



An investigation on the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms

Gökhan Öztürk^{a *}

^a Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyonkarahisar, Turkey

APA Citation:

Öztürk, G. (2016). An investigation on the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(2), 22-37.

Abstract

This classroom research study investigates corrective feedback implications in a sample of Turkish EFL classrooms. The types of corrective feedback, their distribution and the reasons of error ignorance were the foci. Four speaking classes in the English preparatory program of a Turkish state university were video-recorded for 12 hours in total and their teachers were interviewed through stimulated recalls. The video-recorded data were transcribed verbatim and the feedback types were identified based on the taxonomy of Lyster and Ranta (1997) and the interviews were analyzed through content analysis. The results demonstrated that recasts and explicit correction were the most widely used corrective feedback types, and experienced and novice teachers' preferences on corrective feedback type differed in recasts and clarification requests. It was also indicated that teachers sometimes ignored oral errors due to several reasons such as the lack of knowledge about the target item, unwillingness to intervene in the task or activity, tiredness of correcting the same error or paying attention not to affect students negatively.

© 2016 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: Errors; oral corrective feedback; EFL learners; classroom research

1. Introduction

Since communicative language teaching became dominant and effective in language teaching process (Jacobs and Farrell, 2003; Richards, 2006), interaction between teachers and learners in language classrooms has gained more importance. In the literature, researchers in the field of language teaching have focused on various aspects of this interaction such as turn-taking, silence, receptivity etc. Among these aspects, error correction has probably had the biggest attention due to its undeniable contribution to language development. Simply defined as a teacher reaction following an erroneous student utterance, error correction in language classrooms has widely been debated leading to numerous experimental and theoretical studies (Gass, 2003; Schachter, 1991). This popularity as a research matter initially originates from the discussion of what an error is and whether it should be corrected.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +0-272-228-1397
E-mail address: gokhanoztrk@gmail.com

1.1. Definition of error

Because of its developmental role, definition of error is a bit controversial in communicative language pedagogy. Though Allwright and Bailey (1991) claim that it is more important for learners to accomplish their communicative goals than it is for their sentences to be perfectly well-formed, there are several scholars who want to draw a clear cut definition of error. According to Ur (2002), errors are consistent forms or patterns based on mis-learned generalizations. Allwright and Bailey (1991) define errors as linguistic forms or contents that differ from native speaker norms or facts and any other behavior signaled by the teacher as needing improvement. Although these definitions refer to several aspects of errors and cannot agree on certain points, errors are important in language learning process. Selinker (1969; cited in Touchie, 1986) indicates that errors are significant in three points: (1) for the language teacher because they indicate the learner's progress in language learning; (2) for the language researcher as they provide insights into how language is learnt; and finally (3), for the language learner himself/herself as he/she gets involved in hypothesis testing.

1.2. Should errors be corrected?

Whether students' errors should be corrected has been a quite controversial issue in language classrooms for years. In spite of numerous studies in the literature (Doughty and Varela, 1998; Iwashita, 2003; Long, Inagaki and Ortega, 1998; Lyster, 2002; Lyster and Ranta, 1997) which demonstrate a strong tendency and preference for error correction, there are still several points that should always be taken into consideration. The first issue is the problem of error detection. Teacher's ability and capability of detecting errors play a crucial role on their correction. However, Allwright and Bailey (1991) assert that since a great deal of foreign language teaching is done by non-native teachers who provide a non-native model for learners, detecting learners' errors can be problematic in language classes. Secondly, if the errors are left untreated, they may serve as a negative input for other students in the classroom and that may affect their language development negatively. As Schmidt and Frota (1986) put forward, if a teacher chooses not to treat an error in an utterance, the person who uttered it and the other learners may assume that the form or function was correct as it stood. Pondering these issues and considering the studies in the literature, it can be said that error correction has an important place in learners' development and studies uncovering its impact and effectiveness in the learning process are needed (Martinez, 2006).

