



An Analysis of Lecturers' Oral Corrective Feedback on EFL Students' Speaking Performance at One Public University in Jambi

Aniza Rilda

Universitas Jambi

E-mail: anizarilda@gmail.com

Received: 2024-09-03 Accepted: 2025-02-13

DOI: 10.2456/ideas.v12i2.5560

Abstract

Corrective feedback is used as a basis for improvement. Giving corrective feedback plays an important role to encourage students to improve their speaking skills and make them aware of their speaking error. Thus, this qualitative study applied case study approach to explore the types of oral corrective feedback used by lecturers in correcting students' speaking error in Oracy Class at One Public University in Jambi and their reasons for choosing certain types of oral corrective feedback. The participants of this research were three lecturers who teach Oracy Class. The data were collected through semi-structured interviews and observations with the guidance of interview protocol and observation checklist as the instruments. In this study, it was found that lecturers used oral corrective feedback by giving reformulation through explicit correction and recast and giving prompt through clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition. Then, their reasons for using certain types of oral corrective feedback were because they were considering the students' level and skills and preparing the students for global competition. Furthermore, it can be concluded that the lecturers only applied five types of oral corrective feedback proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) such as explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback and repetition.

Keywords: *Corrective Feedback, Performance, Speaking*

Introduction

Speaking skill is a fundamental component of second or foreign language learning, as it enables students to engage in conversations, articulate their ideas, and exchange information effectively. According to Harmer (1998), speaking involves utilizing all the language at students' command to perform various oral tasks. In speaking classes, students are required to undertake diverse tasks that

assess their speaking abilities, including speeches, debates, storytelling, monologues, and dialogues. These tasks not only evaluate students' linguistic proficiency but also their ability to communicate effectively in real-life situations. As such, mastering speaking skills is essential for students to succeed academically and professionally in an increasingly interconnected world.

In the context of speaking tasks, students are expected to meet specific assessment criteria, including grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, pronunciation, and fluency (Brown, 2004). However, it is common for students to make errors during their speaking performances, which can arise from grammatical issues, pronunciation challenges, and lexical choices. [Salija \(2018\)](#) emphasizes that errors are a significant part of the language learning process, necessitating careful attention from educators. Corrective feedback plays a crucial role in addressing these errors, as it helps students recognize their mistakes and encourages improvement. [Mendez and Maria \(2012\)](#) assert that feedback is vital for preventing fossilization in language learning, making it essential for students to receive constructive responses from their lecturers.

This study specifically focuses on oral corrective feedback, which is critical for enhancing speaking performance. [Hattie and Timperley \(2007\)](#) define feedback as information provided by teachers regarding students' performance or understanding. In this research, the emphasis is placed on corrective feedback, which serves as a basis for improvement. Lecturers provide feedback to students to correct their speaking errors, thereby encouraging them to enhance their speaking skills and become more aware of their mistakes.

The present qualitative study aims to explore the types of oral corrective feedback used by lecturers in Oracy Class at a public university in Jambi and the rationale behind their choices. The participants in this research include three lecturers who teach Oracy Class. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and observations, guided by an interview protocol and observation checklist. The findings reveal that lecturers employed various types of oral corrective feedback, including explicit correction, recast, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition. The reasons for choosing specific types of feedback were primarily based on considerations of students' levels and skills, as well as the need to prepare students for global competition.

Then, highlighting the uniqueness of the present study, it is specifically related to its focus on oracy classes and the practical implications of corrective feedback in preparing students for global competition. By examining the feedback strategies employed by lecturers, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of how corrective feedback can enhance students' speaking performance, particularly in the context of oracy education. The findings aim to provide insights into effective feedback practices tailored to students' levels and skills, addressing the unique

challenges faced in developing speaking proficiency.

