



AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY (AJET)

ISSN: 2832-9481 (ONLINE)

VOLUME 2 ISSUE 4 (2023)



PUBLISHED BY
E-PALLI PUBLISHERS, DELAWARE, USA

The Efficacy of Recast vs. Explicit Corrective Feedback on Students' English Pronunciation of Common Words: The Case of English Department Students at Ibn Tofail University

El Ghazi Bougataia^{1*}, Hind Brigui²

Article Information

Received: October 31, 2023

Accepted: December 02, 2023

Published: December 07, 2023

Keywords

*Oral Corrective Feedback,
Explicit Corrective Feedback,
Recast, Pronunciation*

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the effectiveness of recast and explicit corrective feedback on students' pronunciation improvement among first-year English university undergraduates at Ibn Tofail University, and compares these feedback types to determine the most effective one. A pilot study was conducted to give insights into the pronunciation difficulties faced by students. Based on this latter, the main study was done to address the aims of the investigation. A quasi-experiment was designed with 45 participants divided into three groups: Explicit, Recast and a Control group. The impact of recast and explicit corrective feedback was assessed through the Kruskal-Wallis Test, and the comparative assessment was done using Welch's T-test. The results indicate that both recast and explicit corrective feedback positively influenced students' pronunciation development. Yet, the explicit feedback appears superior and more effective than recast, demonstrating a high influence on students' pronunciation errors. Hence, the investigation suggests that educators should be explicit enough to help students better develop their pronunciation.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decades, there has been a dramatic call and a demand for teaching English as a second or foreign language, owing to its essentiality as it allows people to learn and acquire the competencies and skills that are needed for today's world (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). It is true that English has become an international language with many speakers worldwide (Crystal, 2012). However, the teaching of such global language could not escape from some challenges. While there are several ways and techniques to teach English and its skills and subskills, pronunciation remains one of the hardest elements to teach. And due to the globalization and internalization of English, however, perspectives on the teaching of pronunciation have completely changed. Consequently, the world witnessed a great change that has made it from teaching a native-like pronunciation to teaching an intelligible one, since the change emphasizes great use of English in communicative contexts in classroom (Tarone, 2005; Zheng, 2019). Yet, it is not necessary to sound like a native speaker with a perfect native-like accent, but clarity is what counts (Cahyalita, 2013). In fact, a clear pronunciation is the one that enables people to better understand each other without any misconceptions. Far from any pedagogy that targets a native-like accent, the goal of teaching pronunciation is to seek an intelligible accent by addressing some of its main elements, such as speech length, rhyme, pauses, segmental clarity, and stress (Hinkel, 2006).

To help students better acquire and learn languages, as well as language features like pronunciation, several researchers suggested using oral corrective feedback

(e.g., Couper, 2017; Karimi & Esfandiari, 2016; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Zohrabi & Behboudnia, 2017). As Zheng (2019) reported, a teaching approach that combines both oral corrective feedback and communicative language teaching activities is strongly recommended as it allows pupils to focus on and apply the linguistic forms within the communicative contexts, thereby enhancing their accuracy. Nevertheless, providing feedback, especially in the context of communication, was not immune to criticism from some researchers' detractors. Krashen (1982, p. 74) thinks of error correction as a "serious mistake". To support his claim, he noted that feedback makes students go defensive, as they concentrate more on the form rather than the meaning (p. 75). Xu (2009) thinks of correction as a process that makes students monitor themselves to not repeat the error rather than repair it. On the other hand, other researchers found oral corrective feedback to be advantageous and essential as it helps students better notice their errors, especially in communicative activities, learn and acquire languages and features like vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation (e.g., Alsolami, 2019; Ellis, 2009; Hartono *et al.*, 2022; Russell & Spada, 2006; Sheen, 2007).

The concern of providing feedback started a long time ago with the behaviorist theory. According to this theory, pupils are corrected right after they make a mistake since mistakes are seen as undesired behaviors and should be eliminated through a stimulus, mainly a punishment or a reward (Skinner, 1938). The stimulus is the teacher's correction, whereas the response is the students' error reparation. Taking these points to consideration, providing feedback is merely seen as a stimulus, mainly behavior,

¹ Faculty of Languages, Letters and Arts, Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco

² Applied Linguistics and TEFL, Department of English Studies, Faculty of Languages, Letters and Arts, Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco

* Corresponding author's e-mail: elghazi.bougataia@uit.ac.ma

that is aimed at correcting learners' errors through negative or positive reinforcement. Hence, students, according to this theory, are seen as recipients of stimuli. Years after, some researchers have proven that feedback, either oral or written, can trigger learners' cognitive processes (e.g., Fujio, 2017). Far from the stimulus and response procedures, oral feedback can activate essential cognitive processes, such as self-correction and feedback recognition (Fujio, 2017). Further, oral corrective feedback has witnessed a great interest from another theory, namely interactionism, which underlines the importance of learners' meaningful interactions to learn a language (Vygotsky, 1962). The interactionist approach was a result of the interactionist hypothesis, which states that breakdowns of communication could create a situation where learners receive feedback to correct their speaking errors, especially form-focused ones (Long, 1996, as cited in Abbuhl, 2021). Owing to its emphasis on learners' attention to form in meaningful-based contexts, Abbuhl (2021) clearly states its positive outcomes through providing oral corrective feedback during a conversation to better help interlocutors develop their pronunciation, seeking significant improvements to understand and as well as to be understood.

