



Exploring the Use of Oral Corrective Feedback in Turkish EFL Classrooms: A Case Study at a State University

İngilizcenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretildiği Sınıflarda Sözlü Düzeltici Dönütlerin Kullanımının Araştırılması: Bir Devlet Üniversitesinde Durum Çalışması

Özlem FAKAZLI^a

^aKastamonu University, School of Foreign Languages, Kastamonu, Turkey.

Öz

Bu sınıf araştırması, ana dili İngilizce olmayan bir İngilizce öğretmenin İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilere nasıl düzeltici dönüt sunduğunu araştırmaktadır. Daha detaylı bir şekilde, bu çalışma öğrencilerin yaptığı dil hatalarını ortaya çıkarmayı, öğretmenlerin bu hatalara hangi tür düzeltici dönüt verdiğini ve öğrencilerin bu dönütleri kavrama düzeylerini ortaya çıkarmayı hedeflemiştir. Veri, ses kaydı kullanılarak toplanmış; bu veri öğrencilerin hata türlerini, öğretmenin verdiği düzeltici dönüt türlerini ve öğrencilerin kavrama oranlarını bulmak için detaylı bir şekilde analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar; dil bilgisi hatalarının en çok yapılan, sözcüksel hataların en az yapılan hata türü olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, çalışma direkt düzeltmenin en çok kullanılan düzeltici dönüt türü olduğunu, açıklama isteği türünün de en az tercih edilen dönüt türü olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Verilen tüm düzeltici dönütlerin de öğrenciler tarafından yüzde yüz oranla kavrandığı ve dönütlerden sonra öğrencilerin hatalarını başarılı bir şekilde düzelttikleri görülmüştür.

Abstract

This classroom-based research investigated how a non-native teacher of English provided corrective feedback to Turkish EFL learners. More specifically, the study aimed to identify language errors produced by the students, corrective feedback types employed by the teacher, and students' uptake rate following the provided feedback. The data were collected through audio-recording, transcribed, and analyzed in detail for the type of learner errors, type of teacher feedback, and rate of learner uptake. The results revealed that grammatical errors were found to be the most produced error type, and lexical errors were found to be least produced error type. The study also indicated that recast was the most frequently preferred, and clarification request was the least frequently preferred corrective feedback type by the teacher. It was also found that all feedback types led to successful correction of erroneous utterances of the students with 100% learner uptake rate.

Anahtar Kelimeler

hata düzeltme, sınıf araştırması, sözlü düzeltici dönüt.

Keywords

error correction, classroom-based research, oral corrective feedback.

Extended Summary

Purpose

The study investigates how a non-native teacher of English provided corrective feedback to Turkish EFL learners. The study specifically aims at identifying language errors produced by the students, corrective feedback types employed by the teacher, and students' uptake rate following the provided feedback.

Method

This study was designed as a case study. The data were collected from one female English instructor. The teacher was chosen through purposeful sampling. The teacher had 26 pre-intermediate students who were learning English for one year at Kastamonu University School of Foreign Languages. Three hours of English class were recorded via an audio-recorder and the needed data were gathered. All the recordings were transcribed verbatim to find out error types of the students, the types of corrective feedback provided by the teacher, and the students' uptake rate. After the careful examination of the data in detail, the researcher and another colleague categorized error types of the students and corrective feedback types given by the teacher. Upon the analysis of the data, the number of the errors and corrective feedback types were presented via frequencies.

Findings and Comments

The current study arrived at the conclusion that Turkish EFL learners produced grammatical errors the most, phonological errors at the second rank, lexical errors at the third rank. This shows that students mainly have problems with the grammatical structures of the target language, and they need to be presented much feedback particularly for their grammatical mistakes. This might have resulted from the fact that the grammar of the English language and the Turkish language differs. That is why; it might take a little longer for students to acquire the grammatical structures of the target language.

With respect to the corrective feedback types, recast was found to be the most frequently employed feedback type by the teacher, followed by explicit correction and elicitation. Metalinguistic feedback ranked the fourth, followed by repetition. Clarification request was employed the least frequently by the teacher. However, recast, which proved to be the most widely employed feedback type, might be sometimes uncertain for the students to realize where the error is due to the nature of recast. Thus, it can be a better idea for teachers to provide as variable feedback types as possible to be able to offer a lot more understandable feedback.

