

Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues, 4 (2) page 169 – 190, 2021
ISSN: 2615-3920 E-ISSN: 2685-4473
DOI: 10.21043/jetli.v4i2.12254

Lecturer's Feedback toward Students' Willingness to Communicate in Tertiary EFL Classrooms Interaction during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Laily Rahmatika

Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia

| | | | |
|----------|-----------------|---|--|
| Contact: | Laily Rahmatika |  | lailyrahmatika20@gmail.com |
|----------|-----------------|---|--|

ABSTRACT

The transformation of education during the COVID-19 pandemic has significantly impacted English teaching (EFL). To facilitate the successful implementation of this transformation, lecturers provide feedback to correct the error and enhance the skills of students to communicate. This study aims: (1) investigate the types of lecturer's feedback used in the tertiary EFL interaction classroom during the COVID-19 pandemic and (2) identify types of lecturer's feedback effect on students' willingness to communicate of the tertiary EFL interaction classroom during the COVID-19 pandemic. Drawing on a qualitative study, data were collected by observation, audio and video recording, and transcription within two online tertiary EFL classroom of the Department of English Education at Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta. The result indicates that types of lecturer's feedback into evaluative, interactive, corrective, and motivational feedback. Evaluative, corrective, and motivational feedback are identified effect in enhancing skills on students' willingness to communicate. The results offer implications for language lecturers to be aware that providing feedback affects students' willingness to communicate success or failure.

KEYWORDS:

Lecturer's feedback;
EFL classroom;
Discourse classroom;
Willingness to
communicate;

Introduction

The transformation of education during the COVID-19 pandemic significantly impacts English teaching (EFL). Despite the fact that COVID-19 has a significant impact on university teaching in countries such as Indonesia, a number of changes had been implemented to ensure that language lecturers working at the university continue to carry out the classroom learning process through online teaching. However, this

transformation seems to have little impact on how lecturers provide feedback by using online interaction classrooms while teaching. It is essentially equal to providing feedback in traditional classes, but the differentiator, online classroom interaction, in which lecturers provide more feedback to students, is critical to the effectiveness of the defense (Mohamadi, 2018). Although feedback is intended to provide error correction that is responsive to students' needs, it is also intended to increase students' willingness to communicate in certain situations using their foreign language skills.

In connection with that, several studies have focused on feedback, including verbal feedback (Centeno & Ponce, 2019; Fadzil & Said, 2021; Irawan & Salija, 2017; Lyster et al., 2013; Noor et al., 2010; Saputra, 2017; Yulia & Zainil, 2021), written feedback (Annisa & Manalullaili, 2020; Bijami et al., 2016). Meanwhile, some research has focused on the effects of corrective feedback on students' willingness to communicate (Sa'adah et al., 2018; Tavakoli & Zarrinabadi, 2018; Zarrinabadi & Rahimi, 2021; Zadkhast & Farahian, 2017). However, very little research has been conducted to investigate how EFL lecturers taught online during the Covid-19 pandemic using digital platforms. The study addressed two major research questions.

1. What types of lecturer's feedback are used in tertiary EFL interaction classroom during the COVID-19 pandemic?
2. How does types of lecturer's feedback effect on students' willingness to communicate of the tertiary EFL interaction classroom during the COVID-19 pandemic?

Lecturer's Feedback in Online Interaction

During the COVID-19 pandemic, lecturer feedback played an important and unavoidable role in creating communication in the EFL classroom.

Feedback from lecturers is crucial in enhancing students' skills, including

high school and university. According to Hattie (1999), feedback is one of the most influential factors in learning. Furthermore, feedback can assist in reducing mistakes and the ability to engage learners in the classroom. Feedback is essential in online classroom interactions due to students' lack of face-to-face interaction in the changing classroom environment.

