Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi (2009) 2/1

FEEDBACK GIVEN TO EFL LEARNERS: LEARNERS' PREFERENCES

Selma ELYILDIRIM*

Keywords:
Corrective feedback
EFL Learners
feedback preferences

Anahtar Kelimeler:
Düzeltici dönüt
İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrenciler
dönüt tercihleri

Abstract

The main concern of this study was to identify the feedback provision techniques used while teaching English to foreign language learners and also to find out their preferences as regards these techniques of feedback. The study also compared the perceptions of teachers and students in terms of feedback provided in classroom language teaching and learning. Data used in the study came from two different sources: a questionnaire designed to assess students' evaluation of the quality and quantity of the feedback offered to them besides teachers' evaluation of the feedback they give to the students and a focus group activity conducted with a small group of students (i.e. 12 students) and lecturers (i.e. 6 lecturers). The questionnaire was administered to 102 students attending the Department of English Language and Literature at a university in Turkey and 24 lecturers. The results obtained from the questionnaire showed that although learners received feedback, it was restricted. The answers in the focus group activity supported the main findings of the questionnaire and implied that students were not given sufficient and appropriate feedback.

Özet

İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN ÖĞRENCİLERE VERİLEN DÖNÜT: ÖĞRENCİLERİN TERCİHİ

Bu çalışmanın ana konusu yabancı dil öğrencilerine İngilizce öğretirken kullanılan dönüt sağlama tekniklerini belirlemek ve bu dönüt teknikleri bakımından onların tercihlerini öğrenmekti. Çalışma ayrıca sınıf içi dil öğretim ve öğreniminde sağlanan dönüt açısından öğretmenler ve öğrencilerin algılamalarını karşılaştırdı. Çalışmada kullanılan veriler iki farklı kaynaktan geldi: öğretmenlerin öğrencilere verdiği dönütü değerlendirmelerinin yanı sıra öğrencilerin kendilerine sunulan dönütün nitelik ve niceliğini değerlendirmelerini ölçmek üzere hazırlanmış bir anket ve küçük bir öğrenci (12 öğrenci) ve öğretim görevlisi grubu (6 öğretim görevlisi) ile yürütülen bir odak grubu etkinliği. Anket Türkiye'de bir üniversite İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümünde okuyan 102 İngilizce öğrencisi ve 24 öğretim görevlisine uygulandı. Anketten elde edilen sonuçlar öğrencilerin dönüt almasına rağmen bunun sınırlı olduğunu gösterdi. Odak grubu etkinliğindeki cevaplar anketin ana bulgularını destekledi ve öğrencilere yeterli ve uygun dönütün verilmediğini belirtti.

*Gazi Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Ankara, elyildir@atauni.edu.tr

1. INTRODUCTION

Error correction is always an important issue in language teaching. ESL/EFL teachers worry about what to correct, when to correct and how to correct. Although there are many studies dealing with error correction, researchers have not reached a consensus concerning these questions; yet as has been noted by Brown (1994), ignoring errors can be dangerous as this may give way to fossilization.

In fact, in the last decade there has been a growing interest in error correction and many researchers have examined its effects on students' interlanguage development and discussed its effectiveness. However, the results obtained from the empirical studies are controversial as regards this issue. Studies carried out by Polio, Fleck and Leder (1998), Semke (1984) and Sheppard (1992) have found that error feedback in L2 writing classes is not more effective for developing accuracy in learners' writing than content-related comments or no feedback situation. Truscott (1996) argues that error correction of L2 student writing is ineffective, even harmful for learners in the review article of the earlier studies.

The reviewed set of studies has shown different results on the issue. Ashwell (2000), Ferris and Roberts (2001) and Chandler (2003) provide supporting evidence that learners who receive corrective feedback from teachers improve in accuracy as well as fluency overtime. Chandler's study has also shown that direct correction and simple underlining of errors are superior to describing the type of error and doing this with underlining. This study clarifies the types of feedback which are useful but there are only four types of feedback included in this study. In relation with feedback in writing, Todd et al. (2001) discuss the useful feedback given to learners on journals. They have identified that participants of their study want to get feedback related to specific points in the journal instead of a list of general comments at the end. They prefer positive evaluations, suggestions, supportive and informative comments because such comments engender trust and build positive relationships between tutors and participants.

Like Chandler, Ashwell (2000) has investigated four different 'patterns' of teacher feedback. These are content-focused feedback while producing the first draft and then form-focused feedback in drafting the writing for a second time; using the reverse order; form and content feedback mixed at both stages, and finally a control pattern of zero feedback. He reports that none of these patterns produce significantly different results from each other yet there is a difference compared with no feedback situation. This result confirms the finding of Ferris and Roberts' study. In addition, some studies (Davis, 1997; Fotos, 1994; Jones, 1992; Mackey, McDonough, Fuji, & Tatsumi, 2001; Williams, 1999; all cited in McDonough, 2004:221) have concentrated on the teacher feedback versus peer feedback. The results have revealed that learners prefer teacher feedback to peer feedback.

Having used a questionnaire containing both open and close-ended questions and follow-up telephone interviews with a small sub-group of the participants,

Lee (2003) has attempted to identify L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. The results of the study imply that the majority of teachers mark errors comprehensively and spend a lot of time to mark student writing. Nevertheless, they have not been satisfied with their own practice; they have even been convinced that their effort was in vain in terms of student improvement.

