

CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND UPTAKE PATTERNS IN ENGLISH LESSONS AT A TERTIARY INSTITUTION

Huong Thanh Nhac

Hanoi Law University,
Phillipine

Email:
nhacthanhhuong@gmail.com

Article History

Submitted 23 June 2021

Revised 6 July 2021

Published 30 August 2021

Abstract

New teaching methods have led to the changes in the teachers' roles in an English class, in which teachers' error correction is an integral part. Language error and corrective feedback have been the interest of many researchers in foreign language teaching. However, the techniques and the effectiveness of teachers' feedback have been a question of much controversy. This present case study has been carried out with a view to finding out the patterns of teachers' corrective feedback and their impact on students' uptake in English speaking lessons of legal English major students at a Law University. In order to achieve those aims, the study makes use of classroom observations as the main method of data collection to seeks answers to the two following questions: 1. What patterns of corrective feedback occur in English speaking lessons for legal English major students in a Law University? 2. To what extent does that corrective feedback lead to students' uptake? The study provided some important findings, among which was a close relationship between corrective feedback and uptake. In particular, recast was the most commonly used feedback type, yet it was the least effective in terms of students' uptake and repair, while the most successful feedback, namely meta-linguistic feedback, clarification requests and elicitation, which led to students' generated repair, was used at a much lower rate by teachers. Furthermore, it revealed that different types of errors needed different types of feedback. Also, the use of feedback depended on the students' English proficiency level. In the light of findings, a number of pedagogical implications have been drawn in the hope of enhancing the effectiveness of teachers' corrective feedback to students' uptake in foreign language acquisition process.

Keywords: corrective feedback, error, law university, English lesson, uptake

INTRODUCTION

The impact of corrective feedback on learners' second language (L2) or foreign language acquisition remains controversial in the literature. In fact, there has been some polarization of thought regarding the effectiveness of corrective feedback, leading to different or even contradicting theories. For example, DeKeyser (1993) states that corrective feedback is unnecessary to L2 learning, thus, does not lead to the acquisition of L2. However, scholars

such as Brooks, Schraw, and Crippen (2002) and Mason and Bruning (2000), for example, disagree with DeKeyser, holding that feedback plays an important and crucial role in the language learning process.

Recently, there has been increasing empirical evidence that corrective feedback provided by teachers at least enables students to notice the gap between their inter-language forms and the target language forms, thus helping them to restructure the inter-language grammar. Additionally, corrective feedback from teachers also helps enhance students' meta-linguistic awareness (Panova and Lyster, 2002). Therefore, teachers' corrective feedback is of great importance in promoting student-generated repairs and in turn, language acquisition. A literature review shows that researchers have been increasingly interested in examining the relationship between corrective feedback and uptake (Wai King Tsang, 2004). For example, negotiation of form has been shown to be able to elicit uptake and successful repair more effectively than explicit correction. Also, it has shown that different types of feedback move tend to function differentially according to different types of errors.

One issue related to corrective feedback, which has gained little agreement among researchers and scholars is which type of feedback, i.e., explicit or implicit, that is more effective to learners' uptake. Carrol and Swain (1993) suggested that learners would benefit more from direct, explicit corrective feedback, whereas other researchers, such as Lyster and Ranta (1997), Oliver and Mackey (2003) found out that learners would learn better when the feedback is more implicit. It can be interpreted that while consensus has been reached regarding the effectiveness of corrective feedback on students' L2 acquisition, whether explicit or implicit corrective feedback is more effective remains open. This has led to confusion at the practical level.

In Vietnam, corrective feedback has attracted interests from educators and researchers in the field of language teaching and learning. The studies explore either the role of corrective feedback in students' learning (Le, 2014); or teachers and learners' belief (Ha & Nguyen, 2020). Yet, few studies have been conducted about how EFL learners respond to different kinds of teachers' corrective feedback. This motivates the researcher to carry out the present study, which is an expansion of the one she conducted previously in a high school context.