Based on the findings, students were found to show reactive move to all the feedback types, which refers to successful uptake although the number of cases for feedback types is quite limited in the present study. All of the errors were treated immediately by the teacher and the students who were provided with corrective feedback immediately corrected their ill-formed utterances. Thus, feedback types proved to contribute to uptake in grammatical, phonological, and lexical errors. This indicates the beneficial impact of corrective feedback on students' improvement. Therefore, it can be obviously concluded that corrective feedback is an essential element of teaching and learning process. Considering all these aspects above, teachers should realize the valuable role of feedback in language development, should provide regular, clear and meaningful feedback to their students.

Suggestions

It can be suggested on the basis that corrective feedback can be used in language classrooms for some other reasons. It may help to foster students' confidence because when they receive effective feedback, they will see that they are improving which will make them more comfortable and self-assured for classroom activities. Accordingly; their ambition and eagerness will also increase to learn a second/foreign language.

It can be concluded from the study that corrective feedback plays a significant role in language learning. Thus, corrective feedback should be constantly and meaningfully provided so as to make the students aware of their errors, give them opportunity to correct themselves, and get them to end up with eventual acquisition of the target language.

1. Introduction

In the literature, researchers have put emphasis on various aspects of language learning for years. Among all different language learning aspects, error correction has been one of the most disputed issues in the field (Iwashita, 2003; Lyster, 2001; Lyster and Ranta, 1997). Being a common feature of language learning and acquisition, errors are natural part of language learning process (Chu, 2011). It is an undeniable fact that all language learners make errors in the process of language system.

In second language learning field, scholars have attempted to define corrective feedback in various ways. The most common term is corrective feedback, negative evidence, and negative feedback. Schachter (1991) points out that these three terms can be used interchangeably. Lightbown and Spada (1990:171) define corrective feedback as "any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect". According to Long (1996), positive evidence and negative evidence are two categories of providing feedback to learners. Long (1996) gives the definition of positive evidence as supplying students with models of grammatical and acceptable forms in the target language and negative evidence as giving direct and indirect information about ungrammatical and unacceptable utterances. Sheen (2007) also refers to corrective feedback as teachers' effort to encourage the students to focus on the accuracy of their production.

Along with various definitions of corrective feedback in the literature, how to correct errors has become another hot topic in language teaching and learning. In fact, this heavily relies on the methodological perspective of a language teacher. Historically, the behaviorist teaching models that appeared in the 1950s and 1960s such as Audio-lingual Method regarded learners' errors as taboos which should be corrected immediately by teachers (Brown, 2007; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). These errors were caused by the interference from the first language (Celce-Murcia, 2001). However, in the 1970s and 1980s, some scholars put forward that error correction was not only unnecessary, but also detrimental to language learning (Krashen, 1981a; 1982). Krashen (1981a), one of the most well-known proponents of this approach to error correction, asserts that error correction should be abandoned since it might lead to negative impacts on learners' affect. Similarly, Terrell (1977) puts an emphasis on the development of communicative competence instead of perfect grammar acquisition. He further claims that affective factors are to be concerned primarily in language learning; correcting errors is "negative in terms of motivation, attitude, and embarrassment" (Terrell, 1977, p.330). In the 1980s, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) advocates believed that an error should be seen as evidence of learners' linguistic development, not as a sin to be abstained from by identifying the need for fluency and allowing teachers not to correct some errors if they do not disrupt the flow of communication (Nunan, 1989; Wilkins, 1976). In the 1990s, error correction received increasing attention again. Some researchers suggested that explicit grammar instruction, error correction, and focus-on-form could contribute to second language acquisition (Ellis, 1994; Fotos, 1994; Schmidt, 1990). Negative evidence is of vital importance in language acquisition, particularly for adolescent and adult L2 learners; it facilitates second language development, and so error correction is believed to be an inevitable part of mastery in language learning (Long, 1996).

For decades, error correction has been a controversial issue, leading to many theoretical and empirical studies in the field (Carroll and Swain, 1993; Ellis, 2005; Lightbown and Spada, 1990; Suzuki, 2005; White, 1991). In the literature, various researchers have suggested different taxonomies of corrective feedback, but the most instrumental categorization has been put forward by Lyster and Ranta (1997). Their taxonomy included six categories as 'recasts', 'explicit correction', 'elicitation', 'clarification', 'repetition', 'metalinguistic feedback'. Their study conducted in French immersion classes indicated that recast was the most frequently used feedback type, but it was the least effective in terms of students' uptake and repair. The findings also revealed that the most useful corrective feedback type resulting in students' repair was elicitation. In short, the students who received recasts did not show much gain in their L2 accuracy since they could not be certain about how to perceive recasts.