Studies of feedback in oral production have been reviewed and presented in the following part. All are concerned with the type of feedback that should be given to learners. That is as to whether explicit or implicit feedback should be utilized by teachers. Carroll and Swain's study (1993) has indicated that explicit negative feedback works well with adult native speakers of English learning French. Especially the more advanced learners react better than the other learners and this implies the presence of an interaction between correction and proficiency. Lyster and Rana (1997) have examined the types of frequency of corrective feedback from teachers. The results show that teachers should use various methods of correction, not just recasts. McPherson (1998) looks at the issue from the learner's perspective and gives feedback to 10 subjects taking part in the study about their oral presentations. The conclusion drawn from the study is that learners expect and want to get feedback to work on their weak points.

In their review of research on the effectiveness of recasts that is reformulating the utterance produced by the speaker, in first and second language acquisition, Nicholas, Lightbown and Spada (2001) argue that recasts seem to be most effective in contexts where learners understand that recast is a reaction to the accuracy of the form of the utterance rather than the content. Han (2002) has carried out an empirical study of recasts to examine whether recasts increase the L2 learners' awareness and help them improve their tense consistency during oral and written performance. The study designed in the form of pretest, posttest and delayed posttest has involved eight pedagogical recast sessions between the pretest and the posttest for the recast group, no recast sessions but regular sessions for the non-recast group. The results of the study provide evidence that recasts are successful and effective in heightening learners' awareness and leading them to enhance their tense consistency.

Havranek (2002) investigates the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback in terms of the feedback source. The results reveal that learners who are corrected profit from the correction in almost 50% of all cases whereas their peers who are auditors achieve more success, that is 60%. However, linguistic and contextual factors such as the learner's contribution to the correction sequence, the communicative focus of the deviant utterance, and the type of error corrected have affected the test results of both peers and corrected learners.

Considering the importance of interaction, Mayo and Pica (2000) have explored if proficient EFL learners provide each other with the L2 input and feedback they need. They have found that as in the interaction between learners and native speakers, the interaction between advanced EFL learners can generate modified L2 input, and grammatically accurate feedback. Oliver and Mackey (2003) also study interaction and its effect on teacher's feedback provision and

learners' modifications to their original utterances following feedback. They report that teachers provide feedback more than half of the time in the content and communication contexts, and 85% of the time in explicit language-focused exchanges. As in Mayo and Pica's study, learners produce modified output after feedback provided in explicit language-focused exchanges.

Some studies dealt with negative feedback in language learning. McDonough (2004) has studied the effect of negative feedback and modified output during pair and small group activities. The results have demonstrated that learners who had more involvement with these two factors improve their production of the target structure, that is real and unreal conditionals. Oliver's study (2000) examines the differences in the provision and use of negative feedback with reference to the age of learners and the context of interaction. The results display that learners are provided with negative feedback in response to their non-targetlike utterances and use this feedback in their output.

Mackey, Oliver and Leeman (2003) have studied the effects of interlocutor type, that is native speaker (NS) - non-native speaker (NNS) and non-native speaker – nonnative speaker adult and child dyads, on amount of feedback, response to feedback, opportunities for modified output and immediate incorporation of feedback. In view of the results, they have stated that learners received negative feedback from both NS and NNS dyad types and this led to modified output; although NSs provided more feedback that NNSs in adult dyads.

In Gaskell and Cobb's (2004) study the main concern has been to find out whether concordance information can be used as feedback to sentence-level written errors. The preliminary results of their trial with intermediate academic learners have shown that learners are eager to use concordances to work on grammar and also they get benefit from these in making corrections.

Schulz (2001) deals with student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of explicit grammar instruction and corrective feedback in FL learning. A questionnaire is administered to a large student and teacher population (i.e. 1431 students and 214 teachers) from two different cultures. The data showed that both the USA and Colombian students as a group and teachers as a group across cultures are in agreement on the major questions. The results indicate that the students of both cultures believe that explicit grammar study and corrective feedback play a positive role in FL learning. A similar result has been obtained from the majority of teachers in both groups about the positive effect of grammar instruction on language learning.

Panova and Lyster (2002) have attempted to find out common patterns of error treatment in different classroom contexts and how specific types of feedback help learner uptake and immediate repair of error. Researchers have identified seven different feedback types, two of which show a high frequency distribution. These are recasts accounting for 55% of all feedback moves and translation with 22%. In the study, learners' uptake rates as well as immediate repair of error are low.

Rosa and Leow (2004) have researched task essentials, explicitness and feedback in different learning conditions. The results demonstrate that there is a pedagogical potential of implicit and explicit feedback provided simultaneously to input processing. Besides, learners can get benefit from explicit feedback in extracting generalizable knowledge that they can use both in comprehension and production.

Thus, the earlier studies have either dealt with feedback on written production or oral production, but not both of them together. The researchers studied certain feedback preferences but not all of them in terms of their effectiveness and the choice students make. The present study attempted to fill in this gap by focusing on feedback that learners of English as a foreign language are exposed to both in oral production and written production and the learners' preferences in terms of the types of feedback. This study also compared the perceptions of teachers and students in terms of feedback provided in classroom language learning and teaching.

2. RESEARCH DESIGN

2.1 Participants

In the study 102 (70 male and 32 female students) English major students at a university in Turkey took part. The students were attending the Department of English Language and Literature and taking classes about the grammar, vocabulary, reading, writing as well as the literature classes such as novel, drama, poetry, criticism, etc. The students' age ranged between 20 and 25. Twenty-four lecturers were also involved in data collection. The number of lecturers was restricted with the staff teaching the students who participated in the study.