In conclusion, this study highlights the significance of oral corrective feedback in improving students' speaking skills and emphasizes the need for lecturers to adopt effective feedback strategies. By focusing on the specific context of oracy classes, this research aims to shed light on the practical implications of corrective feedback in fostering students' readiness for global communication. Through a comprehensive examination of the types of feedback used and the reasons behind their implementation, this study seeks to contribute valuable insights to the field of language education.

Method

This research was intended to explore the types of oral corrective feedback used by the lecturers in responding learners' speaking errors on the natural situation in the classroom and the reasons why the lecturers chose certain type(s) of oral corrective feedback. Therefore, to achieve the aim of the research, the researcher used qualitative design with a case study approach. This approach is particularly suitable as it allows the researcher to gather rich qualitative data through interviews and observations of three lecturers, thereby providing a detailed understanding of the types of feedback employed and the rationale behind their choices. By focusing on a singular case, the study can effectively address its objectives of identifying the various forms of oral corrective feedback and explaining the reasons for their use, ultimately contributing valuable insights into the dynamics of language teaching and learning in this specific educational setting.

The participants of this research were the lecturers who teach Oracy Class. The criteria for choosing the lecturers are: 1) Lecturers who teach oracy class, and 2) Lecturers who are willing to participate in this research. There were three participants in this research. They were lecturers who teach Oracy Class. The participants consisted of two male lecturers and one female lecturer. Moreover, the lecturers were selected for the study based on their experience teaching Oracy classes and their willingness to participate. Their diverse profiles—two male and one female, with teaching experiences ranging from 2008 to 2015 and expertise in various English Language Teaching areas—provide a broad perspective on oral corrective feedback practices. This variety ensures reliable insights as it captures different teaching styles and approaches, enhancing the depth and richness of the research findings.

The data collection was done through semi-structured interview and observation with the guidance of interview protocol and observation checklist as the research instruments. The interview protocols and observation checklists were developed based on existing literature, specifically adapting the interview protocol from [Gulo \(2017\)](#) and the observation checklist from [Lyster and Ranta \(1997\)](#). To ensure their validity, the researcher conducted member checking, where participants reviewed the transcripts and interpretations of their responses,

allowing them to add or remove information as needed. This collaborative process helped confirm the accuracy and trustworthiness of the data collection instruments used in the study. Then, the data were analyzed according to qualitative data analysis technique proposed by [Miles and Huberman \(1994\)](#) which consists of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification.

Furthermore, for the potential limitations of the study, it is related to a small sample size of only three lecturers and the focus on a single public university in Jambi, which may affect the generalizability of the findings. To mitigate these limitations, the researcher employed data triangulation by using multiple data collection methods, including interviews and observations, to enhance the credibility of the results. Additionally, the detailed descriptions provided in the study aim to demonstrate the transferability of the findings to similar contexts, allowing for broader applicability despite the limited sample.

Results

This section presents participants' answers from interview sections and observations related to research questions. There are two major topics in this section: (1) findings on the types of oral corrective feedback that lecturers gave in oracy class and (2) findings on the underlying reasons of using certain type(s) of oral corrective feedback. The types of oral corrective feedback used by the lecturers are explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition. Then the reasons for using those types of corrective feedback are considering the students level and skills and preparing the students for global competition.

In addition to those findings, based on the results of the observations, it was found that there was a similarity in the finding related to the types of oral corrective feedback in the form of reformulation used by the participants in which they also used explicit correction and recasts. Then, there was a different finding related to another category of oral corrective feedback which was giving prompt in which the participants only used clarification request and metalinguistic feedback for this category. Overall, the lecturers frequently used several types of oral corrective feedback to help students improve their speaking skills. The most common type was recast, where they provided the correct form of a student's utterance without directly pointing out the error followed by explicit correction, which involved directly identifying the mistakes and giving the correct form.

