

Corrective Feedback for Pronunciation Errors: Insights and Practices of Indonesian English Teachers

Bukhori

Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau, Indonesia

bukhori@uin-suska.ac.id

Rosety Apriliya

rosetyapriya@iaincurup.ac.id

Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Curup

Hanisa Insyarani

Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau, Indonesia

hanisainsyarn2002@gmail.com

Abstract: This study aims to explore EFL teachers' cognition of corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation and how these cognitions are reflected in classroom practices. The research was conducted at the English Education Department of an Islamic University in Pekanbaru, utilizing in-depth interviews and classroom observations. The findings revealed that both teachers strongly believed in the importance of corrective feedback and demonstrated their knowledge of various feedback types. The study also reported that both teachers implemented all six types of corrective feedback, in which explicit correction and recast dominating their practices. This research highlights the dynamic interplay between teachers' theoretical understanding and practical application, emphasizing the need for professional development to optimize corrective feedback strategies in teaching pronunciation

Keywords: Teachers' Cognition, Corrective Feedback, Teaching Pronunciation

Introduction

Teacher cognition plays a critical role in shaping instructional practices and has a profound impact on students' academic performance (Chen & Abdullah, 2022). Theoretically, teacher cognition refers to the interplay of beliefs, knowledge, and thought processes that teachers bring to their instructional practices (Borg, 2009). It encompasses how teachers perceive, interpret, and approach specific teaching tasks, often shaped by their professional experiences, formal education, and ongoing reflections (Kagan, 1990). In the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), teacher cognition is particularly influential in the selection and implementation of corrective feedback (CF) strategies, especially in pronunciation instruction. Teachers' cognitive processes guide how they respond to student errors and tailor their feedback to support learning effectively (Couper, 2019).

Several models have been proposed to analyze teacher cognition. Shavelson and Stern's (1981) model underscores the relationship between teachers' decision-making and their classroom behaviors, suggesting that teachers actively integrate information from various sources to promote student learning. Building upon this, Clark and Peterson (1986) refined the model by emphasizing the importance of the socio-psychological context in shaping teacher cognition. Addressing limitations in earlier models, Borg (2006) introduced a comprehensive framework that captures the complexity of language teacher cognition. His model highlights how teachers construct their beliefs and knowledge through a combination of personal educational experiences, professional development, and classroom practice.

Defined as the interaction of beliefs, knowledge, and perceptions about teaching, teacher cognition offers valuable insights into how these elements guide pedagogical decision-making in the classroom (Borg, 2003). In EFL contexts, these cognitive processes significantly influence how teachers plan and deliver instruction (Hidayah, Hasyim, & Azizah, 2023). Consequently, understanding how teachers think, interpret, and apply pedagogical strategies—particularly concerning corrective feedback—is essential for improving the effectiveness of pronunciation instruction (Couper, 2019).

Corrective feedback (CF) is widely recognized as a crucial component in second language acquisition, particularly in pronunciation instruction. Defined as any response to learner errors intended to guide improvement, CF serves to facilitate learners' awareness of language form and accuracy (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In the context of pronunciation teaching, CF targets phonological features such as stress, intonation, and articulation—elements that are vital for achieving intelligible and effective communication (Razali, 2018). Lyster and Ranta (1997) identified six primary types of CF: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Among these, explicit correction and recasts are the most commonly utilized, although a combination of strategies has been shown to foster greater student engagement and encourage self-correction (Sheen & Ellis, 2011).

As an integral part of language instruction, CF plays a pivotal role in helping learners refine their pronunciation by improving articulation patterns, stress placement, and intonation (Razali, Khairil, & Husna, 2018). Effective feedback, especially when personalized and constructive, empowers students to identify and address their weaknesses (Yang, 2022). While explicit correction and recasts dominate pronunciation feedback practices, other strategies such as clarification requests, elicitation, repetition, and metalinguistic feedback are less frequently employed (Rotjanawongchai, 2019; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015). This imbalance may limit learners' exposure to diverse corrective approaches that support deeper phonological awareness and autonomy in learning.