2.2 Instruments

Data were collected from two different sources. The first data collection source was a questionnaire designed to assess both students' evaluation of the quality and quantity of the feedback offered to them and teachers' evaluation of the feedback they give to the students and the second data collection source was a focus group activity, which is defined by Krueger (1994, cited in Puchta & Potter 1999:315) as "a carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment," conducted with a small group of students (i.e. 12 students) and lecturers (i.e. 6 lecturers).

2.2.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in data collection was developed by taking into consideration the feedback provision techniques given in Bartram and Walton (1991). It had two parts: the first part examining oral production and the second part examining written production. There were five items in the oral production section and two items in the written production section.

The first two items were about the approximate quantity and frequency of feedback, in turn. The third item was concerned with the areas on which they received feedback. The fourth item was related to the importance of accuracy and fluency in terms of error correction. The final item of the oral production section addressed the issue of feedback provision techniques used by their lecturers. As to the items of the written production section, Item 6, similar to Item 4 in the preceding section, focused on their preferences as regards the areas on which they want to receive feedback and the seventh item asked how their lecturers correct their mistakes in written production. Items 4, 5, 6 and 7 were in the form of Likert type scale to give more choices to the participants about the level of the feedback provision. Finally there was the open-ended question concerning their preferences.

The same questionnaire was administered to both the lecturers and the students but some slight modifications such as changing the pronouns and words, omitting the third item from the questionnaire and putting a section to make comments about the items and feedback provision, were made in the questionnaire of the lecturers. The different versions of the questionnaire used in the study are presented while discussing the results of each questionnaire.

The questionnaire was piloted with a small group of learners (12 students) and lecturers (4 lecturers) to find out whether it caused any misunderstandings to both participants' groups. In addition, the reliability of the questionnaire was checked. Although there was not too many technical, subject specific questions or wording in the question items, some explanatory definitions, for instance giving a short definition to the term *register* in parentheses in Item 6 or inserting example expressions such as ''mmmmh' with doubtful intonation' and 'errr' to describe non-verbal sounds in Item 5 were used in the questionnaire to help participants understand the questionnaire items better after the pilot study. The necessary explanations were also made to the participants about the Likert type scale used between Item 4 and Item 7. The correlation coefficients calculated for the students and the lecturers ($r=.785$, $p<.01$ and $r=.876$, $p<.01$, respectively) were quite high.

2.2.2 Focus Group

A focus group activity was carried out with each participant group in addition to the questionnaire data. The reason why the focus group was preferred to an interview as a data collection technique was to provide a relaxed atmosphere for participants and also to give insights into the participants' perceptions on the issue through a detailed question guide. In the focus group 12 students responded to the questions concerning the feedback they received. The participants were required to respond to six items. These items were:

- whether the lecturers corrected the mistakes they made while speaking and writing in English, and if so how they corrected them,
- whether the feedback provided to them was adequate,

- on which areas the corrective feedback was concentrated, and why the lecturers put more weight on these areas in their opinion,
- whether they realized the corrective feedback provided and took it into consideration when using the same structures and words again,
- what the most common techniques were to provide feedback to the students were, and what their preferences were as regards feedback provision,
- and what the advantages and disadvantages of feedback provision were.

A focus group activity was carried out with 6 lecturers who taught the students taking part in the data collection, too. The aim of this focus group was to figure out the lecturers' perception of the feedback they offerred to the students. The number of items discussed in the lecturers' focus group was also six and these items partially corresponded to the questions asked the students:

- whether they provided corrective feedback to students,
- whether the feedback they provided to the students was adequate,
- on which areas they mostly provided corrective feedback, and why they gave more weight on these areas,
- whether they used various feedback provision techniques and what the lecturers' preferences were in terms of feedback provision techniques,
- whether students were aware of the corrections they made,
- what the advantages and disadvantages of feedback provision were.

2.3 Data Collection Procedure

In the data collection first the questionnaire was administered to the students in a class hour as a classroom activity. They were informed about the purpose of the study and how they should fill in the questionnaire. The respondents were ensured that the answers of the questionnaire would be used merely for research purposes and their identity would not be revealed as they would not write down their names on the sheets. The same questionnaire was given to the lecturers one by one as they were teaching at different hours.

After collecting the data, the focus group activity was carried out in the native language of the participants. At the opening part of the focus group activity, some statements were made to assure the participants that no wrong or right answer exists for the questions, and they were asked to respond to the items as spontaneously as possible. After getting the consent of the participants, the focus group discussions were recorded. The focus group activity involving students lasted ninety minutes whereas the focus group with lecturers lasted fifty minutes as lecturers were asked fewer questions than the students. As the focus groups were conducted in Turkish, the transcripts of the tape recordings were translated into English and all translations were checked by a bilingual English speaker.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the analysis of the questionnaire data, the frequency counts for each item were found and then they were converted into percentage scores. Although the results of each scale are given individually, the results of scale 4 and scale 5 were calculated together as the positive end, and similarly, the results of scale 1 and scale 2 were presented together to reflect the negative end while discussing the importance of items produced in the form of Likert-type scale. Scale 3 was considered a neutral item. After finding the distribution of frequency counts for each participant, the reliability of the questionnaire was checked by calculating the correlation coefficient through Guttman split-half procedure[1]. The statistical package program SPSS 10.1 was used in the calculation of the correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficients were .6546 at the level of $p<.01$ for the students and .8146 at the level of $p<.01$ for the lecturers, in turn. The results were high for both participant groups.

In the presentation of the results, first the results of the students' questionnaire and then the results of the lecturers' questionnaire are given below for the common items occurring in the questionnaires so that the results can be compared with each other. The comments made in the focus group activity follows the results of the questionnaire items if the question discussed in the activity shows parallelism to the questionnaire item. Otherwise, the items discussed in the focus group are presented after the results of the questionnaire data.

