



ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
POST GRADUATE PROGRAME

English Language Teachers' Feedback on Students' Oral Activities: Goh
and Gorker Secondary Schools in Focus

Submitted to: Department of English

An MA Thesis

By: TAGU ANKALA

Supervisor: Yeshitla Habtemariam (PhD)

September 2010E.C

ADAMA ETHIOPIA

ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
POST GRADUATE PROGRAME

English Language Teachers' Feedback on Students' Oral Activities: Goh
and Gorker Secondary Schools in Focus

Submitted to: Department of English

An MA Thesis

By: TAGU ANKALA

Supervisor: Yeshitla Habtemariam (PhD)

September 2010E.C

ADAMA ETHIOPIA

DECLARATION

I, the under signed, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented in any other University.

NAME: TAGU ANKALA _____

PLACE: ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT, ASTU

DATE OF SUBMISSION: _____

Acknowledgements

It is difficult to list all those people and institution that have helped me in accomplishing my thesis, but the following deserve my gratitude. First and foremost I would like to thank my advisor Yeshitla Habtemariam (PhD) for providing me with the required materials, offering helpful and constrictive comments, guiding and encouraging me in all moments since the research proposal preparation.

I would also like to give my thanks to the colleague teacher participants for being helpful by taking part in the study. Moreover, I wish to show my heartfelt appreciation to my parents for their moral and material support during the entire work.

I extend my high regard to Ato Paulose Worku who is my Director in Gorker secondary school for his encouragement and generous help in facilitating the school community for this research and lending me personal computer, and guidance.

Finally, I would never overlook to thank my friends Teneja Kidane, Shemene, Brahanu Sumi, and Kefeyalew for lending me their own laptop to write research, providing me with constructive comments and sharing me their experience.

II

Table of Contents

Content	Page
Declaration.....	I
Acknowledgement	II
Table of contents	III
List of Table	IV
Terminology	V
Abstract	VI
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.3. Objectives of the Study.....	4
1.3.1. General Objective.....	4
1.3.2. Specific Objectives.....	4
1.4. The Research Question.....	4
1.5. Significance of the Study.....	5
1.6. Delimitation of the Study.....	5
1.7. Limitation of the study	6
Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature.....	6
2.1 Definition of Key Terms	6
2.1.1 Error	6
2.1.2 Corrective Feedback.....	8
2.1.3 Students Uptake	10
2.2. Theories of SLA and the Role of Corrective Feedback.....	11

III

2.3. Types of Oral Corrective Feedback with Examples	12
2.4. Types of Students Uptake.....	13
2.5. Historical Perspective of Error Correction	14
2.6. The Role of Oral Corrective Feedback	16
2.7. Previous Research of Corrective Feedback	16
2.8. Two more Recent Observational Studies	18
Chapter Three: Research Methodology.....	20
3.1. Research Design.....	20
3.2. Research Site	20
3.3. Population and Sampling.....	21
3.4. Instruments of Data Collection.....	21
3.4.1. Questionnaire	21
3.4.2. Interview	22
3.4.3. Observation.....	22
3.5. Procedures of Data Collection.....	23
3.6. Procedures of Data Analysis.....	23
Chapter Four: Presentations of Findings, Results and Discussion.....	25
4.1 Data presentation and analysis.....	25
4.1.1 Results of Teachers response for questionnaires.....	29
4.1.2 Results of teachers Interview	31
4.1.3 Result from observations.....	33
5. Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.....	38
5.1 Introduction.....	38
5.2 Summary of Major Finding.....	38

5.2.1 The Frequency of Various type of Oral Corrective Feedback	38
5.2.2 Students Uptake for Various type of Oral Corrective Feedback	38
5.2.3 The Challenges Teachers Encountered in Implementation OCF.....	39
5.3 Conclusion of the Study.....	39
5.4 Recommendations of the Study.....	40
5.5 Suggested Area for Further Research	41
Appendices	43
Appendix A	43
Appendix B	47
Appendix C	48
Bibliography	49

List of Tables

Tables	Page
1. Teachers response regarding oral corrective feedback	I
2. Distribution of feedback type and focus.....	II
3. Distribution of student's uptake for different type of oral corrective feedback.....	III
4. Teachers response regarding challenges.....	VI
5. Teachers obstacles affect implementation of oral corrective feedback.....	V
6. Type of oral corrective feedback teachers used repeatedly	VI
7. Teachers check students understanding after presenting OCF.....	VII
8. Teachers response for students uptake	VIII
9. Results of Classroom Observations	IV

Abbreviations and Acronyms

EFL: English as Foreign Language

OCF: Oral Corrective Feedback

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

TR: Teachers response

TN: Total Number of teachers

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine oral corrective feedback strategy employed by nine teachers in two secondary school in South Omo zone south Ari woreda Goh and Gorker secondary schools. Analysis and discussion were based on the data collected from questionnaires, interviews and observation. The focus of the study was to identify which type of oral corrective feedback frequently teachers employ, how students uptake and what are the challenges in implementing oral corrective feedback. The questionnaire was administered to all the nine teachers of the two secondary schools. The descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentages were used to analyze the data quantitatively. On the other hand, the data gathered through both observations and interviews were analyzed by using descriptive survey method of data analysis.

The results of the analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data revealed that recast type of oral corrective feedback was the least preferred type used to correct both grammar and pronunciation errors while repetition type of oral corrective feedback was the most common for both grammar and pronunciation type of error. Repetition also seems to lead to successful uptake with two self- and two peer-corrections. The teacher repeated students' utterances without changing anything but by emphasizing on the error.

The remaining discovery was challenges that participant encounter when implementing oral corrective feedback: These are lack of sufficient information and training to implement various type of oral corrective feedback. In addition to this, poor English language background of teachers and students minimize their participation in providing oral corrective feedback target language.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) has developed and registered various achievements in recent years in countries around the world, including Ethiopia. As opposed to the previous other approaches such as grammar-translation, audio-lingual, natural approach and total physical response, communicative language teaching and learning approaches have dominated in the field of English language teaching at different times. Currently, in the international area, communicative language teaching has been widely used for language teaching purpose since the late 1990s to the present was given by (Richards, 2006). However, in Ethiopia, the traditional approach (grammar translation) to classroom teaching still seems the dominant approach practiced by most of English language teachers. In this approach, teachers are the dominant actors who spend much of their time lecturing grammar. Due to this, the learners spend most of their time memorizing structured grammatical rules provided by the teacher and which do not motivate learners for real life communications. Tesfaye (2008) claims that the traditional language teaching approach is the dominant approach that made language teachers dominant by talking much time in the classroom in which their major attention is mainly to let learners master certain pronunciations and grammatical patterns in highly structured and controlled ways.

In order to set a theoretical framework for the study, a definition of “error” should be made. There are many definitions of error made so far and there seems to be no consensus on a single definition. Researchers like Allwright and Bailey (1996) have rightly become aware of the importance of speaking context, the intention of the teacher and student and the prior learning of the students in the process of deciding what an error is. Therefore, researchers dealing with error treatment have chosen the definition applying to their own research context. For this study, an oral error is broadly defined as a form unwanted by the teacher in the given teaching/learning context (Mosbah, 2007). Also, the term “corrective feedback” needs to be defined. It is the teacher reaction that transforms, disapproves or demands improvement of the learner utterance (Chaudron, 1977). Another term in need of clarification is “uptake” that refers to different types of student responses following the feedback, including responses with correct of the non-target items as well as utterances still in need of correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1998). The correction may

come from the student, a peer or the teacher. After some key definitions, the issue of oral error correction should be approached from a historical perspective to see the progress made so far. Traditionally, when the audio-lingual approach to teaching foreign languages was popular among English teaching professionals, errors were seen as something to be avoided. However, today the contemporary research seems to agree on the fact that rather than expecting students to produce error-free sentences, students were encouraged to communicate in the target language and making errors is a natural part of second language acquisition.

The model proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1998) were used for this study. As they suggest that their research on teacher feedback and student uptake does not yield conclusive results related to language, more research in different settings is believed to bring more insights into the issue of spoken error correction. As language learning input comes mainly from teachers, teaching materials and students in EFL contexts, such studies will help practicing teachers realize their correction behaviors in the classroom and shape the way they approach to spoken error correction. In their study that was conducted in an ESL setting, they made a categorization of error, feedback, and uptake to investigate the relationship between error types and types of feedback, and learner uptake. They focused on phonological, and grammatical came up with a model of corrective feedback types such as recasts, explicit correction, elicitation, clarification, repetition of error, and met linguistic feedback. Another focus of their study was on uptake that can be grouped as “self-” or “peer-correction” and “teacher-correction”.

According to Ancker (2000) shows that a mistake is a performance error that is either a random guess or a slip it is a failure to utilize a word correctly, and an error is a noticeable deviation from the language of a native speaker. J. Edge (1989) classified mistakes into three types: slips, errors and attempts. “Slips” are mistakes that students can correct themselves; “errors” are mistakes which students cannot correct themselves; “attempts” are student’s intentions of using the language without knowing the right way. In this research, either the most common linguistic term “error” or the students’ preferred term “mistake” will be used interchangeably.

