



UNIVERSIDAD DE CUENCA

Facultad de Filosofía, Letras y Ciencias de la Educación

Carrera de Lengua y Literatura Inglesa

**Effective Feedback Techniques on Speaking and their Implications in the Context of
Higher Education**

Trabajo de titulación previo a la obtención
del título de Licenciada en Ciencias de la
Educación en Lengua y Literatura Inglesa

Autora:

Sandra Isabel Chicaiza Déleg

C.I.: 0104218649

sandrachicaizad@hotmail.com

Director:

Mgt. Guido Esteban Abad Vicuña

C.I.: 0102064524

Cuenca, Ecuador

15 de diciembre de 2021



Resumen

El presente trabajo tiene como objetivo contribuir al desarrollo de la habilidad del habla de una lengua extranjera con énfasis en el contexto de la educación superior a través de la exploración de la práctica de algunas técnicas correctivas de retroalimentación con enfoque en la competencia oral, presentando por lo tanto las estrategias más eficaces con sus respectivas repercusiones pedagógicas. La metodología empleada se basó en una revisión bibliográfica, la misma que incluyó la investigación existente más actual sobre el tema.

Los resultados demostraron que las técnicas más efectivas para mejorar la habilidad del habla son la retroalimentación metalingüística seguida por la reformulación del habla. De acuerdo a los estudios los dos tipos de retroalimentación correctiva contribuirían, aunque de diferente manera, al desarrollo de la habilidad oral de un segundo idioma en un medio educativo superior.

Finalmente, se concluyó que la técnica de retroalimentación ayudó a mejorar el aspecto gramatical y la pronunciación de los participantes mientras que la reformulación del habla aportó a la fluidez de los mismos. Con relación a la opinión de los educandos, la técnica de reformulación fue la más preferida, puesto que dicha estrategia no implica el esfuerzo cognitivo que demanda la retroalimentación lingüística.

Palabras claves: Habilidad del habla. Retroalimentación correctiva. Técnica metalingüística. Reformulación.



Abstract

This research aims to contribute to the development of the speaking skill of a foreign language particularly in the context of the tertiary level by exploring the practice of some corrective feedback techniques on the oral ability and coming up with the most effective strategies along with their respective pedagogical implications. The methodology employed was the exploratory bibliographic research method, where only the most current research on the topic was taken into account.

The results showed that the most effective type of corrective feedback when supporting the speaking skill was the metalinguistic technique followed by recast. According to the studies both types of corrective feedback might support, although in a different manner, the development of the L2 oral skill in the context of higher education. Finally, it was concluded that the metalinguistic technique mostly assisted the development of grammar and pronunciation while recast enhanced learners' fluency. In regard to students' perspectives, recast was the most preferred corrective feedback technique as this strategy does not demand any cognitive effort as the metalinguistic method does.

Keywords: Speaking skill. Corrective feedback. Metalinguistic technique. Recast.



Table of Contents

Resumen.....	2
Abstract.....	3
Table of contents.....	4
List of tables.....	7
Introduction.....	8
Chapter I	
Description of the Research.....	10
1.1 Background.....	10
1.2 Justification.....	11
1.3 Problem Statement.....	12
1.4 Research Questions.....	13
Chapter II	
Theoretical Framework.....	14
2.1 The Natural Approach and its Principles.....	14
2.2 Fossilization.....	15
2.3 Error Correction and The Affective Filter.....	17
2.3.1 Error Correction.....	18
2.3.1.1 Types of Errors.....	19
2.3.1.2 Components of Errors.....	20



2.3.2 The Affective Filter.....21

2.4 Definition of Feedback and Types of Feedback.....22

Chapter III

Literature Review.....26

3.1 Assessing the Speaking Skill in the EFL Context of the Tertiary Education.....26

3.2 Techniques for an Effective Feedback and their Implications during the Process of Learning and Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Higher Education.....29

Chapter IV

Methodology.....39

4.1 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria.....39

Chapter V

Analysis.....42

5.1 Analysis based on the Research Questions.....42

5.1.1 First Research Question.....42

5.1.2 Second Research Question.....55

Chapter VI

Conclusions and Recommendations.....58

6.1 Conclusions.....58

6.2 Recommendations.....60



References.....62



List of Tables

Table 1. List of Articles Considered for the Study.....	40
Table 2. Effectiveness of Metalinguistic Feedback in L2 Oral Competence.....	43
Table 3. Effectiveness of Recast in L2 Oral Competence.....	48
Table 4. Effectiveness of Other Types of Corrective Feedback Techniques in L2 Oral Competence.....	51
Table 5. Effectiveness of Peer-feedback Technique in L2 Oral Competence.....	54



Cláusula de licencia y autorización para publicación en el Repositorio Institucional

Sandra Isabel Chicaiza Déleg en calidad de autora y titular de los derechos morales y patrimoniales del trabajo de titulación "Effective Feedback Techniques on Speaking and their Implications in the Context of Higher Education", de conformidad con el Art. 114 del CÓDIGO ORGÁNICO DE LA ECONOMÍA SOCIAL DE LOS CONOCIMIENTOS, CREATIVIDAD E INNOVACIÓN reconozco a favor de la Universidad de Cuenca una licencia gratuita, intransferible y no exclusiva para el uso no comercial de la obra, con fines estrictamente académicos.

Asimismo, autorizo a la Universidad de Cuenca para que realice la publicación de este trabajo de titulación en el repositorio institucional, de conformidad a lo dispuesto en el Art. 144 de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior.

Cuenca, 15 de diciembre de 2021

Sandra Isabel Chicaiza Déleg

C.I: 0104218649



Cláusula de Propiedad Intelectual

Sandra Isabel Chicaiza Déleg, autora del trabajo de titulación “Effective Feedback Techniques on Speaking and their Implications in the Context of Higher Education”, certifico que todas las ideas, opiniones y contenidos expuestos en la presente investigación son de exclusiva responsabilidad de su autora.

Cuenca, 15 de diciembre de 2021

Sandra Isabel Chicaiza Déleg

C.I: 0104218649



Introduction

The main goal of learning a new language involves the individual's capacity of communicating with other people (Ahmed, 2015). However, the ability of expressing feelings, opinions, concepts, etc., in an oral form has become a struggling process for many students and instructors. In this respect, there are some alternatives available to support the process of the development of the oral production such as the use of corrective feedback techniques. Hence, this study aims to analyze the effectiveness of those feedback strategies and their educational implications with focus on the tertiary level due to the demands of the competitive professional market. In this sense, the two following research questions are addressed:

1. What are the most relevant techniques that tertiary level educators can use in order to provide effective feedback on their EFL students' speaking skill?
2. What are the reported pedagogical implications of the most significant effective feedback techniques on students' EFL oral competence?

The answers to the above questions attempt to support L2 teachers in their pedagogical practice regarding the speaking skill by means of an exploratory bibliographic methodology. It is sought to explain how some feedback strategies work, which ones have the most relevant impact on learners' oral skill improvement and their effects in the second language learning field. In this context, this study presents theoretical concepts that model the notion of using correction techniques in class; in addition, it analyzes the existing literature about the employment of corrective feedback in universities, colleges and some language learning institutes. Several studies on the topic are compared with the main intention of providing a broad panorama about the use of the different feedback methods. Later on, some remarks on the benefits of the two most effective techniques are made which according to the results are the corrective



metalinguistic strategy and recast. Finally, the document reports some conclusions and recommendations intended to promote the adequate use of correction in class.



Chapter I

Description of the Research

1.1 Background

The speaking skill is one of the abilities that has lately called the attention of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) and ESL (English as a Second Language) researchers as it has become a deciding factor for tertiary level students when getting into the labor market where they are required to show a satisfactory level of their EFL or ESL oral skill (Nazara, 2011).

However, the development of the speaking skill in the classroom has been subjected to different difficulties, among them, related to how instructors support their students' oral competence progress. In this matter, different L2 (Second Language) teaching approaches have been proposed for facing this issue, so several teaching strategies have been implemented in order to help students perfect and polish their speaking skill. In general terms, the least errors a student makes, the most proficient. Concerning this issue, some theories have supported the idea that errors should not be corrected, but on the other hand, some linguists have suggested that correction of errors should be done in the classroom.

Normally, errors have been taken into account for measuring learners' L2 proficiency; yet recently instructors have started to use errors as a base for the teaching practice. In other words, teachers have given to errors a pedagogical use in the L2 class, and they are no longer considered a sign of students' L2 inability; on the contrary, it has been used as a basis for a formative process (Kazemi & Tavassoli, 2019). Therefore, when speaking about processes of evaluation, it can be referred as summative and formative. In this way, evaluation does not strictly allude a score given to students but a supportive mechanism offered to learners when



they make errors. The main advantage of this supportive practice is to make students aware of their own learning process and acknowledge their linguistic weaknesses and strengths (Astin & Antonio, 2012). In short, the summative assessment assigns scores to students which are necessary to promote them up to the next level of studies, but the formative assessment basically provides comments on learners' performance with the intention of helping them progress in their L2 proficiency.

Looking the formative assessment more closely, it can be mentioned that it implies the use of supportive or corrective comments on learners' utterances that carry errors; the instructor points out that an error has occurred, and correction is provided in two forms: as the provision of the information about the nature of the error, or in its turn the provision of the correct target language form by the instructor (Maierdan and Ishizuka, 2019). Such corrective process is called feedback which is performed in various forms, and the instructor will be the one who decides which type of corrective feedback may be the most suitable for enhancing the speaking skill in the class.

1.2 Justification

The main goal of every L2 teacher in a classroom is to promote their learners' four skills proficiency. In this matter, the speaking competence has been one of the hardest abilities to achieve, hence it has motivated that many researchers focus their attention on the development of supportive strategies for improving the oral competence. Those strategies have emerged from the formative assessment, and one of the most popular methods concerns the use of corrective feedback techniques for enhancing the speaking skill, which in other words is the support that the teacher offers to their students when they make errors while producing their output. At present, there are some types of corrective feedback available that can be used in the classroom; however,



it is necessary to know which strategy is the most appropriate for students in accordance with their different characteristics and various L2 necessities. That is the reason why this study becomes relevant as its main purpose is to compile the most effective corrective feedback techniques on speaking and their pedagogical implications by means of an exploratory bibliographic research type.

1.3 Problem Statement

The idea of mastering the oral skill naturally without teacher intervention (Krashen, 1982) has lately changed, and at present instructors are playing an important role in the classroom particularly when they deal with the issue of correcting errors. Regarding the aspect of errors, it has gained relevance in the linguistic area since there is a call for treating them pedagogically as follows: Learners should recognize their errors and repair them critically, and in this way to reassure their L2 progress and keep track of their acquisition of the target language. Astin and Antonio (2012) stated that if students became aware of how they are making progress in their L2, they would be able to focus on the areas that need to be worked and improved.

Therefore, many researchers have seen correction as an essential pedagogical tool to be adopted particularly in the EFL classes where students do not have the chance to practice the L2 in any other place than their classrooms (Bacquet, 2019). Consequently, it seems that correction is central to the L2 oral acquisition as long as it is appropriately implemented in the class. That is, teachers certainly have at hand many types of corrective feedback to support the improvement of the speaking skill, yet they would have no idea about what kind of corrective feedback strategy suits their classes best, so it is expected to provide a deep bibliographic analysis which might offer valid information about the issue in question.



1.4. Research Questions

3. What are the most relevant techniques that tertiary level educators can use in order to provide effective feedback on their EFL students' speaking skill?
4. What are the reported pedagogical implications of the most significant effective feedback techniques on students' EFL oral competence?



