# A Comparison of Corrective Feedback Used in International and EFL Contexts

Julia Simhony
Faculty of Liberal Arts, Mahidol Unviersity, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand

Natthapong Chanyoo
Faculty of Liberal Arts, Mahidol University, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand

*Abstract*—**The current study aims to investigate types of corrective feedback used in two classroom settings (i.e. EFL and international school classrooms) and to compare the frequency of corrective feedback types used in the two classrooms. The participants of this study were 31 students from two classrooms (6 international and 25 in EFL classrooms) and their respective teachers; one in each classroom. Data was collected through four classroom observations and one semi-structure interview conducted with the teacher from each classroom. The findings revealed that all six types of feedback were provided by the teachers in the two classrooms. A comparison of the frequency of the use of corrective feedback in two different classrooms revealed that recast was the most frequently used type of feedback in the EFL classroom while metalinguistic clues were used the most in the international school classroom. Data from the interviews suggested that teachers from both classrooms provided the feedback to students without awareness of how the feedback types should be used appropriately for different foci of the content. This study recommends the need for teacher training on corrective feedback so that the teachers will be able to analyze, select, and provide appropriate feedback types to learners.**

*Index Terms*—**corrective feedback, English language classroom, EFL, immersion program**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Language learners normally receive comprehensible input and feedback through interaction, especially in the classroom setting (Gass, 1997; Long, 1981). Krashen (1994) claimed that that interaction is contrived to promote negotiation in meaning for learners, which is referred as *'internalization'*. According to Vygotsky, internalization is the process through which the learner creates a new schema (or knowledge) as a result of interaction between the children (or learners) and other people. Internalization is an 'outside-in' process. That is, when the learners are first approaching mastery, they start by relying on other-directedness through scaffolding of the input provided by others' guided explanations and corrections. The learners' knowledge is gradually accumulated when they are repeatedly exposed to the input. According to Vygotsky (1978), he claimed that learners then move from the 'other-directed' stage to the 'self-directed' stage in the schematic construction. The learners will finally create (or construct) their own knowledge without assistance from others. Once the learners are capable of constructing their own schema, they internalize the target aspect of the knowledge or the language, and are ready to produce the output of such target aspects of the language (Vygotsky, 1978).

Interaction leads to comprehensible input (Pica, 1994). Comprehensible input is defined as *"language that can be understood by the listener even though some structures and vocabulary may be unknown"* (Krashen, 1994). Thus, comprehensible input is a necessary condition for the completion of the second language acquisition process (Richards & Schmidt, 2002). However, Lyster and Ranta (1997) argued that comprehensible input is not the only indicator of effectiveness in language learning because a teacher needs to assess or assist learners' learning achievements, mainly through their observable behavior. Thus, comprehensible output is another factor of language learning success (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Teachers assess learners' language through language production—or output—and always rely on errors or mistakes produced by learners. This is to help the learners reproduce the target forms of the language with the support of corrective feedback (Gitsaki & Althobaiti, 2010). Corrective feedback is referred to as corrected information that is given to the learners by others who have higher proficiency in that aspect (Gitsaki & Althobaiti, 2010). It is evident that teachers often use corrective feedback to increase learners' uptake of the target aspects of the language. Often teachers employ corrective feedback to help learners acquire the target aspects of the language (Gitsaki & Althobaiti, 2010).

Studies have revealed different perceptions from English teachers about the effective types of feedback used with their students (Kennedy, 2010). The preferred feedback techniques vary across classroom settings. Elicitation and repetition are among the most frequently used feedback types the teachers provide to their learners (Kennedy, 2010). These two methods are preferred, according to the study, because the two techniques allow students to self-correct their errors. Additionally, teachers assess student's proficiency level before employing different types of feedback to suit

student's level of proficiency (Yoshida, 2008). For instance, learners can improve their language if teachers provide clear explanations and gave them enough time to process the language forms. From the learners' perspectives, they agreed with the use of these two techniques, which can best improve their language (DeKeyser, 1993; Lin & Hedgcock, 1996; Tsang, 2004; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Yoshida, 2008).

Choosing different types of corrective feedback depends on various factors. For example, de Gortari and Tedick (1998) suggested four factors are involved whenever teachers choose the type of corrective feedback for their students. One of the factors includes context consideration which may influence the provision of corrective feedback to learners. Differences in context consideration might influence the different corrective feedback types provided by the teachers (Sheen, 2004).