This study was proposed to explore the OCF teaching strategies. Specifically, these are identifying how much attention is given to them in the classroom, seeing if the six types of oral corrective feedback strategies such as, repetition, recast, metalinguistic clu, clarification

request, elicitation and explicit are effectively implemented, and which of them are often used. Therefore, this study can be a spring board to explore how OCF is delivered particularly in grade nine. The study also focuses on students' performance in relation to speaking knowledge, uptake about OCF and attempts to find out factors affecting the implementation of OCF. And this study rather differs from the studies mentioned above in that OCF learning strategies have been researched more than teaching strategies even if researchers pointed out problems such as: lack of attention given to OCF, lack of awareness about various type of OCF and learning linked not only to learning OCF strategies but also OCF teaching strategies.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

As Hendrickson (1978) clearly states, offering oral corrective feedback in schools have several drawbacks. These are lack of attention given to oral corrective feedback and teachers less awareness regard to how oral errors should be corrected and who should do the correction. Regarding the effectiveness of the oral corrective feedback used in secondary schools, Thorndike (1913) pointed out that positive feedback was considered positive reinforcement and negative feedback was considered punishment and both reinforcement and punishment affect learning. More recent studies look at what make some feedback effective and others not effective (Bangert, Drowns, Kulik and Morgan, 1991 and Butler and Winne, 1995) these scholars said that, effective oral corrective feedback should be as specific as possible, given in timely manner, address the learner's advancement towards, involve learners in the process, present feedback carefully and feedback focused on the task not on the learner.

With regard to the use of oral corrective feedback long (1991) point out that, the benefit of oral corrective feedback are drawing students' attention. Through feedback, the teachers indicate there has been a problem with a message and the learners attention is drown to the erroneous form. On the other hand Krashen (19 82), Truscott (1999), Russel (2009), Ellis (2009) Seen (2010), and Ellis (2011) says that, oral corrective feedback have a number of shortcoming. It makes students feeling of inferiority, anger, inhibition, embarrassments and defensive when it offered ineffectively.

It is believed that the purpose of teaching English language in Ethiopia is to make the learners communicate with the language in real life situations and develop their linguistic competencies. As Seid (2012:83) clearly states, the aim of teaching English language is to enable learners to master the basic language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing, vocabulary, and grammar meaningfully for real life communications.

However, as the researcher has experienced for the last ten years as English language teacher, most of EFL teachers in our context are still observed failing to implement OCF strategies in their classroom. Instead most of their teaching practice in EFL classroom is teacher-centered and teacher-directed instruction that does not provide much opportunity for learners to use the language for real purpose communications. Learners are required to listen to the teachers presentation passively and encouraged to memorize grammar rules and vocabularies. Teachers mostly tend to give attention to contents that appear in national examinations, and this practice will have a negative wash-back effect on students' learning.

As a result, learner sat various levels have difficulties in using the four language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing for real life communication with their peers and group mates, even though, English language has been taught as a subject from primary to university levels. To address this difficulty pragmatically, it seems necessary to introduce various type of OCF in our EFL classes effectively.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective of the study

This study mainly focused on assessing grade nine English language teachers' implementation of various type of oral corrective feedback, implementation of OCF challenges and students uptake in language teaching and learning of grade nine students of Goh and Gorker high school.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives this study is to:

- examine the type of oral corrective feedback teachers frequently use

- investigate how English language teachers provide oral corrective feedback to their students
- examine student's way of uptake for oral corrective feedback
- to identify the challenges in implementing oral feedback in English classes of the target school

1.4 Research Questions

- How do teachers provide oral feedback to their students?
- Which type of oral corrective feedback are teachers utilizing frequently?
- What type of learner errors do teachers focus on during their oral feedback?
- How do learners react during teachers' oral feedback?
- What are the challenges that EFL teachers face during implementation of oral feedback?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The finding of this study would help in creating awareness of teachers and school administrations in relation to the implementation of various type oral corrective feedback, students' uptake and challenges of giving oral corrective feedback in improving learners' English language ability. Thus, the researcher desires to examine EFL teachers' oral corrective feedback at Goh and Gorker secondary School.

Moreover, it also helps interested researchers to use it as one source of information when they want to conduct further study in related area that this researcher fails to cover. Furthermore, the findings of this study will suggest some realistic and appropriate procedures and guidelines that will help EFL teachers in implementing OCF.

Generally, this study will inform the educational officers and institutes to analyze and evaluate the pedagogical importance OCF in relation to the subject of the study.

1.6 Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited both in the study area and depth of the study issues. Therefore, this study delimited to Goh and Gorker Secondary School, which is found in the Southern Nation and Nationality People Region South Omo zone South Ari Wereda . On the other hand, the study delimited to only investigating grade nine English language teachers' effective implementation of oral corrective feedback, students uptake and challenges in implementing oral corrective feedback.

1.7 Limitations

The researcher has faced several limitations such as, absence of internet and electric city are the dominate one due to these the researcher has got less amount of data to conduct the research. In addition to this, South Omo Zone found about 1000 Km away from Adama University so that the researcher faced financial problem to come and contact with advisor. Moreover, South Omo Zone is very hot and 60% peoples are nomad and sometimes even they are fighting each other. Generally, south Omo Zone because of the problem that I have mentioned and others it is very difficult to conduct research in South Omo Zone.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. The Definition of Key Terms

Key terminologies used in error treatment in second and foreign language research are fairly diverse. The terms error, corrective feedback and student uptake may carry slightly different meanings depending on the researcher using them. Also, there are various terms used to refer the same kind of phenomena. Thus, it is important to clarify the content of these concepts.

2.1.1 Error, A learner error is inevitably the starting point for the study of corrective feedback. It may seem as a simple term to define but in linguistic terms the concept is more complex than it seems on the surface. Indeed, researchers define error differently depending on their theoretical position. In a broad sense, errors can be seen as foreign language learners' ignorance of the target language (James, 1998) but clearly a more specific definition is needed. As stated by Allwright and Bailey (1991) an error is typically defined as a deviation from the norms of the target language. It is, however, pointed out that this kind of a definition is dubious due to the vague meaning of the term norms. English is a language with a wide range of varieties and it is difficult to determine which of these is to be used as the norm. Also, when speaking of a 'native speaker norm', in many EFL contexts, like in Finland, the teacher is not a native speaker and the language learners are exposed to may differ from the native speaker norm. Since the current study looks at errors committed in the language classroom and the teacher is the one making judgments about them, it is important to include this aspect into the definition.

The learners' ignorance of the target language can manifest itself in different ways. The conception of correctness (or erroneousness) of an utterance is determined by on one hand on its grammaticality and on the other by its acceptability (James, 1998). Grammaticality is an objective and context-free notion and is comparable to 'well- formedness'. Thus, it does not only refer to syntactic, but also to semantic and phonological aspects of speech. Acceptability has to do with the practical side of communication. It does not refer to rules of grammar but to situational and linguistic contexts. The two concepts, however, do not rule each other out. There

are situations when an utterance can be grammatically correct but not acceptable (e.g. collocations). In contrast, an utterance can be grammatically ill-formed but still acceptable (e.g. spoken language). It is often the case that it is native speakers who get to decide.

Following the idea of Chomsky (1965) grammaticality is an aspect of language competence whereas acceptability relates to language performance. Corder (1967) uses the distinction competence/performance in relation to the differences in the concepts of error and mistake. Errors refer to patterns in the learner's production which consistently differ from the target language and thereby reveal the learner's underlying competence. Mistakes are performance errors, such as memory lapses and slips of the tongue. James (1998) views this distinction more from learners' perspective and considers them in terms of their ability to detect and correct the deviances in speech. He divides deviances into slips, mistakes and errors. A slip of the tongue is quickly noticed by its author and can be self-corrected without outside help. A mistake can be corrected by its producer if it is pointed out to him/her. A simple signal that an error occurred may be enough or the learner may need some further information about the nature or location of the deviance. An error cannot be self-corrected by the learner unless he/she is provided with relevant information about the error and its cause, which can change the learner's own underlying grammar. In other words, some further learning is required.

In practice it is often not possible to observe the distinction between errors and mistakes (Corder, 1967). Also, bearing in mind that the focus of the current research is on teacher feedback provided on errors, it is not of primary importance to understand the reasons behind errors. What is needed is a definition of error suitable for the method and data of the present study. Consequently, the definition of error employed is the following:

(1) An objective evaluation of linguistic or content errors according to linguistic norms or evident misconstrue of fact, and (2) any additional linguistic or other behavior that the teachers reacted to negatively or with an indication that improvement of the response was expected (Chaudron, 1986). This definition covers errors in form and content, grammaticality and acceptability, and also takes into account the teacher's perspective and right to make judgments of error in the classroom. The second key term related to oral feedback has been treated below.

2.1.2 Corrective Feedback, the terms used in the treatment of error are various in the SLA literature. The term treatment of error (or error treatment) itself is a very general term and has been frequently used in earlier studies (Fanselow, 1977). It simply means “any teacher behavior following an error that minimally attempts to inform the learner of the fact of error” (Chaudron 1988: 150). Another generally used concept is error correction. As Chaudron (1977: 31) in an earlier study points out, a correction can actually have many meanings. Firstly, it can merely be any reaction of the teacher to a learner error. Secondly, a “successful correction” occurs when the teacher elicits a corrected response from the student after an erroneous utterance. Finally, a “true” correction could be thought of as a change in the learner’s interlanguage, i.e. with the help of the correction the learner would actually learn the language item under discussion. Error correction is thus by some researchers considered a loaded term because it suggests that the teacher’s feedback on learner error has had the desired intention of changing the learner’s interlanguage grammar (Long, 2007). It has, however, become to be used often in the field of SLA too, carrying the same meaning.