Years after, as oral feedback garnered considerable interest from various researchers of applied linguistics, there has been the first investigation on the oral corrective feedback, which conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997). The researchers found that oral corrective feedback entails six categories, namely recast, explicit, metalinguistic corrective feedback, repetition, clarification request and elicitation. The study has aroused a strong interest and desire of several researchers as it necessitates further investigation on the efficacy of the oral feedback categories found by Lyster and Ranta (1997). There have been some studies which attempted to fulfill the gap needed concerning the oral feedback categories, yet most of them yielded contradictions, which resulted in a heated among researchers, especially those who tackled recast and the explicit corrective feedback. Some researchers claim that recast is more effective than the explicit feedback (e.g., Banaruee *et al.*, 2018; Karimi & Esfandiari, 2016; Goo & Mackey, 2013). Conversely, other researchers found that the explicit feedback is more effective than recast (e.g., Alahmed & Jalal, 2022; Couper, 2017; Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Lyster and Ranta, 2013; Sheen, 2004). However, in line with these results, some researchers found nearly no significant difference between the two feedback categories (e.g., Zohrabi & Behboudnia, 2017; Mirzaie & Valizadeh, 2021). But, one extremely all-important point to consider is that identifying the most effective oral feedback category poses great challenges, as the determination demands extensive considerations, such as the level of learners being corrected, teachers' preferred correction technique, classroom contexts, the time provided to students to correct their mistakes, and more (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Yoshida, 2008).

There have been, indeed, considerable studies on the

impact of recast and the explicit corrective feedback, yet few studied investigated this latter regarding pronunciation (e.g., Alahmed & Jalal, 2022; Karimi & Esfandiari, 2016; Zohrabi & Behboudnia, 2017). This issue has also been previously alluded to by Pawlak (2012) a long time ago. The reasons for this loss could be due to the view of pronunciation as less important, lack of special training, confidence and more (Couper, 2017). Additionally, the studies which investigated the oral corrective feedback regarding other skills and elements of language, like grammar acquisition and writing are not yet fully settled, and sometimes the results of those investigations are insufficient when it comes to the implementation of feedback over a long period of time (Russell & Spada, 2006, as cited in Zheng, 2019). Regarding the fact that there were very few studies which dealt with the impact explicit corrective feedback and recast regarding pronunciation in the Moroccan context (e.g., Benhima & Slaoui, 2020), the present study will investigate the efficacy of these oral corrective feedback types on learners' pronunciation, and it will compare their effect as well to identify the most effective one for correcting pronunciation mistakes. Further, the present investigation will explore some studies that examined oral corrective feedback on other language skills and components. However, the targeted pronunciation of this study is the pronunciation of some common words of English. This phenomenon, as Agung *et al.* (2021) stated, is known for many students of English who study it as a second and a foreign language, yet the reasons behind this issue varies according to one person to another.

Research Questions

The study attempts to answer the following research questions:

- Do recast and the explicit corrective feedback have any significant impact on students' pronunciation errors?
- Which oral corrective feedback is more effective in eliminating errors of pronunciation?

In order to find answers for the research questions above, the study suggested the following hypotheses:

- The recast and explicit corrective feedback have a positive impact on students' pronunciation errors
- The explicit feedback type is more effective than recast in improving students' pronunciation

LITERATURE REVIEW

Over the past decades, there has been a renewal of interest in investigating the efficacy of recast and explicit corrective feedback among researchers of applied linguistics. However, while there has been much research concerning this latter, few researchers have taken pronunciation into consideration in their studies. Therefore, the ultimate goal of this paper is to fulfill this gap and study the impact of recast and explicit feedback on pronunciation.

The present chapter presents the importance of pronunciation, reviews different perspectives on oral

corrective feedback, namely recast and explicit corrective feedback, and critically discusses the efficacy of those feedback types regarding pronunciation and other language components as well.

Pronunciation

Darcy (2018) made an eye-catching statement about the importance of pronunciation, in which she noted that no language could be animate without sounds. Further, she stressed that pronunciation is what enlivens the other components of language, such as grammar and vocabulary. Pronunciation is an essential component of language by which interlocutors interact and understand each other perfectly (Thomson & Derwing, 2015). Without smooth pronunciation, pupils might face various issues, like the incapability of being clear to listeners and some kind of prejudice (Gilakjani *et al.*, 2011; Fayer & Krasinski, 1987). A study by Fayer and Krasinski (1987) showed that students with an unintelligible pronunciation were classified as low proficient by their jury members. Also, the investigation reported that some of the teachers who were listening to the audio of those who had pronunciation difficulties made their judgment without completing the audio. With that being said, the learning of pronunciation is found to be advantageous for learners' speech intelligibility since this latter contributes to clear and facile communication between speakers and gives some positive stereotypes about speakers (Darcy, 2018; Thomson & Derwing, 2015). Thus, despite being aware of grammar and vocabulary, students with pronunciation difficulties still find issues when they try to be comprehended by listeners (Gilakjani *et al.*, 2011).

Oral Corrective Feedback

Oliver and Adams (2021) define oral corrective feedback as a teacher or peer response that intends to correct learners when their production of language is faulty, inappropriate, ambiguous or unrelated to the language being learned. However, as a form of error correction and in a more detailed definition, oral corrective feedback, as various researchers agree, refers to any information, comments or acts, either explicit or implicit, verbal or non-verbal, made by teachers to intentionally repair learners' errors (Richards & Schmidt, 2011; Lightbown & Spada, 1999; Oliver and Adams, 2021). Such feedback is a negative type, and it is used to correct students for their faulty language output, unlike the positive kind, which involves words and phrases that encourage students to produce more language (Richards & Schmidt, 2011).

Concerning the effect of oral corrective feedback, there have been some investigations regarding this later on in the development of language learning. Many researchers of applied linguistics investigated the impact of oral corrective feedback on language learning and concluded that it is of great benefit to learners as it helps them enhance their learning of language and repair errors (e.g., Alsolami, 2019; Ellis, 2009; Hartono *et al.*, 2022; Muslem *et al.*, 2021). On the other hand, some other researchers

oppose oral corrective feedback and consider it useless and harmful to learners (e.g., Krashen, 1982; Truscott, 2007; Truscott & Hsu, 2008; Xu, 2009). Truscott and Hsu (2008) conducted a study on the impact of oral corrective feedback on writing, and they concluded that feedback is of no to little use in the short term for students. However, they admitted that error correction may be beneficial to students in day-to-day classrooms.

