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Abstract

During EFL classes, teachers usually use many ways to help their students in improving their learning. Oral Corrective Feedback then, is one way teachers are supposed to use in order to correct students’ errors. This dissertation aims at finding out whether Oral Corrective Feedback enhances Students’ Engagement positively or negatively. We hypothesized that Oral Corrective Feedback enhances positively Students Engagement. To achieve such an aim, a descriptive study was applied at Larbi Ben M'hidi University, Departement of English in which we directed questionnaires to students and teachers of first year lisence. The analysis of the questionnaires confirms our hypothesis and indicates that both students and teachers are aware of the importance of Oral Corrective Feedback in EFL classes. Accordingly, it is recommended that Oral Corrective Feedback and Students’ Engagement should be deeply studied in the next researches.
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General Introduction

Mastering a foreign language has become increasingly important to many people for different reasons. Therefore, in any classroom, teachers use different methods to help students acquire the tools needed to learn. One method is Oral Corrective Feedback (O.C.F) which used to correct students’ errors and encourage their learning improvement since enhancing learning is the main teachers’ objective especially teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Allwright and Bailey (1991: 18) described the classrooms as a crucible container in which teachers and students come together, hoping to improve the language learning. And the nature of interactions teachers have with their students can shape student engagement in the classroom. Because, the interaction with others using the target language is the key to learn it (Yule, 1985: 137).

This research focuses on one of the most important classroom aspects of interaction; the role of EFL teachers’ oral corrective feedback in enhancing students’ engagement.

1. Statement of the Problem

Speaking is one of the most important and used skills in an EFL classes. Students may make some errors in speaking as a result of their limited knowledge in the target language. Teachers’ task then, is to correct students and feedback them until they get enough packages which enable them to avoid errors and faults in their speech.

Meanwhile, students’ response could be different regarding to their quality, Situation, knowledge, and other effects. In other words, O.C.F may enhance students’ engagement positively or negatively.
2. **Aim of the Study**

This study sheds light on the importance of feedback in the process of EFL learning and teaching. It aims at finding out whether oral feedback has positive or negative effects on students’ engagement in EFL classes.

3. **Research Question and Hypothesis**

The research aims at asking the following question:

- Does teachers’ oral corrective feedback enhance students’ engagement?

Accordingly, we hypothesize that teachers’ oral corrective feedback has positive effects on the students’ engagement.

4. **Methodology**

4.1 **Population and Sampling**

The sample of this study includes 60 first year EFL students who have been selected randomly from a total population of 281 first year EFL students at Larbi Ben M’hidi University. The aim behind such a selection is that first year EFL students are less knowledgeable than the other higher levels.

About teachers, 10 first year EFL teachers at Larbi Ben M’hidi University are the sample of our study. Teachers were voluntarily participants.

4.2 **Method**

The study is a survey on the students’ responses to teachers’ correction. Students and teachers’ questionnaires are analyzed in order to find out whether teachers’ Oral Corrective Feedback affects positively or negatively on students’ engagement. Also, the
study sheds light at teachers’ perceptions about this issue. This study will be done at Larbi Ben M’hidi University of Oum El Bouaghi, Department of English.

5. **Structure of the Study**

This study is divided into two chapters. The first chapter is the theoretical part, and it deals with background on O.C.F and Student Engagement. The second chapter is the practical one, and it includes description of the methodology, data collection and analysis.
Introduction

Recently, a great attention has been directed to teachers’ O.C.F and its effects on students’ engagement. In fact, in any EFL classroom, O.C.F is highly predicted, and students’ engagement is very important to enhance the learning process. This chapter will be divided into two sections. Section one deals with classroom interaction, mistakes and errors, definition of O.C.F, its effectiveness, types, O.C.F and students’ uptake. Section two is concerned with classroom psychology, engagement and motivation, definition of student engagement (S.E), student engagement in EFL classes, its dimensions, O.C.F and S.E relationship.

Section One: Oral Corrective Feedback

1.1.1 Classroom Interaction

Broadly speaking, any EFL class communication aims to promote students’ communicative competence. Students then, are supposed to use the target language to get new knowledge, develop skills, establish several relationships, recognize problems of understanding and so on (Walsh, 2011: 2). Teachers and students classroom interactions are better successful when teachers use strategies to improve student’s speaking opportunity. This implies that “without such an opportunity, reticence will be encouraged as the learners’ wish to communicate is not stimulated” (Lee and Ng, 2009: 303). One of the most important communicative interactions is the turn taking. This latter is considered as the speaking floor, it can help teachers’ understanding of the expectations of students as well as the role of classroom speaking (Poole, 2005: 301).

The turn taking is controlled through the use of Initiation-Response-feedback exchange (IRF); “I” refers to teachers’ questions, “R” stands for students’ short and simple responses that had been followed up; and “F” stands for feedback and it refers to teachers’
evaluation either by accepting or rejecting the students’ answers (Nazari and Allahyar, 2012: 22).

Accordingly, IRF exchange structure is an important strategy in EFL classes. Walsh (2011: 20) stressed that “the IRF sequence enables us to understand interaction in the classroom, and comprehend its special nature”. The last exchange of teachers’ feedback is our research interest since students’ responses towards it is not clear, despite a continuous investigation by different researchers who are still examining this issue to improve the quality of classroom interactions.

1.1.2 Mistakes and Errors

During EFL classes, students are expected to commit mistakes and errors when using the target language to communicate. Whereas mistakes are committed due to factors such as slips of the tongue or being tired, the term errors refers to systematic errors which reflects students’ levels (Corder, 1984: 25).

Furthermore, errors are of several types; vocabulary, grammar, content and pronunciation. Pronounced errors in particular, are our focus of attention in this research since perfect pronunciation is the aim of every EFL student. For this reason, EFL teachers provide their students with O.C.F when committing errors.

1.1.3 Definition of Oral Corrective Feedback

During EFL classes, errors are predicted to happen since they naturally take place at the process of learning. Errors, then, will help students to know more the language by mastering its structures and functions (Corder, 1967: 167). Hence, despite the fact that students know their incorrect pronunciation; they still need teachers’ feedback. Askew (2000: 6) defined feedback as “a judgment about the performance of another with the
intentions to close a gap in knowledge and skills”. So, while learning a second language, spoken errors are supposed to appear and this in turn, demands teachers’ feedback.

Corrective feedback (C.F) is the most common name for feedback which represents the given information by teachers to show the students errors within classroom context. The idea was supported by Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013: 2) by declaring that C.F is “responses to learner utterances containing an error”. 

In other words, Chaudron (1977: 31) defined C.F as “any reaction of teachers which clearly transforms disapprovingly, refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance”. There are numerous ways of using C.F in order to correct students’ errors which leads to many types of Oral Corrective Feedback.