The results of Item 1 presented in Table 1 indicated that 45% of the students thought that they received feedback a lot whereas 37% of the students received little. The percentages of the students getting feedback quite a lot and too little were low compared with the first two groups: 11% and 7%, respectively.

Table 1. How much feedback did you get from your lecturers about the mistakes you make?

	too little	little	a lot	quite a lot	Total
N (Number of participants)	7	38	46	11	102
Percentage	7	37	45	11	100

As expressed in section 2.2.1, the modified version of the questionnaire was administered to the lecturers. The results of the first item in this questionnaire showed that 50% of the lecturers believed that they corrected students' mistakes a lot but 38% said they offerred little feedback to the students.

[1] Since it was not possible to administer the questionnaire twice to the same group of individuals, split-half procedure, which produces a correlation coefficient by comparing the results obtained from half of a test or questionnaire with the results on the other half, was used to calculate the correlation coefficient for the participant groups.

Table 2. How much did you correct the mistakes made by the students?

	too little	little	a lot	quite a lot	Total
N (Number of participants)	2	9	12	1	24
Percentage	8	38	50	4	100

The percentage scores calculated for the first items indicated that both the students and the lecturers agreed on the quantity of the feedback as the results were close to each other, though a difference between the students' perception and the lecturers' perception was observed for the first item in the option of 'quite a lot' (i.e. 11% in the students' questionnaire and 4% in the lecturers' questionnaire).

The detailed explanations concerning the quantity of the feedback given to the students came from the focus group activity. The responses elicited in the focus group by the participants revealed that participants received corrective feedback for their mistakes from their lecturers but its amount, type and technique varied from one to another.

In the discussion of the question whether the lecturers preferred overt or covert correction while providing feedback to the students, all the lecturers participating in the focus group activity indicated that they corrected the mistakes made by students as much as possible, but their responses diversified in terms of the correction form.

The results of Item 2 given in Table 3 investigating the frequency of receiving feedback showed that 47% of the students often obtained feedback, 25% always and 28% sometimes[2].

Table 3. How often did your lecturers correct your mistakes?

	sometimes	often	always	Total
N (Number of participants)	29	48	25	102
Percentage	28	47	25	100

In relation to frequency, as can be seen in the following table, half of the lecturers marked the option 'often' and the other half marked the option 'sometimes'.

Table 4. How often did you correct the students' mistakes?

	sometimes	often	always	Total
N (Number of participants)	12	12	0	24
Percentage	50	50	0	100

[2] In the evaluation of the frequency of the feedback provision, the frequency adverb *sometimes* was regarded as the item indicating some occasions, the frequency adverb *often* as the item indicating many times and the last frequency adverb *always* as the item indicating all the occasions and the participants' attention has been drawn to this differentation while filling in the questionnaire.

The results of the second items were different for the participant groups. The results for the option 'often' were nearly the same for both the students and the lecturers. However, the lecturers wrote that they sometimes corrected the students' mistakes but the students marked the options 'always' and 'sometimes' for the frequency of the feedback provision (i.e. 25% and 28%, respectively).

The explanations made in the focus group about the adequacy of feedback given to the students implied that students' contribution was too low and they had little opportunity to participate in all classroom activities because of crowded classrooms and restricted class hours. As for written production, although they did their written assignments they did not sometimes get feedback for these assignments since they were not returned to them. Therefore, they thought they did not get adequate feedback due to the factors beyond their control.

In the lecturers' focus group all the lecturers accepted that they provided feedback to the students but it was insufficient. The reason put forward for this case showed parallelism to the point made by the students. Even though they used every occasion to offer feedback to the students, they did not give feedback to each student in the classroom as classes involved at least 50 students and just a small proportion of these students had the chance of taking part in the activities. A similar concern was expressed in earlier studies that instructors might not be able to give feedback to every pair or small group because of some environmental conditions, one of which was the number of students (Fotos, 1998 cited in McDonough, 2004:210).

Table 5 provides the results of items corrected by the lecturers and this question did not have a corresponding item in the lecturers' questionnaire. According to the results, teachers mostly corrected students' pronunciation mistakes (88%) and grammar mistakes (51%). Vocabulary correction (28%) followed them and finally the correction of content[3] (10%) came. Pronunciation mistakes receive more feedback than the other mistake types because in the EFL contexts phonological mistakes are frequently made and become salient when they cause communication disruptions.

Table 5. What did your lecturers mostly correct in your oral production?

	N (Number of participants)	Percentage
Grammar	52	51
Phonology (i.e. Pronunciation)	90	88
Vocabulary	29	28
Content	10	10

Parallel to Item 5 in the students' questionnaire, the students taking part in the focus group activity were asked on which areas the corrective feedback was concentrated and why, they think, the lecturers gave more feedback on these

[3] Content was included to understand whether lecturers gave more importance to knowledge since students took literature classes as well as language classes.

areas. The responses given by Student 5 and Student 6 revealed that grammar and pronunciation mistakes were corrected more than other areas and these responses confirmed the results obtained from Item 3 in the students' questionnaire. Student 6 said:

> *Most of our lecturers gave great importance to grammar. For example, when we said 'I have been graduated from ...', the lecturer said 'I have graduated from ...'.*

The students themselves expressed the view that grammar was the key component in foreign language learning so their lecturers were right while treating grammatical mistakes severely. Student 7 explained that:

> *If grammar rules of a language were not known this language could not be used properly to convey messages. That is to say, knowledge would be meaningless without grammar.*

These explanations also showed that the influence of formal instructions given in the classrooms was intense as the instructions were mostly centered around grammar topics.