Most of the other studies into corrective feedback are mainly the replications of Lyster and Ranta's research (1997) or similar to their research. For example, Oliver and Mackey (2003) found in their study that recasts were the most commonly employed feedback type for error correction by teachers. Different from Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study, this study indicated that students showed much uptake of recasts. Similarly, Mackey and Philip (1998) showed that recasting facilitated language improvement among L2 learners. Whereas Lyster and Ranta (1997) showed that recasts rarely contribute to immediate uptake and that immediate response to recasts could not predict whether learners will benefit from the recast, these two aforementioned studies (Oliver and Mackey, 2003; Mackey and Philip, 1998) found that improvement level of learner and the content of the recast more accurately indicate future production of the target language. Likewise, Choi and Li (2012) and Lee (2013) concluded that recast was the most frequently employed corrective feedback, which led to considerably high uptake rates.

Some other studies investigated the relationship between feedback types and learners' proficiency levels. One of these studies was carried out by Kennedy (2010) to explore how a teacher of English provided corrective feedback to two classes at different proficiency levels. The teacher showed differences in the type of feedback given to each proficiency group. Low group was found to have received more feedback than mid/high group. The findings also demonstrated that types of errors varied in different proficiency groups, whereas the most produced errors were grammatical errors for both the low and mid/ high group. It was also indicated that recast was the most frequently used type of corrective feedback at different levels of proficiency. Ajideh and Fareed-Aghdam (2012) also studied corrective feedback types in relation to two different proficiency levels and found that recasts were the most frequently used corrective feedback types at intermediate and advanced level. Statistically significant associations between proficiency level and error types, proficiency level and corrective feedback types, error types and corrective feedback types were found.

In Turkish EFL context, Büyükbay (2007) studied the influence of repetition as corrective feedback on learners and found that repetition had a significant effect on learner uptake and acquisition. Coskun (2010) carried out a study with Turkish EFL learners and showed that the teacher treated all the errors immediately and used explicit correction the most frequently among all corrective feedback types. Öztürk (2016), in his classroom-based research, concluded that recast and explicit correction were the most widely preferred corrective feedback types. He also found that novice teachers' and experienced teachers' choices varied in terms of corrective feedback types.

Therefore, having realized the significance of corrective feedback in language learning, this classroom-based research aims to identify error types produced by Turkish EFL learners at a Turkish state university, corrective feedback types provided by a non-native English teacher, and learners' uptake rate. With this purpose in mind, this paper seeks answers to the following questions:

- 1) How many and what types of errors are produced by preintermediate Turkish EFL learners?
- 2) How much and what types of corrective feedback does the teacher provide to pre-intermediate Turkish EFL learners?
- 3) What is the uptake rate of each type of feedback?

2. Methodology

Design of the Study

The research was conducted as a case study, which is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context” (Yin, 1984, p.23). That is, this classroom-based research, in which the major focus is on the interaction among teachers and students, aimed to increase an understanding of certain classroom teaching and learning aspects (Allwright & Bailey, 1991) and to discover the phenomenon in its own context.

Setting

English preparatory schools of the universities in Turkey provide one-year compulsory language course to the students in their first year. At the beginning of the school, the students are placed to the classes based on their current language proficiency level and they have one-year intensive English course. At the end of the year, the students are required to take a proficiency exam. If they get the needed score, they start to learn at their own department in the following year. Otherwise, they have to study at the language school one more year.

Participants

The data were collected from the courses carried out by one female teacher who has three years of teaching experience. The teacher is a native speaker of Turkish and had a master’s degree in English language teaching department. The teacher was chosen through purposeful sampling in which “the researcher intentionally selects individuals to learn and understand a central phenomenon because he/she believes that they can provide rich data for the study” (Creswell, 2012, p.60). The teacher has 26 pre-intermediate students who are learning English at Kastamonu University, School of Foreign Languages. The researcher was closely familiar with the school context.