1.1.4 The Effectiveness of Oral Corrective Feedback

Over times, as teaching and learning of second language has changed, the role of C.F has also changed. Teachers now are not only supposed to use C.F to correct their students’ errors but also to improve their students’ EFL learning. Researches on O.C.F, then, are stressed by many researchers to find out the pedagogical and psychological effects which vary between positive and negative ones.

Starting with the earliest 1950, C.F did not mean too much but only error correction. During late 1950and1960, a lot of opportunities to indicate C.F with psychology had emerged. Weinreich (1953) research focused more on the influence of different languages on each other, but Brooks (1960: 58) presented students’ errors like a sin in which they had to be avoided even though its presence was to be expected. After that, a lot of researches and theories started to emerge like the contrastive analysis and error analysis in the beginning of 1970, much interest on O.C.F types and effects appeared. Chaudron (1977) indicated that uptake is important in C.F measurement of the effectiveness i.e., uptake
shows the difference between existing correction and non-correction during EFL classes (quoted in Ding, 2012: 90).

Moreover, a lot of researches followed the old ones so that clarification of C.F diversities had been applied. Lomacke et al. (2007: 192) argues that teachers’ feedback is very important in enhancing the power of learning, by stressing the idea of “reinforcement through evaluation and feedback”. Othman (2012: 264) research showed that explicit correction was the dominant while teachers focus was on pronounced errors. The study also showed that time constraints and exams limit C.F in EFL classes, yet teachers and students have positive attitudes towards C.F. Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013: 30) found that the provision of C.F is helpful but needs further investigation since individual differences are of crucial role in this complex process. Thus, students may feel discouraged in some cases and this is an obstacle for teachers to help them improve their learning.

Furthermore, some views declared that there may be negative effects towards O.C.F. Black and William (1998: 17) reviewed the assessment questions that teachers use and do not discuss critically with peers. They concluded that there is little reflection on what is being assessed, i.e., teachers may not use exact type of O.C.F. Consequently, students in this case, do not really benefit from O.C.F. Guénette (2007: 52) was also against the random use of oral corrective feedback types by claiming that “any type of feedback that does not take the crucial variable of motivation into consideration is perhaps doomed to fail”; it is very important for teachers to engage in feedback practices taking into account individual differences.

So, the debate between O.C.F. advantages and disadvantages still exists since the importance and effectiveness of O.C.F are not clearly investigated.
1.1.5 Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

1.1.5.1 Explicit Correction

Explicit correction takes place when the teacher points to the error and then corrects it. Lyster and Ranta (1997: 46) defined it as the clear indication of the students’ incorrect utterance within the correct form. So, explicit correction is the provision of the correct form explicitly. Rez (2009: 118) gave the following example that explains how to provide direct O.C.F

Example one:

S: My teacher don’t correct our exams.

T: No, no, my teachers doesn’t correct our exams. We need (S) here.

1.1.5.2 Recast

Recast is a very important type of O.C.F in which teachers are supposed to reformulate the whole student’s utterance correctly. Long (2007: 77) defined corrective recast as immediate reformulation of students’ errors. In other words, Lightbown and Spada (1999: 107) explained that corrective recast is a correction of student utterance when student’s focus is on the meaning of speech. They claimed: “where the teacher repeats a student’s utterance, using correct forms where the student has made an error, but does not draw attention to the error and maintains a central focus on meaning”.

Tarone, Bigelow and Hansen (2009: 59) gave the following example that presents corrective recast:

Example two:

Trigger: what she doing?

Recast: what is she doing? Two knocks

Recall: what is she doing? (Correct).
1.1.5.3 Clarification requests

Clarification request related to both comprehensible and accuracy problems (Lyster and Ranta, 1997: 46). In this type of feedback the teacher is supposed to indicate that the utterance has been misunderstood or ill-formed using phrases like sorry?, pardon me? Excuse me? According to Lightbown and Spada (1999: 107) the teacher makes clarification requests when he/she indicates to the learner that an utterance has been misunderstood or contains an error. Here, the student is asked to repeat or reformulate it. Panova and Lyster (2002: 583) cited the following example:

Example three:

S: I want today, today. (Grammatical error)
T: I’m sorry? (Clarification request)

Also, Mendez, Castro and Arguelles (2010: 264) mentioned this example:

Example four:

T: what’s your surname?
S: Lucy
T: “pardon me”? What’s your surname?
S: Lopez
T: Excellent!

Consequently, we may say that the clarification request is a way of giving the students the chance to correct themselves.

1.1.5.4 Metalinguistic feedback

This type of C.F raises the student’s awareness about the error without the explicit provision of the correct form; here, teachers are supposed to use questions and comments,
Lyster and Ranta (1997: 46) defined it as “either comments information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student utterance, without explicitly providing the correct answer”. Panova and Lyster (2002: 584) illustrated this type of feedback:

Example five:

S: nouvelle ecosse ........ (L1)

T: oh! But that’s in French

(Metalinguistic feedback).

1.1.5.5 Elicitation

Elicitation refers to teachers’ use of some techniques in order to elicit the correct utterance from students. In this strategy, the teacher tries to elicit answers from the students by asking questions. Besides, the teacher can make pauses while speaking to allow the students to complete the learners’ utterance or by asking them to reformulate the utterance (Tedick, 1998: 3). This means that students are going to be helped by using some techniques like questions or pauses to be aware of that error. In other words, Lightbown and Spada (1999: 107) defined elicitation as “where the teacher uses questions to elicit completion of students’ utterances, asks questions to elicit correct forms, or asks to reformulate their utterances”. Example six is an illustration of this type.

Example six:

S: Androches and the lion become good friends.

T: become? (Emphasis)

S: became.

(Mendez, Castro and Arguelles, 2010: 264).
1.1.5.6 Repetition

Repetition is all about repeating the wrong utterance by the teachers in order to draw out the correct form. According to Panova and Lyster (2002: 584) “in a repetition, the teacher repeats the ill formed part of the student’s utterance, usually with a change in intonation”.

Here, teachers are supposed to use repetition as a strategy to raise students’ awareness of errors. Example seven represents this type.

Example seven:

T: …. Here, when you do a paragraph, you start here, well, let’s see, anyway, you write…write,write,write (pretends to be on the board),remember this… what is this called?

S: comma (lexical error)

T: comma? (Repetition)

Difs: period (repair)

(Panova and Lyster, 2002: 584-585)
Table 1

*Examples of the six types of corrective feedback*


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Explicit correction**     | S: he take the bus to go to school.  
T: oh, you should say he takes  
He takes the bus to go to school. |
| **Recast**                  | S: he take the bus to go to school  
T: he takes the bus to go to school |
| **Elicitation**             | S: he take the bus to go to school  
T: he ....?  
T: how do we form the third person singular form in English?  
T: can you correct that? |
| **Metalinguistic feedback** | S: he take the bus to go to school  
T: do we say he take?  
T: how do we say when it dorms the third person singular form? |
| **Clarification request**   | S: he take the bus to go to school.  
T: pardon me? |
| **Repetition**              | S: he take the bus to go to school.  
T: he take? |

*S: Student  
T: Teacher*
1.1.6 Oral Corrective Feedback and Students’ Uptake

In second language acquisition, the term uptake has two meanings. It can refer to what students achieve or learn from a particular lesson, on the one hand. And to students’ reactions, responses to teachers’ C.F on the other hand. Lyster and Ranta (1997: 49) provided the following definition of uptake: “…a student’s utterance that immediately follows the teacher’s feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher’s intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student’s initial utterance”.

