

*Inspecting the Effect of Teachers' Corrective Feedback
on EFL Learners' Grammatical Accuracy: the Case
Study of First-Year License Students of English
Language at M'Sila University of Algeria.*

فحص تأثير التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية للأساتذة على دقة
القواعد اللغوية لدى طلبة اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية.
دراسة حالة طلاب السنة الأولى في تخصص اللغة الإنجليزية
بجامعة المسيلة في الجزائر

Choayb DJOUIBA *

ERAC Laboratory

Doctoral School of Humanity 558

University of Rouen

Normandy / France

Choayb.djouiba@univ-rouen.fr

Received: 11/08/2024 Accepted :19/12/2024 Published :20/12/2024

Abstract:

Corrective feedback is a useful tool for teachers to address the issue of mistakes made by pupils when learning a foreign language. The purpose of this descriptive research is to look at how Algerian EFL learners' oral output of grammar is affected by the corrective feedback they get from their teachers. At the Department of English Language at the University of M'Sila in Algeria, a questionnaire was given to oral expression instructors and students in addition to an audio recording and observation. In order to provide comprehensive information on the topic and serve as the foundation for future studies aimed at improving EFL instruction in Algeria, the results are analyzed. The findings of this study revealed that Teachers should use various techniques to address

* Corresponding author.

student errors and improve language abilities, considering emotional state and individualized treatment to avoid embarrassing or hindering cooperation, ensuring effective instruction.

Keywords: Algeria, Corrective Feedback, EFL learners, Grammar, Oral outputs.

المخلص:

التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية هي أداة مفيدة للمعلمين لمعالجة مشكلة الأخطاء التي يرتكبها الطلاب عند تعلم لغة أجنبية. الغرض من هذا البحث الوصفي هو النظر في كيفية تأثير التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية التي يتلقاها متعلمو اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية من الجزائر على إنتاجهم الشفوي للقواعد النحوية. في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بجامعة المسيلة في الجزائر، تم توزيع استبيان على مدرسي التعبير الشفهي والطلاب بالإضافة إلى تسجيل صوتي ومراقبة. يتم تحليل النتائج لتوفير معلومات شاملة حول الموضوع وتكون أساسًا لدراسات مستقبلية تهدف إلى تحسين تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في الجزائر. كشفت نتائج هذه الدراسة أن المعلمين يجب أن يستخدموا تقنيات متنوعة لمعالجة أخطاء الطلاب وتحسين قدراتهم اللغوية، مع مراعاة الحالة العاطفية والعلاج الفردي لتجنب إحراج أو عرقلة التعاون، مما يضمن تعليمًا فعالًا.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الجزائر، التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية، متعلمو اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، القواعد النحوية، المخرجات الشفوية.

Introduction

In today's English language teaching, most emphasis is placed on spoken language rather than accuracy and correctness of sentences. Therefore, teachers often ignore students' mistakes during oral communication because the main purpose of speech is to teach understanding rather than correct words. However, some teachers may not realize that this approach can have a negative impact on students' development because students may not even realize their mistakes, resulting in less development of facts.

Additionally, intense and frequent feedback can waste teachers' time and effort and distract them from other tasks and activities. It can also be difficult to give the right kind of feedback at the right time. Teachers may also not know how students interpret instruction, and students may be uncomfortable with the type of feedback teachers often use.

Therefore, this study aims to address the following research questions:

- How does teachers' corrective feedback influence the grammatical accuracy of EFL learners at M'Sila University?

- What types of corrective feedback are most effective in improving grammatical accuracy?
- How do learners perceive different types of feedback provided during oral expression?
- What impact does corrective feedback have on learners' motivation and emotional states?

The objectives behind setting up these questions are:

- **To identify the impact of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' grammatical accuracy:**
Explore how various feedback strategies influence the grammatical performance of first-year EFL students at M'Sila University.
- **To determine the most effective types of corrective feedback:**
Investigate which feedback approaches (e.g., explicit correction, recasts, metalinguistic cues) contribute most significantly to improving learners' grammatical accuracy.
- **To analyze learners' perceptions of corrective feedback:**
Understand how students view and respond to different feedback methods provided during oral expression activities.
- **To assess the emotional and motivational impact of corrective feedback:**
Examine how feedback influences students' confidence, willingness to participate, and overall motivation in language learning.
- **To recommend strategies for optimizing corrective feedback:**
Develop actionable suggestions for teachers to enhance the effectiveness of their feedback while considering students' emotional and cognitive needs.