Data Collection Procedure and Analysis

The data were gathered through an audio-recorder with three-hour recording at a preparatory class in the academic year of 2015-2016. The tight schedule of the institution did not allow for further audio-recordings with more teachers. It is also important to note that the researcher was not in the classroom as an observant during the recording so that both the teacher and the students could behave naturally in their own environment. The content of the course included grammar lessons about “simple past tense and present perfect tense” and scientific inventions as reading topic. Neither the teacher nor the students were informed about the focus of the study in order not to influence their attention to the aspect of error correction. They were just explained that the data would be utilized for research into classroom interaction so that they could behave naturally. The recording was transcribed verbatim by the researcher to identify error types of the students and the types of corrective feedback provided by the teacher. For the identification of errors, the definition proposed by Allwright and Bailey (1991) was used. In this definition, the issues of “differ from native speaker norms” and “teacher signal as needing improvement” have been the major points in order to identify the errors. The taxonomy of corrective feedback types proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) was utilized to categorize teacher’s feedback. The six different types of corrective feedback including recasts, repetition, explicit correction, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback and elicitation were followed to categorize teachers’ feedback with the inter-rater in the current study. On the basis of this, after transcribing the record, the researcher and another colleague, who is doing master’s at English language teaching in Turkey, examined the data carefully, analyzed it in detail, and categorized error types of the students and corrective feedback types in order to ensure inter-rater reliability of the findings. In the transcribed data, the number of erroneous utterances, corrective feedback moves and their distribution were analyzed via frequencies.

The following section provides an explanation for each feedback type along with the examples.

Different Types of Corrective Feedback

Lyster and Ranta (1997) proposed six types of corrective feedback after studying corrective feedback; namely, recast, explicit correction, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, repetition. In their study, corrective feedback is defined as the provision of negative evidence or positive evidence for erroneous utterances, which leads learners to repair including accuracy and not only comprehensibility. In addition, learner uptake is described as a student’s utterance that instantly comes after the teacher’s feedback, and that indicates a respond to the teacher’s intention to point to erroneous utterances. Six types of corrective feedback are as follows:

Recast

Lyster and Ranta (1997:46) define recast as “teacher’s reformulation of all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error”. Recast clearly shows what is wrong, providing correct form, and the most commonly preferred method by teachers (Celce-Murcia, 2011).

Explicit correction

It is given by explicit and obvious indication of the erroneous utterances and the provision of the target-like reformulation. Teachers clearly explain what is erroneous and provide learners with positive and negative evidence, helping them to distinguish the gap

between inter-language and the target-like form, and facilitating noticing process (Lyster and Ranta, 1997).

Elicitation

Elicitation is one of the types of corrective feedback that prompts learners to correct themselves; and it may be achieved in three different ways. One of them is requesting reformulations of ill-produced utterances. The second one is accomplished by means of using open questions, and the last one is the use of strategic pauses to give learners time to complete an utterance (Lyster and Ranta, 1997).

Metalinguistic feedback

Lyster and Ranta (1997:47) categorize metalinguistic feedback as “comments, information, or questions regarding correct form of the student’s utterance without the explicit provision of the correct form. Metalinguistic comments demonstrate only the existence of an error, metalinguistic information both shows the occurrence or location of an error and provides some metalanguage. Metalinguistic questions, the third subcategory of metalinguistic feedback, try to elicit information from the student by referring to the nature of the error

Clarification request

This type of corrective feedback includes questions showing that the utterance has been badly-formed, reformulation or repetition is needed. Clarification request, different from recast and explicit error correction, is mostly related to students’ production of modified output, and it could not provide students with information about the location or type of an error.

Repetition

Another approach to error correction that Lyster and Ranta (1997) proposed is repetition which is simply teachers’ or interlocutors’ repetition of wrong utterances of a learner, which is mostly accomplished by adjusting the intonation in order to highlight the error.

Table 1 below, taken from Chu’s (2011) study, shows six types of corrective feedback with example utterances.

Table 1. Examples of the six types of corrective feedback (Chu, 2011, p.455)

Recast	S: he take the bus to go to school T: he takes the bus to go to school
Explicit correction	S: he take the bus to go to school T: oh, you should say he takes. He takes the bus to go to school
Elicitation	S: he take the bus to go to school T: he? T: how do we form the third person singular form in English? T: can you correct that?
Metalinguistic feedback	S: he take the bus to go to school T: do we say he take? T: how do we say when it forms the third person singular form?
Clarification request	S: he take the bus to go to school T: pardon me?
Repetition	S: he take the bus to go to school T: he take?

3. Results

Q1. How many and what types of errors are produced by pre-intermediate Turkish EFL learners?

Table 2. Type and Frequency of Errors

	Grammatical	Error Types Phonological	Lexical	Total
Frequency	18	11	7	36

The first research question investigated the types of errors produced by the learners. On the basis of the analysis of the data, Table 2 indicates types and frequency of errors produced by pre-intermediate Turkish EFL learners. As seen above, a total of 36 errors from the learners were recorded, which includes three types of errors; namely grammatical, phonological, and lexical errors. In addition, Table 2 reveals that grammatical errors (n=18) are produced the most frequently, followed by phonological (n=11) errors. Lexical (n=7) errors were found to be least produced error type by the learners.