Corrective feedback is a type of negative evidence and it is a term commonly used in research of classroom interaction and SLA. It means “any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect”(Lightbown and Spada 1999: 171). It is often used interchangeably with all of the terms mentioned above. However, unlike the concept of error correction, this term does not carry an implication for the actual learning process in its meaning. Neither does it suggest as strong teacher dominance. Feedback on an error is more open to interaction and learner response. It encourages negotiation in error treatment (Lyster and Ranta 1997: 42). Lately a more internationally oriented term interactional feedback has been used in place of or interchangeably with corrective feedback. As mentioned in Lyster and Mori (2006), this term reflects the teachers’ ability to use feedback moves in a way that keeps up the flow of communication in the classroom. It also entails an observation that not all negative feedback is perceived as corrective by students.

At this point it is worthwhile explaining the distinction between two functions of negotiation in language classrooms: conversational and didactic. The first one involves negotiation of meaning

which stands for a process of interaction in case of a communication breakdown in which the speaker and the listener(s) work together to reach a mutual understanding of the message (Pica 1992, as quoted by Ellis et al. 2001). The didactic function involves negotiation of form, which is an activity in which the listener understands the message but signals that there is a linguistic problem and encourages the speaker to self-correct (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). The first has, thus, more to do with comprehension and keeping up the flow of communication whereas the second involves accuracy and greater attention to the precision of form. In terms of corrective feedback, implicit types of feedback (e.g. recasts, clarification requests) are more likely to be associated with negotiation of meaning, as with negotiation of form the more explicit types of feedback are in use. Negotiation of meaning, however, also involves other negotiation strategies, not merely corrective feedback (Lyster and Mori, 2006).

Corrective feedback can vary from implicit to explicit. Implicit feedback does not clearly signal that an error has been made, whereas explicit feedback does. Recasts are classified as an implicit type of corrective feedback and they “involve the teacher’s reformulation of all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error” (Lyster and Ranta 1997: 46). In other words, the teacher corrects the learner’s erroneous utterance without overtly indicating that there has been an error and maintaining the focus on meaning. Explicit types of feedback either clearly point out that errors has been committed or push learners to self-correct, or both (Ellis et al. 2006:341).

Since corrective feedback can involve different features and be used in different situations, I wish to clarify the content of the concept of corrective feedback as used in this study. Firstly, corrective feedback can be written but the focus in this study is only on oral feedback given on oral errors. Secondly, teachers sometimes let the conversation flow without interruption and then give delayed feedback on forms they have noticed students to have had problems with. However, here I will also only concentrate on feedback immediately following student error. Thirdly, preemptive focus on form is a student or teacher initiated act where the focus is explicitly shifted to form in an attempt to prevent errors (Ellis et al. 2001: 285). This study concentrates on reactive focus on form, i.e. occurring in response to the learner’s production attempts. In other words, it is the student error that motivates the attention to form.

2.1.3 Student uptake, the term uptake has been defined in at least two different ways in SLA literature. Previously in some studies it referred to something that learners themselves can report to have learnt from a particular lesson (Allwright, 1984). Nowadays in studies associated with corrective feedback it generally stands for the learner response to the teacher feedback move. Lyster and Ranta's (1997: 49) define uptake as "a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance". It is the student's response to the teacher's provision of information on the student's erroneous utterance. It is something that the student attempts to do with the feedback. Of course there is not always uptake either because the teacher does not give an opportunity for that, or the student simply does not respond to the feedback. This can be due to the fact that the teacher's corrective intention sometimes goes unnoticed, or the student continues with the topic without acting in response. Uptake covers a wide range of reactions from a simple acknowledgement of the feedback to a correct reformulation, or even an utterance that continues to be ill-formed.

Ellis et al. (2001) have a slightly different definition of uptake. What is similar in both studies is that uptake is an optional student move. However, whereas Lyster and Ranta (1997) examine uptake only in relation to the provision of corrective feedback, Ellis et al. (2001) include also student-initiated focus on form in its definition. For example, when a student asks a question about a linguistic form, the teacher provides a response move, not a feedback move. This gives the student a chance to react, which is counted as uptake. Thus, instead of a teacher reaction to a learner error, the focus of interaction moves to form by the student posing a question.

As mentioned above, utilizing feedback, a learner may be able to correct an initially incorrect utterance. This is called repair by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and successful uptake by Ellis et al (2001). It indicates that the student understood the corrective aim of the feedback and consequently is able to use the form correctly. By contrast, if the learner responds to the feedback in some way but does not succeed in the reformulation of the erroneous utterance, the uptake has not resulted in repair. Lyster and Ranta (1997) call this needs-repair.

A term closely related to the term uptake is modified output. It generally refers to the learner's modification of an ill-formed utterance following feedback. It is in some studies used

interchangeably with uptake. This term, however, is different from the term uptake in that it does not contain the aspect of repair in its definition (Sheen, 2008).

2.2 Theories of SLA and the Role of Corrective Feedback

The role of corrective feedback in the process of learners' Interlingua development has been a topic of much discussion in SLA research. Firstly, there has been a debate on whether it is positive or negative evidence that is the driving force behind.

In addition, there are different views of the roles of input compared to output in language learning. In the early 1980s input was the concept that dominated the field. Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis holds that comprehensible input is the one and only necessary condition for SLA. As long as input is one step ahead of the current stage of the learner's linguistic competence, acquisition will naturally and incidentally take place. Later on this claim has been challenged by many researchers. Long's (1996) updated version of Interaction Hypothesis proposes that interaction facilitates acquisition because of the linguistic and conversational modifications occurring during such discourse and by connecting "input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways" (p. 451-2). Negotiation of meaning, which includes the provision of corrective feedback, during interaction, may help learners to notice some forms and thus be facilitative of SLA (Long 1996:414).

A further interactional process that can result from feedback is known as modified output. Swain's (1985) Output Hypothesis suggests that learners need to be 'pushed' beyond the point of simply getting their meaning across. The changes in learners' output following feedback show that they are actively confronting their errors and revisiting their hypotheses about the target language. Learners, thus, need plenty of opportunities for output, and provision of useful and consistent feedback. Also, while producing target language, learners may notice they are not able to convey meanings precisely. This conscious recognition, awareness, leads to cognitive processes necessary in SLA (Swain 1985:249).

The role of consciousness is essential also in Schmidt's (1990) Noticing Hypothesis. This hypothesis claims that the learner must consciously notice the input for it to become intake. In other words, input must be internalized in some way in order to have an effect on the acquisition

process. Understanding the input is not enough. Instead, the gap between the input and the learner's own Interlingua system has to be noticed. Noticing and attention to form may be facilitated through negotiated interaction containing corrective feedback.

2.3. Types of Oral corrective Feedback with Examples

1. Explicit correction: Clearly indicating that the student's utterance was incorrect, the teacher provides the correct form.

S: I have seen monkey in forest.

T: + in /the/ forest

S: yes, I have seen monkey in the forest.

2. Recast: The teacher implicitly reformulates the student's error, or provides the correction without directly pointing out that the student's utterance was incorrect.

S: he like banana.

*T: yes, he **likes** banana*

3. Clarification request: The teacher indicates that the message has not been understood or that the student's utterance included some kind of mistake and that a repetition or a reformulation is needed by using phrases like "Excuse me?"

S: I go to school/ yesterday/.

T: Excuse me? I go to school every day?

S: yes, I go to school every day.

4. Metalinguistic clues: The teacher poses questions like "Do we say it like that?" or provides comments or information related to the formation of the student's utterance without providing the correct form.

S: she/ is visiting/ her parents every day.

T: + visits her parent every day, do you say like that .

S: yes, she visits her parents every day.

5. Elicitation: The teacher directly elicits the correct form from the student by asking questions (e.g., "How do I ask somebody to clean the board?"), by pausing to allow the student to complete the teacher's utterance (e.g., "He is a good...") or by asking students to

reformulate the utterance (e.g., "Can you say that again?").

S: there are a few books in my /librari/

T: in my...? □ □

6. Repetition: The teacher repeats the student's error and changes intonation to draw student's attention to it.

S: How much money do you have in your /pakıt/?

T: /pakıt/? □

S: /pokıt/

T: yes

2.4. Types of Students Uptake

According to, Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997).types of students uptakes are teacher-corrected, peer-corrected and self-corrected, in relation to students uptake, Bot (1996) underlines the importance of pushing learners to produce correct forms themselves after some kind of corrective clue so that they can make meaningful connections in their brains. By doing so, remembering the self-corrected form will be much easier. Pushing learners in their output instead of directly correcting them is believed to be beneficial for learners' interlanguage development (Vigil and Oller, 1976) as learners' production promotes the development of cognitive connections. Allwright and Bailey (1991) also recommended that learners should be provided with ample time and opportunities for self-responce.

The teacher spent at least one minute to get the error self- or peer-corrected before explicitly correcting the error. He tried different types of error correction to elicit correction from the student and finally corrected himself if students fail. Whenever he used explicit correction, he got a student to repeat the corrected utterance to make sure that the correct form was understood.

While the teacher was providing metalinguistic clues, it was realized that code-switching (e.g. “A little pozitif olacak. This sentence is negative”) was used to facilitate understanding of the erroneous utterance by students. Switching from English to the native language, Turkish seems to be an effective way of saving time both while teaching grammar and correcting grammar errors.