Even though lecturers and students are geographically separated in online interaction, the lecturer must provide high-quality feedback to aid students' learning and motivation (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). According to Ko & Rossen (2001), students in online classrooms are engaged in deactivating from the material or environment interaction than students in face-to-face classrooms. In online interactions, lecturer feedback is frequently mentioned as a turning point for student learning, and a lack of feedback is regularly given as a reason for drawing down out of an online classroom. It has been demonstrated that using feedback in online teaching and learning activities increases students' motivation and sense of belonging to an online learning community (Paterson et al., 2020). Furthermore, technological developments have been used to assist and enhance learning strategies and feedback (Schmidt-Crawford et al., 2020). Students might indeed learn and adapt to the online learning process if they obtain accurate and appropriate feedback and self-regulate their learning (Deeley, 2017; Grieve et al., 2016).

Types Feedback in the EFL Classroom

Sinclair & Coulthard (1975) prominently introduce feedback in teaching and learning schemes. They revealed that instructional talking trends were composed of three layers and that they would still classify them into specific functions by characterising the language functions. Consequently, they developed the model of teacher-student interaction based on a hierarchically structured system of ranks. The model's ranking scale was comprised of five components: lesson, transition, exchange, move, and act

(Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Feedback is inferred from the concept of an I-R-F exchange structure, in which 'I' signifies initiation, 'R' reflects student responses, and 'F' embodies follow-up to the students' responses or the lecturer's feedback.

Lecturer's feedback is classified as follows: evaluative feedback, interactive feedback, corrective feedback, and motivational feedback. Evaluative feedback is a type of evaluation of a student's work or performance (Tunstall & Gipps, 1996). Evaluative feedback was classified into five categories: rewarding, punishing, approving, and disapproving. There are 3 types of evaluation feedback, as per Noor et al. (2010), positive, confirm, and repetition. A response in interactive feedback allows students to develop their language production (García, 2005). Corrective feedback is given in response to a learner's mistake (Ellis, 2006). Corrective feedback is categorised by Lyster & Ranta (1997) as explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. According to Mackiewicz & Thompson (2013), motivational feedback aims to engage students in learning. Then, it identified five types of motivational feedback: praise, encouraging or optimistic statements, demonstrations of concern for students, expressions of sympathy and empathy, and reinforcement of students' feelings of ownership and control.

Feedback as Willingness to Communicate (WTC) for EFL Students

Providing feedback is a conversational endeavour wherein the lecturers and students work together to produce meaning. As a result, feedback doesn't quite hold back once student work is brought back to them, because strategic targets are required to increase their learning. Feedback is one of the assessment variables that provides information about student performance in a wide range of ways (Shin et al., 2017). However, Brown (2007) examines that far too much negative feedback - a flurry of

interruptions, corrections, and overt attention to malformations - regularly causes students to stop their efforts to communicate. Zarrinabadi & Abdi (2011, p. 288) investigates the effects of teachers on students' willingness to communicate and discovered that "teacher waiting time, error correction, topic decisions, and support have an impact on students' willingness to communicate."

According to MacIntyre et al. (2011), one of the factors influencing L2 WTC is error correction. MacIntyre et al. (1998) defined the term in the L2 context as the willingness to communicate in L2 with a specific person or persons at a particular time. They introduced a pyramid-shaped WTC heuristic model that explains the impact of contextual and personal factors on students' WTC. MacIntyre et al. (cited in Vongsila & Reinders, 2016), willingness to communicate is the willingness to engage in conversation with specific people or groups of people using a foreign language at particular times. MacIntyre et al. (1998) invented the concept into the L2 context as the willingness to communicate in L2 with a special person or persons at a specific time. They posited a WTC heuristic model in the shape of an inverted to describe the effect of situational and individual factors on students' WTC.

According to Dörnyei & Ryan (2015), willingness to communicate explains how multiple factors influencing an individual's possibility of initiating communication in a given situation. Furthermore, Ellis (2012) asserts that the willingness to communicate can be viewed as a traitor to contextual variables impacted by specific instructional factors. Corrective feedback, as per Macintyre (as cited in Rashidi et al., 2016), alike goes up and down students' willingness to communicate contingent on how this is intended and conveyed. Per another study, the influence of explicit corrective feedback on students' willingness to communicate can be risen (Tavakoli & Zarrinabadi, 2018).