Q2. What types of corrective feedback does the teacher provide to pre-intermediate Turkish EFL learners?

Table 3. Distribution of Feedback Types

Feedback Types	Total (n=36)
Recast	14
Explicit correction	8
Elicitation	6
Metalinguistic feedback	4
Repetition	3
Clarification request	1

As for corrective feedback types employed by the teacher, which is the focus of the second research question, Table 3 demonstrates that recast (n=14) proved to be the most widely used corrective feedback type by the teacher in the obtained data, followed by explicit correction (n=8) and elicitation (n=6). Metalinguistic feedback (n=4) ranked the fourth, followed by repetition (n=3). Clarification request (n=1) was employed the least frequently by the teacher.

Table 4. Distribution of Errors Receiving Feedback across Feedback Types and Error Types

	Grammatical	Phonological	Lexical
Recast	7	5	2
Explicit correction	3	3	2
Elicitation	4	-	2
Metalinguistic feedback	2	2	-
Repetition	2	-	1
Clarification request	-	1	-

Table 4 indicates the distribution of the corrective feedback types according to three error types. As seen in the table, all the error types were provided with various types of feedback by the teacher. For grammatical errors and phonological errors, recast was found to be the most frequently used corrective feedback. Clarification request, which was the least employed, was used to correct a phonological error.

Some extracts below are taken from the collected data regarding each type of corrective feedback in order to illustrate how the teacher provided the learners with different feedback types for certain erroneous utterances.

Excerpt 1 for recast

T : Who is going to do the following question? Alright, yes!

Se : How long have you lived [larvd] in this city?

T : Hıı hııı! How long have you lived [lıvd]?

T : Very good! Yes, please do the following question.

Eg : Have you ever cooked [kukəd] Indian food?

T : Yes, have you ever cooked [kukt] Indian food? Thank you.

In this extract, an example of recast is seen. The teacher reformulates the student's wrong utterances by repeating the same utterance with the correct pronunciation. The teacher attempts to indicate what is wrong and make the students aware of their mistakes in an implicit way by providing the correct form, which was found to be the most widely employed corrective feedback type by the teacher.

Excerpt 2 for explicit correction

S : Hocam, fillerin üçüncü halleri aynıysa –ed getircez mi yoksa aynı mı kalıcak?[Tr.]

T : No,no,no it is the same. Let's look at this example, I read the book, I have read the book. Do you understand?

Ss : Yes.

T : Ok. Three. Who wants to do it?

Re : My nineteen year old neighbor,

T : My ninety year old, not nineteen.

Re : My ninety year old neighbor have never used a computer.

In the extract above, explicit correction feedback type, which is preferred by the teacher as the second most frequently corrective feedback type, is given by the teacher explicitly by demonstrating ill-formed utterance and providing the target-like reformulation obviously. The teacher attempts to show the students what is wrong, and enables them to raise awareness of the gap between inter-language and the target-like structure.

Excerpt 3 for elicitation

Re: My ninety year old neighbor have never used a computer.

T : It is singular. How do we say when the subject is “he” or “she”? Can you correct it now?

Sl: Hocam, has not never olmaz mı? [Tr.]

T : No, there is “never” here. It is negative. You don’t need to use “not”. The meaning is already negative with “never”. Is it clear now? (explicit correction)

Based on the extract taken from the class recording, it is obviously seen that the teacher gives elicitation type of corrective feedback for the student’s grammatical error. With this type of feedback, the teacher prompts the learner to correct himself, and requests reformulation of ill-formed structure from the student. The teacher achieves to hear correct utterance at the end by giving such clues as “it is singular”, and asking questions in order to lead him to reach the correct form.

Excerpt 4 for metalinguistic feedback

T : Practice 2. Choose the correct option, and complete the conversation, Ok? First one, you both do the first conversation, please.

Re : Have you ever been to Rome?

Se : Yes, I have.

T : Good, continue.

Se : I was there between 2005 and 2008.

T : Question two!

Fa : Can you remember her name?

Le : I have forgotten. She has been at the university with me last year.

T : Last year? This is simple past. How do we say when the sentence has “last year”?

Fa : She was at the university with me last year.

T : Great job! “Last year” shows that you should use simple past tense.