Uptake is also considered as a way to evaluate the effectiveness of feedback types (Rezaei, 2011: 30). Therefore, it is important to notice whether students’ uptake is successful or not in order to investigate the effects of teachers’ O.C.F on students especially when related to student engagement which is our research interest.
Section Two: Student Engagement

1.2.1 Classroom Psychology

Any classroom is a combination of both pedagogical and psychological sides. That is to say, teachers and students’ interaction is not limited to the use of target language and its aspects. Rather, taking into consideration the emotional side of every single person during classes has an equal importance. Because every person inside the classroom has his/her own thoughts and feelings. This leads to different individual factors, aptitudes and engagements which reflect a lot of issues in the learning/teaching process. Moreover, Ecclestone and Hayes (2009: 380) also emphasized that the emotional side of classroom is more important than the intellectual one leading education to take much more a “therapeutic turn”.

Therefore, diversity in students’ engagement is something expected especially when related to classroom interaction. Atwater and Waldman (2008: 33) refer to students’ diversities as cultural ones. They argued that there are several ways in which communication is influenced by cultural differences, especially feedback process, i.e., individual differences reflect students way of thinking, speaking and behaving during classroom interactions, and O.C.F effects on students’ engagement is an example of that.

1.2.2 Engagement and Motivation

Broadly speaking, S.E and motivation are treated interchangeably due to their interrelated aspects and aims in any EFL class. Whereas S.E is related to psychological experience or behavior, motivation refers to the reasons behind being engaged (National Research Council Institute of Medicine, 2004: 31). In other words, Barkley (2010: 9) claimed that “motivation is a theoretical construct to explain the reason or reasons we
engage in particular behavior”. So, S.E is not the same as motivation but they are connected together in order to enhance EFL classes learning achievement.

1.2.3 Definition of Student Engagement

Student engagement can be defined as students’ physical and psychological involvement in the classroom. Astin (1984: 518) defined S.E as “the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience”. Students may vary in their involvement in terms of time and efforts given to their activities which aim at achieving learning/teaching goals. Kuh (2009: 638) claimed that S.E is “the time and efforts students devote to activities that are empirically linked to desired outcomes of college and what institutions do to induce students to participate in these activities”.

In other words, S.E refers to students’ willingness and ambitions in participation during learning classes (Bomia et al., 1997: 294). It can also be described as the level of participation and even interest shown as a set of behaviors and attitudes. Reeve et al. (2004: 147) declared that “engagement refers to the behavioral intensity and emotional quality of person’s active involvement during a task”. Consequently, S.E is not only viewed as a learning strategy or self-regulation of students’ cognition but also behaviors (efforts, attention), and emotions (enthusiasm, interest). Students’ engagement largely depends on the quality of interactions among and between students and teachers (Harper, 2009: 1)

1.2.4 Student’s Engagement in EFL classes

A lot of theories related to EFL classes focused on S.E because engaging students justifies the success of EFL learning/teaching process. Pascarella & Terezini (2005) believed that student learning is related to the experiences in which they are involved
during classroom activities. Evans et al. (1998: 27) in the Schossberg theory, argue that marginalized students may have negative outcomes like depression and it focuses on peer interaction to enhance engagement.

Many researches had been conducted to measure S.E during EFL classes. Skinner and Belmont (1993) research about S.E and teacher behavior showed that the behaviors of teachers influence EFL classroom interaction, i.e., teachers’ ways of interaction within students reflect the improvement of their learning. Bryson and Hand (2007: 6), after collecting data about higher education students, proved that “engagement underpins learning and is the glue that binds it together”. However, in a research conducted by Jang et al. (2010: 594) discovered that S.E is not related to school systems but rather to teachers’ interactions. So, there are different reasons which may trigger different levels of engagement in EFL.

Furthermore, Fredricks et al. (2004: 87) declared that engagement is positive due to many reasons among them teachers’ support, authentic tasks, and so on. However, others focus on threats and obstacles that may appear, and hence lead to students’ disengagement. Kuh et al. (2008) argue that showing engagement is a hard job, “it is not clear to what extent student engagement and other measures of effective educational practice contribute to achievement and persistence over and above student ability” (542). According to National Research Council Institute of Medicine of the National Academies (2004: 60), the most important factors which have an impact on engaging students are the nature and context of instruction.

In brief, we may say that within time, S.E in EFL classes takes crucial part among researchers’ investigations in order to enhance the learning/teaching processes.
1.2.5 Dimensions of Engagement

Students’ engagement is crucial to learning success. It may help in addressing the level of each student. We can define it through its dimensions. They explain the way students think, feel and behave in EFL classes. In fact, before being cognitively engaged, and experience some emotions, students need to be present in class (behavioral engagement). Dimensions of S.E then, are interconnected and important to the improvement of the learning process.

1.2.5.1 Cognitive Engagement

Cognitive engagement is related to students’ self-regulation, control and relevance of school work, deep cognitive strategy and so on. Marks (2000: 154-155) defined cognitive engagement as “a psychological process involving the attention, interest, investment, and effort students expend in the work of learning”. This definition involves psychological investment and efforts. Furthermore, indicating the purpose of mastering knowledge, skills, or crafts is clearly presented in Neumann et al.’s definition: “the student’s psychological investment in and effort directed toward learning, understanding, or mastering the knowledge, skills, or crafts that academic work is intended to promote”(1999: 12).

So, cognitive engagement refers to student’s level of investment in learning, showing willingness to exert the efforts necessary in comprehension and mastering skills.

1.2.5.2 Emotional Engagement

Emotional engagement is embodied in students’ reactions, feelings and attitudes. Patrick et al. (2007: 83) defined it as “social environment including affiliation, cohesion, fearless, mutual respect, and support from the teacher”.
Tyler and Boelter (2008: 30) suggested that emotional engagement raises the awareness and usefulness of tasks given by declaring that emotional engagement includes the “perceived importance of the task, utility of the task, and cost of successfully carrying out the task”.

Consequently, we may say that emotional engagement focuses on the psychological sides of the student.

1.2.5.3 Behavioral Engagement

Behavioral engagement includes work involvement, participation, persistence and compliance with school structures. Jones (2008: 1) stated that behavioral engagement is all about behaviorally engaged in classes. Dunleavy (2008: 23) declared that it is “behavioral value of schooling outcomes, participation in extracurricular and non-academic school activities attendance”.

