

EFL STUDENTS' PREFERENCES FOR CLASSROOM FEEDBACKS

Asfar Arif Nurharjanto

English Language Education Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Yogyakarta State University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Language learners' environment holds a vital contribution to learners' language development. It provides them with the target language, in this case, English as a Foreign Language, which is usually taken in the form of input and feedback. Learners may choose the feedback variously depending on their proficiency and background. However, prior studies in this area show inconsistent results regarding the effect of learners' background and proficiency on their preference for feedback. Hence, this study aimed to explore EFL University students' preferences for classroom feedback. The research was qualitative, and the data were gained through interviews involving 20 students of the Graduate Program of English Education whose English competencies are mostly upper intermediate to advanced level. This study found that the learners could accommodate all types of given feedback and they do not significantly tend to choose particular types of feedback. This implies that learners' language proficiency and surrounding environment could determine their choice of feedback. As a result, teachers or other language trainers should take their learners' current language development into account to give those appropriate types of feedback.

Keywords: *classroom feedback; EFL learners; and language input*

The linguistics environment and linguistics evidence surrounding learners, provide a significant role in one's language development (Sheen, 2004). This is usually carried out through communication in which language learners are engaging with a speaker of another language. The communication provides them with additional information about the target language in the form of input and feedback which help them shape their language. The input and feedback will later become the learner's comprehensive input through meaning negotiation with others of a better speaker. The information comes in the form of language input and feedback. Through communication, learners will get comprehensible input through meaning and

feedback negotiation from others. Therefore, it is crucial to consider it as a crucial factor in someone's language development. In addition, giving proper feedback will not only help learners develop their language but also enhance their motivation (Nurya et al., 2019; Wahyuningsih, 2020).

Although feedback and intake become factors that support learners' language development, numerous factors determine learners' preference for feedback. (Ortega, 2014) emphasizes that context and how the feedback is implemented determine the effectiveness of feedback. The context here means whether it is a classroom or non-classroom context as feedback might be used differently. Implementation or choice of feedback whether it is implicit or explicit will

also influence its effectiveness. In addition, the way learners react to feedback is determined by several factors and some of which are the learner's proficiency level and cultural background (Sheen, 2004; Sippel & Jackson, 2015). In this way, context, proficiency, and cultural background should be considered when choosing feedback for the learners.

Learners' current language development is found to be a predominant factor influencing students' choice of feedback. (Li, 2013) finds that learners with high proficiency process feedback, especially information within the feedback, effectively compared to those of lower proficiency. High-proficiency learners have more cognitive room to deal with information given in the feedback. Those spare memories will differentiate students' choice of classroom feedback. Moreover, (Ellis & Sheen, 2006) emphasized that learners' factor will also influence their choice of feedback. They emphasized that learners' readiness and literacy level would influence how to choose their feedback. Further, studies pointed out the differences between low-achieving learners who likely chose feedback directly given to them (Kennedy, 2010; Sippel & Jackson, 2015). These researchers believed that more advanced learners have more language and resources to support the given feedback thus they could follow up on the error and repair easily compared to early language learners who just started to learn the language.

Opportunity to use English is fairly limited in EFL context compared to where English is the second language. That condition represents Indonesia where English is considered as a Foreign Language. Students here do not possess as many chances to use their English outside the classroom compared to those of ESL countries. (Lee, 2016) also believes that particular ESL or EFL context influences learners' choice of feedback as each offers a peculiar learning process, goal and situation.

This claim is supported by some studies. (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) ' findings have similarities with those of (Sheen, 2004) that students' background cultures affect their choice of feedback. In its study, sheen examined three different instructional contexts varying across immersion groups, ESL and EFL. He found out that students' choices of feedback vary differently across settings. Further, Lyster et al., (2013) stated that both ESL and EFL likely to choose different kinds of feedback. It is because ESL students emphasized communication while EFL students do more on grammar.

Opposed to those supportive findings, Lyster and Saito (2010) pointed out that instructional context did not play a role in learners' choice of feedback. This may be due to the learner nature that is still in development. Their findings are in line with Lyster and Mori (2006) who discovered that students from different instructional settings did not differentiate their choice of feedback. However, their rate of uptake and repair vary across settings. From the previous studies, it can be perceived that instructional settings can be either influencing or determining students' choice of feedback.