This extract from the data shows an example of metalinguistic feedback preferred by the teacher for a grammatical error. The teacher does not provide explicit correction, only indicates the existence of an error by giving grammatical explanations with metalinguistic information, which reveals the occurrence of the error in the student’s production. In other words, the teacher shows an attempt to elicit information from the student by asking question and referring to erroneous form. With the help the feedback, the student ends up with the correct form as shown in the extract above.

Excerpt 5 for repetition

T : Open the page 157. Complete the sentences with the present perfect form of the verb. The first one is “I have downloaded a lot of music. Who is going to the second one? Please do it.

Bu: My father is travelled to several countries.

T : My father is?

Bu: My father was travelled to several countries.

T : My father was?

Bu: My father has travelled to several countries in South America.

T : Ok, well done!

In the example above, which includes repetition corrective feedback type, the teacher simply repeats the wrong utterance of the learner when the learner produces erroneous form of simple past tense in order to indicate that there is something wrong with the production of the student. The student comes up with the correct form at the end after the teacher's provision of the same feedback type two times. The teacher accomplishes to receive the corrected version from the student by adjusting her intonation so as to underline the error.

Excerpt 6 for clarification request

- T* : Thank you. Question 5. Yes, you are the next.
Se : I have not written [raitən] a letter by hand.
T : Sorry? Are you sure? Is it written [raitən] ?
Se : I have not written [ˈritən] a letter by hand.
T : Very good. Thanks.

In the light of the analysis of this extract, it is quite a noticeable fact that the teacher provides the student with clarification request type of feedback. In this extract, the student makes a phonological error, and the teacher asks a question showing that the utterance has been ill-formed and reformulation is necessary, but does not explicitly state the type of the error and the location. This corrective feedback type is closely concerned with the student's production of modified output.

Q3. What is the uptake rate of each type of feedback?

Table 5. Frequency of Uptake Following Teacher Feedback

	Uptake
Recast (n=14)	14
Explicit correction (n=8)	8
Elicitation (n=6)	6
Metalinguistic feedback (n=4)	4
Repetition (n=3)	3
Clarification request (n=1)	1

Uptake has been viewed as an indicator of the effectiveness of the feedback provided. The third research question aims to see uptake rate of each type of feedback. Table 5 indicates that students were found to show reactive move to all the feedback types, which refers to successful uptake although the number of cases for feedback types is quite small. Feedback types proved to contribute to uptake in grammatical, phonological, and lexical errors. As seen in Table 5, all of the errors were treated immediately, so the teacher did not ignore any erroneous production of the students. Thus, six corrective feedback types led to 100% uptake, revealing the effectiveness of feedback types.

4. Discussion

The purpose of this classroom-based research was to find out error types produced by Turkish EFL learners and corrective feedback types employed by a Turkish non-native teacher at a state university. With this purpose in mind, three research questions were addressed in order to identify what types of errors are produced by the students, and what types of corrective feedback are provided by the teacher and learners' uptake rate. Based on the findings obtained through audio-recording, mostly consistent and also inconsistent results with the previous studies, to be mentioned later, were found in the present study.

The first research question in this study concerns the error types produced by the learners. The study indicated that grammatical errors were the most frequent among other types, and phonological and lexical errors were less frequent. This outcome is in the same line with the study of Kennedy (2010), which also revealed that grammatical errors appeared as the most widely produced error by the learners, and lexical error proved to be the least produced type of error. This finding is partially incongruent with Ajideh and FareedAghdem's (2012) research since the study demonstrated that intermediate level learners produce phonological errors the most, whereas advanced level learners produce grammatical errors the most.

The second research question attempted to find an answer to corrective feedback types provided by the teacher. As the findings indicated, recast was the most widely preferred feedback type in the current case study, which shows congruence with the outcomes of Agangari and Amirzadeh's (2011) study. They also found that the most frequently feedback type was recast in both elementary and intermediate level students. This finding is also consistent with the conclusion of Lee's (2013) study, showing that teachers utilized recast the most frequently. The other significant result reached at the end of the current study is that clarification request proved to be the least frequently employed feedback type by the teacher, which is in the same line with the finding of Lochman's (2002) and Yoshida's (2013) research studies, which also revealed that clarification was one of the least employed feedback type.

The present study came to another conclusion that explicit correction ranked the second by showing quite a high frequency. By the same token, Lee (2013) came up with the result that explicit correction was the second most frequently provided feedback type by the teachers. These findings are incongruent with the finding of Ahangari and Amirzadeh's (2011) study, revealing that explicit correction proved to be one of the least preferred feedback type at different levels of proficiency. Yoshida (2010) also found that explicit correction showed relatively low frequency, and teachers did not utilize this type of feedback quite often.