The teacher’s use of body language is also noteworthy. For example, to facilitate self- and peer-correction in response to the faulty sentence “she has got a blue shoe”, the teacher changed the mood of his face and pretended to be surprised by pointing out his shoes. Then, he asked “a blue shoes or blue shoes?”

2.5. Historical Perspective of Error Correction

According to Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia (August 2008) the issue of oral error correction should be approached from a historical perspective to see the progress made so far. The most famous early systematic use of error detection was by Jewish scribes in the precise copying of the Jewish bible, beginning before Christ. An emphasis on minute details of words and spellings evolved into the idea of a perfect text in 135 CE, and with it increasingly forceful strictures that a deviation in even a single letter would make a Torah scroll invalid. The scribes used methods such as summing the number of words per line and per page (Numerical Masorah), and checking the middle paragraph, word and letter against the original. The page was thrown out if a single mistake was found, and three mistakes on a single page would result in the entire manuscript being destroyed (the equivalent of retransmission on a telecommunications channel). The effectiveness of their methods was verified by the accuracy of copying through the centuries demonstrated by discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947–1956, dating from c.150 BCE-75 CE.

According to (Ellis, 2009a) Farrokhi & Sattarpour (2012, 50) Current researchers has moved from addressing whether corrective feedback actually works for language acquisition to examining what type of corrective feedback strategy works best in classroom settings . In this respect, they claim that;

«It is not just a question of whether oral corrective feedback is effective but also which type is effective. The fact is that it is still unclear which feedback strategy is more effective in classroom settings, that is, the findings are not yet conclusive. There is still debate over what types of oral corrective feedback are more effective and, therefore, it is not easy to decide which type of feedback is best for all Learners in all contexts. »

According to this (Ellis, 2011) states that, there does not actually exist any 'ideal corrective feedback recipe', the fact is that how teachers provide corrective feedback makes the difference. In this respect, considerable disagreement seems to exist over how best to handle oral corrective feedback and, accordingly, it is not still possible to specify general guidelines for corrective feedback that are appropriate for all instructional contexts. While feedback on error can be provided in a wide variety of ways, the fact is that learners also perceive and respond to corrective feedback in different ways.

Regarding to the above idea, (Lyster, et al. 1999) argue that what is best for one learner in one context will not necessarily be best for the other learners in various context. Therefore, teachers must adapt and adjust flexibly a wide variety of oral corrective feedback techniques to the particular learners' cognitive and affective needs.

Regarding to issues related to challenges that teachers face when they present oral corrective feedback, such as whether oral corrective feedback contribute to second language acquisitions, which errors to correct, who should do the correction (teachers or learners him or herself), which type of corrective feedback is the most effective, and what is the best timing for corrective feedback -immediate or delayed- (Ellis, 2009a). In fact, there does not exist a unifying view of corrective feedback in SLA research due mainly to theoretical disputations and different research findings. Although most SLA research studies suggest evidence of the efficacy of corrective feedback (Han 2002; Chandler, 2003; Lyster 2004; Bitchener et al. 2005; Sheen, 2007; Bitchener&Knoch, 2009), Hyland and Hyland, (2006, p. 84) claimed that "it is difficult to draw any clear conclusions and generalizations from the literature as a result of varied populations, treatments and research designs". Particularly, limitations in the design (see Guenette, 2007; Bitchener 2008 for discussion of these issues) and differences in their contexts and in the proficiency level of their participants make it difficult to assess the value of the claims made.

2.6. The Role of Oral Corrective Feedback

First, the role of oral corrective feedback in second language acquisition is based on different theories on language learning. According to Truscott (1999). Effectiveness of corrective feedback in classroom claimed that error treatment was not only unnecessary, settings has been extensively debated in both SLA but also potentially harmful to SLA. According to research and language pedagogy, becoming a Krashen (1982, p. 75), stated that corrective feedback "has highly controversial issue, with arguments both for the immediate effect of putting the student on the land against providing.

One group of researchers argues that oral corrective feedback has negative effect. According to Truscott (1994, 441), Russell 2009; Ellis 9a, sheen 10a; ellis2011) oral corrective feedback has negative effect in class room seating. It causes embarrassment, inhibition, and feeling of inferiority, discourage learners. Regarding those researchers oral corrective feedback a general weakness existing of oral corrective feedback that has focused narrowly on the cognitive aspect of correction and less attention given for social and psychological aspect of students characteristics'. In contrast, positive evidence provided through oral corrective feedback plays a facilitative role in L2 acquisition in potentiality, improve grammatical accuracy. Second language pedagogy has highlighted the impotency of positive oral corrective feedback or reinforcement in providing affective support to the learners by stimulating motivation to continue learning. Accordingly, the potential affective damage corrective feedback can cause among learners needs to be seriously taken into consideration. In short, learner individual characteristics and affective aspects may influence the effectiveness of corrective feedback. A growing body of qualitative case study research has highlighted the importance of these factors in explaining learners' responses to the teacher's feedback (see Hyland 2003; Hyland & Hyland 2006).

2.7. Previous Research of Corrective Feedback

The attitude towards learners' errors is largely determined by prevailing beliefs about the learning process. The audio-lingual approach, which dominated foreign language teaching in the 1950s and 60s, advocated a very mechanistic approach to avoiding and correcting errors. A great effort was made to get students produce error-free utterances, and if errors occurred, they were immediately corrected and followed by repetition of the correct pattern (Hendrickson, 1978).

From the late 1960s, when the approach to L2 teaching started to shift towards communicative language teaching, the attitude to learner errors took a more positive turn. Linguists started to see errors as evidence of an internal learner system, a natural part of learning, which served as clues to how languages are acquired, and gave teachers insights into what still needed to be taught (Corder, 1967).

After the pedagogical focus shifted from preventing errors to learning from errors, the research on error correction expanded. One of the first comprehensive reviews on error correction was written by Hendrickson (1978). Five fundamental questions were addressed:

1. Should learners' errors be corrected? 2. When should learners' errors be corrected? 3. Which errors should be corrected? 4. How should errors be corrected? 5. Who should do the correcting? (Hendrickson 1978:389)

Hendrickson concluded that a lot of experimental research was needed in order to come to any kind of a standard in regard to these questions. To this day, many of these questions still have no clear, unambiguous answers. Nonetheless, a great deal of research has been done to tackle these issues. The present study is mainly concerned with all questions: Before it is possible to say much about the effectiveness of different ways of correcting errors, it is necessary to operationalize the process of error treatment in L2 classrooms. The incidents of error treatment in the lesson need to be identified by researchers. In effect, we first need to ask: How are errors corrected? One way of describing the treatment of errors is by listing the various options available to the teacher i.e. creating a kind of an observation scheme. Fanselow (1977) and Chaudron (1977) were two of the first researchers to develop comprehensive taxonomies of this kind by observing classroom discourse.

The primary aim of Fanselow's (1977) study was to describe how teachers treated oral errors in their classes. Eleven experienced ESL teachers were videotaped giving the same lesson to one of their classes. The analysis yielded a table of 16 different treatment types and the frequencies of their use. Providing the right answer after an error (i.e. 'recasting' in more recent research) was the most popular treatment. This type of feedback was criticized by the researcher on the grounds that it does not offer learners much of a chance to revise faulty hypotheses of how language works or to establish deep-level rules. In addition, ambiguity and inconsistency in the treatment

of errors within a lesson and between the teachers was detected. This was caused, for example, by the teachers' manner of accepting an erroneous form in one part of a lesson and refusing it in other parts, or presenting the right answer both after correct and incorrect student responses. Fanselow also suggested alternative treatments on learner errors. Instead of giving the right answer, teachers could present 'tasks' immediately following an error or sometime after it. These tasks could help students

Practice language forms in different ways by isolating the error and giving explicit information about the form in question. The purpose of the tasks is to learn from one's errors by trying to change inner grammar rules and help move the patterns to long-term memory.

Similarly, Chaudron (1977) conducted a large scale study of 8th and 9th grade French immersion teachers' treatment of learners' errors. He also attempted to develop an adequate description of corrective interaction in the classroom. The underlying aim of the research was, firstly, to list the options available to teachers, and secondly, to aid further studies to investigate which corrective treatments are most likely to contribute to L2 learning. Chaudron was interested in the learner performance after feedback (i.e. learner uptake), and pointed out that 'successful correction' following feedback (i.e. learner repair) can be considered an indication of an apparently effective corrective treatment. Chaudron established a model of discourse concerning corrective interaction and a list of different types of corrective reactions. Various kinds of 'repetition' were most frequently used as feedback. The author claimed that 'repetition with change' (i.e. recast), which was the most widely used feedback type, is especially weak in helping to isolate the nature of the error. Great variation in the teachers' ways of dealing with errors was also noticed in this study, which makes locating errors difficult. Consequently a great deal of feedback went unnoticed or at least failed to generate successful correction by the students.

2.8. Two More Recent Observational Studies

Next, two studies with a special significance to the present study are introduced. Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study is influential in that it gives a systematic presentation of patterns of interactional moves concerning error treatment in classroom discourse. The profit of this analytic model describing teacher-student behavior turn-by-turn is that it is easy to apply to subsequent studies. Also, the framework of the error treatment sequence goes beyond the traditional cycle,

namely teacher Initiation- learner Response- teacher Feedback/Follow-up (Nunan ,1987). In the model the starting point, as well as the end point are different. Since the focus is on error treatment, the starting point is ‘error’, followed by ‘feedback’, followed by a possible student response after feedback, i.e. ‘uptake’. The error treatment sequence, thus, also takes the student into consideration as an active participant in the discourse.