1.3. Corrective feedback

The combination of communicative pedagogy, negotiation of meaning and the popularity of error has made corrective feedback a research field which focuses on the treatment of errors and provides guidance for the teachers. Since the needs and levels of learners who make errors and the approach of teachers towards these errors may change in actual practice, corrective feedback has been defined and elaborated by the scholars in various ways. Lightbrown and Spada (1990, 171) define corrective feedback as 'any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect'. According to Chaudron (1998), it is any kind of teacher behavior that follows an error and tries to inform the learner of the fact of error. Sheen (2007), on the other hand, defines corrective feedback as a teacher's attempt to invite a learner to pay attention to the grammatical accuracy of the utterance which is produced by the learner. It is seen that corrective feedback does not only emphasize the form of language just like the traditional teaching methods, but it draws students' attention to linguistic forms as they arise incidentally during lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication (Chu, 2011). Additionally, it is also believed to be facilitative in L2 development by providing learners with both positive and negative evidence (Long, 1996).

1.4. Related studies

In the literature, different researchers have put forward various categorizations of corrective feedback, but probably the most influential model has been the one proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997). In their model, they classified corrective feedback into six categories as 'recasts', 'explicit correction', 'clarification requests', 'metalinguistic feedback', 'elicitation', and 'repetition'. Their study which was conducted in French immersion classrooms revealed that recasts were the most commonly used type of corrective feedback but the least likely one leading uptake and repair. It was also indicated that in the corrective feedback process, there is negotiation of form when signals are provided to the learner since these signals assist in the reformulation of the erroneous utterance.

Most of the other studies on corrective feedback in the literature mainly replicate the study of Lyster and Ranta (1997) or take it as a model. Jabbari and Fazilatraf (2012) investigated the error types, corrective feedback moves, and learner uptake in Iranian communicatively-oriented EFL classrooms. Their results showed parallelism with Lyster and Ranta (1997) and recasts were found to be the most widely used corrective feedback in Iranian classrooms in spite of their ineffectiveness at student-generated repair. A similar study to Lyster and Ranta (1997) was conducted by Panova and Lyster (2002) in an adult ESL setting. The types of corrective feedback were grouped under seven different terms: 'recasts', 'elicitation', 'metalinguistic feedback', 'translation', 'clarification request', 'repetition', and 'explicit correction'. The findings revealed that recasts and translations were the most frequently used feedback moves. In addition to this, it was concluded that teachers' using recasts so frequently can be the reason of the low proficiency level students' incapability in correcting their own errors. In the study, the lowest rates of learner uptake were found to occur when the teacher used a recast or he/she corrected an error explicitly.

Nassaji (2009) examined recasts and elicitations on grammatical features in incidental dyadic interactions in terms of their immediate and delayed effects. The results revealed that recasts were more effective than elicitations in immediate effects. It was also indicated that in both types of corrective feedback, the more explicit form was more effective than its implicit form. Hence, it was demonstrated that the degree of explicitness is very crucial in the effectiveness of these two types of corrective feedback.

Some other studies in the literature investigated the use of corrective feedback and teacher experience. Pica and Long (1986) examined the classroom interaction of L2 teachers having different levels of teaching experience. Their study demonstrated that there was no significant difference between experienced and less experienced teachers in terms of the use of reactive focus on form. On contrary to that result, Mackey et al. (2004) put forward that teachers' experience and education had a significant impact on the use of incidental focus on form techniques. They assert that experienced ESL teachers use more incidental focus on form techniques than novice teachers.

There are few research studies conducted in Turkish EFL classrooms to identify the types of corrective feedback and their influence on learners. Büyükbay (2007) carried out a thesis study on the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback through grammar tests and stimulated-recall interviews with 30 students in two classes. The findings indicated that repetition as a correction technique is effective in terms of its contribution to uptake and learning, and students and teachers have positive attitudes towards repetition. Coşkun (2010) conducted a classroom research study on error correction with 30 beginner students in Turkey, an EFL context. It was concluded that all the errors were immediately treated by the teacher and he used explicit correction more than the other types of corrective feedback.

1.5. Research questions

In the light of this theoretical base and considering the scarcity of the studies investigating corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms, the objective of the current study is to focus on the use of corrective feedback in a sample of Turkish EFL classrooms from several aspects. Therefore, the following research questions will be addressed:

- 1) To what extent do the teachers correct oral errors in Turkish EFL speaking classes?
- 2) Do the teachers ignore any oral errors in speaking classes? If so, what are the reasons of this?
- 3) What types of corrective feedback are used by the teachers and what is their distribution?
- 4) Is there a significant difference between more and less experienced teachers in terms of the distribution of corrective feedback types?

