# Libyan EFL learners' attitudes towards oral interactional corrective feedback

Najat Milad, ELT, Cyprus International University, North Cyprus, najatsharaf@yahoo.com

Behbood Mohammadzadeh, ELT, Cyprus International University, North Cyprus, behbudm@ciu.edu.tr

## Recommended Citations:

# Libyan EFL learners' attitudes towards oral interactional corrective feedback

Najat Milad[1]
Behbood Mohammadzadeh[2]

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) is essential because it supports learners to learn distinct forms of the target language correctly. Thus, the present research aimed to examine Libyan English students' attitudes towards oral interactional corrective feedback techniques and compare male and female learners' perceptions. The study took place in the English department at Sirte University, and it was based on completing a 36-item questionnaire by 97 EFL students. The learners' perceptions were investigated further by conducting semi-structured interviews with eight students, including six open-ended questions. The gathered data was examined quantitatively and qualitatively. SPSS was utilized to interpret the quantitative facts, and the means of inductive content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative ones. The outcomes confirmed that students favored teacher feedback, self-correction, and students' responsibility for correction. Furthermore, the preferable kinds of OCF among learners were elicitation and repetition. Moreover, they liked to be corrected immediately as well as at the end of a conversation. The findings also revealed that there was no statistically significant difference among their attitudes in terms of gender.

Error is a natural part of learning, and it is claimed that making errors is useful and helpful for students, researchers, as well as teachers (Richard, 1974). Besides, feedback is divided into two categories, oral and written corrective feedback. It can be determined as "information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of ones' performance or understanding" (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p.81). Thus, the feedback techniques provided in classrooms to correct the learners' errors are beneficial, natural, and powerful for the learning process. Furthermore, several scholars have positive

[1] ELT, Cyprus International University, North Cyprus, najatsharaf@yahoo.com
[2] ELT, Cyprus International University, North Cyprus, behbudm@ciu.edu.tr

support in terms of OCF as Lightbown, Spada, and Schmidt argue that this technique motivates students to correctly learn different target language forms (Lightbown & Spada, 1999; Schmidt, 1990). Whereas other researchers do not support this strategy, as Krashen and Truscott, who claim that OCF does not have any beneficial role in classrooms, it breaks the flow of learners' communication (Krashen, 1981; Truscott, 1996).

*1.1. Theoretical Background*

There are distinct factors that support and enable learners to learn a foreign language (FL). One of the essential factors is the provision of OCF to students to modify their oral errors. Some researchers had different opinions about these techniques over the decades, such as Corder, who proposes that these techniques are not appropriate because they do not let students test different language theories (Corder, 1967). Furthermore, Chastain proposes that students are pushed to freely utilize the foreign language in classrooms without being corrected regularly by their teachers, who create a pleasant atmosphere for helping learners feel comfortable while producing the target language (Chastain, 1971). Those changes had a powerful impact on methodological suggestions for the classroom. At the end of the 1970s, different authors tried to improve the effectiveness of CF techniques as recasts and prompt students' uptake. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, some researchers as Corder, Nemser, and Selinker claim that students' errors while learning L2 are not committed randomly, but they are proof of their learning (Corder, 1975; Nemser, 1971; Selinker, 1972). Besides, Hendrickson suggests five questions regarding CF: when should students' errors be corrected? Which errors should be corrected? Should students' errors be corrected?  How should errors be corrected? Who should correct their errors? (Hendrickson, 1978).

Herron also suggests that errors are an essential source of students' linguistic improvement; teachers can help their learners communicate meaningfully in the L2 context and reduce their self-esteem by utilizing the CLT (Herron, 1981). Since the beginning of the 1990s, Schulz argues that there are some followers to the communicative approaches, who think that errors of L2 students are a productive factor of the cognitive procedure (Schulz, 1996).

Eventually, it is essential to define the error item. For instance, Corder suggests that errors are considered a lack of learner's mastery of the correct grammatical form, leading to the variation in his/her language (Corder,1967). This survey will focus on errors and how they can be corrected by utilizing different types of OCF techniques. Furthermore, oral corrective feedback (OCF) is divided into the following six types: explicit vs. implicit feedback, recasts, clarification requests, meta-linguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

There were some dissertations, which had a focus on OCF in the literature of second language learning. For instance, Zhang and Rahimi (2014) conducted a study investigating distinctions in the beliefs of high-anxiety and low-anxiety students regarding OCF. Participants included 160 Persian EFL students from three language institutes in Iran, between 18 and 23 years old. Corrective Feedback Belief Scale (CBFS) and Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale were employed for data collection. The findings indicated that students in low- and high- groups supported CF. They preferred receiving it immediately when they were made aware of the importance, aim, and CF types like Ellis' suggestion (2009). However, the learners suggested that not all errors should be corrected, but only the ones, which caused misunderstanding in sending meaning and corrector's choice; they preferred the teacher correction.

In conclusion, the volunteers had the same attitudes towards CF beliefs. The authors implicated that more research is needed about the young EFL students' awareness effectiveness of the importance, purpose, CF types on their anxiety level and their beliefs about CF.  It also revealed how specific changes affect EFL students' anxiety while learning L2 by utilizing different instruments.

Almuhimedi and Alshumaimeri (2015) conducted a study to examine the grammatical error correction effectiveness on EFL learners and their attitudes regarding CF in grammar. Participants included 304 Saudi Arabian female students from secondary school in Riyadh. The data was collected using a five-point Likert scale questionnaire. It was analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. The findings pointed out that rectifying the grammatical mistakes helped the students remember the correct answers; the students favored the immediate grammatical feedback and the coded correction of their errors. However, the Arabic language's excessive usage and expending much time for correcting the errors were serious obstacles.

The conclusion showed that making a balance between learners' errors and a suitable error correction could achieve teachers' effectiveness. The implications revealed that more surveys should examine other Saudi EFL learners' perspectives on active error correction in writing, speaking, reading, or vocabulary.