The nature of the context where English is taught is unique in terms of characteristics of the classroom and exposure experience. For example, international school classrooms in Thailand consist of students from different cultures, and the students are mostly taught by native speakers of English or competent foreign nationals. The international school classroom provides students opportunities to communicate with their peers and teachers in English. Students in the international school classroom are active and engage in English communication since students and teachers are from different L1s so that they adopt English as a means of communication. In addition, students in the international context possess an adequate level of English competence so they are somehow ready and able to communicate in English. On the contrary, in a typical EFL context, learners are passive, and they prefer to sit silently and listen to their teachers (Kennedy, 2010). The environment of the EFL context is that the native language of the learners is used as a language of communication in the school; whereas, the target language is only used in the subject hours of that target language. In Thai public schools, learners learn English as an EFL. Typical characteristics of good Thai students are ones who keep silent, sit still, and never interrupt while the teacher is speaking. For students, being passive learners was considered a preferable characteristic of the learners in Thailand (Kanoksilapatham, 2014). Moreover, Thai EFL students may have rather low levels of English competence and this thus impedes them from engaging in any conversations where English is used as a means of communication. Based on differences in the nature of the two different contexts, the researchers, therefore, are interested in exploring whether corrective feedback types are provided differently in the two contexts, and the objectives are clearly stated as (1) to investigate the types of corrective feedback given by the teacher and used orally in two different English classrooms, and (2) to identify the frequency of different types of corrective feedback from teachers (i.e., explicit correction, recast, metalinguistic clues, elicitation, repetition, and clarification request) in the two different classrooms. Corresponding research questions are also grounded as (1): Which types of the teachers' corrective feedback are used orally in the two different classrooms? And (2): What are the frequencies of the corrective feedback types orally used in the two different classrooms?

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### A. Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback has a great influence on the way teachers scaffold the learners or the method the learners learn a language. A series of studies conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997) revealed that a number of previous studies exclusively focused on the nature of corrective feedback types used in the English language classrooms (for example, de Gortari & Tedick, 1998). The studies were mostly conducted to answer the questions as proposed by Hendrickson (1978) about corrections provided by the teachers or peers to help learners acquire the target linguistic features. Some studies also went further to investigate the specific types of errors or specific techniques that the teachers or peers scaffolded toward designated learners. Even though these questions have been studied over 20 years especially in L2 classrooms, the answers to these questions have been found to be complicated. Due to these complications, Lyster and Ranta have provided a framework of corrective feedback which consists of six types of corrective feedback, as presented in Table I.

TABLE I
FRAMEWORK OF SIX TYPES OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK (LYSTER AND RANTA, 1997)

| | Teacher corrective feedback | Definition | Example |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Explicit correction | Clearly identifying that the student's utterance was incorrect, the teacher provides the correct utterance. | *Teacher: You mean I didn't practice this song* |
| 2 | Recast | Not identifying that the student's utterance was incorrect, the teacher provides the correct utterance. | Teacher: *He became a doctor.* |
| 3 | Metalinguistic clues | Without providing that the utterance has been wrong, the teacher provides questions or comments relate to the utterance. | *Teacher: Who stopped? Subject of sentence* |
| 4 | Elicitation | The teacher elicits the correct form from the student by asking or pausing to allow learners to correct their utterances. | *Teacher: Who's ready? Two people* |
| 5 | Repetition | The teacher repeats the learner's error and puts in an intonation to get the learner's attention. | *Teacher: It visit (with rising intonation)* |
| 6 | Clarification request | By using questions, the teacher allows learners to realize that their utterance has not been understood and that a correction needs to be made. | *Teacher: What? You are going to work with your friend?* |

Table I illustrates the six types of Corrective feedback which was proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997). The table consists of the types together with definitions and examples of the types of corrective feedback.

*B. Previous Studies*

A number of studies have been done on corrective feedback in second language classrooms. For example, Lyster (1987) investigated learner's uptake or learners' responses to corrective feedback. The learners in the study were students from the immersion program. Their problems were that these learners did not attain native-like productive skills. Their data revealed six types of corrective feedback, including explicit correction, recast, metalinguistic clue, repetition, elicitation and clarification requests. The data revealed two types of uptake. The first category is uptake as utterances that still need some repair. The other is uptake as utterances that were produced as repairs of error and again were repaired by the teacher. Data took the form of a set of in-class audio-records. The findings revealed that about 62% of teachers' responses to students' errors were corrective feedback. Among these, recast and explicit correction were the most frequently used feedback types in the classroom. Interestingly, however, the researchers concluded these two most frequently used feedback types did not help students to generate repairs in the uptake process. One major explanation was that these two types of corrective feedback provided students with a direct form, which only helped students to repeat the correction provided by the teachers.