The second study reviewed here is by Panova and Lyster (2002). It is very much a replication of Lyster and Ranta’s study with a change made to the analysis, which is significant regarding the present study. A closer look of these two studies is given below.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) observed four French immersion classes in grades 4-6 in Canada during subject-matter and French language arts lessons. For most of the students the immersion program had started in grade 4, and their proficiency level was considered intermediate. Using an error treatment sequence model developed for the study, the lessons were analyzed with the focus on error, feedback and uptake. Six different types of feedback were distinguished when teacher responses to learner errors were analyzed. 62% of the student utterances with error received some kind of feedback.

The percentage of recasts, however, was not as high as in Lyster et al.’s studies. The recast constituted 35% of all the feedback moves, whereas in both model studies the percentage was 55%. Nevertheless, explicit correction, which also provides the student with the correct reformulation, accounted for 19% of the total number of feedback turns. Thus, 54% of all the corrective turns by the teacher did not give the students a chance to self-correct. Met linguistic feedback and elicitation, however, were used much more frequently than in the model studies: 22% and 23% respectively. Clarification requests and repetition were not popular at all. Both together accounted for less than 2% of all the feedback moves. With regard to uptake and repair, recasts and explicit correction were both rather unsuccessful in resulting in uptake (both less than 20% of the time), whereas the “negotiation of form” generated uptake, and also repair, almost 100% of the time. This percentage, however, has to be interpreted cautiously due to the low number of some of the feedback types.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides detailed information of the research methodology which comprises of the research design, research site, the population and sampling, and the research tools that were used to collect data. In addition, it explains the procedures of both data collection and analysis.

3.1. Research Design

The researcher used a mixture of qualitative and quantitative research design. This research design was used because it is appropriate method and technique in researching which type of oral corrective feedback teachers' present commonly. It also provides opportunities for the researcher to collect and describe numerical and non-numerical data. Moreover, qualitative approach helps to collect data through observation and in-depth interview and quantitative approach enables the researcher to collect larger amount of data from questionnaire (Abyet al, 2009).

Generally, both qualitative and quantitative approach provide the researcher with the opportunity to observe the way teachers presenting various types of oral corrective feedback and the way students' uptake feedback provision as well as teachers' encountered challenges in that particular setting and it can increase the reliability and applicability of research conclusions.

3.2. The Research Site

Goh and Gorker secondary School, which is found in southern region south omo zone south Ari woreda, is the research site of the study. It was established in 1974 E.C and it has been serving for many years as the most famous school that accommodates above 2514 students from grade 9 to grade 10 each year and serve students and parents of the villages and the districts. Moreover, it has over 98 teachers who teach different subject in both schools.

3.3. Population and Sampling

The researcher employed a comprehensive (availability) sampling design of the non probability sampling. This sampling was mainly practical for small number of units; it was because of the inclusion of every unit of the population in the study (Abebayehu A. et.al. 2003, p. 126 & 127).

The participants of the study were grade nine English language teachers in the sample school. The total number of English language teachers who had been teaching English in different grade levels at the time of data collection from this study was 9. They were teaching grade 9 students. In the school, there were 20 sections of grade with a total of 1100 students.

Grade nine English language teachers were preferred because they were relatively had much time to engaged students in implementation of OCF and seven of them were degree holders and two of them M.A in addition to this, all are male and might have an insight how language methodologies are used and implemented for a better goal achievement. Moreover, in grade nine, students naturally were very interested to work together either with their friend or with school mate as they were preparing for the national exam. This created ample time for the researcher to observe and assess how they practiced OCF learning in their classroom.

3.4. Instruments of Data Collection and Procedures

In order to gather valuable information for the study, the researcher used questionnaire, interview, and classroom observation.

3.4.1. Questionnaire

Questionnaire is important data gathering tool because it helps to collect data from a large number of participants. Thus to investigate the practice of grade nine English teachers' oral corrective feedback. The study used both structured and unstructured questionnaire. The structured questionnaire was used to reduce bias, cost and time connected with data processing. And this type of question is easier and faster to administer for the researcher. On the other hand, by means of the open ended or unstructured questionnaire the researchers get general attitudes of participants. In addition, the respondents are not influenced by a prearranged set of response alternatives and can freely express views different from the researchers' expectations. And this

provides the investigator with insights, side comments, and explanations, which are useful in developing a ‘‘feel’’ for the research findings (Ababayehu A. 2003, p. 156).

The items of the questionnaire were prepared in English and distributed for nine (9) Goh and Gorker teachers in the same time. The questionnaire enabled the researcher understand which type oral corrective feedback teachers implemented regularly , how teachers offer various type of OCF, students uptake for different oral corrective feedback and challenges teacher encounter in implementing OCF . For this reason, issues that were not observed in the classroom were obtained through questionnaire.

3.4.2. Interview

The study employed both structured and unstructured interview to gather more data for cross-checking. The purpose of using interview as data gathering instrument is to get information concerning which type of oral corrective feedback teachers provided regularly and to see how grade nine English language teachers implement various type of oral corrective feedback, the responses for oral corrective feedback and what challenges they face during presenting oral corrective feedback process.

Confirming this idea Cathrine (2007) asserted that the main reason of using interviewing is to obtain participants’ attitudes, perceptions, values, and behaviors and experiences and their views about the subject in a more detailed ways.

Generally, the interview was made with 5 (five) interviewees of Goh and Gorker secondary schools teachers engaged. It was carried out to have clear understanding on the issue through triangulation of data. This was because of items of interview were similar with both observation and questionnaire.

3.4.3. Observation

The study employed structured method used to gather more data for cross-checking. In addition to the above tools, direct classroom observation was made to get information regarding which type of oral corrective feedback teachers present commonly and to see how grade nine English language teachers implement various type of oral corrective feedback. The responses for various

type of oral corrective feedback and what challenges they face during presenting various type of oral corrective feedback process.

Moreover, this tool is also appropriate to collect qualitative data that was allow the researcher to crosscheck what has been responded in the questionnaire and interview and what actually takes place in the actual classroom teaching learning process. Furthermore, it was mainly focused on teachers- students' interaction in relation to feedback provision. The items for observation question set based from the research objectives and research questions and it is semi-structured type of questions.

The researcher had seen the class program of each English teacher at staff level before the class was observed. The researcher observed seven (7) selected classes, based on the checklist in the hand (Appendix c) and in the checklist, the research filled the two columns which were said to be "Yes" or "No" statements. Additionally, each randomly selected class was observed 5 times in different periods in the actual classroom teaching and learning process.

3.5. Procedures of Data Collection

After developing the research instrument as presented above based on the research objectives and research questions, the researcher followed various procedures to gather reliable and valid data for the study.

First, the questionnaires were ready to be distributed to the sample at different times. Before distributed, questionnaires were organized in well manner and participants were informed to write their genuine response in secrete and the questionnaires were collected only by the researcher because of the less number of participants. After that, interview was conducted with those selected sample populations. Finally, classroom observations were employed five times in different periods with the help of observation check-list. The researcher followed this procedure, since the researcher wants to see the real practice in the class room after gathering information by questionnaire and interview to cross-check the teachers' given data reality and to increase soundness of the research.

3.6. Procedures of Data Analysis

The data collected through the questionnaires were organized under similar characteristics and tallied to get each items respondent's frequency. After that participants' questionnaires were interpreted and analyzed quantitatively by using percentage and frequency. Data obtained by open ended questionnaire were grouped the same response and interpret qualitatively in word.

On the other hand, the data gained through interview was organized in different folder and transcribed. After the necessary information collected, the results of the interviews data were summarized, interpreted and discussed qualitatively in words. In addition, data obtained through structured interview grouped in to the same type and then interpret quantitatively in number. Moreover; the data collected through classroom observations check-list were organized and analyzed quantitatively in number.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter deals with the data presentation, analyses and discussions from the three research tools: questionnaire, interview and classroom observation which was collected from the teachers, and classroom observation of grade nine. As it was clearly stated in the objectives, the main aim of the study is to investigate the implementation of English language teacher's oral corrective feedback on students' utterance in Goh and Gorker high schools. Therefore, results from questionnaire, interview, observation and the two open ended items of the questionnaire as well as factories that hinder employing various type of oral corrective feedback have been discussed based on quantitative and qualitative analysis of data. Totally ten (10) items of questionnaire were distributed to the nine participant and nine participants returned the questionnaire. All the characteristics of questionnaires have been shown in table below except for two open ended items.

4.1. Data Presentation and Analysis

4.1.1. Teachers' Response to the Questionnaire

In the teachers' questionnaire, the researcher gathered and analyzed the data of questionnaire as presented and discussed below.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of teachers' response regarding their awareness on various type of oral corrective feedback.

No	Item Description	Options	TR	TNR	%
1	Are you aware all type of oral corrective feedback?	Yes	3	9	33
		No	6		67
	Total				100
2	Write your understanding about OCF?				

As presented in Table 1, regarding whether the respondents had the concept about OCF or not. A large number of respondents (67%) of them replied that they did not have awareness about it. The remaining 33% of the respondents have the concept about OCF.