Finally, the results of the study will make a significant contribution to the existing literature on teaching English to speakers of other languages. This is especially useful for English teachers because understanding the connection between their feedback and students' actual words will help them choose the most appropriate method of giving feedback to ensure significant improvement in students' speaking skills. Additionally, this study will provide teachers with an understanding of students' reactions to feedback and its impact on their thinking. The findings can also be used to advocate for feedback as an

important part of teacher education and to ensure that teachers understand all its aspects.

1. Literature Review:

Foreign language proficiency can be defined as the ability to communicate both verbally and non-verbally in that language, but reaching this level of expertise is not a slow and fast process. There are some problems that teachers and students will face during teaching, and one of them is the mistakes that students have to overcome many times. Error refers to strange words that students will produce due to their lack of knowledge of a particular language (Ellis, 2003, p. 15; as cited in [4], p. 1127). Mistakes are natural (Harmer, 2012, p. 86, as cited in [4], p. 1127), important and valuable (Lightbown and Spada, 1993, p. 80, as cited on [4], p. 1127). It shows the learning process occurring in students' brains with the influence of language (L1) ([7]; Harmer, 2012, as cited in [4], p. 1127). However, teachers may question whether they should correct students' mistakes or ignore them. In this context, Gebhard (2006) and Brown (2001) state that teachers should play the role of providing feedback to students (as cited in [4] p. 1127). More specifically, this form of interaction teaches students about their mistakes and guides them in correcting their work [12]. Extensive research on teacher feedback shows that feedback plays an important role in understanding, developing, and supporting communication patterns that support second language acquisition ([1]). However, teachers can ask whether they should address and correct all students' mistakes to help students improve their sentences, or whether they should avoid these mistakes to motivate and encourage students to talk more without worrying too much about grammar.

Feedback is conceptualized as an information provided by an agent, who can be a teacher, a peer, a book, a parent, a self, or an experience) considering aspects of one's performance or understanding [8]; therefore, feedback is a "consequence" of performance (p. 81). Another group of researchers gave a different classification for feedback. According to Cohen (1985), feedback can be categorized within the instructionally powerful and least understood features in instructional design (as cited in Shute, 2008). Moreover, feedback can be counted as one of the most influential features in learning and achievement, and this influence can be either positive or negative ([8], p.81).

Corrective feedback was defined as “any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect” ([3]). It means that whenever teachers detect a misuse of the target language rules, this should be referred to as corrective feedback. Additionally, ([5] as cited in [16], p.04) declared that: “Corrective feedback is a response to a learner's erroneous utterance by:

- a. indicating where the errors has occurred;
- b. providing the correct structure of the erroneous utterances; or
- c. providing metalinguistic information describing the nature of the error, or any combination of these”. In other words, when the teacher responds to the learners' incorrect utterance by indicating the error, he is providing the correction and additional information describing the nature of error, so that the learner can understand it and avoid it next time.

In terms of the types of oral corrective feedback, [13] in an observational study (as cited in [14], pp.4-5) identified six types of feedback that are considered at the same time strategies and moves used by EFL teachers to correct their students' phonological, lexical and grammatical erroneous utterances in a communicative activity, and these types are the following:

a. *Explicit Correction:*

This type of corrective feedback is presented in the explicit provision of the correct form by the teacher, after indicating that what the learner had said was incorrect ([13], p. 46). In other words, the teacher clearly indicates and identifies the error the learner committed and provides a correct reformulation for it ([14], p.04; [6]). The following example was given by [13] in French, and was cited and translated into English by [16] :

S: Procedure: We cut the straws into six different “sizes” and attach the straws with the rubber tape. [Error-multiple]

T: Uh, David, excuse me. I want you to use the word “length.” You have cut straws in different lengths. No sizes. [FB-explicit]

Another clear example was introduced recently by Idrees [17]:

S: On May.

T: Not on May, In May. We say, “It will start in May”

S: Are there some people in the garden?

T: Are there any people in the garden? Ok. We use “any” in plural question.

b. Recast:

This type of corrective feedback was explained by [13] and [16] as “the teacher’s reformulation of all part or a student’s utterance, minus the error”. Also, [17] referred to recast as a reformulation of all or just part of the incorrect word or phrase, in which the correct form is shown without identifying the error explicitly. However, as cited in [13], some scholars such as Spada and Frohlich (1995) have pointed to the reformulations (recast) as “paraphrase”; whereas, Chaudron (1977) classified it with “repetition with change” and “repetition with change and emphasis”. Finally, [6] gave a definition for recast by declaring that: “The corrector incorporates the content words of the immediately preceding incorrect utterance and changes and corrects the utterance in some way (e.g., phonological, syntactic, morphological or lexical)”. The following example was provided by [6]:

S: I went there two times.