Calsiyao (2015) carried out a survey on OCF with Filipino students in Kalinga-Apayao State College (KASC), Tabuk City, Kalinga, to investigate their preferences regarding OCF. Participants involved 365 learners, and data collected by using a questionnaire and informal interviews. The findings proposed that KASC learners favored receiving feedback for all their oral mistakes; mainly, they favored self-correction, teacher correction, and peer correction. They favored their grammatical errors to be corrected regularly. However, the others to be corrected frequently, and the instructors' most OCF techniques were the explanation for phonological errors, recast, and direct feedback for grammatical mistakes.

The author concluded that volunteers had a negative attitude regarding their teachers' correction tolerance. However, the recent language acquisition and teaching methodology theory prevented the feedback of all errors. Besides, they preferred to self-correct, and the teacher- or peer- correction to be in the middle of the conversation. Finally, there was a discrepancy in the learners' responses regarding the method-providing hint.

*1.2. Research Questions*

This study intends to explore answers to the following research questions:
1. What are Libyan EFL learners' perceptions of different oral interactional corrective feedback techniques regarding their oral errors?
2. Is there any significant difference between Libyan EFL students' attitudes towards oral interactional corrective feedback techniques in terms of gender?

*1.3. Purpose of the Study*

This descriptive study examines Libyan EFL learners' perceptions and views on the oral interactional corrective feedback techniques and aims to find out their attitudes in terms of gender.

*1.4. Significance of the Study*

This study's outcomes might support and complete some existing research about error correction and learner feedback, as there are few studies in Libyan EFL contexts. Furthermore, we hope these results will be a useful contribution to the researchers who want to carry out other research in this domain to resolve any remaining doubts about the essentials of OCF.

**2. Method**

A five-point Likert-type scale questionnaire and interview questions were used to clarify the learners' perceptions of oral interactional corrective feedback techniques.

### 2.1. Setting and Participants

The survey volunteers were 97 learners who participated in completing the questionnaire, and eight students (4 males and four females) were interviewed in-person via Skype to answer the interview questions. Both of the samples were from the same setting, the English department at Sirte University.

### 2.1.1. Sample / Participants

Table 1
Statistic Features of Students

| Statistic features of students (n=97) | | F |
|---|---|---|
| Sex | Male | 37 |
| | Female | 60 |
| Native Language | Arabic | 95 |
| | Amazeghie | 2 |
| How long have they Been studying English? | 1-2 years | 30 |
| | 3-5 years | 26 |
| | >5 years | 41 |

The survey volunteers were 97 students who opted from the first, second, third, and fourth levels in the department (37 boys and 60 girls) whose ages ranged between 18 to 22 years old. Besides, all learners were Libyan, and their native languages varied, Arabic and Amazeghian languages, and at least one year of experience in studying English.

### 2.1.2. Participants Selection Process

The researcher adopted the Convenience Sampling method by selecting 25 students from each level. They were encouraged by their teachers, and an extra mark was devoted to those who have participated enthusiastically and completely in answering the questionnaire. Eventually, the researcher administered the questionnaires to the volunteers by papers and gave them time to take the forms home for answering them very carefully, then bringing them back. Although many cautions were mentioned to the participants, few did not take the task seriously; thus, the uncompleted forms were excluded while analyzing data to become 97 questionnaires instead of 100.

Three weeks later, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews, including six open-ended questions with eight learners from the same sample via Skype because they were busy for final exams autumn 2018-2019.

### 2.2. Data Collection Instruments

A questionnaire was first designed and employed in research for comparing students' and instructors' attitudes towards oral interactional feedback (Kaivanpanah et al., 2015), which was adopted in this survey for learners. It was also utilized in another study comparing teachers' and learners' attitudes regarding corrective feedback in oral communication (Hassan, 2017). As well, this survey conducted semi-structured interviews with the participants, which included six questions, developed and used first by

(Hassan, 2017) in order to obtain more specific information about his volunteers' preferences for CF. Furthermore, before adopting both of the hints, the researcher got permission from Hassan's supervisor.

*2.2.1 Questionnaire for Learners*

The researcher used a two-part questionnaire to investigate the Libyan EFL learners' attitudes towards oral interactional corrective feedback and differences among them in terms of gender. Thus, they were requested to give statistical data like sex, native language, and years of English study in the first part of the form. However, in the second part, they were requested for determining their favor of many kinds of OCF techniques involving 36 items, and using a five-point Likert Scale, which ranged from "totally disagree," "disagree," "agree to some extent," "agree," or "totally agree." Appendix A presents the full English version of the questionnaire.

Table 2 illustrates the constructs addressed by the 36 different items comprising the questionnaire. Items 1, 5, 6, 12, 17, 18, 19, 22, 28, and 31 concentrated on students' replies regarding peer-assessment and on which specific components of the language they liked to receive it. Other items examined the instructor feedback preferences; 2, 7, 8, 10, 26, 30, 34, 35, and 36. Also, some items recognized students' preferences for different kinds of feedback; 3,4,9,13,14,15,16,20,21,23,25,29, and items 11, 24, and 32, focused on the volunteers' see for instant and after long time feedback, but item 27 related to their attitudes regarding the self-correction. The last item, 33, identified learners' responsibility for correction.

Table 2
Constructs and Items Analysis of the Questionnaire

| Constructs | Item addressing the construct |
|---|---|
| Perceptions of peer feedback | 1, 5, 6, 12, 17, 18, 19, 22, 28, 31 |
| Perceptions of teacher feedback | 2, 7, 8, 10, 26, 30, 34, 35, 36 |
| Perceptions of distinct kinds of feedback | 3,4,9,13,14,15,16,20,21,23,25,29 |
| Immediate or delayed feedback | 11, 24, 32 |
| Perceptions of self-assessment | 27 |
| Learners' liability for feedback | 33 |

(Source: Hassan, 2017)

*2.2.2. Reliability of the Questionnaire*

The researcher utilized a Pilot Study with 110 learners from the department for identifying the reliability of the questionnaire, after obtaining permission from the head of the department in November 2018. This study means "A small-scale trial run of all the procedures planned for use in the main study" (Monette, Sullivan, & Dejong, 2002, p.9). As a result, it was confirmed that respondents found the items clear, understandable, and confidential, which determined that the questionnaire was trustworthy and reliable, with a Cronbach's value of .84, which is shown in table 3. Finally, the questionnaire was administered to 100 students, and then the uncompleted forms were separated and removed to be only 97 learners' questionnaires utilized for the statistical analysis.