Even though most studies (e.g., Ammar and Spada, 2006; Ellis, Lowen & Erlam, 2006; Nassaji, 2007; Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009) revealed that recast was found as the most frequently used corrective feedback type in the English classroom, these studies do not affirm that recast was the most effective technique in providing the learners the necessary feedback to achieve mastery in the specific target linguistic aspect. Lyster and Ranta concluded that it is difficult to point out only the most effective feedback types in the language classroom because the effectiveness depends upon (1) context, (2) teacher's awareness of current practices, (3) teacher's employment of diverse corrective feedback techniques, and (4) adequate time allowed for the learners to self-correct (1997).

Contextual difference is the focus of the current study. Previous studies conducted in outside Thailand showed that it is a major key for teachers or peers to select different corrective feedback types for learners. For example, Milla & Mayo (2013) focused their research on the different use of corrective feedback in two different contexts. These contexts included the EFL context and Content and Language Integrated learning approach (CLIL) context. The study was conducted in a secondary school, the classes which were observed were a business class (CLIL context) and English class (EFL context). The teachers who taught both classes were non-native English teachers, and had different perceptions about the use of corrective feedback. The teacher who taught in the business class was a male teacher who preferred to use implicit correction repetition, and recast). Whereas, the female teacher who taught the English class preferred to use explicit correction. The results showed a difference in the use of corrective feedback in different contexts. That is, implicit corrective feedback type was predominant in the CLIL classrooms while a wider range of corrective feedback types were provided in the EFL classrooms. It is thus interesting to explore whether different feedback types were to provide in the different classroom types in Thailand.

III. METHODOLOGY

The present study attempted to investigate the use of teacher's corrective feedback by two teachers from two different contexts. The international context was the classroom in an international school (or so called the immersion

classroom) located in Chiang Mai province. The English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context was the English classroom in a public school located in Chiang Rai province.

*A.  Participants*

Participants of the study were broken up into two groups according to their respective context. The international context comprised one teacher and 6 eleven-graders in one classroom of an international school, while the EFL context comprised one teacher and 25 Matthayom 5 students (comparable to eleventh graders) in an EFL classroom in the Thai public school.

*B.  Research Instruments*

Four instruments were employed in the study. Concerning research ethical issues, all instruments were approved by the institutional research board (IRB) prior to the pilot study and data collection stage. These four instruments included:
   1. Non-Participant Observation Form

The researcher used the non-participant observation form to collect data on the corrective feedback used by teachers in classes. Non-participant observation was chosen in this study as the researcher wanted to avoid making the teachers and students feel uncomfortable in the class. The observation form was used to help the researcher record data in the class, and it also helped the researcher to focus her attention to specific interaction (questions, responses, and corrective feedback) in class. Additionally, the observation helped the researcher record down observations. The form was created by the researcher, and it consisted of parts of the minutes (timings of the class), context of the class, and the frequency of corrective feedback found in the class. Suggestions for language used in the form had been done by a native-speaking teacher. The organization and ethical concerns were reviewed by the experts and the researcher's supervisor. Consent was granted from the teachers of both classrooms before the form was used in the real settings.
   2. Audio recording

The researcher used the audio-recording tool during all observations and interviews. Before conducting the interview, it was very important to ask permission from the teachers about recording in their classes and during the interview. The EFL teacher was informed about the recording when the researcher went to the school and asked whether the researcher could conduct the study. A consent form was provided to the teachers before the data was collected. The recordings were used to record all logs in the classrooms to ensure that the researcher did not miss any important input in the classroom. The recordings also helped in the accuracy of data recording and are used as evidence to prove the findings of the data.
   3. Semi-structured interview

The interview regarding the use of teachers' corrective feedback in the classroom was conducted with the teachers from both classrooms. The semi-structured interview was used as a guideline and a recording instrument. The interview was also to clarify the corrective feedback and verify and summarize what was observed in the observation. The questions were based on the knowledge of corrective feedback of the teacher and their perception about errors used in the classroom. The semi-structured interview was composed of three parts. These parts were broken up into background information, errors found in classrooms, and teacher's impression about the use of corrective feedback.
   4. Feedback categorization form

The feedback differentiation form was design by the researcher after transcribing the audio recording. The form included definitions of each type of corrective feedback. This form helped the researcher record teachers' corrective feedback according to the corrective feedback categories. The researcher used Lyster and Ranta's (1997) framework to indicate the types of corrective feedback.