Regarding to item 1, respondents were also asked to give further explanations about their understanding in open-ended questions. Hence the majority (70%) of the respondents explained that OCFs are considered as one of the language teaching method, teachers giving corrections, few participant not answered and some teachers explained that teachers activities and that enables teachers to teach students' to improve their language skills.

This seems to indicate that the majority of the respondents were not aware of about the substantial benefit of OCF to improve students' language skills. On the other hand, few of the respondents explain that teacher's reaction to transform, disapprove or demand to improve students' language skills in open-ended item, so they have any information about it. This indicated that all the teachers in the school were not implementing the strategy consistently.

Teachers were asked to respond weather they used all types of OCF as one of the language teaching method or not and their overall experience in implementing OCF in which skills they focus. Hence, the responses are presented in the following table.

Table 2: Regarding teachers' response about their offer of feedback types and focus

Focus	Recast	Clarification Request	Metalinguistic clues	Explicit correction	Repetition
Grammar error	1	1	1	2	4
Pronunciation error	---	1	3	1	4

Item number 2 in the table above examines teachers' response for the implementing OCF as strategies of improving students' language skills. Nearly half 8 times (44.5%) of English language teachers use repetition type of OCF for both grammar and pronunciation error correction. It is followed by met linguistic clues used four times (22.3%). Explicit correction was

utilized three times (16.7%) and recast utilized once times (5.6%) in addition to this, clarification request used only once.

From the above result, therefore, it appears reasonable to generalize that these English language teachers have used repetition type of OCF for both grammar and pronunciation errors most frequently.

As it can be seen in focus 1 in the table above reveals that out of the total of 18(eighteen) items of both grammar and pronunciations errors English language teachers used only 1(5.6%) recast type of OCF employed.

Therefore, from the data shown above, we can conclude that the majority of the teachers use repetition types of OCF consistently only few teachers use recast type of OCF strategy consistently and the majority of the teachers use it inconsistently. Hence, it is impossible to say English language teachers were effectively implementing various type of OCF strategy very well.

The respondents were also asked ‘Why they did not use recast type of OCF strategy frequently? The majority of the respondents explained that there were different reasons. The first one is absence of information how to implement OCF and poor language backgrounds were the other deterrence during the implementation of the strategies.

Table 3: With reference to distribution of students’ uptake following different types of corrective feedback.

Students uptake	Various type of OCF and students uptake					%
	Recast	Clarification Request	Metalinguistic clues	Explicit correction	Repetition	
Self-corrected	---	1	---	---	3	23

Peer-corrected	---	1	1	1	3	34
Teacher-corrected	1	---	---	3	4	45

As presented in table 3 in the above table indicates regarding provision of OCF the teachers' presenting OCF takes for both repetition and elicitation 8 times out of 18 OCF that means (45%) correction students expected from teachers and students' used from repetition three, elicitation one, clarification request and metalinguistic-clu 6 times from 18 OCF that means (34%) students utilized the correction that comes from their friends and finally, students used three repetition and one metalinguistic clu 4 times from that means (23%) 18 OCF in addition to this OCF that comes from students'.

To sum up, a number of OCF that comes from self- correction, peer-correction and teachers corrections among these students frequently used teachers' OCF. Which account (45%) of the correction and the remaining peer-correction accounts (34%) and correction that comes from students themselves 23% used by students.

Table4: Regarding Challenges they encounter when they implement oral feedback.

No	Item Description	Options	TR	TN	%
7	Do you encounter challenges when you are implementing oral corrective feedback? Such as, lack of awareness of various type of OCF, poor English language background and lack of interest for English language.	Yes	7	9	78
		No	2		22
	Total				

As shown in the Table 4 above, the majority (78%) of the respondents responded that they faced challenges when they try to implement OCF in their classes. On contrarily, 22% of them replied

that they did not face any challenges. Concerning this, respondents were asked to list the types of challenges in the open-ended questions. The respondents were also asked to list the challenges faced presenting OCF. The majority of the respondents explained that there were different reasons. The first one is absence of information how to implement various types of OCF and poor English language background of the students were mentioned as the problems.

4.1.2. Results of Teachers' Interviews

The researcher interviewed five (5) English language teachers out of the total of nine (9) who had been teaching English as a subject in grade nine in Goh and Gorker high school.

Therefore, the results of the interview which were conducted with the teachers were summarized as follows to triangulate the data gathered from questionnaires and classroom observations.

4.2.1. Table1 concerning which type of OCF do you use most frequently

No	Item description	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Teacher3	Teacher4	Teacher5	TNR
1	Which types of OCF do you used most frequently?	Explicit and Repetition	Repetition and Explanation	recaste and Metalingustic clue,	Reptition and Clarificatio n	Explanation and Repetition	5

The interviewees were asked which type of oral corrective feedback do you most frequently used in the classroom, almost all (4) of the English language teachers agreed that repetition type of oral corrective feedback was one of the most decisive method that helps students to learn the language in a more practical ways which helped them to improve their communicative skills. They further elaborated that when students learn through this way, they can develop self-confidence and avoid anxiety to express their ideas with their fellow mate orally. However, in responding to this question, only one teacher used recast and Metalingustic clue most frequently. Therefore, both the data gathered from the teachers questionnaire and an interview indicated that majority of the language teachers frequently used repetition type of OCF methods in improving students' language proficiency.

4.2.2 Table2 . in relation to how often do you use various type of OCF.

No	Item description; How often do you use various type of OCF?	Frequency of use of OCF														
		always					sometimes					rarely				
		T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5
1	explicit,	√						√	√		√					
2	recast,											√	√	√	√	√
3	Repetition	√	√	√		√										
4	metalingustic clue	√					√	√		√						
5	clarification request						√		√		√					
6	elicitation		√		√			√						√		√

The other question that the teachers were asked how often teacher used oral corrective feedback effectively in their classroom; the majority (4) reported that they were present repetition type of oral corrective feedback always. Most of teachers (3) of the interviewee reported that they provide explicit, metalingustic clue and clarification employed sometimes. However, all the interviewees agreed that they were provided recast type of oral corrective feedback rarely. To sum up, teachers most commonly provide repetition type of oral corrective feedback and less frequently present recast type of oral corrective feedback.

4.2.3 Table 3 with reference to teachers' check students understanding after presenting OCF.

No	Item description	option	TR	TNR
3	Teachers present all types of OCF effectively for students?	Yes	-	5
		No	5	
4	List the reasons why not you offer OCF effectively?			

Question number three which were interviewed by the researcher about whether teachers' teachers present OCF for students effectively or not. As indicated in the above table question

three all of them replied that they simply repeatedly offered some types of oral corrective feedback without checking what extent students understand oral corrective feedback. They were also asked to reason out why it is not provided effectively and all of them (5) said that lack of information about various type of oral corrective feedback, and their own unfamiliarity with different type of oral feedback and students' poor English language were the deterrence that hinders them not to provide effectively.

4.2.4. Table 3 .Data Obtained from the Teachers' Interview: as regards Teachers' Response for Students' Uptake.

no	Type of response	Recast	Elicitation	Clarification Request	Metalinguistic clues	Explicit correction	Repetition
	Self-corrected	---	---	---	---	---	1
	Peer-corrected	---	---	---	1	---	---
	Teacher-corrected	1	1	1	1	1	3
6	Students understand teachers command in the interaction?					Yes 4 No 1	5
7	List the challenges offering OCF?						

Question number five which was asked how students uptake oral corrective feedback? Most (3) of the interviewee reported that students used teachers-correction for repetition type of oral feedback, peer-correction for metalinguistic clue and student correction for explicit type of oral corrective feedback.

On contrarily, only one (1) interviewee replied that all students were used teachers correction for all type of errors. But when they reason out both in the interview and on open-ended questionnaires that all of the interviewee agreed on the same idea that teachers had never checked students understanding of oral feedback after providing because of lack of experience

and awareness that never worked hard before rather they were happy to implement it in their classroom to work on students language skills.

The six question which was asked to assess if students are capable enough in their command of English language during their engagement in oral corrective feedback, Most (3) of the interviewees replied that students were not capable enough to use the language the learning to share ideas and feelings. They believed that this inefficiency and incapability was occurred due to lack of exposure from the students' side in expressing their ideas in English at lower grade and the lower grade teacher did not wok much in teaching students the language in a communicative fashion. Moreover, most of them underlined that students do not have keen interest to learn the language because they believed that learning the language is something very difficult. However, few (2) teachers believed and suggested that if they made their lesson very smart and attractive and follow up them during discussions, the students would be interested to use the language communicatively though several of them use Amharic.

The interviewees were also asked whether they faced challenges when they implemented oral feedback in their classroom or not, all of (5) the teachers were facing challenges to implement in the language teaching- learning process. In asking them to list the types of challenges they faced, and they explained that students have low interest, poor background knowledge of the English language, lack of awareness of various type of oral corrective feedback; students feel shyness, so students prefer to use mother language.

Finally, the researcher interviewed teachers to give him their recommendations about the effective implementation of oral feedback in the futures, and they recommend that to overcome the challenges and implementation of oral feedback in the future, teachers capacity should be built well by giving them scientific and practical training about types and implementation of oral feedback.

4.3.1. Result of Classroom Observation

As it was presented in the methodology, the researcher observed each of five (5) randomly selected sections of grade nine (9) for four (4) successive periods of each section. The data was collected with the help of observation checklist (see appendix C). One checklist was used for one classroom observation and a total of twenty (20) checklists were used. After the researcher observed five participants, there were some of frequently used type of oral corrective feedback by almost all the participants, most students utilize teachers correction for grammar and pronunciation error and the majority of teachers face challenge such as, lake of awareness for various type of oral corrective feedback and poor English language background of the teachers exist to cross-check finding in both questionnaire and interview the researcher design the flowing questions below.