On the basis of the current outcome, repetition, which also showed quite a low frequency, ranked the fifth. The result is consistent with the Lee's (2013) outcome, suggesting that teachers employed repetition type of feedback less frequently than explicit correction, recast, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and elicitation. In the same vein, Yoshida's (2010) study found that repetition was the least frequently employed corrective feedback type.

As a consequence of the current study, Turkish pre-intermediate EFL preparatory school students were found to produce grammatical errors the most, phonological errors at the second rank, lexical errors at the third rank, indicating that students mostly have problems in acquiring grammar of the target language, and they need to be given much feedback especially for their grammatical errors. As for the corrective feedback types, recast proved to be the most frequently employed feedback types by the teacher, which can be sometimes unclear for the students to understand the existence and location of the errors due to the nature of recast. Hence, teacher can vary their feedback type preferences to be able to offer a lot more understandable and beneficial feedback. As clearly understood, the point is that students need to be corrected at the right amount, at the right time. Otherwise, their errors can be fossilized, which will be challenging to eradicate in the future (Iwashita, 2003; Lyster, 2001; Lyster and Ranta, 1997).

On the basis of this study, it can be also seen from uptake rate that corrective feedback contributed to students' learning. The study yielded the outcome that students who got corrective feedback from their teachers immediately corrected their wrong utterances, which indicates the beneficial impact of corrective feedback on students' improvement. Thus, it can be obviously seen that corrective feedback is an essential part of teaching and learning process. Considering all these aspects above, teachers should realize the valuable role of feedback in language development, should provide regular, clear and meaningful feedback to their students (Chu, 2011).

Additionally, corrective feedback should be preferred in language classrooms for some other aspects. First, it helps to enhance students' confidence and self-esteem. When they receive effective feedback for their errors from the teacher; they will see that they are making progress in the target language, which will make them more secure and self-confident. As a result of this self-confidence, they will gain better understanding of their skills, strengths, and weaknesses. Their motivation and enthusiasm will also increase in order to learn a second/foreign language (Klimova, 2015).

Corrective feedback plays a momentous role in developing language accuracy. Given the findings of the case study and benefits of corrective feedback, it should be constantly and meaningfully provided so as to make the students aware of their errors, give them opportunity to correct themselves, and get them to end up with eventual acquisition of the target language (Chu, 2011; Iwashita, 2003; Lyster, 2001).

5. Conclusion

The study aimed at investigating error types produced by the students, corrective feedback types utilized by the teacher, and their successful reaction to feedback provided.

In terms of students' error types, grammatical errors were found to be the most produced errors, and lexical errors turned out to have produced the least frequently, which shows that Turkish EFL learners have some difficulties in acquiring grammar structures of the target language. The reason might be that English language is quite different from Turkish in terms of such points as word order, linguistic items, and grammatical structures, which lead to problems for the students to acquire grammar of a new language. The students may have ignored the meaning of grammatical structures, and do not use these structures that they have learned in various contexts. In addition, they may need to practice a lot with exercises and real-life situations after the teacher present the grammar topics in the class. On the other hand, it can be also concluded that students are good at learning vocabulary items. Maybe, they employ some strategies to memorize the words. That is why; they may have produced fewer errors regarding vocabulary items. Furthermore, they may have the awareness of the significance of vocabulary acquisition in learning a foreign language.

With regard to corrective feedback types employed the teacher; the study concluded that recast was the most frequently used feedback type at pre-intermediate proficiency level. The teacher mostly preferred to correct the students' errors in an implicit way by repeating the same utterance with the correct form. The reason for high frequency of recast use in the current study as well as in the majority of other related studies is that recasts unlike other feedback types, do not disrupt the flow of communication in classroom. The teacher might have used recast because of this reason. However, teachers should be aware that students, especially low level students, usually do not recognize recasts. As a consequence, sometimes students may not benefit from this type of implicit technique (Lyster and Ranta, 1997).

In this study, explicit correction and elicitation also showed considerably high frequency, which are more explicit error correction techniques. These types of corrective feedback enable students to notice their wrong utterances, and try to potentially correct their erroneous production. Thus, these techniques may have more encouraging impact on the learners' inter-language development.