*C.  Data Collection Procedure*

Two main steps were adopted in the current study: non-participant observation and interviews with the teachers from both classrooms. Both steps are described in the following sections.
   1. Non-participant Observation

The researcher asked the teachers to sign all consent forms to allow the researcher to collect data. Before the data collection, the researcher trained two teachers about corrective feedback. The observation was held four times in both classrooms. However, the observations at both schools were not held during the same period. The international school classroom observation was held first during the four last weeks before the midterm presentation. In the meantime, the EFL classroom observation was held four weeks before the second semester ended. The duration of observation for each time was one hour. When the class observation started, the researcher sat at the back of the class so as not to disturb the class. After the observation of each class, the researcher transcribed the classroom observation by writing it down on pieces of paper. After each classroom observation was transcribed, the researcher categorized the types of corrective feedback found in each classroom.
   2. Interview

A series of semi-structured interviews were done with two teachers from the two different contexts. The researcher started by looking at previous studies about corrective feedback using semi-structured interviews. After that, the researcher created nine interview questions which were based on three factors. The qualifications of the teachers were that they were native English speakers who had over 5 years of teaching experience and had attained either their

bachelor degree or a certificate of education. After the tool was created, the researcher along with a consent form, asked both teachers for permission for an interview.  When the teacher arrived, the researcher briefed the teacher about the information that was going to be asked during the interview. When the interview started, the researcher informed the teacher that if they felt uncomfortable, they should say stop, and the interview would stop immediately. During the interview, the researcher held a notebook to note down important points. After the interview, the researcher transcribed the interview record.

*D. Data Analysis*

Two methods of analysis were used to fulfill two research questions, including (1) content analysis of the transcriptions from classroom observations and interview sessions, and (2) descriptive analysis of the frequency of corrective feedback types used in the two different contexts. The first analytical methods were done with two data sets: classroom observations and interview sessions with the teacher from each respective classroom. Transcriptions from classroom observations were transcribed from the tape recordings that were done in every observation. During the process, the researchers categorized all utterances that were considered as the feedback the teacher provided to learners. After that, all feedback was categorized into the six feedback types in accordance to Lyster and Ryanta's (1997) framework. The frequency was further conducted as in the second process to fulfill the second research questions. The second content analysis was done with interview transcriptions from the interview sessions with the teacher from the two classrooms. As described earlier, data from sessions were mainly about teachers' backgrounds, and their perceptions of the corrective feedback they used in their classrooms.

## IV. RESULTS

The findings in the study are presented following the research questions formulated earlier: (1) Which corrective feedback types were provided by the teachers in the two different classrooms?, and (2): What are the frequencies of each type of teacher's corrective feedback used in the two different classrooms?

To answer research question number 1, data from transcription analyses revealed that both teachers from the two different contexts (i.e., international and EFL classrooms) used all six corrective feedback types (explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic clue, elicitation and repetition). Corrective feedback types and exemplary statements from the two classrooms are provided in Table II.

TABLE II
EXAMPLES OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK FOUND IN BOTH CLASSES

| Type of Corrective Feedback | International School Classroom *(Example Provided)* | EFL Classroom *(Example Provided)* |
|---|---|---|
| Explicit Correction | **Student**: Women used and rejected by men is almost a theme in the novel. (wrong modifier) <br> **Teacher**: Not almost, it is. | **Student**: David likes to lides horses.  (phonological error) <br> **Teacher**: Not lides it's rides. |
| Recast | **Student**: ... develops the understanding to have an equal trade. <br> **Teacher**: of having an equal trade | **Student**: I will wait you.  (wrong tense) <br> **Teacher**: I will wait for you. |
| Clarification Request | **Student**: She is able to preserve the link to the family's forgotten past. <br> **Teacher**: How? | **Student**: There are exhaibition (wrong pronunciation) <br> **Teacher**: What? |
| Metalinguistic Clues | **Student**: Regarded with awe yet Hagar's vanity drive her mad. <br> **Teacher**: Tense? (The correct form is 'drove') | **Student**: Kingkong is a meter tall. <br> **Teacher**: Preposition? (the correct form is 'It is a meter tall.') |
| Elicitation | **Student**: Morrison puts an emphasis on the physically overwhelming hunt. <br> **Teacher**: puts an emphasis on the physically (teacher pauses and uses hand gesture) hunt? <br> Student: demanding hunt. | **Student**: David from Toronto Canada. <br> **Teacher**: David (teacher pauses) verb? (in Thai) from Toronto Canada. |
| Repetition | **Student**: The author is trying to send a message to the audience of the book. <br> **Teacher**: audience? | **Student**: I will call you next day. <br> **Teacher**: Next day? |

Research question number 2 asked about the frequencies of the types of feedback provided by the teachers in the two different classrooms. Data revealed that the percentage of the feedback types provided by the teachers from two different classrooms were different, as presented in Table III and IV for the international school classroom and the EFL classroom, respectively.