So, behavioral engagement includes the effort and involvement of student in terms of being active when dealing with inside as well as outside classroom activities.
Table 2

*Examples of positive and negative engagement*


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive engagement</th>
<th>Non-engagement</th>
<th>Negative engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Attends lectures, participates with enthusiasm</td>
<td>Skips lectures without excuse</td>
<td>Boycotts, pickets on Disrupts lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Meets or exceeds assignment requirements</td>
<td>Assignment able bushed or absent</td>
<td>Redefines parameters for assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.6 **Oral Corrective Feedback and Student Engagement Relationship**

O.C.F and S.E are strongly related and they reflect classroom interaction from both sides: Pedagogical and psychological ones. Concerning the pedagogical side, in any EFL classroom, students and teachers are supposed to be involved in interactions using different types of O.C.F. The latter is considered as a type of the teaching strategies that may show S.E since it is not spontaneous but used intentionally by teachers during classes (Marzano and Pickering, 2011: 1). Teachers may interact with students for the reason of correcting
their errors and then improving their communicative competence. However, students' reactions may differ (either positively or negatively), and this is the psychological side of classroom interaction. Berrett (2003: 16), in his definition to S.E, declared that it is not only a matter of fusing, merging, reciprocity or listening and dialogue; but looking to enhance mutual relation during classroom interactions, i.e., S.E is not restricted to cognitions but also feelings and emotions.

We can clarify the relation between O.C.F and S.E by mentioning some views which explain the several effects of O.C.F on students’ engagement. Starting with negative reactions, Truscott (1999: 441) believed that O.C.F causes “embarrassment, anger, inhibition, and feelings of inferiority”, reflecting student disengagement. Other researchers believed that O.C.F is essential in second language pedagogical field because it raises students’ awareness of their errors (Larsen, 2000: 19). This, in turn, encourages students by attracting their attention to learn from their errors as well as to improve their abilities (Netten, 1991: 299).

Considering that O.C.F and S.E are strongly related, it is not clear whether O.C.F has positive or negative effects on S.E. Hewings (1992: 184) summarized such a relation by suggesting the following definition of feedback: “feedback, is of course, a complex phenomenon, to which a number of physical and psychological factors contribute”.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, from the information tackled in the first chapter dealt with O.C.F several aspects and S.E elements, it is clear that O.C.F is a way to let students know how effective they are in what they are trying to accomplish. Yet, students’ engagement may vary between positive and negative after teachers’ O.C.F. The next chapter will investigate students and teachers overall views about that by giving them such issue.
Introduction

This chapter is designed with the aim of investigating whether students will react positively or negatively towards the use of O.C.F. For this reason, two questionnaires are directed to both students and teachers at the department of English, Oum El Bouaghi.

Therefore, this chapter is divided into two sections. First, Students’ questionnaire, its sample, description, analysis and discussion of the results. Second, Teachers’ questionnaire, its sample, description, analysis and discussion of the results.

2.1 Students’ Questionnaire

2.1.1 The Sample

The study took place during the academic year 2014/2015, the sample of 60 students who are selected randomly from a total population of 281 first year LMD students. The choice of this sample stems from the fact that first year students are beginners and they are supposed to make errors in terms of pronunciation, grammar, content and vocabulary more than the advanced levels.

2.1.2 Description of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire includes 14 questions, which are grouped into four sections. The questions are either closed questions requiring a “yes” or “no” answer or to choice of the appropriate answer from a set of options or open-ended questions in which students are asked to provide justification. The first section (question from 1-3) is designed to provide us with students’ background information. The first question is about specifying students’ gender, and the second one related to whether studying English at university was their choice. Question 3 is about how they see their level in English. The second section is about O.C.F, and it contains five questions (from 4 to 8). For instance, they were asked about the
frequent O.C.F used by their teachers and how much they like to be corrected. Section three is the extent of students’ engagement after being corrected. It consists of five questions (from 9 to 13) which elicit answers about their feelings, their thoughts and reactions when they are corrected by their teachers.

2.1.3 Analysis of the results

Q1: Gender:

a. Female  
b. Male

**Table 3**  
*Students’ gender.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16,67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 1**  
*Students’ gender.*
Table three shows that the number of females (83.33\%) exceeds the number of boy males (16.67\%).

Q2: Was it your choice to study English at University?

a. Yes  

Table 4

Students’ choice to learn English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 2

Students’ choice to learn English.

This question aims at knowing whether students are interested in studying English or not. Table four shows that 85\% of students are studying English on the basis of their choices. However, 15\% did not choose to study English.
Q3: Do you consider your English pronunciation as?

a. Good  c. Average
b. Above the average  d. Poor

Table 5

Students’ level of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 3

Students’ level of English.

This question was designed to measure students’ English level. Table five shows that 43.33% of students consider their English as average, 26.67% claimed that their English as
good. 16.67% believed they have poor English, and only 13.33% judged their English as above the average. In short, the level of first year EFL students needs more improvement.

**Q4:** How much do your teachers use Oral Corrective Feedback?

a. Always  
   b. Sometimes  
   c. Often  
   d. Rarely

**Table 6**

*Students’ perceptions about teachers’ use of O.C.F.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 4**

*Students’ perceptions about teachers’ use of O.C.*
This question focuses on the amount of O.C.F used by teachers, according to students. Table six shows that according to students, 55% of teachers sometimes use O.C.F, 25% often use O.C.F, 13.33% of teachers do use O.C.F all the time, and only 6.67% rarely use it.

**Q5**: Do you consider Oral Corrective Feedback important in your learning process?

a. Yes  b. No

**Table 7**

*Students’ perceptions of O.C.F.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 5**

*Students’ perceptions about O.C.F importance.*
This question is about students’ views and perceptions of O.C.F. That is to say, whether O.C.F is important in the learning process or not. Table seven shows that 95% of students consider O.C.F as an important strategy, whereas 50% do not think so.

Q6: What is the most frequent type of Oral corrective Feedback used by your teacher(s)?

a. Explicit correction  
d. Metalinguistic feedback
b. Recast  
e. Elicitation
c. Clarification requests  
f. Repetition

Table 8
Students’ perceptions of O.C.F types used by teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + d</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + f</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + e + f</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b + e</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c + f</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 6

Students’ perceptions of O.C.F types used by teachers.

This question had been asked in order to know the most frequent type of O.C.F by teachers. According to Table eight, 20% of students declared that explicit correction is the frequent type used by teachers. 11.67% declared that metalinguistic feedback is the second used type. 8.33% represents other types like recast, and even types together such as explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback. In addition to that, other types seemed to be used together by some teachers such as recast and elicitation (5%).