2. Method

2.1. Setting

In Turkey, English preparatory programs of universities provide one year compulsory language education to the students in their first year. The students are placed in the classes according to their current proficiency level and they get one year intensive language education. All the universities have their own program and curriculum. At the end of the academic year, students have to take a proficiency exam, and if they get the required score, they can continue to their departments. Otherwise, they have to repeat one more year in the language program.

The study was conducted in the English preparatory program of a Turkish state university in the spring semester of 2012-2013 academic year. Speaking classes of that certain program were specifically chosen for the research to gather better data on oral errors. In speaking classes, the teachers prepare specific tasks and materials, parallel with the main course book and grammar topic of the week, which promote students to communicate in classroom atmosphere. The tasks and materials included various topics which were supposed to encourage the students interact with their peers and teachers. For these reasons, speaking classes were found appropriate to be observed by the researcher considering the aims of the current study.

2.2. Participants

The participants of the study included four teachers who were determined 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). For this study, since the researcher was quite familiar with the context, he purposefully selected the participants below since they would provide valuable data on oral corrective feedback. Each of the participants had 27 pre-intermediate students in his/her speaking class. They were all native speakers of Turkish, non-native speakers of English and graduate of English language teaching department. To provide fluency during the study, they were named as T1, T2, T3 and T4 hereafter, and some brief information about them is provided below:

T1: female, 27 years old, two years of experience

T2: female, 38 years old, ten years of experience

T3: male, 29 years old, three years of experience

T4: male, 42 years old, eleven years of experience

2.3. *Data collection procedures*

After determining the teachers and their classes for the study, the researcher got their consent and agreement. The teachers and students were not informed about the focus of the study in order not to affect their tendency on error correction. They were just told that the data would be used for a study on classroom interaction so that they would behave as natural as in their normal speaking classes. First of all, all the classes were video-recorded for two or three hours to eliminate observer paradox as much as possible by making them familiar with the issue of video-recording, and these recordings were not included in the actual data of the study. After that, each of the classes was recorded for three hours, 12 hours in total, to obtain the actual data that would be used during the analysis. The data derived from 12 hours of video-recording were transcribed verbatim and prepared for the analysis.

In order to address the second and fourth research questions, the teachers were also interviewed through stimulated recalls and semi-structured interviews. The stimulated recall contributes to the qualitative studies with minimal intervention in the flow of events under investigation (Lyle, 2003). It is also used to discover what goes on inside participants' heads during the teaching- learning process. In stimulated recalls of the current study, the teachers were asked to comment on why they ignored some erroneous utterances of students. The researcher edited the video beforehand so that only the segments in which the teacher ignored an error could be shown in sequence, and then he asked the teacher to make a comment for each video clip. In addition to this, all the teachers were also interviewed in English through semi-structured interviews on their preferences of corrective feedback types. The types and the number of corrective feedback moves of each teacher were shown and they were asked to comment on their preferences.

2.4. *Data analysis*

The data derived from stimulated recalls and semi-structured interviews were analyzed based on the qualitative content analysis scheme of Creswell (2009). First, the data were transcribed verbatim and checked to see whether there were any missing points. Next, the familiar and coherent parts were labeled initial codes. Finally, emerging themes based on these codes were presented frequencies. This coding process was also assisted by a colleague to increase the reliability of findings.

In the identification of errors, the definition proposed by Allwright and Bailey (1991) was followed. In this definition, as previously mentioned, the issues of 'differ from native speaker norms' and "teacher signal as needing improvement" have been the major points in the identification of errors. Based on this, the transcribed data were analyzed with the help of a native speaker instructor, having six years of teaching experience and a master degree in ELT, in order to identify the errors considering the native speaker norms and to ensure inter-rater reliability for the identification of errors. On the other hand, the categorization of corrective feedback types proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) was utilized in the analysis of error correction. In the transcribed data, the teachers' corrective feedback moves following student turns which consist utterances with an error were coded pertaining to corrective feedback types. Then, the number of erroneous utterances, corrective feedback moves and their distribution were analyzed via percentages and frequencies.

The six different types of corrective feedback employed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) including recasts, repetition, explicit correction, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback and elicitation were used to categorize teachers' feedback in the current study. All six types of feedback in the present study precisely follow the ones presented in that study in terms of their definitions. The

following provides explanation for each feedback type, along with the examples from the actual data of the current study.