TABLE III
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK OCCURRENCE IN THE INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL CLASSROOM (N=236)

| Types of Corrective Feedback | Frequency of Corrective Feedback Type | Percentage of Corrective Feedback occurrence in the international school classroom |
|---|---|---|
| Explicit Correction | 29 | 12.29% |
| Recast | 40 | 16.95% |
| Metalinguistic Clues | 61 | 25.84% |
| Elicitation | 53 | 22.46% |
| Repetition | 23 | 9.75% |
| Clarification Request | 30 | 12.71% |

Table III illustrates the frequency of different types of corrective feedback found in the international school classroom. Data collected from four classroom observations revealed the total frequency of 236 instances of corrective feedback provided by the teacher in the classroom. Among these, the most frequent feedback type provided by the teacher was metalinguistic clues ($N= 61$, or 25.84%), followed by elicitation ($N= 53$, or 22.46%) and recasting ($N= 40$, or 16.95%). Repetition and explicit correction were the least common feedback types provided by the teacher, accounting for 12.29% and 9.75% respectively.

Table IV illustrates the frequency of different types of corrective feedback found in the EFL classroom. Data collected from four classroom observations revealed the total frequency of 57 instances of corrective feedback provided by the teacher in the EFL classroom. Among all six feedback types provided by the teacher, recasting was the most frequently used feedback type in the EFL classroom ($N=29$, or 50.88%), followed by explicit correction ($N=10$, or 17.54%), and clarification request ($N=9$, or 15.79%). From the observations, recasting was provided when students provided incorrect answers during practices. It was provided immediately once the teacher noticed the mistake made by students. Metalinguistic clues and elicitation were among the least common types of feedback for the teacher, with a total number of 2 times (or 3.51%) for each type during the four observations.

TABLE IV
PERCENTAGE OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK OCCURRENCE IN THE EFL CLASSROOM (N=57)

| Types of Corrective Feedback | Frequency of Corrective Feedback Type | Percentage of Corrective Feedback occurrence in the EFL classroom |
|---|---|---|
| Explicit Correction | 10 | 17.54% |
| Recast | 29 | 50.88% |
| Clarification Request | 9 | 15.79% |
| Metalinguistic Clues | 2 | 3.51% |
| Elicitation | 2 | 3.51% |
| Repetition | 5 | 8.78% |

After the first lessons of each classroom were observed the researcher conducted a semi-structured interview with the teachers. Eight questions were asked of both teachers. After the interview the researcher transcribed the recorded interview.

The first question that was asked of both teachers was about their background. The EFL teacher completed her bachelor degree in English from a higher education institution and completed her master's degree in Law in Thailand. The international teacher completed her bachelor degree in English literature in England and completed a General Course of Education (GCE) course in Education. The next question was about their working experience. The EFL teacher had taught English for 11 years whereas the international teacher has taught English and English literature for 18 years. Both teachers rated their teaching proficiency as 8 out of 10, indicating a high competence. When the teachers were asked about corrective feedback they were both not sure about the term. The EFL teacher reported that when she thought of corrective feedback she thought of giving feedback to her students about their grammatical skills. Whereas the international teacher thought of corrective feedback as being an interesting term, but she was only aware of feedback not corrective feedback.

V. DISCUSSION

The discussion will now be provided following the research questions. Regarding the first research question of whether all six corrective feedback types were used in the two classrooms, the findings revealed that all six corrective

feedback types were provided by the teachers in both classrooms. To find that all six corrective feedback types were provided in both contexts was in line with the findings of corrective feedback types used in the language classroom in the previous studies. For example, Lyster and Ranta's (1997) investigation of 18 hours of classroom observation and recording reported six corrective feedback types the teacher provided to the students. Moreover, Milla and Mayo's study (2013), which examined corrective feedback used in different classrooms (i.e., CLIL classroom and EFL context classroom), revealed the six different types of corrective feedback used in both classrooms. These studies support the claim that teachers tend to employ a variety of corrective feedback types for their students that suit students' mistakes in their language lessons.