T: You’ve been. You’ve been there twice as a group?

Another example by [17] is presented to make more illustration:

S: I have to find the answer on the book?

T: In the book.

c. Clarification requests:

This type of feedback is concerned with a situation where the teacher indicates either a misunderstood or ill-formed utterance occurred by the student, in which a repetition or a reformulation is required (Spada and Frohlich, 1995, p. 25; as cited in [13]). In addition, a simple explanation was provided for this type of feedback when the teacher indicates that he/she has not understood what the student said, [6] asks the student to reformulate it [17]. [16] defined clarifying request as a request to the learner to clarify their meaning without any indication of the presence of an error, and gave a good and a clear example, as follows:

S: Why does he fly to Korea last year?

T: Pardon?

S: Why did he fly to Korea last year?

Next, the bellow example was common between [6] and [17]:

S: What do you spend with your wife?

T: What?

d. Repetition:

The teacher repeats the student's utterance highlighting the error and adjusting his/her intonation, using emphatic stress ([13]; [6]; [17]; [14]).

▪ **Example of [6] and [17]:**

S: I will showed you.

T: I will SHOWED you?

S: I will show you.

▪ **Example of [13] "in French language":**

S: Le...Le giraffe. (Error-gender)

T: Le girafe? (FB-repetition)

e. Elicitation:

It refers to the teacher's repetition of a part of the student's utterance and pause in order to be completed (fill in the blank) by the student (self-correction) using a rising intonation as a signal for that ([6]; [14]; [17]).

▪ **Example by [6] :**

S: I'll come if it will not rain.

T: I'll come if it.....?

▪ **Example by [17]:**

S: This tea is very warm.

T: it's very?

S: Hot

[13] explained elicitation as a combination of three techniques. First, teachers elicit completion of their own utterance by pausing to allow students to fill in the blank as it were. Second, teachers provoke students by questions to elicit correct forms, such as (How do we say X in French?), and the answer to this type of question cannot be yes/no answers; questions that require yes/no answer are part of metalinguistic feedback, not elicitation. Third, teachers ask students to reformulate their utterance.

f. Metalinguistics Feedback

It refers to the comments, information or questions, that the student receives, related to his/her well-formedness of an utterance without explicitly providing the correct form ([13]; [14]; [17]). Metalinguistic comments are like: "There is an error", "We don't say that", "No, not X" or even just "No". Metalinguistic information can be as like as: "It's a

masculine”. Metalinguistics questions are questions that point to the nature of the error but tend to elicit the information by the student, such as: “Is it a feminine?” [13].

▪ **Example by [17]:**

S: There are influence person who

T: Influence is a noun.

▪ **Example by [16]:**

S: I went to the train station to pick up my aunt.

T: Use past tense consistency!

S: I went to the train station and picked up my aunt.

▪ **Example by [13]:**

St : Euhm, le, le éléphant, le éléphant gronde.

T : Est-ce qu'on dit le éléphant ?

In contrast, [6] did not mention the metalinguistic feedback; instead, he gave an alternative, which is paralinguistic signal. This last is related to the teacher's use of gestures or facial expression to indicate that there is an error occurred by the student.

Finally, teachers may prioritize or ignore positive feedback over corrective and repetitive feedback or fail to provide specific feedback. This conflict is still evident among scholars as [15] advocate for benefit and support feedback, while [11] suggest that feedback should highlight student errors and focus on improving future performance. Further research is needed due to inconsistencies among researchers regarding the type and presentation of teachers' feedback, as well as teachers' uncertainty about the appropriate instruction and frequency needed to correct students' statements.

Practical Implications

This study provides actionable insights for educators and policymakers. It recommends training modules focused on feedback strategies and emotional intelligence integration to enhance teaching practices. Additionally, it suggests that institutions prioritize professional development sessions to equip teachers with effective corrective feedback methods that align with students' emotional and linguistic needs.