For all those reasons, this study is a modest attempt to contribute to the common knowledge of the correlation between corrective feedback on learners' foreign language acquisition. It focuses on (a) subsequent language teacher feedback to learners' spoken errors and (b) learners' uptake patterns (learner responses to feedback) at the university level. Two research questions are formed to address the above issues:

1. What patterns of corrective feedback are observed in English speaking lessons for students taught by the teachers in an EFL context of a Law University?
2. To what extent does that corrective feedback lead to students' uptake?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Idiom Translation

TERMINOLOGY IN THE STUDY

1. Foreign Language (FL) - language that is learned by a student who speaks other languages everyday

2. Second Language (L2) - language that is learned by a student which is different from the first language
3. *Second Language Acquisition (SLA)*—acquisition of another language within one of the regions where the language is commonly spoken (Shrum & Glisan, 2000, p. 2)
4. *Target language*—"language of instruction in a foreign language classroom" (Shrum & Glisan, 2000, p. 2) or language that is learned by a student
5. *Turn*—one piece of a student-teacher dialogue that contains an error/s or feedback.
6. *Corrective feedback*: " any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance" (Claudron, 1977:31)
7. *Explicit correction*: By explicit correction, the teacher clearly indicates that the student's utterance is incorrect, and then, he/ she provides the correct form (Lyster and Ranta, 1997: 47)
8. *Recast* is an implicit corrective feedback move that reformulates or expands an ill-formed or incomplete utterance in an obtrusive way, similar to the type of recasts provided by primary caregivers in child L1 acquisition (Long, 1996)
9. *Clarification request*: is one kind of teacher's corrective feedback in which teacher uses phrases like " Excuse me?" or " I don't understand", she/ he indicates that the message has not been understood or that the student's utterance contained some kind of mistake and that a repetition or a reformation is required (Lyster and Ranta, 1997)\
10. *Meta-linguistic feedback*: refers to either comments, information, or questions related to well- formedness of the student utterance, without explicitly providing the correct answer (Lyster and Ranta, 1997:46)
11. *Clarification request* is a corrective technique that prompts the learner to self- correct (Lyster and Ranta, 1997)
12. *Repetition*. The teacher repeats the students' errors and adjusts intonation to draw student's attention to it.
13. *Elicitation* - a corrective technique that prompts the learner to self- correct (Lyster and Ranta, 1997)
14. *Uptake* - a student's utterance that immediately follows the teachers' feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teachers' intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance. (Lyster and Ranta, 1997:49).
15. *Repair* - the correct reformulation of an error as uttered in a single student turn (Lyster and Ranta, 1997:49)
16. *Needs Repair* —A learner's actions as a reaction to corrective feedback on his/her erroneous turn that failed to result in correction of an error/s
17. *Pushed output* is the output that reflects what learners can produce when they are pushed to use the target language accurately and concisely (Swain, 1985).

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The study was carried out with the participation of English major students at 4 English speaking classes of Hanoi Law University for observation. Their English proficiency levels were between pre-intermediate and intermediate. All the participants had learned English as a core subject in school for at least seven years.

Data Collection Instruments

The research focuses on teachers' corrective feedback and its impact on students' uptake, a kind of teacher- student interaction; classroom observation proves to be the most helpful method of data collection because according to Nunan (1989) there is no substitute for direct observation as a way of finding out about language classroom.

Unlike qualitative research, in this quantitative research, the researcher was not actively involved in the creation of the data, but merely served as a recorder and data analyst. The English speaking lessons were recorded and transcribed to provide a record of the discourse between and among teachers and students. This data provided a picture of the human behavior that occurred in the classroom during the observations. There are three stages of structured or systematic observational research: (a) recording of the events, (b) coding events using predetermined set of categories, and (c) analyzing the events (Galton, 1988, p. 474).

To aid this procedure of observational strategy, note- takings of teacher- student interaction in speaking lessons was employed. An observation scheme, therefore was also developed to assist the researcher in taking notes of the observed class according to number of students' errors, their types and teachers' corrective feedback, which led or did not lead to students' uptake.