Research on CF in EFL contexts has primarily focused on its role in speaking and writing instruction. In Indonesia, several studies have examined different aspects of CF. For example, Dayat (2023) investigated the use of direct and indirect written CF, while Rifqi (2019) explored teachers' beliefs about spoken CF in classroom settings. Persi (2015) examined CF strategies to support speaking development, and Rahman et al. (2018) reported explicit correction as the most common technique for addressing pronunciation errors. Haryanto (2015) highlighted recasts and metalinguistic feedback as dominant practices in pronunciation teaching. On the international stage, research has similarly contributed to our understanding of CF in EFL education. Studies by Yunus et al. (2016) and Baker (2014) examined teachers' pronunciation strategies and their alignment with classroom practices, while Baker and Burri (2016) and Moradkhani and Goodarzi (2020) investigated CF methods across different teaching experience levels. Phuong (2023) found that Vietnamese teachers predominantly used recasts and explicit correction in pronunciation feedback.

Despite these contributions, a significant research gap remains regarding EFL teachers' cognition of CF in pronunciation instruction—especially within the Indonesian context. This gap is particularly relevant as pronunciation plays a crucial role in promoting clear communication and comprehension, which directly influences students' overall language performance (Qutub, 2023). The effectiveness of pronunciation instruction has been well-documented, with studies demonstrating its positive impact on learner outcomes (Lee, Jang, & Plonsky, 2015; Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013). Its importance is further evidenced by its inclusion in international language proficiency tests such as IELTS, TOEFL, and TOEIC, where pronunciation constitutes a core component of speaking assessment (Henderson et al., 2012). However, in many EFL contexts, pronunciation remains underemphasized due to factors such as inadequate teacher training, limited instructional resources, and time constraints (Derwing, 2018; Khaghajinejad, 2015; Warren, Elgort, & Crabbe, 2009).

Furthermore, much of the existing literature on teacher cognition and CF tends to emphasize speaking and writing skills, often neglecting the specific domain of pronunciation (e.g., Tesfie, 2017; Ha & Nguyen, 2021). When pronunciation is addressed, studies typically focus on instructional techniques rather than exploring the underlying cognitive processes that inform teaching decisions (e.g., Baker, 2014; Couper, 2019). Additionally, most of this research is conducted outside of Indonesia, highlighting the need for localized investigations into EFL teachers' beliefs and practices. A preliminary study conducted at an Islamic university in Indonesia revealed that EFL teachers predominantly rely on explicit correction and recasts when providing pronunciation feedback. In contrast, strategies such as clarification requests and metalinguistic feedback are rarely implemented. This limited use of CF types may restrict the pedagogical benefits that a more varied feedback approach could offer, ultimately affecting the quality of student learning experiences.

Therefore, this study seeks to explore the cognition of Indonesian EFL teachers regarding corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation at the English Education Department of an Islamic university in Pekanbaru-Indonesia. This research bridge gaps in the literature and practice, and provide insights into teachers' cognitive processes. This research aspires to inform teacher training programs, promote varied feedback strategies, and enhance the quality of pronunciation teaching in EFL contexts.

Methods

This study employed qualitative research with case study as the design. Case study was chosen to provide an in-depth understanding of the participants' experiences, beliefs, and practices within their specific teaching contexts. The data for this research were obtained from interviews and classroom observations. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the teachers and students to explore teachers' beliefs, knowledge, and experiences related to corrective feedback. Classroom observations were carried out to examine how teachers applied corrective feedback during pronunciation instruction. The data were analyzed using thematic analysis, which involved several systematic steps. First, familiarization was carried out by thoroughly reading and re-reading the data to identify key patterns. Next, coding was performed by assigning codes to significant statements, actions, or patterns. These codes were then grouped to develop themes that addressed the research questions. Finally, the themes were interpreted to conclude the teachers' cognition and practices regarding corrective feedback.