Chapter II

Theoretical Framework

2.1 The Natural Approach and its Principles

In the second and foreign language learning field, for many years, many instructors have been occupied on finding manners for helping learners become proficient in the target language, and consequently different approaches have come out with the object of proposing the best L2 learning methods. In this way, the adoption of different methodologies has varied; for instance, some instructors have resorted to a method mostly based on their own teaching philosophy, and other several teachers have taken up practices laid on their students' needs.

In this regard, one of the approaches that have become commonly used in the L2 classroom is the one referred as the Natural Approach which values the meaning of the message rather than accuracy and is based on the first language acquisition. According to Krashen and Terrell (1983), the natural approach consists in using the target language for communicating in the L2 class without turning to the native language. The emphasis is not put on the output produced by the learner but on the input received. The approach minimizes the grammar aspect especially in the initial stages of the L2 learning and is connected with other current communicative approaches. Krashen and Terrell considered the language lexicon more essential and important for comprehension and production of messages than syntactic structures. Some authors as Gregg (1984) criticized the stance of Krashen and Terrell since according to Gregg, grammatical structures are necessary and thus deserve attention in the classroom.

Another important aspect to mention in regard to the natural approach is the particular difference posed by Krashen and Terrell (1983) between acquisition and learning. They



explained that acquisition has to do with first language achievement, and learning occurs with second or foreign language knowledge. In other words, acquisition denotes the natural way of developing language ability by means of comprehension and production of the language, and the process is seen as unconscious. Learning, on the other hand, is the result of explicit instruction of a language in its form and use where teaching and correction are essential during the process. According to Krashen and Terrell (1983), conscious learning works only as a monitor but not as a generator of the language; this is, it just edits and corrects the L2 output. Conversely, the acquisition itself is carried out naturally in contrast to learning which requires instruction. In acquisition of an individual's first language, errors are expected during the process and are not straightforwardly corrected; likewise, the acquisition of the language is supported by the exposition of the learner to a comprehensible and interesting input which is to some extent beyond their current level of competence ($I + 1$). Comprehension takes place with the help of context, extra linguistic information, and knowledge of the world. In like manner, in order to start producing the language independently, there has to be a considerable language intake on the part of the learner. The focus is mainly on reading and listening, and the main notion is that nobody teaches the learner to speak; on the contrary, the ability emerges by itself. Learning, for its part, demands a certain dependence on the instructor, and errors are directly corrected. Both input and output are essential for L2 development.

2.2 Fossilization

Foreign and second language learners go through different stages when learning a foreign language. Therefore, during the learning process learners may find themselves involved in different circumstances and face difficulties which could be overcome with the respective and proper guidance.



Coming across errors on the way to acquire the target language is considered completely normal and usual, and that is why many researchers have dedicated their time to study the different types of errors that learners of a second language make and how to overcome them. However, there is a theory that has called the attention of many linguists since it states that certain errors get stabilized and despite of the correction they stay and live in the learners' minds. It is referred as the deficient development in the target language or fossilization (Selinker, 1972). In other words, this is a bad linguistic habit that cannot be easily corrected. According to Declerck (2015), fossilization can be defined as a gap between what we know and all the unknown linguistic features that we do know not yet but are available in the linguistic system. It is the learner's linguistic insufficient performance due to the lack of the target language resources which is accompanied by the unfavorable environmental conditions (Declerck, 2015). When we talk about fossilization, it can be said that learner's learning process has been frozen, and the skills are no longer operative. This is, the learner does not react when using the target language incorrectly, and it falls in behavioral linguistic attitudes (Declerck, 2015). According to Nemser (1971), when a linguistic element has been fossilized, it does not matter how much instruction learners receive in the L2, they will not reach a high linguistic competence or be similar to a native speaker.

On the other hand, some researches have seen fossilization as a phenomenon that necessarily takes place during the L2 acquisition process because they consider that fossilization may be the expression of the usual failures that an L2 learner inevitably goes through. Fossilization itself does not present a distinguishing error, yet it may vary according to each individual who might manifest their mistakes differently; in other words, fossilization may be defined as an individual or idiosyncratic process. In spite of that, in order to understand



fossilization, some researchers have focused their attention on the critical period principle, and some others on the native language transfer. In this sense, Han and Selinker (2005) affirmed that one of the reasons why fossilization takes place could be due to the influence of the learner's L1 (Han & Selinker, 2005).

Fossilization due to learners' L1 interference mainly refers to errors where the first language is involved. In this matter, some longitudinal studies have been carried out in order to explain processes of defossilization; however, in some cases the attempts have been unsuccessful, and learners have relapsed in errors. Such is the case of a longitudinal study during eight years where a Chinese girl could not master the past tense in spite of the corrective feedback approach, but the same girl was successful at improving her pronominal marking failure. The possible explanation was based on the Universal Grammar theory which says that certain aspects of the grammar are common to many languages and they influence positively as they help to rectify errors in the L2; however, on those linguistic features that are not alike or common between languages, there is a tendency to fossilize the error. As a matter of fact, there is evidence of fossilization even in the most advance learners of a second language. Likewise, a few researchers have suggested that some pedagogical practices could be contributing to fossilization; for instance, if in a class there is only focus on meaning and not on form, the syntax may not evolve, and thus it will get fossilized, and consequently communication will be negatively affected; this phenomenon frequently happens when grammar is not included in the formation of the L2 learner (Han & Selinker, 2005). Thus, it is suggested that fossilization should be treated appropriately and on time since it could be recurrent and resistant but no unsurmountable.

2.3 Error Correction and The Affective Filter



2.3.1 Error Correction

The main objective of a second or foreign language learner is to master the L2, and one of the ways to do it is by means of adjusting erroneous utterances. Bhela (1999) claimed that when students jump on their journey to learn a new language, they start accumulating several structural aspects of the second language which seem hard to organize appropriately in their minds. Likewise, Bhela pointed out that some of the errors made by learners are derived from the interference of the native language due to the differences and similarities between the structures of the native and the target language; in this regard, learners have the tendency to make use of the first language in order to produce the second language; for example, habits that students have in their L1 are used for learning the L2, and eventually these habits impede the formation of new habits for acquiring the target language.

It is worth mentioning that in the field of linguistics, some authors have differentiated the concept about errors and mistakes. Gefen (1979) claimed that mistakes are failures in production, and errors demonstrate lack of capacity in the L2. That is to say, a mistake is unintended because of the rule wrong choice, and on the contrary, error is committed because of a complete lack of knowledge of the rules of the target language

Errors and mistakes generally have a negative connotation. Even in instruction when teachers talk about students' errors, it implicitly means that something must be improved or changed. However, many authors have stated that errors are necessary during the learning process of a new language. Krashen (1983), for instance, considered errors as a natural part of the L2 learning process. In the same manner, Touchie (1986) expressed that learning presupposes failing and succeeding. Selinker (1972) on his part, stated that errors are significant because of three reasons: errors make student's learning progress visible for the teacher; errors



show how a student learns a second language, and by means of errors learners hypothesize the correct use of the target language.

2.3.1.1 Types of Errors

According to Touchie (1986) there are two types of errors: interlingual and intralingual or developmental. The interlingual error refers to the interference of the native language when using the target language. The interlingual phenomenon occurs as a blend of the foreign and native languages which result in an inaccurate use of the L2. Referring to grammar errors, it basically refers to learners who intend to express their ideas by using all the linguistic equipment available in their brains which usually is a mixture of the target and native language features (Fauziati, 2011). In the same manner, Touchie (1986) explained that the intralingual or developmental errors are associated with errors occurring inside the target language system and are subdivided into simplification, overgeneralization, faulty teaching, fossilization, avoidance, inadequate learning, false concepts hypothesized and hypercorrection. Following, a short description of each type:

Simplification: It is the use of ungrammatical basic structures rather than the complex ones.

Overgeneralization: It is the extension in the application of a rule over other structures where such rule is not the most suitable.

Faulty teaching: When educators and their pedagogical resources fail to teach the correct form of the second or foreign language; sometimes teachers are influenced by an erroneous practice taken place throughout the years of practice.

Fossilization: It is about errors that are not modified for a long time and become difficult to overcome.



Avoidance: The learner eludes the use of some complex syntactic structures and use the simple ones instead. This error aspect is quite related to simplification.

Inadequate learning: It is the unawareness of rule restrictions or incomplete learning such as subject-verb inversion in the interrogative sentence.

False concepts hypothesized: These are erroneous assumptions on the part of the learner about the application of an L2 grammatical rule.

Hypercorrection: It is about overcorrecting every single grammar feature even the accepted or standard forms (Touchie, 1986).

Other linguists have differentiated other types of errors such as: performance errors and competence errors. Performance errors are those that the learner commits because of weariness or any other lack of energy. Conversely, competence errors reveal insufficient knowledge of the target language (Touchie, 1986). Further, Davutoglu (2011) called unsystematic errors to the linguistic failures because of psychological reasons such as emotional states or physiological factors like the slips of the tongue and slips of the ear.

A group of researchers, on the other hand, have distinguished between local and global errors: Local errors do not impede communication and understanding, for example, the incorrect use of prepositions, but the global ones do hinder comprehension, for example, wrong order in a sentence (Touchie, 1986).

2.3.1.2 Components of Errors

The typical components of errors are mainly related to the phonological, the morphological, the lexical and the syntactic aspects (Touchie, 1986). One of the most common



phonological mistakes among Spanish speakers is the pronunciation of /t/ instead of /th/; a morphological error is the production of *mans* or *childrens*; a lexical error, for instance, is the confusion in the meaning of *department* instead of *apartment*; and a syntactic error may be the structure *house beautiful*.

The main objective of treating errors is to find the way of mastering the target language. Bhela (1999) stated that the main purpose of L2 is to get the learner to communicate his or her message meaningfully and accurately. According to Bhela, error handling can be carried out by anticipating possible future errors, especially, when the instructor understands the syntactical structures of learners' mother tongue and the target language. However, as previously mentioned, some authors have stated that L2 learners will not be able to assimilate the target language as a native speaker does, hence claiming that errors will become permanent or fossilized features of learners' interlanguage. In this regard, Lenneberg (1967) assured that there is a critical period for second language learning which affirms that the most adult L2 learners are not capable of internalizing the L2 successfully. On the other hand, Fauziati (2011) in her study concluded that errors are not permanent, but temporary, and they can be reduced to a great extent with pedagogical interventions. In short, the error issue may be quite complex and instructors should be prepared to deal with it.

2.3.2 The Affective Filter

In the matter of error correction, there is a significant and crucial factor that must be taken into account, and it has to do with the learner, who according to Krashen and Terrell (1983), should be considered as a holistic entity whose emotional state must be observed when correcting errors because it could ease or impede language comprehension. Touchie (1986) likewise argued that frequent correction could make a student demoralize and thus interrupt the



process of learning. The author remarked specially on shy students and gave some general guidelines for correcting the L2 errors, namely: teachers should correct errors that interfere meaning and comprehension; instructors should concentrate their attention on the most frequent errors and the ones that affect their students the most; in the same manner, errors related to the sociolinguistic aspect must receive special attention in order to guarantee the proper use of the L2; finally, it is suggested to emphasize on the errors which are significant to the center of the lesson, this is, if the focus of the lesson plan is the present simple, the instructor would not be correcting errors related to articles.

2.4 Definition of Feedback and Types of Feedback

Corrective feedback is information given to learners to indicate that their L2 production contains errors and hence must be rectified (Lightbown & Spada, 2013) and attempts to get students realize and reflect on the formal aspects of a language (Schmidt, 1990), and not just on meaning.