Q7: What is the type that you prefer to be used by your teachers?

a. Explicit correction
e. Elicitation
b. Recast
f. Repetition
c. Clarification requests
d. Metalinguistic feedback
Table 9

*Students preferred O.C.F type.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 7

*Students preferred O.C.F type*

This question is designed to know the type of oral correction preferred by students. Table nine shows that 26.67% of students prefer explicit correction, 23.33% of them like repetition and 16.67% support elicitation, 13.33% choose metalinguistic feedback and 11.67% chose clarification requests. Yet, only 8.33% prefer recast. Clearly, explicit correction is the first choice, and there is diversity in the other options.
Q8: Do you like to be orally corrected?

a. Always  c. Often

b. Sometimes  d. Rarely

Table 10

Students’ perception of the amount of times to be corrected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16,67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46,67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 8

Students’ perception of the amount of times to be corrected.

This question aims to know how much students want to be corrected. The tables above shows that 46,67% most of the time like to be orally corrected, 23,33% like from
time to time to be corrected, and 16.67% prefer to be corrected always. But 13.33% do not favour too much correction.

**Q9:** Have you ever been disengaged by your teacher(s) Oral Corrective Feedback?

a. Yes       b. No

**Table 11**

*Students’ engagement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 9**

*Students’ engagement.*

This question aims at finding out whether students feel engaged after their teachers’ feedback or not. Table 11 shows that 75% of students are not influenced by their teachers’ O.C.F. However, 25% declared that they feel disengaged.
Q10: What do you think and what do you do after the teachers’ correction?

a. I wish I had not spoken anything.

b. I just listen, and I do not speak anymore.

c. I think about the reasons of making these errors.

d. I think the teacher is not patient enough to wait for the end of my sentences.

Table 12

Students’ thoughts and reactions after being orally corrected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16,68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61,67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b + c</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c + d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students’ thoughts and reactions after being orally corrected.

By asking this question, we want to investigate students’ thoughts and reactions after being orally corrected. Table 12 shows that 61.67% of students think positively after being orally corrected, 16.68% say nothing. And 3.33% represents students who think that their teachers did not give them enough time to talk.

Q11: How do you feel when the teacher corrects your errors?

a. I feel happy.

b. I feel bothered.

c. I feel satisfied.

d. I feel angry.

e. I feel embarrassed.
Table 13

*Students’ attitudes towards O.C.F.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46,67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + c</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b + e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 11**

*Students’ attitudes towards O.C.F*

This question is about students’ feelings after their teachers’ O.C.F. Table 13 shows that 46,67% of students feel satisfied after being orally corrected, 23,33% of them feel happy, and 8,33% feel satisfied and happy at the same time. However, 8,33% feel
embarrassed, 6.68% feel bothered, and 3.33% feel angry, 3.33% feel both bothered and embarrassed. In brief, most students feel positively after being orally corrected reflecting the awareness of O.C.F importance, and only few students, may be because of their individual differences, have some negative feelings.

**Q12:** Do you agree with the following sentences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want to be corrected after doing the errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want my mistakes to be given to me by the end of the lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not want to be corrected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be corrected all the times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sentence One**

**Table 14**

_Students’ perceptions of being corrected after the errors._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 12 is a confirmation to the previous questions (5 and 8) but in other way. Table 14 shows that 65% of students agree upon being corrected just after they made errors and 35% disagree about that. Students then, are conscious of the importance of O.C.F.

Sentence Two
Table 15
Students’ perceptions of giving feedback after the end of the lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61,67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 shows that 61.67% of students disagree about giving their errors by the end of the lesson, but 38.33% agree about that. This indicates that late O.C.F is of less value then after committing the error.

**Sentence Three**

Table 16

*Students’ perceptions of learning without feedback.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>93.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 14

*Students’ perceptions of learning without feedback.*

Table 16 shows that 93,33% disagree on to be corrected and only 6,67% agree. It is argued by students that without O.C.F, learning EFL will be uncompleted.

**Sentence Four**

**Table 17**

*Students’ perceptions of continuous feedback.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16,67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 shows that 83.33% of students agree on being corrected all the times and 16.67% disagree about that. Clearly learners reflect their willing to learn English pronunciation rapidly.

**Q13: Which statement(s) do you think describes your situation?**

a. I think that oral corrective feedback is necessary and helpful.

b. I worry about making oral mistakes because they make me doubt myself.

c. I resent being orally corrected by the teacher in the classroom.

d. I get upset when I do not understand what the teacher is correcting.
Table 18

*Students’ reactions to O.C.F.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + d</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 16

*Students’ reactions to O.C.F.*

In this question, students are supposed to tick the sentence which describes their situation after being corrected. Table 18 shows that 66.67% of students consider O.C.F as necessary and helpful, 11.66% declared that O.C.F is important and at the same time get
upset when they do not understand what the teacher is correcting. 3.33% of students worry about making errors and only 5% resent being orally corrected.

2.1.4 Discussion of the Results

Students’ questionnaire shows that the number of females (83.33%) is higher than males (16.67%). This may be an indicator that females are more interested in studying English than males who may prefer other specialties. In addition, 85% of the chosen sample declared that they study English because they like it, and they are keen to improve their English abilities to communicate fluently. Concerning students ‘level in English, 43.33% of them consider it as average, and 26.67% as good, and 16.67% evaluate it, as poor. This reveals that despite the fact that they are first year students, they are working to improve their English level. But on other hand, 16.67% evaluate their English level as poor. Actually the first two percentages reflect the fact that English was the choice of the students, while the first percentage indicates that students are still in need to improve their skills.

According to students’ answers, more than half of the teachers sometimes use O.C.F and this is due to the importance of O.C.F in learning EFL. 95% of students agree with such importance claiming that they really learn from their mistakes after being orally corrected. They further declared that after being corrected, they do more efforts to pronounce better without repeating the same errors. Hence, there is diversity in the results when it comes to students’ perceptions about the most frequent type of O.C.F used by teachers. This could explain the fact that either teachers’ personalities or individual differences affect the chosen type. Yet, the dominant used type was explicit correction, because EFL teachers seek to give clear correction and to avoid confusing the students. This in turn, was supported by students when 23.33% of them chose Explicit correction.
among O.C.F list of types since first year students do not really have enough information to correct themselves, teachers’ explicit correction do not only help them to correct their mistakes but also to learn more about the target language. Q8 was a kind of ensuring students’ perceptions about of the importance of O.C.F. 46.67% of them declared that they most of the time like to be orally corrected focusing on their willingness to improve English pronunciation.

The majority of students (75%) had never been disengaged by their teachers’ O.C.F because they are aware of its importance and consider it as key component in the learning process. However, 25% of them had been disengaged, and this could be due to either individual’s differences such as being shy or less confident student due to teachers’ misuse of O.C.F types. Q10, then, focuses on students’ thoughts and reactions after being orally corrected. The study shows that 61.67% of students are conscious of the importance O.C.F since they think about the reasons behind doing errors. Concerning their feelings, 46.67% feel satisfied towards teachers’ corrections, because it makes them aware of their errors, and this in turn will improve their levels. In Q12 was a truck, we aimed to make students either confirm their previous answers, or give alternatives. Sentence one and two are correlated together because students who chose agree for the first sentence, are supposed to disagree with the second one. Fortunately, 65% of students agree about being corrected after doing errors. At the same time, 61.67% disagree about giving feedback by the end of the lesson. So, students, then, prefer to be corrected just after committing errors. This could help them to learn directly by remembering the correct form. Alternatively, delaying the correction may not attract students’ attention, on the one hand, and may not assure that teachers will remember all students’ errors by the end of the lesson on the other hand.