Results and Discussion

Teachers' belief in the essential of corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation.

Based on the data analysis, the researcher found that EFL teachers considered corrective feedback crucial for teaching pronunciation. They emphasized its implementation for several reasons, including addressing habitual errors, raising awareness of mistakes, avoiding misunderstandings, fostering positive improvement, preventing fossilization, and managing errors that could hinder communication.

Teacher 1 highlighted that corrective feedback is necessary because, without correction, students may persist in mispronouncing English sounds. She stated: *"In my opinion, it is necessary. If mistakes are not corrected, especially fundamental errors, students will continue to mispronounce words because they do not know the correct concept. Without feedback, these errors will persist"*. Teacher 1 further noted that feedback helps students become aware of their careless errors, enabling easier and quicker corrections: *"Some students know the correct pronunciation but may be careless at times. When reminded, they can quickly improve and recognize their mistakes. Thus, corrective feedback is necessary"*. Additionally, Teacher 1 emphasized the importance of corrective feedback in phonetics and phonology courses, as the focus of these courses is on proper pronunciation: *"Corrections are essential, especially in phonetics and phonology, as the primary goal is to improve pronunciation"*.

Teacher 2 echoed the significance of corrective feedback, explaining that uncorrected mistakes could become fossilized, making them harder to change later. She noted: *"If errors are not corrected, they can become deeply ingrained, or 'fossilized.' Students may continue to use incorrect pronunciation without realizing it is wrong. By the time they are aware, it may be difficult to change the habit"*. Teacher 2 also stressed the need to guide students using practical strategies, such as encouraging them to watch English videos featuring native speakers: *"As lecturers, we must guide students toward proper pronunciation. I often advise them to regularly watch videos of native English speakers. This complements the theoretical knowledge they gain and helps them develop accurate pronunciation"*. Furthermore, Teacher 2 argued that feedback should focus on correcting errors according to the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), especially when errors result from mispronunciation rather than accent: *"While accents like Javanese or Batak are natural, errors in pronunciation based on IPA standards must be corrected to prevent them from becoming fossilized"*. Teacher 2 also clarified that English pronunciation is not about being "good" or "bad," but about being "correct" or "incorrect." She explained: *"In English pronunciation, the focus is not on 'good' or 'bad,' but on being 'correct' according to IPA standards. For instance, Jackie Chan's English pronunciation is correct despite his Chinese accent. Thus, the focus should be on achieving correct pronunciation"*.

These findings indicate that both teachers agreed that corrective feedback is essential in teaching pronunciation. It helps students identify and correct errors, fosters awareness, avoids misunderstandings, and prevents fossilization. These facts align with Borg's (2006) framework on teacher cognition. The findings also highlight that corrective feedback ensures students develop clear and confident communication skills. Teachers emphasized that feedback assists students in identifying and correcting phonological errors, which is critical for effective communication. For instance, one participant stated: *"Corrective feedback ensures students understand their mistakes and improve their pronunciation clarity."* This belief corresponds to theories by Celce-Murcia et al. (2010), emphasizing the role of feedback in enhancing communicative competence.

Teachers' knowledge of corrective feedback strategies in teaching pronunciation

The result of analysis indicated that the teachers were knowledgeable on corrective feedback strategies in teaching pronunciation. They demonstrated a strong understanding of corrective feedback strategies, including explicit correction, recast, elicitation, and metalinguistic feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Teacher 1 recognized both direct and indirect correction as valuable, stating that each serves different contexts. She emphasized the importance of direct correction for preventing persistent errors and indirect correction for addressing minor mistakes due to carelessness. For example, when students made pronunciation errors, she directly corrected them and demonstrated the correct form. She stated: *"Correction can be either direct or indirect, that's what I understand so far. Both direct and indirect corrections are actually important in my opinion. In certain situations, direct correction might be more appropriate, and in other situations, indirect correction might be more suitable. Sometimes we focus on indirect correction, but there are times when even after indirect correction, students still make mistakes, right? So, direct correction is very important to prevent them from making errors. Indirect correction works well for students who are careless, maybe just because they are inattentive, but when it comes to errors, where they genuinely don't know the correct pronunciation, that's when direct correction might be more suitable"*.