Language feedback usually refers to *negative feedback or classroom feedback* that is represented in the form of error correction and corrective feedback (Ortega, 2014). Ellis and Sheen (2006) feedback into different forms that are a sign of error, correct language form and metalinguistic information of the error. In addition, Lyster and Mori (2006) emphasized the importance of feedback for learners' language development and that learner uses feedback to help them portray the target language and compare it to their interlanguage.

The feedback does not merely come into the language speakers' mind; it has to go through some processing that is called "*intake*". Lyster and Ranta (1997) described intake as a student's response to feedback given by the teacher as a result of addressing

some part of students' utterance. The intake is divided into two categories: a. utterances that need to repair and b. utterance with a repair. As the process of intake occurs, it is then followed by repair. A repair usually comes in some forms such as "recast", "explicit correction" and "self or peer-repair following prompt" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Those three processes work together in learners' language development. They also serve as an indicator that learners respond to feedback when feedback is followed by intake and repair. Moreover, in making meaning of the target language, learners usually go through the process of negotiating meaning with the interlocutor in order to convey the message. This process also needs feedback. Feedback provides them with the correct form of the target language thus it helps them to communicate by changing their language accordingly through language production (Gass & Selinker, 2008). Among all those definitions, the classroom feedback definition by Lyster and Ranta provides the most complete and thorough feedback. Hence, it is used in this present study.

Feedback is often defined as information providing a means to improve comprehension or output as a result of learners' successful or error utterances (Gass & Selinker, 2008; Ortega, 2014). The feedback is presented in various ways such as an indication that errors have occurred, the suggestion to correct the form in regard to the error, metalinguistics information about causes of error and a combination of those. While, the learner's responses to feedback are also reflected in different forms: noticing, up-taking and repairing errors. (Ellis et al., 2006). In addition, Lyster and Ranta (1997) described briefly the types of feedback for the learners such as:

1. Explicit Correction

Explicit correction refers to the correct form of language that briefly facilitates the learners with the correct form. It is usually indicated that the learner' made

errors by "Oh you mean" or "You should say....".

2. Recast

Recast refers to teachers' reformulation of the learners' but eliciting the error. It is stated implicitly and does not require the teacher to say "You mean...." or "You should say...".

3. Clarification Request

Clarification request refers to asking the learners to repeat or reformulate utterance that contains errors or is misunderstood by the teacher. It is introduced by some phrases like "Pardon me," or "What do you mean?"

4. Metalinguistic Feedback

Metalinguistics feedback refers to any clue given to the learners that brings the information they need to correct their utterances. It is indicated by a kind of comment such as "Can you find the error?", or metalinguistic information such as grammatical terminology or a word definition in the case of lexical error.

5. Elicitation

Elicitation refers to technique that helps students find out correct form from themselves. It is done by showing completion of their utterance for example "it is a" or using question to drive the correct form such asking learners to reformulate utterance.

6. Repetition

Repetition refers to repeating learners' utterance that contain error but here the teacher highlights the error. It can be done for example by changing the intonation in the error.

Later after some considerable amount of research, Sheen and Ellis (2011) also proposed some corrective feedback types developed from Lyster and Ranta's. Here, they had a similar pattern of CF as those of Lyster and Ranta but they added some categories that are separated reformulation and prompt as well as the differences between explicit and implicit. Although Sheen and Ellis (2011) provided more divisions of the CF, Lyster and Ranta's framework seems to have more categorizations thus it is used in this present

study as it helped the researcher differentiate the feedbacks.

METHOD

This present study aimed to explore the participants' view of classroom feedback. In this regard, qualitative research was employed, and the interview was conducted to gain their views on feedback. The interview was chosen due to its ability to deeply elaborate on participants' opinions and views about the feedback thus it provided a thorough understanding and explanation of the participants' views (McKay, 2008). This study involved 10 graduate students whose major is English Education in a teaching college in Yogyakarta. They mostly earned their bachelor's degree in English Education and had been learning English for at least 10 years. Their English competencies were at intermediate and advanced levels. The participants were randomly selected from 60 graduate students in the Program.