Sentence three confirms that students really appreciate O.C.F effectiveness by declaring that they disagree (93.33%) on to be corrected. In fact, as beginners they need
teachers’ O.C.F to enhance their EFL learning. After that, sentence four was an enforcement to Q8 since 83.33% agree with being corrected all the. Regarding Q13, 66.67% of students declare that O.C.F is necessary and helpful i.e., it is a great value when it comes to improving English pronunciation.

To conclude, the results obtained from students’ questionnaires show that O.C.F really enhances students’ engagement positively at the level of their thoughts, feelings and reactions. This, in turn, confirms our hypothesis which declared that O.C.F enhances positively students’ engagement.

2.2 Teachers’ Questionnaire

2.2.1 The sample

The sample consists of 10 volunteered teachers of first year English LMD students at the Department of English, Larbi Ben M’hidi University. The selection was carried out randomly because we believe that most teachers do use O.C.F with all their first year classes regardless of the sessions.

2.2.2 Description of the Questionnaire

Teachers’ questionnaire contains 17 questions that are grouped into four sections. Teachers are asked yes or no question; to choose the appropriate answer from a set of options by providing justifications, and they are also asked about their opinions and perceptions concerning O.C.F in open-ended questions.

Section one tackles teachers’ Background information (from 1 to 3). Here teachers were asked about their gender, the degree held, and their experience in teaching EFL.
Section two is designed to clarify teacher viewpoints and attitudes towards O.C.F. (from 4 to 11). Here, teachers are asked questions on the amount of O.C.F used in EFL classes and most useful types suit their students’ needs.

Section three is related to students’ engagement after being orally corrected (from 12 to 16). Teachers were asked whether they focus on accuracy or fluency, the most frequent errors committed by EFL learners, students’ reactions after providing them with O.C.F, and also the possibility of facing students when could be disengaged after being corrected.

Section four is about teachers’ further suggestions and comments concerning the use of O.C.F in EFL classes.

2.2.3 Analysis of the Results

**Q1: Gender:**

a. Male

b. Female

**Table 19**

*Teachers’ gender.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 17

Teachers’ gender.

Table 19 indicates that 80% of teachers are women, and 20% are men.

Q2: Degree held:

a. BA (Licence)

b. Magister

c. Master

d. Ph.D (Doctorate)
Table 20

*Teachers’ educational qualification.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 18

*Teachers’ educational qualification.*

Table 20 clearly shows that 100% of teachers hold Magister degree.
Q3: How long have you been teaching English?

Table 21

Teaching experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 19

Teaching experience.

This question targeted teachers teaching experience. Table 21 illustrated that 60% of teachers taught between 1 to 5 years, 20% of them have a teaching experience from 6 to 10 years. The other 20% of them have a longer teaching experience (more than 10 years).
Q4: How much do you use oral corrective feedback in your classes?

a. Always  c. Often

B. Sometimes  d. Rarely

Table 22

Teachers’ amount of O.C.F used in EFL teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 20

Teachers’ amount of O.C.F used in EFL teaching

This question aims at knowing the amount of O.C.F used by teachers during EFL classes. From table 22, 50% of teachers declared that they always use O.C.F, 20% often
use it, and 30% of them sometimes use it. However, none of the teachers chose the option “Rarely”.

**Q5**: Do you find oral corrective feedback useful?

a. Yes  

b. No

**Table 23**

*Usefulness of O.C.F.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 21**

*Usefulness of O.C.F.*

The aim behind this question is to clarify the usefulness of O.C.F by EFL teachers. Table 23 clearly showed that all teachers consider O.C.F as useful.
Q6: When do you correct your students’ errors?

Table 24

*Teachers’ time of correcting errors.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. After making errors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. By the end of the lesson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 22

*Teachers’ time of correcting errors.*

This question focuses on the appropriate time of correction. In table 24, all teachers declared that they correct their students just after making the errors. However, none of them chose the second choice.

Q7: What do you correct when giving Oral Feedback?

a. Grammar.  
b. Pronunciation.  
c. Content.  
d. Vocabulary.
Table 25

*Teachers’ oral feedback focus correction.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + b + c + d</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + b + d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 23

*Teachers’ oral feedback focus correction.*

This question seeks to classify the importance pronunciation among the other aspects of language. Table 25 summarized teachers’ comments concerning O.C.F, 60% of them stated that they comment on grammar, pronunciation, content and vocabulary
together. 40% chose grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary but not content. However, no one chose one specific focus.

**Q8:** What is the preferred type of oral feedback when dealing with first year EFL students?

a. **Explicit correction:** The explicit provision of the correct form.

b. **Recast:** The teacher reformulation of all or part of the student’s utterance, minus the error.

c. **Clarification requests:** Indicate to the student that the utterance is ill formed and a reformulation is required.

d. **Metalinguistic feedback:** Comments, information or questions related to how well-formed the student’s utterance is, without explicitly providing the correct form.

e. **Elicitation:** Techniques used to directly elicit the correct form from the student.

f. **Repetition:** Teacher’s repetition of a student’s erroneous utterance.
Table 26
Teachers’ preferred O.C.F type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 24
Teachers’ preferred O.C.F type.

Table 26 shows that the preferred type of feedback applied on first year students is explicit correction (40%). Then, 30% of them do prefer both explicit correction and
20% chose only repetition, and 10% preferred recast. However, none of them use the other types.

Q9: Which type is the most useful when focusing on errors of pronunciation?

Table 27

**Feedback and errors of pronunciation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 25

**Feedback and errors of pronunciation.**
As it is shown in table 27, above half of teachers (60%) declared that the most useful type when focusing on pronunciation is explicit correction. And 40% think that it is repetition. However, nobody chose the other options.

Q10: In your opinion, what type of Oral Corrective Feedback gives the best student uptake?

Table 28
*O.C.F and students’ input.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By this question, we aim to find the most suitable O.C.F type that increases students’ input. Table 28 shows that 40% of teachers claim that the type which increases students’ input is explicit correction, 20% of them declared that repetition is the best type. 10% chose recast as the most suitable one, and 30% of them did not answer this question.

Q11: Do you adapt your Oral corrective Feedback to the needs of individual students?
   a. Yes               b. No

Table 29
The adaptation of O.C.F to students’ level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This question is related to whether teachers take into consideration individual differences or not. From table 29; 80% of teachers claimed that they adapt their O.C.F to the needs of individual students, and only 20% of them do not do that.