Teacher 2 also highlighted the use of explicit correction, especially for critical pronunciation errors. She prioritized addressing major mistakes, such as mispronouncing "language," while being more lenient with accent variations. She explained: *"I think it is always the case, as I mentioned earlier, if the mistake is very critical—like very critical—for example, the word language /'læŋɡwɪdʒ/, and they pronounce it as /'læŋ.jwɪdʒ/, that is a very serious mistake. I have to correct that directly. But if it is about accent—like a thick Javanese accent or a Batak accent that is different—that is just natural, and the error is not too fundamental. I do not force them to correct it to be*

perfectly like a native speaker". She further explained that when one student made a mistake, she corrected it for the entire class to ensure everyone benefited. She said: "So, for example, if they make a mistake, even if only one student makes an error, I won't just explain it to that student. I will explain it to the whole class so that everyone knows, because we can't be sure which student understands and pronounces correctly. So, when I explain, I still want everyone's attention to be focused on me. With my explanation, I ensure that everyone receives the correct information. Then, as I mentioned earlier, it's the same, I practice it directly. The first step is to practice it directly". Additionally, she used tools like the Oxford Dictionary to demonstrate correct pronunciation and wrote phonetic symbols on the board. She commented: "I pronounced it as well, played the sound from the Oxford Dictionary online, and wrote the phonetic symbols on the board".

Then, teacher 1 explained utilizing recasts as a subtle correction strategy, repeating the correct pronunciation without explicitly indicating the mistake. She believed this method was effective for addressing errors caused by carelessness. She stated: "Indirect feedback occurs when students are asked a question, then respond, or are given instructions to pronounce something. For example, if they make a mistake, I might repeat the correct pronunciation without directly telling them that it's wrong. I just repeat what they said with the correct pronunciation. I do this too, but sometimes after they repeat the correct version, it seems like they still do not quite get it (laughs), they have not fully grasped it... The concept is like this, I hope that the mistakes they make in their pronunciation are only due to carelessness. So, when the correct pronunciation is provided, they can realize, "Oh yes, it should be like this". Similarly, Teacher 2 also explained the use of recasts to correct students' pronunciation while ensuring they felt supported and not embarrassed. She commented: "If it causes harm, I think it might be minimal. For example, if we correct a specific student directly, it is possible that their confidence might decrease because they feel embarrassed. However, personally, in class, I always try to tell students not to feel embarrassed or discouraged because we are in the process of learning. I would tell them the correct way and emphasize that there is no need to be embarrassed since this is not our native language. I always say things like that so that students do not feel disheartened when they are corrected."

Furthermore, Teacher 1 also explained metalinguistic feedback, including the reasons behind correct pronunciations, phonetic rules and accent variations. For instance, she discussed the differences between British and American pronunciations of words like "often." She encouraged students to refer to phonetic symbols to avoid guessing and improve accuracy. She stated: "...For example, if there are many varied and frequent mistakes made by an individual, it's not always possible to correct them all because it would take too much time. Usually, when students mispronounce sounds, I tend to write them down—the incorrect sounds they produce. Then, at the end of the session or in the middle of it, I usually tell them, "There were a few mispronunciations earlier," and explain how it should sound. Afterward, I ask them to repeat the correct pronunciation... and it is explained that even if it is not wrong, the philosophy is discussed, like this belongs to American English and this does not. For example, when I speak, for instance, often /'ɔ:fən/, sometimes when it is pronounced, I notice some peoples' responses are a bit confused, like, „Why is it pronounced /'ɔ:fən/?" They might be used to pronouncing it /'ɔ:ftən/... It is not about correcting, but rather to prevent others from thinking that what their friend said was wrong. She just explains that both pronunciations are correct. Then, from their initial recordings, improvements will be made. One way might be by referring to the phonetic symbols, so for each word, they will write the phonetic symbol underneath, allowing them to know the correct pronunciation, so they do not have to guess. The phonetic symbols provide certainty about how it is pronounced. After that, the corrections are made, and they read the text again. Usually, there are changes".