Previous studies have found that error correction by teachers (lecturers) seems to have an influence on L2 willingness to communicate in the classroom. Zarrinabdi (2014) notes on how the timing of correction (postponed vs. instant) influenced L2 WTC). They claimed that the explicit type accelerated L2 WTC by decreasing anxiety and rising perceived effective communication in learners. According to Zadkhast & Farahian (2017), both immediate and deferred corrective feedback affected students' willingness to communicate. According to Zarrinabadi & Rahimi (2021), Manova and post hoc comparisons, praising students for their endeavours enhanced their anxiousness, enthusiasm, skill, and growth.

Method

Participant

This study was conducted with two lecturers-one female and male contain 70 students-males and females from two online tertiary EFL classrooms of the Department of English Education at Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta. The tertiary EFL classrooms were selected based on random sampling.

Research Design

This study uses an approach in the domain of qualitative. A qualitative descriptive is using the Conversation Analysis or CA approach. The use of the CA approach as an online interaction classroom mostly forms feedback and responses.

Instrument

The instrument is used in this study is series of utterances which form a sequence pattern in two lectures-Lexico Grammar and Lexicon in tertiary EFL classrooms.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data were collected by observation, audio and video recording, and transcribed from online interaction classroom through Google Meet and Zoom. The duration of each class was approximately 50 minutes. A female lecturer classroom is audio recording, while a male lecturer classroom is video recording. In the process of transcription, the series of utterance is coded 'L' as lecturer and 'S' as students. The following excerpt may clarify the point.

- L [65] Ada four dimation. Jadi dimendition yang pertama based on segment component based on the meaning ada subject, finite, indicator, complement, adjunct right?
- S9 [66] Right
- L [67] Right, understood?
- S9 [68] Ya
- S13 [69] Ya

Following the data transcription, a series of feedback from lecturers classified into four types of feedback would be presented. The data was then analysed in order to determine how lecturers' feedback affected EFL students' learning and speaking.

Result and Discussion

The results and discussion in this study are based on the research questions. This study investigates the types of lecturer's feedback used in the tertiary EFL interaction classroom during the COVID-19 pandemic and identifies types of lecturer's feedback effect on students' willingness to

communicate of the tertiary EFL interaction classroom during the COVID-19 pandemic. Table 1 below summarizes the analysis of types and frequency of lecturer's feedback toward students' responses in the tertiary EFL classrooms during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Table 1. Types of Lecturer's Feedback

| Types of Feedback | | Lecturers | | Total | % |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------|----|-------|----|
| | | LG | L | | |
| Evaluative Feedback | Approving | 28 | 39 | 67 | 39 |
| | Disapproving | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4 |
| | Repetition | 6 | - | 6 | 3 |
| | Confirming | 6 | 29 | 35 | 20 |
| Interactive Feedback | | 11 | 12 | 23 | 13 |
| Corrective Feedback | Recast | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| | Clarification request | 8 | 11 | 19 | 11 |
| | Praise | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Motivational Feedback | Encouragement | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| | Reinforcement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 |

Types of Lecturer's Feedback

Evaluative Feedback

Evaluative feedback refers to lecturers evaluating students' responses based on language (Cullen, 2002), and it has been described as forms of 'judgment' made on the students' performance (Nunn, 2001). According to Gattulo (as cited in Noor et al., 2010), this type of feedback is the most prevalent type of feedback used in second and foreign language classrooms. When lecturers use this type of feedback, they will use words or phrases to indicate that the student's response is acceptable. As shown in table 1, evaluative feedback accounted for a sizable portion of the total,

equalling 39% in giving praised which means approving students by saying "good," "yes", "yeah", "oh yeah", "heem", "hoo", "right", "all right", "very good," "correct," "okay", and "ok," and they repeated the responses given by the students or giving the answer of students' responses. Besides, the lecturers used other evaluative feedback by disapproving, repeating, and confirming. Based on the data analysis, this study discovered that the lecturers' feedback generally followed two patterns: 1) the lecturer approving by praising the students' response; 2) the lecturer confirming the students' responses. The following extracts exemplify below.