According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), there are six types of feedback:

1. **Recast** refers to the instructor's intervention by proving the correct form over the learner's mistaken production. It consists of leaving the error out of the student's statement.

Example: **S:** I go shopping yesterday.

T: I went shopping yesterday.

2. **Repetition** in essence consists of reproducing the error made by the learner with a loud tone of voice.

Example: **S:** It is a house big.



T: a house big?

3. **Explicit correction** has to do with stating clearly that the student made a mistake and consequently correcting it.

Example: **S:** She live in Cuenca.

T: No, we say... *she lives*...

4. **Clarification requests** is primarily a technique where the teacher asks the learner several questions because her or his output is unintelligible or incoherent, and the student has the task of clarifying it.

Example: **S:** I ate a bowl of soap.

T: Sorry, I do not understand. Can you rephrase what you just said?

5. **Metalinguistic information** mainly involves the instructor providing further information or comments as regards the well-formedness of the learner's output. The teacher does not provide the correct form.

Example: **S:** People is unpredictable.

T: Is people singular or plural?

6. **Elicitation** by means of which the student is stimulated to reformulate the utterance or provide more elaborated answers rather than a simple yes or no.

Example: **S:** My sister went to a tent and bought some stuff.

T: My sister went to a.....

How do we say *tienda or comercio* in English?

The six types of feedback may be classified into two general groups: reformulations or prompts (Ranta & Lyster, 2007). On the one hand, the reformulation type is a strategy based on the reconstruction of the student's incorrect delivery by the instructor; the student does not



intervene in the error correction. Reformulation mainly includes recast and explicit correction. On the other hand, prompting primarily consists in supplying clues, comments, signals, alternatives that push students to self-repair. This type of feedback comprises repetition, clarification requests, metalinguistic clues and elicitation.

Likewise, Ellis, Loewen and Erlam (2006) classified the six types of corrective feedback into implicit and explicit feedback. In regards to the implicit feedback, it is stated that this type of feedback essentially involves the instructor directly correcting the learner's error without going further in explanation and does not demand learner's awareness of the error committed. The instructor provides immediate and direct correction. Recast and explicit corrections might fit into this category. On the other hand, explicit feedback refers to the assistance provided to students by the instructor with the main intention of having learners correcting themselves by means of their L2 knowledge; this is, the learner realizes that an error exists and fix it by applying the appropriate grammatical rule. It is worth mentioning that the teacher does not provide direct corrections. Repetition, clarification requests, metalinguistic information and elicitation might be included in this group. According to Ellis (1994), implicit knowledge is more related to acquisition while explicit to learning. Implicit information is unconscious, automatic and spontaneous while the explicit one involves a more conscious process which is more planned and goes through a reflexive process. It is argued that implicit knowledge is built on explicit knowledge. For instance, when a person is learning a second language at the very beginning his or her production lies on the rules of the target language, but eventually the practice and habitual interaction with the L2 make the learner act more spontaneously without relying too much on the rules.



In addition to the six types of corrective feedback previously mentioned, it was found that other types of feedback are being used in the L2 classroom (Fu & Nassaji, 2016). They are mainly: immediate recasts, delayed recasts, re-asks, translations, directing questions to other students and using the learners' L1.

1. Immediate and delayed recast: When we refer to immediate and delayed recasts, the difference mainly lies in the period of time that the teacher takes in order to reformulate the student's utterance; it could be at the right moment of making the mistake or when the student has finished his or her intervention.
2. Re-ask: The other type of feedback known as re-ask consists of restating the initial question in order to get response from the student.
3. Translation: The teacher translates the student's L1 utterance into the L2.
4. Directing questions to other students: The teacher does not provide any correction but another student from the class does it.
5. Learner's L1: The teacher uses the learners' L1 to make students understand certain structures or aspects of the L2.

In relation to these five types of feedback, it can be said that information is limited, hence further research may be needed.



Chapter III

Literature Review

3.1 Assessing the Speaking Skill in the EFL Context of the Tertiary Education

In Latin America, education has always been an issue of discussion when referring to its low quality and proficiency standards (Abrahams & Farias, 2010). Unfortunately, within this academic field, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) has also been a cause for concern. For instance, as an indicator, the Education First Program (2017) rated Ecuador as one of the countries with the lowest English Proficiency Index score in the world. Ortega (2014) claimed that one of the reasons for this matter is the need of pedagogical strategies that help to support students during the process of the L2 learning.

Speaking specifically of the productive skills and focusing particularly on the oral ability, it can be said that the speaking competence has lately been considered of special interest in the tertiary level due to its importance in the professional life of learners (Huang, Kubelec, Keng, & Hsu, 2018). However, research has been very limited in the oral area. Peñuela (2018), for instance, affirmed that studies regarding speaking and its subcomponents are scarce as many instructors have focused their efforts on the development of the reading and listening skills over the writing and speaking abilities in the class considering that teaching and evaluating the receptive skills result easier than working and assessing the productive ones. Due to this scenario, it is vital to know how to teach and assess the L2 oral ability, particularly in the tertiary level, and the way of using the assessment information with a more pedagogical orientation where students get benefited from this process.



Among the aspects to be assessed when dealing with the speaking skill are: sounds, speed, pause, variations in pitch, stress, volume and intonation (Luoma, 2003). Kingen (2000) additionally recommended to take into account the function of communication: personal, descriptive, narrative, instructive, questioning, comparative, imaginative, predictive, interpretative, persuasive, explanatory, and informative. Hughes (2003) for his part stated that the most common aspects to be evaluated are: pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and nonlinguistic parameters such as matter, manner and method. Therefore, instructors have the responsibility to identify what they are evaluating in the speaking skill and what they are trying to cause on students: a spontaneous conversation or a formal presentation.

Concerning evaluation of the grammatical aspect, it is important to mention that this feature is one of the aspects that is mostly assessed in speaking and whose main objective is to require learners to express accurately according to the grammatical forms; however, it is important to distinguish how grammar works when speaking. In this matter, instructors need to give some thought to the difference between spoken grammar and written grammar. For instance, talkers do not speak in full well-structured sentences, they rather express themselves in short phrases linked with connectors and making many pauses in between since they are trying to communicate their ideas in real time which means no time for processing and analyzing mistakes as we usually do in writing (Luoma, 2003). In other words, grammar might be differently utilized in planned and unplanned speech. Planned speech mainly includes advanced preparation and practice which will sound quite formal, accurate, and well structured, while the unplanned speech is what the learner says at the right moment of interacting with other speakers and will usually use short phrases, ordinary words, fillers, fixed phrases, etc., with a great nuance of informality and containing some slips and errors which differ significantly from standard written



clauses (Luoma, 2003). For instance, in some classes, oral presentations, discussions, role-plays, debates, etc., may involve real-life language with content-focused and authentic language material (Susiati, 2017) while in other classes, formal presentations will be the nucleus of the course. That is the reason why it is important that in the classroom teachers identify what they are trying to provoke on students: a spontaneous conversation or a formal presentation.

Therefore, recognizing the main purpose of the oral evaluation will help instructors to consider the adequate and corresponding variables for teaching speaking.

Another relevant aspect about assessing speaking has to do with the advantages that the process of corrective feedback can offer to students and teachers. Ounis (2017) stated that current oral evaluation is no longer based on traditional standardized tests but is more oriented to a more communicative assessment; this is, teachers are more prone to connect formative assessment with speaking skill development whose process is done by means of several instruments such as checklists, rubrics (written feedback), verbal feedback, and others. Speaking of the tertiary level in Ecuador, the resource of using rubrics has been very common in oral assessment. Arter and McTighe (2001) argued that rubrics usually provide valuable information about the performance of a learner unlike the traditional standardized testing. In other words, the use of rubrics might facilitate evaluation and learning at the same time. Two types of rubrics could be utilized: the analytic and the holistic. According to Nitko (2001), through analytic rubrics students output gets detailed feedback which helps students to continue developing and progressing in their L2 oral performance. On the other hand, the holistic rubric offers a broad and global notion of the learner's performance, so no specifics are provided (Ounis, 2017). Likewise, it has been proposed that the results obtained from evaluation should be used as valuable information for learners themselves. Astin and Antonio (2012) claimed that providing feedback



may benefit students since they will know with certainty what are the areas they should improve and work on the most. Therefore, implementing both formative and summative evaluation in the speaking class is necessary, understanding that formative evaluation does not demand assigning a grade but allows instructors to keep track of their learners' oral skill progress (DiRanna et al., 2008).

Based on the information above mentioned, following some studies related to assessment and feedback are presented with the main intention of collecting the most effective ways of providing appropriate correction on speaking and their pedagogical implications.

3.2 Techniques for an Effective Feedback and their Implications during the Process of Learning and Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Higher Education

Some researchers have experimented with different types of corrective feedback in regard to the speaking skill; however, the majority of them have considered in their studies the most common six types of feedback, namely: recasts, repetition, explicit correction, clarification, metalinguistic clues and elicitation (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Therefore, the following academic works that were taken into account for the present study will reveal information principally related to the Lyster and Ranta's corrective feedback classification.

In a research project carried out in Japan with EFL university students by Maierdan and Ishizuka in 2019, it was tested the efficacy of two types of feedback namely: recast and repetition. It was done by means of oral presentations where two groups of students received recast and the repetition feedback on grammar respectively. The results emphasized on the efficacy of the recast over the repetition technique. The reason seems to be related to the fact that learners preferred not to correct their mistakes by themselves, but they wanted their instructors to provide the correct form. In other words, when we speak about recast, we can notice that learners



merely limit themselves to listen and repeat to what the teacher has said without being aware of the error itself. On the other hand, repetition demand learners to repair their errors by themselves, and probably that is the reason why the number of correct uptakes when recasting was more significant than the repetition. However, recast may not be provoking learning but merely replication. This reasoning is supported by Tamayo and Cajas (2017a) who stated in their conclusions about a study they carried out with a group of EFL students of the tertiary level where they tested the effectiveness of recast in contrast to the metalinguistic corrective feedback. According to the results, they verified the success of metalinguistic feedback over the recast technique. They claimed that when recasting, teachers do not encourage analysis for the corresponding reparation and learners are only imitating what their teacher stated. On the other hand, the metalinguistic feedback incites reflection on the part of the student since the correct form is no provided by the teacher; on the contrary, the instructor makes the learners notice that there is an error and supports students on the correction of such inaccuracy. In this way, it could be seen that the metalinguistic corrective feedback offers some advantages when learning the target language. When Tamayo and Cajas (2017a) experimented the effectiveness of the metalinguistic technique, they could notice that the high scores on the final test were due to the meaningful learning that this strategy produced. In other words, it can be stated that the information provided by means of recast can be easily forgotten meanwhile the metalinguistic information was more significant and permanent which eventually contributed to the learning of the target language. Therefore, taking into consideration that metalinguistic corrective feedback in the classroom might encourage learning.