2.4.1. Recasts

Recasts involve the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error. The teacher implicitly reformulates the student's error, or provides the correction without directly pointing out that the student's utterance was incorrect. Most of the time, they are not introduced by phrases such as 'You mean,' 'Use this word,' and 'You should say.'

Excerpt 1

T4: Ok. Now. To start with. What can we say about the man's habits?

S2: He always goes to bed early.

T4: Ok. Good.

S5: He doesn't never drink alcohol.

T4: Yes. He never drinks alcohol

Excerpt 2

S: Teacher, I have a question?

T2: Yes, please.

S: How many questions in the quiz?

T2: How many questions are there in the quiz? Hmmm. I think, twenty five.

S: Ok. Thank you.

2.4.2. Repetition

Repetition refers to the teacher's repetition, in isolation, of the student's erroneous utterance. In most cases, teachers adjust their intonation so as to highlight the error.

Excerpt 3

T2: Guys, when is Ceceli's concert?

S: Tomorrow /təʊməʊrɹəʊ/, hocam.

T2: Tomorrow? /təʊməʊrɹəʊ/

S: Yes. Tomorrow /təʊməʊrɹəʊ/

T2: Tomorrow? /təʊməʊrɹəʊ/ (rising tonation)

S: Heee. Tomorrow. /tə' mɔrəʊ/

T2: Thank God!! (Ss laugh)

Excerpt 4

S: When I was a child, I was used to...

T3: (interrupting) was used to?

S: I used to drink a lot of milk but now, I don't.

2.4.3. Explicit correction

This refers to the explicit provision of the correct form. As the teacher provides the correct form, he/she clearly indicates that what the student said was incorrect.

Excerpt 5

S: When I was at high school, I was used to wear.....

T3: was used to değil, sadece used to. Dikkat edin ama biraz.

(Not “was used to”, only “used to”. Please be careful.)

S: I used to wear school uniform, but now I have casual clothes.

Excerpt 6

T1: Ok. What about America?

S: America discovered by Christopher Columbus.

T1: Not discovered, but was discovered, Ok.

S: was discovered.

2.4.4. Clarification Requests

It indicates to students either that their utterance has been misunderstood by the teacher or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way and that a repetition or a reformulation is required. This is a feedback type that can refer to problems in either comprehensibility or accuracy, or both. A clarification request includes phrases such as ‘Pardon me’ or, ‘Excuse me.’ It may also include a repetition of the error as in ‘What do you mean by X?’

Excerpt 7

S: I don’t like person who, himm, they never I can’t say true things.

T1: Burçin, I don’t understand what you mean, can you repeat please?

S: Neyse hocam, sonra söyleyim ben. (Anyway, I will tell later.)

Excerpt 8

T4: Yes, any other habit?

S: He never eats chocolate /ʃəkoleyt/.

T4: Ne yemiyo?(What doesn’t he eat?)

S: Chocolate /ʃəkoleyt/.

T4: Chocolate /tʃɒk(ə)lət/ Osman, Chocolate /tʃɒk(ə)lət/. (Ss laugh)

2.4.5. Metalinguistic Feedback

Metalinguistic feedback contains either comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student’s utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form. Metalinguistic information generally provides either some grammatical metalanguage that refers to the nature of the error or a word definition in the case of lexical errors. Metalinguistic questions also point to the nature of the error but attempt to elicit the information from the student.

Excerpt 9

T1: Ok, now let’s talk about penicillin. When was it discovered?

S1: It was discovered in 1928.

T1: Very good Sezer. Another question. Who was it discovered by?

S2: Alexander Fleming.

T1: Let’s make it passive.

S2: Penicillin discovered by Alexander Fleming.

T1: simple past passive yaparken ne ile V3 kullanıyorduk?

(What do we use with V3 when we make passive?)

S2: was discovered, was discovered.

Excerpt 10

T2: Ok. Another sentence. "I don't like selfish people"

S: she said she don't like selfish people.

T2: There is a small mistake here, about the tense. What is it?

Ss: didn't like, didn't like.

