Original Research

Teacher practices and student preferences of oral corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A Vygotskian perspective

by Bambang Irfani and Aisling O'Boyle

Bambang Irfani
ORCID 0000-0001-6269-2311 ✉ bambangirfani@radenintan.ac.id
UIN Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia

Aisling O'Boyle
ORCID 0000-0002-5695-2225 ✉ a.oboyle@qub.ac.uk
Queen's University Belfast, UK

Oral corrective feedback (OCF) is considered a salient pedagogical process which teachers use to assist students to enhance their language learning. Less is known about which feedback practices students prefer or consider effective for particular language learning processes. From a sociocultural perspective, this study investigated the extent of congruency between teacher practices and student preferences for OCF in Islamic Senior High Schools in Indonesia. Using a mixed-methods approach, quantitative data were collected from 444 students using a five-point Likert scale and administered across one province. Complementary data were collected from classroom observations, teacher interviews and student focus groups. The analyses of these multiple datasets illustrate that teacher practices are not congruent with student preferences for OCF. Findings show that students favour feedback on vocabulary errors, whereas in practice, teachers respond more often to pronunciation errors. Students prefer negotiated feedback, but in practice teachers mostly use clarification requests. The groups are aligned in relation to one area; students indicate a preference for teacher feedback, likewise teachers' practice demonstrably favours teacher feedback. Pedagogically, the findings indicate a need for teachers to transform their conceptual understanding and practices of OCF to better support student collaboration and mutual meaningful scaffolding for L2 development.

KEYWORDS: oral corrective feedback, Indonesian EFL classroom, congruency, sociocultural theory, Zone of Proximal Development

1. INTRODUCTION

Oral corrective feedback (henceforth, OCF) in L2 learning is provided in response to students' errors during classroom speaking activities which are designed to practice the use of a target language. Previous studies have evidenced that OCF is considered a salient pedagogical process used by teachers to assist students in recognising the differences between correct and incorrect utterances (Li, 2010, 2018; Li & Vuono, 2019; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Nassaji, 2016; Russel & Spada, 2006). Further OCF studies explore how, when and by whom OCF should be provided, and for what type of error (Agudo, 2014; Argüelles et al., 2019; Fadilah et al., 2017; Kaivanpanah et al., 2015; Papangkorn, 2015; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014; Zhu & Wang, 2019). Research has been conducted on the aspect of beliefs of OCF focusing merely on students' beliefs (Rassaei, 2013; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014) or on teachers' beliefs (Kirgoz & Agcam, 2015; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Uysal & Aydin, 2017). The exploration of both students' and teachers' beliefs have also been reported (Faharani & Salajegheh, 2015; Li & Vuono, 2019) alongside those which focus on teachers' beliefs and practices (Ha & Murray, 2020; Kartchava et al., 2020; Nassaji et al., 2023). However, there are a limited number of studies examining the congruency

of student preferences and teacher practices of OCF (Bulbula & Areda, 2020; Huong, 2020; Lee, 2013; Sung & Tsai, 2014; Yoshida, 2008). Misalignment between student preferences and teacher practices of OCF are shown to have an impact on language learning (Plonsky & Mills, 2006; Roothooft & Breeze, 2016), contributing to students' sense of satisfaction with their teachers emerging from how they are treated relative to their expectations (Li & Vuono, 2019). Therefore, it is important to examine the extent of congruency between student preference and teacher practices of OCF as it is experienced in classroom contexts. Moreover, Loewen et al. (2009) recommend more studies on context-specific settings to explore how student preferences for OCF may vary depending on the circumstances under which they are learning the language, and the cultural contexts underlying teachers' decision whether to implement OCF (Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). Therefore, this study of OCF in Islamic high schools in Indonesian offers a unique perspective, which has not yet been evidenced in the literature.

Additionally, previous studies on student preferences and teacher practices of OCF are largely conducted within a cognitive/interactionist perspective which regards OCF as a means that helps learners acquire linguistic knowledge (Lyster et al., 2013; Sheen, 2011) using certain kinds of strategies employed in isolation or in combination (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). It is argued that students' modification of erroneous utterances indicates cognitive development of a particular linguistic feature (Lyster, 2004; Sheen, 2011). An alternative way to research OCF is by considering an approach drawing on Sociocultural Theory (SCT). This Vygotskian perspective prioritises interactionally supported student development (Vygotsky, 1986). Poehner (2008) attests that each individual student deserves a certain support (mediation) suitable to the specific situation of the student. Such support may differ from person to person, even for similar errors. With a limited number of studies on OCF employing this framework, further observation in specific contexts is much deserved. Hence, the current study focuses on examining the congruency between student preferences and teacher practices of OCF in EFL setting drawing on SCT.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND
2.1. Student preferences and teacher practices of OCF
Research on student preferences and teacher practices of OCF is primarily aimed to identify whether student preferences for OCF match or mismatch teachers' instructional practices. Previous research on this focus delved into the congruency between the two groups in terms of the five pivotal issues of OCF provision proposed by Hendrickson (1978) including the necessity, timing, error type, provider, and strategy of OCF either fully or partially. In relation to who provides feedback and OCF strategies used, Yoshida's (2008) qualitative study of teachers' choice of OCF strategies and student preferences in Japanese classes at a university in Australia found that teachers mostly employ recast as their OCF strategy, believing that it effectively corrects errors without having a negative impact on emotionality of students. For students, their preference was for an opportunity to self-correct their errors under the teachers' guidance, indicating that OCF provider and strategy use was somewhat incongruent across the two groups. Likewise, Lee (2013) shows how in an examination of the patterns of strategies teachers employed in an advanced level ESL classrooms in the US, teachers mostly employ recast, but most students prefer explicit corrections and direct feedback, provided immediately. It is also reported that, contrary to students' preferences, teachers in the study applied selectivity in providing OCF. They were not keen to respond to all errors. Such a mismatch is also significantly evident in Huong's (2020) study of student and teacher preferences for OCF strategies in speaking classes at a Vietnamese university where recasts were favoured by teachers, but not by students. However, it is important to caution against depicting an overgeneralised picture. As Sung and Tsai (2014) illustrate, investigations of congruency between student preferences and teacher practices of OCF can furnish mixed results. In their study of Chinese language classrooms, teacher practices and beginner learner preferences align, however this alignment shifts as learners increase in proficiency with advanced students preferring different types of OCF strategy than those used by their teachers. Similarly, studies with different age groups and in different learning environments can indicate the contextual influences on the congruency of teacher practices and student preferences. For example, Bulbula and Areda (2020) reveal in their investigation of school language classrooms in Ethiopia that there is a certain amount of congruency between student preferences and teacher practices of OCF in terms of necessity, error type, provider, and timing of OCF. Both are in favour of correction of most errors that are focused on grammatical mistakes and provided by teachers with delayed feedback.