2. Methodology

This study focuses on first-year students and their language teachers at Mohamed Boudiaf University. Students are selected because

they are new to the program, giving them the opportunity to receive in-depth advice from their instructors. Three different data collection tools are used in this study to complete the triangulation process and to validate and strengthen the data collected from each tool. The first tool is a questionnaire, which is distributed to 50 students selected randomly from a pool of 238 students and is designed to measure their grammatical accuracy, comprehension, and respond vocabulary to teacher feedback. The second tool includes interviews with speech teachers to gather qualitative information about the importance of feedback and the strategies they use to provide feedback. The final tool, that can validate data collected through questionnaires and interviews, involves classroom observation of the phenomenon in its own environment.

2.1. Research Design

This study will focus on first-year undergraduate students in the Department of Literature and English at Mohammad Boudiaf University. The reason for choosing this sample is that first-year undergraduate students are just starting their education, have a solid foundation in English, and want to better understand language structures and functions. Therefore, feedback from teachers can have a significant impact on their skills, especially in the area of grammar.

2.2. Research Instruments

Two methods are used to collect data in this statement: observation and administering surveys to teachers and students. Voice recorders are also used as an additional tool to monitor the process. The subjects of the study are three teachers from the total of four teachers in the first year of the university and fifty (50) first-year undergraduate students from a total of two hundred thirty-eight (238) students. The sample is selected entirely and anonymously to ensure fairness and consistency.

2.2.1. The Pilot Study

Directing the research ensures careful planning and preparation of data collection instruments, which increases the effectiveness and reliability of the research, although completion of the study cannot be guaranteed. Simon (2011) states, " although a pilot study does not guarantee success in the main study, it greatly increases the likelihood" (as cited in [9], p. 36).

2.2.1.1. The observation pilot test

Before using the observation method to collect data, two experimental tests of the analysis were conducted in two optional speech selections in the laboratory of the Faculty of Overseas Writing and Languages at Mohamed Boudiaf University in M'Sila. This was done to evaluate the validity of the developed survey instrument and its results. Evaluation framework updated following this test run.

2.2.1.2. The Questionnaires' Pilot Tests

The student survey was distributed to ten (10) individuals selected for their first year of undergraduate study from the Department of Literature and English Language at Mohammad Boudiaf University. This is to show areas where the questions and patterns are unclear and to estimate how long the questions will take to complete. The participants were a group of students at the same educational level as the pilot study, first-year college students, who were excluded from the study. This particular group was one of six first-year graduate groups excluded from the study due to lack of adequate analysis; most of the discussions were devoted to quizzes and tests. Students' comments indicate that the survey is easy to understand and has few explanations. . The examiner was pleased with the well-designed questions and carefully selected study guides and found the questions important and easy to understand.

2.3. Data Analysis

2.3.1. The Questionnaires

This section contains the findings, analysis, discussion, and interpretation of the data collected through the questionnaires. The data is presented using tables, graphs, and written explanations. It begins with the analysis and interpretation of the student questionnaires, followed by the analysis and interpretation of the teacher questionnaires.

2.3.1.1. Students' Questionnaire

2.3.1.1.1. The aim of the questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to investigate students' understanding of the importance of grammatical proficiency in language acquisition and teachers' perceptions of correcting sentence errors in language classes. Additionally, this survey aims to investigate when and how teachers correct errors, and whether error correction affects students' perceptions. The purpose of this survey is to identify student

preferences and provide recommendations to improve the delivery and understanding of instructor feedback.

2.3.1.1.2. Administration of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was administered to fifty (50) first-year undergraduate students in the Department of Literature and English at M'Sila Mohamed Boudiaf University. First-year students are selected based on their status as novice English learners and their ability to respond to feedback from their instructors.

2.3.1.1.3. Description of the Questionnaire

There are four different question types in this questionnaire. The first category consists of multiple choice or closed questions with "yes"/"no" possible answers. Open questions fall into the second category, they collect free responses from students and ask them to explain their answers. They can also be used to capture their thoughts and feelings. The real question is in the third category was determined by questions such as: "If yes, why?" and "If yes, how often?". The scale in the survey ranges from "disagree" to "agree". The survey contains a total of twenty-one (21) questions divided into ten (10) sections.:

- **Section One:** Questions 1 to 3 provide an overview of students' speaking skills in oral expression.
- **Section Two:** Question 4 gathers participants' opinions on the importance of grammatical accuracy in speaking.
- **Section Three:** Questions 5 to 7 focus on participants' grammatical errors, including the frequency of errors, types of mistakes, and their emotional responses to making them.
- **Section Four:** Question 8 seeks participants' views on whether teachers correct their mistakes, with a follow-up question on how frequently corrections are made.
- **Section Five:** Question 9 explores participants' feelings about receiving corrections from their teacher.
- **Section Six:** Question 10 investigates participants' preferences regarding the best source of corrections (teacher, peer, or self).
- **Section Seven:** Questions 11 and 12 inquire about participants' preferences for the timing of corrections and the types of questions teachers should prioritize.