As this present study is qualitative, the interview was chosen as means of gathering data. There were 10 main questions administered which were devised from the Classification of Feedback proposed (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Each item would be an open-ended question that represented each type of feedback and each of them would be developed throughout the process of the interview adjusting the participants' responses on the questions. The participants were asked a total of 10 main questions and their answers were recorded to avoid missing information and to facilitate the transcription process. The interview was conducted individually with each of the participants with time and place following their daily schedule.

The data analysis process was done following Miles et al., (2014)' steps of data

analysis namely *data condensation, data display and conclusion drawing/verification*. In data reduction, the data were altered, grouped, extracted, or moved. Hence, in this research, data were in the form of oral records and later on the data were encrypted into interview transcripts to simplify and help alter and group the data. The data were grouped into several clusters based on Lyster and Ranta' framework of feedback. From this group, the pattern of similarities and differences appeared thus the researcher could find a conclusion from the data being analyzed. After that, in data display, the data were meant to be presented in a way it makes the researcher as well as the reader easier to see and take conclusions from the data Here, the researcher used a table that provided data from the reduction process that delivered into several clusters based of the feedback framework. In the conclusion or verification process, the data were further analyzed to separate the highlighted phenomenon, and similarities so that conclusion could be drawn. In this paper, the conclusion was drawn from the table and cluster used to distinguish participants' answers based on the feedback framework.

FINDINGS

This research sought to answer how the EFL teachers in Indonesia view the corrective feedback and their opinion of each feedback presented in the interview. The results are as follows.

4.1. View of Feedback definition

The first interview was aimed at finding participants' views of what they know about feedback and its importance in the classroom. The table showing participants' views is shown below.

Table 1. View of Feedback Definition

Summary of Responses		Participants
Feedback	Among all participants, feedback was perceived as appreciation,	All

definitions	supporting comments, clarification, input, critics, correction, and direction that comes from the teacher to improve the learning process and achieve goals in the classroom.	participants
--------------------	---	--------------

It can be seen that all participants understood what feedback is in the classroom or at least they have a picture of what feedback. Most of their perceptions on feedback is in a positive way that supports their own learning experience through critics, correction, direction, or clarification so that learning goals can be achieved. Furthermore, they also understand that feedback comes from someone such teacher or your friend.

4.2. Importance of Feedback

Despite their perceptions of what feedback is, the participants were also asked about

what importance of getting feedback in the classroom especially what they should get in the feedback. The summary of the responses shows below.

From the summary, feedback was perceived as a major contribution to the learning process and from feedback mistakes could be highlighted and minimized so that they won not do the same mistakes again. Along with that, feedback is also perceived as containing appraisal that helps motivation to grow. In this regard, the participants saw feedback in positive ways as no one of them did not mention any drawback to feedback.

Table 2. Responses on the Importance of Feedback

	Summary of Responses	Participants
Importance of Feedback	All participants agree that feedbacks have a vital contribution to the learning process especially for learners. Through feedback, learners know both their mistakes and right so that they will not repeat their mistakes again. Moreover, feedback also improves their motivation as sometimes it contains appraisal for the learners.	All participants

4.3. Clarification Request

Based on the participants' responses, the clarification request seems to benefit learners who are already advanced compared to those who are beginners. From their statements, beginner-level learners do not have sufficient knowledge to locate or

repair the mistake if the feedback given is just in the form of a clarification request. On the other hand, advanced learners, with their knowledge, find it easier as they can rely on past language experience or knowledge they have to follow up on the mistake they made.

Table 3. Responses to Clarification Request

	Summary of Responses	Participants
Clarification Request	Clarification request is perceived as more suitable feedback for the advanced level learners for it will be too difficult for beginner level learners as it requires a particular level of knowledge. Beginner level learners will be difficult to understand this feedback because participants think that beginner learners need more exact information about their mistakes for example where is the mistake, what mistake they	All participants.

4.4. Explicit Correction

<< | 76

From the summary above, the participants' opinions are divided into different groups. Most participants agree that this kind of feedback could benefit both beginner and advanced learners. The information provided in explicit correction is clear

enough to follow up thus making mistakes easier to repair. On the other hand, some other participants disagree with previous statements. They think that this kind of feedback was not challenging for advanced learners and might become detrimental emotionally if it was not used carefully.