From these investigations on the congruency between student preferences and teacher practices of OCF, it seems that relationships have the potential to be congruent (Bulbula & Areda, 2020), partially congruent (Huong, 2020; Sung & Tsai, 2014), or incongruent (Lee, 2013; Yoshida, 2008). The instances of congruency are apparent in terms of necessity, error type, provider, timing of OCF (Bulbula & Areda, 2020), and strategies of OCF (Sung & Tsai, 2014). Meanwhile, the incongruent instances are mostly related to OCF strategy in which teachers are in favour of recast (Huong, 2020), yet students prefer output-prompting strategies such as metalinguistic cue or elicitation (Yoshida, 2008), explicit correction (Lee, 2013) or various kinds of OCF strategy (Sung & Tsai, 2014). The evidence of mixed findings from these studies suggests there is a need for further research, particularly focused on currently underrepresented learning contexts which can enrich the overall field of research on classroom based OCF. Thus, this study was conducted in the context of EFL learning at Islamic senior high schools in rural areas of Indonesia, focusing on such critical issues of OCF provision as error type, provider, and strategy of OCF.

Teacher practices and student preferences of oral corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A Vygotskian perspective

by Bambang Irfani and Aisling O'Boyle

2.2. SCT perspective of OCF

To date, there is somewhat of a paucity of prior research from an SCT perspective on OCF queries. SCT is a theoretical framework initiated by a Russian psychologist Vygotsky (1978, 1986), and later developed by his colleagues and followers such as Leontyev (1978) and Luria (1982). This framework considers knowledge to be social and can only be acquired through an interaction between students/children and more knowledgeable others such as teachers, adults, and more proficient peers. However, in this regard learning does not occur as the end result of interaction but along the process of the interaction (Lantolf, 2000a, 2000b). Accordingly, students' L2 development is undoubtedly dependent on dialogic interaction occurring in the classrooms between students and teacher or among students.

Aljaafreh and Lantolf's (1994) landmark study established a protocol for the provision of OCF within an SCT perspective. Through dyadic conversations, they collaborated with the research participants to revise grammatical errors in essays. Via the longitudinal study of negotiated feedback between the teacher and the students, four keys are of note: (i) both explicit and implicit feedback are effective, if relying on the students' potential development (ZPD); (ii) the same students may have different ZPD for different linguistic features, and different students may have different ZPDs for the same linguistic feature; (iii) language development depends on mediation between the teacher and the students; (iv) the students' performance, as well as shifting between explicit and implicit mediation, reveals their language development (Lantolf & Beckett, 2009). The protocol comprises a list of regulation or steps of assistance the mediator might provide during the dyadic interaction with students to correct writing errors in accordance with their ZPD. These steps are arranged from the most indirect to the most direct regulation. It is important to note that derived from Aljaafreh and Lantolf's (1994) investigation there are three fundamental characteristics of providing mediation (interactional feedback) tailored to the students' ZPD. It should be negotiated, graduated, and contingent. Firstly, the hints provided by the more proficient interlocutor are negotiated and graded from implicit to explicit in nature to encourage the students to self-correct. Secondly, the feedback should be adapted to the individual student's ZPD. Lastly, it should be provided only when needed (Rassaei, 2019). In short, the provision of OCF moves from providing generic to more specific, implicit to more explicit responses.

Inspired by the study of Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994), Nassaji and Swain (2000), Nassaji (2011), Erlam et al. (2013), Han and Hyland (2016) and others have researched OCF form this perspective. These studies employed the protocol introduced by Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) to provide OCF during the dyadic interaction between OCF provider and students to correct their written errors. Rassaei (2014, 2019), modified the protocol and carried out inquiries to provide OCF to respond to students' oral errors. All these studies evidenced the effectiveness of negotiated feedback, the OCF strategy within the perspective of SCT, compared to other OCF strategies.

Further research within the scope of OCF with a SCT perspective was conducted by de Guerrero and Villamil (2000), Ohta (2000) and van Compernolle and Smotrova (2014). In their study, De Guerrero and Villamil (2000) through micro genetic analysis scrutinise interaction between 2 ESL students in revising a written work of one of the students. They report that peer collaboration does not only result in one way scaffolding but is in fact, mutual in both students benefit from the interaction. Ohta (2000), focusing on analysing one important aspect of SCT in the process of learning – inner speech or private speech – collated students' private speech as they responded to OCF. It is reported that the students produce private speech in response to recasts from their teacher. Surprisingly, the private speech is produced not only by those who receive OCF, but also by other students attending to the OCF provision. This indicates that student uptake can be in the form of private speech, and that recasts addressed to a particular student may also benefit others. Interestingly, van Compernolle and Smotrova's (2014) study on OCF focuses on the use of gestures in classroom interaction. The study finds that gesture might serve as a supportive mediational symbolic tool for the provision of OCF, and this can assist students to appropriate the mediation provided.

Although many previous studies on the congruency of student preferences and teacher practices of OCF were conducted using cognitive/interactionist perspective, researching OCF from an SCT perspective affords an opportunity to views OCF as a kind of mediation which gradually assists students to develop their linguistic cognition by considering how this can be achieved through dialogic interactions in the classroom context between teacher and students or among students.

2.3. Research questions

Drawing on the SCT perspective, this study investigated the following questions. 1. What are EFL student preferences for OCF during classroom interaction in state Islamic senior high schools in Lampung, Indonesia? 2. What are EFL teacher OCF practices during classroom interaction in state Islamic senior high schools in Lampung, Indonesia? 3. To what extent are EFL student preferences for OCF during classroom interaction in state Islamic senior high schools in Lampung, Indonesia, congruent with EFL teacher OCF practices in the classroom?

3. Methodology
3.1. Context

This study focuses on English language learning in an Indonesian senior high school setting. Generally, students at this stage of education are 16 to 18 years old. English as a subject at senior high school is usually taught for two instructional hours a week. In terms of error correction in the classroom, evidence suggests that Indonesian EFL teachers are keen to improve students' accuracy and lessons with a form-focused or grammar-oriented nuance (Jayanti & Norahmi, 2014). Hence, it is likely that students in this context may be preoccupied with the expectation to produce accurate utterances, which in turn can produce

feelings of nervousness and anxiety about using English. As observed by Eddraoui and Wirza (2019), students in this context fear committing errors, in anticipation that they will be laughed at, receive negative judgments, or be considered unintelligent. Hence, it is important to explore how error correction or OCF is preferred and practised by students and teachers in Indonesia.

3.2. Participants

Through cluster random sampling techniques, 444 students were selected from 15 state Islamic senior high schools in the rural area of Lampung Province in Indonesia to be questionnaire respondents. Through purposive random sampling technique 12 of the students took part in focus groups, and 12 teachers participated in semi-structured interviews and agreed to non-participant classroom observations. The student sample for surveys comprised 279 (63%) females and 165 (37%) males. For the focus groups, the application of student variation strategy in terms of gender and self-perceived English proficiency was applied in selecting the sample. The proportional distribution regarding the year group of study was as follows: 156 (35%) students from year group 16/grade X, 143 (32%) from year group 17/grade XI and 145 (33%) from year group 18/grade XII. For the self-perceived English proficiency, 426 (96%) and 18 (4%) of respondents claimed to be in basic and intermediate level of English proficiency respectively.