Considering these points, the researchers who are against oral corrective feedback are not opposing the act of correction itself. In fact, most of them have a contrary view of the way correction occurs and when. That is, it is when and how that matters. These issues were tackled by Hendrickson (1978) from the very beginning of error correction and feedback. In his article, he stated five extremely essential questions on error correction, and two of them were about when and how to correct errors.

Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

Lyster & Ranta (1997) have determined the types of oral corrective feedback. They concluded that this latter consists of six categories, namely recast, explicit correction, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, repetition, and clarification request. However, the explicit and recast oral feedback types are the ones that will be tackled in the next session since they are the main concern of the present study.

Explicit Corrective Feedback

The explicit feedback refers to teachers' indication to students' errors which is followed by a correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). See the following example:

Student: I have a cat (/kAt/). (Phonological error)

Teacher: Well, it is pronounced as cat (/kæt/).

The student, phonetically speaking, made two mistakes. The first one is the sound /k/ which was pronounced as a backed sound. The second mistake is the utterance of the vowel /æ/. However, the teacher in this example made the student aware of his or her mistake and provided the correct pronunciation of the word cat.

Recast

Recast is an implicit type of correction that merely involves teachers' paraphrases of mistakes that are meant to correct students, without any indication to errors. (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Richards & Schmidt, 2011). See the following example:

Student: I have a cat (/kAt/). (Phonological error)

Teacher: Okay, you have a cat (/kæt/).

In this case, the educator indirectly provided the pupil with the correct pronunciation without indicating the error.

The recast corrective feedback is known to be an implicit type of correction. Nevertheless, the issue with this category of feedback at hand is that it is multifaceted and requires a detailed approach to thoroughly understand its intricacies. As Sheen (2006) noted, recasts could sometimes be non-corrective or corrective, i.e., they can

be positive or negative feedback. Also, they can sometimes be explicit, especially when they are clear and short (Sheen, 2006; Sato, 2011). To put it differently, recasts can be clear and direct as the explicit corrective feedback when teachers correct their students by reformulating the faulty utterances but adjusting their tone to make corrections noticeable (Sheen, 2006). Moreover, the directness of this latter depends on students' recognition of recast as negative corrective feedback rather than positive, the context of the discourse, the length of the correction process, and more (Sheen, 2004, 2006; Sato, 2011).

The Effectiveness of Recast and Explicit Corrective Feedback

The determination of the efficacy of any strategy, whether it is feedback, a way of teaching and learning or any other pedagogical strategy, requires many considerations, such as learners' levels, classroom context, educators' knowledge of pedagogy, learners' and teachers' behaviors and attitudes, and so on (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Nevertheless, some researchers have tried to compare the efficacy of the explicit and recast feedback types on pronunciation through quasi-experiments. Yet, the results have been inconsistent, as some researchers reported that explicit feedback provides significant advantages for students more than recasts, while others have found no significant difference or even the opposite. A study conducted by Alahmed and Jalal (2022), which tackled the effect of using explicit and recast corrective feedback on students' pronunciation, revealed that explicit correction was more beneficial than recasts. Conversely, Karimi and Esfandiari (2016) reported in their study, which investigated the stress patterns in English, that recasts were more effective than explicit corrective feedback. However, a study by Zohrabi and Behboudnia (2017), which tackled the effect of delayed and immediate explicit and recast feedback types on students' pronunciation, revealed that there was no significant difference between the two corrective feedback types, and both of them were useful to students. Additionally, some studies have compared the impact of the explicit and recast feedback types, yet their focus was on other skills and components of language, such as students' willingness to communicate, speaking, writing, grammar, and more. However, their results yielded contradictory and conclusive evidence too, with some studies supporting the efficacy of the explicit corrective feedback over recast (e.g., Yu, 2022; Zheng, 2019; Varnosfadrani & Basturkmen, 2009), while others suggesting the opposite (e.g., Banaruee *et al.*, 2018; Li, 2010; Ayoun, 2001). Still, some studies found evidence to support them both (e.g., Mirzaie & Valizadeh, 2021). In light of these points, studying the efficacy of error correction or any other method in the field of teaching will never yield a singular outcome. As stated by Bingjie (2016), the question "Is recast the most effective corrective feedback type?" is controversial itself, though it seems to be simple. The divergence in the studies which tackled the explicit feedback and recast could be due to

many factors, such as students' level and recognition of this latter as corrective feedback, the difficulty of words and components being treated, and more (Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Banaruee *et al.*, 2018; Bingjie, 2016). As Banaruee *et al.* (2018) reported regarding the conflicting results on the impact of recast and explicit correction, it is rather difficult to assume that one feedback type would be effective in treating all errors; thus, it is essential to investigate several error categories to approximate a better result.

The purpose of this literature review was to clearly show the importance of pronunciation and critically tackle its concern regarding recast and explicit feedback. As with any method or strategy in the field of teaching, there are opposers and supporters of oral corrective feedback, especially when it comes to communicative contexts. For instance, Krashen (1982) strongly attacks feedback and states that it hinders students' communicative progress, while Hartono *et al.* (2022) claim that oral corrective feedback facilitates rather than interferes with students' speaking performance, without denying the fact that oral corrective feedback indeed made some students worry about make mistakes. Concerning the issue with oral corrective feedback, the literature review presented previous studies that studied the recast and explicit feedback and elaborated on these two types more. However, while the study aims at finding a solution for the issue of oral feedback and pronunciation that has existed for a long time, it could be said that the efficacy of those feedback types, namely recast and explicit, could not be easily determined but at least an approximate and a better result could still be achieved.