The study revealed notable differences in feedback strategies among the three participants. Participant 1 (P1) frequently used both explicit correction and recast, favoring a diplomatic approach to avoid discouraging students. In contrast, Participant 2 (P2) relied on metalinguistic feedback and explicit correction, focusing on phonological errors and providing explanations to help students understand the root causes of their mistakes. Participant 3 (P3), while less focused

on direct error correction, preferred repetition and clarification requests to encourage self-correction, reflecting a desire to prepare students for native-like communication. The variations in strategies appeared to stem from individual teaching philosophies and the specific challenges encountered in their classrooms.

Among the challenges, lecturers noted the difficulty of balancing fluency and accuracy, especially for students with anxiety or low confidence. P2, for instance, emphasized prioritizing fluency to avoid increasing students' nervousness, particularly in an online setting. Additionally, P3 highlighted the challenge of bridging the gap between students' academic English proficiency and their ability to engage in real-world, native-level conversations. These challenges underscore the need for tailored corrective feedback strategies to address diverse student needs effectively.

The overview of findings can be seen in the following table:

Table 1. Themes and Sub-themes of the findings

		Themes	Sub-themes
1	Types of Oral Corrective Feedback	Giving Reformulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit Correction • Recast
		Giving Prompts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification Request • Metalinguistic Feedback • Repetition
2	Reasons for using certain type(s) of oral corrective feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considering the students' level and skills • Preparing the students for global competition 	

Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

The first objective of this research is to find out the types of oral corrective feedback used by lecturers in three classes of Oracy in Academic Context Class. Lecturer has many ways to correct students' mistake or error in classroom. The way lecturer gives corrective feedback determine the types of corrective feedback that lecturer gives in Oracy Class. Based on the result of the interview sections and

observation that have been conducted, the researcher found that lecturers gave corrective feedback in two ways, namely by giving reformulation and prompt.

Giving Reformulation

a) Explicit Correction

Based on the result of the interview sections, all of the participants claimed that they used explicit correction to correct students' speaking error. They explained that they identified the error and provided the correction.

P1 stated that he tried to use explicit correction in a more diplomatic way. More precisely, he said that:

"Eee sometimes ya, sometimes eee because eem I didn't really do it in formal sentences, I just eee mostly ya corrected the vocabularies the pronunciations ya and also the grammar eee because I didn't really write the sentence what they talk about so I didn't really make the corrections in the full sentence". To make your document look professionally produced, Word provides header, footer, cover page, and text box designs that complement each other. For example, you can add a matching cover page, header, and sidebar. Click Insert and then choose the elements you want from the different galleries. "Yes, I mean I said I but I didn't say I didn't really say oh you're wrong ya, I said eee this is more appropriate ya, eee I try to not eee make the students feeling very down by judging he is wrong or not I'm trying to be eee as diplomatic as possible by eemm praising them at the beginning and then after that eee that would be good if you change this this this".

In addition, P2 emphasized the use of explicit correction to correct error in terms of pronunciation. She said that:

"Eem ya I think just like what I've mention earlier that eee I I tell them what words they mispronounce and then I told them what is the correct one".

Then, P3 in his statement about using explicit correction, he went with an example of student's speaking error related to the use of preposition. Literally, he said that:

"Oh, yes, for example the error is related to the use of preposition "at", I live at, [the address] should be complete, right?" (Translated from Indonesian Language), "Street, or maybe I live on but he/she, it is only the street but he/she says the complete [address]" (Translated from Indonesian Language), "So, I might say eee you mean I live at". (Translated from Indonesian Language)

Then, based on the result of the observations that have been conducted, the example of explicit correction used by the lecturer is presented below:

Student : The fifth /farv/

Lecturer: It's the fifth /fifθ/ not the fifth /farv/.

b) Recast

Based on the result of the interview sections, P1 claimed that he used recast to correct student's speaking errors. P1 said that he sometimes repeated student's utterance and provided the correction for the erroneous part of the utterance without pointing out that the student's utterance was incorrect. He said that:

"Eee sometimes ya, sometimes eee because eem I didn't really do it in formal sentences, I just eee mostly ya corrected the vocabularies the pronunciations ya and also the grammar eee because I didn't really write the sentence what they talk about so I didn't really make the corrections in the full sentence".