Proportional distribution was also applied to teacher participants of classroom observations and interviews. For practicality reason, the researcher selected the teachers to be observed and interviewed by referring to the strategy of maximal variation sampling. The criteria included the variation in terms of gender (male or female), educational background (bachelor, master's or doctorate degree) and length of service (under five years, more than five but fewer than ten years, or more than ten years). This way, the researcher might obtain varied sources of information to gain a variety of insights into the issues under study, teachers' beliefs and practices of OCF in the classroom. The teacher participants consisted of 9 (75%) females and 3 (25%) males, 6 (50%) master's degree in TESOL and 6 (50%) bachelor's degree in TESOL, 3 (25%) less than five years of teaching experience, 6 (50%) 5 to 10 years of teaching experience and 3 (25%) more than 10 years of teaching experience.

3.3. Data collection

Following ethical approval and consent from the participants, a mixed methods convergent design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018) was utilised to obtain data through questionnaires, focus groups and semi-structured interviews. Data of student preferences for OCF were collected through questionnaire and focus groups, while those of teacher practices were gathered via classroom observations and semi-structured interviews. A five-point Likert scale questionnaire was designed to identify student preferences for OCF by considering the five pivotal issues of OCF provision recommended by Hendrickson (1978) including the necessity, timing, error type, provider, and strategy of OCF.

As this paper focuses on error type, provider, and strategy of OCF provision, the two other issues are not discussed in this paper (Irfani, 2023). The questionnaire was in Bahasa Indonesia to make sure that the respondents understood the questions and the optional answers. To ascertain the 34 item questionnaires' validity and reliability, a pilot study was conducted with 40 students from state non-Islamic senior high schools (see Appendix). Measured with *Cronbach alpha* formula, it was found that the questionnaire had high reliability with α = 0.94.

Classroom observations were then carried out to collect data on teacher practices of OCF. For this, four teachers were observed once for the full session of the instructional activity. To obtain more comprehensive and in-depth data of student preferences and teacher practices of OCF, students focus groups and teacher semi-structured interviews were conducted. The classroom observations, the focus groups and the interviews were video recorded and transcribed for analysis.

3.4. Data analysis

Quantitative data of the study were analysed to produce descriptive statistics and frequency measurements. Qualitative data from the study are in the form of transcripts from the student focus groups and teacher interviews which were analysed using thematic content analysis. As this study adopts the mixed methods design, the results of the quantitative and the qualitative analysis were integrated to determine areas of divergence and convergence in the analyses of the multiple datasets.

S2G1 means the excerpt was taken from student participant 2 in focus group 1. *T1* means the excerpt was taken from teacher participant 1.

5. STUDY RESULTS
5.1. Student preferences for OCF

Table 1 shows the results of the student questionnaire in relation to student OCF preferences: error type, provider, and strategy of OCF. In terms of the error type of OCF, students preferred to receive feedback on all types of linguistic errors – vocabulary (34.47%), pronunciation (34.03%) and grammar (31.50%) – during classroom interaction with a primary preference for feedback on vocabulary errors. The focus groups also evidence this focus on vocabulary and reveal reasons for this preference, which is the difficulty finding equivalent words in English. As one interviewee stated, *'My vocabulary is so limited. I often have problems with vocabulary. So, the teacher should pay more attention to vocabulary errors to make sure that my utterances are understandable'* (S2G1). Another interviewee emphasised this point by making a comparison of the effects of linguistic errors: *'My English is not good. Although I make mistakes in grammar or pronunciation, I think people still can understand me. But, if error in vocabulary, it's hard to understand. So, I prefer vocabulary'* (S7G2). OCF on other error types was also strongly expected for the sake of students' L2 growth, as stated by an interviewee: *'I want all my errors to be corrected, all types of errors. I need feedback to improve my English'* (S5G1).

Teacher practices and student preferences of oral corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A Vygotskian perspective

by Bambang Irfani and Aisling O'Boyle

Table 1

The rank of student preferences for OCF per fundamental issue of OCF

OCF ISSUES	CATEGORY	ITEMS	MEAN	AVE	%	RANK
ERROR TYPE	Pronunciation	I prefer correction of any of my mispronunciations in oral classroom activity.	3.94	3.90	34.03	2
		I don't like it when my teacher ignores my errors in pronunciation.	3.86			
	Vocabulary	I learn something when I get correction of my errors when using words or phrases to express my ideas orally.	3.84	3.95	34.47	1
		Any correction of my errors in using words or phrases is preferable to me.	4.05			
	Grammar	When my teacher ignores my grammatical errors during the oral activity of classroom interaction, I just feel neglected.	3.61	3.61	31.50	3
			19.30	11.46	100	
PROVIDER	Teacher	I prefer to have corrections of my oral errors from my teacher.	3.89	3.86	53.24	1
		I expect to receive corrections only from the teacher.	3.84			
	Peer	Receiving correction from friends is fine with me.	2.77	3.39	46.76	2
		I feel happy if my friends correct my errors in speaking.	4.01			
			14.51	7.25	100	
STRATEGY	Repetition	T: 'Go?'	3.30	3.25	13.44	5
		T: 'Ali have?'	3.20			
	Elicitation	T: 'Yesterday you ....'	3.24	3.24	13.39	6
		T: 'No, not like that. Ali ...'	3.23			
	Metalinguistic feedback	T: 'Use verb two for past action'	3.35	3.50	14.47	4
		T: 'In Simple Present Tense, use verb 1 plus 's' or 'es' for the 3rd singular subject like Ali'.	3.64			
	Clarification request	T: 'Pardon me?'	2.97	2.94	12.15	7
		T: 'What do you mean by 'have'?'	2.91			
	Recast	T: 'Yesterday you went to the zoo'.	3.94	3.71	15.34	2
		T: 'Has'.	3.48			
	Explicit correction	T: 'You mean, yesterday you went to the zoo'.	3.68	3.61	14.92	3
		T: 'You should say, Ali has ...'.	3.53			
	Negotiated feedback	T: 'Ali have?' (If the response is still incorrect) T: 'Ali is a 3rd person singular.' (If the response is still incorrect) T: 'Use verb 1 plus 's' or 'es'. (If the response is still incorrect) T: 'For example. 'Goes' is derived from 'go' plus 'es'. (If response is still incorrect) T: 'You should use 'has' instead of 'have'. (If the response is still incorrect) T: 'You should say: 'Ali has no brothers'.	3.94	3.94	16.29	1
			46.32	25.15	100	

As for the provider of OCF, students preferred teacher feedback (53.24%) to peer feedback (46.76%) during classroom interaction (see Table 1). The focus groups reveal that expectation of acquiring accurate feedback is the underlying reason for this preference. For instance, an interviewee remarked: *'The teacher knows better about English subject than our friends'* (S1G1). Another interviewee added: *'I also prefer teacher feedback because it is accurate and clear'* (S2G1). Another expressed his concern about peer feedback: *'It's fun when we have a debate with friends because of the feedback. Our friends sometimes are only guessing. They are not really sure with the accuracy of their correction'* (S11G2).