Excerpt 1: (source - LG. 103-105)

- L : [103] Iya berarti masuk jenis process apa?
- S4 : [104] Mental process.
- L : [105] Good, yeah its is mental process kalau dilihat dari ideational meaning. He nya adalah kalau mental proses henya adalah senser isnya adalah is nya digandeng studying kalau ideational menaing Mungkin kalian bingung ya in the use of 4 dimensions.

In excerpt 1, the lecturer praised "good" and "yeah," to say that the answer is correct. She praised both of them as approving of the students' responses. Furthermore, she explained the student's answer in greater detail by identifying the analyses in the mental process one by one word at a time. Ran and Danli (2016) discovered that teachers' affirmations are "good" and "yes" as positive signals after students give the correct sentence. Use the mentioned praise marker to indicate that the student's satisfactory response. Positive signs can demonstrate the teacher's agreement while increasing students' trust in language learning.

Evaluative feedback approves as self-confident to students for the answers given. Giving positive signals such as "good" and "yes" can encourage other students to take the initiative in answering questions from lecturers. Chafi & Elkhouzai (2016) argued that the use of praise given by teachers in class stems partly from patterns of automatic discourse and schemes that aim to improve students' ability to monitor appropriate thinking rather than just praise or give the correct meaning.

Excerpt 2: (source - L. 27-29)

L : [27] What is economical, Arlenda, Dea, Alya or anybody economicals?

S2 : [28] Economics?

L : [29] I was economicals individual, I was economical student, what is it? I don't study Economy, what is economical? I don't know much money yeah economies, what is it?

In excerpt 2, the lecturer repeated student's responsibility to confirm the lecturer means that by giving examples complete sentences with grammatical structure, such as "I was enonomical individual" and "I was enonomical student" to make a clear the meaning that what does it mean by the lecturer is being able to save money. For students to capture clear meaning, the lecturer uses self-repair by changing substitutions from "individual" to "student" according to context. To make students interact, the lecturer posed the question "what is it?" and "what is economical?". The lecturer used self-repairs to provide confirming feedback from students. The use of self-repair is not at the end of the answer, but the lecturer throws the question to students to permeate the questions given by lecturers. Refers to Noor et al. (200) discovered that teachers repeat the structure of the student response as a pattern of confirming or accepting what students mean when providing confirming feedback.

Interactive Feedback

Interactive feedback was identified by Richard and Lockhard (1996) as a strategy for expanding or modifying a students' response. According to Noor et al. (2010), teachers give this type of feedback to help and encourage students, and it is not considered negative feedback. In excerpt 3, the lecturers initiated the conversation, followed by a question. However, in the following exchange, the students were unhesitant to answer the question. While in excerpt 4 answering the students' questions, the students actively asked back after the lecturer responded. Thus, to assist as well as encourage the student to complete the question and raise curious questions.

Excerpt 3: (source - LG. 130-134)

L : [130] Marry will give them souvenir. Semuanya harus 4 dimension 4 layer. Sekarang layer 1 based on the segment of menaing. Siapa yang bisa?

S4 : [131] Aku, Bu.

L : [132] Analyse the clause marry wil give them souvenir based on the dimation number 1 yakni based on the segmental meaning. Marry sebagai apa?

S1 : [133] Subject.

L : [134] Haa? ndak ada didalam lexico grammar itu objek tidak ada.

S24 : [135] Senser.

L : [136] Haa subjectnya apa?

S8 : [137] Subject.

L : [138] Subject.

- S2 : [139] Layer pertama kan subject, Bu.
- L : [140] Lha iya, layer pertama itu yang componenya apa coba apa sebut?
- S1 : [141] Subject. Predicate.
- S2 : [142] Subject , predicatore, complement.
- L : [143] Subject, finite. Menyebutkannya urut ya nggak boleh subject predicator finite. Urutannya dalam declarative clause itu subject finite predicator complement adjunct. Hanya itu ya subject finite predicator complement adjunct. Lima itu dihafalkan itu.