Then, based on the result of the observations that have been conducted, the example of explicit correction used by the lecturer is presented below:

Student : Leader of opposite

Lecturer : Opposition

Giving Prompt

a) Clarification Request

Based on the result of the interview sections, P1 and P3 claimed that they used clarification request in which they would give a question indicating that the students' utterances are unclear so that they had to repeat or reformulate their utterances.

P1 stated that he used clarification request after students finished talking. He said that:

"I sometimes did that ya, I mean I sometimes do it ya, but not very often not very often eee I usually almost all of the time let the students finish talking and then after that I try to eee give some correction ya".

Then, P3 said that he used clarification request in case he could not catch the idea of student's utterance. Literally, he said that:

"Excuse me would you please clarify that again, that's what you mean, right? Unless we're fully blank, we don't know, yes [asking for clarification], but if for example eee I understand the main idea I didn't ask like that". (Translated from Indonesian Language)

Then, based on the result of the observations that have been conducted, the example of clarification request used by the lecturer is presented below:

Student : I think I hear something, Sir.

Lecturer : Sorry?

b) Metalinguistic Feedback

Based on the result of the interview sections, P2 claimed that she used metalinguistic feedback in which she corrected students' speaking error through question, comment, or information related to the student's utterance.

P2 stated that in correcting students' speaking error she told them the cause of their errors. More specifically, she said that:

"Eemm ya actually when I'm telling them the correct form I also tell them the cause of their mistakes ya, the cause of their speaking error, eee like I've mention earlier in the beginning of the interview, I've mentioned that actually there are some sounds in English that Indonesian people don't have it so I think that's the challenge that students have and then ya sometimes the students have difficulty in eee in identifying the class of words, so eee you know because the class of words also influence the pronunciation, right?", "So I have to tell them whether they said healthy or health cause if health it's belong to noun and healthy is adjective".

Then, based on the result of the observations that have been conducted, the example of explicit correction used by the lecturer is presented below:

Student : ...good result instant

Lecturer: What is the correct form? How is the grammar? Put the noun in the end [of the phrase] (Translated from Indonesian Language)

c) Repetition

Based on the result of the interview sections, P1 and P3 claimed that they used repetition in which they repeated student's error and adjusted their intonation to make the student noticed it as an error.

P1 said that he sometimes repeats students' error and says it louder to make them notice their error. He said that:

"Oh okay I got your point, yes sometimes I do it sometimes I rise the error by saying it louder ya and I also eee repeated ya repeated several times ya eee to eee make them realize what they did wrong something like that..."

Then, P3 stated that he used repetition in case the errors are essential to be corrected. He said that:

"Yes, sometimes. But it's in case the errors are really essential, actually, for this one, it is the responsibility of lecturers who teach grammar not speaking". (Translated from Indonesian Language)

Reasons for Using Certain Type(s) of Oral Corrective Feedback

Based on the result of the interview sections with the participants, P1 and P2 said that they tend to use the types of oral corrective feedback that enable the students to receive the correct form of the error. Then, P3 said that he rarely gave corrective feedback to the students. However, he claimed that he often provides input in the form of expressions that are often used by native speaker of English. Furthermore, the participants had their own reasons related to those answers, namely considering the students' level and skills and preparing the students for global competition.

Considering the Students' Level and Skills

This research was conducted in third semester classes of undergraduate English Study Program. Therefore, the lecturers made some considerations on what types of oral corrective feedback they were going to use to correct every case of speaking error so that the feedback would be appropriate for the students. This was what P1 and P2 concerned about in giving oral corrective feedback.