Coding Designations

Error categories

- a. Grammatical
- b. Lexical
- c. Phonological

Feedback types

- a. Explicit correction
- b. Recast
- c. Meta-linguistic feedback
- d. Elicitation
- e. Clarification request
- f. Repetition

Uptake

- a. Repair
- b. Needs Repair

Procedures

Data Collection

Observations were carried out in an objective way. The researcher, who taught English at Hanoi Law University, became a non-participation observer. The researcher's presence, in fact, did not interfere with students' normal performance. This was due to the fact that students at Hanoi Law University got used to the presence of teachers of English in their classes. Annually, the teaching staff of English Division of Hanoi Law University employs new teachers of English. Those teachers of English have to observe their colleagues' teaching periods as a requirement to get teaching experiences. Thus, they could often attend their colleagues' lessons and students considered this as normal. In the process of classroom observation, the observer sat at one corner of the classroom to observe and take notes with the help of observation scheme. The database did not contain any lessons devoted only to grammar but that focused on both meaning and forms in speaking lessons.

Data Analysis

The categories used to code the data in the study were adapted from the error treatment sequence delineated in Lyster and Ranta (1997) model. In Lyster and Ranta's coding scheme, an error treatment starts with a learner utterance containing at least one error. The erroneous utterance is followed either by teachers' corrective feedback or topic continuation. If corrective feedback is provided, then it is followed either by learner uptake or topic continuation. If there is uptake, then the learner's initial erroneous utterance is either repaired or continues to need repair in some way. In this current study, the main unit of analysis was the error treatment sequence, which contains teacher and student turns in the following order:

- Learner error
- Teacher feedback
- Learner uptake, with either repair of the error or needs-repair
- The relationship between teacher feedback and learner uptake

This order reflected what usually happened when a teacher responded to an utterance containing an error and when a student attempted to respond to the teacher's feedback move. In other cases, learners' errors, teacher's feedback, uptake with repair, or uptake with needs-repair might be followed with teacher-initiated or student-initiated topic continuation. All students' utterances with errors were included and counted. Errors were coded as phonological, grammatical, and lexical. Even though the types of errors were isolated in the coding stage of the analysis, they were not the main subjects of interest in this study; they were coded to find out the patterns of teachers' corrective feedback.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research question 1: What patterns of teachers' corrective feedback are observed in English Speaking the EFL context of a Law University?

There is a huge difference in the distribution of different types of teacher corrective feedback used in English speaking lessons of students at elementary and pre-intermediate levels, which is clearly shown in Tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1: Distribution of corrective feedback of elementary classes.

Corrective Feedback Types	Total (116)	Pre-intermediate (62)	
		n	frequency
Recast	35	21	60%
Elicitation	23	9	39%
Clarification Request	15	7	47%
Meta-linguistic feedback	16	6	38%
Explicit correction	14	10	71%
Repetition	13	9	69%

Table 2: Distribution of Corrective Feedback of pre-intermediate classes

Corrective Feedback Types	Total (116)	Intermediate (54)	
		n	%
Recast	35	14	40%
Elicitation	23	14	61%
Clarification Request	15	8	53%
Meta-linguistic feedback	16	10	62%
Explicit correction	14	4	29%
Repetition	13	4	21%

The statistics in the table 1 and 2 clearly show the differences in the use of corrective techniques by teachers: recast, explicit correction and negotiation in English speaking lessons of 2 levels. Of students at elementary level, teachers of English use a large number of corrective techniques, namely recast and explicit correction, which account for 60% and 71% respectively, leaving only 40% and 29% of the same techniques in the pre-intermediate classes. Moreover, in the pre-intermediate classes, there is a high rate in the use of negotiation techniques, including elicitation and meta- linguistic feedback.