Table 4. Responses to Clarification Request
Summary of Responses

Participants

Explicit Correction	This feedback will be suitable more for beginner learners because they get more information about the error through this feedback hence it can drive more motivation and follow-up. Even though it will be easier for the beginner learners, advanced learners still can make benefits from it.	P2, P3, P5, P7, P8
	Advanced learners did not need this feedback because they already know their mistakes. Moreover, it may now be suitable feedback for them because it is too easy for them as they are told directly where the mistake is or it can be said it is not challenging. Moreover, this kind of feedback must be treated carefully. In this feedback, the students are directly told that they make a mistake that possibly hurt their feeling or shame them in front of their classmates.	P1, P4, P6,

4.5. Recast

In the recast, some participants think that highlighted error is not enough. For beginner learners, a highlighted error will not merely lead them to follow up or correct the error. Thus, they think it is needed to

add some explanation for error rather than just highlighted it. In contrast, some other participants think that this feedback is clear enough for both beginner and advanced learners. Information given through highlighted errors within sentences is just enough for them to know where the error is.

Table 5. Responses on Recast
Summary of Responses

Participants

Recast	This feedback is not acceptable for beginner level learners because it requires more explanation of the error.	P1, P2, P3, P7
	This feedback is acceptable for both beginner level and advanced level learners. As for beginners, this feedback provides a lot of information on the errors which is highlighted within a sentence thus it easier to	P4, P5, P6, P8

follow up.

4.6. Elicitation

Some participants here view this feedback as having more advantages for those advanced learners. The prior knowledge helps them figure out the error and along with clear information about the error provided in the feedback, the error can merely be followed up. Meanwhile, beginner learners, in their opinion, will find

it difficult to follow up on this feedback due to insufficient knowledge of the language and need an explanation to make the error clearer. In contrast, some participants think that it is appropriate for both learners. They do not think that some learners will find it difficult because the error is highlighted, and the correction is simply provided thus learners will find it easier to fix.

77 | >>

Table 6. Responses on Elicitation

	Summary of Responses	Participants
Elicitation	This feedback is not acceptable for beginner level learners because the information of error this feedback provided is not enough. It needs more explanation through which beginner learners will understand and be able to follow up on the error. Moreover, this kind of feedback demands sufficient language competencies.	P1, P2, P5
	This feedback is acceptable for both beginner level and advanced level learners. It is good for both learners' levels due it leads directly to errors and information on how to correct the error is clearly provided.	P3, P4, P6, P7, P8

4.7 Repetition

Some participants believe that this feedback will be beneficial for both learners. This feedback provides explicit information on learners' errors in the sentence and repeated it with the correct formula. So that, they believe that both learner levels will get advantages this way. In addition, there is a

participant who thinks that this way feedback is still not clearly presented and beginner level will still need information or explanation from the teacher. Some participants, on the other hand, believe that this feedback just only suitable for beginner level learners because it is too easy for advanced learners if feedback is given this way that it may demotivate them.

Table 7. Responses on Repetition

	Summary of Responses	Participants
Repetition	This feedback can be suitable for both learners' level. It provides them with clear information about errors through repeating the part containing the error along with its correction. Despite that, it may require further explanation about the error and the correction to make the learner understand why it is corrected that way.	P1, P3, P5, P8
	This feedback may be suitable just for the advanced learner as, like the previous feedback, beginner learner do not seem to always get the clue from the feedback.	P2, P7

This feedback is only appropriate for beginner level learners as it provides the error and correction in a clear way that it is possible to demotivate advanced learners. P4, P6

<< | 78

4.8 Metalinguistics Feedback

Metalinguistic feedback provides learners with errors along with corrections through sentences. Participants' view of this feedback is that it is suitable for both

learners. Information or error and correction in this feedback is perceived as sufficient information for learners to follow it up thus both beginner and advanced learners will easily take this feedback.

Table 8. Metalinguistics Feedback

	Summary of Responses	Participants
Metalinguistic Feedbacks	This feedback may not be the best for beginner level. They still require to directly point the error rather than only giving the clue of where the error is. The beginner learners also may find it difficult to get where the error through if they do not have sufficient knowledge of the language.	P2, P3, P6, P8
	This feedback is suitable for both learners' levels due to information on the error and correction provided within it.	P1, P4, P5, P7

4.9 Feedback for Advanced Learners

The table above shows that the participants see language competence as a basic or foundation to understand feedback given in the classroom. Some of them believe that

advanced learners may take all feedback equally but some of them believe that particular feedback will give the learner all the benefits.