In contrast to the two previous studies, Sheen (2004) reported different findings from the current study. Sheen compared four different classroom contexts and revealed seven types of corrective feedback that were used frequently in all classrooms. The corrective feedback types included explicit correction, recasting, clarification, metalinguistic clues, elicitation, repetition, and translation. The translation type of corrective feedback was also referred to as multiple feedback (Sheen, 2004). Thus, according to Sheen, the translation corrective feedback type was employed when the teacher combined different feedback types to the learners.

In addition, the findings from the current study have also revealed that various types of corrective feedback are used by teachers in their English language, and English literature classrooms. It is evident that for effective corrective feedback it is essential for teachers to vary their use of types of corrective feedback in their classes, not only according to the preferences and learning styles of the students, but also the preferences and teaching styles of the teachers. The international teacher claimed that it was important to vary the types of corrective feedback in the classes because students would get bored easily if the teacher stayed with the same type of corrective feedback. The importance of varying types of corrective feedback was supported by de Gortari and Tedick (1998). One of their suggestions for teachers to choose how to use corrective feedback in classrooms is varying the type of corrective feedback because employing a variety of feedback types may suit learners' different preferences. Although the findings from Sheen's study are somewhat different from the current study, it still suggests that in language classrooms, teachers always provide their students with various corrective feedback types. The main objective in providing these different corrective feedback types was the teacher's evaluation of student's mistakes, and their needs for the feedback. Therefore, it can be concluded that offering corrective feedback is a typical action of teachers in language classrooms. Moreover, whether the teachers were aware of the different characteristics of different types of the corrective feedback or not, they still employed different sets of feedback to improve students' target linguistic aspects of the language.

To answer the second research question, the researcher counted the frequency of each feedback type from transcriptions recorded from classroom observations. The findings revealed that the teacher in the EFL classroom used corrective feedback altogether only 57 times. Recast was the most frequently used corrective feedback type in the EFL classroom, followed by explicit correction, clarification request, repetition and metalinguistic clues. The findings from the EFL classroom were in line with the study done by Sheen (2004). Sheen looked at four instructional settings where corrective feedback was employed. Three settings were data from other studies whereas one of the data sets was her own. All the four settings revealed different types of corrective feedback used. These corrective feedback types consisted of explicit correction, recasting, clarification requests, metalinguistic clues, repetition, and translation. However, according to Sheen, recasting was found as the most frequently used feedback type in the two settings: ESL classes (French immersion) and the ESL classroom in Korea.

In the present study recast was the most frequently used feedback type in the EFL classroom setting. The findings were in line with those of Sheen's study (2004). The reason that teachers preferred to use recast in class was due to limited class time (Yoshida, 2008). In a rather short period of time in the classroom, students were not required to correct the utterance, so the lesson could continue without interruption. Another reason that teachers preferred recasts was due to students' low proficiency. Kennedy (2010) claimed that students with lower proficiency levels did not have enough knowledge to correct their own errors. This was because recasts do not require students to correct their utterances. However, the other types of corrective feedback such as metalinguistic clues, elicitation, and clarification require sufficient knowledge of the language. Therefore, they suit students of a higher proficiency level. Yoshida (2008) has claimed that teachers preferred recasts because they were afraid that students with low proficiency will not be able to self-correct their utterance.

Regarding international school classroom context, a total number of 236 instances of corrective feedback from four classroom observations were found. The most frequently used feedback type was metalinguistic clues, whereas repetitions were used least. These findings differed from those of Milla and Mayo's (2013), which compared Content and Language Integrated learning approach (CLIL) and EFL classrooms. Their study revealed that explicit correction was the most frequently used feedback type in the CLIL. The findings differed from the present study in that the explicit correction was one of the least frequently used corrective feedback type in the international school classroom of the current study.

The findings from the international school classroom revealed that the most frequently used of corrective feedback types were metalinguistic clues and elicitation. These findings can be interpreted as teachers believing that students with higher English proficiency are able to repair their own errors. Whenever the teacher judged that the student may have sufficient linguistic resources and is capable of using clues provided by the teacher as a source for the repair, the teacher

tended to provide implicit corrective feedback types such as metalinguistic clues or clarification requests. The techniques could be done with help from the teachers providing prompts. This was supported from the interview of the international teacher who claimed that the students had high English proficiency levels; therefore, she did not focus on correcting their errors, or local mistakes, but mainly on providing clues, or asking the students to clarify what they want to talk about, so the students achieved the target communicative goal, with the repair of their linguistic mistakes.