4.2.2 Research question 2: To what extent does that corrective feedback lead to students' uptake?

It may be asked whether all types of feedback are equally effective in leading to learner uptake. This question can be addressed by referring to the patterns of uptake following different types of feedback, which is presented in table 3

Table 3: Uptake Moves Following Different Types of Feedback of both Elementary and Pre- intermediate levels

Feedback types	Uptake moves	Repair	Needs repair	No uptake
	n %	n %	n %	n %
Recast (n=35)	17 49%	10 29%	7 20%	18 51%
Elicitation (n=23)	23 100%	19 83%	4 17%	0 0

Clarification request (n=15)	14 82%	14 82%	1 18%	1 18%
Meta- linguistic (n=16)	16 100%	15 94%	1 16%	1 16%
Explicit correction (n=14)	7 50%	5 36%	2 14%	7 50%
Repetition (n=13)	10 77%	8 62%	2 15%	3 23%

Table 3 shows the relationship between types of corrective and responses to those corrective techniques of both elementary and pre- intermediate classes. In general, every learner response that follows teacher feedback is coded according to whether or not there is evidence of uptake. In many cases, feedback does not lead to uptake because there is topic continuance provided by teacher or students. The number and percentage of feedback moves that do not lead to uptake are provided in the “NO uptake (there was no uptake)” column. Specifically, of both elementary and pre-intermediate levels, recast and explicit correction are the least effective in leading to students’ uptake, which is 49% and 50% respectively. On the contrary, negotiation techniques, namely elicitation and meta-linguistic feedback, which prove to be the most successful feedback types, lead to 100% of students’ uptake. Those kinds of techniques are followed by clarification request and repetition with the rate of 82% and 77%.

The results of uptake following corrective feedback types between pre-intermediate level and intermediate level are shown more clearly in table 4 and 5.

Table 4: Uptake Moves Following Different types of feedback at Elementary level.

Feedback types	Uptake moves	Repair	Needs repair	No uptake
	n %	n %	n %	n %
Recast (n=21)	9 43%	5 24%	4 19%	12 57%
Elicitation (n=9)	9 100%	7 78%	2 22%	0 0
Clarification request (n=7)	7 100%	5 71%	2 29%	0 0
Meta- linguistic (n=6)	6 100%	6 100%	0 0	0 0%
Explicit correction (n=10)	5 50%	3 30%	2 20%	5 50%
Repetition (n=9)	7 78%	6 67%	1 11%	2 22%

Table 4 shows the relationship between types of corrective feedback and uptake in pre-intermediate classes. It is evident that the recast, the most popular and frequent technique, is the least likely to lead to uptake. Uptake in this case contributes about 43% of the total number of its feedback type. This low rate of uptake might be explained by the fact that teachers give the correct model without correcting explicitly, thus students seem to pay no attention and continue with topic continuation. When the teacher explicitly corrects an error by providing the target form, uptake is slightly higher, reaching at 50%. Repetition is a much more prominent indicator of learner uptake as it is effective

in eliciting uptake from the students, which is 78%. The highest rates of learner uptake occur with clarification requests, elicitation and meta-linguistic, which account for 100%. In those techniques, teachers often search for students' self- or peer- correction. It means that time for students' responses is expected, which leads to higher rate of uptake.

With respect to learner repair, rates of repair following recast and explicit correction are the lowest, at 24% and 30%, respectively whereas percentage of repair following other types of feedback is much higher. As for the less frequently used types of feedback, teacher turns with meta-linguistic feedback result in the highest rate of learner repair with 100%, followed by feedback moves with elicitation (78%), clarification requests (71%), and repetition (67%). Those statistics are easy to understand as two former techniques lead to low rate of uptake, thus low rate of repair, as a consequence. Whereas, the four latter techniques are teachers' indications of students' errors, students, hence, have more time to realize errors, to correct and repair.