Table 9. Feedback for Advance Learners

	Summary of Responses	Participants
Advance Learner	Learner can take all kind of feedback because they already have proper language competence as the basis to understand feedback. But mistake is still acceptable since English is not their first language.	P1, P3
	Among these participants, metalinguistic feedback always of their choices.	P2, P3, P4, P6, P7, P8

5.0 Feedback for Beginner Learners

From the summary, it can be seen that most of the participants believe that beginner learners will likely get the most advantages of feedback when it contains clear information about where errors happen. Some believe that beginner learners will be

easier to follow up the feedback if correction is explicitly stated in the feedback. Despite that, one participant believes that elicitation in which information of error is not as clear as in metalinguistic feedback or repetition may encourage learners to think more about how to correct their mistakes.

Table 10. Feedback for Beginner Learners

	Summary of Responses	Participants
Beginner Learner	Metalinguistic Feedback provides the learner exact location of the error. So, they will clearly know that they make a mistake.	P1, P2, P5, P7
	Explicit Correction and Repetition provide learners with the location of the error and learners will likely follow up the feedback since the error is known and the correction is provided.	P3, P4, P8
	Elicitation because it encourages learners to respond to the error.	P6

79 | >>

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to find out EFL University students' views on classroom feedback. It mainly sought how they perceived advanced and beginner learners would likely react to particular types of feedback, and what feedback would best work for them. This study mainly came from the idea that learner competencies and language background such as ESL or EFL learners played a role in their choice of feedback. However, the result showing the relation between language background and learner competency showed various results and this study aimed to seek the answer, especially from learners in EFL context, in this term Indonesia. Table 1 above shows that the majority of the participant views feedback as an important contribution to learner development in the classroom. Question regarding the first table was devised to look for the participants' view of what feedback is. From their interview, it can be seen that feedback is perceived positively by the participants and they understand how vital it is for learner's language development. Meanwhile, table 2 possessed a similar vibe that the purpose of feedback in the classroom is crucial in that it can help learners grow and motivate them. It is important to know their expectation of feedback as discussion on feedback needed to consider its expectation concerning where the feedback was used (Lee, 2016). From there, it seems that all participants recognize feedback and its importance in the classroom. Their positive view of the feedback might be influenced by

their prior experiences in their undergraduate degree where they used to get feedback from their lecturers or friends. Moreover, their view may also be influenced by their knowledge of how learners learn the language and their experience in teaching language so deem classroom feedback as important.

Table 3 on Clarification request, participants believed that it is appropriate feedbacks for advanced learners rather than for beginner. As Recast demands some of the learners past language experiences when they have to respond to this feedback, the learners need to figure out the correction themselves which the beginner level will find difficult. This view might arise from their experience dealing with English as a Foreign Language. They believe that this feedback will work better for advanced learners because they simply have the required knowledge to make use of this feedback. This view might rise from their experience dealing with beginner learners where their English is limited. Here, as English is still a foreign language, they might believe that beginner learners have fairly limited exposure to English as in Indonesian, English is not a widely used language. Their view is similar to what Kennedy (2010) found that providing a clue on correction will invite more responses on the feedback for beginner learners as they still struggle with the language their learning which makes them difficult to draw for the language they do not yet understand. Learners' past language

learning experiences have a vital contribution to their ability to process the feedback given.

On table 4 some participants viewed explicit correction as beneficial for beginner and advanced learners. The participants thought that it provides learners with information on the error hence beginner learners will easily follow it up. However, despite it is also beneficial for advanced learners, they believed that this feedback will not be challenging and boring for them. This finding suggests that beginner and advanced learners in the EFL context might learn better through feedback that shows them information of errors clearly. This information might trigger their current knowledge thus promoting the students to follow up and respond feedback. This information clearly helps learners as in an EFL context, English language exposure is limited thus such information provides significant help. This finding is similar to Ellis et al., (2006) that explicit correction supports the learners with more cognitive comparison so that the learners may find it more useful compared to the implicit one. This high response for explicit correction was influenced by the nature of the feedback that gave learners more information about where the error occurred. The information will help the learners to uptake and respond to the error. In the repetition especially, the error information is shown clearly as the interlocutor or teacher in the classroom will highlight the error and the learners just need to uptake and respond to the highlighted error. In turn, the repetition will invite more learners' uptake and response. Despite that, this study suggests that the use of explicit correction must be done thoughtfully as it may have drawbacks such as being too easy which decreases students' motivation or make shame of them possible when it is done inappropriately in the classroom.