In the same manner, Ellis, Loewen and Erlam (2006) compared two types of feedback in an ESL class of Asian students in New Zealand. The two types of feedback were recast and the



metalinguistic method. In this occasion the researchers had two experimental groups and a control group. Three tests were applied during the research study, namely: a pretest, an immediate posttest, and a delayed posttest. As a result, in the immediate posttest, there were not significant differences in the performance of all groups; however, in the delayed posttest, the group which was given the metalinguistic feedback performed better than the other two groups. This is, the metalinguistic technique was more evident as time passed, and thus it contributed to L2 learning. The group that received recast, on the other hand, did better than the control group which may signify that implementing any type of feedback in a classroom may be better than an absolute absence of it. In order to complement the idea of effectiveness of the metalinguistic feedback in the class, it is worth citing the study carried out by Naeimi, Saeidi and Behnam (2018) which proved that the metalinguistic feedback was more significant than recast and elicitation when talking about retention. Three EFL classes were tested after a month of having received the respective treatment, and the group which was given the metalinguistic feedback scored higher than the others. It is also interesting to bring up the fact that recast was the most effective in inducing immediate correct uptake which did not necessarily mean cognitive processing due to the nature of the technique which pushes students to repeat their teachers' repaired utterance. Thus, a relation between uptake and learning could not be established because repetition can hardly be considered as learning; conversely, lack of uptake could not be assumed as absence of learning since learners could be taking in knowledge without showing uptake. However, this fact does not mean that recast should be totally discarded from a classroom, as a matter of fact, many instructors have made use of recasting because it may be playing a different role in the class; for example, recast may not be utilized when looking for meaningful and reflective learning but to prevent permanent fossilization by means of rapid correction.



Supporting students during the process of corrective feedback seems to be absolutely necessary, so if instructors do not play this supportive role, students would probably not be able to correct errors by themselves. It is expected that teachers guide students throughout the error-repairing process. Concerning this situation, Tamayo and Cajas (2017b) in a second study about students' response on corrective feedback, affirmed that the role of the teacher is crucial when providing proper clues to improve students' language awareness and subsequently resulting in error repair. Thus, they analyzed two types of corrective feedback which were employed in order to measure the number of students' successful uptakes. They were recast and the metalinguistic feedback technique. The recast feedback registered the lowest rate of successful uptakes and repairs as many students did not even notice that they were being corrected or restated the utterance incorrectly. On the other hand, the metalinguistic technique revealed to have a high rate of uptake and successful repairs as learners clearly perceived their teachers' observations. Therefore, comments, clues and any other assistance given to students contributed to the correction of errors. In this study learners demonstrated a positive attitude towards the aid that the instructor offered through the metalinguistic technique.

Alavi, Foo, and Amini (2015) for their part, focused their study about corrective feedback on the aspect of noticing feedback, which mainly consisted on students detecting and reacting to feedback. In this regard, a number of Malaysian college students were split into four different groups and each one received a different type of feedback while working on a simple past oral task. Two types of feedback were the focus of this study. Recast, which was mainly the repetition of teacher's corrected form, and prompting which consisted in the students correcting their errors by themselves through interaction with their instructor. The first group received recast feedback, the second group prompting, the third group a mixture of recast and prompting



feedback, and the fourth one was the control group. The results about noticing feedback, showed that students receiving prompting feedback could notice and fix their errors better than the other groups receiving recast or no feedback. Therefore, both studies belonging to Alavi, Foo, and Amini (2015) and Tamayo and Cajas (2017b), showed that teacher's assistance resulted very productive when noticing and repairing errors. However, unlike Tamayo and Cajas (2017b) students' perspectives results, in Alavi, Foo, and Amini (2015) research, learners stated that feedback in general was productive; yet their preferences were not on prompting even though it helped them to notice and react to errors; instead, they selected recast feedback as their most-liked feedback technique. Therefore, this piece of information gives a different perspective on the type of feedback to be applied in the classroom as it can be seen that students in general do not like to be pushed and put under pressure when correcting errors. Then, it can be inferred that in order to apply the best technique, the instructors should also take into account other variables such as students' opinions in order to guarantee learning in a comfortable environment.

Other than recast and the metalinguistic technique, it is fair to take into account other studies that have tested other types of feedback in terms of efficacy. However, most of these studies also included recast and metalinguistic feedback in the treatment in order to compare them against other feedback techniques. Zhai and Gao (2018) studied the effect that five types of corrective feedback techniques have on L2 learning, namely: recast, repetition, confirmation check, clarification request and metalinguistic feedback. All the five techniques were applied in two types of tasks, simple and complex. It was evident that clarification request and metalinguistic feedback had the highest positive effect when dealing with simple tasks. Regarding the complex task, the metalinguistic feedback showed the highest positive effect. The researchers concluded that clarification request and metalinguistic feedback had positive



repercussion on the students' oral performance in the simple as well as in the complex tasks since they involved support and clues on the part of the teacher; meanwhile, the other types of feedback: repetition and confirmation check presented a low impact since those techniques just indicated the existence of errors in the speech production without providing the logic for the corresponding repair. It is important to point out that recast was fairly meaningful for correcting errors in the complex tasks. This fact contradicts the conclusions of Alavi, Foo, Amini (2015) and Tamayo and Cajas (2017b) studies that determined that recast had an insufficient effect on the participants of their experimental work. The reason for recast to be significant may be due to the fact that students were so focused on the elaboration of their complex tasks which limited their time to reflect on each error, so they preferred to take their teacher's correction directly and proceed with their oral performance. Likewise, it was evident that learners preferred clarification requests and the metalinguistic feedback when dealing with simple tasks since they counted on enough time to analyze their errors. Consequently, based on the result of this study, the most effective corrective feedback techniques might also be chosen according to the level of difficulty of the task or activity assigned in class.

Following, another type of corrective feedback technique is addressed. It is called elicitation. As previously mentioned, this strategy consists in inducing students to reformulate their utterance or come out with more details and ideas when interacting with someone else or when providing specific information. In this regard, Alavi and Amini (2016) tested the effect of recast and elicitation when working with interactive tasks in a communicative environment, finding that elicitation was highly productive in the classroom. These results contrasted with those of Naeimi, Saeidi and Behnam (2018) where elicitation was also tested and did not have much impact on the class when recalling information after a certain period of time, thus it is



noteworthy the fact that elicitation seemed to be successful at the moment of interaction within a communicative classroom more than helping students retain information.

Apart from the types of corrective feedback techniques proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), there is a variety of corrective feedback techniques which are also being employed in the classroom. Fu and Nassaji (2016) observed a class where the instructor used different types of corrective feedback techniques, namely: immediate and delayed recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic information, elicitation, explicit correction, repetition, re-ask, translation, asking direct questions, directing questions to other students, using students' L1. Concerning this study, there are two remarkable aspects that should be tackled: first, the availability of new types of corrective feedback techniques; second, the use of the explicit feedback with grammar-focused oral lessons and the implicit feedback with pronunciation or fluency. As it is known, the explicit corrective feedback involves the teacher calling the attention of students by interfering the flow of the speech or conversation when errors are produced; in this way the learner stops, recognizes the error and fix the inaccurate element which generally belongs to the grammatical category. In this matter, Alavi, Foo, and Amini (2015) carried out a study on oral competence where explicit feedback was employed in order to treat a specific grammatical point and the results demonstrated a high increase in grammar accuracy. Similarly, the results of the study by Safdari and Fathi (2020) with a group of EFL college students revealed that the grammar and vocabulary accuracy were incremented to a great extent after learners received explicit feedback. It is important to mention that in this study, the fluency aspect did not show any improvement due to the constant interruptions when pointing out corrections.

On the other hand, the implicit feedback is less intrusive since interruptions are avoided to the outmost unless the grammatical error is significant and affects the meaning of the message



(Ellis, Loewen and Erlam, 2006). Therefore, types of implicit feedback are more prone to be used when dealing with fluency or pronunciation. However, Ansarin and Chehrazad (2015) in their study about corrective feedback acknowledged the use of recast as ideal for perfecting grammatical errors. It is worth mentioning that recast practice matches with that of the implicit feedback. They assured that accuracy and fluency were improved through form-focused recast. Nevertheless, if this study is observed more closely, it can be seen that only one type of technique was employed; it was recast, which was divided into two subcategories: focused and unfocused recast, so the results were mostly disposed to show either one of the two types of recast as the most effective.

Considering the usefulness of corrective feedback in terms of the implicit and explicit classification, it can be mentioned the study by Zarei, Ahour and Seifoori (2020) who worked with a group of young adult Iranian students in an EFL context where three ways of providing feedback were tested. The first group received implicit feedback, the second group received explicit feedback and the third one a mixture of implicit and explicit feedback. The implicit feedback was given in form of recast, the explicit feedback in form of the direct method which consisted in assisting students when correcting their errors, and the third group received a mixture of implicit and explicit feedback by means of recast, clarification, repetition, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback and the explicit correction. Thus, at the end of the study, the experts concluded that the third group that received the mixture of the two types of feedback performed better in their posttest. As a result, it can be inferred that in the classroom not only one type of feedback could support students' learning process but the employment of implicit and explicit feedback together. This study provided a different perspective about which type of feedback should be used in the class by suggesting a combination of both the implicit and the explicit. It



seems that a varied range of feedback in the class could guarantee the satisfaction of a greater number of students in the class as each individual has a different way of learning.

There is another important criterion for giving feedback in the classroom which should not be overlooked by instructors, and it has to do with peer feedback. McGarrell (2010), Ahangari, Rassekh-Alqol and Hamed (2013) and Vasu, Ling and Nimehchisalem, (2016), have suggested that students can play an active role while providing feedback. This is, students being capable of evaluating and correcting their own peers; however, learners have resisted to this idea since they have the notion that teachers are the only individuals who are capable of evaluating and giving feedback in the classroom. Despite this conception, the three previously mentioned studies reported interesting facts about students evaluating and contributing to their peers' L2 development. First, all the studies were carried out in a tertiary level environment where learners who had an adequate level of English were more successful than the beginners. This is, participants who belonged to the intermediate and advanced levels of English felt more independent and comfortable with peer-feedback while the beginning level students tended to rely more on their teachers. Secondly, before applying peer-feedback, the instructors provided a set of criteria to the students for the corresponding peer evaluation and guided them throughout the process. In this sense, the results showed that peer-feedback was satisfactory and cleared any distrust coming from students about not being able to provide productive feedback; however, some participants stated that although they found peer-feedback beneficial, they still preferred feedback from their teachers since it gave them a certain sense of security. Another remarkable aspect stated in the studies was the high correlation between teacher and peer feedback which suggested that students might judge similarly as an instructor usually does. As a conclusion, the researchers in the three studies claimed that by means of peer-feedback students can better



understand the nature of evaluation and feedback which can help them increase their metacognitive ability and consequently understand how their process of learning takes place.



Chapter IV

Methodology

4.1 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

In order to come up with the most effective corrective feedback techniques on speaking and analyze their implications in the L2 classroom, this study used an exploratory bibliographic research type whose main objective is the compilation of information from published materials (“Research Methods,” 2017) which helped to have a clearer panorama about the topic in question.

In the first place, this study demanded the revision of theoretical foundation for L2 learning, speaking assessment and feedback, and for this matter digital and physical books were analyzed as well as some articles concerning the theory at issue. Later on, the review of the literature was specifically done on corrective feedback techniques on the oral skill in order to answer the two questions posed for this study.

The research was carried out by means of different academic search engines such as Google Scholar and DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals). Some key words and phrases were used in order to precisely obtain the required articles for the analysis of the matter in question. Some of these key words were: *effective feedback*, *oral assessment*, *errors on speaking*, *summative*, *formative evaluation on speaking*. However, it is worth mentioning that articles related to corrective feedback on the L2 oral competence were not abundant as it was expected.