- **Section Eight:** Questions 13 to 15 examine participants' perceptions of the teacher's corrective feedback and its influence on their language proficiency.
- **Section Nine:** Questions 16 to 19 aim to identify participants' preferred strategies for teachers to use when correcting their mistakes.
- **Section Ten:** Questions 20 and 21 solicit participants' opinions and suggestions on how the teacher's corrective feedback affects their psychology and motivation.

2.3.2. Observation and Tape Recording

Observation is considered the best and most reliable method of data collection, especially in behavioral research. It is true that everyone takes care of their environment, but not everyone does this knowingly. According to [10], observation can be divided into research tools and methods used by researchers to collect data when it works for a particular study, is well planned and used in writing, and will be valid and reliable in gender analysis and control (page 92).

2.3.2.1. The Aim of the Observation and Tape Recording

The purpose of this survey is to collect data in a real-world setting to better understand the ways teachers give and students receive criticism. In this study, audio recording is also used to record the watched episodes and collect missing data.

2.3.2.2. Description of the Observation and Tape Recording

The purpose of this survey is to engage five groups of first-year students from the Department of Literature and English, M'Sila Mohamed Boudaf University, to participate in ten (10) subject teaching discussions in regular classrooms and laboratories. Additionally, fifteen hours (15 hours) of the lecture will be video recorded with the permission of the professor.

2.3.2.3. Observation Analysis

Based on the results, we can say that:

The most used treatment strategy is repetition and is used thirty-one (31) times, accounting for 70.45% of the total. Since then, there have been six (06) requests for clarification, accounting for 13.64%. Metalinguistic correction was then used three (03) times, accounting for

6.82% of cases. Corrective action was implemented two (2) times or 4.55%. Additionally, reuse was used once (01) at 2.27%, and elimination was used once (01) at 2.27%.

Compared to other professors, Professor "A" uses different strategies. "Teacher and Teacher "C" Especially Teacher "A" used clear instructions, repetitions, request for clarification, repetitions and verbal clues. In contrast, Teacher "C" uses repetition, clarification requests, and instructions. Finally, Teacher "B" used only repetition and explanation. Additionally, from Appendix 02, it can be seen that Teacher C did not correct sixty-two (62) errors, i.e. 88.57% in total, and made seventy (70) errors. Later, Teacher "B", who did not correct forty (40) errors, corresponding to 74.07%, made fifty-four (54) errors. Finally, Teacher "A" failed fifteen (15) errors and made thirty-seven (37) errors, corresponding to 40.54%. Of the 161 errors, 35 (79.55%) were corrected immediately after they occurred, while nine (09) errors (20.45%) were corrected later. The number of corrections and corrections for personal errors is fifteen (15) times, accounting for 12.52%. Likewise, students corrected each other eleven (15) times, accounting for 8.42%.

3. Results and Discussion

- Student survey results show that students continue to attend speaking classes and are committed to improving their speaking skills. It was also revealed that students decided to speak correctly as an important part of good speaking. Additionally, most of the students mentioned the importance of correct grammar in speaking, as they wanted to improve their grammatical accuracy. Considering that students frequently make grammatical errors such as incorrect use of tenses and letters, demands that teachers should first correct their own speaking errors rather than other types of errors that may occur in speech also support this. Although these mistakes can create negative emotions and affect the learning process, students see mistakes as a natural phenomenon, not a sign of weakness; relying on the fact that teachers are more experienced and reliable in correction. Some students even say that teachers have a responsibility to give them the right advice. In addition, students experienced more negative emotions when they were corrected than when they made mistakes; forty percent of students did not report any negative emotions affecting their hearts.