In excerpt 3, the lecturer asked students to answer a question. Some students want to respond to the questions right away in person because students were asked to identify the function of the sentence in the word mentioned, which the question is quite simple to answer. However, when answering the function of the sentence mentioned as "subject," the lecturer's feedback. The lecturer directly questioned the answer with "haa?" without providing a direct answer, it is only a disapproving explanation with the phrase "tidak ada". Despite such lecturer feedback, other students continue to respond. The lecturer repeated the question by mentioning "subjeknya apa?" so that students can actively participate in the implementation of the lecturer's example sentences. The lecturer used interactional feedback, which is undaunted to question students' responses that can create the involvement of other students to answer and encourage students to provide answers by posing a continuous question in which there is an active interaction between lecturers and students.

Excerpt 4: (source - L. 223-227)

- L : [223] Who's next yeah yes next please.
- S17 : [224] Yes, Sir .
- L : [225] Amelia Amelia
- S17 : [226] Hey I want to I want to show up where's the culture shock in UK?
- L : [227] Culture shock yes I think food food will be will be the most crucial one because you know when I'm home I always eat a local food yeah even here I don't go for steak I don't go for you know toast.
- S18 : [228] What's what's different of education system between Indonesia and UK?
- L : [229] Well well it's a big difference they have infrastructures yeah they have this you know uh facility and amazing bandwidth internet campus connections yeah yes that make it different and how people there how how how the the academics staff and lecturers are really uh focusing on what they're doing I don't say that they are much better than us but in some elements and dimension yeah they are better.
- L : [230] Yeah which is nice yeah and do you have any anything else?
- S18 : [231] No no thank you for your answer my questions.
- L : [232] You are welcome okay who's next okay you don't turn on your video there you go oh it's it's look like night time there yeah where are you no where are you.

In excerpt 4, the lecturer acknowledges interactive feedback by asking, "who's next?" to encourage students to be active such as giving questions

to the lecturer. When the student took the initiative to inquire, the lecturer addressed the student by name. Here, students are the main center which is they were allowed to talk and ask anything to the lecturer. Then the lecturer gave feedback by answering the culture shock experience he had during his master's degree study in the UK. However, after the lecturer explained what had happened, the student received no response. Instead, the lecturer gave answers based on his experience, making other students curious to ask what they didn't know, which was related to the differences in the education system between Indonesia and the UK. When the lecturer finished explaining, there were no more feedback and question from the students. While to make it stay interactive classroom, the lecturer asked with "Who's next?" The interaction of lecturer feedback shown here is to elicit student questions.

Corrective Feedback

According to Ellis (2009), corrective feedback is negative feedback. If the lecturers did not use it frequently, students would not notice the gap between the intermediary and target languages and fossilization. Corrective feedback can consist of several forms, which are recast, clarification request, and praise. The following excerpts of corrective feedback are below.

Excerpt 5: (source - LG. 248-252)

L : [248] Bored. Bosen sebagai apa? Phe phenomenon. Right now?

S8 : [249] Circumstantance.

S10 : [250] Time.

S1 : [251] Time.

L : [252] Circumstance of adijuct of time. Iyak bagus.

In excerpt 5, the lecturer asked students to identify sentences in the third dimension in terms of ideational meaning or transitivity. The lecturer used this way to instruct the students to match one word to another, followed by the answer code provided by the lecturer. While S8 answered correctly, two other students-S10 and S1, had similar responses when it came to declaring the word "time". In this case, the lecturer defends the students' responses without identifying the error address. Lecturers directly justify answer S8 by completing the transitivity meaning in question by concluding the answer with praise marked with the word "iyak bagus", which intends to explain answer S8. According to Ran and Danli (2016), teachers do not point out mistakes by saying 'no' or 'you've made mistake when providing recast feedback. According to her findings, her female teacher provided the correct pronunciation answer, and her students immediately corrected the error. The recast supplied by the lecturer gives the correct answer without pointing out the mistake made by S10 and S1.

The lecturer did the corrective feedback to reduce the student's fear in answering his question by not directly blaming the responses of the two students. This can encourage students to answer without being aware that they should try to provide answers to other questions given more observantly. The lecturer does not create a frightening atmosphere in question-and-answer sessions to express themselves.

Excerpt 6: (source - L. 87-89)

- S7 : [87] I want to ask you sir how to manage your time and your money while you were study abroad?
- L : [88] I'm sorry, I wasn't listening. I think we got the problems with the voice from you can you repeat that?