The criteria of inclusion taken into account for this bibliographic research was based on the date of publication of the articles, thus the academic papers analyzed for the present study were published between the years of 2000 and 2020 and were strictly related to the use of corrective feedback on speaking. The articles that were subject to review were mainly empirical



studies which included quantitative and qualitative data. The empirical works allowed to examine and understand the different corrective feedback techniques that were observed and measured during the corresponding interventions of the studies. In regard to the context, both ESL and EFL educational environments were analyzed. Concerning the age of the participants, all the studies were carried out in the tertiary level of education or with individuals who were the regular college age. Based on this inclusion criteria, the following articles presented in Table 1 were analyzed:

Table 1

List of Articles Considered for the Present Study

Author and year of publication	Context/Country	Type of study	Participants
1. Ellis, Loewen & Erlam (2006)	ESL/New Zealand	Empirical	Mean age 25 years old
2. McGarrell (2010)	ESL/USA	Empirical	Tertiary level students (Graduate-level)
3. Ahangari, Rassekh-Alqol & Hamed (2013)	EFL/Iran	Empirical	Tertiary level students
4. Jafarigohar & Gharbavi (2014)	EFL/Iran	Empirical	Tertiary level students
5. Alavi, Foo & Amini (2015)	ESL / Malaysia	Empirical	Mean age 20 years old
6. Ansarin & Chehrazad (2015)	EFL/Iran	Empirical	Learners from 15 to 23 years old
7. Alavi & Amini (2016)	EFL-ESL/Thailand	Empirical	Tertiary level students
8. Espinoza & Rodriguez (2016)	EFL/Costa Rica	Empirical	Tertiary level students
9. Fu & Nassaji (2016)	EFL/ Poland	Empirical	Tertiary level students
10. Vasu, Ling & Nimehchisalem (2016)	ESL/Malaysia	Empirical	Tertiary level students
11. Naeimi, Saeidi & Behnam (2018)	EFL/Iran	Empirical	Tertiary level students
12. Tamayo & Cajas (2017a)	EFL/Ecuador	Empirical	Tertiary level students
13. Tamayo & Cajas (2017b)	EFL/Ecuador	Empirical	Tertiary level students



14. Zhai & Gao (2018)	EFL/China	Empirical	Tertiary level students
15. Maierdan & Ishizuka (2019)	EFL/Japan	Empirical	Tertiary level students
16. Safdari & Fathi (2020)	EFL/Iran	Empirical	Tertiary level students
17. Zarei, Ahour & Seifoori (2020)	EFL/Iran	Empirical	Learners from 15 to 25 years old

Note. Articles are displayed in chronological order.

These seventeen articles, as it will be seen in the analysis section, were grouped in 4 categories: the metalinguistic technique as the most effective technique, the recast technique as the second most effective strategy, other types of corrective feedback, and the novel peer-feedback technique. Likewise, information about the effectiveness of each one will be tackled. It is worth mentioning that most researchers have tested the metalinguistic feedback technique and recast while studies about other types of corrective feedback techniques were limited. Finally, all the studies were simultaneously compared and contrasted in order to determine their implications in the L2 classroom.



Chapter V

Analysis

5.1 Analysis based on the Research Questions

Responding to the two questions posed for this study, the scientific articles that were considered for the review of the literature showed relevant data about which feedback techniques on speaking were proved to be the most effective and what their pedagogical effects are regarding the L2 oral development.

5.1.1 First Research Question

What are the most relevant techniques that tertiary educators can use in order to provide effective feedback on their EFL students' speaking skill?

In regards to the first question, it can be mentioned that when analyzing and comparing the studies on corrective feedback techniques on the speaking skill, there were two corrective feedback strategies that were persistent along the studies: the metalinguistic strategy (Tamayo & Cajas, 2017a; Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006; Naeimi, Saeidi & Behnam, 2018; Fu and Nassaji, 2016; Safdari & Fathi, 2020; Zarei, Ahour & Seifoori, 2020; Tamayo & Cajas, 2017b; Zhai & Gao, 2018; Espinoza & Rodriguez, 2016) and recast (Tamayo & Cajas, 2017a; Maierdan & Ishizuka, 2019; Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006; Naeimi, Saeidi & Behnam, 2018; Alavi & Amini, 2016; Fu & Nassaji, 2016; Ansarin & Chehrazad, 2015; Zarei, Ahour & Seifoori, 2020; Alavi, Foo & Amini, 2015; Tamayo & Cajas, 2017b; Zhai & Gao, 2018; Espinoza & Rodriguez, 2016).

The recurrence of the metalinguistic and recast techniques throughout the review of the studies may be on account of the nature of the type of correction that metalinguistic and recast



techniques offer. First, metalinguistic feedback may be opportune in order to increase learners' cognitive capacity besides the interaction that this technique produces between the teacher and the student which evidently favors the learner's oral development (Fu & Nassaji, 2016; Naeimi, Saeidi & Behnam, 2018). On the other hand, recast usually implies correction on the spot and not interrupting the flow of the speech or dialogue (Zhai & Gao, 2018). When recasting, learners usually repeat what the teacher says and do not reflect on the error itself. In both cases when using the metalinguistic technique or recast, speaking is meant to be improved yet the focus is on different aspects.

Then, the first most effective feedback technique according to the results of different experimental studies was the metalinguistic strategy. Following, Table 2 shows the results that back up the effectiveness of the metalinguistic technique.

Table 2

Effectiveness of Metalinguistic Feedback in L2 Oral Competence

Study	Participants	Target of the study	Method and Design	Tests	Results
Ellis, Loewen & Erlam (2006)	34 students from an ESL New Zealand Language School; 2 groups of 12 and 1 group of 10 students.	Grammar	Experimental Group 1 received recast, group 2 received metalinguistic, and group 3 was the control group. Treatment: 1 up 2 hours a day; activities mostly related to story retelling; feedback was focused on form and was provided while performing the task.	Pretest, Immediate Test, and Delayed Test based on oral elicited test and focused tasks.	The metalinguistic group was more accurate than the other two groups in the delayed posttests. However, Recast proved to be more effective than the control group. In the immediate posttests there were not meaningful changes.



Espinoza & Rodriguez (2016)	12 levels of EFL college students from Costa Rica; beginner groups, intermediate groups, advanced groups.	Grammar, vocabulary and phonology	Experimental Quantitative (surveys) and Qualitative (interviews) Different corrective feedback techniques were given by the teachers in the different levels: metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, recast, clarification request and repetition.	Surveys and interviews	Explicit correction in form of metalinguistic and elicitation were mostly used and resulted effective. Students agreed with the correction practice but not all of them were effective for all levels, so it was suggested that techniques may be chosen according to the level of learners.
Fu & Nassaji (2016)	13 EFL college students in Poland; only one group.	Grammar on students' successful uptakes	Experimental Mixed method Quantitative and qualitative method on successful uptakes and opinions. Treatment: 50-minute class 3 times a week. Students received 12 types of feedback during 13 sessions, namely: immediate recast, delayed recast, clarification request, metalinguistic technique, elicitation, explicit correction, repetition, re-asks, translation, asking a direct question, directing question to other students and using students' L1.	Frequency tables and surveys	The type of explicit feedback, the metalinguistic information, was mostly used in the classroom when lessons were more grammar-focused and this type of feedback produced more successful uptakes than the other types of feedback.
Tamayo & Cajas (2017a)	28 EFL undergraduate students from an Ecuadorian college; participants were divided into two groups.	Grammar on error repair	Experimental Group 1 received metalinguistic feedback; group 2 received recast. Treatment: 128 hours; 15 oral activities such as role plays, conversations and	9 oral tests along the semester after finishing a content included in the syllabus	Group 1 which received metalinguistic feedback outperformed the recast group in terms of error repair.



			interactions between teacher and student with focus on grammar. Feedback on errors was progressive during the duration of this study.		
Tamayo & Cajas (2017b)	30 EFL undergraduate students from an Ecuadorian college; 2 groups of 16 and 14 students each.	Grammar on students' uptake	Experimental Group 1 received metalinguistic feedback and group 2 received recasting. Treatment: 9 sessions per group. Individual and group oral tasks on videos and readings. Feedback was provided during the oral activity individually.	Diagnostic Test, final course test.	Group 1 which received metalinguistic feedback showed a high rate of uptake, so it was proved that there is a relationship between the kind of teacher feedback and student uptake.
Naeimi, Saeidi & Behnam (2018)	54 EFL undergraduate students from an Iranian college; 3 groups of 18 learners each.	Pronunciation	Experimental Group 1 received recast, group 2 elicitation and group 3 metalinguistic information. Treatment: 105 minutes of duration; corrections were made on the most 3 common phonological errors. The activities were based on storytelling. Feedback was provided while students were presenting.	Pretest and two posttests: immediate and delayed.	All groups improved from the pretest to the immediate posttest. However, the metalinguistic group showed the highest score in the delayed posttest. On the other hand, the recast group outperformed the metalinguistic and elicitation groups when referring to students' uptake.
Zhai & Gao (2018)	24 EFL undergraduate students from a Chinese college; 6 groups of 4 students each.	Grammar and meaning based on the complexity of an oral task	Experimental Group 1 and group 2 received different types of feedback: recast, repetition, confirmation, clarification request and metalinguistic feedback. Treatment: 1.5 horas of treatment was given. Each group worked on a simple and a complex oral	Posttest: Final oral presentation.	In the complex and simple tasks, the metalinguistic technique had the greatest impact. However, less than the metalinguistic technique but important to mention, was the positive impact of the



			presentation. Each presentation was done individually. After each presentation, students got feedback from their teachers.		clarification request on the oral simple task and the recast strategy on the oral complex task.
Safdari & Fathi (2020)	62 EFL undergraduate students from an Iranian university; group 1 and 2 of 31 students each.	Accuracy and fluency	Experimental Group 1 received feedback mainly in the form of direct questioning, metalinguistic information and prompting, and group 2 was the control group. Treatment: 8 sessions; teacher acted as mediator in the experimental group providing feedback from the most implicit to the most explicit type. The activities focused on the meaning and form of the oral production of different tasks of a text book.	Pretest: speaking test based on the Preliminary English Test. Posttest: Interviews	The feedback techniques provided in group 1 affected the speaking accuracy of learners while the fluency did not get any significant impact. Students responded that feedback in form of metalinguistic form helped them when correcting their errors on form.
Zarei, Ahour & Seifoori (2020)	54 EFL participants from an Iranian teaching center; 3 groups of 18 students each.	Grammar	Experimental Group 1 received recast, group 2 received direct correction, and group 3 received a mixture of recast, clarification, repetition, elicitation, metalinguistic explanation and explicit correction. Treatment: 10 sessions of 75 minutes by means of focused tasks such as retelling stories.	Pretests and Posttests combined with questionnaires and semi-structured interviews.	The group 3 revealed the effectiveness of the explicit feedback in the form of the metalinguistic technique. Other types of explicit feedback were also considered by students as convenient.

Note. Articles are displayed in chronological order.



The information about the effectiveness of the metalinguistic feedback clearly demonstrated that this type of feedback was useful when working on the L2 grammar (Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006; Espinoza & Rodríguez, 2016; Fu & Nassaji, 2016; Tamayo & Cajas 2017a; Zhai & Gao, 2018; Safdari & Fathi, 2020; Zarei, Ahour & Seifoori, 2020). In most of the studies, the metalinguistic feedback was tested against the recast technique, and the results openly showed the benefits that the metalinguistic technique could bring to the classroom when dealing with form and accuracy. Another relevant aspect about the metalinguistic technique bore on students' successful uptakes after correction. This is, students in the different studies were given feedback by means of different corrective feedback techniques, but not all the learners repaired their mistakes; but in the case of the metalinguistic technique, it was evident the influence of this strategy on the matter of successful uptakes (Tamayo & Cajas, 2017b). On the other hand, it is important to state that the metalinguistic technique outperformed other feedback techniques in the delayed posttests of the studies (Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006; Naeimi, Saeidi & Behnam, 2018) which according to the authors, it meant that metalinguistic information can be recalled for a long period of time. Likewise, the metalinguistic feedback was beneficial when working with both complex and simple oral tasks (Zhai & Gao, 2018). In other words, the metalinguistic feedback constituted an efficient pedagogical tool with beginners as it offers teacher's support and with advanced learners since it leads to a stance of reflection. In the same manner, the metalinguistic technique appeared to play a positive role in the improvement of pronunciation (Espinoza & Rodríguez, 2016; Naeimi, Saeidi & Behnam, 2018); however, it did not seem to have a major repercussion on fluency (Safdari & Fathi, 2020); nonetheless, further studies on this matter are needed.