- This indicates a positive attitude towards correction or feedback from the teacher. Additionally, the survey shows that the time students prefer to receive teachers' feedback varies from person to person, with correction immediately following the error being the most popular one. Similarly, the survey shows that students' needs for remedial strategies varied, with repetitions being the most preferred strategy, followed by correct treatment. Heuristic strategies support students' conflicting preferences, and metaconversational feedback is the most preferred. These results can be explained by the accuracy and directness of the first two concepts relative to the last two concepts. Most participants confirmed that they accepted the feedback teachers gave and said it was mostly accurate, indicating that students understood the concept of leaving practical advice. Additionally, the survey shows that students took into consideration the corrections made by their teachers because they had a positive impact on improving their vocabulary.
- Students believe that getting the right advice will make them realize their mistakes, allow them to correct themselves immediately, ensure they do not repeat their mistakes in the future, and prevent them from falling into a rigid situation. As for the claim that teachers negatively impact students' communication skills and willingness to participate, it is not clear why there is conflict among students on this issue. . This combination is designed to ensure accuracy and effectiveness and to track students' interest in speaking. It also shows that teachers do not tolerate mistakes and believe that mistakes must be corrected to prevent violence.
- It is also important that the most common mistake made by students is the misuse of voltage, and this finding is also supported by student questions. Teachers also noted that they sometimes gave students feedback on their mistakes. Moreover, teachers think that giving correct instruction is an easy task; however, other factors such as time constraints, students' motivation, and the teacher's behavior towards correcting the lesson will make the job difficult. Therefore, teachers explicitly teach students the importance of correct mathematics and the positive effects of correction feedback on their correct sentences in order to reduce some factors that may interfere with the process of providing correction instructions.

- Providing corrective feedback, usually includes a combination of explicit and implicit feedback, depending on the type of error. Similarly, each teacher used their own correction strategies and agreed on two strategies: clarification and elimination, while repetition and feedback were the least used strategies. Although it is the most popular idea among students, the fact that no teacher chooses to repeat reveals the problems that may arise. Similarly, teachers often delay correction by correcting students after they have finished speaking. This delay may be due to the belief that slow corrective feedback is effective in maintaining students' communication skills, but this is related to the student's preference for immediate remedial feedback. Although there is no training on the concept of feedback, teachers recognize that by teaching students to learn from and correct errors, their feedback will reduce students' errors and thus improve their vocabulary. Therefore, since most of the work Teacher "C" does is self-presentation, there is little correction and students correct each other on their own. This is why the peer correction percentage of Teacher "C" class is higher than that of Teacher "A" and Teacher "B" classes.
- Regarding the correction time of the feedback, Teachers "A" and "C" stated in the survey that they made delayed correction; that is, they corrected after the students finished the message. However, the data analyzed in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 reveal a different picture. For Teacher "A," fourteen (14) of the thirty-seven (37) errors were corrected immediately and only eight (8) errors were corrected later. Similarly, for Teacher "C", all eight corrections (8) were made immediately. Only Teacher "B" followed up on the survey responses and made thirteen (13) out of fourteen (14) corrections immediately and only one (1) delayed correction. The result is that Teacher A corrected 59.46% of students' errors, majority of students self-corrected (32.43%), and the percentage of grammatical errors in words was (23.46%). In comparison, Teacher C corrected 11.43% of sentence errors; students had the lowest rate of self-correction (1.43%) and the highest rate of sentence errors (43.21%). This shows that there is a positive relationship between teachers' suggestions and students' errors, suggesting that teachers' corrections can help reduce students' incorrect words and increase grammatical accuracy. All teachers agree on the need to use more

than one strategy to correct student errors. Some teachers emphasize that it is a better way to demonstrate the importance of grammar in language learning and to prevent the same mistakes from being repeated. This was confirmed by analyzing data showing that all three teachers used more than one correction strategy, allowing students to avoid corrections most of the time.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

This article focuses on the analysis of the results and questions of the survey. The results show that most students believe that teachers are the best at improvement because they are the most qualified people in the classroom. However, there are differences in terms of treatment method and duration. Some students believe that correcting an error immediately after it occurs is the best way to prevent that mistake from recurring, while other students think that the teacher should delay correction until the student finishes. It is handled completely and covertly to avoid embarrassment.

In their responses, teachers said that most of the mistakes made by students were related to tense and sentences, and that these mistakes should be corrected, clarified and affected by using various corrections. The survey shows that most students' mistakes are not corrected, and the main reason is that students are not corrected in the account, which makes the task of correction even more difficult. Additionally, students are not required to respond correctly to instructions. Moreover, although teachers use many strategies, they rely only on feedback strategies for correction, that is directly correcting grammatical errors without pointing them out. This is because there is no training in the basics of giving proper advice. Therefore, this study aims to provide suggestions to teachers and students based on the findings.