METHODOLOGY

The goal of the present investigation is to study the effectiveness of recast and the explicit corrective feedback on students' pronunciation errors, and compare the impact of those feedback types to determine the most effective one. So as to reach the objectives of this investigation and answer the research questions and test the hypotheses, the present paper carried a quantitative, quasi-experimental design. The participants in this experiment are assessed in three groups, mainly two experimental groups and one control group. The efficacy of the explicit corrective feedback and recast is assessed through the measures of pre-test and post-test. Concerning the variables of this investigation, there are 2 independent variables and 1 dependent variable. The independent variables are the feedback types which are the explicit corrective feedback and recast, while the dependent variable is students' correction of pronunciation errors.

Participants

The participants were 45 undergraduate students. They were taken from the department of English at the university of Ibn Tofail, faculty of Languages, Literature and the Arts. The students shared the same level as all of

them were S2 students. The students who made between 7 and 10 errors are the students were counted in this investigation. Those who made fewer mistakes, while not included in the study, were also corrected ethically speaking.

Instrumentation

The instruments that were used in this study were a pre-test and a post-test. The pre-test contained ten words which involve some common mispronounced words by students. The post-test contained the same words, yet their order was different. The use of isolated words outside of the context in tests was intentional, strategically speaking, so as to avoid any words’ influence on other words at the level of pronunciation. Thus, this ensures a well-focused evaluation on students’ phonetic features and makes their pronunciation clear to analyze.

The words were chosen based on approximately 7 years of experience as a student. That is, throughout being a student at Ibn Tofail University, some words of English were mispronounced daily by students of English both inside and outside of the class.

Pilot Study

Before the main investigation, a pilot study was used to assess the appropriateness and as well as the effectiveness of the research instruments (see appendix C). It involved 10 most repeated errors of pronunciation, based on 7 years of experience as a student at Ibn Tofail university. Therefore, 15 participants were selected for this pilot investigation and divided into 3 groups: Explicit, recast and control group, to make sure that the chosen words were actually mispronounced. The participants sat for both a pre-test and a post-test as well.

The aim of the pilot study was to potentially identify and account for any issues in the chosen words, and evaluate the clarity of the pronunciation assessment criteria. The results of the pilot study yielded feedback to make necessary modifications and adjustments to the instruments and used procedures, ensuring the validity and reliability for the main investigation.

Data Collection and Procedures

The participants of this investigation were first divided into 3 groups, namely explicit, recast and control group. Each group contained 15 students. All the groups were asked to read the selected words individually. After few days, approximately 5 days, the students individually sat for the post-test which includes the same words but in different order.

The present investigation acknowledges the importance of statistical assumptions when it comes to ensuring

the reliability of research. Therefore, 2 tests, namely normality and homogeneity, were conducted to test the assumptions, since those tests are ultimately essential for the chosen statistical method of this research paper which is one-way ANOVA. The one-way ANOVA is used to evaluate the impact of recast and explicit feedback on students’ pronunciation.

Normality Assumption

The ultimate goal of the normality test is to assess the data and see whether it meets the normality assumption. I.e., it tells whether the collected data follows a normal distribution. This test helps selecting the correct and appropriate methods for analyzing the data.

Homogeneity Assumption

The homogeneity assumption assesses whether the variability within each group is closely the same. It is very essential as it ensures the validity of the statistical analyses, especially those which rely on equal assumption variances. Thus, the test of homogeneity was deployed to determine if the variances within the groups are statistically comparable or not.

The assumption tests are extremely crucial to the analysis of the data of the present investigation. Making sure that the data meets the required criteria makes the reliability of this study stronger to draw conclusions on the impact of recast and the explicit corrective feedback on students’ pronunciation.

Data Analysis

The data were collected, statistically analyzed and summarized using descriptive statistics. Also, methods of inferential statistics were used to test the hypotheses of the present investigation.

First, the data were prepared. The mean, median and mode of the pre-test and post-test were calculated. The first hypothesis (H1) was tested via one-way ANOVA, while the second hypothesis (H2) was tested though a T-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The following section shows the pilot study’s results and then moves to the results of the normality test, homogeneity test, the pre-test and post-test, descriptive and inferential statistics.

Results of the Pilot Study

Table 1 show the number of errors made the students. In the explicit group, the students made 45 errors with mean of 9. For those who received recast, they committed 47 errors with the mean of 9.4, yet those in the control group made 49 with 9.8 in the mean.

Table 1: Pre-test results

Groups	Number of students	Number of errors	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Dev
Explicit	5	45	9	9	9	0
Recast	5	47	9.4	9	9	0.45
Control group	5	49	9.8	10	10	0.44

Table 2: Post-test Results of the Repeated Errors

Groups	Number of students	Repeated errors	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Dev
Explicit	5	23	4.6	6	6	1.94
Recast	5	32	6.4	6	6	0.54
Control group	5	48	9.6	10	10	0.54

Table 2 reveals the results of the post-test and the students' repeated mistakes. The explicit group repeated 23 errors with the mean of 4.6. For the recast group, the students repeated 32 errors with 6.4 in the mean. As for the control group, the students made 48 errors with the mean of 9.6. Only one error was corrected by a student in this group, which did not receive any feedback.

Table 3 shows the results of the post-test and students' corrected errors. The students in the explicit group corrected 22 errors with the mean of 4.4. For those in the recast group, they corrected 15 errors with 3 in the mean. As for the control group, there was only one corrected error by a student, with the mean of 0.54.

The pilot study provided essential insights and proved

Table 3: Post-Test Results of the Corrected Errors

Groups	Number of students	Corrected errors	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Dev
Explicit	5	22	4.4	6	6	2.3
recast	5	15	3	3	2	1
Control group	5	1	9.6	10	10	0.54

that the pronunciation of chosen words was challenging to the targeted students, and the explicit feedback and recast to be effective. Therefore, this pilot study has paved the way to the main investigation on the impact of oral corrective feedback, mainly explicit and recast on students' pronunciation.