Teacher 2 also points that she was knowledgeable in metalinguistics feedback. She highlighted that phonology involves both theory and practice. She explained the theoretical aspects of pronunciation, demonstrated how it should be practiced, and elaborated on the positions of sounds in the speech organs. For example, she described how the tongue's position—

whether at the front, middle, or back of the palate—and whether the air exits through the nose or mouth are key to understanding sound production. She stated:

"In phonology, there is a theory that explains the position of certain sounds in the speech organs, and this is demonstrated. The tongue's position, such as whether it touches the front, middle, or back of the palate, is explained, along with examples of how air exits through the nose or mouth. These concepts are taught both theoretically and practically. Symbols are written on the board, and examples of other words are provided to reinforce the explanation, ensuring the students understand both the correct and alternative examples".

Then, Teacher 2 also noted that when correcting students' pronunciation errors, she provides examples of other words containing the same sound. She shared: *"For instance, if a student mispronounces /θ/ in think (/θɪŋk/), I provide examples like Thursday and Thirty. Then, I differentiate these from similar-looking words with different pronunciations, such as that (/ðæt/), father (/ˈfɑːðə/), and think (/θɪŋk/). While all these involve "th" the pronunciation varies. That is the approach I take".* She elaborated that she uses phonetic symbols and practical demonstrations during lessons. For instance: *"When teaching the word language (/ˈlæŋɡwɪdʒ/), I write the phonetic symbols /l/ /æ/ /ŋ/ /g/ /wɪ/ /dʒ/ on the board and pronounce them clearly. To ensure accuracy, I use the online Oxford Dictionary to play the correct pronunciation for the students and repeat it multiple times".* Teacher 2 also explained that she observes and records problematic sounds during individual activities and later addresses them collectively. She commented: *"When students come forward individually, I survey the sounds they struggle with. If I notice recurring errors, I note them down and later explain them to the entire class. Even if only one or two students make the mistake, I provide a collective explanation to ensure everyone understands."*

Additionally, elicitation feedback is also explained by Teacher 1, who noted that students are generally receptive to corrections and repeat the correct pronunciation. She explained: *"I often ask students to repeat the correct pronunciation until they get it right. For instance, if they mispronounce a word, I might say, 'Would you repeat that again?' and guide them to the correct form."* Teacher 1 also mentions the use of clarification requests, especially when students' pronunciation is unclear. She shared: *"If a student says something unclear, like mispronouncing „I was born" as „I was brown," I respond with „Sorry?" to prompt them to self-correct. Sometimes, other students make the same mistake, and I address it collectively."* Teacher 2 also confirmed using clarification requests, sometimes encouraging other students to verify or correct errors: *"Sometimes, I ask if a pronunciation is correct, hoping other students will respond. If no one answers, I provide the correct explanation myself."*

Reflection of teachers' cognition of corrective feedback in pronunciation classroom practices

Based on the analysis data, the researcher found that both teachers reflected their cognition of corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation. They applied some strategies of corrective feedback in their teaching practice, such as explicit correction, recast, requesting repetition, and clarification. The findings are in line with some strategies of corrected feedback mentioned by Lyster & Ranta (1997).