2.4.6. Elicitation

It refers to at least three techniques that teachers use to directly elicit the correct form from the student. First, teachers elicit completion of their own utterance by strategically pausing to allow students to 'fill in the blank' as it were. Second, teachers use questions to elicit correct forms. Third, teachers occasionally ask students to reformulate their utterance.

Excerpt 11

S1: He said me he didn't...

T2: (interrupting) He...?

S1: He said me.

T2: He...?

Ss: told me.

Excerpt 12

S: When I was a child, I used to ride / ri:d/ a bike.

T3: I used to.....?

S: Sorry, ride /rʌɪd/ a bike.

3. Results

3.1. Research question 1

The first research question investigated to what extent the teachers correct oral errors in the observed classrooms. Depending on the data analysis based on the transcriptions of 12 hours video-recording, 142 utterances by the students were agreed and identified as erroneous. Of these 142 turns, 125 utterances were followed by the teachers' corrective feedback moves whereas 17 were ignored or not corrected. The distribution of these numbers according to the teachers is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The extent of oral corrective feedback.

	Erroneous student turn	Corrective feedback moves	Errors ignored or not corrected	Percentage of error correction
T1	28	25	3	89%
T2	44	37	7	84%
T3	32	28	4	87.5%
T4	38	35	3	92%
Total	142	125	17	84%

The results show that whereas 84% percent of student errors were corrected in speaking classes, 16% of oral errors received no corrective feedback by the teachers. It can be understood that although there were several errors ignored or not corrected, the teachers try to provide corrective feedback to most of the erroneous utterances made by their students.

3.2. Research question 2

Excerpt 13

T2: Ok. The last question. He said he killed the woman. Why did he do this? What do you think?
Yes, Özge.

S1: I think he wanted rescue the girl.

T2: Yes, may be. Any other answer.

Excerpt 14

S: I used to have Atatürk's signature /sɪnəʃə/ on my arm when I was at high school.

T3: Ok, very good. Any other example.

As in the excerpts taken from the actual data of the study, some oral errors were ignored by the teachers in language classes. The focus of the second research question was to find the reasons of why teachers ignore oral errors in speaking classes. To do this, stimulated recall interviews were conducted with the teachers and they were asked why they ignored the error on that straight moment. Their answers yielded significant results and they are shown in Table 2 with their frequencies.

Table 2. The reasons of ignoring oral errors

The reason of ignorance	Frequency
Not to intervene	7
Not to affect the student negatively	4
Lack of knowledge	4
Tiredness of correcting the same error	2

It is seen in the table that nearly a third of the errors were intentionally ignored by the teachers whereas four of them were unintentionally ignored. Seven of the 17 erroneous utterances were ignored by the teachers in order not to intervene in the interaction or activity. While the teachers did not provide corrective feedback to four errors not to affect their students negatively, they reported tiredness of correcting the same errors for ignoring two erroneous utterances. Finally, it is striking that

four of the errors were not corrected because of the teachers' lack of knowledge about the target items in students' utterances.

3.3. Research question 3

The present study employed the six types of corrective feedback moves proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and the third research question investigated the distribution of these types in speaking classes. The distribution of corrective feedback moves on 125 erroneous utterances is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Distribution of corrective feedback types

	Recast	Repetition	Explicit correction	Clarification Request	Metalinguistic Feedback	Elicitation
T1	6	4	3	5	7	-
T2	16	3	9	2	5	2
T3	5	4	6	6	-	7
T4	22	2	4	3	1	3
Total	49 (39%)	13 (11%)	22 (17%)	16 (12%)	13 (11%)	12 (10%)

The results show that recasts (39%) were the most widely used type of corrective feedback in speaking classes. Another prominent corrective feedback move was found to be explicit correction which was used 22 times (17%) among the total corrections. The other types of corrective feedback had the following frequencies: repetition 11%, clarification request 12%, metalinguistic feedback 11% and elicitation 10%.

3.4. Research question 4

The last research question was to investigate whether there is a significant difference between experienced and novice teachers in terms of types of corrective feedback they use in their speaking classes.