P1 stated that he provided the correct form in giving oral corrective feedback for students' speaking error considering that they were undergraduate students who were in the process of learning. Literally, he said that:

"Eee my my concern is because they are students the first thing and then they are in the process of learning eee if I am eee a lecturer let say without giving the correct form when I give the correction ya eee it might not be like I think it will be useless the students will say ya I will do it but they might not do it eee it would be different if I check eee I give in the written form for example the students make eee the mistakes throughout the manuscript I just check one or two and then I asked them to find out the similar mistakes and change it by themselves eee while if it is in the spoken form I think it is necessary for me to give them the correct form of their mistakes something like that".

Then, P2 also explained the same thing as P1 where she also considered the level and English skills of the students when providing oral feedback for them. More specifically, she said:

"eee because I think that is the most appropriate way when we are dealing with the students from eee tertiary level ya, I mean university students, I think that is the most appropriate one because you cannot just interrupt them and correct them directly, because it will hindered their fluency and you know I don't want to cause them to have anxiety to talk cause we know that oracy because oracy is eee you know not everyone can talk in English, right?"

Preparing the Students for Global Competition

Regarding the reasons for using feedback to correct speaking errors, P3 gave his own reason for this, where he said that he often gave input rather than corrected students' speaking errors. Literally, he said that:

“The reason is because we are preparing these students for global competition, what we call it, eee so actually if we prepare our students to become English teachers, it's actually wrong, that's what colonial thinking really is, so we prepare these students to compete globally, for example like this, how many percent of our students who are graduating now can directly communicate with native speakers, they can't, they can teach English, but how many percent of them can keep up with native speakers, so what we need to understand is that actually the native speaker's language that is used every day is different from what we use, so to enter eee what we call it, their area is, then we have to learn English in their way, which they can understand”. (Translated from Indonesian Language)

Discussion

Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

Giving Reformulation

In response to the first issue in this study, it was found that giving reformulation is the first way used by the lecturers in giving the oral feedback in the online oracy class. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997) this type of corrective feedback supply students with the correct way of saying a certain word or a sentence. In other words, the teachers or lecturers will directly give reformulation as the correct formula from the utterance. The theory is related to the results of this study. In which, in order to apply reformulation technique, the lecturers as directly point out the erroneous part of the students' utterances and then provide the correct form.

Then, based on the analysis, it was found that explicit correction and recast are the types of feedback used by lecturers in implementing the reformulation technique. In this case, the researcher will discuss the types of feedback one by one. This is similar to what was found in this study. The participants explained that the explicit correction feedback used to correct students' error directly. The method that the participants used in implementing explicit correction as the oral corrective feedback was pointing out students' error and providing the correction.

Furthermore, the second oral feedback used by the participants in the reformulation way is recast. Recast is the activity when the teacher implicitly reformulates all parts of students' error by repeated the students' ill-formed sentences or utterances and adjusting intonation to highlight their error (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). The results of this study reveal that the theory is true. In implementing recast feedback, the participants explained that they were more likely to repeat students' utterance and provide the correction in the error section without showing errors in the students' utterances when speaking.

Based on the observation the researcher found one case where the lecturer implemented recast feedback such as; the student said "leader of opposite" instead of "leader of opposition". Therefore, the lecturer gave correction directly by saying "opposition".

Giving Prompt

Furthermore, the second ways of giving feedback used by the participants was through giving prompt. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997) this type of oral corrective feedback would include numerous signals without reformulation to encourage learners to revise their errors by themselves. In this study, it was found that giving prompt was implemented as a way of giving feedback by participants. The results of this study showed the same fact in which in some cases of speaking error, the lecturers or participants tried to encourage students to revise their error by relying on the prompts given. Based on the research results, the researcher found that there are three types of feedback that are often used by participants when correcting students' mistakes through the giving prompts technique. The three types of feedback consist of; clarification request, metalinguistic feedback and repetition. The researcher will discuss the three types of feedback one by one in the following discussion.