NO	Item descriptions	option		TR	TNR	%
1	Teachers present all type of OCF? Such as , Recast, Elicitation, Clarification Metalingustic clue, Explanation Repetition,	Yes		6	20	30%
		No		14		70%
2	Teachers give emphasis for oral corrective feedback?	Yes		7	20	35%
		No		17		65%
3	Teachers offer feedback for all errors?	Yes	14	20		70%
		No	6			30%
4	The frequency of Students' uptake for grammar and pronunciation error?	Teachers correction	11	20		55%
		Peer correction	6			30%
		Self-correction	3			15%
5	Teachers utilize correct language while presenting OCF in the classroom?	Yes	6	20		30%
		No	14			70%
6	Teachers cheek students understanding after presenting OCF?	Yes	3	20		15%
		No	17			85%
7	Teachers face challenge while offering OCF? For example, Lake of awareness of various	Yes	20	20		100%
		No	-			-

The teachers come to their classes with different type of oral corrective feedback and offer oral feedback for various type of error that can be compatible with their own belief, style of teaching and interest of students. Therefore, the data found from classroom observation proved (70 %) that English language teachers did not provide different type of oral corrective feedback effectively, clearly and only (30%) present different type of OCF effectively and did not check students understanding after providing oral corrective feedback. During four successive classroom observations, the researcher observed that the majority (85.71%) of the language teachers were not seen checking students understanding of oral corrective feedback for various error teaching different language skills.

However, the researcher only found one teacher (14%) who attempt to check students understanding of oral corrective feedback after providing oral feedback. The above data and the data found from teachers' questionnaire Table 1-4 and interviews show that the majority of teachers replied that they did not provide different type of oral corrective feedback effectively and clearly. Therefore, it seems possible to conclude the majority of the English language teachers offered oral corrective feedback have not been implemented well by the teachers. for teaching and learning process of English language. In fact, this happened due to lack of awareness and training on how it can be implemented because the teachers' questionnaire, interviews confirmed that teachers did not have clear understanding of different types of oral corrective feedback and experience about the process of the implementation.

On the other hand, the classroom observation also indicated that the majority (72%) of the observed teachers did not give students clear oral feedback on how they improve that language skill. The majority of the teachers simply provided oral corrective feedback on the teachers guide and let them do the activities accordingly. But few (28%) of them do as opposed to the majority of the teachers. These teachers tried their best by giving clear oral feedback and how students are improved the error and why they made error so as to avoid confusion and draw their attention to the lesson.

The researcher has observed students' uptake for teachers' oral corrective feedback. The observation data depicted that from the five observed classes almost all (57.14%) of the observed

students expected teachers provided oral corrective feedback to improve their error. A few (28.57%) of students use peer-correction to improve their error and few (14.28%) of students correct their error by themselves. Almost all of teachers have provided the majority (70%) of oral corrective feedback for students and let them do activities and assignments. Moreover, teachers' questionnaire and interview also proved the above facts.

The classroom observation result regarding teachers motivational strategies used and their role during teaching and learning shows that the large number of (85%) and (60%) English language teachers respectively did not use different motivational strategies to engage students learn various English language skill and make them active participant in their language learning. Teachers were not observed giving equal responsibility for each student for both individual and group work rather they have been observed giving the chance for volunteer students to present what they have done by representing the whole class.

In most of their teaching periods, almost all the teachers were observed that after once they gave students certain activities from students' text book, they simply wrote the instruction on the chalk-board or told them orally what students would do in the activities. The students' questionnaire and interview confirmed this fact. Students complained that most of their teachers were not responsible in motivating them to work in English language rather they mostly focused on the actively participated students in most cases.

Regarding item 6 of the observation checklist, the observation data indicated that almost all four of the observed English language teachers did not bring different tasks and materials that could motivate students to learn the language and fit their levels and interest during English language teaching and learning. From the three observed teacher only one attempted to use authentic materials and tasks that were compatible with students' levels and interest. These teachers were used tables and chart when he teaches conditional sentences type two and three and passive and active voice. With this teaching style students were seen very active and interested to learn the language. The researcher observed that students of this teacher were active participant in their class room than other teachers. Most of the teachers depended on the students' text book and use it as the only materials that satisfy their students.

The classroom observation data regarding item 10 of the observation checklist which was intended to see whether teachers face challenges or not during providing oral corrective feedback in the class room teaching and learning and to triangulate the data found from the teachers and students questionnaire and interview. The observation data clearly shows that all (100%) of the English language teachers faced many challenges when they attempted to implement oral corrective feedback language learning in their classroom. The type of challenges which were found from observation was compatible with the data found from teachers' questionnaire in Table 1- 4 item and interview questions. Therefore, we cannot generalize; oral corrective feedback being implemented successfully by the English language teachers in Goh and Gorker secondary school.

All in all, it is possible to say that the abovementioned classroom observation data presented above clearly shows the factors that minimize the effective implementation of oral corrective feedback from the three points of view: teachers, type of OCF and students and needs solution for the future to minimize the challenges.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This is the last chapter of this study which consists of summary of major findings, conclusions and recommendations. In the first part of this section summary of the major findings are presented from three points of view: student's uptake, the practice of OCF and possible obstacles which affect the effective implementation of OCF. Following this conclusion of the major findings is forwarded. Finally, possible solutions for the findings are drawn respectively.

5.2. Summary of Major Findings

5.2.1. The frequency of various type of oral corrective feedback.

Data collected through questionnaire, interview and observation to come to sound conclusions, this research has some light on the participating teacher's oral corrective feedback practices during an activity. It would be fair to suggest that the teacher did not neglect any of the errors and treated errors immediately using different techniques by means of which errors were corrected explicitly by teachers, self- and peer-corrected. As findings mentioned, recast was the least preferred type used to correct both grammar and pronunciation errors while repetition was the most common for both grammar and pronunciation. Repetition also seems to lead to successful uptake with four teachers, three self and three peer corrections. The teacher repeated students' utterances without changing anything but by emphasizing the error. By this way, the teachers give the learners clue to self-correct the erroneous utterance by repeating the error in a rising intonation as if it was a question posed to the students.

5.2.2. Students uptake for various type of oral corrective feedback

It is also found that student's uptake for the implementation of various type of OCF was teacher feedback, peer-feedback and self-feedback. Teachers feedback uptake most dominantly utilize in both grammar and pronunciation in the research. However, As cited; Bot (1996) underlines the importance of pushing learners to produce correct forms themselves after some kind of corrective clue so that they can make meaningful connections in their brains. By doing so,

remembering the self-corrected form will be much easier. Pushing learners in their output instead of directly correcting them is believed to be beneficial for learners' interlanguage development (Vigil and Oller, 1976) as learners' production promotes the development of cognitive connections. Allwright and Bailey (1991) also recommended that learners should be provided with ample time and opportunities for self-correction.

5.2.3 The challenges teachers encounter in implementation of oral corrective feedback

According to data shown in table 1 the first and the main challenge is lack of sufficient information and training for teachers about the practical implementation of various type of oral corrective feedback. Almost all the participants agreed that they did not have clear information about the implementation of various type of OCF.

Poor English language background of students which minimized their participation in OCF. The data indicated that students were not capable in their command of English that hindered them expressing their ideas and feelings. Due to this they prefer in order not to speak English or they speak Amharic to express their ideas and feelings during discussions.

Past habit of teaching and learning experience of the participants. The majority of the respondents admitted that they were mostly stick to traditional ways of providing OCF teaching approach. Teachers thinking that oral corrective feedback takes much energy in preparing task that fit student interest, teachers worry to cover the content which are part of the exam since they compete with other students and teachers worry that evaluation of speaking activities.

5.3. Conclusion

1.To sum up, the most commonly utilized oral corrective type of feedback is repetition type of oral corrective feedback applied 8 times (40%) however, the least utilize type of oral corrective feedback is recast applied only one times(5%) Consequently, repetition type of oral corrective feedback were given more emphasis than recast, but both repetition and recast type of oral corrective feedback utilize in language classroom to improve students language ability.

2. Generally, out of ten repetitions type of oral corrective feedback four were teacher-corrected, three self-corrected and three were peer-corrected. Therefore, students most uptake come from teacher-correct applied 4times (40%), student- correct applied three times (30%) and peer-correct applied three times (30).Finally, the only one recast type of oral corrective feedback occurred during the transcription was teacher-corrected.

3. Finally, the main challenge of implementation of oral corrective feedback are lack of sufficient information and training for teachers concerning the practical implementation of various type of oral corrective feedback, students poor English language back ground and teachers thinking that oral corrective feedback takes much energy in preparing task that fit student interest in addition to this, teachers worry to cover the content which are part of the exam since they compete with other students moreover, teachers worry that evaluation of speaking activities.

Generally, teachers of English should get involved in classroom research and take the role of a pedagogic explorer in order to become aware of their current practices in the classroom. As Tedick and de Gortari (1998) suggest, teachers should take the teaching context into account and get to know what kind of classroom behaviors they display. They also point out that teachers should practice a variety of feedback techniques as different techniques might appeal to different students in terms of their needs, proficiency level, and age and classroom objectives. Because these factors have an influence on whether to correct, which errors to correct and how to correct, studies done in some other settings can yield different results and thus there is a need for further research conducted with different classrooms and learners. Classroom research will help teachers gain the awareness that each class is a small world requiring special attention with its unique dynamics.

