Teachers' Corrective Feedback in the English Classroom at SMP IT Tunas Cendekia Mataram

Imansyah
[1]Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika

Article Info	Abstract
	*This study investigates English teachers' use of corrective feedback in classroom interaction at SMPIT Tunas Cendekia Mataram. Employing a qualitative case study design, data were collected through classroom observations and semi-structured interviews. The findings reveal that teachers employed a range of corrective feedback types, with **recasts** being the most frequently used, followed by explicit correction, clarification requests, and elicitation. Corrective feedback was implemented flexibly depending on instructional focus, task type, and student proficiency, with teachers favoring implicit feedback during fluency-oriented activities and more explicit feedback during accuracy-focused instruction. The reasons underlying teachers' selection of particular feedback types were influenced by pedagogical beliefs, concern for students' affective factors, classroom constraints, and institutional values. Triangulation of interview and observation data indicated a strong alignment between teachers' stated beliefs and their classroom practices. Overall, the study highlights the context-sensitive nature of corrective feedback and underscores the importance of considering teacher cognition and school culture in understanding feedback practices in EFL classrooms*

Corresponding Author:
Imansyah
Akademi Bisnis Lombok

1. INTRODUCTION

Corrective feedback (CF) has long been recognized as an integral component of second language (L2) teaching and learning. In communicative English language classrooms, corrective feedback plays a crucial role in facilitating learners' interlanguage development by helping them notice gaps between their language production and the target language forms. Through corrective feedback, learners are guided to refine linguistic accuracy while continuing to engage meaningfully in classroom interaction.

The importance of corrective feedback is firmly grounded in major theories of second language acquisition. Long's Interaction Hypothesis posits that negotiation of meaning, including corrective feedback moves, facilitates L2 development through interactional modifications that provide comprehensible input, opportunities for modified output, and metalinguistic information. Similarly, Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis emphasizes that learners must consciously notice mismatches between their interlanguage and the target language for acquisition to occur, and corrective feedback serves as a crucial trigger for such noticing. From a sociocultural perspective, corrective feedback is viewed as scaffolding or mediated assistance that supports learners' gradual movement toward self-regulation and independent language use (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

Empirical research has consistently demonstrated the pedagogical value of corrective feedback. Various types of corrective feedback—such as explicit correction, recasts, clarification

requests, elicitation, metalinguistic clues, and repetition—have been shown to contribute differently to learners' accuracy, uptake, and long-term language development. The seminal study by Lyster and Ranta (1997) provided a foundational taxonomy of corrective feedback types and revealed that feedback strategies encouraging learner participation, such as elicitation and metalinguistic feedback, often result in higher rates of successful uptake. More recent studies (Li, 2010; Nassaji, 2016) further confirm that corrective feedback is effective across diverse instructional contexts, although its implementation is shaped by factors such as teachers' beliefs, classroom culture, instructional goals, and learners' proficiency levels.

In the Indonesian EFL context, corrective feedback has received increasing scholarly attention. Suryati (2015) reported that teachers in secondary schools predominantly employed recasts and explicit correction during classroom interaction. Fitriani (2019) similarly found that although teachers tended to prefer implicit corrective feedback, explicit feedback often resulted in higher instances of learner self-repair. More recent research reinforces these findings. Mahmudah (2021), in her study of Islamic junior high schools, observed that teachers' choices of corrective feedback were influenced by students' affective responses, with teachers favoring less face-threatening strategies such as recasts to maintain classroom harmony. Likewise, Ardiansyah and Rukmini (2022) found that instructional focus and time constraints played a significant role in shaping teachers' corrective feedback practices, with explicit correction being more commonly used in grammar-focused lessons. Collectively, these studies illustrate that corrective feedback practices are highly context-sensitive and shaped by pedagogical, cultural, and affective considerations.