For Teachers

- Teachers should not hesitate to correct students' errors.
- Teachers should raise students' awareness of the significance of both corrective feedback and grammatical accuracy.
- Teachers should neither excessively correct nor tolerate students' grammatical errors.
- Teachers should ensure that their corrective feedback is clear and understood by students to indicate that they are being corrected.

- Teachers should consider students' emotional factors before, during, and after correcting their grammatical errors.
- Teachers are encouraged to vary their corrections between individual and group settings to avoid threatening students' self-esteem.
- Teachers should adapt their corrective feedback strategies based on the context of the correction.
- Teachers should time their corrections based on the type of task. For fluency work, delayed corrective feedback is recommended, while immediate feedback is advised for accuracy work.
- Teachers are advised to focus on a specific error on different occasions to ensure the student fully addresses the error.
- Teachers are recommended to initially use implicit corrective feedback to allow for student self-correction, and if that is ineffective, they should address the error explicitly.
- Teachers are encouraged to discuss corrective feedback strategies and timing with their students.

For Learners

- Students should not feel embarrassed about making mistakes, as it is a normal and beneficial occurrence.
- Students are encouraged to focus on their grammatical accuracy, as it reflects a high level of proficiency in the language.
- Students should maintain a positive attitude towards their teacher's corrective feedback.
- Students should consider and act upon their teacher's corrective feedback.

These suggestions should not be viewed as mandatory directives for both teachers and students. Rather, they should be considered as a series of ideas that can be deliberated and negotiated to achieve the most effective corrective feedback in the foreign language learning context. They should be seen as a new approach to teacher's corrective feedback.

5. Limitations of the Study

The current study may have some limitations. The first limitation relates to the limited number of teachers evaluated because the results of the teacher survey are not required to be made available to all teachers, and because one teacher's work may not produce the same results as another teacher's work. A second limitation is the small number of

observations made; this may have limited the study to include all aspects of treatment feedback. Therefore, future research is encouraged to resolve these limitations by increasing the number of research teachers and the observations made during the study.

6. General Conclusion

Grammar plays an important role in the translation of words in foreign language teaching. However, English learners often make many grammatical errors that need to be corrected; otherwise, these errors will affect the quality and integrity of English. Therefore, teachers try to solve these problems by correcting the suggestions. Teachers were aware of the benefits of remedial counseling, but their needs varied based on their previous education, training, and experience. These differing views revolve around five main questions: whether corrective feedback leads to second language access, what is corrected, who should do the remedial work, what type of feedback is best, and the best time to adjust the feedback. In addition, teachers use a variety of strategies such as correction for clarity, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, asking for clarification, and repetition when delivering accurate instruction. These rules are applied directly (immediately after the error occurs) or implicitly (indirectly after the error occurs). Students also have opinions and beliefs about teachers' correct instructions. For example, they believe that it is the teacher's responsibility to correct errors and that the teacher is reasonable and trustworthy. Students also consider how this treatment affects their personal and emotional states (pain, anxiety, risk, and shyness) and their actual language. It is very important to use the correct language in spoken or written communication.

The Importance of grammar is obvious in terms of facilitating the learning process, influencing reality, and being able to use different languages ([2]), whether it is direct method, listening method, communicative language teaching method, deductive or inductive method. Analysis of the findings provided useful information about the timing of treatment, treatment strategies, treatment methods (immediate or delayed), the best treatment method, and the impact of these factors on students' correct language. The survey and evaluation results show that teachers know the importance of correcting the proposal and the role of grammar in foreign language learning. However, even if they are not trained in the principles of propositional correction, they still use some correction strategies based on their experience, such as repetition,

explicit correction, and transverbal feedback. However, they face problems in giving appropriate feedback because many students do not respond to feedback or do not think about it regularly. For this reason, teachers often avoid making corrections.

Therefore, to meet the needs of different students, teachers should use a variety of strategies to correct students' mistakes and provide them with opportunities to acquire language skills as soon as possible. It is also best to use the correct treatment as a guide, paying attention to the emotional state so as not to create embarrassment or affect cooperation, as this will overwhelm students and complicate the task of providing correct teaching.