The manifestation of teachers' cognition is shown by the results of observations carried out by the researcher in the field. The researcher saw that *"Teacher 1 asked a student to pronounce van, but the student pronounced it as /fæn/. Teacher 1 responded, "It is not /fæn/ but /væn/," and the student corrected it. Teacher 1 explained that the "v" sound is produced with vibration."* These activities can be categorized as the type of corrective feedback provided by Teacher 1 is explicit correction. This was shown when they directly corrected the students' pronunciation mistakes and explained the correct version. Similarly, the researcher found that Teacher 2 also provided corrective feedback in the form of explicit correction when teaching pronunciation in the following observation of Teacher 2: *"Teacher 2 wrote the word 'said" with the sound /3/. When students pronounced it as /sɛɪd/, Teacher 2 immediately corrected them, saying, "There's no „i" sound, it is*

/sɛd/," and the students repeated it correctly". The data indicated that Teacher 2 directly pointed out the correct pronunciation and identified the error in producing the English sound.

Furthermore, the observation also found that Teacher 1 provided recast as another form of corrective feedback when teaching pronunciation, as shown in the following field notes: "Teacher 1 then asked everyone to repeat after them, emphasizing certain words, such as "receive," pronounced /rɛsɪv/, and then Teacher 1 immediately corrected it to "/rɪ'si:v/." Then, Teacher 1 emphasized the word "restricted" by pronouncing it clearly and repeatedly as "/rɪ'strɪktɪd/". In the same way, the researcher also found that Teacher 2 used this method when correcting students' mistakes in teaching pronunciation, as can be seen from the results of the following field notes: "Teacher 2 continued to the slide on "tongue and jaw height" and asked one student to read that part. When the student mispronounced "tongue" as /tɒŋ/, Teacher 2 immediately corrected them to /tʌŋ/, and the student improved. Teacher 2 asked the student to continue reading and corrected other mispronunciations directly".

Moreover, the results of observations on Teacher 1 also showed the occurrence of metalinguistic corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation, as shown in the following field notes: "The first student made a mistake when pronouncing "learning." The student was pronounced /'lɜ:nɪŋ/. Teacher 1 said, "Baca kata tersebut sesuai transcript nya" (Read the word according to the transcript) and the student repeated /'lɜ:nɪŋ/, and Teacher 1 responded "yes, good". Similarly, the researcher also found that Teacher 2 provided the same type of corrective feedback in the following observations of Teacher 2: "Teacher 2 then approached the first group to review their completed task and test their pronunciation. Teacher 2 asked a female student from Group 1 to read words with the long /u:/ sounds such as /ui/, /ew/, /ue/. The student mispronounced "cruel" as /kru:l/, and Teacher 2 immediately showed the phonetic transcription in the digital dictionary and corrected her: "There is an /ə/ sound. Try again!" The student then correctly pronounced /kru:əl/ and Teacher 2 added, "There is an /ə/ after the /u/".

In addition, the researcher found that Teacher 1 corrected by requesting a repetition of the pronunciation while providing prompts to help the students notice their own pronunciation. This is called elicitation feedback. Here is fieldnotes:

"Teacher 1 called on one student to read and answer question 1, "What time are you leaving?" The student answered "rising," and Teacher 1 asked the next student, who also answered "rising," and this continued for five students. When Teacher 1 asked the 6th student, the student answered "falling, maam," and Teacher 1 responded, "That is correct, it is falling, but you read it as rising." Unsatisfied, Teacher 1 asked another student to pronounce it correctly, but the 6th student still pronounced it with rising intonation. Then, Teacher 1 tried another student, who correctly said, "What time are you leaving (f)?" Teacher 1 responded, "Yes, that way".

The results of observations on Teacher 2 also showed that corrective feedback in the form of elicitation was also used in teaching pronunciation. Fieldnotes show that: Teacher 2 asked a female student from Group 1 to read words with the long /u:/ sounds such as /ui/, /ew/, /ue/. The student also mispronounced "guide" as /jwit/. Teacher 2 responded, "What? What is the correct pronunciation?."