Despite this growing body of research, limited attention has been paid to corrective feedback practices in integrated Islamic schools, including SMPIT Tunas Cendekia Mataram. As an institution that emphasizes character building, Islamic values, and communicative English learning, SMPIT Tunas Cendekia Mataram represents a distinctive educational context in which teachers' corrective feedback practices may be influenced not only by pedagogical goals but also by institutional values such as fostering respect, maintaining students' confidence, and promoting supportive classroom interaction. However, empirical understanding of how English teachers in this context employ corrective feedback—specifically in terms of the types used, the ways feedback is implemented during classroom interaction, and the rationales underlying teachers' choices—remains scarce.

Given this gap, it is essential to investigate corrective feedback practices at SMPIT Tunas Cendekia Mataram. Accordingly, this study seeks to explore what types of corrective feedback are used by English teachers at SMPIT Tunas Cendekia Mataram, how teachers implement corrective feedback during English classroom interaction, and why teachers choose particular types of corrective feedback in their classroom practices.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH METHOD

Corrective feedback (CF) has been extensively examined in second language acquisition (SLA) research and is widely regarded as one of the most influential instructional interventions in classroom interaction. Lyster and Ranta's (1997) seminal study proposed a taxonomy of corrective feedback consisting of six types: recasts, explicit correction, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Their findings demonstrated that different feedback types lead to varying levels of learner uptake, highlighting the importance of teacher intention and learner engagement. Subsequent studies (e.g., Lyster & Saito, 2010) further suggested that although explicit and metalinguistic feedback often results in higher uptake and longer-term learning gains, the effectiveness of CF is strongly shaped by instructional context.

The pedagogical value of corrective feedback is further supported by major theoretical frameworks. From an interactionist perspective, CF contributes to interlanguage development by providing negative evidence and opportunities for modified output through interaction (Long, 1996). In this view, CF functions as an interactional mechanism that prompts learners to negotiate meaning

and attend to linguistic form. Schmidt's (2001) Noticing Hypothesis complements this view by emphasizing that conscious awareness of linguistic mismatches is a prerequisite for language acquisition, positioning CF—particularly explicit forms—as a trigger for noticing. From a sociocultural perspective, CF is conceptualized as scaffolding, whereby teachers provide mediated assistance that supports learners' gradual movement toward self-regulation (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). These theoretical perspectives collectively conceptualize CF as an interactional, developmental, and context-sensitive practice rather than a uniform corrective technique.

Empirical research in Asian EFL contexts indicates that teachers tend to favor implicit feedback, particularly recasts, due to cultural expectations of maintaining classroom harmony and minimizing learner embarrassment (Bao, 2019). However, studies consistently report higher uptake when elicitation and metalinguistic feedback are employed. In the Indonesian context, Suryati (2015) found that teacher–student interaction in secondary schools is dominated by corrective feedback moves, with recasts and explicit correction being the most frequently used types. Similarly, Fitriani (2019) reported that although teachers preferred implicit feedback in speaking classes, explicit feedback led to higher rates of learner self-repair. Research conducted in Islamic school settings further underscores the influence of affective and institutional considerations. Mahmudah (2021) observed that teachers adjusted their corrective feedback strategies based on students' emotional responses, often selecting softer feedback forms to maintain confidence and classroom harmony. Ardiansyah and Rukmini (2022) likewise demonstrated that teachers' corrective feedback choices were shaped by instructional focus and time constraints, with explicit correction being more prevalent in accuracy-oriented lessons.

More recent studies highlight the nuanced and strategic nature of corrective feedback practices. Oktaviani and Indrawati (2023) found that teachers' rationales for feedback selection were influenced by lesson objectives, students' emotional readiness, and beliefs about learner autonomy. Yuliana and Dewi (2023) similarly reported that Indonesian junior high school teachers strategically combined implicit and explicit feedback depending on whether classroom activities emphasized fluency or accuracy. Collectively, these findings suggest that corrective feedback is not merely a response to learner error but a pedagogical decision embedded in classroom interaction, teacher cognition, and sociocultural context.

Despite the extensive body of research, limited attention has been given to corrective feedback practices in integrated Islamic schools. Given the emphasis on character building, affective support, and communicative learning in such institutions, teachers' feedback practices may reflect distinctive pedagogical and institutional values. This contextual gap justifies an in-depth qualitative investigation of corrective feedback practices at SMPIT Tunas Cendekia Mataram.