Normality Test Results

The normality test was conducted to assess the distribution of the data of the present investigation. In the test, 2 common normality tests were used, which are the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and the Shapiro-Wilk. They assess whether the data is deviated from the normal

Table 4: Normality Test Results

Tests of Normality						
Feedback	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Explicit	.172	15	.200*	.909	15	.129
Recast	.201	15	.106	.874	15	.038
CG	.473	15	.000	.525	15	.000

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

distribution. The results of the normal test are shown in Table 1.

Based on table 4, the test of Kolmogorov-Smirnova shows 0.172 in statistics in the explicit group with the p value of 0.200*, 0.201 for the recast group with 0.106 in the p value and 0.473 for the control group with the p value of 0.000. As for the Shapiro-Wilk test, the explicit group got 0.909 in statistics with the p value of 0.129, 0.874 for the recast group with 0.038 in the p value and 0.525 for the control group with the p value of 0.000. Taking these points to consideration, as the p values of the explicit and recast groups are greater than the alpha value ($\alpha = 0.05$), the data of those groups are normally distributed. However, the control group scored 0.000 in both the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests, resulting in a low p value that is less than that of the alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$). Hence, the data of the control group are not normally distributed.

Homogeneity Test

Levene's test was done to assess the whether the groups' variance is equal. Table 2 shows the results of the homogeneity test.

According to those findings, the Levene statistic based on mean is 18.417 with 2 and 42 degrees of freedom and the p value of 0.000. Based on median, the statistic shows 11.438 with 2 and 42 degrees of freedom as well and the p value of 0.000. Based on Median and with adjusted df, statistic reveals 11.438 with 2 and 26.483 degrees of freedom and 0.000 in the p value. Last, based on trimmed mean, the statistic shows 19.202 with 2 and 42 degrees of freedom and the p value of 0.000. Therefore, as all of the methods' results have 0.000 in the p value, which is a very low value (less than 0.05), they all indicate a high difference in variances among the groups.

Based on the tests of normality and homogeneity, it appears that the explicit and recast groups are normally

Table 5: Homogeneity Test Results

Tests of Normality					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Students' Corrected Errors	Based on Mean	18.417	2	42	.000
	Based on Median	11.438	2	42	.000
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	11.438	2	26.483	.000
	Based on trimmed mean	19.202	2	42	.000

distributed, yet the control group is not. Also, the test of homogeneity shows that the groups' variances are not equal. This is due to the control group which made more errors than those groups which received the oral feedback. Hence, the investigation opts for a non-parametric test (e.g, Kruskal-Wallis Test).

Results of the Main Study

Pre-test and Post-test Results

Descriptive statistics were used to calculate the groups' mean, median, mode and the standard deviation as well. Table 3 indicates the results of the pretest. For the post-

test results, 2 tables were used to do the calculation for the repeated and corrected errors. Tables 4 indicates the results of the repeated errors in the post-test, whereas table 5 shows the corrected errors.

Table 6 show the number of errors made by each group. As shown above, the total number of errors made by students in the Explicit group is 145 with mean of 9.66. In the Recast group, the students got 147 errors with the mean of 9.8, while the Control group made 149 with 9.93 in the mean. The is no big difference between the groups concerning this latter.

The table 7 reveals the number of repeated errors by

Table 6: Pre-test Results

Groups	Number of students	Number of errors	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Dev
Explicit	15	145	9.66	10	10	0.48
Recast	15	147	9.8	10	10	0.41
Control group	15	149	9.93	10	10	0.25

Table 7: Post-test Results of the Repeated Errors

Groups	Number of students	Repeated errors	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Dev
Explicit	15	62	4.13	5	6	2.44
Recast	15	110	7.33	7	9	1.49
Control group	15	146	9.73	10	10	0.59

the groups. The Explicit group which has the mean of 4.13 repeated 62 errors. For the recast and the control group, the former has 110 repeated errors with the mean of 7.33, while the latter got 146 errors with the mean of 9.73. According to those calculations, the students who received explicit correction made less errors than those who received recast. For the control group, the students got 149 errors in the pre-test, yet they corrected 3 errors

though they received no feedback.

According to table 8 the errors that were corrected, the explicit group repaired 88 errors with the mean of 5.86. The students in the recast group fixed 40 errors with the mean of 2.66, while the control group with the mean of 0.26 corrected 3 errors without receiving feedback.

Considering those findings, the students who received feedback corrected some of their errors, unlike those who

Table 8: Post-test Results of the Corrected Errors

Groups	Number of students	Corrected errors	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Dev
Explicit	15	88	5.86	5	4	2.44
recast	15	40	2.66	3	1	1.49
Control group	15	3	0.26	0	0	0.59

received no impact. However, some students in the control group, while did not receive any correction, corrected a total of 3 errors. This latter surely was out of the investigation's control, and the way these students corrected those words remains unknown. For the group that received the correction explicitly, they fixed more errors than those who

were corrected implicitly using recasts.

Kruskal-Wallis Test

To test the first hypothesis (H1), the Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted as the study is dealing with a non-parametric measurement. A null hypothesis (H0.1) was

made to test the first hypothesis (H1). Consider the following:

H1: Recast and explicit corrective feedback have a positive impact on students' pronunciation errors.

H0.1: Recast and explicit corrective feedback have no positive impact on students' pronunciation errors.

Firstly, since the investigation deals with the efficacy

of the corrective feedback types, the dataset of the corrected errors was taken into consideration regarding the Kruskal-Wallis Test (see table 7), and a post-hoc test was used to compare the pairwise of the feedback types. A test of the null hypothesis was done and the results are shown in table 9.