- S7 : [89] How to manage your time and your money? can you hear me?
- L : [90] Oh yeah yeah yeah time and money yeah. Okay Adiba don't mute your microphone, stay with me.

In excerpt 6, the lecturer asked about managing time and money while pursuing a master's degree abroad as a student. However, the lecturer did not hear the student's question and responded by saying "sorry" and explaining why he did not hear his voice. Then, by inserting the phrase "can you repeat that?" The lecturer directly asks for clarification of the request to repeat the question. To ensure that the lecturer heard the question a second time, S7 repeated it with the confirmation question, "can you hear me?" Following that, the lecturer used praise such as "oh yeah yeah yeah" and "okay" to indicate that the lecturer heard the question. The lecturer then ensures that S7 does not mute the microphone while the lecturer answers questions.

Clarification of the request feedback made in the excerpt above is not to correct or question his students to provide the correct answer—the feedback given leads to more repetition of student questions. When providing feedback to confirm the student's question, the lecturer allows students to actively participate by turning on the microphone as long as the lecturer answers questions. In corrective feedback, it can say that lecturers give students complete freedom to communicate directly by freely interrupting lecturer responses.

Motivational Feedback

Motivational feedback (Scaffolding) is used to build rapport and solidarity with students and engage and retain them (Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2013). They state that this motivational feedback can direct attention, improve both effort and perseverance, and performance to learn. The following

motivational feedback consists of two forms which are encouragement and reinforcement below.

Excerpt 7: (source - LG. 01-04)

L : [01] Good morning, my student.

S1 : [02] Good morning

L : [03] Have great in this lesson. You will have occasion be active in the class and then you have to raise your hand to ask me a question by interrupting is ok. If you still do not understand about everything I explain to you. Jadi kalau belum paham boleh langsung interupsi. OK.

S2 : [04] Ok, Mom.

In excerpt 7, after the student says greeting, the lecturer provides motivational feedback and encourages students to be active in the classroom by explaining the provisions for free interruption when the lecturer explains. Encouragement in this context refers to positive feedback intended to foster an enthusiastic spirit in students involved in the learning process. When students feel they do not understand what the lecturer is explaining, they have complete freedom in the classroom. Irawan and Salija (2017) stated that motivational feedback encouragement to make the situation comfortable in classroom learning.

Excerpt 8: (source - L. 276-278)

L : [276] Hello hello there.

S24 : [277] What do we need to prepare if we want to starting a product if you want to study abroad?

L : [278] Well you prepare everything what do you mean I dream you that's your dream yeah first of all believe in your dream because nobody will believe but yourself my family my friends my teachers keep talking about it yeah so of course we have to prepare everything the school and so and so but but once you have your dream yeah you keep going yeah uh we still have uh you know few times I know it's a little time sorry.

In excerpt 8, the lecturer provides motivational feedback in reinforcement for S24's dreams. The steps that students can take were detailed in the reinforcement. Lecturer uses the phrase "believe in your dream" to emphasize that as long as you have good intentions, anything positive thoughts will realize your dreams over the process and preparation done in advance to pick your dream up. Furthermore, the phrase "keep going" is to stay upright for his desires. Motivational feedback is used here as reinforcement to boost students' self-confidence in her dreams and optimism about achieving her. This is consistent with Mackiewicz and Thompson (2013), who state that motivational feedback improves students' self-confidence and optimism.

Lecturer's Feedback Effect on Students' Willingness to Communicate

In general, not all types of lecturers' feedback can affect students' willingness to communicate. The effect of the lecturer's feedback is seen based on a series of utterances of classroom interaction. The results indicate that the lecturers have three lecturers' feedback: evaluative, corrective, and motivational feedback containing students' willingness to communicate in tertiary EFL classrooms interaction during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The effect of the lecturer's feedback does not cause students to be unwilling to communicate during class. In the context of this class interaction, the lecturer provides full opportunities for students to be involved in-class sessions. However, sometimes the responses given by students cause feedback from the lecturer. Instead, the lecturer's feedback in this class aroused students' intention to interactively ask and answer questions about what the lecturer ordered and the material presented. In this case, the most important thing is the students' willingness to speak in class despite receiving repeated feedback and communicating fluently and confidently.

