training in writing must require systematic correction of individual scripts. He also indicates that the correction of student compositions is often ineffective in reducing errors because teachers correct mistakes inconsistently. Ayedh and Khaled (2011) have given a recommendation to the researchers so they can investigate the questions posed in this study with larger samples and different methodology in the future. Further research is also recommended by considering the limitations of the study to investigate factors that are most likely to be associated with teachers' use of feedback in ESL writing classes. These factors may have significance in the context of second or foreign language teaching.

According to Abdul Razak, Saeed, and Ahmad (2013) who have investigated the effect of error correction on grammatical accuracy in student essay revision, teacher feedback will always be a major topic for both teachers and students. Therefore, researchers still need to investigate different feedback strategies to help students and teachers. The present study is a short termed and experimental study that has limitations, but it highlights the possibility that some feedback strategies work better than others. However, it suggests that more research still needs to be done.

In the other research, Chu (2011) has stated that corrective feedback has a positive effect on improving oral English accuracy. Compared with the score of experimental classes and control class in post –test, the score of the experimental class is obviously higher than that control class. Besides that, he has stated that corrective feedback has a better effect on English accuracy. Corrective feedback does make a great effect on oral accuracy, but the effectiveness for a different student level is different. For the low and medium group of students, the effectiveness is better because there is enough space for them to improve. For the high group of students, their oral accuracy is better, so what they need to do is improving their oral fluency and complexity.

A various operationalized definitions of corrective feedback have been used by the Researchers. Kazem (2005) has defined the term feedback correction as the replacement

of error or mistake by what is correct. The correction is given when the speaker explains the action and listener gives a reaction. Moreover, Butler (2007) has defined correction as an action of the teacher who apparently transforms, disapprovingly refers to or demands improvement of the student's correlation, which is the most common conception employed by researchers.

Lightbown (2000) has defined corrective feedback as an indication for the students that their use of the target language is incorrect in using it. Corrective feedback includes both explicit and implicit feedback. Teachers can provide corrective feedback without interrupting the flow of conversation (implicit feedback) or overtly with an emphasis on the ill-formed utterance (explicit feedback).

Long (1996) has stated about negative and positive feedback: negative points of feedback are related to the students that their utterances are faulty in some way, and all feedbacks that are not negative are positive. He also defines negative feedback as giving a correction by following an ungrammatical learner system. Long (1996) has claimed that negative feedback is facilitative of L2 Acquisition and Foreign Language Acquisition because negative feedback, such as recast, contains positive evidence providing the correct form.

Lyster & Ranta (2013) has developed six types of feedback used by teachers to respond the students' errors. There are: (1) Explicit correction refers to the explicit provision of the correct form. As the teacher provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the student has said is incorrect (e.g., "Oh, you mean", "You should say"); (2) Recasts involve the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error; (3) Clarification requests are when students either that their utterance has not been understood by the teacher or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way, so a repetition or a reformulation is required. A clarification request includes phrases such as "Pardon me?"; (4) Metalinguistic feedback contains a comment, information, or question-related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form (e.g., "Can you find your error?"); (5) Elicitation refers to a technique that teachers use to elicit the correct form from the student directly. Teachers elicit completion of their utterance by strategically pausing to allow students to "fill in the blank."; (6) Repetition refers to the teacher's repetition, in isolation, of the student's erroneous utterance. In most cases, teachers adjust their intonation to highlight the error.

Having known some cases of feedback according to the researcher, models of Lyster and Ranta (2013) are used by the teacher to give feedback for the students. This model is used in this research. The researcher is concentrated in teaching process to find the students' responses and perceptions in corrective feedback given in teaching speaking activity.

The study gives a positive contribution to education specifically in the process of setting and shaping students speaking ability and identifying the student's perception toward the corrective feedback technique. This will show how the students can produce commentary feedbacks into their future revision in speaking. However knowing the perspective can influence the teaching process to make optimal outcome.

METHODS

The research uses quantitative approach. The objects

of the research are the students at of English Department of Muhammadiyah University Makassar in academic 2012/2013. There are two classes used in this research. Those are Class of 2F and 2A. Each class consists of 35 students. The researcher chooses both of them because they have similarity in term of the students' performance after the researcher has done observation. Thus, the researcher has taken two of them as the sample of the research.