In the lecturers' focus group, in connection with the same issue two lecturers, Lecturer 1 and Lecturer 6 acknowledged that they mostly corrected grammar and pronunciation mistakes and they did this overtly through directing students' attention to the difference between the correct and incorrect items while discussing whether they corrected students' mistakes overtly or covertly.

Item 4 in the questionnaire was in the form of Likert-type scale to have a detailed analysis of the points on which learners thought lecturers should focus on in their oral production. The results of this item would reflect students' perception of the important items. As a brief reminder, some participants did not answer some questionnaire items so the total number of the participants answering the item was given at the end of each line. The students asserted, as can be seen in Table 6, that accuracy should come first and fluency should follow it (i.e. 69% for the former and 66% for the latter) but the difference between them was just 3%.

Table 6. What was important in correcting students' mistakes in oral production?

	NI	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	T	VI
Accuracy		2	2	4	4	22	24	25	27	39	42	92	
Fluency		2	2	10	10	22	22	36	35	32	31	102	

T: Total number of participants answering the item NI: Not Important
VI: Very Important

The results of the third item in the lecturers' questionnaire revealed that like the students the lecturers thought that accuracy (63%) was more important than fluency (46%).

Table 7. What was important when correcting students' mistakes in oral production?

	NI	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	T	VI
Accuracy		0	0	2	8	7	29	9	38	6	25	24	
Fluency		1	4	0	0	11	48	8	33	3	13	23	

T: Total number of participants answering the item NI: Not Important VI: Very Important

A parallelism between the students and the lecturers was obvious in the perception of the important item in feedback provision. The choice of the option 'accuracy' by the students might have been the result of the weight given to it in the classroom language teaching. If the lecturers mostly corrected students' grammar mistakes they would think that this was the aspect that should considered in oral production.

As for the ways of feedback provision, the results of Item 5 shed light on them. The most common feedback type was the overt correction of the lecturer, if the student could not realize and correct his/her own mistake (64%). The reformulation[4] of the students' utterances by the teacher, that is recast, was the second common feedback type in view of the results (62%). This result partly confirmed the findings obtained in the earlier research which discussed this way of feedfack provision as one of the most common ways (Fanselow, 1977 cited in Han 2002:545, Doughty 1994 cited in Nicholas, Lightbown & Spada 2001:737, Roberts, 1995 cited in Panova & Lyster 2002:576, Lyster & Ranta, 1997, Panova & Lyster, 2002). The third feedback type frequently used by the lecturers was the one in which the lecturer repeated as far as the mistake and then let the student continue and correct the mistake (53%). Some of the feedback provision types identified above corresponded to the types of corrective feedback presented by Lyster (1998, cited in Han, 2002:545) as the most frequently used strategies. These were explicit correction, repetition and recasts.

Although the percentages were not very high, the two feedback types whose frequency percentages were close to each other were the use of question intonation to make the student aware of the mistake (49%) and taking notes

[4] In many studies investigating feedback the term reformulation was given in the definition of the term recast as in Han's definition which relied on the definition provided by Long, Inagaki and Ortega (1998: 358, cited in Han, 2002:543): 'recasts are reformulations of "all or part of a learner's utterance so as to provide relevant morphosyntactic information that was obligatory but was either missing or wrongly supplied in the learner's rendition, while retaining its central meaning." However, in the present study the term reformulation has been used to indicate the target feedback provision technique to prevent subjects from facing any problem concerning the terminology.

during oral production and letting the student correct his/her mistake (48%). 40% of the participants reported that lecturers helped them in a pair or group activity by acting as a guide for negotiating the meaning by talking to each other. Lecturers could observe the students' production to intervene any communication breakdown when they offered feedback to each other during interaction as they, according to the study conducted by Mayo and Pica (2000:276), were also providers of feedback even at a low-intermediate level of proficiency. However, the result of the percentage score showing the use of the technique of acting as a guide was not high at all.

Table 8. How were your mistakes in oral production corrected by your lecturers?

	N	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	T	A
The lecturer stopped you in the middle of what you were saying and corrected the sentence or the utterance		15	15	18	18	23	23	23	23	21	21	100	
The lecturer indicated that you made a mistake by using gestures (e.g. shaking the head frowning, doubtful expression, etc.)		48	48	23	23	22	22	7	7	1	1	101	
The lecturer showed you that you had made a mistake by using non-verbal sounds such as 'mmmmmh' with doubtful intonation and 'errr'		49	49	27	27	12	12	9	9	4	4	101	
The lecturer implied you that you had made a mistake with simple phrases (e.g. 'nearly ...', 'not quite ...', 'good, but ...')		22	22	24	24	36	36	18	18	0	0	100	
The lecturer indicated verbally which item was wrong, but did not correct		50	51	19	19	9	9	9	9	11	11	98	
The lecturer repeated as far as the mistake and then let you continue and correct your mistake		9	9	13	13	26	26	30	30	23	23	101	
The lecturer pretended to misunderstand when he heard an incorrect item and drew your attention to the item		12	12	25	25	25	25	24	24	14	14	100	
The lecturer repeated the target item in the intonation of a question sentence to make you aware of the mistake		7	7	16	16	29	28	34	33	16	16	102	
The lecturer reformulated what		14	14	5	5	20	20	34	33	29	28	102	

you had said in a correct form													
The lecturer helped you in a pair or group activity to negotiate the meaning expressed. The lecturer acted as a guide and let you negotiate the meaning by talking to each other		26	25	15	15	21	21	22	22	18	18	102	
If you could not realize and correct your mistake, the lecturer corrected it overtly		5	5	14	14	17	17	33	32	33	32	102	
During oral production the lecturer noted down the mistake on a card, notebook or a sheet and let you correct your mistake		24	24	13	13	16	16	23	23	26	25	102	