Table 3
Get Cronbach's Alpha

| Reliability | Statistics |
|---|---|
| Cronbach's Alpha | No. of items |
| .842 | 36 |

*2.2.3. Interviews*

After conducting and completing the questionnaire with several students, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with eight English department learners to gain more information about their attitudes toward OCF types. It also discusses their teachers' preferences, peer, immediate and delayed feedback, self-correction, and learners' responsibility for correction. Specifically, the interviews involved six open-ended questions for learners. According to the developer of those questions (Hassan, 2017), two EFL teachers had PhDs scanned the interviews before starting the analysis. Then it was decided that they were trustworthy and valid. For the reason that they had measured what was planned as well as the same results might be acquired by carrying out the same interviews two times with distinct persons. After that, they were conducted with the volunteers.

*2.2.3.1. Open-ended interview questions*

1. What do you think of teacher correction? Do you find it beneficial regarding
2. vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation?
3. What do you think of peer correction? Do you find it beneficial regarding
4. vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation?
5. How do you want to be corrected?
6. When do you prefer to be corrected? (Immediately or at the end of conversation)
7. What do you think of self-correction? Do you prefer your teacher to point out the
8. errors and prompt you for self-correction?
9. What do you think of your responsibility for correction as a learner? Do you think
10. that everyone is responsible for correcting his/her errors?

*2.3. Data Collection Procedures*

To gather data from the volunteers, the researcher first obtained a license from the head of the English department and the instructors responsible for each classroom at the end of November 2018. Then, the learners were given information about the content and the purpose of the study, and the questionnaire was explained to them to be clear and respond efficiently.

The researcher utilized the Convenience Sampling method by selecting 25 students from each level. They were encouraged by their teachers, and an extra mark was devoted to those who have participated enthusiastically and completely in answering the questionnaire. Eventually, the researcher administered the questionnaires to the volunteers by papers and gave them time to take the forms home for answering them very carefully, then bringing them back. Although many cautions were mentioned to the participants, few did not take the task seriously; thus, the uncompleted forms were excluded while analyzing data to become 97 questionnaires instead of 100.

Three weeks later, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews, including six open-ended questions with eight learners via Skype, because they were busy for final exams autumn 2018-2019.

*2.4. Data Analysis*

The quantitative and qualitative methods were adopted in this study to know the volunteers' attitudes regarding oral interactional CF. Accordingly, "in quantitative research, there is an attempt to determine relationships between and within variables" (Mackey and Gass, 2011, p.137). In the same path, Nunan confirms that a quantitative approach is conspicuous and controlled, generalizable, results-oriented,

impartial. It is referring that there is a fact that can be independent and external from the researcher. Whereas in the qualitative approach, all information is correlative, it has an emotional component to all research, and that uncommon surveys are reasonable (Nunan, 1992).

The researcher used one questionnaire and semi-structured interviews with learners to gather data. The former instrument was carried out to generate quantitative data, but the latter was conducted to generate qualitative data. Data gathered from the questionnaire were analyzed using Statistic Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. The researcher analyzed that data regarding frequency and percentage for recognizing the students' attitudes regarding OCF techniques. This survey included a research question; if any statistically significant discrepancy was found between students' attitudes regarding OCF based on gender, the T-Test was used to analyze data regarding the Mean, Standard Deviation, and P-value. The gathered data from the interviews were interpreted using inductive content analysis to get specific and further details about students' attitudes regarding OCF.

## 3. Results

*3.1. What are Libyan EFL learners' perceptions of different oral interactional corrective feedback techniques concerning their oral errors?*

SPSS is utilized to analyze the data collected by the questionnaire, including a five-point Likert Scale from "totally disagree" to "totally agree." To determine the frequencies and percentages of the students' attitudes towards OCF techniques, teacher assessment, various kinds of feedback, instant or after long time feedback, and the students' liability for feedback was used.

Table 4
Students' Attitudes towards Teacher Feedback

|  | Totally Disagree | | Disagree | | Agree to Some Extent | | Agree | | Totally Agree | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Item 1 | 9 | 9.3 | 19 | 19.6 | 16 | 16.5 | 41 | 42.3 | 12 | 12.4 |
| Item 2 | 13 | 13.4 | 27 | 27.8 | 11 | 11.3 | 31 | 32.0 | 15 | 15.5 |
| Item 3 | 10 | 10.3 | 24 | 24.7 | 12 | 12.4 | 35 | 36.1 | 16 | 16.5 |
| Item 4 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7.2 | 17 | 17.5 | 38 | 39.2 | 35 | 36.1 |
| Item 5 | 16 | 16.5 | 27 | 27.8 | 21 | 21.6 | 22 | 22.7 | 11 | 11.3 |
| Item 6 | 12 | 12.4 | 20 | 20.6 | 19 | 19.6 | 27 | 27.8 | 19 | 19.6 |
| Item 7 | 14 | 14.4 | 20 | 20.6 | 18 | 18.6 | 27 | 27.8 | 18 | 18.6 |
| Item 8 | 4 | 4.1 | 10 | 10.3 | 20 | 20.6 | 30 | 30.9 | 33 | 34.0 |
| Item 9 | 15 | 15.5 | 22 | 22.7 | 18 | 18.6 | 22 | 22.7 | 20 | 20.6 |

Concerning students' evaluation of teacher feedback, there is a general agreement. The learners choose the score of agree with 42.3% for the 1st item, 32.05 for the 2nd item, 36.1% for the 3rd item, 39.2% for the 4th item, 27.8% for the 6th item, 27.8% for the 7th item, and 22.7% of them agree as well as disagree with the 9th item. 34.0% of students strongly agree with the 8th item, but 27.8% disagree with the 5th item.