To get accurate information about the students' response when applying feedback, the researcher will give questionnaires, which is one of the effective instruments. According to Gamlem & Smith (2013), if the research project is going to use questionnaire, then it is essential to put time and effort into getting the format right. According to Arikunto (2012), the first step is to determine precisely what information the researcher needs to know while thinking carefully about the hypothesis. Although it can be important to include relevant background questions, the researchers need to make sure that the questions reflect the aims of the project and the researchers do not collect unnecessary data in attempting to answer their questions as stated by Creswell (2009). The references seem not to contribute anything to explain the questionnaire.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In getting the students' illustration on the necessity of feedback, the researcher gives some questionnaires. The questionnaires are made to know the students' response to the teachers' feedback. It is made by using Likert scale. There are 22 questions including all the activities which are shown when the teacher is teaching in the classroom. The questionnaires are classified into some criteria like the frequency of feedback, the timing for treating students' error, the rate of each feedback in which the researcher should address the students' error.

There are 33 students given the questionnaire to know their response. The students' responses are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 shows the response of the students in regarding the essential of positive correction in teaching English. There are 11 or 33.33% students who respond "strongly agree" regarding the essential of corrective feedback, 21 or 63.63% students "agree", and only 1 or 3.03% students "disagree". It means the students agree that they want their error to be corrected, and get feedback from the teacher.

Table 2 shows the result of the students' response to corrective feedback frequency. There are 10 students or 30.30% choosing "always" feedback frequency from their teacher. 19 students (57.57%) answer "usually" about getting feedback and 2 students or 6.06% choose "sometime." Only 2 students (6.06%) say "occasionally." No students choose "never."

Table 3 illustrates the result of the timing of the correction from the teacher. The students agree to get corrective feedback as soon as an error is made. There are 6 (18.18%) students who strongly agree, 10 (30.30%) students who are neutral, and there are many students who disagree or strongly disagree to get feedback as soon as an error is made. If the researcher compares between the timings (as soon as and after finish speaking) after finish speaking has a higher percentage than as soon as. It can see on the table that there are 30 students or 90.90% state "strongly agree", no one chooses "neutral", and only 3 students or 0.90% disagree. For the fifth question after the activities, there are 16 (48.48%) students stating "strongly agree", 8 (24.24%) students are neutral, and 9 (27.27%) students strongly disagree. On the other hand, there are 7 (21.21%) students stating "strongly agree" to get feedback at the end of the class, 11 (33.33%) students choose "neutral", and 15 (45.45%) students strongly disagree to get feedback at the end of the class.

Table 1 Students' Response to The-Teacher's Corrective Feedback

Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
11	33.33%	21	63.63%	0	0%	1	3.03%	0	0%

Table 2 The Students' Response to Corrective Feedback Frequency

Always		Usually		sometimes		Occasionall		Never	
10	30.30%	19	57.57%	2	6.06%	2	6.06%	0	0%

Table 3 The Result of the Timing Spoken Error to Be Treated In Giving Feedback

The timing for treatment	Strongly agree/ Agree		Neutral		Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	
As soon as error are made	6	18,18	10	30,30	17	51,51
After finish speaking	30	90,90	0	0,00	3	0,90
After activities	16	48,48	8	24,24	9	27,27
The end of the class	7	21,21	11	33,33	15	45,45

Table 4 presents students' response on the type of error needed to be corrected in teaching English that in the students group with the highest anxiety, there are 23 (69.69%) students who want the serious error to be corrected and 4 (12.12%) students want a serious error. Then, 5 (15.15%) students want to be occasionally corrected, and only 1 (3.03%) student wants to be always had a correction from the teacher. However, 3 (9.09%) students do not want to be never corrected. They have chosen serious error, less serious, and frequent to be the highest points. In the less serious, 23 (69.60%) students want to be usually corrected, and 3 (0.90%) want to be sometimes corrected. Then 6 (18.18%) students choose to be occasionally treated, and only 1 (3.03%) student wants to be always treated. Also, no one wants to be never corrected. Moreover In the frequent group also describes the similar thing. 1 (3.03%) student chooses to be always corrected, and 3 (3.03%) students want to be usually corrected. 22 (66.66%) students want to be sometimes addressed. Next, 7 (21.21%) students want to be occasionally corrected, and only 1 (3.03%) student who chooses to be never corrected.