N: Never A: Always T: Total number of participants answering the item

The results showed that several feedback types were not preferred by the lecturers. These were the use of gestures (71%), the indication of a mistake by using non-verbal sounds such as 'mmmmh' with doubtful intonation and 'errr' (76%), the indication of mistake verbally, but without correction (70%). The feedback provision technique related to the use of simple phrases such as 'nearly…', 'not quite…', 'good, but…' was not frequently preferred, too (46%). The technique 'the lecturer pretended to misunderstand when he heard an incorrect item and drew the student's attention to the item' was in the middle because 38% of the students (i.e. 14% for scale 5 and 24% for scale 4) wrote that lecturers did that but 37% (i.e. 12% for scale 1 and 25% for scale 2) claimed the opposite. This difference could be attributed to the difference in students' perception of the lecturers' behaviours.

In the students' focus group the most common feedback provision ways used by the lecturers were discussed and the students were asked which one or ones they prefer. The common view was that lecturers did not have a variety in their disposal in presenting feedback to the students. For that reason, they usually preferred to reformulate the sentence during oral production. Student 4 explained this technique as follows:

> *The lecturers usually reproduce the sentence constructed by one of our friends. The other students as well as the speaker compare the sentence uttered by the lecturers with the sentence s/he produced and try to find the difference, that is the incorrect item or the part.*

In the meantime, several students added that during oral production few lecturers took notes of the mistakes and went through these mistakes towards the

end of the class by giving explicit feedback and drawing the students' attention to the incorrect lexical items, grammar structures and pronunciations. The students also stated that the lecturers identified the incorrect parts and even sometimes corrected them while giving feedback in written production. The students expressed their desire of getting feedback in different forms. They argued that this might be motivating for them.

In relation with their preferences, they indicated that the reformulations were quite effective and useful in directing their attention to the incorrect items or parts, but some other forms such as interrupting the students' utterance to correct the mistake, asking another student the answer or the correct form were nerve wracking.

The results of the same item in the lecturers' questionnaire displayed that lecturers (76%) thought that they mostly reformulated the utterances produced by the students. Doughty (1994, cited in Nicholas, Lightbown & Spada 2001:737) made the point that recast comprised 60% of the teacher's feedback and added that it was preferred to repetition, which was the type of feedback given to the correct utterances, when a single error made in utterance production. This result was different from the result obtained from the students as they identified reformulation as the second common way of feedback provision. This difference might have been the result of a misunderstanding experienced in content-based classrooms. Students may have missed recasts as feedback drawing their attention to their nontarget output as recasts had the risk of being perceived "as alternative or identical forms fulfilling discourse functions other than corrective ones" (Lyster, 1998b:207, cited in Oliver & Mackey, 2003:520).

The lecturers also preferred acting as a guide and creating a means among the students for negotiating meaning (71%) as well as correcting the students' mistakes overtly when the student could not recognize the mistake (71%). However, for the former way of feedback provision, 40% of the students marked the options 1 and 2 on the scale which meant they did not receive feedback in this way and 40% supported the lecturers' claim that they employed this technique while giving feedback.

The feedback provision technique 'stopping the student in the middle of his/her explanation and correcting the sentence or the utterance' was rejected by most of the lecturer participants (84%) as they marked the option 'never' on the scale, but 44% of the students indicated the opposite because they marked options 4 and 5 which represented 'always' on the scale. This implied that the students perceived the interventions of the lecturers as a negative form of feedback provision. The feedback provision technique 'pretending as if the item produced incorrectly was misunderstood and drawing the student's attention to this item' was marked by 52% of the lecturers. However, the percentage score calculated for this feedback provision technique did not overlap with the students' perception. This might be the result of the students' being unaware of pretence.

Table 9. How did you correct the students' mistakes in oral production

	N	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	T	A
You stopped the student in the middle of what he was saying and correct the sentence or the utterance		17	71	3	13	2	8	2	8	0	0	24	
You indicated that the student had made a mistake by using gestures (e.g. shaking the head, frowning, doubtful expression, etc.)		3	13	11	46	7	29	2	8	1	4	24	
You showed the student that he had made a mistake by using non-verbal sounds such as 'mmmmmh' with doubtful intonation and 'errr'		7	29	8	33	8	33	1	4	0	0	24	
You implied the student that he had made a mistake with simple phrases (e.g. 'nearly ...', 'not quite ...', 'good, but ...')		4	17	6	25	9	38	3	13	2	9	24	
You indicated verbally which item was wrong, but did not correct it		4	17	6	25	9	38	4	17	1	4	24	
You repeated as far as the mistake and then let the student continue and correct his mistake		4	17	8	33	5	21	5	21	2	8	24	
You pretended to misunderstand when you heard an incorrect item and drew the student's attention to the item		3	13	4	17	4	17	11	46	2	8	24	
You repeated the target item in the intonation of a question sentence to make the student aware of the mistake		1	4	5	22	7	30	8	33	2	9	23	
You reformulated what the student had said in a correct form		1	4	0	0	5	21	9	38	9	38	24	
You helped students to negotiate the meaning expressed. You acted as a guide and let them negotiate the meaning by talking to each other		1	46	2	8	4	17	10	42	7	29	24	
If the student could not realize and corrected his mistake, you correct it overtly		0	0	0	0	7	29	6	25	11	46	24	
During oral production you noted down the mistake on a card, notebook or a sheet and let the student correct his mistake		5	21	5	21	6	25	3	13	5	21	24	

N: Never A: Always T: Total number of participants answering the item

Other techniques of feedback provision were marked by few lecturers as their percentage was lower than fifty. This indicated that feedback provision ways

preferred by the lecturers did not show a wide variety. However, as expressed by Panova and Lyster (2002:592), exposing students to various feedback types could be more successful than relying on one or two common types: "A balance, therefore, of different feedback types selected in the light of various contextual, linguistic, and cognitive factors is likely to prove more successful than overusing any one type of feedback."