Regarding the strategy of OCF, students prefer receiving OCF mostly using negotiated feedback (16.29%), followed by recast (15.34%), explicit corrections (14.92%), metalinguistic feedback (14.47%), repetition (13.44%), elicitation (13.39%), and clarification requests (12.15%) during classroom interaction (Table 1 above). The focus groups reveal that this preference is driven by their expectation to be guided in carrying out self-repair. For instance, a student interviewee opined: *'The teacher should help us or guide us to do self-correction'* (S3G1). Another interviewee associated the ability to do self-repair with his feelings: *'I feel so happy If can do self-repair'* (S10G2). Another highlighted the positive impact of self-repair opportunities: *'I will feel more motivated to study. I feel being challenged if the teacher encourages me to do self-repair'* (S6G1).

These findings indicate a preference for high school students in this context to undertake self-repair under teacher guidance to boost their learning motivation and further improve their English language development. From the data of the student questionnaire and the student focus groups, it can be inferred that students liked to receive feedback on all types of linguistic errors – vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar – with the priority on vocabulary, as they often had difficulty finding equivalent words in English. Students reported that they would rather receive feedback from teachers, as they might provide more accurate feedback than peers.

5.2. Teacher practices of OCF

Table 2 shows the results of the analysis of classroom observation data by scrutinising teacher practices of the fundamental issues of OCF – the error type, provider, and strategy of OCF. These results are discussed below with the findings of the semi-structured interviews.

In terms of the error type of OCF, teachers corrected 61.70% pronunciation errors, 31.92% grammatical errors and 6.38% vocabulary errors, indicating that teachers respond to all types of linguistic error types. The semi-structured interviews reveal that teachers provide OCF to respond to students' errors that they thought necessary to correct, regardless of type, with the major purpose of enhancing students' L2 development. A teacher interviewee stated: *'All kinds of errors are necessary to correct. We should not let students make mistakes without feedback. This is the ideal principle, I think'* (T1). Another interviewee shared similar reasons for responding to the whole range of linguistic errors: *'I think those errors needed correction. That's why I responded to them. I think students needed the feedback to improve their linguistic knowledge'* (T3). Another explained why pronunciation errors got most attention from teachers during oral activity: *'Mispronounced words may cause misunderstanding. I just wanted my students to produce understandable utterances'* (T2).

Table 2

Teacher practices of OCF

OCF ISSUES	CATEGORY	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
ERROR TYPE	Vocabulary	3	6.38
	Pronunciation	29	61.70
	Grammar	15	31.92
		47	**100**
PROVIDER	Teacher feedback	63	85.13
	Peer–feedback	10	14.87
		73	**100**
STRATEGY	Clarification request	17	26.98
	Recast	15	23.81
	Negotiated feedback	12	19.05
	Explicit correction	10	15.87
	Repetition	6	9.52
	Metalinguistic feedback	3	4.76
	Elicitation	0	0.00
		63	**100**

Teacher practices and student preferences of oral corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A Vygotskian perspective

by Bambang Irfani and Aisling O'Boyle

Regarding the provider of OCF, teachers dominated the provision of OCF, 85.13%, compared to peers, 14.87%, in responding to students' oral errors during classroom interaction (see Table 2). The results of semi-structured interviews indicate that teachers' domination was due to feedback accuracy and time constraint. A teacher interviewee explained why she did not involve peers to provide feedback: *'I think it's more about the accuracy and time'* (T12). Another interviewee mentioned a similar view: *'My feedback was mostly concerning about students' pronunciation, so I didn't ask students to correct their friends' errors. I was not sure if they could help with the pronunciation errors'* (T9). Another added: *'I didn't need to involve them as they might not do any help. I mean if I ask students to help their friends, I'm afraid that they cannot provide the right feedback, and it may just cause confusion among them'* (T4).

Regarding the strategy of OCF, to respond students' oral errors during classroom interaction teachers employed 26.98% clarification requests, 23.81% recast, 19.05% negotiated feedback, 15.87% explicit correction, 9.52% repetition, 4.76% metalinguistic feedback, and no elicitation (see Table 2). The results of semi-structured interviews reveal that mostly teachers purposefully picked strategies to cope with students' oral errors by considering their effectiveness regardless of their unfamiliarity with the names and characteristics of the OCF strategies. A teacher interviewee described her knowledge of OCF strategies: *'Frankly, I don't know much. I don't even know the names. I use the ones which I think effective. That's it'* (T8). Another interviewee remarked: *'I'm not really sure about the names of the strategies. I used the ones which I think were suitable or effective to make students realise their errors and make corrections'* (T10). When asked further about the criterion of effective OCF

strategy, an interviewee replied: *'The one which may make students aware of the wrong and the right version of utterances'* (T7). Another added: *'The strategy which can make students understand their errors and the correction, so they can improve their linguistic knowledge'* (T6). Apparently, teachers think that clarification requests are the most effective strategy, which made it the most frequently employed (26.98%) among the seven types of OCF strategy to respond to students' oral errors during classroom interaction. Overall, from the data of classroom observation and teacher semi-structured interviews, teachers respond to all types of linguistic errors, but mostly pronunciation, considering that mispronunciation might give rise to misunderstanding. Teachers dominate the provision of OCF, due to feedback accuracy and time constraint. They apply all types of OCF strategy, but mostly use clarification requests to provide more chances for students to carry out self-repair.

5.3. The congruency of student preferences and teacher practices of OCF

Table 3 displays the comparison of the highest percentage weight of each fundamental issue of student preferences and teacher practices of OCF indicating the extent of congruency or incongruency. In terms of the error type of OCF, student preference for feedback on vocabulary errors (34.47%) was not congruent with teacher practice of responding more to pronunciation errors (61.70%). Concerning the provider of OCF, student preference for teacher feedback (53.24%) was congruent with teacher practice of dominating OCF provision (85.13%). For the strategy of OCF, student preference for negotiated feedback (16.29%) was not congruent with teachers' practice of mostly employing clarification requests (26.98%).

Table 3

The comparison of student preferences and teacher practices of OCF

OCF ISSUES	CATEGORY	PERCENTAGE OF PREFERENCES	PERCENTAGE OF PRACTICES
ERROR TYPE	Vocabulary	34.47	6.38
	Pronunciation	34.03	61.70
	Grammar	31.50	31.92
		100	100
PROVIDER	Teacher	53.24	85.13
	Peer	46.76	14.87
		100	100
STRATEGY	Clarification request	12.15	26.98
	Recast	15.34	23.81
	Negotiated feedback	16.29	19.05
	Explicit correction	14.92	15.87
	Repetition	13.44	9.52
	Metalinguistic feedback	14.47	4.76
	Elicitation	13.39	0.00
		100	100

Moreover, the results of the analyses of the focus groups and the semi-structured interviews indicate the underlying reasons for the instances of congruency or incongruency between student preferences and teacher practices of OCF. In terms of the error type of OCF, the results of the focus groups and semi-structured interview analyses reveal the underlying reasons for difference of priority between student preferences and teacher practice. Student preference for vocabulary errors was because they often had difficulty finding equivalent words in English. A student interviewee remarked: *'My vocabulary is so limited. I often have problems with vocabulary. So, the teacher should pay more attention to vocabulary errors to make sure that my utterances are understandable'* (S2G1). Nevertheless, in practice teachers provided more OCF on pronunciation errors to help students produce comprehensible utterances as pointed out by a teacher interviewee: *'Mispronounced words may cause misunderstanding. I just wanted my students to produce understandable utterances'* (T2).