Table 5 shows the rate of feedback from the teacher in speaking that almost all of kinds of feedback are given similar responses. In the implicit correction, the students' response are 11 (33.33%) students choosing it as very effective, 14 (42.42%) are neutral, and only 8 (24.24%) choose it as very ineffective. The most popular type of feedback is the explicit correction in which 30 (90.90%) students choose it as very effective feedback. Only 3 (9.09%) are neutral, and no one answers very ineffective. On the other hand, regarding recasts, 18 (54.54%) students respond to it as very effective, 10 (30.30%) students choose neutral, and 5 (15.15%) students think of it as very ineffective. In classification requests, there are 18 (54.54%) students answering very effective. 6 (18.18%) students are neutral, and 9 (27.27%) students say it is very ineffective. For metalinguistic feedback, there are 16 (48.48%) students agreeing it as very effective, 8 (24.24%) students are neutral, and 9 (27.27%) students answer "very ineffective". Furthermore, Elicitation gets a higher response than explicit correction that 21 (63.63%) students answer "very effective", 12 (36.35%) students choose "neutral", and no one chooses "very ineffective". The next item is about no corrective feedback. Only 6 (18.18%) students think it as very effective. 10 (30.30%) students choose "neutral", and 17 (51.51%) students answer "very ineffective" if there is no corrective feedback. The last item is repetition. There are various answers that 20 (60.60%) students choose repetition as very effective, 6 (18.18%) students are neutral, and 7 (21.21%) students answer "very ineffective". After the researcher rates the kinds of feedback, it can be concluded that in general all of the feedback is needed depending on the skill the teacher teaches.

Table 6 shows the students' response regarding who should correct their errors in speaking English. 17 students (51.51%) strongly agree that their classmates should be the ones who correct the error. 13 (39.39%) students choose neutral, and there are 3 (9.09%) students who strongly disagree if their classmates correct their errors. In the other section, 21 (63.63%) students strongly agree if their teacher addresses their error. However, 5 (15.15%) students choose to be neutral, and only 7 (21.21%) students strongly disagree about this. Besides that, students also give a response to their friends who would treat their error. In this case, 20 (60.60%) students strongly agree other students gave them correction, 10 (30.30%) students choose "neutral", and only

3 (9.09%) students answer "strongly disagree".

The first item is about the essential of teacher's positive feedback which includes two questions. The first question is about the students' response to the essential of teacher's corrective feedback. Students as the respondents answer "agree" in general. 33 students or 96.96% agree if teacher's corrective feedback is very essential and only 1 student or 3.03% disagrees. This result indicates that students think their spoken error should be corrected when learning English as the foreign language. It is supported by Ayedh & Khaled (2011), that the students want their spoken errors to be addressed more than the teacher has thought.

The next question is about the frequency of teacher's corrective feedback. 10 or 30.30% students always want to have a correction from the teacher, 19 students or 57.57% answers "usually frequency" is okay, and 2 or 6.06% choose "sometime" as the frequency to be corrected. Only 2 or 6.06% students choose to have an occasionally correction. However, none of the students thinks that their errors should never be corrected by the teacher. The result of the research indicates that students want the teacher to correct their errors more frequently.

The second item is the essential of positive feedback which consists of four choices. It is suggested that interrupting the students' speaking to correct their error is not a good option for the teacher (Chu, 2011). It is because the teacher is more focused on accuracy in their teaching, but sometimes the teacher regards fluency and comprehensibility as well as accuracy as one of the critical factors for students to develop their speaking skills. The students believe that correcting errors after completing the communicative activities can enhance both accuracy and fluency since this allows the students to engage in communication without interruption caused by corrective feedback.

The third item is the students' response to the types of error which need to be corrected. This consists of five choices. It is not realistic to expect that teachers provide their students with corrective feedback on individual errors in the classroom because it can influence their confidence (Chu, 2011). These findings show that teacher focuses more on serious and frequent errors made by their students rather than infrequent and less serious errors in speaking class. By focusing on serious and frequent spoken errors, teachers can help students in enhancing the students' accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility.