Table 5: Uptake Moves Following Different Types of Feedback at Pre- Intermediate level

Feedback types	Uptake moves	Repair	Needs repair	No uptake
	n %	n %	n %	n %
Recast (n=14)	8 57%	5 36%	3 21%	6 43%
Elicitation (n=14)	14 100%	12 86%	2 14%	0 0%
Clarification request (n=8)	7 88%	7 88%	0 0%	1 12%
Meta- linguistic (n=10)	10 100%	9 90%	1 10%	0 0%
Explicit correction (n=4)	2 50%	2 50%	2 0%	2 50%
Repetition (n=4)	3 75%	2 50%	1 25%	1 25%

Looking at the statistic in Table 5, there is no big difference with the results founded in pre-intermediate class. In pre-intermediate class, explicit correction, which is used the least, leads to the lowest uptake with 50% of the total feedback type. Recasts and elicitation with the most frequent use in elementary class produce different results of student uptake. The rate of uptake the preceding leads to is 57% whereas that of the latter leads to 100% of feedback type. This difference leaves a big question for the teachers when they give corrective technique to student errors. The highest rate of learner uptake (100%) also occurs with meta-linguistic feedback, this result is the same as that in elementary level. Repetition and clarification requests are in the prominent indicator group of learner uptake as they produce a high rate of learner uptake, which are 75% and 88%, respectively.

In terms of learner repair, in English speaking class of pre-intermediate level, rates of repair following recasts, and explicit correction are the lowest, at 36% and 50%, respectively, however still much higher than those following the same corrective techniques in pre-intermediate class. As for the less frequently used types of feedback, teacher turns with meta-linguistic feedback result in the highest rate of learner repair

with 90%, followed by feedback moves with clarification requests (88%), elicitation (86%). Those statistics are easy to understand as two former techniques lead to low rate of uptake, thus low rate of repair, as a consequence. Whereas, the four latter techniques are teachers' indications of students' errors, students, hence, have more time to realize errors, to correct and repair.

DISCUSSION

Although there is a major difference between former studies such as Lyster and Ranta (1997): the classrooms in Lyster and Ranta were meaning- centered whereas the classrooms in the present study is a mixture of meaning focused and form- focused instruction, this study shares similar findings with Lyster and Ranta's study (1997).

Teachers in the four classes of elementary and pre-intermediate levels being observed use six different types of corrective feedback: recasts (30%), explicit correction (12%) and repetition of errors (11%), meta- linguistic feedback (14%), elicitation (20%), clarification requests (13%). Recasts are the most frequently used type of feedback, which supports the findings obtained in other observational studies with child and adult language learners (Doughty, 1994; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). The extensive use of recast by teachers in this study can be attributed to the fact that this feedback technique doesn't interrupt the flow of lessons because of the implicit nature of the technique, which is also consistent with Lyster's 1998 study. Yet, in most of the case, the use of recasts does not lead to learners' uptake and repair. Only a small percentage of recasts lead to students' uptake or repair, meaning that students do not react to it. Consider the following examples:

Example 1:

S: She had the best sales results of the team during the last five years. (grammatical error)

T: very good. She has had (recast)

S: and she is excellent at Polish and Russian (no uptake)

As it can be seen from examples of dialogue 1, this type of error is treated using recast feedback type. However, it fails to result in immediate student repair, which is fairly common for the implicit feedback. This is consistent with Lyster and Ranta's (1997) research, who stated that the students don't realize that they made a mistake due to the fact that they are not provided any information about its existence. In the first dialogue, the teacher sends the student mixed message by providing positive reinforcement (very good!) before providing recast feedback. A teacher's positive reinforcement targeting student's successful choice of word, not the grammatical mistake is useful. However, if used with a correction without repair of recast feedback, it can be very confusing to students, even might have no positive effects on students. It is due to the fact that students might misunderstand that it is the second way of expressing ideas without realizing their errors. Actually, after observing 12 English speaking lessons of four classes at pre- intermediate and intermediate level, the researcher notices that there is a big difference in the effects of recasts to learners' uptake and repair.