Furthermore, the researcher found teacher 1 also used clarification feedback. In this regard, the teacher occasionally asked for confirmation of the students' utterances because some sounds were not clearly pronounced in teaching pronunciation, as shown in the following field notes: "Teacher 1 asked each student to read the text that was transcribed by one of the students, word by word. The next word was "language," which the female student pronounced hesitantly as /'læŋgwɪdʒ/. Teacher 1 said, "sorry?" The female student repeated the pronunciation correctly as /'læŋgwɪdʒ/". In line with Teacher 1, Teacher 2 also provided clarification request corrective feedback, as shown in the following field notes: "Then, Teacher 2 continues explaining the material and pronounces the word "TEAcher," with the students following to stress the correct syllable. Next, the word "center" is read by the students, but the stress is not properly heard. Teacher 2 asks them to repeat it and highlights the stressed syllable, "CENter".

Furthermore, the results of observations on Teacher 1 showed another type of corrective feedback, repetition, when teaching pronunciation, as shown in the following field notes: “Teacher 1 gave 10 questions to determine rising or falling intonation and called on students one by one to answer them. After questions 1-6, Teacher 1 moved on to question 7, “I prefer green tea (r),” and asked, “Rising or falling?” The student replied, “Rising, ma'am,” and Teacher 1 responded, “Rising? Okay, coba You!,” pointing to another student.” Similarly, Teacher 2 also used the same corrective feedback, as shown in the following field notes: “Teacher 2 continued to Group 3, where there was a mispronunciation of “upon” as /ju.pon/, and Teacher 2 immediately corrected, “/ju.pon/ bacanya? Coba cek kamus” (How do you pronounce '/ju.pon/'? Try checking the dictionary”.

Although teachers acknowledged the benefits of other strategies like elicitation and metalinguistic feedback, these were rarely implemented. This finding resonates with Rotjanawongchai's (2019) observation that teachers often default to familiar methods due to time constraints or perceived effectiveness.

Table 1. Frequency of the reflection of corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation

Corrective Feedback	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Frequency
Explicit correction	18	23	41
Recast	20	14	34
Metalinguistic Feedback	9	2	11
Elicitation	6	2	8
Clarification request	2	1	3
Repetition	1	1	2

Conclusion

This study explored the cognition of EFL teachers regarding corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation and its reflection in classroom practices. The findings revealed that the teachers held strong beliefs about the importance of corrective feedback for addressing phonological errors and enhancing communication skills. Their knowledge encompassed a range of feedback strategies, though explicit correction and recast dominated in their practices. Despite recognizing the value of alternative methods like elicitation and metalinguistic feedback, these were infrequently employed due to factors such as time constraints and familiarity with certain techniques. These results emphasize the dynamic interaction between teachers' theoretical understanding and practical application of corrective feedback, underscoring the need for professional development to diversify and optimize feedback strategies in pronunciation instruction.

References

- Baker, A., & Burri, M. (2016). Feedback on Second Language Pronunciation: A Case Study of EAP Teachers' Beliefs and Practices. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(6), 1-20.
- Baker, C. (2014). *Teacher Cognition and Language Teaching: A Guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching: A Review of Research on What Language Teachers Think, Know, Believe, and Do. *Language teaching*, 36(2), 81-109.
- Borg, S. (2009). Language Teacher Cognition. *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*, 163-171.
- Chen, F., & Abdullah, R. B. (2022). Teacher Cognition and Practice of Educational Equity in English as a Foreign Language Teaching. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 820042.
- Couper, G. (2019). Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning: A review of the Literature. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(1), 10-29.