The fourth item is the rate of each feedback. There are eight kinds of feedback presented in teaching the students. They are the implicit correction, explicit correction, recast, classification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, no corrective feedback and repetition. The students are asked to rate the feedback with five points scale: very effective, effective, neutral, ineffective, and very ineffective. Explicit correction refers to the explicit provision of the correct form as the teacher provides the correct form. He or she clearly indicates that what the student has said is incorrect, and teacher can make a correction (Lyser & Ranta, 2013). It is the most popular type of corrective feedback used in speaking. The students highly value explicit feedback over implicit feedback since direct feedback that points out the error can increase the chance of modifying and accelerating their learning.

In addition, the students also favor elicitation that can help students produce the target language. It is a surprising result since many previous studies have shown that recasts are the most frequently used type of corrective feedback by teachers in the second language classroom. However, they

are not the most effective method to correct students' errors due to ambiguity and implicitness (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006), (Lyster & Ranta, 2013), (Yoshida, 2008).

The result of classification request indicates a discrepancy between teachers' beliefs and their actual practices. Besides that, the teacher does not use the type of feedback they consider as the most effective in teaching. Considering the fact based on the students' responses, the teacher may not be aware of their actual practices. These responses are based on their ideal types of corrective feedback. In this research, students in both the high and low anxiety groups regard recasts as the effective type of corrective feedback (Pan, 2015).

Metalinguistic feedback is not the popular type of feedback. This result suggests that the students think grammatical explanations do not help them to modify their original utterances, or produce target-like forms. They still feel that another type of teacher feedback is more effective than others in improving their speaking skill.

Elicitation is the second most favored type of corrective feedback which is chosen by the students. The seventh is no corrective feedback. It is ineffective that this feedback type is the least popular among the students

regardless of their anxiety levels. The researcher concludes that the students may value the time when they can practice their speaking in class without correction. Given the fact that some students can notice their spoken errors right after they make mistakes, no corrective feedback is useful as used by teacher.

Repetition is one of the most favored types of corrective feedback. Pan (2015) also suggests that repetition has given a different result to the students' accuracy and fluency in speaking. Repetition shows that an error has been made and thus can lead the students to produce the target language by modifying the formed utterance or pronunciation.

The fifth item is related to the person who should correct the students' error. There are three types of delivering agent the error correction; a classmate, teacher, and student. This result of the research has shown that more anxious students are more open to the corrective feedback from various agents, such as teachers, peers, and themselves than less anxious students (Pan, 2015). This indicates that more anxious students are more concerned about accuracy than less anxious students. Thus, their anxiety level increases when they speak English in speaking class.

Table 4 Students' Response to Type of Error Needed To Be Corrected In Teaching English

Error types	Always	Usually	Sometime	Occasionally	Never					
Serious	1	3,03	4	12,12	23	69,69	2	6,06	3	9,09
Less serious	1	3,03	23	69,69	3	0,90	6	18,18	0	0,00
Frequent	1	3,03	2	6,06	25	75,75	5	15,15	0	0,00
Infrequent	0	0,00	3	9,09	22	66,66	7	21,21	1	3,03
Individual	0	0,00	0	0,00	24	72,72	8	24,24	1	3,03

Table 5 The Rate of Feedback from The Teacher In Speaking Class

Feedback types	Very effective/ effective	Neutral	Ineffective/ very ineffective			
Implicit correction	11	33.33%	14	42.42%	8	24.24%
Explicit correction	30	90.90%	3	9.09	0	0.0%
Recasts	18	54.54%	10	30.30%	5	15.15%
Clarification requests	18	54.54%	6	18.18%	9	27.27%
Metalinguistic feedback	16	48.48%	8	24.24%	9	27.27%
Elicitation	21	63.63%	12	36.36%	0	0.0%
No corrective feedback	6	18.18%	10	30.30%	17	51.51%
Repetition	20	60.60%	6	18.18%	7	21.21%

Table 6 The Students Respond Should Correct Their Error

Agents	Strongly agree/ Agree	Neutral	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree			
Classmates	17	51.51%	13	39.39%	3	9.09%
Teachers	21	63.63%	5	15.15%	7	21.21%
Students	20	60.60%	10	30.30%	3	9.09%