Whereas the metalinguistic technique had a considerable effect on grammar, the recast strategy had impact on different linguistic situations. Putting in another way, recast according to the literature review was not employed for specific language reasons but for several. As previously mentioned, when recast was tested against the metalinguistic technique on grammar, the latter normally proved to be the most effective in the classroom. However, recast resulted very useful when talking about immediate uptakes, pronunciation, fluency and even grammar when being contrasted with other techniques except the metalinguistic strategy. That is the reason why recast resulted in being the second most effective type of feedback technique in different circumstances according to Table 3.

Table 3

Effectiveness of Recast in L2 Oral Competence

Study	Participants	Target of the study	Method and Design	Tests	Results
Ansarin & Chehrazad (2015)	54 EFL students from an English school in Iran; 3 groups of 18 learners each.	Grammar	Experimental Group 1 received focused recasts, group 2 unfocused recast, and a control group. Treatment: 6 training sessions of 90 minutes each; activities had to do with storytelling where teachers provided focused recast only aiming at the simple past in group 1; unfocused recast on all grammatical errors in group 2, and no feedback for the control group.	Pretest and Posttest: oral presentations at the beginning, during and at the end of the study.	The focused recast group significantly outperformed the unfocused recast group on oral accuracy and fluency. There was not a significant difference between the unfocused recast group and the group that did not receive treatment.



Naeimi, Saeidi & Behnam (2018)	54 EFL undergraduate students from an Iranian college; 3 groups of 18 learners each.	Pronunciation	Experimental Group 1 received recast, group 2 elicitation and group 3 metalinguistic information. Treatment: 105 minutes of duration; corrections were made on the most 3 common phonological errors. The activities were based on storytelling. Feedback was provided while students were presenting.	Pretest and two posttests: immediate and delayed.	All groups improved from the pretest to the immediate posttest. The recast group received the highest score and outperformed the metalinguistic and elicitation groups when referring to students' immediate uptake. However, the metalinguistic group showed the highest score in the delayed posttest.
Zhai & Gao (2018)	24 EFL undergraduate students from a Chinese college; 6 groups of 4 students each.	Grammar and meaning based on the complexity of an oral task	Experimental Group 1 and group 2 received different types of feedback: recast, repetition, confirmation, clarification request and metalinguistic feedback. Treatment: 1.5 horas of treatment was given. Each group worked on a simple and a complex oral presentation. Each presentation was done individually. After each presentation, students got feedback from their teachers.	Posttest: Final oral presentation.	In the complex and simple tasks, the metalinguistic technique had the greatest impact. However, less than the metalinguistic technique but important to mention, was the positive impact of the clarification request on the oral simple task and the recast strategy on the oral complex task.
Maierdan & Ishizuka (2019)	8 EFL undergraduate students from a Japanese college; 2	Grammar on students' repaired uptakes	Experimental Group A received recast; group B received repetition feedback.	Pretest and Posttest based on the Test of English for International Communication.	Group that received recast feedback performed significantly more repair



groups of 4
students each.

Treatment:
activities focused
on interviews and
oral presentations;
feedback was
provided on
grammar
immediately after
the activity.

uptakes than
the group of
repetition
feedback.

Note. Articles are displayed in chronological order.

Based on the recast principle where the teacher intervenes on students' erroneous utterance by providing the correct answer, it can be claimed that this feedback technique generally produced a high number of students' uptakes particularly in immediate posttests; however, not all the uptakes were necessarily correct. In delayed posttests, recast did not impact the L2 oral competence at all; as a matter of fact, students' uptakes decreased substantially. In this respect, the metalinguistic feedback proved to be the most effective in delayed posttest as mentioned before. In other words, recast worked well with instantaneous responses but was not effective with retention. Likewise, when talking about immediate responses, the repetition, elicitation, and the metalinguistic techniques were outperformed by recast.

In relation to recast and grammar, the type of recast that showed to be efficient in the speaking class was the focused recast while the unfocused recast did not provide any significant help. This means that during an oral activity drawing the attention on something specific is better than correcting all students' errors at once (Ansarin & Chehrazad, 2015). It is worth mentioning that in Ansarin and Chehrazad's study, recast was not tested against any other type of corrective feedback strategy, but recast was subdivided into focused and unfocused recast.

Another relevant aspect about recast is the fact that students expressed their preference on using this strategy since it did not interrupt the flow of the conversation or speech. It was



suggested that recast favored the development of complex oral tasks as students chose to be the least interrupted while presenting their oral assignments (Zhai & Gao, 2018). This aspect becomes relevant especially in classes where the improvement of fluency is the priority.

Aside from the metalinguistic and recast corrective feedback, other types of strategies are worth mentioning since their results have also impacted the learners' speaking skill in the classroom, and they are: prompting (Jafarigohar & Gharbavi, 2014; Alavi, Foo & Amini, 2015), elicitation (Alavi & Amini, 2016), and clarification request (Zhai & Gao, 2018). This information is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Effectiveness of Other Types of Corrective Feedback Techniques in L2 Oral Competence

Study	Participants	Target of the study	Method and Design	Tests	Results
Jafarigohar & Gharbavi (2014)	45 EFL undergraduate students from a language institute from Iran; 3 groups of 15 learners each.	Grammar	Experimental Group 1 received prompting feedback, group 2 recast, and group 3 no treatment. Treatment: 6 sessions; activities were related to picture descriptions as focused tasks where interactional feedback in the form of prompts and recast took place.	Pretest Posttest based on the speaking section of the TOEFL test.	Learners achieved better results in the prompting group. There was not a significant difference between the recast and the control group.
Alavi, Foo & Amini (2015)	40 participants from an ESL Malaysian institution; 4 groups of 10 learners each.	Grammar and error noticing	Experimental Group 1 received recast, group 2 received prompting, group 3 received a mix of recast and prompting, and group 4 played the role of the control group. Treatment: 9 classes of grammar error correction in communicative tasks.	Pretest, Posttest, and Delayed Posttest.	The scores were high for the mixed group. The prompting and the mixed group were able to notice the teacher's corrections meanwhile the recast group reported the less noticing.



			Immediate feedback and reflection of students at the end of the activity were provided.		However, learners preferred recast over prompts.
Alavi & Amini (2016)	38 EFL/ESL college students from Thailand; 3 groups with an average of 13 students each.	Grammar	Experimental Group 1 received elicitation, group 2 received recast, and group 3 did not receive any treatment. Treatment: 9 meetings of 90 minutes each. The activities were based on interactive focused tasks. Students were given feedback on the grammatical point while performing the tasks.	Pretest Posttest based on teacher-student interviews	Two groups that received corrective feedback benefited from the elicitation and recast strategies, and they revealed a considerable improvement in their oral performance. However, the elicitation group outperformed the recast one. The intact group showed highly poor performance.
Zhai & Gao (2018)	24 EFL undergraduate students from a Chinese college; 6 groups of 4 students each.	Grammar and meaning based on the complexity of an oral task	Experimental Both groups 1 and 2 received 5 different types of feedback: recast, repetition, confirmation check, clarification request and metalinguistic feedback. Treatment: 1.5 horas of treatment was given. Each group worked on a simple and a complex oral presentation. Each presentation was done individually. After each presentation, students got feedback from their teachers.	Posttest: Final oral presentation.	In the complex and simple tasks, the metalinguistic technique had the greatest impact. However, less than the metalinguistic technique but important to mention, was the positive impact of the clarification request on the oral simple task and the recast strategy on the oral complex task.

Note. Articles are displayed in chronological order.

In the study carried out by Jafarigohar and Gharbavi (2014) where prompting and recast were tested on their effectiveness, the prompting technique happened to be the most successful. Prompting, for its part, belongs to the explicit feedback group technique and is somewhat similar



to the metalinguistic strategy which mainly leads learners to repair their errors with the help of teachers. Something very much alike occurred in Alavi and Amini (2016) study whose results showed a great impact of the elicitation technique over recast. The elicitation strategy also belongs to the explicit feedback group and principally demands learners to reformulate or expand on their answers. Nevertheless, Alavi, Foo and Amini (2015) concluded that a mixture of recast and prompts was effective when providing feedback and thus suggesting that the most effective feedback practice might not fall specifically on only one technique but on the simultaneous employment of two corrective feedback techniques in the classroom. Likewise, in the study by Zhai and Gao (2018), where many types of corrective feedback were tested, reported that the explicit-type clarification request technique was one of the most successful strategies applied in the class. This type of feedback mainly requires students to clear up their output by means of answering several questions.

On the other hand, another aspect that was noticeable in the literature review bore on the corrective feedback between learners (McGarrell, 2010; Ahangari, Rassekh-Alqol & Hamed, 2013; Vasu, Ling & Nimehchisalem, 2016) whose data in displayed in Table 5. According to the reviewed studies, the peer-feedback strategy at the beginning was skeptically seen by some learners and instructors in view of the fact that teachers were considered the only ones who could provide feedback in the classroom (Vasu, Ling & Nimehchisalem, 2016); however, the results showed that peer feedback could bring significant benefits to the class as long as the process is properly organized and familiarized with students beforehand. In the same manner, it is worth mentioning that this type of feedback has been satisfactorily adapted in the region of the southeast of Asia with intermediate and advanced learners of the tertiary level (Ahangari, Rassekh-Alqol & Hamed, 2013).



Table 5

Effectiveness of Peer-feedback Technique in L2 Oral Competence

Study	Participants	Target of the study	Method and Design	Tests	Results
McGarrell (2010)	54 ESL graduate-level learners from a North American University.	Peer-feedback on a research class	Empirical Study based on questionnaires. Students' essays received feedback from peers by means of assessment guidelines established by the instructors.	Pre and post questionnaires about peer-feedback	Participants' comments revolved primarily around a lack of confidence in their own and their peers' ability to offer useful feedback. Learners were worried about affecting social relationships due to negative criticism about their peers' work. They considered peer-feedback as useful to a certain extent, but they indicated that peers' feedback would not help them improve their L2.
Ahangari, Rassekh-Alqol & Hamed (2013)	52 EFL undergraduate students from an Iranian University; two groups of 26 students each.	Meaning (content)	Empirical Mixed-method Treatment: 28 hours; group 1 received peer and teacher feedback; group 2 received feedback only from teachers. Peer-feedback activities were based on oral presentations and interactions. Students used an evaluation sheet where they included their	Pretest: TOEFL test Posttest: oral presentation Questionnaire about students' perceptions	There was a high correlation between the teacher and peer-feedback suggesting that students can make similar judgements as their teachers do as long as learners are already familiarized with the evaluation and feedback process.



			comments; this process was supported by their teachers. Last weeks of work, students were evaluated only by their peers.		Students mostly approved peer-feedback.
Vasu, Ling & Nimehchisalem (2016)	107 ESL undergraduate students from a private Malaysian university.	Teacher or peer-feedback.	Experimental Cross-sectional study based on surveys and a questionnaire. Treatment: students were given teacher and peer-feedback and their perspectives about both types of feedback were collected.	Surveys (quantitatively) Questionnaires (qualitatively)	Students perceived peer-feedback as highly important, but they still prefer teacher feedback over peer-feedback because learners do not trust their classmates at the moment of assessing the L2.