Table 5
Students' Attitudes towards Peer Feedback

|  | Totally Disagree | | Disagree | | Agree to Some Extent | | Agree | | Totally Agree | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Item 1 | 9 | 9.3 | 16 | 16.5 | 19 | 19.6 | 32 | 33 | 21 | 21.6 |
| Item 2 | 13 | 13.4 | 20 | 20.6 | 21 | 21.6 | 31 | 32 | 12 | 12.4 |
| Item 3 | 11 | 11.3 | 17 | 17.5 | 18 | 18.6 | 32 | 33 | 19 | 19.6 |
| Item 4 | 14 | 14.4 | 22 | 22.7 | 24 | 24.7 | 28 | 28.9 | 9 | 9.3 |
| Item 5 | 7 | 7.2 | 15 | 15.5 | 31 | 32 | 29 | 29.9 | 15 | 15.5 |
| Item 6 | 5 | 5.2 | 25 | 25.8 | 27 | 27.8 | 26 | 26.8 | 14 | 14.4 |
| Item 7 | 13 | 13.4 | 26 | 26.8 | 28 | 28.9 | 18 | 18.6 | 12 | 12.4 |
| Item 8 | 9 | 9.3 | 10 | 10.3 | 21 | 21.6 | 35 | 36.1 | 22 | 22.7 |
| Item 9 | 20 | 20.6 | 34 | 35.1 | 21 | 21.6 | 18 | 18.6 | 4 | 4.1 |
| Item10 | 7 | 7.2 | 20 | 20.6 | 25 | 25.8 | 36 | 37.1 | 9 | 9.3 |

As seen in the previous table, the findings indicate that students generally support peer feedback. 33% of learners agree with the first item, 32% agree with the second item, 33% with the third item, 28.9% with the fourth item, 36.1% with the eighth item, and 37.1% with the tenth item. They agree to some extent regarding the 5th item 32%, the 6th item 27.8%, and the 7th item 28.9%. Moreover, 35.1% disagree with the 9th item.

Table 6
Students' Attitudes towards Different Types of Feedback

|  | Totally Disagree | | Disagree | | Agree to Some Extent | | Agree | | Totally Agree | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Item 1 | 7 | 7.2 | 12 | 12.4 | 16 | 16.5 | 41 | 42.3 | 21 | 21.6 |
| Item 2 | 11 | 11.3 | 10 | 10.3 | 17 | 17.5 | 38 | 39.2 | 21 | 21.6 |
| Item 3 | 9 | 9.3 | 9 | 9.3 | 19 | 19.6 | 34 | 35.1 | 26 | 26.8 |
| Item 4 | 12 | 12.4 | 15 | 15.5 | 22 | 22.7 | 37 | 38.1 | 10 | 10.3 |
| Item 5 | 7 | 7.2 | 14 | 14.4 | 26 | 26.8 | 35 | 36.1 | 14 | 14.4 |
| Item 6 | 7 | 7.2 | 16 | 16.5 | 19 | 19.6 | 37 | 38.1 | 18 | 18.6 |
| Item 7 | 9 | 9.3 | 17 | 17.5 | 19 | 19.6 | 35 | 36.1 | 17 | 17.5 |
| Item 8 | 8 | 8.2 | 13 | 13.4 | 30 | 30.9 | 31 | 32.0 | 15 | 15.5 |
| Item 9 | 9 | 9.3 | 6 | 6.2 | 22 | 22.7 | 39 | 40.2 | 21 | 21.6 |
| Item10 | 6 | 6.2 | 19 | 19.6 | 25 | 25.8 | 36 | 37.1 | 11 | 11.3 |
| Item11 | 9 | 9.3 | 16 | 16.5 | 26 | 26.8 | 30 | 30.9 | 16 | 16.5 |
| Item12 | 14 | 14.4 | 14 | 14.4 | 30 | 30.9 | 25 | 25.8 | 14 | 14.4 |

As mentioned above, the findings show that volunteers have positive perceptions of different types of feedback in OCF. The learners choose the score of agree with 42.3% for the first item, 39.2% for 2nd item, 35.1% for 3rd item, 38.1% for 4th item, 36.1% for 5th item, 38.1% for 6th item, 36.1% for 7th item, 32% for 8th item, 40.2% for 9th item, 37.1% for 10th item, 30.9% for 11th item. Moreover, 30.9% of learners agree to some extent for the 12th item.

Table 7
Students' Attitudes towards Immediate and Delayed Feedback

|  | Totally Disagree | | Disagree | | Agree to Some Extent | | Agree | | Totally Agree | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Item1 | 9 | 9.3 | 8 | 8.2 | 17 | 17.5 | 39 | 40.2 | 24 | 24.7 |
| Item 2 | 7 | 7.2 | 12 | 12.4 | 19 | 19.6 | 33 | 34.0 | 26 | 26.8 |
| Item 3 | 5 | 5.2 | 8 | 8.2 | 23 | 23.7 | 37 | 38.1 | 24 | 24.7 |

Concerning whether an oral correction should be instant or at the end of the speech, the outcomes show that general approval between the students. The volunteers correspond with all items in terms of the immediate and delayed feedback; 40.2% with 1st item, 34% with 2nd item, and 38.1% with 3rd item.

Table 8
Students' Attitudes towards Self-correction

|  | Totally Disagree | | Disagree | | Agree to Some Extent | | Agree | | Totally Agree | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Item 1 | 5 | 5.2 | 11 | 11.3 | 33 | 34.0 | 36 | 37.1 | 12 | 12.4 |

In respect of students' evaluation of self-correction, most agree. The findings' analysis shows that 37.1% of the volunteers agree with the item in terms of self-correction.