## VI. TEACHING IMPLICATIONS

The study does not only provide information about teachers' corrective feedback but also helps create awareness about the use of different types of corrective feedback. From the observation and interview it was seen that teachers used corrective feedback without being aware of the definition of corrective feedback. During the interview sessions, both teachers claimed not to know about the definition of corrective feedback. However, from the observation it was evident that the teachers always provided different types of corrective feedback to their students. Thus, it implies there is a need for teacher training on the use of corrective feedback in the classroom. It would be better if teachers provided corrective feedback types with an idea of what, when, and how. Regarding the what, teachers need to know that different corrective feedback types serve different purposes of mistake correction. For example, if the focus of correction is on grammatical mistakes, then explicit corrective feedback type such as explicit correction is the appropriate one. In contrast, if the teacher knows that the students are competent, to provide metalinguistic clues would be adequate for such learners. Awareness of when and how should be taken into consideration as well. When the teacher is fully aware of the objective of a particular lesson, whether on the grammatical mistakes, or the holistic communicative function, the teacher would provide the appropriate corrective feedback types at the appropriate time and in the appropriate manner that does not interrupt a student's flow of thought. During the teacher training process, therefore, sessions devoted to the provision of corrective feedback should be provided. To reiterate, the training should include the definition of corrective feedback, emphasis of the importance of corrective feedback, different types of corrective feedback, the purposes of the types of corrective feedback, and the benefits of using each type of corrective feedback in language classrooms.

## VII. LIMITATIONS

Although the study achieved all of its objectives, there were two limitations of this study. The first limitation of the study was the number of classroom observations, and the time when the observations were held during the semester of the school. Four classroom observations were done in the EFL classroom during the four weeks before the semester end. For the international school classroom, the four observations were done before the midterm exam. Therefore, the readers must exercise caution in interpreting the findings of the frequency of corrective feedback provided by the teachers from the two classrooms. The higher frequency of corrective feedback provided by international school teachers may be related to the looming examination period so that all topics or contents were fully covered. The teacher might assume that students may, at times, review all linguistic aspects in the content. Therefore, implicit corrective feedback types were provided because the students were able to retrieve their memory about specific linguistic aspects of the language. In contrast, instruction and learning in the EFL classroom were not already completed. Thus, the teacher still needed to provide some target linguistic aspects to the students. With such objectives, it was almost impossible for the teacher not to provide explicit corrective feedback types to their students.

Another limitation of the study was that the study did not prolong its observation span to assess whether the students were able to repair their language after receiving the corrective feedback provided by their teachers. It is important to assess student self-correction after corrective feedback is given. If the students do self-correction successfully after the corrective feedback was given, it would imply that corrective feedback is an effective method for successful language learning.

## VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering the limitations of the present study, three recommendations were proposed for future studies of corrective feedback in a language classroom. A long-term time span of observation, student's self-repairing after feedback sessions, and student's perceptions about all types of corrective feedback found in language classrooms are recommended for richer information on the corrective feedback in a second/foreign language classroom. These recommendations would lead future studies to promote the use of corrective feedback in language classrooms. These studies would also suggest language teachers to provide different types of corrective feedback effectively in language classrooms, so the learners would achieve their potential as an effective learner and user of the target language.

## IX. CONCLUSION

The main objectives of the current study were to investigate and compare types of corrective feedback provided by teachers in two different classrooms (international school and EFL). Participants included two teachers (one from each classroom) and 31 eleventh graders (25 from the EFL classroom and 6 from the international school classroom). Data

was collected by classroom observations and tape-recording, and interview sessions with the teacher. Classroom, recordings, and interview records were content analyzed and categorized into six different corrective feedback types following Lyster and Ranta's framework. The findings revealed that all six corrective feedback types were used in both classrooms but in different numbers and proportions. That is to say, the teacher in the EFL classroom provided less corrective feedback ($N$=57), as compared to that in the international school classroom ($N$=246). In addition, recasting was the most frequently used feedback type in the EFL classroom, while metalinguistic clues ranked first in the data set of the international school classroom. Data from the interview sessions with teachers from the two classrooms revealed that teachers reflected their lack of awareness in the use of corrective feedback in the classrooms. They evaluated the mistake and anticipated their student's level of proficiency before providing corrective feedback. This leads to the recommendation of the study that a session of how to provide different types of corrective feedback should be provided in any teacher training sessions because corrective feedback is essential for teachers to scaffold students in the language learning process.