As students make nearly as many pronunciation errors as grammatical and vocabulary errors combined (pronunciation errors = 47, grammatical errors = 12, and vocabulary errors = 11), it is understandable that teachers mostly provide OCF on pronunciation errors. Teachers respond to students' errors which they think urgently need correction, regardless of the type, as stated by a teacher interviewee: *'I corrected all errors which I thought necessary. I didn't really care about the types'* (T4).

Regarding the provider of OCF, the results of the focus groups and semi-structured interview analyses reveal students' and teachers' reasons for preferring teacher feedback. The focus groups reveal that expectation of acquiring accurate feedback is students' underlying reason for this preference. For instance, a student interviewee opined: *'The teacher knows better about English subject than our friends'* (S1G1). Another student added: *'I also prefer teacher feedback because it is accurate and clear'* (S2G1).

Meanwhile, the semi-structured interviews indicated that teachers' reasons for preferring teacher feedback were feedback accuracy and time constraints. As a teacher interviewee noted, *'I think it's more about the accuracy and time. Correction from peers is not always accurate, so it may take more time to deal with one error only. Meanwhile, there are many errors that need attention'* (T1). Another teacher mentioned the impact of inaccurate feedback from peers: *'I mean if I ask students to help their friends, I'm afraid that they cannot provide the right feedback, and it may just cause confusion among them'* (T4).

Regarding the strategy of OCF, the results of the focus groups and semi-structured interview analyses reveal the underlying reasons for difference of priority between student preference and teacher practice. Student preference for negotiated feedback is profoundly driven by their expectation of being guided in self-repair. A student interviewee said: *'I like it better if I have the chance to correct my own errors'* (S1G1). Another student added: *'The teacher should help us or guide us to do self-correction'* (S3G1).

Nevertheless, in the instructional practice teachers did not consistently guide their students to carry out self-repair by employing negotiated feedback as expected by students. To respond to students' errors, teachers mostly employ clarification requests to generate self-repair. When students failed to do that, instead of employing other strategies which might generate self-repair, teachers tend to supply corrections. This could happen due to their limited understanding of the realm of OCF strategies. For instance, when asked about her knowledge of OCF strategies, a teacher interviewee replied: *'Frankly, I don't know much. I don't even know the names. I use the ones which I think effective. That's it'* (T1). Another teacher expressed a similar situation: *'I'm not really sure about the names of the strategies. I used the ones which I think were suitable or effective to make students realise their errors and make correction'* (T4).

Moreover, teachers thought that it would be time-consuming to keep guiding students to carry out self-correction. A teacher who mostly uses negotiated feedback, elucidated why she did not always employ this strategy to cope with all student errors: *'It's because of the time. It takes time to guide students to do self-correction'* (T3).

Apparently, teachers' understanding of the OCF strategies and the availability of time might affect their instructional practices of OCF. In short, student preferences for OCF are not congruent with teacher practices of OCF, especially in terms of the error type and strategy of OCF. However, they are congruent regarding the provider of OCF.

In general, from the data of student preferences OCF and teacher practices of OCF, supported by the student focus groups and teacher semi-structured interviews, it is evident that student preferences for OCF are not congruent with teacher practices of OCF, as there are more incongruent instances than the congruent ones. Some degree of congruency between student preferences and teacher practices of OCF during classroom interaction is evident only in terms of the provider of OCF. Both students and teachers indicated that they preferred teacher feedback for the sake of feedback accuracy. Nonetheless, incongruency instances occur in terms of the error type and strategy of OCF. Students prefer vocabulary errors to be prioritised, while teachers tend to provide feedback more on pronunciation errors. Students prefer receiving feedback using negotiated feedback strategy, yet teachers mostly employ clarification requests.

6. DISCUSSION

In terms of error type of OCF, this study reveals students' and teachers' alignment in preference and practice of receiving or providing all types of linguistic errors during classroom interaction. This might be driven by their awareness of the students' phase of target language development. Both realise that students are at the other-regulation phase. This means that they depend on assistance from more knowledgeable others to develop their linguistic knowledge (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007). They highly depend on others who serve as sources and mediators of development (Lantolf, 2006b). In this context, students very much rely

Teacher practices and student preferences of oral corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A Vygotskian perspective

by Bambang Irfani and Aisling O'Boyle

on their mediator to provide OCF regarding all types of linguistic error to support them in regulating language-learning, as their language cognition is not yet sufficiently developed. Nevertheless, as they gradually internalise the knowledge and develop their language cognition, they may become less dependent on others. Once they have developed their capacity and can perform tasks without assistance, they become self-regulated (Lantolf, 2006b). At this point, they become independent, and the presence of external sources might not affect their task or activity completion to the same extent (Sadri & Tahririan, 2018). As this finding suggests that teachers are seemingly ready to act as mediators by providing OCF on all types of linguistic errors, students may be facilitated to self-regulate more language features and further develop their linguistic knowledge.

However, the study also evidenced that students and teachers show a difference of priority among the three types of linguistic errors. Students expect to receive more vocabulary feedback, but teachers provide more pronunciation feedback. This might suggest that students are focused more on achieving communication and fluency, whereas teachers are focused on accuracy, e.g., correct pronunciation of known words. In terms of error correction in the classroom, evidence suggests that Indonesian EFL teachers are keen to improve students' accuracy (Jayanti & Norahmi, 2014). Hence, it is likely that students in this context may be preoccupied with the expectation to produce accurate utterances, which in turn can produce feelings of nervousness and anxiety about using English. As observed by Eddraoui and Wirza (2019), students in this context fear committing errors, in anticipation that they will be laughed at, receive negative judgments, or be considered unintelligent. Hence, it is important to explore how error correction or OCF is preferred and practised by students and teachers in Indonesia.