Table 9
Students' Attitudes towards Learners' Responsibility for Correction

|  | Totally Disagree | | Disagree | | Agree to Some Extent | | Agree | | Totally Agree | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Item 1 | 8 | 8.2 | 12 | 12.4 | 9 | 9.3 | 30 | 30.9 | 38 | 39.2 |

Furthermore, the outcomes point out that there is a strong general agreement. 39.2% of learners strongly agree with the item concerning the students' preferences for learners' responsibility for correction.

*3.2. Is there any significant difference between Libyan EFL students' attitudes towards oral interactional corrective feedback techniques in terms of gender?*

An Independent-sample t-test is organized to compare males' and females' attitudes towards OCF and their replies, which are studied for all questionnaire elements. The findings are outlined concerning mean, standard deviation, and p-value.

Table 10
The distinction between Male and Female Students

| Students' Attitudes towards Corrective Feedback | Male | | Female | | sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |
| Attitudes towards Teacher Feedback | 3.59 | 0.39 | 3.63 | 0.53 | 0.87 |
| Attitudes towards Peer Feedback | 2.45 | 0.69 | 2.8 | 1.22 | 0.57 |

| Attitudes towards Various Types of Feedback | 2.86 | 1.01 | 2.88 | 1.41 | 0.97 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Immediate or Delayed Feedback | 3.66 | 1.16 | 3.87 | 1.03 | 0.78 |
| Attitudes towards Self-correction | 3 | 1.41 | 4.5 | 1 | 0.10 |
| Students' Responsibility for Correction | 3.66 | 1.75 | 3.25 | 2.06 | 0.73 |

**H0:** there is no meaningful distinction between the scores of boys and girls.
**H1:** there is an essential distinction between the scores of boys and girls.

Eventually, the scores for 2, 7, 8, 10, 26, 30, 34, 35, and 36 items are calculated to compare learners' attitudes towards teacher feedback based on gender. The findings show that no significant discrepancy to occur among the boys' scores (M=3.59, SD=0.39) and the girls' ones (M=363, SD=0.53), and p >.05.
Besides, to compare students' attitudes towards peer feedback based on gender, the scores for 1, 5, 6, 12, 18, 19, 22, 28, and 31 items are calculated. The outcomes point out that no statistical distinction between appearing among the boys' scores (M=2.45, SD=0.69) and the girls' scores (M=2.8, SD=1.22), and p >.05.

The researcher studies and calculates the scores for 3, 4, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23, 25, and 29 items by utilizing an independent-sample t-test to contrast students' perceptions on different types of feedback in terms of gender. The findings similarly point out that no vital discrepancy to occur among the boys' scores (M=2.86, SD=1.01) and the girls' scores (M=2.88, SD=1.41), and p >.05.

Moreover, to contrast students' attitudes towards the immediate and delayed feedback based on gender, to know if OCF should be instantly or after a long time of speech. The researcher calculates the scores for 11, 24, and 32 items, and the findings show that no statistically essential discrepancy among the boys' scores (M=3.66, SD=1.16) and the girls' ones (M=3.87, SD=1.03), and p >.05.

Furthermore, the researcher studies and calculates the scores for 27 items in order to contrast learners' attitudes regarding self-assessment based on sex. Consequently, the findings indicate that no essential discrepancy to occur among the boys' (M=3.0, SD=1.41) and the girls' scores (M=4.5, SD=1.0), and p >.05.

Besides, the scores for 33 items are studied and calculated by utilizing an independent-sample t-test to compare students' perceptions of learners' liability for feedback based on sex. As well, the results of this calculation indicate that no significant discrepancy among the boys' (M=3.66, SD=1.75) and the girls' scores (M=3.25, SD=2.06), and p >.05.

According to what was mentioned above, there is no critical difference between males and females relating to the learners' attitudes towards OCF and p >.05.

*3.3. Findings of the Interviews*

To get further information about the volunteers' views on OCF, eight learners were asked to explain their attitudes regarding peer-, self-, and teacher assessment, various kinds of feedback, instant or after long time feedback, and the students' liability for feedback.
S with numbers in table 11 refers to the student and the number assigned for each student instead of their names.

Table 11
Public Themes in Learners' Interviews

| Constructs | Themes | Learners |
|---|---|---|
| **Teacher Feedback** | The instructor as the main sole of the target language | S2, S4, S5 |
| | Students' insufficiency of information | S3, S8 |
| **Peer Feedback** | Friendly classroom atmosphere | S1 |

| | Source of exchanging information | S6 |
|---|---|---|
| | Encouraging students to be active | S7 |
| **Various Types of Feedback** | Preferring explicit | S1, S7 |
| | Preferring elicitation | S2, S4, S8 |
| | Preferring repetition | S3, S5, S6 |
| **Immediate** | Not feeling ashamed | S3, S4, S5, S7 |
| **Delayed Feedback** | Avoiding negative feeling about classmates' comments | S1, S2, S6, S8 |
| **Self-correction** | Self-dependence | S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7 |
| | Self-conscious shame | S1, S8 |
| **Learners' Responsibility** | Learning from errors | S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S8 |

Regarding what showed above, most learners (S2, S3, S4, S5, and S8) support the teacher feedback. According to the second, fourth, and fifth students, the instructors are the primary source of knowledge in the learning process who have the expert knowledge needed to correct their errors. The other two learners also guess that peer feedback is not useful because their classmates do not have enough background or knowledge about the correct forms of their errors. The analysis also indicates that they can be improved correctly concerning grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary aspects in line with teacher feedback more than peer feedback. For example, a student stated that:

Excerpt **1**: I do like it, especially in grammar and pronunciation, because the teacher has enough expert knowledge (S2, personal communication, December 2018).