In Recast on Table 5, the participants believed that recast is not suitable for beginner learners. They needed more explanation on the error in which recast does not provide. This finding implies that

beginner learners will find it difficult to follow feedbacks that provide less information about error. Learners' limited current language proficiency might not catch up with the less information provided in the feedback so the feedback will be less likely to be followed up and responded. In contrast, advanced language learners might be able to follow this feedback due to their adequate language proficiency. This finding is in contrast to Lyster and Mori (2006) where both positive and negative information enabled in recast provides learners with more opportunities to language development. Despite that, some participants agreed with that of Lyster and Mori's where they think that this feedback will benefit both beginner and advanced learners for its clear information given in regardless of the error. It showed the participants might see the amount information given in the recast to a different degree thus it is treated differently. Some might see that information on the recast is clear enough for students and some of them might think otherwise. Moreover, Sheen (2010) argued that feedback that is implicit did not invite learners' awareness and responses to the error therefore it did not support language development.

Moreover, as for Elicitation, the participants' view of this feedback are also divided into two. Some of the participants believed that elicitation work just for both beginner and advanced learner due elicitation provides learners with both error and correction at the same time which highlighted the error explicitly. This finding is similar to Sheen (2010) where the medium of feedback does not matter as much as how explicit or implicit the feedback is. This explains why some participants perceived elicitation as not giving clear or explicit feedback whereas the other participants believed that it is too explicit thus learners can follow it up easily.

In repetition, some participants perceived repetition as having enough explicit information thus it is appropriate for beginner and advanced learners. In addition,

some points must be noted in this finding; some participants also saw that repetition must be followed by an explanation where learners still could not find the information of error from the feedback itself. It implies that learners' current language development influences their perception of information provided in feedback. Moreover, the recast might demotivate some learners when they find it easier because teachers will just directly point out their mistakes hence the use of repetition must be thoughtful.

In addition, metalinguistic feedback also got participants' attention divided into two. Some believed that it was not suitable for learners with low level language proficiency in which in contrast with other participants who thought it could be for both learners. The participants may see it as easy to follow up because the correction is explicitly stated thus making them easier to respond to the error. Explicit correction provides the learners with more cognitive comparison hence the learners take more advantages from it compared to the implicit one (Ellis et al., 2006). Another reason some participant sees it as difficult for a beginner might be because the metalinguistic feedback carries information on the error like "Can you find the error on your utterance?" which just contains limited information about the correct form. Meanwhile, the explicit correction is usually represented in the sentence "You should say ..." which is usually followed with the correct form. In turn, it makes the explicit correction clearer for the learners. Regarding this finding, it suggests that the amount of information of error provided in the feedback also holds a crucial role. Beginner learners in the EFL context might require a particular amount of error information given in the feedback in order to have them follow up on the feedback whereas advanced learners might be easier as they already have sufficient basis.

Furthermore, the learners' experience in learning English and teaching English may also help them deal with various kinds of feedback, especially for feedback that needs

particular language competence. Here, the finding implies that the learners do not belong entirely to one kind of feedback rather than having each feedback with the opportunity to uptake and repair equally. This strengthens (Budianto et al., 2020) study ensuring that learners' proficiency levels might not determine their choice of feedback. However, these findings lie on quite different sides to Stefanou and Révész (2015) who found that learners with more language proficiency would likely learn better through direct feedback. Learners who have more experience in learning language may treat and see errors differently compared to the early language learner. It is because they have been learning or exposed to the language longer than the early learners. Responding or following feedback can be difficult for learners unless they have enough language exposure (Wahyuningsih, 2020). Despite that, the participants' perspective lies on feedback that provides explicit information for the students such as metalinguistic feedback, and explicit correction. This finding supports Li (2013) and Kennedy (2010) where language proficiency will influence learners' choice of feedback. Furthermore, learners' learning situation, expectations of language use, and proficiency likely contribute to the feedback preferences (Ha et al., 2021; Ha & Murray, 2023).