Q12: In your classes; do you focus on?

a. Accuracy  b. Fluency  c. Both of them

Table 30
EFL teaching focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + b</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*EFL teaching focus.*

The objective of this question is to highlight the importance of correct pronunciation during EFL classes, and teachers’ interest in achieving that. As table 30 indicates, 100% of teachers have an equal focus on both accuracy and fluency.

**Q13:** Do your students’ errors appear?

a. Always

b. Sometimes

c. Often

d. Rarely
Table 31

*Students’ errors.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 29

*Students’ errors.*

The aim of this question is find out teachers’ awareness of students’ errors. Table 31 clearly shows that 40% of teachers claim that they sometimes notice their students’ errors, 30% always notice students’ errors, and 30% often do so.
Q14: What are your students’ reactions after being corrected?

Table 32

Students’ reactions to O.C.F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Accept and continue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Stop speaking and feel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embarrassed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 30

Students’ reactions to O.C.F.

Knowing students reactions to O.C.F was the aim behind such a question. According to teachers, table 32 obviously indicates that 90% of students’ reactions after being orally corrected are positive since they accept the correction and continue speaking. However, only 10% stop speaking and feel embarrassed.
Q15: Have you faced disengaged students after providing O.C.F?

A. Yes b. No

Table 33
Disengaged students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 31
Disengaged students.

The objective of this question is to know whether O.C.F is always successful. From table 33, it is clearly stated that 60% of teachers faced disengaged students by their O.C.F, and 40% did not face disengaged students.
Q16: If yes, what are the feelings and reactions you had remarked?

Table 34
Disengaged students’ feelings and reactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Feel frustrated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Feel embarrassed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Feel bothered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Stop speaking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Loss of ideas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 32
Disengaged students’ feelings and reactions.

The aim of this question is to describe disengaged students reactions to O.C.F. From table 34, teachers clearly indicate that 25% of disengaged students feel embarrassed, 25% feel bothered, and 25% stop speaking.
2.2.4 Discussion of the Results

The analysis of the results indicates that 80% of teachers are women. This is due to the fact that number of female teachers exceeds that of males. Besides, all teachers hold magister; this is due to the importance that is giving to EFL teachers of university. Concerning question three, 60% of teachers taught from 1 to 5 years, they have enough experience on O.C.F situations. But the left percentage 20% from 6 to 10, and 20% more than 10 are supposed to enrich the results by important answers.

Half of teachers claimed that they always use O.C.F since they teach first year EFL students. All the teachers declared that O.C.F is useful, because students’ level would never be improved without the provision of O.C.F. So, EFL students need to know their errors in order to correct them. Concerning feedback, 100% of teachers correct their students just after making errors. They also claimed that if they delay the feedback to the end of the lesson, they will decrease students’ attention to their errors.

Concerning teachers’ focus when providing O.C.F, 60% of teachers determine that they are interested in correcting all types of errors. Thus, they consider pronunciation as equally important as the other choices. In Q8, explicit correction is the first choice to be applied on first year students, because they are beginners and they need to learn from their errors. Repetition also has a crucial role in pushing students’ memorization of the correct answer.

Most of teachers (60%) pointed that errors of pronunciation are successfully avoided after explicit correction. Here students are in need to direct correction in order to remember it. Also, 40% of teachers think of repetition as suitable choice to enhance memorization since it increases students’ input.

In correcting students, 80% of teachers adapt their O.C.F to their students’ differences. That is to say, students’ level and capacities. Others care about age, sex,
personalities and learning strategies. Consequently, all teachers are aware of the most suitable type of O.C.F that meets their students’ errors. Another interpretation that the research included from the results is that teachers focus on both accuracy and fluency when correcting students’ errors.

Question 13 confirms teachers’ interest in theirs students’ errors. 40% of them claimed that students sometimes make errors; this may lead us to say that EFL students have little time to speak during EFL classes. Therefore, teachers should encourage their students to talk even if they commit errors. They should always stress the fact that the focus is on fluency rather than accuracy. Students are aware of the importance and effectiveness of O.C.F in EFL classes. This is supported by 60% of teachers who declared that they did not face disengaged students in their career. This could be justified by the correct use of O.C.F by teachers. However, half of teachers who faced disengaged students remarked students’ embarrassment. This is mainly due to individual differences.

From teachers’ questionnaire, we may agree on the importance and effectiveness of O.C.F during EFL classes, because it enhances students’ engagement especially in speaking activities.

**Conclusion**

The results obtained from students’ and teachers’ questionnaires showed that student engagement is enhanced during EFL classes even after being orally corrected by their teachers. Therefore, both students and teachers need O.C.F as a tool of improving students’ level of pronunciation especially at early levels of EFL learning and teaching.

**Pedagogical Implications**

Some students would have negative beliefs about O.C.F in general. To make them change these views; it is preferable for teachers, especially at the beginning of the course, to prepare the ground before engaging in correcting errors. That is to say, they should
know that individual differences have an impact on language learning, and thus need to be psychologically prepared.

Also, it is advisable for teachers to use O.C.F more in small classes to enhance the learning process effectively, because it is very difficult for teachers to apply O.C.F correctly in overcrowded classes.

Limitations of the Study

- The first limitation is the limited time we had; we were obliged to conduct a questionnaire since it allows us to gather a large amount of data in a short period of time.

- The second one is related to the nature of the tool used. The experimental method would give more reliable and valid results since questionnaires’ answers would not always reflect students and teachers’ real opinions.

- The third limitation is about resources. We were obliged to include many secondary resources in order to get the exact information needed.

Suggestions for Further Research

- For further studies, future researchers will be well served on the same problem following an experimental design.

- Also, O.C.F as an important process in EFL classes is needed to be investigated within several aspects of the target language such as grammar and vocabulary.

- Students’ engagement, in turn, demands more researchers’ attentions especially when dealing with its dimensions (cognitive, emotional and behavioral).
General Conclusion

Learning English requires mastering the four skills. Besides writing, speaking is the skill which reflects students’ level during EFL classes. Some students, and due to their lack of knowledge of the target language, may commit errors when pronouncing words. Teachers’ task, then, is to help their students by providing them with O.C.F. The latter is a part of the learning process. If teachers used it effectively with its different types, they could enhance their students’ engagement during EFL classes.

The present study sheds light on the role of O.C.F in enhancing students’ engagement. We hypothesized that students will be engaged positively after being orally corrected by the teacher this hypothesis was confirmed through the results obtained from questionnaires answered by both first EFL students and teachers.

The study showed that almost all students are engaged positively even after being orally corrected. Students and teachers are aware of the importance and effectiveness of O.C.F in enhancing students’ engagement for the ultimate aim of being successful English speakers.
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Appendix A

Students’ Questionnaire

Dear students,

This questionnaire is designed for the aim of collecting information needed for the accomplishment of a master dissertation. We are looking to find out whether oral corrective feedback has positive or negative effects on students engagement in EFL classes. Please put tick in the box correspondent to your answer(s) and make full statements where necessary.