On the other hand, there are three learners (S1, S6, and S7) who favor peer feedback more than teacher feedback in all language aspects; grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. They guess that it creates a kind classroom environment. They also confirm that when classmates correct their errors, it helps them be social and active and supports them to interchange ideas among themselves. They think that it is suitable and useful when the teacher is not integrated. For instance, a learner stated the following:

Excerpt **2**: I think peer correction is an essential implement, which can be used in classrooms, supporting us to be active. Besides, we can learn new words with their correct pronunciation from each other easily. (S7, personal communication, December 2018).

Regarding students' assessments of distinct kinds of correction during the interview, they have general preferences for all types. Only two learners prefer explicit feedback, such as a student stated the following:

Excerpt **3**: I prefer to be rectified explicitly to be aware of my errors and avoid them next time (S1, personal communication, December 2018).

However, the other six learners; three of them favor the elicitation (S2, S4, S8) and the other students (S3, S5, and S6) favor repeating the whole sentence with a high intonation; the former example relating to elicitation feedback, but the latter one relating to repetition feedback.

Excerpt **4**: I prefer all kinds of corrective feedback, but my favorite one when the teacher asks me why I have formed the sentence in this way and supports me positively to evoke the correct answer by myself (S4, personal communication, December 2018).

Excerpt **5**: I want my instructor to point out my mistakes by repeating the utterance that has the mistake with a rising intonation to be able to recognize it easily (S3, personal communication, December 2018).

In addition, concerning the immediate or delayed feedback, four of them (S3, S4, S5, and S7) favor to be corrected immediately, just because they think that immediate correction can help them remember their errors exactly and avoid them next time, not as the delayed one. As well, they do not feel ashamed or embarrassed while being corrected in front of their peers. (S1, S2, S6, and S8) prefer the feedback to be at the end of the conversation to avoid getting the negative feeling about their peers' remarks or comments on their production and support them practicing the language confidently. For instance, some students asserted the following quotes; the first one relating to the immediate feedback, but the next one has a rapport with delayed feedback.

Excerpt **6**: I prefer to be corrected immediately because it can help me remember my errors precisely and avoid them next time (S3, personal communication, December 2018).

Excerpt **7**: I prefer to be corrected at the end of the conversation to be able to avoid the negative feeling about my colleagues' comments on my errors (S2, personal communication, December 2018).

Concerning the self-correction, most students prefer the teacher to determine their errors, especially in grammar and pronunciation, ask them for correction, then be corrected by themselves (S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, and S7). Moreover, they believe that it helps them improve their self-dependence in the classroom. A learner asserted the following:

Excerpt **8**: I prefer my instructor to point out my syntactical and linguistic mistakes and then ask me to correct them by myself, because it gives me a chance to learn from my mistakes (S2, personal communication, December 2018).

On the contrary, the other two learners (S1 and S8) declare that they cannot depend on this kind of feedback in terms of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation as they commit some errors might be beyond their levels or abilities, and it makes them feel self-conscious shame, such as a student confirmed the following:

Excerpt **9**: I do not prefer the self-correction technique as I think some errors might be beyond my level, and that may cause me confused and embarrassed (S8, personal communication, December 2018).

Furthermore, all interviewed students believe that every single language learner is responsible for correcting his/her errors. They guess that responsibility for correction depends on the type of errors, and it should be divided into 50% for teachers and 50% for students during the learning process. Besides, they point out that responsibility can support them in improving their outputs and performances by paying

attention to their errors, thinking accurately about their correct forms. Then they will not make these errors again. For instance, a student asserted the following:

> Excerpt **10**: I think everybody should take part in the responsibility process. I mean fifty percent for teachers and fifty percent for learners (S8, personal communication, December 2018).

## 4. Discussion

Regarding the first research question outcomes, the volunteers do not agree with receiving corrective feedback from teachers *only* (item26=27.8). They have a general agreement regarding the teacher only having the expert knowledge to provide feedback (item34=27.8), but this score is less than the highest score (item5) about the peer feedback. This outcome might be related to the learners' thought that their peers can give more regular feedback because of spending a long time negotiating the errors with each other than the teacher. Concerning receiving feedback for language aspects, learners generally agree with teacher feedback in terms of the grammatical mistakes (item8=36.1), they have middle support for teacher correction of pronunciation (item7=32.05), and the lease agreement with teacher correction of vocabulary (item 30=27.8). Besides, some of the students agree, but the others do not agree that instructors are careful about recovering their errors (item 36=22.7), and it is clear that their peers are better than their teachers concerning the carefulness about feedback; the score of this item is less than the one for corresponding the peer feedback (item18). Learners want their teachers to illustrate the errors that their peers pointed out and corrected them (item10 =39.2) that is higher than (item 31) concerning peer feedback, as learners cannot trust and rely on their classmates entirely. They strongly support that the learning process is more beneficial and useful when it involves teacher feedback (item 35=34.0), but in (item22), which relates to the peer feedback, they have only general agreement.

Furthermore, the findings show that students generally agree with peer feedback, and they think that their peers may give a better understanding of some language points which they might be unaware of (item31 =37.1). They feel that learning is more dynamic when it includes peer feedback (item22= 36.1). They do not believe that their classmates should correct only pronunciation errors (item28 =35.1), but they somewhat agree to receive feedback from their peers for vocabulary errors (item6 =33.0) and grammatical mistakes (item19 =28.9) too. Besides, learners believe that their peers have the ability needed to recover each other's mistakes (item5 =32.0), and they tend to agree somewhat that they are faithful in correcting (item17=32.0) because they are careful about the feedback process (item18 =27.8). Moreover, they have a general agreement that they do not feel ashamed or humiliated while being recovered by their peers (item12 =28.9). Eventually, the participants' general positive perceptions on peer feedback might be related to the friendly classroom atmosphere that can be created while interchanging ideas among each other actively. Although students had general positive perceptions of peer feedback, as we mentioned above, they still considered teacher feedback as the best type comparing with the former. Thus, they have an agreement with the suggestion that they feel relaxed and less stressed while receiving the teacher feedback (item 2=42.3), which is ultimately higher than the score of (item 12) about peer feedback. According to the previous results, the Libyan learners did not wholly reject peer feedback. Some believed that it could be a helpful and creator technique for a kind learning environment in classes.