In addition, in providing feedback of student errors, lecturers prefer to answer with correct answers without blaming students' responses explicitly to reduce students' fear and lack of confidence in answering questions. Even though the students fixed that the answer was incorrect in the question and answer session, they still wanted to answer. In this case, the lecturer corrects students by providing the correct answers, explanations, and confirmations for the errors during the class session can encourage students to respond without thinking about the destructive consequences of making mistakes.

Furthermore, to create a positive effect in the classroom, the lecturer does not create a frightening atmosphere for students in the classroom to express themselves, especially in question and answer session. The existence of feedback from lecturers can improve student WTC through self-confidence, enthusiasm, reduction of fear, and increased competence in active communication, even though learning sessions were carried out online.

Conclusion

This study discusses the lecturer's feedback toward students' willingness to communicate in the EFL classroom during the COVID-19 pandemic. The results revealed that the lecturer's types of feedback were classified as evaluative, interactive, corrective, and motivational. However, not all types have an impact on WTC. Based on the result, only evaluative, corrective, and motivational feedback from lecturers increases WTC through self-confidence, enthusiasm, fear reduction, and increased active communication. The feedback found in this study was not only for correcting errors. However, there was a shift in the meaning of feedback in two series of tertiary EFL utterances: non-grammatical sentences, phonological and semantic errors, and pronunciation errors. Still, the lecturers were more focused on responding based on the context. Lecturers do not pay much attention or pay attention to the use of language. They focus more on the content of the material provided.

The results have implications for language lecturers and other researchers. As a language lecturers might be aware that providing feedback affects students' willingness to communicate success or failure. The study may also shed more light on the types of lecturer's feedback that can influence WTC. The other types of lecturer's feedback have not been shown in previous research to improve WTC. The study looks at the impact of explicit and implicit feedback on EFL students' willingness to communicate (Tavakoli & Zarrinabadi, 2018). As a result, more research into lecturers' evaluative, corrective, and motivational feedback types in EFL classrooms is required to provide a more complete picture of how error correction can affect WTC students. This study discovered that any type of lecturer who demonstrates a willingness to communicate with students during the learning process.

There are some peculiarities in this study. First, only two lecturers from two EFL tertiary classes participated in the study. Second, there is no comparison of the results of the interaction of male and female lecturers in providing feedback to language learners, which has an effect on students' willingness to communicate. Third, the use of language in inadequate language learning where there is a shift in the meaning of feedback. Furthermore, due to the limited number of online classes available, the sample used as data is required to generalise the study results.

References

- Annisa, N., & Manalullaili. (2021). Implementing teacher written feedback and oral writing conference: Do they work for introvert and extrovert students? Proceedings of the 5th Asian Education Symposium 2020 (AES 2020). 344-347. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210715.072>
- Bijami, M., Pandian, A., & Singh, M. K. M. (2016). The relationship between teacher's written feedback and student's writing performance: Sociocultural perspective. (2016b). *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.4n.1p.59>
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Chafi, M. E., & Elkhouzai, E. (2016). The use of feedback in classroom interaction in Moroccan primary school. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, 12(4), 281. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2016.v12n4p281>
- Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talk: the importance of the F-move. *ELT Journal*, 56(2), 117–127. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.2.117>
- Deeley, S. J. (2017). Using technology to facilitate effective assessment for learning and feedback in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(3), 439–448. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1356906>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315779553>
- Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA Review*, 19, 18–41. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.19.04ell>

- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1).
<https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054>
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. John Wiley & Sons. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781118271643>
- Fadzil, I. M., & Said, N. E. M. (2021). Exploring ESL teachers' insights on corrective oral feedback in a Malaysian secondary education context. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 6(9), 504–512.
<https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v6i9.993>
- García, A. (2005). The effect of teacher feedback on EFL learners' functional production in classroom discourse. *Anglogermania Online*, 10-18.
- Grieve, R., Padgett, C. R., & Moffitt, R. L. (2016). Assignments 2.0: The role of social presence and computer attitudes in student preferences for online versus offline marking. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 28, 8–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.08.002>
- Hattie, J. (1999). *Influences on student learning*.
- Irawan, E., & Salija, K. (2017). Teachers' oral feedback in EFL classroom interaction (A descriptive study of senior high school in Indonesia). *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 138.
<https://doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v4i2.4496>
- Ko, S., & Rossen, S. (2017). *Teaching online: A practical guide*. Routledge.
- 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., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1-40.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365>
- MacIntyre, P. D., Burns, C., & Jessome, A. (2011). Ambivalence about communicating in a second language: A qualitative study of French immersion students' willingness to communicate. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(1), 81-96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01141.x>
- MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualising willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545-562.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x>
- Mackiewicz, J., & Thompson, I. (2013). Motivational scaffolding, politeness, and writing center tutoring. *The Writing Center Journal*, 33(1), 38-73.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/43442403>

- Mohamadi, Z. (2018). Comparative effect of online summative and formative assessment on EFL student writing ability. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 59, 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2018.02.003>
- Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- Noor, N. M., Aman, I., Mustaffa, R., & Seong, T. K. (2010). Teacher's Verbal Feedback on Students' Response: A Malaysian ESL Classroom Discourse Analysis. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 7, 398–405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.054>
- Nunn, R. (2001). Language learning across boundaries-negotiating classroom rituals. *TESL-EJ*, 5(2).
- Paterson, C., Paterson, N., Jackson, W., & Work, F. (2020). What are students' needs and preferences for academic feedback in higher education? A systematic review. *Nurse Education Today*, 85, 104236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2019.104236>
- Rashidi, A., Basiro, S. R., & Motlaq, H. S. (2016). The effect of corrective feedback strategy types on Iranian EFL learner's willingness to communicate. *The Caspian Sea Journal*, 10(1), 56-65.
- Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667169>
- Sa'adah, L., Nurkamto, J., & Suparno, S. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: Exploring the relationship between teacher's strategy and students' willingness to communicate. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(2), 240–252. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v5i2.11532>
- Centeno, A., & Ponce, S. (2019). Beliefs about oral corrective feedback in an Argentinean EFL university classroom. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 13(3), 35–58. <https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201907063591>
- Saputra, R. (2017). Teachers' feedback used in learning English process at SMAN 1 Sungai Tarab. *Ristekdik: Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling*, 2(2).
- Schmidt-Crawford, D. A., Lindstrom, D. L., & Thompson, A. D. (2021). Moving Online in 2020: Lessons Learned from Successful Virtual Conferences. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 37(1), 4–5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2020.1855949>

- Shin, J., Lee, Y. K., & Seo, E. (2017). The effects of feedback on students' achievement goals: Interaction between reference of comparison and regulatory focus. *Learning and Instruction*, 49, 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.11.008>
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.
- Tavakoli, M., & Zarrinabadi, N. (2018). Differential effects of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(3), 247-259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2016.1195391>
- Tunstall, P., & Gipps, C. (1996). Teacher feedback to young children in formative assessment: a typology. *British Educational Research Journal*, 22(4), 389–404. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141192960220402>
- Vongsila, V., & Reinders, H. (2016). Making asian learners talk: Encouraging willingness to communicate. *RELC Journal*, 47(3), 331–347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216645641>
- Yulia, M., & Zainil, Y. (2021). An analysis of teachers' oral feedback in EFL classroom interaction at SMP Negeri 10 Batam. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(1), 45-52.
- Zadkhast, M., & Farahian, M. (2017). The impact of immediate and delayed corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 6(6), 28. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.6p.28>
- Zarrinabadi, N. (2014). Communicating in a second language: Investigating the effect of teacher on learners' willingness to communicate. *System*, 42, 288–295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.014>
- Zarrinabadi, N., & Abdi, R. (2011). Willingness to communicate and language learning orientations in Iranian EFL Context. *International Education Studies*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v4n4p206>
- Zarrinabadi, N., & Rahimi, S. (2021). The effects of praise for effort versus praise for intelligence on psychological aspects of L2 writing among English-majoring university students. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2021.1934928>