REFERENCES

[1] Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(4), 543-574.
[2] Bruner, R, W. (1979). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*(2), 89-100.
[3] Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talk: The importance of the f-move. *ELT Journal, 56*(2), 117-127.
[4] Davies, M. (2011). Increasing students' L2 usage: An analysis of teacher talk time and student talk time. (Unpublished Master thesis) University of Birmingham.
[5] DeKeyser, R. (1993). The effect of error correction L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. *Modern Language Journal*, *77*, 501-514.
[6] 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.
[7] Gass, S. (1997). Input, interaction and the second language learner. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
[8] Gitsaki, C. & Althobaiti, N. (2010). EFL teachers' use of corrective feedback and its effect on learners' uptake. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 7*(1), 197-219.
[9] de Gortari, B. & Tedick, D. (1998). Research on error correction and implications for classroom teaching. London, UK: *The Bridge: From research to practice*.
[10] Hattie, J. & Timperley. H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77, 81-112.
[11] Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern Language Journal*, *62*, 387-398.
[12] Kanoksilapatham, B. (2014). Thai elementary school teachers' English pronunciation and effects of teacher variables: Professional development. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (TESL-EJ), 18,* (1), 1-13.
[13] Khaemanee, T. (1999). The teaching and learning by using learner-centered CIPPA model. *Journal of education*, *3*, 57-59.
[14] Kennedy, S. (2010). Corrective feedback for learners of varied proficiency levels: A teacher's choices. *TESL CANADA Journal*, *27*(2), 31-50.
[15] Krashen, S. (1994) The input hypothesis and its rivals. In Ellis, N. (Ed.) *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*, pp. 45-77. London: Academic Press.
[16] Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J. M. (2005). The nativeness factor: An analysis of students' preferences. *ITL International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *148*, 21–43.
[17] Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (2006). How Languages Are Learned (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[18] Lin, Y., & Hedgcock, J. (1996). Negative feedback incorporation among high-proficiency and low-proficiency Chinese-speaking learners of Spanish. *Language Learning, 46,* 567-611.
[19] Liu, F., & Maitlis, S. (2010). Nonparticipant observation encyclopedia of case study research. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
[20] Long, M. H. (1981). Questions in foreigner talk discourse. *Language Learning, 31*, (1), 135-57.
[21] Lyster, R. (1987). Speaking immersion. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *43*(4), 701-17.
[22] Lyster, R., & Izquierdo, J. (2009). Prompts versus recasts in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning*, *59*(2), 453-498.
[23] Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*, 37-66.
[24] Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction and second language development: an empirical study of question formation in ESL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *21(*4), 557-587.
[25] Milla, R. & Mayo, M. (2013). Corrective feedback episodes in oral interaction: A comparison of a CLIL and an EFL classroom. *International Journal of English Studies*, 14(1), 1-20.
[26] Nassaji, H. (2007). Elicitation and reformulation and their relationship with learner repair in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning*, *57*(4), 511-548.
[27] National Institute of Educational Testing Service. (2017). Basic Education Achievement Report. https://krunumchai.files.wordpress.com/2015/02/e0b89ce0b8a5onete0b8a1-3e0b89be0b8b52556.pdf (accessed 12/10/2017).
[28] National Institute of Educational Testing Service. (2017). Summary of Ordinary Test Result for Basic Education of Grade 12 Students, academic year 2016. https://newonetresult.niets.or.th (accessed 12/10/2017).
[29] Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *36*, 573-595.
[30] Piaget, J. (1964). Biology and knowledge. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
[31] Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes and

outcomes? *Language Learning, 44*:493-527

[32]    Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2002). Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics. Harlow: Longman.

[33]    Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research, 8*, 263-300.

[34]    Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, R/M. (1975). Towards an analysis of discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[35]    Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

[36]    Tsang, W. (2004). Feedback and uptake in teacher-student interaction: An analysis of 18 English lessons in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, *35*, 187-209.

[37]    van Lier, L. (2004). The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective. Boston: Kluwer Academic.

[38]    Wengraf, T. (2001). Qualitative research interviewing: biographic narrative and semi-structured method. London: Sage Publications

[39]    Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[40]    Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, *17*, 78-94.

[41]    Yang, Y. (2016). Feedback and uptake in Chinese EFL classrooms: In search of instructional variables. *The Journal of ASIA TEFL, 6*(4), 1-22.

**Julia Simhony** (first author) received her MA in Applied Linguistics from Mahidol University in Thailand. Her research interests include corrective feedback, teaching English in an international context, and promoting verbal fluency for foreign language learners.


**Natthapong Chanyoo** (corresponding author) is a lecturer of the graduate program in Applied Linguistics at the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Mahidol University. He received a PhD in instruction and learning, with concentrations on English Communications Education and Applied Linguistics from the University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA. His research interests include applied linguistics, language and mind, TEFL, and systemic functional linguistics. He may be reached at natthapong[dot]cha[at]mahidol.edu.