Regarding the OCF provider, the results of the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the multiple datasets show the extent of congruency between student preference and teacher practice. Both groups favour teacher feedback considering this to be the most accurate feedback. English lessons in Indonesian EFL setting have a form-focused or grammar-oriented nuance (Jayanti & Norahmi, 2014; Sahiruddin, 2013) in which teachers are very prone to correcting students. Consequently, the provision and reception of accurate feedback is highly expected, and this is most possibly provided by teachers. This entails some pros and cons which might affect students' L2 development. On the one hand, it is not a strategic decision, as it indicates that teachers are not confident about giving more opportunities to their students to interact and help each other through peer collaboration or peer feedback which might lead to peer scaffolding (Barnard, 2002; Lantolf, 2006b; Nguyen, 2013; Sadri & Tahririan, 2018), even mutual scaffolding (de Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Nguyen, 2013). The teachers in this study indicate that such an approach would be time-consuming and end up confusing, as students are unsure of the accurate version of the issues being discussed. This might happen, as when working with peers without the presence of teachers with their embedded-authoritative nature,

students feel free to experiment with their language production (Henderson & Palmer, 2015; Philp et al., 2013; Sato & Ballinger, 2012), so there would be plenty of emergent, uncontrolled ideas delivered with inaccurate utterances. They might also get involved in a long debate to discuss a certain topic (Foster & Ohta, 2005; Philp et al., 2013). In such an activity, students may in fact gain both from providing and receiving assistance (Sadri & Tahririan, 2017) which undoubtedly may help them develop their linguistic cognition. On the other hand, it seems a practically focused decision for teachers with limited time available to provide more accurate feedback, or more opportunities for students who produce errors to carry out self-repair under the guidance or scaffolding process of teachers as the more knowledgeable other (Aljafreeh & Lantolf, 1994).

Concerning OCF strategy, the study evidenced that student preferences are not congruent with teacher practices in which students highly preferred negotiated feedback, but teachers mostly used clarification request. From the perspective of SCT, OCF as a mediation is aimed at developing students' language. It should be carried out with students, not for students, through a negotiation to determine the students' ZPD to ensure that the mediation provided is within the students' ZPD (Lantolf, 2006a, 2011). The strategy to achieve this is by employing negotiated feedback, borrowing the terminology from Nassaji and Swain (2000) and Nassaji (2011). In fact, this study evidenced that students favour the employment of negotiated feedback. They expect that it should be prioritised to guide them to carry out self-repair. This indicates that they believe mediation should be provided gradually to cope with the difficulties they face with certain language features while completing classroom assignments. It is worth noting that negotiated feedback is carried out in a dialogic nature by employing combinations of strategies which are thoughtfully and purposefully selected (Nassaji, 2015, 2016), not randomly employed strategies, from the generic to the more specific responses, and from the implicit to more explicit responses, to ensure that the feedback provided is within the students' ZPD (Ellis, 2009). This strategy is employed by considering graduated, contingent, and negotiated interactional feedback within the learners' ZPD (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Rassaei, 2014, 2019). From the students' viewpoint, the employment of negotiated feedback is beneficial in several ways. First, it suits their current needs under development, considering their ZPD. Second, it is timely, as they receive mediation only when they need it. Third, it accommodates their need to develop their linguistic cognition by trying to self-correct their errors.

Teachers' use of clarification requests as the strategy of OCF to cope with oral errors during the classroom interaction in this study indicates teachers' good intention to provide an opportunity for students to self-correct their errors, but its overuse indicates a lack of creativity in feedback. They may variably employ other output-prompting strategies, such as repetition, metalinguistic feedback, or elicitation, as they did in this study, but unfortunately may do so with a very limited frequency. This

'ZPD is not naturally in stasis but may expand or narrow as the interactional process is progressing or regressing (Wells, 1999). Therefore, in the context of language learning, language teachers play a vital role in fostering learning by carrying out dialogic interactions with each individual student or a group of students to determine their ZPD, later providing the mediations or scaffolding accordingly. Also, teachers should encourage their students to help each other through peer scaffolding by allowing them to work collaboratively'

could be due to the restriction of time or their unawareness of alternative strategies, as discussed earlier. Nassaji et al.'s (2023) study reported that time constraints and a lack of understanding of the OCF strategy profoundly affect teachers' practice of OCF. From the perspective of SCT, OCF as mediation should be provided by considering students' ZPD. To determine students' ZPD OCF provision begins with providing the opportunity for students to locate and correct their own errors by employing clarification requests or repetition strategy. This is gradually followed by other strategies providing more explicit feedback, e.g., metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, recast and explicit correction (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Rassaei, 2014, 2019). This means that teachers in this study are already off to a 'good start' by employing clarification request strategy, but unfortunately not followed by a gradual order of strategy combination to suit students' ZPD. Some teachers made some combinations of strategies in practice as they claimed, but very few belonged to negotiated feedback.

Most of the combined strategies employed by teachers in this study were created without considering the level of implicitness or explicitness of the strategies. Consequently, these combinations cannot be categorised as negotiated feedback as the mediation was provided without considering students' ZPD. Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) and Nassaji and Swain (2000) argue that OCF is not effective in developing students' language if it is not provided within the students' ZPD. As a result, even though students have received feedback and repair their incorrect utterances, this does not guarantee that their L2 development optimally occurs. Thus, consideration of students' ZPD is of paramount importance when providing mediation – OCF – to enhance their L2 development.

ZPD is not naturally in stasis but may expand or narrow as the interactional process is progressing or regressing (Wells, 1999). Therefore, in the context of language learning, language teachers play a vital role in fostering learning by carrying out dialogic interactions with each individual student or a group of students to determine their ZPD, later providing the mediations or scaffolding accordingly. Also, teachers should encourage their students to help each other through peer scaffolding by allowing them to work collaboratively. This may effectively develop

their interlanguage and broaden their ZPD (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 1995). The alignment between students' preferences and teachers' practices of OCF may intensify the dialogic interactions to co-construct their ZPD during the process of OCF provision to further develop their linguistic knowledge. Otherwise, the misalignments may hinder the development of students' ZPD and their interlanguage as well.

7. CONCLUSION

The study examined the congruency between student preferences and teacher practices of OCF in senior high school classroom context in Indonesia. While students are in favour of receiving more feedback on their vocabulary errors to help them construct meaningful utterances, teachers respond more to students' pronunciation errors to help them produce understandable sentences. Students expect to receive OCF using negotiated feedback to assist them to do self-repair, but teachers used more clarification requests. However, both groups are aligned regarding the OCF provider in which they favour teacher feedback considering the accuracy of the feedback.

To better align the incongruencies between teacher and students in terms of OCF provision, both could openly share their views and preferences along with the underlying reasons and participate in discussions to negotiate differences. In this manner, both teachers and students may gain a better understanding about each other's views and preferences and about the theoretical and practical concept of OCF provision. Loewen et al. (2009) emphasise the significant role of understanding the students' sociocultural context affecting their OCF preferences. Students, on the other hand, deserve explanation about the cultural contexts underlying teachers' decision in providing OCF (Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). For the sake of the alignment, teachers are also encouraged to broaden their knowledge about the variety of OCF strategies with their pros and cons and discuss with students to decide which ones suit them better. Recognising that even with a mutual understanding of OCF incongruencies may still occur, however, it might be expected that there will be no detrimental impacts on students as indicated in the literature (Plonsky & Mills, 2006; Roothooft & Breeze, 2016). Considering the students and teachers' high expectation of negotiated feedback and its benefits, it may be a priority to recommend an increased awareness and training in the use of negotiated feedback for day-to-day classroom interactions. This awareness could be cascaded to students or implemented as a strategy to enable greater peer collaboration. Indeed, Ha and Murray (2021), Ha (2022) and Nassaji et al. (2023) recommend professional development programmes for teachers to improve their conceptual understanding and practical effectiveness of OCF provision.