5.4. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion of the study the researcher would like to forward the following solutions for challenges EFL teachers encountered and for their effective implementation OCF in their classroom:

1. As it was found and discussed, the majority of English language teachers were faced various challenges during the implementation of OCF in their classroom. This was proved that due to lack of clear information and practical training before they involved implementing it practically. These hindered the teachers' effective implementation of oral corrective feedback. Therefore, teachers' capacity should be improved by arranging short-term training which would be more scientific and practical. If this is so it would be easy for them to accept as it is one of the modern language teaching ways and implement it practically with no or little difficulty. Otherwise, teachers become de-motivated and reluctant and stick to traditional ways of teaching the language.
2. The government, the education management, NGOs, the school managers, parents of students, and all the stakeholders of education should contribute their part to solve problems hindering using various type of oral corrective feedback and for language proficiency of their students.
3. English curriculum developers should give a great deal of attention in designing language syllabus on various strategies of oral corrective feedback regarding the language background ability of learners, the environment in which both teachers and students are living, the accessibility of language materials' and the situation in which learning and teaching language happens so that a beneficial language learning environment could be made and language learning would increase as well.
4. Furthermore, researches could be conducted to make more trustworthy conclusions on various types of oral corrective feedback provision strategies.

5.5 Suggested Areas for Further Research

The researcher would not be able to assess and investigate everything regarding various types of oral corrective feedback in detail. This study aimed on investigates the practice of English teacher's oral corrective feedback on the teaching and learning of English in Goh and Gorker high schools. Therefore, further research should be conducted in assessing teachers' perception towards using various type of oral corrective feedback in a more and detailed ways. Another area is to study the roles and opportunities of oral corrective feedback in improving students' language skills like listening and speaking in detailed. Moreover, further investigation should be conducted on the effect of the grade nine English for Ethiopian text book's tasks and activities with regards to oral corrective feedback.

APPENDIX A

Adama Science and Technology University

School of Humanities and Law

Department of English (PG)

Questionnaire for English Teachers

General Directions _ this study mainly focused on investigates the practice of English teacher's oral corrective feedback on the teaching and learning of English in Goh and Gorker high schools.

The findings will be used only for the academic purpose. The data will be confidential and in no way will harm the respondent. Therefore, choose one of the following scales from the given alternatives provided in the table below.

Personal Data

1. Teacher's Code: _____ 2. Sex: please encircle either Male / Female

3. Number of years you have been teaching English in Goh Secondary school: _____years

Gorker Secondary school: _____years.

Academic background

	Bachelor's Degree	Major in.
	Master's Degree	Major in.....

Feedback is information about reactions to product, a person's performance ... Meaning' pronunciation 'example sentences, and more from oxford.

The main purpose of this questionnaire is examine practice of various type of oral corrective feedback, the way teacher offer feedback, learners' response and challenge that teacher face to

implement oral corrective feedback in Goh and Gorker Secondary School. Hence, this study is intended to know the points mentioned below. These are:

Examine which type of oral corrective feedback teachers' used regularly;

Investigate how English language teachers provide oral corrective feedback to their students;

Examine student's way of response for oral corrective feedback

To identify the challenges in implementing oral feedback their English classes room.

This questionnaire has four pages. Please try to answer all the questions carefully. When you get confused in answering any question, please try to ask the researcher for clarification openly. All the answers for this questionnaire will be treated with a great care and secret and used for only research purpose

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE!

Read each Statement Carefully and Put a Tick (✓) Mark under each Number in the Table1A

no	Description of implementation of oral corrective feedback?	Yes	no	remark
1	Do you aware various type of oral corrective feedback?			
2	Do you motivate students to learn from mistake?			
3	Do you check whether students aware or not OCF?			

Read each statement carefully and put a tick (✓) mark under each number in the T2B

no	Description of various type of oral corrective feedback	Grammar error	Pronunciation error
1	Recast type of OCF used for grammars or pronunciations errors?		
2	Elicitation type of OCF used for grammars or pronunciations errors?		

3	Clarification type of OCF used for grammars or pronunciations errors?		
4	Metalingustic clue type of OCF used for grammars or pronunciations errors?		
5	Explicite type of OCF used for grammars or pronunciations errors?		
6	Repletion type of OCF used for grammars or pronunciations errors?		

Read each statement carefully and put a tick (✓) mark under each number in the T3C

no	Responses' for various type of oral corrective feedback	Various types of oral corrective feedback for various type of students uptake					
		Recast	Elicitation	Clarification	Metalingustic clue	Explicit	Repetition
1	Self-feedback						
2	Peer-feedback						
3	Teacher-feedback						

Read each statement carefully and put a tick (✓) mark under each number in the T4D

Description of oral corrective feedback	Yes	No
Do you encounter challenges when you offered oral corrective feedback		

II. Additional comments

Can you suggest which type oral corrective feedback teachers' present commonly?

.....

.....

.....

.....

Can you list the challenge that you face when you implement OCF?

.....

.....

APPENDIX B

Adama Science and Technology University

School of Humanities and Law

Department of English (PG)

Interview Questions

Dear colleague,

The main purpose of this interview is to get your response on the implementation of oral corrective feedback you are employing in your English class. You are, therefore, kindly requested to provide your genuine reaction to the items in the interview below.

1. Do you be familiar with various type oral corrective feedbacks?
2. Can you explain type of oral corrective feedback you frequently used?
3. How students' respond for various type oral corrective?
4. How do you check your students understanding after giving oral corrective feedback?
5. What type of oral error do your students frequently commit?
6. What factors affect your implementation of oral corrective feedback?
7. What other points do you want to point out?

APPENDIX C

Adama Science and Technology University

School of Humanities and Law

Department of English (PG)

Classroom Observation Checklist

School: _____ Teacher's Code: _____

Date1 _____ Date2 _____ Date3 _____ Lesson topic: _____ Time: _____

No. of students: _____

No	Statements	Yes	No
1	The teacher often employs different type of oral corrective feedback. Such as, Recast, Elicitation, Clarification, Metalinguistic clue, Explanation and Repletion		
2	The teachers provide feedback for all errors.		
3	The teachers provide feedback regularly.		
4	Peer-correction takes place in the lesson.		
5	The teacher motivates students to participate in the classroom.		
6	The teacher give emphasis to oral corrective feedback		
7	Teacher check students understanding of feedback.		
8	Teacher uses various types of oral corrective feedback		
9	Teachers utilize correct language in the classroom		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allwright, D. & Bailey, K. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Allwright, D. and Bailey, K. (1996). *Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ammar, A., and Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28, 543-574.

Anker, B. (2000). Focus on the mistake is random guess or is it a failure to utilize a word carefully.

Carroll, S., and Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback. An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15(3), 357-386.

Carroll, S. (2001). *Input and evidence: the raw material of second language acquisition*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning* 27, 29-46.

Chaudron, C. (1986). Teachers' priorities in correcting learners' errors in French immersion classes. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: conversation in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 64-84.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Corder, S.P. (1976). The significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 5(4): 161-170.

De Bot, K. (1996). The psycholinguistics of the output hypothesis. *Language Learning*, 46, 529-555.

Doughty, C., and Valera, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (Eds.) *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 114-138.

Egi, T. (2007). Recasts, learners' perceptions, and L2 development. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 249-267.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., and Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learners* 51(2), 281-318.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., and Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28, 339- 368.

Fanselow, J.F. (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. *Foreign Language Annals*, 10, 583-593.

Hawkes, L. (2003). Recasts revisited: The role of recasts in error detection and correction by adult ESL students. Published MA thesis.

Hendrickson, J.M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research and practice. *Modern Language Journal* 62(8): 387-398.

James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use. Exploring error analysis*. London: Longman.

Krashen. S.D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: issues and implications*. New York: Longman.

Lightbown, P., and Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-Form and Corrective Feedback in Communicative Language Teaching: effects on Second Language Learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12(4), 429-48.

Lightbown, P.M., and Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, and C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 39-52.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Richie, and T. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*. San Diego: Academic Press, 413-468.
- Long, M. H. (2007). *Problems in SLA*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lyster, R., and 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 classroom. *Language Learning* 51(1), 265- 301.
- Lyster, R. (1998b). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 20, 51-81.
- Lyster, R., and Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28, 269-300.
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 32, 265-302.
- Mosbah, G. A. (2007). *Treatment of Classroom Oral Errors: a Comparative Study Between Native and Non-native Speaking Teachers*. Published Doctoral Dissertation.
- Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: making it work. *ELT Journal* 41(2), 136-145.
- Richards, Jack C. (1990). The teacher as self-observer. In Jack C. Richards, *The Language Teaching Matrix*. New York:Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11, 129-158.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research* 8(3), 263-300.

Sheen, Y. (2008). Recasts, language anxiety, output and L2 learning. *Language Learning* 58(4), 835-874.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass, and C. Madden (Eds.), *Input on second language*

Tedick, D. & de Gortari, B. (1998). Research on error correction and implications for classroom teaching. *The ACIE Newsletter* 1(3).

Vigil, N. A., & Oller, J. W. (1976). Rule fossilization: A tentative model. *Language Learning*, 26, 281-295.