Regarding students' evaluations of various feedback types, learners generally prefer their peers and teachers to provide the right form of their errors directly (item 3=42.3). They also have general support to the clarification feedback (item21=40.2) when their teacher or classmates indicate their errors and ask them to reformulate them by saying "sorry?" or "excuse me?" They favor eliciting the correct form by prompting them to select the correct form from two choices (item4=39.2). Moreover, learners generally agree with all items concerning repetition; the highest score is with two items (item 13 and 15 = 38.1) in which they prefer

their errors to be repeated in a high intonation as well as the right form of their whole utterances to be reproduced with normal intonation. As well, they somewhat agree with their teacher's and peers' repetition to the whole sentence by determining the error in the unnoticed way (item 29=30.9). The volunteers prefer their peers or teacher to repeat their utterances, which included a mistake and supporting them for eliciting the right answer (item25= 30.9).

Whether OCF should be given instantly or after a long time of speech; the findings display that learners do not determine any obvious attitude towards one versus the other, and they have a general agreement with both the immediate feedback of pronunciation and vocabulary (item 11=40.2 and item 24= 34.0) and the delayed correction for grammatical mistakes (item32=38.1). Besides, students generally favor their errors to be pointed out and then asked to practice the self-correction (item 27=37.1). In the same path, they strongly support that they should be careful about recovering their errors (item 33=39.2), and this determination confirms the vital role of self-correction. Over and above, learners' comments in the interviews confirm the questionnaire's outcomes; most of the participants prefer teacher feedback. Regarding types of OCF, most of them favor elicitation and repetition. Concerning the time of feedback, half of them favor to be corrected immediately, but the other half prefer the delayed feedback. Besides, they agree with determining their errors and being given a chance for self-correction and support that they are responsible for correcting their mistakes because that capable of learning from their errors.

There are some studies, which are in agreement with this study. For instance, Zacharias conducted a study in the Indonesian context, and Zhang carried out another survey in the United States; both of them pointed out that students favored the teacher's feedback or confirmation when their classmates recovered their errors, as learners did not completely believe in their peers' language knowledge or abilities (Zhang, 1995; Zacharias, 2007). In addition, a study was conducted to examine the useful impact of elicitation; thus, it was explored that the elliptical elicitation and the elicitation with prompts were strongly accepted by the learners (Nassaji, 2007). Another study managed to investigate Iranian EFL students' preferences for OCF techniques; it was learned that most of them favored repetition and preferred their teachers to prompt them for self-correction (Kazemi et al., 2013). In the same path, Camps researched to explain the impact of oral self-correction on learners' progress in Spanish past verb tense forms, and he confirmed that they favored self-correction on the one hand. They were able to concentrate on the features of language as a person, number, tense, and aspect (Camps, 2003).

Concerning the time of feedback; a study was carried out to recognize the effect of immediate and delayed feedback on EFL students' willingness to speak in an Iranian context; it was presented that learners preferred to be repaired immediately and at the end of speech (Zadkhast & Farahian, 2017). The results of this study concerning learners' responsibility for correction are supported by a study, which was carried out about the advantages of encouraging learners to recognize their errors. It confirmed that students first started to be aware of their mistakes, guess about the suitable way for recovering them, and apply and utilize the correct form of the erroneous part of the utterance themselves. This means they can be responsible for correcting their own mistakes quickly (Toyoura & Watkins, 2013).

On the contrary, some surveys are not in harmony with the findings of this study. Roskams surveyed to illustrate learners' perceptions of peer feedback, and it was explored that students believed in this technique as helpful, useful, collaborative, and it made the learning experience very favorable (Roskams, 1999). Katayama carried out a study to investigate Japanese EFL learners' attitudes towards the feedback of oral errors in the classroom. He found out that they had extreme preferences for metalinguistic feedback and recasts (Katayama, 2007). Besides, a researcher managed a study to examine Turkish students' attitudes regarding OCF; she proposed that learners favored to be corrected immediately and by their teachers rather than peers (Dilek, 2015).

Relatively, Masadeh and Elfeky managed a study to recognize the impact of immediate and delayed feedback. They explored that learners' skills, who received feedback after submitting their lesson plans, developed in lesson plan performance and classroom management (Masadeh & Elfeky, 2017). Under the results of the study of Radecki and Swales, the majority of learners favored being rectified by their teacher rather than self- or peer-feedback as they tended to believe that the teacher only who is responsible for the feedback process (Radecki & Swales, 1988).

Concerning the results of the independent-sample t-test, it is proved that there is no essential difference between males and females regarding their attitudes towards oral interactional corrective feedback, and the p-value is > .05. Subsequently, the outcomes of this research question are seen to give support to some forgoing studies. Khorshidi and Rassaei illustrated the effect of Iranian learners' gender on their preferences for CF. They found out that there was no essential difference between male and female students concerning their CF preferences (Khorshidi & Rassaei, 2013). On the other hand, the current study's findings are revealed inconsistent with some other previous research. Zarei conducted a study with 205 participants for discovering the rapport between sex and corrective feedback in the Iranian context, and he pointed out that there was a significant difference between male and female learners for oral corrective feedback as well as there was a passive correlation between gender and CF (Zarei, 2011). After presenting the findings of some studies, which are for and against the results of this survey, it is claimed that the effectiveness of gender on ESL and EFL learning process has already explained by different views. However, the nature of the correlation between learning a foreign or second language and gender is still challenging to find (Green & Oxford, 1995).