Thank you in advance

Miss: TADRANET Meriem

Master Research Student

Department of English

Faculty of Latters and Languages

University of Oum El Bouaghi
Section one: Background Information

1. Gender:
   1. Female ☐
   2. Male ☐

2. Was it your choice to study English at University?
   a. Yes ☐
   b. No ☐

   Justify your answer, please.................................................................

...........................................................................................................

3. Do you consider your English pronunciation as?
   a. Good ☐
   b. Above the average ☐
   c. Average ☐
   d. Poor ☐

Section two: Oral Corrective Feedback

4. How much do your teachers use oral corrective feedback?
   a. Always ☐
   b. Sometimes ☐
   c. Often ☐
   d. Rarely ☐

5. Do you consider oral corrective feedback important in your learning process?
   Yes ☐
   No ☐

   Clarify, please ...........................................................................................

...........................................................................................................

6. What is the most used type of oral corrective feedback by your teacher(s)?
   a. Explicit correction: the explicit provision of the correct form. ☐
   b. Recast: the teacher reformulation of all or part of the student’s utterance, minus the error. ☐
   c. Clarification requests: indicate to student that the utterance is ill formed and a reformulation is required. ☐
d. **Metalinguistic feedback**: comments, information or questions related to how well-formed the student’s utterance is, without explicitly providing the correct form. □

e. **Elicitation**: techniques used to directly elicit the correct form from the student. □

f. **Repetition**: teacher’s repetition of a student’s erroneous utterance. □

7. **What is the type that you prefer to be used by your teacher? Please, explain why?**

................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

8. **Do you like to be orally corrected?**

   a. Always □
   b. Sometimes □
   c. Often □
   d. Rarely □

**Section three: Student Engagement**

9. **Have you ever been disengaged by your teacher(s) ‘oral corrective feedback?**

   a. Yes □
   b. No □

If yes, why? ..................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

10. **What do you think and what do you do after the teachers’ correction?**

   a. I wish I had not spoken anything. □
   b. I just listen, and I do not speak anymore. □
   c. I think about the reasons of making these errors. □
   d. I think the teacher is not patient enough to wait for the end of my sentences. □

   Others, ........................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
11. How do you feel when the teacher corrects your mistakes?

a. I feel happy. □

b. I feel bothered. □

c. I feel satisfied. □

d. I feel angry. □

e. I feel embarrassed. □

12. Do you agree with the following sentences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want to be corrected after doing the errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want my mistakes to be given to me by the end of the lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not want to be corrected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be corrected all the times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Which statement(s) do you think describes your situation?

a. I think that oral corrective feedback is necessary and helpful. □

b. I worry about making oral mistakes because they make me doubt myself. □

c. I resent being orally corrected by the teacher in the classroom. □

d. I get upset when I do not understand what the teacher is correcting. □
Section four: Further Suggestion or comments

14. Would you like to add other comments to the discussion of teachers’ Oral Corrective Feedback in EFL classes?

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

Thank you so much
Appendix B

Teachers’ Questionnaire

Dear teachers,

This questionnaire is designed for the aim of collecting information needed for the accomplishment of a master dissertation. We are looking to find out whether oral corrective feedback has positive or negative effects on students engagement in EFL classes. Please tick in the appropriate box (es) and make full statements when needed.

Thank you for your time and co-operation in completing this questionnaire

Miss: TADRANET Meriem

Master Research Student

Department of English

Faculty of Latters and Languages

University of Oum El Bouaghi
Section one: background information

1. Gender:

a. Male □ b. Female □

2. Degree held:

a. BA (License) □

b. Magister □

c. Master □

d. Ph. D (Doctorate) □

3. How long have you been teaching English? .................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Section two: Oral Corrective Feedback

4. How much do you use oral corrective feedback in your classes?

a. Always □ c. Often □

b. Sometimes □ d. Rarely □

5. Do you find oral corrective feedback useful?

a. Yes □ b. No □

Clarify, please
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

6. When do you correct your students’ errors?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
7. What do you correct when giving Oral Feedback?

a. Grammar. □

b. Pronunciation. □

c. Content. □

d. Vocabulary. □

8. What is the preferred type of oral feedback when dealing with first year EFL students?

a. Explicit correction: the explicit provision of the correct form. □

b. Recast: the teacher reformulation of all or part of the student’s utterance, minus the error. □

c. Clarification requests: indicate to the student that the utterance is ill formed and a reformulation is required. □

d. Metalinguistic feedback: comments, information or questions related to how well-formed the student’s utterance is, without explicitly providing the correct form. □

e. Elicitation: techniques used to directly elicit the correct form from the student. □

f. Repetition: teacher’s repetition of a student’s erroneous utterance. □

Explain why? Please………………………………………………………………………..

9. Which type is the most useful when focusing on errors of pronunciation?

………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

10. In your opinion, what type of Oral Corrective Feedback give the best student uptake? Why?

……………………………………………………………………………………………..

……………………………………………………………………………………………..

……………………………………………………………………………………………..
11. Do you adapt your Oral corrective Feedback to the needs of individual students?
   a. Yes □  b. No □
Justify, please ……………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Section three: Student Engagement

12. In your classes, do you focus on?
   a. Accuracy □  b. Fluency □  C. Both of them □
   Explain why? Please ……………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

13. Do your students’ errors appear?
   a. Always □  c. Often □
   b. Sometimes □  d. Rarely □

14. What are your students’ reactions after being corrected?
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

15. Have you faced disengaged students after providing oral corrective feedback?
   a. Yes □
   b. No □
16. If yes, what are the feelings, and reactions you had remarked?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Section four: Further Suggestion or comments

17. Please add other comments that you may consider important to the discussion of the effects of oral corrective feedback on students engagement.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Thank you
Résumé

المناخ

من خلال الحصص المخصصة لتعليم اللغة الأجنبية، يعتمد الأساتذة مساعدة تقدم دراسة الطلاب باستعمال أساليب عدة.

يعتبر التصحيح اللغوي من الطرق المعتمدة لتصحيح الاخطاء المرتكبة من طرف الطلبة. بحثنا هذا يهدف إلى معرفة ما إذا كان لهذه التقنية تأثير إيجابي أو سلبي على مشاركة الطلاب في الدراسة. وقد اقترحنا أن التأثيرات ستكون إيجابية لذلك اعتمدنا دراسة وصفية تمثلت في مجموعة استبيانات لطلبة واساتذة السنة الأولى لنظام الام دي تخصص لغة إنجليزية جامعية العربي بن مهديي و بعد تحليل و مقارنة النتائج استنتجنا أن تقنية التصحيح اللغوي فعلا تتعكس إيجابيا على مشاركة الطلاب في الدراسة وذلك لإنهاك كل من الطلبة والأساتذة بأهمية وفعالية هذه التقنية. وقد اقترحا أن تدرس أكثر تقنيات التصحيح اللغوي ومشاركة الطلاب في الدراسة.