In table 9, the null hypothesis (H0.1) assumes that there

Table 9: Hypothesis Test Summary Results

Hypothesis Test Summary				
	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
H _{0.1}	The distribution of Groups is the same across categories of feedback.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.000	Reject the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .050.

is no significant difference in the feedback distribution among the groups. The p value associated in Kruskal-Wallis test is less than the significance level (0.05). Therefore, there is a strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis and accept the other hypothesis, which states that the oral corrective feedback has a positive impact on students' pronunciation errors.

In table 10, total N represents the number of students, which is 45. Test statistic shows 32.944, which is a large score that indicates a big difference among the groups regarding the targeted variable. The degree of freedom is 2, and a very small value of p which is 0.000 in the Asymptotic Sig. (2-sided test), which indicates a strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 10: Kruskal-Wallis Test Result

Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test Summary	
Total N	45
Test Statistic	32.944 ^a
Degree of Freedom	2
Asymptotic Sig. (2-sided test)	.000

a. The test statistic is adjusted for ties.

Table 11: Post Hoc Test (Pairwise Comparisons of feedback)

Pairwise Comparisons of feedback					
Sample 1-Sample 2	Test Statistic	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig.	Adj. Sig. ^a
CG-Recast	15.567	4.728	3.293	.001	.003
CG-Explicit	27.033	4.728	5.718	.000	.000
Recast-Explicit	11.467	4.728	2.425	.015	.046

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same.

Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05.

a. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

The table 11 reveals the comparisons between different pairs of feedback groups (explicit, recast and control group). The Sample 1-Sample 2 column shows which two groups are being compared in each row. For each comparison, a statistical test value is provided, which assesses the difference between the means of the two groups that are being compared. For the Std. Error column, it indicates the standard error associated with each comparison. The Std. test statistic shows standardized test statistic that helps assess the significance of difference between groups. While Sig is the p value, Adj. Sig. is the adjusted significance which allows to control the familywise error rate when dealing with

multiple comparisons.

In each row, the p value is less than the significance level (0.05). This indicates a significant difference, statistically speaking, between the groups. The adjusted significance level in the Adj. Sig. column is very low with the value of 0.000, stressing a statistical significance of the comparisons.

According to these findings, the oral corrective feedback recast and explicit significantly influenced students' pronunciation development. Hence, the explicit corrective feedback and recast, based on the present results, have a positive impact when it comes to helping students correct their pronunciation errors compared to the control group.

Welch's t-test

Since the present investigation is dealing with both normal and non-normal distributed groups with unequal variance, the study adopted The Welch's t-test to test the second hypothesis (H2). The Welch's t-test is a suitable test that is used to compare the mean of 2 groups, which have unequal variance. The results of the test are

shown in table 12. A second null hypothesis (H0.2) was created to test the second hypothesis (H2), and they are represented as follows:

H0.2: The explicit feedback type is less effective than recast in improving students' pronunciation

H2: The explicit feedback type is more effective than recast in improving students' pronunciation

Table 12: Welch's T-test results

Independent Samples Test		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Feedback	Equal variances assumed	6.531	.016	4.323	28	.000	3.200	.740	1.684	4.716
	Equal variances not assumed (Welch's t-test)			4.323	23.191	.000	3.200	.740	1.669	4.731

Since the investigation is dealing with 2 groups with unequal variance, the results that are considered are those of the "Equal variances not assumed" column, which is the Welch's t-test. In the test, it seems that the t statistic is 4.323, the degrees of freedom are nearly 23.191, and the p value (Sig.) is very low as it is 0.000. The mean difference between the explicit and recast groups is 3.200, with the standard error of 0.740, and a confidence interval for the mean difference that ranges from 1.669 to 4.731.

The Welch's test indicates a significant difference between the groups, since the p value is very low (0.000). Also, as the mean difference of 3.200 on average, it suggests that the group which received an explicit feedback outperformed the group which received recast in correcting students' pronunciation errors. Considering these points, there is a strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis (H0.2).

All in all, the hypotheses (H1 and H2) were both confirmed. The first one which deals with the impact of the oral feedback, namely recast and the explicit feedback, was confirmed with the test of Kruskal-Wallis. The results show that the students who received oral corrective feedback corrected some of their pronunciation errors, yet those who were in the control group did not since they received no feedback. As for the second hypothesis, it was done by the independent T test, which was Welch's test since the groups had unequal variances. The results of the Welch's t-test revealed that the students who were corrected explicitly outperformed those who received recast.

DISCUSSION

This section presents the analysis, discussion and interpretation of the key findings of the present study. The objectives of the study were to investigate the impact of recast and explicit corrective feedback regarding students' pronunciation and determine the most effective corrective

feedback between the two types. The results came up with essential insights into the objectives and purposes of the study. Therefore, so as to provide a more comprehensive understanding and implications of the results, the section examines them in the context of existing literature and explains their significance as well.

The investigation deals with the efficacy of recast and explicit corrective feedback as oral treatments regarding students' pronunciation and also investigates the most effective type between those 2 treatments, namely recast and explicit. As indicated in the results, the students who were exposed to oral corrective feedback, either recast or explicit, repaired some of their pronunciation errors. Yet, the students who did not receive any feedback, namely the control group, did not repair their errors. But, few of them pronounced very few words correctly. The justification for this is that they either corrected the error by doing their own investigation to correct errors or met some students who received feedback, from whom they might get the corrected pronunciation. Hence, in line with the first hypothesis, which states that recast and the explicit have an impact on students' pronunciation, recast and explicit indeed influenced students positively and helped them fix their pronunciation errors. As for the most effective type of feedback, the explicit corrective feedback type appears to be the dominant one compared to recast. Therefore, the second hypothesis, which says that the explicit feedback is more effective than recast when it comes to correcting students' pronunciation errors, was also confirmed.