Table 4. Differences between experienced and novice teachers

	Recast	Repetition	Explicit correction	Clarification Request	Metalinguistic Feedback	Elicitation
Experienced Teachers (T2-T4)	38	5	13	5	6	5
Novice Teachers (T1-T3)	11	8	9	11	7	7
Total	49(39%)	13 (11%)	22 (17%)	16 (12%)	13 (11%)	12 (%10)

The results in the table indicate that there is not a big difference in the use of repetition, explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback and elicitation. However, it is seen that experienced teachers use

recasts more than novice teachers. It is also clear that novice teachers use clarification request much more than their experienced counterparts.

4. Discussion

4.1. *Corrective feedback: Usage, types and teacher experience*

The present study examined the use of corrective feedback in a sample of Turkish EFL classes focusing on the extent and types of it. The findings demonstrated that the teachers try to provide corrective feedback for most of the erroneous statements uttered by their students although there are several ones ignored during the lesson. In addition to this, the types of corrective feedback and their distribution in these classes were also investigated, and it was found out that recasts were the most frequently used corrective feedback in the observed classes. The teachers use recasts a lot more than the other types of corrective feedback. Confirming the seminal study conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997), this finding shows parallelism with numerous studies (Jabbari and Fazilatraf, 2012; Panova and Lyster, 2002; Nassaji, 2007; Ellis and Sheen, 2006) which also put forward that recasts are the most preferred corrective feedback move in language classrooms (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). Furthermore, the second frequent feedback type was found to be explicit correction. That finding, on its own, may not seem remarkable, but when it is combined with the extensive use of recasts in the same classrooms, it can be concluded that the teachers used input-providing types of corrective feedback more in their classrooms. They corrected more than half of the errors by providing the correct form on their own, which may hinder the negotiation of form between teachers and students. Lyster and Ranta (1997) assert that the feedback-uptake sequence engages students more actively when there is negotiation of form, that is, when the correct form is not provided to the students—as it is in recasts and explicit correction. However, since the correct form is provided by the teachers most of the time, it is concluded that negotiation of form is hindered in communicative activities. On the other hand, it is a need to say that the teachers' providing the correct form of the errors, which has some negative impact on classroom interaction, may have some cultural origins. In Turkey, since teachers are perceived as the source of knowledge (Cerit, 2008) by students in classroom atmosphere. For this reason, the teachers in this study might have felt the necessity to provide the correct knowledge for their students in order not to damage this cultural perception, and because of this, their way of corrective feedback might have been more teacher-based.

4.2. *Teacher Experience and Corrective Feedback*

Another issue investigated by the present study was the difference between experienced and novice teachers in terms of their preferences on corrective feedback moves. Though no remarkable difference was found between these two groups in terms of four types (repetition, explicit correction, meta-linguistic feedback and elicitation), the results demonstrated that experienced teachers use recasts more than their novice counterparts. On this issue, the expressions uttered by T4 and T3 on recasts in the interviews are quite enlightening:

'I frequently use them during my lessons because I believe that it is the best and quickest way of correcting an error. (prompt). I mostly provide the correct form because when students try to it, it may be time-consuming and irritating for them. With recasts, students understand their mistakes immediately. (T4)

‘I try to make use of all types of corrective feedback. Sometimes I need to use recasts but sometimes elicitation is the best way. I don’t think that one is better than the other. (prompt). Well, I think the teacher’s giving the correct form is a bit problematic. (T3)

As it is seen, in the case of recasts, it can be concluded experienced teachers perceive recasts as an effective technique for error correction whereas novice teachers do not perceive them as effective as their experienced counterparts do. This disagreement in the usage and effectiveness of recasts has also been debated in the literature. Although several scholars (Doughty, 2001; Long, 2006) believe that a recast is an effective type of corrective feedback, some others (Panova and Lyster, 2002; Lyster, 1998a; Lyster and Ranta, 1997) claim that a recast rarely leads an uptake and repair so it is not effective for language development. Therefore, experienced and novice teachers may have different beliefs on the effectiveness of recasts, and further research should be conducted on their preferences in using recasts in their classrooms.

When the number of corrective feedback types was analyzed in total, it is also seen that novice teachers used 20 input-providing types of corrective feedback (recasts and explicit correction) and 33 output-prompting types (repetition, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation) whereas experienced teachers utilized 51 input-providing and 21 output-prompting types. Depending on these results, though the number of output-prompting types between the two groups is not so comparable, it can easily be seen that experienced teachers in the observed classes used input-providing feedback types more than the inexperienced ones, and they mostly provided the correct forms when their students made an error during the activities. When that result is combined with the utterances of teachers above, it is concluded that experienced teachers have the tendency to provide the correct form and they believe the effectiveness of these types of corrective feedback. Being a major difference between these two groups of teachers, this result, the impact of teacher experience on feedback types, should be investigated through further research studies.