As mentioned before, clarification request was the least frequently used corrective feedback type in the present research. The reason why the teacher did not prefer to employ this technique more widely might be that clarification request could not provide students with information about the location or type of an error, so the students can get embarrassed and frustrated when they do not understand clearly the teacher's intentions. Additionally, clarification request might discourage the students for further speaking activities. Another reason could be that the students were pre-intermediate learners. That is why; the students might not notice their errors since clarification request only offers unclear and vague corrections to be able to correct wrong utterances. The teacher in the current case study possibly made a correct decision by providing clarification request the least for pre-intermediate level learners.

As to uptake rate in the study, the students corrected all their erroneous utterances with well-formed production after immediately the teacher provided feedback, showing that focus on form through feedback turned out to be quite prospering for these students. The learners achieved to correct their ill-formed utterances with 100 % uptake rate, which reveals the facilitative effect of feedback on language development.

Although the case study aimed to provide better insights into behaviors of the teachers and the students in terms of error correction, it has some limitations. Firstly, the tight schedule of the institution did not allow for further audio-recordings with other teachers, which could have provided richer data regarding error types and corrective feedback types. Secondly, this study only focused on one pre-intermediate class, which gives no way to compare error types and choice of feedback types across different levels of proficiency. In other words, the effects of proficiency level on the teacher's preference of feedback could have also been investigated in various classes, which could be carried out as a further study. Thirdly, there is a need to conduct studies on the effect of recasts in L2 classroom settings so as to understand their role and effects a lot better. Overall, further studies based on L2 classrooms should be carried out to identify the most effective corrective feedback types for L2 learners' speaking abilities in terms of uptake, and teachers' preferences of corrective feedback types across different levels of proficiency.

6. References

- Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011). Exploring the teachers' use of spoken corrective feedback in teaching Iranian EFL learners at different levels of proficiency. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1859-1868.
- Ajideh, P., & FaraedAghdam, E. (2012). English language teachers' corrective feedback types in relation to the learners' proficiency levels and their error types. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies*, 2(8) & 2(9), 37-51.
- Allwright, D. & Bailey, K.M. (1991). *Focus on the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, D. B. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Pearson.
- Büyükbay, S. (2007). *The effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback type*. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 357-386.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. New York : Newbury House.
- Choi, S., & Li, S. (2012). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in a child ESOL classroom. *RELC Journal*, 43(3), 331-351.
- Chu, R. (2011). Effects of teacher's corrective feedback on accuracy in the oral English of English-majors college students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(5), 454-459.
- Coskun, A. (2010). A classroom research study on oral error correction. *Humanizing Language Teaching Magazine*, 12(3).
- Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Doughty, C. (1994). Finetuning of feedback by competent speakers to language learners. In J. Alatis (Eds.), *Strategic interaction and language acquisition: Theory, practice, and research*. GURT 1993 (pp. 96-108). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Ellis, N. C. (2005). At the interface: How explicit knowledge affects implicit language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 305-352.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 1-36.
- Fotos, S.S. (1994). Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (2), 323-351.
- Klimova, B. (2015). The role of feedback in EFL classes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 172 – 177.
- Krashen, S. (1981a). *Second language acquisition and language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford :Pergamon Press.
- Kennedy, S. (2010). Corrective feedback for learners of varied proficiency levels: A teacher's choices. *TESL Canada Journal*, 27(2), 31-49.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principals in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, E.J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41(2), 217-230.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus on form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on L2. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 429-448.
- Lochtman, K. (2002). Oral corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom: How it affects interaction in analytic foreign language teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37, 271-283.

- Long, M.H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T.K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Lyster, R. (2001). Negotiation of Form, Recasts, and Explicit Correction in Relation to Error Types and Learner Repair in Immersion Classrooms. *Language Learning*, 51 (1), 265–301.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Mackey, A., & Philip, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 338-356.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2003). Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87 (4), 519-533.
- Öztürk, G. (2016). An investigation on the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language and Linguistics Studies*, 12(2), 22-37.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research*, 7, 80-102.
- Schmidt, R (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.
- Suzuki, M. (2005). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classrooms. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 1-21.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback, language aptitude, and learner attitudes on the acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (Eds.), *Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquisition: A Collection of Empirical Studies* (pp.301-322). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Terrell, T. D. (1977). A natural approach to second language acquisition and learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 61(7), 325-337.
- White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *L2 Research*, 7, 133-161.
- Wilkins, D. A. (1976). *Notional syllabuses: A taxonomy and its relevance to foreign language curriculum development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yin, R.K. (1984). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Yoshida, R. (2010). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 78-93.