The items dealing with the techniques lecturers used in presenting feedback and their preferences for any specific feedback forms were discussed in the lecturers' focus group, as well. Four lecturers stated that they corrected the mistakes covertly whereas two lecturers acknowledged that they preferred overt correction. Lecturer 2 explained that students were usually ashamed of the direct correction and did not want to contribute to the classroom activities next time after they had offered overt feedback. Lecturer 4's argument was related to the process of learning a new language. He thought that students should not be forced to understand the correction via presenting formal instruction. Lecturers 3 and 5 emphasized the fact that students usually made the same mistakes repeatedly and so producing the correct form would be enough for students to realize the target mistake. Lecturers also indicated that they did not use many techniques and preferred reformulations as the main technique of feedback provision in oral production. They pointed out that they gave clues to the students about their mistakes through intonation and repetition of the incorrect parts they produced.

The second section of the questionnaire has focused on feedback given in the written production. According to the previous studies investigating student writers' views toward error feedback (see Ferris & Roberts 2001), second language learners want, expect and appreciate teacher feedback on their written errors. Therefore, the items in the section of written production have concentrated on the issues that should be corrected, the techniques used by lecturers to correct the students' errors and also techniques preferred by students.

In the light of the results most of the students (84%) thought that grammar should be corrected. The observation that students want grammar correction has also been made by Truscott (1996). Vocabulary was the second item which should be corrected (65%) and a mistake causing difficulty in understanding the meaning was the third one (61%). Incomprehensible sentences (51%) and spelling (48%) came after the items given above[5]. They did not show a strong

[5] Putting a clear cut boundary among the items grammar, vocabulary and incomprehensible sentences was difficult since they were intervowen. However, while administering the questionnaire to the students, they were instructed that grammar was related to the topics of grammar such as articles, adjectives, active-passive sentences, reported speech, etc. and vocabulary was connected with the lexical items and the right choice of the idiomatic expressions. As to the incomprehensible sentences, they referred to the sentences which could not be made out from the context. A mistake associated with the meaning was related to ambiguity.

bias for punctuation and consider mistakes of register[6] (i.e. level of formality) as an important item that should be corrected (41%).

Table 10. What should the lecturer correct in your written production?

	N	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	T	A
Grammar		1	10	6	6	9	9	19	19	66	65	101	
Vocabulary		6	6	6	6	24	24	30	30	35	35	101	
Spelling		17	17	17	17	19	19	21	21	27	27	101	
Punctuation		17	18	18	19	29	31	14	15	17	18	95	
Mistakes of register (i.e. level of formality in writing)		19	20	20	21	28	29	23	24	7	7	97	
Incomprehensible sentences		9	10	13	14	24	26	27	29	20	22	93	
A mistake where the meaning was not clear		7	7	8	8	24	24	24	24	37	37	100	

N: Never A: Always T: Total number of participants answering the item

In the results of the lecturers' questionnaire, the following order was seen with regard to important aspects in correcting students' written production: grammar (86%), incomprehensible sentences (79%), vocabulary (77%), a mistake where the meaning was not clear (71%), spelling (55%), punctuation (50%) and finally mistakes of register (48%).

Table 11. What should be corrected in students' written production?

	N	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	T	A
Grammar		0	0	1	5	2	9	6	27	13	59	22	
Vocabulary		0	0	0	0	5	23	7	32	10	45	22	
Spelling		1	5	3	15	5	25	5	25	6	30	20	
Punctuation		2	5	3	15	5	25	4	20	6	30	20	
Mistakes of register (i.e. level of		1	5	6	29	4	19	5	24	5	24	21	

[6] All the students taking part in the data collection have taken the course called Introduction to Linguistics and hence they were familiar with the technical terms such as register but to remind the term to the students and assist the lecturers answering the questionnaire a brief definition indicating that it is related to the level of formality used in the text was given in parentheses.

formality in writing)													
Incomprehensible sentences		1	5	2	11	1	5	8	42	7	37	19	
A mistake where the meaning was not clear		1	4	1	5	4	19	3	14	12	57	21	

N: Never A: Always T: Total number of participants answering the item

Both the students and the lecturers believed that grammar mistakes should be corrected. The students marked vocabulary and mistakes hindering semantic interpretation as important items while providing feedback in written production but the lecturers considered vocabulary and incomprehensible sentences as items having almost equal importance and put the 'a mistake related to the meaning' to the fourth position.

According to the results presented in Table 12, the techniques used while offerring corrective feedback in written production were restricted. The most frequent feedback provision technique was to mark the incorrect items with a pen and write down the correct ones (58%).

Table 12. How did your lecturers correct your mistakes in written production?