Guided by this literature, the present study adopts a qualitative descriptive case study design, which is appropriate for exploring teachers' corrective feedback practices, beliefs, and rationales in authentic classroom settings (Creswell, 2012; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The study is conducted at SMPIT Tunas Cendekia Mataram, an integrated Islamic junior high school in Mataram, with two English teachers selected through purposive sampling to represent English instructional practices at the school.

To capture both observable practices and underlying pedagogical rationales, data are collected through multiple methods. Non-participant classroom observations are conducted to identify the types of corrective feedback used and examine how feedback is implemented during classroom interaction. An observation checklist adapted from Lyster and Ranta's (1997) taxonomy is employed to systematically categorize corrective feedback types, supported by audio or video recordings to ensure accuracy in identifying feedback episodes. Semi-structured interviews are conducted with participating teachers to explore their beliefs, intentions, and reasons for selecting particular feedback types. In addition, relevant instructional documents, such as lesson plans or teaching materials, are reviewed to provide contextual insight into instructional goals that inform feedback practices.

Data analysis follows Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis framework. The process involves familiarization with the data, coding corrective feedback occurrences based on established categories, identifying themes related to how and why teachers use particular feedback types, and interpreting the findings in relation to relevant theories and previous research. Triangulation is achieved by comparing observation data, interview responses, and instructional documents to enhance the credibility of the findings. Member checking is also conducted to validate the accuracy of teachers' interpretations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Findings

This chapter presents the findings derived from **classroom observations**, **semi-structured interviews with English teachers**, and **questionnaire responses**. The findings are organized according to the three research questions.

3.1.1 Types of Corrective Feedback Used by English Teachers

The findings indicate that English teachers at SMPIT Tunas Cendekia Mataram employed **multipl**e types of corrective feedback during classroom interaction. However, the frequency of use varied across feedback types.

The most frequently observed corrective feedback type was recasts, particularly during speaking activities. Teachers often reformulated students' incorrect utterances implicitly without overtly signaling the error. For example, when students produced grammatically incorrect sentences, teachers responded by restating the utterance in its correct form, allowing communication to continue smoothly.

In addition to recasts, teachers also used explicit correction, especially when addressing repeated grammatical errors or when introducing new language forms. Clarification requests and elicitation were occasionally employed to prompt students to self-repair, while metalinguistic feedback was used sparingly, mainly in form-focused segments of the lesson.

These findings suggest that teachers tended to favor **implicit corrective feedback** over explicit forms, particularly during communicative activities.

3.1.2 Implementation of Corrective Feedback in Classroom Interaction

The findings reveal that teachers implemented corrective feedback in context-sensitive and flexible ways depending on instructional goals, task type, and student proficiency.

During fluency-oriented activities, such as role-plays and discussions, teachers tended to provide immediate but implicit feedback, primarily through recasts, in order to maintain the flow of interaction. In contrast, during accuracy-focused activities, such as grammar exercises or sentence construction tasks, teachers more frequently employed explicit correction and metalinguistic explanations.

Classroom observations further showed that teachers sometimes delayed corrective feedback until the end of an activity, especially when correcting multiple students simultaneously. This delayed feedback was often delivered through collective explanation or board work.

Importantly, teachers appeared to adjust their corrective feedback strategies based on students' responses. When students demonstrated the ability to self-correct, teachers used elicitation or clarification requests. However, when students showed hesitation or confusion, teachers shifted to explicit correction.

3.1.3 Reasons for Teachers' Selection of Corrective Feedback Types

The findings indicate that teachers' selection of particular corrective feedback types was influenced by a combination of pedagogical beliefs, affective considerations, student proficiency, and institutional values.

Interview data revealed that teachers believed corrective feedback was essential for improving students' language accuracy; however, they also expressed concern about students' confidence and emotional comfort. As a result, teachers preferred recasts because they perceived them as less threatening and more supportive of students' motivation.