On the one hand, at elementary level, although recast leads to uptake, some lead to repair, students at this level, in some cases, in fact, do not notice that is teachers'

correction. Therefore, they might speak out the correct form after receiving recast, still commit the same errors in the next speaking lessons. After observing two English speaking lessons of one teacher teaching at elementary class, the researcher notices that a student still commits the same error even after being given recast technique. The researcher notices that in a speaking lesson, there is not much time for the teacher to correct students' errors; thus, using recast is time- saving. In some other cases, other negotiation techniques such as meta- linguistic, clarification requests are used, however, students seem not to have enough linguistic resources to be aware and find out the correct answer.

On the other hand, two teachers of English, teaching in pre-intermediate classes, who use a lower rate of recasts as corrective techniques than two teaching in elementary, still use this corrective technique at higher rate than other ones. It might be explained by the fact that students at this level have enough acquired knowledge to understand and realize their mistakes.

Concerning the use of explicit correction technique in classes of elementary level, it is still higher than other techniques, and lower than recasts only. This statistic reflects in six speaking lessons of students at elementary level, learners make a huge number of phonological errors. In those cases, explicit correction and recasts prove to be more effective than other techniques (Tsang, 2004).

Example 2:

S: one conference room /kɒnfərəns/ (wrongly pronunciation)

T: one conference room /kɒnfərəns/ (recast)

S: one conference room /kɒnfərəns/

Elicitation and clarification requests and meta-linguistic feedback lead to a very high rate of students' uptake in English classes of both level, especially, meta- linguistic feedback led to 100% uptake, which is similar to findings by Lyster and Ranta (1997). However, it is important to note that elicitation is the only type of feedback according to Lyster and Ranta that led to uptake in 100% of cases, which is not totally consistent with the results of this study, which reports that elicitation results in 100% of uptake, but so do all the other feedback types.

Example 3:

S: In order to getting a full refund, customers must send back goods...

T: Excuse me? In order to getting or in order to get? (clarification request)

S: in order to get a full refund,...

As can be seen from the interaction between the teacher and the student in dialogue 3, it results in student successful uptake. Success in terms of student uptake is consistent with experiences that clarification request provides the learner with the clues regarding the nature of his/her error thus facilitating repair. Specifically, the teacher asks a clarification question that indicates to the student that an error has occurred and provides the student with two choices. It also motivates the student to analyze the options.

Example 4:

S: Luke is quite ambitious and does not want to be a sales assistant all his life. in fact, he hopes to make a promotion very soon.

T: Do we say: “make a promotion” in English? (meta-linguistic feedback)

S: oh, get a promotion

Dialogue 4 demonstrates the use of the meta-linguistic feedback type in response to lexical error category. This type of feedback provides students with opportunities to critically analyze their own mistakes. It provides the students with enough information for them to make connections between the error and their background knowledge and therefore, correct their own errors.

In elementary classes, three above negotiation techniques, namely: clarification requests, elicitation, meta-linguistic feedback are not used at a high rate in all six speaking periods observed. This data might be explained by the fact that low- level students might not have enough linguistic resources to self- repair. Another reason might concern the drawback of clarification requests. Low- level students might not understand teacher’s implication that there is something wrong in their utterances. Instead, they might simply repeat their ill- formed utterances as the teacher’s requests without realizing and correcting errors. This fact is contrast to the results founded in English speaking periods of pre-intermediate level, in which those negotiation techniques are found quite useful. That finding is interesting as it illustrates the fact that students of different levels need different types of teachers’ corrective feedback. In other words, when choosing types of corrective techniques, teachers of English should take levels of students into consideration to find out the most suitable and effective corrective feedback.

One more thing to be noticed in this research is that those kinds of corrective feedback, namely elicitation, meta- linguistic feedback, and clarification requests lead to higher rate of students’ uptake as well as student- generated repairs (above 90% and 80% for both). This finding reiterates the effectiveness of simply drawing learners’ attention to errors while withholding correction to leave room for learners’ reformulation. Meta-linguistic feedback is quite effective as the teacher could imply to their students that there is problem in their speech and implicitly requires them to self- repair. Also, elicitation helps teachers elicit correct forms from students as teacher asks open – questions, which require more than a Yes/ No response, thus giving students more time thinking and giving the answers and encouraging self- repair. Moreover, meta- linguistic feedback and elicitation could attract others students, which means that the whole class would have chances to realize their friends’ errors, and help them repair, if they could. In other words, negotiation techniques are helpful not only for students who commit errors, but other students, as well.