Note. Articles are displayed in chronological order.

To sum up, based on the number of articles published on the issue in question, recast and metalinguistic have been proved to be the most effective so far. However, the other corrective feedback techniques cannot be disregarded considering the fact that they have also shown positive results in the classroom although research on those techniques is limited.

5.1.2 Second Research Question

What are the reported pedagogical implications of the most significant effective feedback techniques on students' EFL oral competence?

When talking about the effectiveness of recast and metalinguistic feedback, the following pedagogical considerations should be taken into account. Some authors have recommended the use of recast when focusing on meaning (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006) and metalinguistic feedback when focusing on form (Tamayo & Cajas, 2017a). In this respect, recast is a practice that adults do when they teach children their first language, so no linguistic explanations are



necessary and accuracy is not a big deal; corrections come into play when meaning is largely affected, and corrections are very superficial and are considered enough to support acquisition; in other words, the focus is not on form but on meaning. Metalinguistic information, meanwhile, is generally used on foreign or second language learning since students are mostly taught the L2 based on explanations about grammatical rules in order to guarantee accuracy. Therefore, when applying the metalinguistic technique, the interaction between the teacher and learner is based on linguistic information, clues and comments, and it is expected that students will assimilate the language consciously, meaningfully and permanently. In this sense, the process of the L2 oral internalization might start from the most explicit knowledge up to the most implicit type (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006). In other words, students might start learning a second or foreign language consciously, and as they progress in their L2 competence will no longer be in need of any grammar explanations when making errors but just quick and superficial corrections. On the contrary, Espinoza and Rodriguez (2016) based on a different perspective, concluded that what comes first is the implicit corrective feedback and then the explicit correction as L2 students in early stages of learning will not be able to understand any linguistic information, so insightful corrections will not help.

Apart from form and meaning, fluency is another fundamental aspect of oral proficiency. The aid that recast and metalinguistic information cater might be related to the ongoing flow of communication and interaction respectively. In this regard, the focus of both feedback techniques is put on the fact that students get to speak anyway (Ansarin & Chehrazad, 2015); this is, when recasting learners are not considerably interrupted and when providing metalinguistic information, interaction between the teacher and the student occurs.



Another aspect that can be drawn from the literature review about recast and metalinguistic information relates to the reflective thinking that the L2 student adopts. In this matter, both recast and the metalinguistic technique are opposites. Recast, for instance, is related to a more implicit correction where students mainly restate what the teacher said, and as opposed to recast, metalinguistic feedback tends to be more explicit and pushes students to analyze and correct their errors with the support of the teacher (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In other words, when recasting, learners mainly play a passive role while with the metalinguistic strategy, learners are more active individuals in the class (Fu & Nassaji, 2016). Consequently, students become more aware of their own learning process and thus engage in the advancement of their L2 (Astin, & Antonio, 2012).

Concerning the other feedback techniques, namely: prompting, elicitation, and clarification request, it can be claimed that they are quite interactive and supportive (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) which might help learners to develop cognitively. Therefore, prompting, elicitation and clarification request could contribute to a more dynamic and participatory class which may be ideal to develop the speaking skill.

As for peer-feedback, it constitutes a novel way of providing feedback, and the main advantages might be related to the development of learners' metalinguistic awareness and certainly the progress of their speaking ability. Ahangari, Rassekh-Alqol and Hamed (2013) proved that students could learn from one another by means of oral interaction, and at the same time learners showed they were able to experience and understand their own and their classmates' learning process as they could establish reflective judgement on their peers' work. Likewise, Vasu, Ling & Nimehchisalem (2016) perceived that the peer-feedback promoted the transition of the students from non-autonomous to autonomous learners.



Chapter VI

Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

Based on the findings obtained of the literature reviewed, it was learned that one of the most employed corrective feedback in the L2 classroom with regard to the development of the oral competence was the metalinguistic feedback technique whose main characteristics have to do with the following main aspects: teacher support while repairing the error committed, increase of learners' metalinguistic awareness and long-term memory. Likewise, the other corrective feedback technique that has caused pedagogical impact in the L2 oral competence class is the recast strategy which stands out because of its simple, quick and already-provided correction on the part of the instructor and the learner's non-reflective response. These both corrective feedback techniques are totally different as the metalinguistic technique belongs to the explicit corrective feedback category and recast is mostly related to the implicit feedback technique family. Thus, their employment might vary according to the linguistic focus of the class, the type of learners, instrumental purpose of the L2 training course, or the teaching philosophy of the instructor. For instance, if the speaking course is focused on a specific linguistic feature, teachers will tend to use the corrective metalinguistic feedback when teaching grammar and pronunciation whereas recast will be used when working with fluency.

On the other hand, other types of corrective feedback techniques have been mentioned in this study considering that they have also had significant impact on the L2 oral development. Those feedback strategies are prompting, elicitation and the clarification request. It is worth mentioning that all these techniques correspond to the group of the explicit-type corrective



feedback which characterizes by the role that the instructor plays when correcting or fixing an error. The teacher is basically a supportive figure rather than a provider of the correct target form; in other words, the teacher works on encouraging learners to repair their errors by themselves.

Furthermore, a type of feedback which is not commonly used in the classroom but could bring surprising benefits to the L2 oral development is the peer-feedback technique. Regarding this type of corrective feedback, the conclusions of these studies showed that learners do not wish to take a chance on this type of feedback; however, researchers claimed that if students were given the necessary pedagogical resources in this matter and were properly supported by their teachers, the peer-feedback technique would be of a great usefulness for both teachers and learners. For teachers because they will be able to save time when assessing students and could focus more on other learners' necessities, which are many, within their classes. In the same manner, peer-feedback might be of a great benefit for students because they will understand how the teaching and evaluation processes take place in the class and how their own process of learning and that of their classmates take place.

Likewise, the students' perspectives and points of view reported in the literature review should not be disregarded. Most of learners agreed on the usefulness of being corrected, but some of them claimed that they disliked certain corrective feedback strategies since they made them feel uncomfortable and pressured; for example, some learners stated their preference for recast over the metalinguistic technique because recasting put less stress on them as teachers were in charge of repairing the errors. On the other hand, when applying the metalinguistic technique in the class, learners felt that their L2 knowledge was tested, and it triggered feelings of anxiety.



Regarding learners' uptakes, it was concluded that an instructor should be aware of all the complexity that a student's response implies. For example, it is very important to mention that when using the metalinguistic feedback technique, if learners do not react to the stimulus given by the teacher, it should not be taken for granted that they lack of L2 knowledge or that the process of learning failed, but it could be an indicator that students may need more time to process the information. As a matter of fact, according to the results of the studies, the metalinguistic feedback was not significant in regard to the immediate posttests but the recast was, and the other way around, the metalinguistic had a high impact on delayed posttests, but recasts failed with long-term memory. In this regard, when talking about the number of learners' uptakes, it should be mentioned that responses or uptakes on the part of the students when applying corrective feedback were considerable but not all of them were necessarily accurate. Therefore, no relationship was found between students' number of uptakes and learning.

An additional relevant matter to be taken into account is the reason why metalinguistic was recurrent in tertiary level contexts, and it could be posited that higher education level students are prone to think critically rather than assimilating information mechanically, this is, they would not want instructors merely providing answers but supporting their learning efficiently and appropriately so that learners can find responses to their questions by themselves.

6.2 Recommendations

It is suggested that correction in the EFL classroom should not be seen as a forbidden practice as it could benefit learners to a great extent. Natural acquisition may be useful in an ESL context, but in the EFL setting, learners hardly can access the target language when they are out of their classrooms and thus need support and feedback from their instructors in order to avoid permanent fossilization and hence progress in their L2 learning. In this regard, some critics have



disagreed with the correction practice in the classroom arguing that it could affect students' L2 development; however, it is worth mentioning that the types of corrective feedback that are being suggested in this study are totally different from the traditional correction methods whose usual practice used to distress and embarrass learners in front of their peers then affecting students' affective filter and consequently the advance of their L2. Therefore, it is pivotal that teachers are knowledgeable about the way that each corrective feedback works in order to apply correction appropriately. Improvisation when providing corrective feedback should not take place in the L2 class as the correction practice should be systematized, well-organized and discreet.

Consequently, instructors should thoughtfully consider the particularity of each educational situation. For instance, it would not be prudent to apply the same type of corrective feedback with every group of students as each learner will always differ from one another. In this respect, it is advisable to take into account students' opinions regarding the type of feedback that they prefer so that both the instructor's expertise and students' points of view will be considered, and as a result the teaching process will become more participatory.

On the other side, in accordance to the academic articles that were analyzed for this study, the use of the peer-feedback technique is suggested particularly with students with an acceptable level of English.

Finally, it is recommended to do further research on corrective feedback since studies about the metalinguistic technique and recast are plentiful; however, the other types of feedback have not been extensively explored, and as a consequence, corrective feedback resources on speaking at present seems to be limited.



References

- Abrahams, M.J., & Farías, M. (2010). Struggling for change in Chilean EFL teacher education. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 12(2), 110-118. Retrieved from <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/calj/v12n2/v12n2a09.pdf>
- Ahangari, S., Rassekh-Alqol, B., & Hamed, L. (2013). The Effect of Peer Assessment on Oral Presentation in an EFL Context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 2(3), 45-53. doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.3p.45
- Ahmed, S. (2015). Attitudes towards English Language Learning among EFL Learners at UMSKAL. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6 (18), 6-16. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1079681.pdf>
- Alavi, S., Foo, T., & Amini, M. (2015). L2 Learners' Proficiency Development through Noticing Feedback. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 2 (5), 25-41. doi:10.18415/ijmmu.v2i5.24
- Alavi, S., & Amini, M. (2016). Language Trajectory through Corrective Feedback. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 3(4). 7-13. doi:10.18415/ijmmu.v3i4.53
- Ansarin, A. & Chehrazad, M. (2015). Differential effects of focused and unfocused recasts on the EFL learners' oral accuracy. *Colombian Applied Linguistic Journal*, 17(1), 86-97. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.14483/udistrital.jour.calj.2015.1.a06>
- Arter, J., & McTighe, J. (2001). *Scoring rubrics in the classroom: Using performance criteria for assessing and improving student performance*. New York: Corwin Press. Retrieved from



https://books.google.com.ec/books?id=1PAGSvgtDTJEC&printsec=frontcover&hl=es&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

Astin, A. W., & Antonio, A. L. (2012). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Retrieved from

<https://books.google.com.ec/books?id=jEsRVTbukyMC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

Bacquet, G. (2019). Is Corrective Feedback in the ESL Classroom really Effective? A

Background Study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 8(3), 147-154. doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.8n.3p.147

Bhela, B. (1999). Native language interference in learning a second language: Exploratory case studies of native language interference with target language usage. *International Education Journal*, 1 (1), 22-31. Retrieved from

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.133.6401&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Davutoglu, E. (2011) A Study on Errors in the Second Language Acquisition. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2 (11), 220-224. Retrieved from

http://www.ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol._2_No._11_%5BSpecial_Issue-June_2011%5D/31.pdf

Declerck, G. (2015). How we remember what we can do. *Socioaffective, Neuroscience & Psychology*, 5(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.3402/snp.v5.24807>

DiRanna, K., Osmundson, K., Topps, J., Barakos, L., Gearhart, M., Cerwin, K., ... Strang, C. (2008). *Assessment – centered teaching: A reflective practice*. California: Crown Press.



Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.ec/books?id=2iSF->

[Je840gC&printsec=frontcover&hl=es&source=gsbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com.ec/books?id=2iSF-Je840gC&printsec=frontcover&hl=es&source=gsbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false)

Education First (2020). *The biggest ranking on English proficiency*. Retrieved from

<https://www.ef.com.ec/epi/>

Ellis, R. (1994). A theory of structured second language acquisition. In N. C. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages* (pp. 1-31). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Retrieved from

[https://books.google.com.ec/books?hl=en&lr=&id=3KglbyrZ5sC&oi=fnd&pg=PP7&dq=Ellis,+R.+\(1994\).+A+theory+of+structured+second+language+acquisition&ots=wFWkqk7AuZ&sig=f8QMyB1pWo4qbNmM7-](https://books.google.com.ec/books?hl=en&lr=&id=3KglbyrZ5sC&oi=fnd&pg=PP7&dq=Ellis,+R.+(1994).+A+theory+of+structured+second+language+acquisition&ots=wFWkqk7AuZ&sig=f8QMyB1pWo4qbNmM7-LVTs5kjF4#v=onepage&q=Ellis%2C%20R.%20(1994).%20A%20theory%20of%20structured%20second%20language%20acquisition&f=false)

[LVTs5kjF4#v=onepage&q=Ellis%2C%20R.%20\(1994\).%20A%20theory%20of%20structured%20second%20language%20acquisition&f=false](https://books.google.com.ec/books?hl=en&lr=&id=3KglbyrZ5sC&oi=fnd&pg=PP7&dq=Ellis,+R.+(1994).+A+theory+of+structured+second+language+acquisition&ots=wFWkqk7AuZ&sig=f8QMyB1pWo4qbNmM7-LVTs5kjF4#v=onepage&q=Ellis%2C%20R.%20(1994).%20A%20theory%20of%20structured%20second%20language%20acquisition&f=false)

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar. *SSLA*, 28, 339-368.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060141>

Espinoza, L., & Rodríguez, J. (2016). Corrective Feedback in Conversation Courses at CEIC, Alajuela Site. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, 24, 295-316. Retrieved from

<https://revistas.ucr.ac.cr/index.php/rlm/article/view/24666>

Fauziati, E. (2011) Interlanguage and Error Fossilization: A study of Indonesian Students

Learning English as a Foreign Language. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1

(1), 25-40. Retrieved from



https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276389245_DYNAMICITY_OF_INTERLANGUAGE_ERRORS_A_CASE_STUDY_OF_INDONESIAN_STUDENTS_LEARNING_ENGLISH_AS_A_FOREIGN_LANGUAGE/fulltext/55a7632d08aeb4e8e646e909/DYNAMICITY-OF-INTERLANGUAGE-ERRORS-A-CASE-STUDY-OF-INDONESIAN-STUDENTS-LEARNING-ENGLISH-AS-A-FOREIGN-LANGUAGE.pdf

Fu, T., & Nassaji, H. (2016). Corrective Feedback, Learner Uptake, and Feedback Perception in a Chinese as a Foreign Language Classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 159-181. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.1.8>

Gefen, R. (1979). The analysis of pupils' errors. *English Teachers' Journal*, 22, 16-24.

Gregg, K. (1984). Krashen's monitor and Occam's razor. *Applied Linguistics* 5 (2), 79-100. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/5.2.79>

Han, Z-H., & Selinker, L. (2005). Fossilization in L2 learners. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 455-470). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292353759_Han_Z-H_Selinker_L_2005_Fossilization_in_L2_learners_In_E_Hinkel_Ed_Handbook_of_Research_in_Second_Language_Teaching_and_Learning_pp_455-70_Mahwah_NJ_Lawrence_Erlbaum

Huang, L., Kubelec, S., Keng, N., & Hsu, L. (2018). Evaluating CEFR rater performance through the analysis of spoken learner corpora. *Language Testing in Asia*, 8(14), 1-17. doi: 10.1186/s40468-018-0069-0



Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511732980>

Jafarigohar, M., & Gharbavi, A. (2014). Recast or Prompt: Which one does the trick? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 695-703.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.470>

Kazemi, N., & Tavassoli, K. (2019). The Comparative Effect of Dynamic vs. Diagnostic Assessment on EFL Learners' Speaking ability. *Research in English Language Pedagogy*, 8(2), 223-241. doi:10.30486/RELP.2019.1878561.1155

Kingen, S. (2000). *Teaching Language Arts in Middle Schools.: Connecting and Communicating*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK:

Pergamon. Retrieved from

<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.463.8762&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

f

Krashen, S. (1983). *Natural Approach*. New York: Pergamon. Retrieved from

<http://www.library.brawnblog.com/Natural%20Approach.pdf>

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon. doi:10.5785/1-2-506

Lenneberg, E. (1967). *Biological foundations of language*. New York: Wiley.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2013). *How Languages are Learned*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from



[https://books.google.com.ec/books?hl=en&lr=&id=7GUzEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT10&dq=Lightbown,+P.,+%26+Spada,+N.+\(2013\).+How+Languages+are+Learned&ots=dHR2kRvuRS&sig=iqN3RNMtr2YxRT8JB Yr82xIktQg#v=onepage&q=Lightbown%2C%20P.%2C%20%26%20Spada%2C%20N.%20\(2013\).%20How%20Languages%20are%20Learned&f=false](https://books.google.com.ec/books?hl=en&lr=&id=7GUzEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT10&dq=Lightbown,+P.,+%26+Spada,+N.+(2013).+How+Languages+are+Learned&ots=dHR2kRvuRS&sig=iqN3RNMtr2YxRT8JB Yr82xIktQg#v=onepage&q=Lightbown%2C%20P.%2C%20%26%20Spada%2C%20N.%20(2013).%20How%20Languages%20are%20Learned&f=false)

Luoma, S. (2003). *Assessing Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://assets.cambridge.org/052180/0528/sample/0521800528ws.pdf>

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37-66.
doi:10.1017/S0272263197001034

Maierdan, F., & Ishizuka, H. (2019). Effects of Grammatically Corrective Feedback on Learner Uptake. *Journal of Hokkaido University of Education, 70*(1), 57-67. <http://s-ir.sap.hokkyodai.ac.jp/dspace/handle/123456789/10527>

McGarrell, H. (2010). Native and non-native English speaking student teachers engage in peer feedback. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13*(1), 71–90. Retrieved from <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19930>

Naeimi, A., Saeidi, M., & Behnam, B. (2018). Immediate Uptake of Phonological Corrective Feedback in Language Learning and Retention. *Education Research International, 2018*, 1-11. doi.org/10.1155/2018/2579421

Nazara, S. (2011). Students' Perception on EFL Speaking Skill Development. *Journal of English Teaching, 1*(1), 28-43. doi:10.33541/jet.v1i1.50



Nemser, W. (1971). Approximative systems of foreign language learners. *IRAL*, 9, 115-123.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1971.9.2.115>

Nitko, A. (2001). *Educational assessment of students*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234641990_Educational_Assessment_of_Students_Third_Edition

Ortega, M. (2014). Assessing trainees' oral performance in a Chilean teacher training program:

A corpus-based study. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 16(1), 10-16.

<https://doi.org/10.14483/udistrital.jour.calj.2014.1.a01>

Ounis, A. (2017). The Assessment of Speaking Skills at the Tertiary Level. *International Journal*

of English Linguistics, 7(4), 95-112. doi:10.5539/ijel.v7n4p95

Peñuela, D. (2018). Using Metacognitive Strategies to Raise Awareness of Stress and Intonation

in EFL. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 20(1), 91-104.

<https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.12383>

Ranta, L., & Lyster, R. (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral

language abilities: The awareness–practice–feedback sequence. In R.DeKeyser (Ed.),

Practicing for second language use: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive

psychology (pp. 141–160). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved

from [https://books.google.com.ec/books?hl=en&lr=&id=-L6j8jR-](https://books.google.com.ec/books?hl=en&lr=&id=-L6j8jR-jAC&oi=fnd&pg=PA141&dq=Ranta,+L.,+%26+Lyster,+R.+(2007).+A+cognitive+approach+to+improving+immersion+students%E2%80%99+oral+language+abilities:&ots=JY3d7NcXPN&sig=vEarp9ZnKjuTuAdDdJe1LO4NTTI#v=onepage&q&f=false)

[jAC&oi=fnd&pg=PA141&dq=Ranta,+L.,+%26+Lyster,+R.+\(2007\).+A+cognitive+approach+to+improving+immersion+students%E2%80%99+oral+language+abilities:&ots=JY](https://books.google.com.ec/books?hl=en&lr=&id=-L6j8jR-jAC&oi=fnd&pg=PA141&dq=Ranta,+L.,+%26+Lyster,+R.+(2007).+A+cognitive+approach+to+improving+immersion+students%E2%80%99+oral+language+abilities:&ots=JY3d7NcXPN&sig=vEarp9ZnKjuTuAdDdJe1LO4NTTI#v=onepage&q&f=false)

[3d7NcXPN&sig=vEarp9ZnKjuTuAdDdJe1LO4NTTI#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com.ec/books?hl=en&lr=&id=-L6j8jR-jAC&oi=fnd&pg=PA141&dq=Ranta,+L.,+%26+Lyster,+R.+(2007).+A+cognitive+approach+to+improving+immersion+students%E2%80%99+oral+language+abilities:&ots=JY3d7NcXPN&sig=vEarp9ZnKjuTuAdDdJe1LO4NTTI#v=onepage&q&f=false)

[3d7NcXPN&sig=vEarp9ZnKjuTuAdDdJe1LO4NTTI#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com.ec/books?hl=en&lr=&id=-L6j8jR-jAC&oi=fnd&pg=PA141&dq=Ranta,+L.,+%26+Lyster,+R.+(2007).+A+cognitive+approach+to+improving+immersion+students%E2%80%99+oral+language+abilities:&ots=JY3d7NcXPN&sig=vEarp9ZnKjuTuAdDdJe1LO4NTTI#v=onepage&q&f=false)



- Research Methods. (2017). In M. Allen (Ed.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods* (1st ed.). doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411>
- 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), 1-19. doi:10.1080/2331186X.2020.1818924
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage, *IRAL*, 10(2), 209-231. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>
- Susiati, S. (2017). Examining a Speaking Syllabus at Tertiary Level. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, 18(2), 77-87. doi.org/10.23917/humaniora.v18i2.5193
- Tamayo, M., & Cajas, D. (2017a). EFL teachers' corrective feedback and its effect on learners' error repair in speaking. *AXIOMA*, 16, 96-104. Retrieved from <http://axioma.pucesi.edu.ec/index.php/axioma/article/view/487>
- Tamayo, M., & Cajas, D. (2017b). Strategies of Metalinguistic and Recast Feedback during Oral Interactions. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 19(2), 165-176. doi.org/10.14483/22487085.11315
- Touchie, H. (1986). Second language learning errors: their types, causes, and treatment. *JALT Journal*, 8(1), 75-80. Retrieved from https://jalt-publications.org/sites/default/files/pdf-article/art5_8.pdf



- Vasu, K., Ling, C., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2016). Malaysian tertiary level ESL Students' Perceptions toward Teacher Feedback, Peer Feedback and Self-assessment in their Writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 5 (5), 158-170. doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.5p.158
- 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), 1-17. doi:10.1080/2331186X.2020.1727130
- Zhai, K., & Gao, X. (2018). Effects of corrective feedback on EFL speaking task complexity in China's university classroom. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), 1-13. doi:10.1080/2331186X.2018.1485472