The first feedback is clarification request. Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that a clarification request is a type of oral feedback in which a lecturer asks questions to students to indicate students' unclear statements. According to the participants, clarification request feedback was used when they not catch the idea of students' utterance. According to P1, a clarification request was given by after the students finished talking. After analyzing the results of the study, the researcher can conclude that the use of clarification requests is related to the type of feedback proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997). In which the lecturers asked the students to indicate either that their utterance has not been understood so that they need to repeat or reformulate their utterance. In its implementation, the lecturer used the phrase "Sorry?" in using clarification request.

Then, the second type of oral feedback in the giving prompt technique is metalinguistic feedback. According to the participant metalinguistic feedback is a type of oral feedback that involves giving a response by the lecturer to students through questions, comments, or information without providing the correct form. Based on the results of the study, participants who used metalinguistic feedback were more likely to be concerned with the students speaking errors such as pronunciation. In its implementation, the participants gave more metalinguistic feedback in the form of questions to showing students pronunciation error. After analyzing further, the researcher can conclude that the process of implementing metalinguistic feedback is related to the concept of giving prompt proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997). In which they explained that in correcting students' errors using the prompting technique, the teacher could ask a question with different words that is adjusted to the knowledge of students.

The third oral feedback in giving prompt technique found in this study is repetition. According to participant repetition is oral corrective feedback given by repeating students' error and adjusting the intonation to make students notice it as an error. Based on the explanation from P1 the purpose of this activity is to make students noticed their errors. This was done because according to P3 the errors are essential to be corrected using repetition feedback. In this regard, the researcher reviewed that this type of feedback was related to the concept of giving prompt proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997). In which they explained that to implement corrective feedback in the form of prompt the lecturer had to repeat students' errors and making kind of different intonation to make students notice their errors.

Reasons of Using Certain type(s) of Oral Corrective Feedback

The findings from the interview result reveal that there are two main reasons why the lecturers used certain types of oral corrective feedback in Oracy class. Based on the results of the study, P1 and P2 explained that the main reason they used oral corrective feedback that enabled the students to receive the correct form was because they considered the students' level and skills. In other words, they chose to give that kind of oral corrective feedback for the students' who were in tertiary level in order to make sure that they realize their speaking errors and revise them in their next performance. According [Siska et al \(2018\)](#), in her study, the teachers tend to used particular strategies in giving oral corrective feedback was because they knew the level of the students' understanding, motivation, condition, and the ability in understanding and receiving what the teacher gave. Therefore, that finding is closely related to the results of this study in which P1 and P2 also concerned with the level of the students in giving oral corrective feedback.

Then, a different reason proposed by P3 in which he explained that in his Oracy Class, he prepared the students for global competition. Moreover, according to P3, he preferred to give some kinds input in the form of phrases, sentences, and English expressions used by Native speakers of English in their daily life since giving oral corrective feedback for the case of students' speaking errors in Oracy Class was not his biggest concern. In this regard, according to Lewis in [Siska et al \(2018\)](#) the reason of giving oral corrective feedback is because it provides advice for the learners about learning and it also helps them to acquire some kind of language input as they might learn new vocabulary and structures in context. Therefore, this is related to P3's reasons. In other words, he provided language input for the students even though he did not use oral corrective feedback. Then, P3 also explained that it was also important to teach students regarding how to use expressions in English based on the context of its use.

Conclusion

The present study revealed two findings related to oral corrective feedback. The first findings explain the types of oral feedback used by the lecturers in the Oracy class which is covered by theories of corrective feedback proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997). In this study, the researcher found that the lecturers used two ways in giving oral corrective feedback namely by giving reformulation and giving prompt. Then, the second finding is related to the reasons of using certain type(s) of oral corrective feedback. The results of the study revealed that there were two main reasons why the participants preferred to use certain types of oral corrective feedback to improve students' speaking skills. The first reason is because they considered students' level and skills. Then, the second reason is that the participants prepared the students for global competition.