One more striking feature of this study is that teacher’s repetition of students’ ill- formed utterance along with rising intonation would achieve her/his purpose of drawing students’ attention to their errors immediately, and thus, would encourage learners to try to correct their own errors. Therefore, they might not commit the same errors next time. The researcher notices that the use of repetition technique is more useful to learners of pre-intermediate level than those of elementary level. Consider two examples

Example 5:

S:high promotion (lexical error- fast promotion)

T: high promotion? (repetition with rising intonation)

S: high promotion and....

The teacher uses repetition feedback in dialogue number 5. Similar to recast, this type of feedback is sometimes too implicit for students to notice especially in the context of the intense classroom interaction. In this particular case, the teacher uses repetition with intonation, which student does not notice as he continues with the rest of the dialogue.

It is important to acknowledge the need for teachers to carefully take into account their students' level of L2 proficiency when making decisions about feedback; for example, two English teachers of pre-intermediate classes, in their lessons, they use recasts considerably less often than six speaking periods of students at elementary level. This allows teachers at pre-intermediate classes to draw more on other feedback types, and in particular, on those that are likely to lead to uptake. Thus, given their students' higher level of proficiency, they are able to push students more in their output and rely less on the modeling techniques used by the other teachers with less advanced students. These similar findings could be found in Lyster and Ranta (1997). They reported that the teacher of the most advanced class tended to recast learner errors to a lesser degree than the other teachers. This class was also reported as having highest rates of uptake and repair. In this study, the researcher observes that the rate of students' responses resulting from teachers' recasts of students who are at intermediate classes is higher than that of elementary classes.

Yet, in some cases, in which the teacher uses different types of correction techniques for one type of errors, there is still no uptake or repair from student. This phenomenon appears mostly among students of pre-intermediate classes.

Consider those examples:

Example 6:

S: She is doing a bath now, so she cannot answer the telephone.

T: Do we say: "doing a bath" in English? (meta-linguistic feedback)

S: yes, she is doing a bath, so.....

T: Doing a bath? (repetition with rising intonation)

S: yes, she is doing a bath, so....

T: yes, she is having a bath, so.....

S: oh, yes, she is doing a bath

The teacher in the example 6 uses three types of corrective feedback, namely meta-linguistic feedback, repetition and recast, however, none of them leads to uptake from learners. This finding supported Pienneman (1981) view on teachability theory in second language acquisition, in which he stated that a given linguistic structure cannot be learned by any means without prior learning/acquisition of the developmental earlier structure. It means whether the learner of a certain interlanguage is prepared for the learning of a given structure or not. In other words, if learners are not ready to acquire a particular grammar structure, they never acquire it.

The study also reveals that when giving correction to students' errors, all four teachers being observed, often take the types of errors into consideration. It is clear that each kind of error has different features, which requires different ways of correction. The data

show that recasts and explicit correction are used mainly for phonological errors whereas negotiation of form as meta-linguistic feedback, repetition, clarification requests and elicitation are often used for grammatical errors. In fact, from the classroom observation, it is found the use of negotiation for grammatical in English classes of pre-intermediate level is much higher than that in classes of elementary level. This is easy to understand as it is due to the fact that students at more advanced level have enough linguistic resources to self- correct.

CONCLUSION

Providing effective oral error feedback is a difficult and complex process involving many challenges and complexities. When a student commits an error, the teacher who wishes to give effective corrective feedback should take a number of things into consideration, such as which kind of error is it, whether to correct it, if so how to correct it depending on individual student. The findings of this study suggest some pedagogical implications for language teachers which are presented subsequently.