Given that this study was conducted at state Islamic senior high schools in the rural area of Lampung province, Indonesia, contextually driven studies such as this can help to better inform the potential of such professional development and future transformation.

Teacher practices and student preferences of oral corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A Vygotskian perspective

by Bambang Irfani and Aisling O'Boyle

Appendix. The coefficient correlation of student questionnaire

ITEMS	PEARSON CORR.	SIG.	STATUS
I like it when my teacher corrects my oral errors in grammar.	.053	.748	Dropped
I like it if all my errors during classroom interaction are corrected.	.483	.002	Valid
I would prefer to have correction of my oral errors immediately following the errors.	.300	.060	Dropped
I prefer to have correction of any of my mispronunciations in oral classroom activity.	.462	.003	Valid
I prefer to have corrections of my oral errors from my teacher.	.692	.000	Valid
I learn something when I get correction of my errors in using words or phrases to express my ideas orally.	.495	.001	Valid
I prefer to have correction only on errors which may interfere with communication.	.801	.000	Valid
I feel uneasy and disturbed when my teacher interrupts me to correct my errors.	.715	.000	Valid
When my teacher ignores my grammatical errors during oral activity of classroom interaction, I just feel neglected.	.737	.000	Valid
Receiving correction from friends is fine with me.	.521	.001	Valid
I dislike at all having correction on my errors during classroom interaction.	.746	.000	Valid
I don't like when my teacher ignores my errors in pronunciation.	.740	.000	Valid
I feel fine when my teacher interrupts me to correct my error.	.677	.000	Valid
I feel happy and grateful if my teacher corrects all oral errors I make to help me improve my English proficiency.	.308	.053	Dropped
I don't like to receive corrections from my friends.	.569	.000	Valid
Any correction of my errors in using words or phrases is preferable to me.	.608	.000	Valid
I would rather have correction of my errors after I finish my speaking task.	.475	.002	Valid
I would prefer if my errors which do not cause misunderstanding are not corrected.	.661	.000	Valid
I feel happy if my friends correct my errors in speaking.	.698	.000	Valid
I feel disturbed when my errors during the oral classroom activities are corrected.	.686	.000	Valid
T: Go?	.500	.001	Valid
T: Yesterday you ….	.563	.000	Valid
T: Use verb two for past action.	.532	.000	Valid
T: Pardon me?	.620	.000	Valid
T: Yesterday you went to the zoo.	.540	.000	Valid
T: You mean, yesterday you went to the zoo.	.620	.000	Valid
T: Yesterday? (If the response is still incorrect) *T: What did you do yesterday?* (If the response is still incorrect) *T: Yesterday indicates past action, so you should use Verb 2.* (If the response is still incorrect) *T: For example, 'wrote' is the past form of 'write'.* (If the response is still incorrect) *T: You should say: 'Yesterday I went to the zoo'.*	.075	.645	Dropped

ITEMS	PEARSON CORR.	SIG.	STATUS
T: You should say, 'Ali has...'	.627	.000	Valid
T: Ali have?	.366	.020	Valid
T: What do you mean by 'have'?	.454	.003	Valid
T: In Simple Present Tense, use Verb 1 plus 's' or 'es' for the 3rd singular subject like Ali.	.541	.000	Valid
T: No, not like that. 'Ali...'	.447	.004	Valid
T: Has.	.747	.000	Valid
T: Ali have? (If the response is still incorrect) *T: Ali is a 3rd person singular.* (If the response is still incorrect) *T: Use Verb 1 plus 's' or 'es'.* (If the response is still incorrect) *T: For example, 'goes' is derived from 'go' plus 'es'.* (If the response is still incorrect) *T: You should use 'has' instead of 'have'.* (If the response is still incorrect) *T: You should say: 'Ali has no brothers'.*	.427	.006	Valid

References

Agudo, J. D. M. (2014). Beliefs in learning to teach: EFL student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. *Ultrecht Studies in Language and Communication, 27,* 209-362. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401210485_013

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation: Second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal, 78,* 465-483. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02064.x

Argüelles, L. G., Méndez, E. H., & Escudero, M. D. P. (2019). EFL teachers' attitudes towards oral corrective feedback: A case study. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 21*(1), 107-120. https://dx.doi.org/10.15446/profile.v21n1.69508

Asari, Y. (2019). EFL teachers' L1 backgrounds, beliefs and the characteristics of their corrective feedback. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 16*(1), 250-266. https://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.1.16.250

Bahador, H., & Mofrad, M. H. (2020). Classroom dynamic assessment of EFL learners' oral production: A case of female intermediate learners. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly, 18,* 83-97. https://dx.doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2020.18.06

Barnard, R. (2002). Peer tutoring in the primary classroom: A sociocultural interpretation of classroom interaction. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 37*(1), 57-72. https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/handle/10289/448

Bulbula, D. A., & Areda, D. B. (2020). EFL teachers' practice and learners' preferences for oral error corrective feedback in EFL speaking class. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics, 66,* 1-10. https://dx.doi.org/10.7176/JLLL/66-01

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.

De Guerrero, M. C. M., & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal, 84*(1), 51-68. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00052

Eddraoui, B., & Wirza, Y. (2019). *Speaking anxiety of EFL high school students: Indonesian and Moroccan cases.* In *Proceedings of the 4th Asian Education Symposium* (AES 2019) (pp. 349-356). https://dx.doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200513.079

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal, 1,* 3-18. https://dx.doi.org/10.5070/L2.V1I1.9054

Erlam, R., Ellis, R., & Batstone, R. (2013). Oral corrective feedback on L2 writing: Two approaches compared. *System, 41*(2), 57-68. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.03.004

Fadilah, A. E., Anugerahwati, M., & Prayogo, J. A. (2017). EFL students' preferences for oral corrective feedback in speaking instruction. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora, 5*(2), 76-87.

Farahani, A. A., & Salajegheh, S. (2015). Iranian teachers' and students' preferences for correction of classroom oral errors: Opinions and responses. *Argentinian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 3*(1), 14-25.

Foster, P., & Ohta, A. S. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(3), 402-430. https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami014

Ha, X. V. (2022). Effects of a professional development program on teachers' oral corrective feedback practices. *System, 110,* 102917. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102917

Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2020). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese Primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research, 27*(1), 137-167. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168820931897

Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2021). The impact of a professional development program on EFL teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. *System, 96,* 102405. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102405

Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2016). Oral corrective feedback on L2 writing from a sociocultural perspective: A case study on two writing conferences in a Chinese university. *Writing and Pedagogy, 8*(3), 433-459.