CONCLUSIONS

The students' responses about the essential of corrective feedback showing that 11 or 33.33% students respond strongly agree regarding the essential of corrective feedback, 21 or 63.63% agree, and only 1 or 3.03% disagree. It means that the students agree that they want their error to be corrected and get feedback from the teacher. The students' response for corrective feedback frequency is 10 students or 30.30% choose "always" feedback frequency from their teacher. There are also 19 students (57.57%) answering "usually" about getting feedback. 2 (6.06%) student choose "sometime", and only 2 students (6.06%) choose "occasionally". Surprisingly, none of the students answer "never". Then, in the students' response regarding who should correct their error, they strongly agree that their teacher gives them correction in speaking. They also agree that their friends should correct their error. Next, The most popular corrective feedback in teaching speaking is the explicit correction, elicitation, and repetition. They have an effective function in detecting the students' mispronunciation, and low accuracy and fluency. The other corrective feedback like implicit correction, recast, clarification request, and metalinguistic feedback are not favored because the percentage is lower than other corrective feedback. It implies that not all corrective feedback effective if used in speaking, depending on the skill.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Razak, N., Saeed, M., & Ahmad, Z. (2013). Adopting Social Networking Sites (Snss) as Interactive Communities Among English Foreign Language (EFL) Learners in Writing: Opportunities And Challenges. *English Language Teaching*, 6(11), 187–198. <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n11p187>
- Abedi, R., Latifi, M., & Moinzadeh, A. (2010). The Effect of Error Correction Vs. Error Detection on Iranian Pre-Intermediate EFL Learners' Writing Achievement. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 168-174. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsenet.org/elt>
- Alghazo, K., Abdelrahman, M. B., & Qbeitah, A. A. (2009). The Effect of Teachers' Error Feedback On AL-Hussein Bin Talal University Students' Self-Correction Ability. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(1), Retrieved from <https://scholar.google.co.id/scholar>
- Arikunto, S. (2012). *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- Ayedh, A., & Khaled, E. (2011). EFL Teachers' Feedback To Oral Errors in EFL Classroom: Teachers perspectives. *Arab World English Journal*, 2(1), 214-232.
- Butler, A. (2007). The Effect of Type And Timing of Feedback On Learning From Multiple-Choice Tests. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: applied*, 13(4), 273-281. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/xap/13/4/273/> doi: 10.1037/1076-898X.13.4.273
- Chu, R. (2011). Effects of Teacher's Corrective Feedback on Accuracy in the Oral English of English-Majors College Students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(5), 454-459. Retrieved from <http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/tpls/article/view/4691> doi:10.4304/tpls.1.5.454-459
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. California: SAGE publication.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and The Acquisition of L2 Grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 339-368. Retrieved from http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0272263106060141
- Gamlem, S., & Smith, K. (2013). Student Perceptions of Classroom Feedback. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(2), 150-169. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0969594X.2012.749212>
- Kazem, R. (2005). The Effect of Teachers' Feedback on The Students' Ability to Self-Edit in L2 Writing Classes-by Rola Ali Kazem. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.aub.edu.lb/handle/10938/6825>
- Keizer, E., Albakry, M., & Weijer, J. Van De. (2007). IEnglish Language. *Year's Work in English*, 86(1). Retrieved from <http://ywes.oxfordjournals.org/content/86/1/1.1.short>
- Lightbown, P. (2000). Anniversary Article. Classroom SLA Research and Second Language Teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(4), 431-462. Retrieved from <http://applij.oxfordjournals.org/content/21/4/431.short>
- Long, M. (1996). The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition. In Ritchie, W. C., & Bahtia, T. K. (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition (pp. 413-68)*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (2013). Counterpoint Piece: The Case for Variety in Corrective Feedback research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 35(1), 167-184. Retrieved from http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_.doi:10.1017/S027226311200071X
- Pan, Y. (2010). The Effect Of Teacher Error Feedback On The Accuracy Of EFL Student Writing. *TEFLIN Journal*, 21(1), 57-77. Retrieved from <http://www.journal.teflin.org/index.php/journal/article/view/33>
- Saeed, A.N. (2010). *School of Humanities and Social Sciences*. Retrieved from <http://dar.aucegypt.edu/handle/700>, doi 10.5539/elt.v6n11p187
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' Choice and Learners' Preference of Corrective Feedback Types. *Language Awareness*. 17(1), 78-93. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.2167/la429.0>