4.3. Reasons of ignoring oral errors

It is seen in the excerpts of the actual data that teachers sometimes ignore and do not correct some oral errors in their classroom. To identify the reasons behind this situation, the participants were interviewed through stimulated recall technique. The utterances below were taken from the interviews:

‘The only thing I want is their speaking, so I sometimes ignore their errors not to intervene.’

‘She is a very sensitive student, and she never wants to be corrected in front of others.’

‘I am really tired of correcting the same things because nothing changes.’

‘To be honest, I didn’t know it was an incorrect pronunciation’

As it is clearly seen from the statements above, there are several reasons why teachers ignore some errors in their classrooms. The findings indicated that teachers sometimes do not correct oral errors in order not to interrupt the students or intervene in the interaction in the classroom. In their opinion, the fluency of the task or students’ speaking is sometimes much more important than error correction. Their ideas, to some extent, support Allwright and Bailey (1991) who claim that in communicative pedagogy; sometimes it is more important for learners to accomplish their communicative goals than it is for their sentences to be perfectly well-formed. However, the issue of ignored errors as negative evidence contradicts with this idea and is open to discussion.

Secondly, it was found that teachers may sometimes ignore student errors considering the character of their students. They believe that some of the students can be affected negatively by being corrected in front of others, and that may influence their affective filter. On this issue, Öztürk and Gürbüz (2014)

put forward that teacher's attitudes for giving feedback on the speaking performance of students, even correcting a small mistake, play a remarkable role on students' speaking anxiety. Since some teachers are aware of this fact, they sometimes ignore their students' errors not to affect their mood negatively.

Finally, the last, probably the most striking, reason of ignoring oral errors was found to be teachers' lack of knowledge. The results indicated that teachers may not know the correct pronunciation of some lexical elements in the dialogue, and for this reason, they do not correct the errors in students' utterances. On this issue Allwright and Bailey (1991, p. 84) states that:

'A great deal of foreign language teaching is done by non-native teachers who provide a non-native model for learners. Thus, languages the learners are taught in classroom may itself actually deviate from the native speaker norm, in a number of systematic ways, depending on the target language proficiency of the non-native speaking instructor.'

For this reason, it can be concluded that non-native teachers' level of proficiency or lack of knowledge on a certain linguistic element can be a reason for ignoring an erroneous student utterance. However, it is an undeniable fact that this ignorance may serve as a negative evidence and model for the students' interlanguage development.

5. Conclusions

This classroom research study examined the use of corrective feedback in a sample of Turkish EFL classrooms. To what extent teachers provide corrective feedback, teachers' reasons of ignoring errors, distribution of corrective feedback types and the difference between experienced and novice teachers were the focus. Four classrooms were video-recorded and their teachers were interviewed through stimulated recall technique. The transcribed data derived from video-recording was analyzed based on the categorization proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), and the interviews were analyzed through content analysis.

The results revealed that the teachers in this study provided corrective feedback for most of the oral errors, but some of them were ignored. The teachers reported that their lack of knowledge about the target linguistic item, unwillingness to intervene in the task or activity, and their attention not to affect the student negatively were the basic reasons of this ignorance. Recasts and explicit correction were found to be the most widely used corrective feedback moves in the observed classrooms. Finally, it was found that the experienced and the novice teachers' preferences on corrective feedback type during their practices differed in recasts and clarification request.

Though the current study has some limitations (more observation, number of teachers) originating from time and logistics constraints, it is a classroom research study based on actual classroom data, this study has several implications that would serve as a pathway for the teachers in terms of error correction. It was indicated that since the teacher provides the correct form him/herself, extensive use of recasts and explicit correction may hinder negotiation of form in classroom atmosphere. For that specific reason, teachers should be careful about the ratio of their feedback types they use in the class and set a balance if possible. In addition to this, teachers may sometimes ignore oral errors and have some strong reasons for doing that. However, no matter what the situation is, language teachers should be aware of the fact that if a teacher chooses not to treat an error in an utterance, the form of function may serve as a negative input for learners (Schmidt and Frota, 1986).