Based on the results of the interview sections, the participants used the category of giving reformulation through explicit correction and recast. Then, the results of the observations showed that there was a similarity in the finding in which the participants also used explicit correction and recast to correct students' speaking error. Then, the second category of corrective feedback was "giving prompt". Based on the results of the interview sections, in the category of giving prompt, the participants used three types of oral corrective feedback, namely 1) Clarification request, 2) Metalinguistic feedback, and 3) Repetition. Meanwhile, the results of the observations revealed a different finding in which the participants used clarification request and metalinguistic feedback for the category of giving prompt.

The findings indicate that certain feedback types, such as repetition, were less commonly used, potentially due to their limited immediate impact on improving accuracy compared to explicit correction or recast. This suggests that lecturers prioritize methods that directly address errors, especially in time-constrained classroom settings. Future research could explore student perceptions of these feedback types to understand their effectiveness from the learners' perspective and expand the study to include diverse educational contexts, such as primary schools or multicultural classrooms. The findings could significantly inform teacher training programs, emphasizing the need for adaptive feedback strategies tailored to students' proficiency levels and emotional states. In curriculum design, integrating opportunities for balanced fluency and accuracy practice is essential. A critical reflection highlights a trade-off: while explicit correction enhances accuracy, it may hinder fluency, necessitating careful application to foster a supportive and effective learning environment.

References

- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson/Longman.
- Gulo, J. M. (2017). Students 'perception On Corrective Feedback Giving by Lecturer In Speaking For Professional Context Class. *Universitas Jambi*.
- Harmer, J. (1998). *How To Teach English: An Introduction To The Practice Of English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: UK.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power Of Feedback. *Review Of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.
- Husnaini, H., Syam, A. T., Niken, N., & Soares, A. (2024). Teachers' Strategies In Teaching Speaking At High Schools: Obstacles And Challenges. *Linguistics Initiative*, 4(2), 243-262.
- Husnaini, H. (2022). Development Of Self Esteem-Oriented Micro Teaching Materials For IAIN Palopo English Education Students. *IDEAS: Journal On English Language Teaching And Learning, Linguistics And Literature*, 10(1), 538-560.
- Madehang, M., Masruddin, M., & Iksan, M. (2024). Reflecting on the Implementation of Online English Learning in Islamic Higher Education: Lecturers and Students' Perspectives. *International Journal of Asian Education*, 5(3), 183-197.
- Ismayanti, D., Said, Y. R., Usman, N., & Nur, M. I. (2024). The Students Ability In Translating Newspaper Headlines Into English A Case Study. *IDEAS: Journal On English Language Teaching And Learning, Linguistics And Literature*, 12(1), 108-131.
- Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback And Learner Uptake: Negotiation Of Form In Communicative Classrooms. *Studies In Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66
- Masruddin, M., & Abduh, N. K. (2024, May). Indonesian Language Learning For Foreign Speakers Based On Luwu Culture: A Needs Analysis Study. In 4th International Conference On Linguistics And Culture (ICLC-4 2023) (Pp. 75-80). Atlantis Press.
- Masruddin, Hartina, S., Arifin, M. A., & Langaji, A. (2024). Flipped Learning: Facilitating Student Engagement Through Repeated Instruction And Direct Feedback. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2412500.
- Mendez, E. H. & Maria, Del R. R. C. (2012). Teachers' Perceptions About Oral Corrective Feedback And Their Practice In EFL Classrooms. *Profile: Issues In Teachers' Professional Development*, 14(2): 64.
- Miles, Mathew B., & A. Michael Huberman. (1994). *An Expanded Sourcebook: Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

- Nasriandi, N., & Masruddin, M. (2021). The Use Of British Parliamentary Debate Style In Teaching Speaking Skill. IDEAS: Journal On English Language Teaching And Learning, Linguistics And Literature, 9(1).
- Salija, K. (2018). *Error Analysis In English Speaking*. 3.
- Siska, W., Mukhaiyar, & Ratmanida. (2018). English Teachers' Strategies In Giving Oral Corrective Feedback On Students' Speaking Performance. *Xth International Cnference On English Language And Teaching*, 158–168.