Classroom observations strengthened these claims by showing that teachers consistently avoided overt correction in front of the whole class when students made minor errors. Instead, they opted for subtle reformulation or postponed correction.

Teachers also reported that time constraints and class size influenced their feedback choices. Recasts were considered efficient and practical, especially in large classes. Furthermore, the institutional culture of SMPIT, which emphasizes character building and positive reinforcement, encouraged teachers to adopt corrective feedback strategies that minimized student anxiety.

3.2 Discussion

The findings of this study align with and extend existing theories and empirical research on corrective feedback in second language classrooms.

3.2.1 Preference for Implicit Corrective Feedback

The dominance of recasts observed in this study supports the findings of **Lyster and Ranta (1997)** and **Suryati (2015)**, who reported that recasts are the most commonly used corrective feedback type in EFL classrooms. From an **interactionist perspective** (Long, 1996), recasts allow learners to notice the gap between their interlanguage and the target form without disrupting communication.

However, consistent with **Li (2018)**, the limited use of elicitation and metalinguistic feedback suggests that opportunities for learner-initiated repair may not be fully maximized.

3.2.2 Corrective Feedback as Context-Dependent Practice

The variation in corrective feedback implementation across task types confirms **Ellis's (2009)** assertion that corrective feedback is most effective when aligned with instructional focus. Teachers at SMPIT Tunas Cendekia Mataram demonstrated pedagogical sensitivity by adjusting feedback timing and explicitness according to whether the lesson prioritized fluency or accuracy.

This finding also supports **Ha and Murray (2020)**, who emphasized that corrective feedback practices are shaped by classroom realities rather than purely theoretical considerations.

3.2.3 Teacher Cognition and Institutional Influence

The reasons underlying teachers' corrective feedback choices reflect **teacher cognition theory** (Borg, 2003), which posits that classroom practices are deeply influenced by teachers' beliefs, experiences, and contextual constraints.

The alignment between teachers' stated beliefs in interviews and their observed practices suggests a strong belief-practice congruence. Moreover, the influence of institutional values highlights the role of school culture in shaping pedagogical decisions, particularly in faith-based educational contexts.

4. CONCLUSION

In summary, this study reveals that English teachers at SMPIT Tunas Cendekia Mataram predominantly employ **implicit corrective feedback**, particularly recasts, and implement corrective feedback in ways that balance linguistic accuracy, communicative flow, and students' affective needs.

Teachers' corrective feedback practices are shaped by their pedagogical beliefs, classroom interaction patterns, student characteristics, and institutional values.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Exsample: We would like to thank for providing support for this research activity.

6. DECLARATIONS

Author Contribution   : **Imansyah**: Conceptualization, Writing - Original Draft, Editing and Visualization, Review & Editing, Formal analysis, and Methodology.

7. REFERENCES

Ardiansyah, M., & Rukmini, D. (2022). Teachers' corrective feedback practices in Indonesian EFL classrooms. *Journal of English Education and Teaching, 8*(2), 145–158.

Bao, R. (2019). Recasts in classroom interaction: Features and effectiveness. *RELC Journal, 50*(1), 78–95.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson.

Fitriani, A. (2019). Corrective feedback in EFL speaking classrooms. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 9*(1), 152–160.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 309–365.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37–66.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*, 265–302.

Mahmudah, N. (2021). Corrective feedback practices in Islamic junior high schools. *Journal of Islamic Education Research, 5*(1), 45–58.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.

Nassaji, H. (2016). Anniversary article: Corrective feedback in SLA. *Language Teaching, 49*(4), 527–553.

Oktaviani, A., & Indrawati, L. (2023). Teachers' rationales in providing corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms. *TEFLIN Journal, 34*(1), 120–139.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge University Press.

Suryati, N. (2015). Classroom interaction strategies in EFL classrooms in Indonesia. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 6*(5), 924–933.

Yuliana, G., & Dewi, S. (2023). The use of implicit and explicit corrective feedback in junior high school English classrooms. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy, 4*(2), 101–112.