Firstly, learners' outputs can be pushed to be modified by providing consistent feedback to signal clarification while delaying correction makes room for self- repair (as suggested by Claudron 1977, 1968), and student- generated repairs, i.e. self- and peer- repairs in contexts with a component of form- and- accuracy in addition to a focus on meaning. More use may be, thus, made of negotiation feedback types other than recasts or explicit correction such as elicitation, meta-linguistic feedback and repetition to elicit students' uptake and student- generated repairs. In other words, teachers should make use of all types of corrective feedback, especially elicitation, clarification requests, meta- linguistic feedback and repetition to increase the rates of students' uptake and repairs. Through using those techniques, teachers can achieve their goals of correcting errors and enhance students' inspiration of self- correcting in particular and self- study in general. Specifically, teachers' use of negotiation techniques, to some extent, may result in long-term effects on students' process of second language acquisition. This may open an interesting research avenue.

Secondly, teachers have to choose different types of feedback moves in response to different types of errors in order to ensure the most effective learners' uptake. The findings of this study show that recasts and explicit corrections are suitable for phonological errors as they help teachers achieve their goals in such a short time but still are very effective. Students themselves also like correct model for pronunciation as in fact, the most effective way of studying pronunciation is listening, imitating and repeating. Moreover, negotiation facilitates grammatical and lexical repairs. This finding parallels with Piea' idea (1994): "Negotiation enables the learners to acquire grammar as a result of engaging in authentic use". Hence, when giving corrective feedback, teachers should take notice of types of errors to find out the most suitable and useful kinds of feedback, which can lead to the highest rate of students' uptake and repair.

Thirdly, choice of teachers' corrective feedback types also depends on students' L2 proficiency level. The participants of the study involved students of both elementary and pre- intermediate levels show that classes with more high- level students of English

should be provided with negotiation techniques such as elicitation, repetition and meta-linguistic feedback, etc. because they may have a enough basic knowledge and linguistic resources to self- repair. In contrast, classes with less advanced learners may have predisposed the teacher to focus on providing linguistic input via reformulation as those students may not have enough linguistic resources to understand as well to response to teachers' indication. Thus, teachers working with those kinds of students may view recasts and explicit correction as a suitable strategy for providing exemplars of the target language.

Last but not least, the informal talk with four teachers of English teaching in elementary and pre- intermediate classes being observed shows that the choice of types of correction also relies on specific grammar or lexis phenomena. For new phenomena of grammar and lexis, recasts and especially explicit corrections are more favored as students may not yet deeply understand them. By providing explicit correction, students have the change of revising new knowledge. Thus, in this case, elicitation, meta- linguistic feedback, repetition, and especially clarification requests seem to have no impact on students. Moreover, in such a case, the use of those methods is time- consuming. However, for revised knowledge, it is better to use negotiation technique as it will elicit self- repair or peer- pair, which can have long- term effects on learners' second language acquisition.

REFERENCES

- 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.
- Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning*, 27(1), 29-46.
- DeKeyser, R. (1993). The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. *Modern Language Journal*, 77, 501-514.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: OUP
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL *Language Learning*, 51(2), 281-318.
- Ellis, R. Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006) Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 339- 368.
- Ha, X.V., & Nguyen, L.T. (2021). Targets and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: Are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 697160.
- Le, H. M. (2014). The role of corrective feedback in Vietnamese High school students' writing. *Ho Chi Minh Open University Journal of Science*, 3(1), 61-69.
- Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus- on- form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 429-448
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Lyster, R. (1998a). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48, 183-218.
- Lyster, R. (1998b). Recasts, repetition and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 51-81.

- 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.
- Loewen, S. (2004). Uptake in incidental focus on form in meaning-focused ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 153-188.
- MacKey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recast, responses, and red herrings. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 338-356
- Mackey, A., Gass, S.M. and McDonough, K. 2000: How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22: 471_97.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). *Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom*.
- White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research*, 7(2), 133-161.
- Waxman, H. C., Tharp, R. G., & Hilberg, R. S. (Eds.). (2004). *Observational research in U.S. classrooms: New approaches for understanding cultural and linguistic diversity*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press
- Young, S. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classroom across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8, (3), 263-300.