References

- Allwright, D. & Bailey, K.M. (1991). *Focus on the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Büyükbay, S. (2007). *The effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback*. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Cerit, Y. (2008). Students, teachers and administrators' views on metaphors with respect to the concept of teacher. *Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 6(4), 693-712.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Chu, R. (2011). Effects of teacher's corrective feedback on accuracy in the oral English of English-major 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. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage: Thousand Oakes.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Doughty, C. (2001). Instructed SLA: Constraints, compensation, and enhancement. In C. Doughty and M. Long, (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 256-310). New York: Blackwell.
- Doughty, C. & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 575-600.
- Gass, S. (2003). Input and interaction, In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 104-129). Oxford, Blackwell Publishing Ltd
- Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction: Differential effects on L2 development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 1-36.
- Jabbari, A. A. & Fazilatfar, A. M. (2012). The role of error types and feedback in Iranian EFL classrooms. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(1), 135-148.
- Jacobs, G. M. & Farrell, S. C. (2003). Understanding and implementing the CLT Paradigm. *RELC Journal*, 34(1), 5-30
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus on form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effect on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 429-448
- 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). Academic Press, San Diego.
- Long, M. H., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 357-371.

- Long, M. (2006). *Problems in SLA*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lyle, J. (2003). Stimulated recall: A report on its use in naturalistic research. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(6), 861-878.
- Lyster, R. (1998b). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 51-81.
- 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 form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Mackey, A., Polio, C. & McDonough, K. (2004). The relationship between experience, education and teachers' use of incidental focus-on-form techniques. *Language Teaching Research*, 8, 301-327.
- Martinez, S. G. (2006). Should we correct our students' errors in l2 learning? *Journal of Research and Innovation in the Language Classroom*, 16, 1-7.
- Nassaji, H. (2007). Elicitation and Reformulation and their Relationship with Learner Repair in Dyadic Interaction. *Language Learning*, 57(4), 511-548.
- Nassaji, H. (2009). Effects of recasts and elicitation in dyadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. *Language Learning*, 59(2), 411-52.
- Öztürk, G., & Gürbüz, N. (2014). Speaking anxiety among Turkish EFL learners: The case at a state university. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(1), 1-17.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 573-595.
- Pica, T., & Long, M. (1986). The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn* (pp. 85-98). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research*, 7, 80-102.
- Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. N. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: a case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 157-174). Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- 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.
- Touchie, H. Y. (1986). Second language learning errors: Their types, causes, and treatment. *JALT Journal*, 8(1), 75-80.
- Ur, P. (2002). *A course in language teaching: Theory and practice*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği sınıflarda sözlü düzeltici dönütlerin kullanımı üzerine bir araştırma

Öz

Bu sınıf araştırması İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği sınıflarda düzeltici dönüt uygulamalarını araştırmaktadır. Çalışmanın odak noktasını bu dönütlerin türleri, dağılımı ve hataların neden görmezden gelindiği oluşturmaktadır. Her biri 27 öğrenciden oluşan dört konuşma sınıfın toplam 12 ders saati video ile kayıt edilmiş ve bu sınıfların öğretmenleri ile çağrışım tekniğine dayalı görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Sonuçlar direkt düzeltme ve açıklayıcı düzeltmenin en çok kullanılan dönüt şekli olduğunu ve tecrübeli ve tecrübesiz öğretmenlerin dönüt uygulamalarının değişiklik gösterdiğini ortaya koymuştur. Buna ek olarak, öğretmenlerin öğrencilerin yaptığı sözlü hataları bazen görmezden geldiğini ve bunun temel sebeplerinin dilbilimsel bilgi eksikliği, aktiviteyi bölmeme isteği, aynı hatayı düzeltmenin verdiği tükenmişlik ve öğrenciyi olumsuz etkilemeye olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar sözcükler: dil sınıflarında hata; sözlü düzeltici dönüt; sınıf araştırması

AUTHOR BIODATA

Dr. Gökhan ÖZTÜRK is an instructor of English at Afyon Kocatepe University School of Foreign Languages in Turkey. He has been teaching English for eight years. His research interests are second language teacher education, language teacher cognition, oral corrective feedback and affective factors in language learning.