- Couper, G. (2019). Teachers' cognitions of corrective feedback on pronunciation: Their beliefs, perceptions and practices. *System*, 84, 41-52.
- Derwing, T. M. (2018, September). Putting an Accent on the Positive: New Directions for L2 Pronunciation Research and Instruction. In *International Symposium on Applied Phonetics* (pp. 19-21).
- Haryanto, E. (2015). Teachers' Corrective Feedback on Students' Pronunciation at the Daffodils English Course Kampung Inggris Pare Indonesia. *Linguists: Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 2(2), 78-82.
- Hidayah, N. S. L., Hasyim, F. Z., & Azizah, A. (2023). Mastering Language Skills: Exploring Key Aspects In ELT (English Language Teaching). *Digital Bisnis: Jurnal Publikasi Ilmu Manajemen dan E-Commerce*, 2(3), 386-405.
- Kagan, D. M. (1990). Ways of Evaluating Teacher Cognition: Inferences Concerning the Goldilocks Principle. *Review of Educational Research*, 60(3), 419-469.
- Lee, J., Jang, J., & Plonsky, L. (2015). The Effectiveness of Second Language Pronunciation Instruction: A Meta-Analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(3), 345-366.
- 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.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in Second Language Classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1-40.
- Moradkhani, S., & Goodarzi, A. (2020). A Case Study of Three EFL Teachers' Cognition in Oral Corrective Feedback: Does Experience Make a Difference. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 9(1), 183-211.
- Persi, V. F. (2015). *Teacher's Oral Corrective Feedback in EFL Junior High School*. Doctoral dissertation, Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris FBS-UKSW
- Peterson, P. L., & Clark, C. M. (1978). Teachers' Reports of Their Cognitive Processes during Teaching. *American educational research journal*, 15(4), 555-565.
- Phuong, W. T. N., & Loi, T. P. (2023). A Survey on Students' Perception of Using YouTube for Pronunciation Learning. *International Journal of All Research Writings*, 5(1), 36-38.
- Qutub, H. (2023). The Role of Pronunciation-Focused Corrective Feedback in Learning Second Language Pronunciation. *JETT*, 14(6), 102-110.
- Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2015). Exploring Non-native English-Speaking Teachers' Cognitions about Corrective Feedback in Teaching English Oral Communication. *System*, 55, 111-122.
- Rahman, M. M., & Singh, M. K. M. (2020). A Synthesis of Oral Corrective Feedback Literature: Theoretical Underpinning, Types, Linguistics Focus and Timing. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 17(3), 1093.
- Razali, K., & Husna, N. (2018). The Teachers' Techniques In Providing Corrective Feedback On Students' Pronunciation Error. *JL3T (Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching)*, 4(2), 1-16.
- Rifqi, M. S. (2019). EFL Teachers' Belief about Spoken Corrective Feedback and Their Classroom Practice. *TEFLA Journal (Teaching English as Foreign Language and Applied Linguistic Journal)*, 2(1), 35-43.
- Rotjanawongchai, S. (2019). *Teacher Cognition of Corrective Feedback in the EFL Speaking Classroom: A Case Study of Thai University Teachers*. Doctoral dissertation, University of York.
- Shavelson, R. J., & Stern, P. (1981). Research on Teachers' Pedagogical Thoughts, Judgments, Decisions, and Behavior. *Review of educational research*, 51(4), 455-498.
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective Feedback in Language Teaching. In *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 593-610). Routledge.
- Tesfie, A. (2017). Teachers' Cognition on Process Genre Approach and Practice of Teaching Writing Skills in EFL Context. *English for Specific Purposes World*, 54(19), 1-17.
- Warren, P., Elgort, I., & Crabbe, D. (2009). *Comprehensibility and Prosody Ratings for Pronunciation Software Development*.

- Yang, M, (2022). High - Performance Flexible Pressure Sensor with a Self - Healing Function for Tactile Feedback. *Advanced Science*, 9(20), 2200507.
- Yunus, M. M., Salehi, H., & Amini, M. (2016). Impact of Using CALL on Iranian EFL Learners' Vocabulary Knowledge. *English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 173-187.