Teacher practices and student preferences of oral corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A Vygotskian perspective

by Bambang Irfani and Aisling O'Boyle

Henderson, K., & Palmer, D. (2015). Teacher scaffolding and pair work in a pre-K bilingual classroom. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 3*(1), 77-101. https://dx.doi.org/10.1075/jicb.3.1.04hen

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice, *Modern Language Journal, 62,* 387-398. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1978.tb02409.x

Huong, L. T. (2020). Matches and mismatches between EFL teachers' and students' preferences for corrective feedback in English speaking classes at a Vietnamese university. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies, 36*(1), 142-155. https://dx.doi.org/10.25073/2525-2445/vnufs.4505

Irfani, B. (2023). *Indonesian EFL students' and teachers' beliefs, preferences and practices of oral corrective feedback in the classroom context: A sociocultural perspective* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Queen's University of Belfast. https://pure.qub.ac.uk/en/studentTheses/indonesian-efl-students-and-teachers-beliefs-preferences-and-prac

Jayanti, F. G., & Norahmi, M. (2014). EFL: Revisiting ELT practices in Indonesia. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language, 4*(1), 5-14. https://dx.doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v4i1.70

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. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2012.705571

Kartchava, E., Gatbonton, E., Ammar, A., & Trofimovich, P. (2020). Oral corrective feedback: Pre-service English as a second language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research, 24*(2), 220-249. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168818787546

Kirgoz, Y., & Agcam, R. (2015). Teachers' perceptions on corrective feedback in Turkish primary schools. *Procedia − Social and Behavioral Sciences, 192,* 574-581. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.096

Lantolf, J. P. (2000a). *Sociocultural theory and language learning*. Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000b). Second language learning as a mediated process. *Language Teaching, 33,* 79-96. https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800015329

Lantolf, J. P. (2006a). Sociocultural theory and L2: State of the art. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(1), 67-109. https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060037

Lantolf, J. P. (2006b). Language emergence: Implications for applied linguistics − a sociocultural perspective. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(4), 717-728. https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml034

Lantolf, J. P. (2011). The sociocultural approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 21-47). Routledge.

Lantolf, J. P., & Beckett, T. G. (2009). Research timeline: Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition. *Language Teaching, 42*(4), 459-475.

Lantolf, J. P., & Pavlenko, A. (1995). Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 15,* 108-124. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500002646

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2007). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. In B. van Patten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 693-701). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lee, E. J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System, 41*(2), 17-30. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.022

Leontyev, A. N. (1978). *Activity, consciousness and personality*. Prentice Hall.

Levi, T. (2016). Developing L2 oral language proficiency using concept-based dynamic assessment within a large-scale testing context. *Language and Sociocultural Theory, 3*(2), 77-100. https://dx.doi.org/10.1558/lst.32866

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60,* 309-365. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x

Li, S. (2018). Corrective feedback. In J. I. Liontas & F. Raafat (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopaedia of language teaching*. John Wiley and Sons. https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0247

Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System, 84,* 93-109. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006

Loewen, S., Fei, F., Ahn, S., Chen, X., Li, S., Thompson, A. S., & Nakatsukasa, K. (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *Modern Language Journal, 93*(1), 91-104. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00830.x

Luria, A.R. (1982). *Language and cognition*. John Wiley and Sons.

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(3), 399-432. https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263104263021

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

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46,* 1-40. https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365

Mackey, A., & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition* (pp. 407-472). Oxford University Press.

Nassaji, H. (2011). Correcting students' written grammatical errors: The effects of negotiated versus nonnegotiated feedback. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 1,* 315-334. https://dx.doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2011.1.3.2

Nassaji, H. (2015). *The interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning: Linking theory, research, and practice*. Bloomsbury.

Nassaji, H. (2016). Anniversary article, interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: A synthesis and analysis of current research. *Language Teaching Research, 20*(4), 535-562.

Nassaji, H., Bozorgian, H., & Golbabazadeh, E. (2023). Teachers' stated cognition and its relationship with oral corrective feedback practices in EFL classrooms. *System, 113,* 102993. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.102993

Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness, 9*(1), 34-51. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658410008667135

Nguyen, M. H. (2013). EFL students' reflections of peer scaffolding in making a collaborative oral presentation. *English Language Teaching, 6*(4), 64-73. https://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n4p64

Ohta, A. S. (2000). Rethinking recasts: A learner-centered examination of corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom in the Japanese classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. Verplaeste (Eds.), *The construction of second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 47-71). Erlbaum.

Papangkorn, P. (2015). SSRUIC students' attitude and preference toward error corrections. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 197,* 1841-1846. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.244

Philp, J., Adams, R., & Iwashita, N. (2013). *Peer interaction and second language learning*. Routledge.

Plonsky, L., & Mills, S. V. (2006). An exploratory study of differing perceptions of error correction between a teacher and students: Bridging the gap. *Applied Language Learning, 16*(1), 55-74.

Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic assessment. A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting L2 development*. Springer.

Poehner, M. E., & Leontjev, D. (2020). To correct or to cooperate: mediational processes and L2 development. *Language Teaching Research, 24*(3), 295-316. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168818783212

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2015). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' cognitions about corrective feedback in teaching English oral communication. *System, 55,* 111-122. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.09.006

Rassaei, E. (2013). Corrective feedback, learners' perceptions, and second language development. *System, 41*(2), 472-483. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.05.002

Rassaei, E. (2014). Scaffolded feedback, recasts, and L2 development: A sociocultural perspective. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*(4), 17-31. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12060.x

Rassaei, E. (2019). Tailoring mediation to learners' ZPD: Effects of dynamic and non-dynamic corrective feedback on L2 development. *The Language Learning Journal, 47*(5), 591-607. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2017.1343863

Roothooft, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness, 25*(4), 318-335. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580

Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 Grammar. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133-164). John Benjamins.

Sadri, E., & Tahririan, M. H. (2018). Teacher-assisted vs. peer-assisted performances and L2 development: A mixed methods approach. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics, 9*(1), 3-28. https://dx.doi.org/10.22055/rals.2018.13403

Sahiruddin. (2013). The implementation of the 2013 curriculum and the issues of English language teaching and learning in Indonesia. In *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Language Learning ACLL2013* (pp. 567-574). IAFOR.

Sato, M., & Ballinger, S. (2012). Raising language awareness in peer interaction: A cross-context, cross-methodology examination. *Language Awareness, 21*(1-2), 157-179. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.639884

Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*. Springer.

Sung, K., & Tsai, H. (2014). Exploring student errors, teachers' corrective feedback, learner uptake and repair, and learners' preferences of corrective feedback. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 4*(1), 37-54.

Uysal, N. D., & Aydin, S. (2017). Foreign language teachers' perceptions of error correction in speaking classes: A qualitative study of foreign language teachers' perceptions of error correction in speaking. *The Qualitative Report, 22*(1), 123-135.

Van Compernolle, R. A. & Smotrova, T. (2014). Corrective feedback, gesture, and mediation in classroom language learning. *Language and Sociocultural Theory, 1*(1), 25-47.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*. Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. MIT Press.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness, 17*(1), 78-93. https://dx.doi.org/10.2167/la429.0

Wells, C. G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge University Press.

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

Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: A large-scale survey. *Language Awareness, 28*(2), 139-161. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755

Bambang Irfani

ORCID 0000-0001-6269-2311 ✉ bambangirfani@radenintan.ac.id
UIN Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia

Aisling O'Boyle

ORCID 0000-0002-5695-2225 ✉ a.oboyle@qub.ac.uk
Queen's University Belfast, UK