CONCLUSION

This present study departed from the idea that language proficiency and context play a crucial role in learners' choice of feedback. The previous studies did not yield consistent results in regard to this matter hence this study was conducted. From this study, it is found that learners' language proficiency influences their choice of feedback. Both advance and beginner learners will likely prefer feedback that provided them with explicit information but for beginner learners, feedback that contains little to no information about their error will

hinder them to follow the feedback. It is because they do not possess the language needed or the feedback given is too difficult to follow. This study implies that teachers or other language users must carefully take into

account for learner's current language development since it will determine the feedback choice so that it will be effective and keep the learner motivated.

REFERENCES

- Budianto, S., Sulisty, T., Widiastuti, O., Heriyawati, D. F., & Marhaban, S. (2020). Written corrective feedback across different levels of EFL students' academic writing proficiency: Outcomes and implications. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 7(2), 472–485. <https://doi.org/10.24815/SIELE.V7I2.16569>
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND THE ACQUISITION OF L2 GRAMMAR. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 339–368. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060141>
- Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). REEXAMINING THE ROLE OF RECASTS IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(4), 575–600. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310606027X>
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course, Third Edition* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Ha, X. Van, & Murray, J. C. (2023). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820931897>
- Ha, X. Van, Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: A teaching and learning perspective. *Heliyon*, 7(7). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550>
- Kennedy, S. (2010). Corrective Feedback for Learners of Varied Proficiency Levels: A Teacher's Choices. *TESL Canada Journal*, 27(2), 31–31. <https://doi.org/10.18806/TESL.V27I2.1054>
- Lee, E. J. (Esther). (2016). Advanced ESL Students' Prior EFL Education and Their Perceptions of Oral Corrective Feedback. *Journal of International Students*, 6(3), 798–816. <http://jistudents.org/>
- Li, S. (2013). The interface between feedback type, L2 proficiency, and the nature of the linguistic target. <Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/1362168813510384>, 18(3), 373–396. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813510384>
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). INTERACTIONAL FEEDBACK AND INSTRUCTIONAL COUNTERBALANCE. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 269–300. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060128>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND LEARNER UPTAKE: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). ORAL FEEDBACK IN CLASSROOM SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265–302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520>
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365>
- McKay, S. L. (2008). *RESEARCHING SECOND LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS*. Routledge.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook. In *Huberman, A. Michael* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publication.

- Nurya, A., Fatma, A., & Putri, A. R. (2019). THE EFFECT OF USING PEER FEEDBACK TECHNIQUE IN TEACHING WRITING AT ELEVENTH GRADERS OF SMA WALISONGO PECANGAAN IN THE ACADEMIC YEAR OF 2018/2019. *Edulingua: Jurnal Linguistiks Terapan Dan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 6(2). <https://ejournal.unisnu.ac.id/JE/article/view/1181>
- Ortega, L. (2014). *Second language acquisition*. Routledge.
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 263–300.
- Sheen, Y. (2010). DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS OF ORAL AND WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN THE ESL CLASSROOM. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 203–234. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990507>
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective Feedback in Language Teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning and Critical Pedagogy in Second Language Teaching and Learning • Language Planning and Policy Changes in Volume II* (pp. 593–610). Routledge.
- Sippel, L., & Jackson, C. N. (2015). Teacher vs. Peer Oral Corrective Feedback in the German Language Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(4), 688–705. <https://doi.org/10.1111/FLAN.12164>
- Stefanou, C., & Révész, A. (2015). Direct Written Corrective Feedback, Learner Differences, and the Acquisition of Second Language Article Use for Generic and Specific Plural Reference. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(2), 263–282. <https://doi.org/10.1111/MODL.12212>
- Wahyuningsih, S. (2020). THE ROLE OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON ACADEMIC WRITING PERFORMANCE: EFL STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS. *Edulingua: Jurnal Linguistiks Terapan Dan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 7(1). <https://ejournal.unisnu.ac.id/JE/article/view/1167>