## 5. Conclusion

To sum up, the results generally show that learners prefer to be corrected by their teachers most of the time. They also favor the feedback to be given immediately, as it helps them remember their errors precisely and at the end of a conversation to avoid the negative feelings about their classmates' comments on their performances and to communicate confidently. Regarding the types of OCF, the preferable types by the volunteers are elicitation and repetition. Besides, they like their instructors to support and encourage them to self-correct after pointing out their errors. They believe in their responsibility for recovering their errors because they guess that responsibility can help them learn from their mistakes. Furthermore, after comparing the means of both learners' preferences, it is revealed that their attitudes towards OCF techniques are not distinct. Overall perceptions show that no vital difference is found between both genders' attitudes concerning these strategies.

## 6. Implications

The results of the present study explore different pedagogical implications for Libyan EFL teachers and learners. The current study illustrated that Libyan EFL learners have perceptions of OCF techniques that can motivate teachers to investigate the practical ways they have to follow inside the classroom to utilize these techniques with their learners in the right way. Concerning types of feedback, the participants favored elicitation and repetition. Thus, instructors should have the knowledge, awareness, and capacity to recognize their students' preferences and expectations to provide a beneficial feedback technique without embarrassing them. Furthermore, the students favored receiving feedback immediately and at the end of speaking. That is why teachers should avoid interrupting the flow of their students' communication by allowing them to complete their speech, then providing the error correction. They should not neglect the immediate feedback completely because learners sometimes prefer it (Amara, 2015). Finally, teachers

should make learners aware that the language-learning process includes the student's interaction with his/her teacher and peers as both teachers and students are parts of the teaching procedure.

Further research might include more learners because it is not easy to make generalizations relying on this study's findings. Private universities, primary, secondary, or high schools can also be involved to have more specific results. Besides, it might be more useful to rely on case-study methods for gathering data as they provide an in-depth description of a process. Ultimately, the impact of cross-cultural discrepancies on EFL learners' perceptions and views can be examined.

**References**

Amara, N. (2015). Errors correction in foreign language teaching. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, *5*(3), 58-68.

Almuhimedi, R., & Alshumaimeri, Y. (2015). Effective error correction in grammar classes: A students' perspective. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, *5*(6).

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *5*(1-4), 161-170.

Chastain, K. (1971). *The development of modern language skills: theory to practice*.Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development, Inc.

Corder, S. (1975). Error Analysis, Interlanguage, and Second Language Acquisition.*Language Teaching*, *8*, 201–218.

Camps, J. (2003). The Analysis of Oral Self-Correction as a Window into the Development of Past Time Reference in Spanish. *Foreign Language Annals*, *36*(2), 233-242.

Calsiyao, I. (2015). Corrective feedback in classroom oral errors among Kalinga-Apayao State College students. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, *3*(1), 394-400.

Dilek, F. (2015). Learners' preferences of oral corrective feedback: An example of Turkish as a foreign language learner. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *10*(9), 1311-1317.

Green, M., & Oxford, L. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 Proficiency, and Gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(2), 261–297.

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching: Recent Theory, Research, and Practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, *62*(8), 387–398.

Herron, C. (1981). The Treatment of Errors in Oral Activities: Developing Instructional Strategies. *The French Review*, *55*(1), 6–66.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.

Hassan, A. (2017). Iraqi EFL teachers' and learners' preferences for corrective feedback in oral communication.MA Thesis, Gaziantep University, Iraq.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* Oxford, England: Pergamon.

Katayama, A. (2007). Japanese EFL students' preferences toward correction of classroom oral errors. *Asian EFL Journal*, *9*(4), 289-305.

Khorshidi, E., & Rassaei, E. (2013). The effects of learners' gender on their preferences for corrective feedback. *Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English, 1*(4), 71-83.

Kazemi, R., Mahdi Araghi, S., & Davatgari, H. (2013). Iranian EFL Learners' Preferences toward Classroom Oral Error Correction: With the Main Focus on Their Proficiency Level. Theory & Practice in Language Studies, 3(11).

Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & Sepehrinia, S. (2015). Preferences for interactional feedback: differences between learners and teachers. *The Language Learning Journal*, *43*(1), 74-93.

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

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Monette, D., Sullivan, Thomas, & DeJong, Cornell. (2002). *Applied Social Research*. Orlando, FLA: Harcourt Press.

Mackey, A., & Gass, M. (2011). *Research Methods in Second Language Acquisition: A Practical Guide*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Masadeh, T., and Elfeky, A. (2017).Immediate versus Delayed Feedback in Promoting Student Teachers Skills for Lesson Plan Implementation. British Journal of Education.Vol.5, N8, PP.43-58.

Nemser, W. (1971). Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners. *IRAL, 9*, 115–123.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning.* Cambridge university press.

Nassaji, H. (2007). Elicitation and reformulation and their relationship with learner repair in dyadic interaction. *Language learning*, *57*(4), 511-548.

Richards, J. C. (1974). A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. *Error analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition*, 172-188.

Radecki, P. M., & Swales, J. M. (1988). ESL students reaction to written comments on their written work. *The system*, *16*(3), 355-365.

Roskams, T. (1999). Chinese EFL students' attitudes to peer feedback and peer assessment in an extended pair work setting. *RELC Journal*, *30*(1), 79-123.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL, 10,* 209–231.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129–158.

Schulz, R. a. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, *29*(3), 343–364.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, *46*(2), 327–369. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80124-6.

Toyoura, A., & Watkins, S. (2013). The Benefits of Encouraging Learners to Notice    Their Errors. The Asian Conference on Language Learning, Official Conference Proceedings, Osaka, Japan.

Zhang, S. (1995). Re-examining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. Journal of second language writing, 4(3), 209-222.

Zacharias, N. T. (2007). Teacher and student attitudes toward teacher feedback. *RELC Journal*, *38*(1), 38 52.

Zarei, N. (2011). The relationship between gender and corrective feedback. *An online journal of ICT for Language Learning*, 59-79.

Zhang, L. J., & Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes. *System*, *42*, 429-439.

Zadkhast, M., & Farahian, M. (2017). The impact of immediate and delayed corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' willingness to communicate. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 6(6), 28-39.