Considering these points, the results of the first research objective, which is about the impact of recast and explicit feedback on students' pronunciation, seem to be similar to those found by Zohrabi and Behboudnia (2017) and Mirzaie and Valizadeh (2021), as their results show that the use of oral corrective feedback, namely recast and explicit,

helps students improve their pronunciation. Concerning the second research objective, which is about the most effective feedback type, the results are in line with those found by Alahmed and Jalal (2022), Varnosfadrani and Basturkmen (2009), Yu (2022) and Zheng (2019). Their investigation shows that explicit corrective feedback is more beneficial to students compared to recast. However, this latter contradicts the findings of Karimi and Esfandiari (2016), which show in their investigation that the students who received recast benefited more than those who received the explicit corrective feedback.

The explicit corrective feedback is a type of error treatment that involves clear indication of errors before the process of correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). It could also contain feedback only without any indication of errors, just like recast, but with an adjusted voice tone, which indicates that there is a faulty use of the target language (Sheen, 2006; Sato, 2011). As for the recast corrective feedback, it is done by paraphrasing the learners' faulty language production (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In the Results, students subjected to explicit corrective feedback demonstrated superior performance comparable to those exposed to recast. The superiority of the explicit type could be due to its ability to point out errors and give tutors more time to help students correct those errors. On the other hand, recast can be done most of the time quickly, and the learners may correct their mistakes instantly but forget them quickly owing to the short time they get when corrected through this type of correction.

The results of the present investigation yielded essential significance in the process of oral error treatment regarding the mastery of pronunciation. Based on this study, recast and explicit corrective feedback are very crucial to students as they contribute to their pronunciation improvement. While the findings show that the explicit type is more effective than recast, still recast is a kind of feedback that could sometimes be a good choice, especially when dealing with students who can realize its corrective force.

CONCLUSION

The objectives of this investigation were to study and question the efficacy and impact of recast and explicit corrective feedback regarding students' pronunciation errors and determine the most effective one. This study was conducted to fill the gap that was left a very long time ago (Pawlak, 2012), given the very limited investigations that were done regarding the efficacy of recast and explicit feedback on pronunciation (e.g., Alahmed & Jalal, 2022; Karimi & Esfandiari, 2016; Zohrabi & Behboudnia, 2017). The findings show that the students who received oral corrections, mainly recast and explicit feedback, repaired most of their pronunciation errors, unlike those who received no treatment. Yet, the learners who were corrected explicitly repaired more errors than those who were corrected through recast. This suggests strong evidence for teachers to be more explicit when correcting their students' pronunciation. And because of the advantages that the explicit feedback type has over recast, being more explicit

helps learners become more focused while receiving the correction and grants them more time to correct their specific errors after their teachers indicate them.

Pedagogical Implications

The investigation tackled the efficacy of recast and explicit corrective feedback regarding pronunciation. According to its findings, educators can use oral feedback to help students repair pronunciation errors. Also, the study recommends using explicit correction as it is a very direct and clear feedback type, which helps students notice their faulty utterances and correct them. While recast is also effective, explicit feedback seems to be more effective, according to this study, as it makes learners more focused and aware of their errors for better correction. Therefore, the more educators help students repair errors, the more correct and natural the students' pronunciation will be.

Recommendations for Further Research

The study investigated recast and explicit feedback and compared their efficacy regarding students' pronunciation improvement. However, while the results were essential, there were some areas that the investigation could not tackle, such as the examination of the other four corrective feedback types, namely metalinguistic corrective feedback, repetition, clarification request and elicitation, and the investigation of the other language skills and components.

LIMITATIONS

As with any investigation, this study has some potential limitations. The limitations help better understand and make good use of the implications of the results. This section discusses the limitations of this study and the areas that could not be tackled.

The first concern in this study is the number of participants, which is a total of 45 students. While the results were significant, a larger number of participants could have yielded more sufficient results. Also, some participants had only five days between the pre-test and post-test, yet some had 7 seven days. Furthermore, while this investigation tried to create a homogeneous environment for all the participants by selecting only s2 students, this process still does not guarantee that all of them had the same proficiency level. Considering these points, stating the limitations helps refine further research on the used methods and strategies to correct students' pronunciation and excel at facilitating language acquisition.

REFERENCE

- Abbuhl, R. (2021). *Interactionist approach to corrective feedback in second language acquisition*. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics)*, pp. 44-64). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789.003>
- Agung, A., Laksmi, S., & Yowani, L. D. (2021). Common pronunciation problems of learners of English.

- ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355788555_Common_Pronunciation_Problems_of_Learners_of_English
- Alahmed, K. I., & Jalal, B. R. (2022). The effect of explicit corrective feedback on improving the English pronunciation of Iraqi intermediate graders. *Journal of Basic Science*. <https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/ecb72cdcb109948e>
- Alsolami, R. (2019). Effect of oral corrective feedback on language skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(6), 672-677. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0906.09>
- Ayoun, D. (2001). The role of negative and positive feedback in the second language acquisition of the “passé composé” and the “imparfait”. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 226-243. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00106>
- Benhima, M., & Slaoui, S. (2020). The effectiveness of prompt and recast on the pronunciation of Moroccan EFL learners: the case of English Department students in SAIS faculty. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 2(5), 30-38. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijels.2020.2.5.4>
- Bingjie, G. (2016). Is recast the most effective type of corrective feedback? - under cognitive and sociolinguistic approach. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8072/2016.04.006>
- Cahyalita, R. D. (2013). Issue of intelligibility as a main goal in teaching pronunciation: teachers’ perspectives. Satya Wacana Christian University. https://repository.uksw.edu/bitstream/123456789/7273/1/T1_112008150_Abtract.pdf
- Cambridge Dictionary: Find Definitions, Meanings & Translations. (2023). <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/>
- Couper, G. (2017). Teacher cognition of pronunciation teaching: Teachers’ concerns and issues. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(4), 820-843. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44984794>
- Crystal, D. (2012). English as a global language. Cambridge University Press.
- Darcy, I. (2018). Powerful and effective pronunciation instruction: How Can We Achieve It?. *The CATESOL Journal*, 30, 13-45. http://www.catesoljournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/CJ30.1_darcy.pdf
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054>
- Fayer, J. M., & Krasinski, E. (1987). Native and nonnative judgments of intelligibility and irritation. *Language learning*, 37, 313-326. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14671770.1987.tb00573.x>
- Fujio, M. (2017). Cognitive processes triggered by oral corrective feedback in second language learning. McGill University Libraries. <https://escholarship.mcgill.ca/downloads/8623j151r?locale=en>
- Gilakjani, A., Ahmadi, S., & Ahmadi, M. (2011). Why is pronunciation so difficult to learn? *English Language Teaching*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p74>
- Hartono, D., Basthomi, Y., Widiastuti, O., & Prastiyowati, S. (2022). The impacts of teacher’s oral corrective feedback to students’ psychological domain: A Study on EFL Speech Production. *Cogent Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2022.2152619>
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 62(8), 387-398. <https://doi.org/10.2307/326176>
- Hinkel, E. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching the four skills. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 109-131. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264513>
- Karimi, L., & Esfandiari, N. (2016). The effect of recast vs. explicit corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners’ stress patterns learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0606.05>
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. New York: Pergamon Institute of English. http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/principles_and_practice.pdf
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). Techniques and principles in language teaching. Oxford University.
- Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309-365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x>
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). How languages are learned. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. https://www.saintdavid.net/uploads/1/0/4/3/10434103/how_languages_are_learned.pdf
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. *Handbook of second language acquisition*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-012589042-7/50015-3>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263197001034>
- Mirzaie, H., & Valizadeh, M. (2021). A comparative study of recast vs. explicit and intensive vs. extensive correction regarding speaking ability. ResearchGate.
- Muslem, A., Zulfikar, T., Astilla, I., Heriansyah, H., & Marhaban, S. (2021). Students’ perception toward oral corrective feedback in speaking classes: a case at English Education Department students. *IJoLE (International Journal of Language Education)*, 5(4), 244. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i4.19010>
- Oliver, R., & Adams, R. (2021). *Oral corrective feedback*. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching* (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics, pp. 187-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789.010>
- Pawlak, M. (2012). The effect of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on eliminating pronunciation errors. In *Teaching and researching English accents in native and non-native speakers* (pp. 85-101). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-24019-5_7
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and

methods in language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R.W. (2011). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833835>

Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). *The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar: A Meta-Analysis of the Research*. In J. M. Norris, & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 133-164). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.13.09val>

Sato, M. (2011). Constitution of form-orientation: Contributions of context and explicit knowledge to learning from recasts. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 1–28. <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19864>

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8, 263-300. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168804lr146oa>

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(4), 361–392. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168806lr203oa>

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255–283. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40264353>

Skinner, B. F. (1938). *The behavior of organisms: an experimental analysis*. Appleton-Century. <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.191112/page/n3/mode/2up>

Tarone, E. (2005). *Speaking in a second language*. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 485-502). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Thomson, R. I.; Derwing, T. M. (2015). The effectiveness of L2 pronunciation instruction: A Narrative Review. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(3), 326–344. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu076>

Varnosfadrani, A. D., & Basturkmen, H. (2009). The effectiveness of implicit and explicit error correction on learners' performance. *System*, 37(1), 82-98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.04.004>

Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press

Xu, C. (2009). Overgeneralization from a narrow focus: A response to Ellis *et al.* (2008) and Bitchener (2008). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 270–275. <https://doi.org/10.6016/j.jslw.2009.05.005>

Yu, W. (2022). Explicit vs. Implicit corrective feedback: Which is more effective? In *Advances in social science, education and humanities research*. Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220401.123>

Zheng, L. (2019). The effectiveness of different corrective feedback on college English learners' acquisition of subjunctive mood. *Proceedings of the 2019 5th International Conference on Social Science and Higher Education (ICSSHE*

2019). <https://doi.org/10.2991/icsshe-19.2019.239>

Zohrabi, M., & Behboudnia, N. (2017). The effect of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on segmental word-level pronunciation errors. *Applied Research on English Language*, 6(2), 237-266. <https://doi.org/10.22108/are.2017.21348>

Appendices

Appendix A: Pre-test

Read the following words:

- 1- Increase
- 2- Develop
- 3- Based on
- 4- Education
- 5- Vegetables
- 6- Young
- 7- Strong
- 8- Communication
- 9- Professor
- 10- Of

Appendix B: Post-test

Read the following words

- 1- Of
- 2- Professor
- 3- Communication
- 4- Strong
- 5- Young
- 6- Vegetables
- 7- Education
- 8- Based on
- 9- Develop
- 10- Increase

Appendix C: Pilot Study

The correct pronunciation (transcription) of the words was taken from Cambridge Dictionary (Cambridge Dictionary: Find Definitions, Meanings & Translations, 2023).

Words	Students' pronunciation	Correct Pronunciation
Increase	/* ɪn'kri:z/ or /* ɪn'krɪz/	/ɪn'kri:s/ or /ɪn'kris/
Develop	/*'dɪvələp/	/dɪ'veləp/
Based on	/*beɪzɒn/	/beɪstɒn/
Education	/*'edʊkeɪʃn/	/edʒə'keɪʃn/ or /edʒʊ'keɪʃn/
Vegetables	/*veʒɪteɪblz/	/'vedʒtəblz/
Young	/*jʌŋg/	/jʌŋ/
Strong	/*strɒŋg/	/strɒŋ/ or /strɒŋ/
Communication	/*'kʌmɪnɪkeɪʃn/ or /*'kʌmnju:keɪʃn/	/kəmju:nɪ'keɪʃn/
Professor	/*'prɔ:fɪsə(r)/	/prə'fesə(r)/
Of	/*ɒf/	/ɒv/ or /əv/