References :

- [1] AISYAH, E. & Hidayati, D. R. (2010, Augusti). iTeacher istrategies ifor iinitiating iESL iyoung ilearners ito ispeak iEnglish. iPaper ipresented iat ithe i3rd iInternational iConference ion iApplied iLinguistics (iCONAPLIN), iIndonesia iUniversity of iEducation (iUPI), iBandung.
- [2] CHAARAOUI, J. (2017). iGrammar iAccuracy, iLanguage iThreshold iLevel, and iDegree of iBilingualism in the iSaudi iEFL iLearner's Interlanguage. iInternational iJournal of iLanguage and iLinguistics, 86–101. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330145087_Grammar_Accuracy_Language_Threshold_Level_and_Degree_of_Bilingualism_in_the_Saudi_EFL_Learner%27s_Interlanguage
- [3] CHUI, Ruilii. (2011). iEffects of iTeachers' iCorrective iFeedback on iAccuracy in the iOral iEnglish of iEnglish-iMajor iCollege iStudents. iTheory and iPractice in iLanguage iStudies, i1.10.4304/tpls.1.5 (pp. 451-459). Retrieved from: <http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol01/05/03.pdf>
- [4] DEVI, A. Pranita (2014). iTeacher's iCorrective iFeedback on iStudents' iSpoken iErrors in an iEFL iClassroom. In iproceeding of the iSixty First iTEFLIN iInternational Conference (pp. 1127–1130), Retrieved from: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/43025129.pdf>
- [5] ELLIS, R. (2006). iCurrent iIssues in the iTeaching of iGrammar: An iSLA iPerspective. iTESOL iQUARTERLY, 83–107. Retrieved from: http://www.personal.psu.edu/kej1/APLNG_493/old_site/ellis.pdf
- [6] ELLIS, Rod. (2009). iCorrective iFeedback and iTeacher iDevelopment, L2 iJournal, 1, pp. 3–18. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5070/L2.V1I1.9054>
- [7] HARMER, J. (2007). iThe iPractice of iEnglish ilanguage iteaching (4th ed.). iHarlow: iPearson iEducation.

- [8] HATTIE, John & Timperley, Helen. (2007). The Power of Feedback. Review of Educational Research. 77. 81-112. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- [9] KASRI, S., & iChouia, N. (2018). iExploring iExtrovert and iIntrovert iLearners' iAttitudes iTowards and iPreferences for iOral Error iCorrection: A iCase of iSecond-Year iEFL iStudents at iMohammed iBoudiaf M'sila iUniversity. Retrieved from: <http://dspace.univ-msila.dz:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/7754>
- [10] KOTHARI, C. (2004). iResearch iMethodology, iMethods, and iTechniques (iSecond iRevised iEdition). iNew Age iInternational (P) iLtd., iPublishers. iRetrieved from https://www.academia.edu/33779875/C.R._Kothari_Research_Methodology_Methods_and_Techniques
- [11] LENZI, B. K., iEllis, E. S., & iScanlon, D. (1996). iTeaching ilearning iStrategies to iAdolescents and iAdults with ilearning iDisabilities. iAustin, TX: Pro-Ed, Inc.
- [12] LEWIS, M. (2002) iGiving iFeedback in iLanguage iClasses. iSingapore: iSEAMEO iRegional iLanguage Center.
- [13] LYSTER, R., & Rantai, L. (1997). iCORRECTIVE iFEEDBACK AND iLEARNER iUPTAKE: iNegotiation of Form in iCommunicative iClassrooms. <i>iStudies in iSecond iLanguage iAcquisition, </i><i>19</i>(1), pp. 37-66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- [14] RAUBER, Bárbari. (2017). iTThe iRole of iOral iCorrective iFeedback in L2 iPortuguese iClassrooms. iRevista iEntreLinguas. 3. 6-18, pp. 06-18. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.29051/rel.v3.n1.jan-jun.2017.9015>
- [15] SCRUGGS, T.E., & iMastropieri, M.A. (1994b). iSuccessful iMainstreaming in iElementary iScience iClasses: A iQualitative iInvestigation of Three iReputational iCases. iAmerican iEducational iResearch iJournal, 31, 785-811.
- [16] VAHEDI Deroei, iMohammad iAli. (2016). iTThe iRole of iOral iCorrective iFeedback in iEFL iLearners' iOral iProficiency: A Review iPaper, pp. 4-21 Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299390683_The_Role_of_Oral_Corrective_Feedback_in_EFL_learners%27_Oral_Proficiency_A_Review_paper
- [17] ZEBARI, Idreesi, and Ahmedi, Asst. (2018). iOral iCorrective iFeedback: iInvestigating iKurdish iHigh iSchool iTeachers' iBeliefs and iPractices. pp. 115-117. iRetrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327606050_Oral_Corrective_Feedback_Investigating_Kurdish_High_School_Teachers%27_Beliefs_and_Practices