	N	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	T	A
The lecturer marked the incorrect items with a pen and wrote down the correct ones		18	19	10	11	12	13	23	24	32	34	95	
The lecturer reacted the content rather than grammar, spelling, and punctuation mistakes		27	27	27	27	25	25	14	14	6	6	99	
The lecturer concentrated on the mistakes that were related to the language point in question and ignored the others		23	24	31	32	22	23	18	19	2	2	96	
The lecturer identified the incorrect parts and gave the written work to you in order to make you correct them by yourself.		45	46	17	17	13	13	13	13	10	10	98	

The lecturer made you work in pairs on your partner's script. That is you corrected each other's written work (peer-correction)		35	36	17	18	17	18	17	18	10	10	96	
The lecturer used specific codes to highlight your mistakes and made you correct the script		40	42	18	19	20	21	18	19	0	0	96	

N: Never A: Always T: Total number of participants answering the item

The other feedback provision techniques presented in the questionnaire were marked towards the option 'never' on the scale. The item indicating that the lecturer identified the incorrect parts and gave the written work to the student for self-correction had the highest percentage towards the negative end (63%). Nevertheless, Ferris and Roberts (2001) have pointed out that second language acquisition theorists and ESL writing specialists support indirect feedback provision in the form of indicating the existence of an error but letting the writer correct as it gives an opportunity of learning through problem solving.

The second highest percentage score was for using specific codes to highlight students' mistakes and making the student correct the script (61%) when considering the non-use of feedback provision techniques. Although it was not used by the teachers, this was the most popular feedback choice (48%) in Ferris and Roberts' study. Peer-correction was not made use of in written production (54%), though many studies had indicated the positive effect of the peer correction in improving writing. Finally, the results of item 7 displayed that concentrating on the mistakes that were related to the language point in question and ignoring the others and reacting to the content rather than grammar, spelling, and punctuation mistakes were not used in feedback provision (i.e. 56% for the former and 54% for the latter).

In relation with the written feedback, the students taking part in the focus group activity stated that they were deprived of proper written feedback to find out their common mistakes. They said that they should see their mistakes to avoid making these mistakes repeatedly. The views expressed by the students about the error correction in writing were consistent with the previous studies reporting that second language learners consider error feedback from their teachers important to their success (Ferris, 2004).

The effective techniques that could be employed in providing feedback in written production were discussed in the focus group. Student 12 stressed that written feedback should have special coding systems and looking at the codes, the student should realize his/her mistakes. He was against direct feedback, because he thought the student should find the correct answer using the clue

presented in the codes, but in the case of failure, he could get help from some reference sources such as grammar books, internet, dictionaries, etc. Thus, the student might develop his/her research skills.

As to the results of the lecturers' questionnaire for the item concerning the written feedback, the results showed that the most common feedback provision technique was the same, that is, marking the incorrect items with a pen and writing down the correct ones (70%), with the one identified by the students. For the rest no significant percentage score which was over 50% was found. The results revealed that the lecturers did not use various techniques to correct the mistakes produced in writing. This was apparent in both the results of the students' questionnaire and the results of the lecturers' questionnaire.

Table 13. How did you correct the students' mistakes in written production?

	N	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	T	A
You marked the incorrect items with a pen and wrote down the correct ones		1	4	2	9	4	17	8	35	8	35	23	
You reacted to the content rather than grammar, spelling, and punctuation mistakes		3	14	3	14	9	43	3	14	3	14	21	
You concentrated on the mistakes that were related to the language point in question and ignored the others		5	22	5	22	6	26	5	22	2	9	23	
You identified the incorrect parts and gave the written work to the student in order to make him correct them by himself.		3	13	7	30	5	22	3	13	5	22	23	
You made the students work in pairs. That is they corrected each other's written work (peer-correction)		2	10	4	19	9	43	5	24	1	5	21	
You used specific codes to highlight the students' mistakes and mdke them correct the script		4	17	3	13	6	26	4	17	6	26	23	

N: Never A: Always T: Total number of participants answering the item

In terms of written feedback, the lecturers in the focus group pointed out that classes were too large to give many written assigments and to return them to students after identifying the mistakes. They confessed that evaluation of written assignments requires a lot of time which they do not have due to heavy teaching

burdens. In Lee's (2003) study, similar comments were made by second language writing teachers in relation with the practices they make. Regarding the practices, Lee (2003:227) commented that "it could be possible that teachers are not aware of the range of error feedback techniques, or that they are so much overburdened by their marking load that there is not enough time and space for them to reflect on their error feedback practice and to adjust and improve it." In addition, the responses provided for Items 5 and 6 confirmed the complaints made by the students that they did not receive adequate written feedback and there was no variety in feedback provision techniques.

The responses given to the final open-ended item about which technique(s) of correction the student preferred were grouped together to find out the common points among students' remarks shown in Table 14. Some students did not make any comment about their preferences in this item.

Table 14. Which technique(s) of correction given above do you prefer?

In oral production	Frequency	Percentage
Lecturers should repeat the target item in the intonation of a question sentence to make the student aware of mistake	19	19
After completing the sentence, lecturers should correct the student's mistake	18	18
lecturers should correct pronunciation mistakes	15	15
Lecturers should correct mostly the student's grammar, vocabulary and spelling mistakes	15	15
Lecturers should stop the student and correct the sentence	14	14
Lecturers should note down the mistake on a card or a sheet and inform the student about the mistakes	12	12
If lecturers correct my mistake in the middle of my sentence I forgot what I would say next.	8	8
Lecturers should reformulate what the student said in a correct form	6	6
Implication of the mistake with simple phrases	4	4
lecturers should pretend as if they misunderstand to draw the student's attention to the incorrect item	4	4
Others (lecturers should help the student in a pair or group activity, use non-verbal cues …)	5	5
In written production	Frequency	
Lecturers should identify the incorrect parts and return the written work …	28	28
Lecturers should indicate the mistakes, especially grammar mistakes	27	27
Lecturers should note the mistakes in a notebook and inform the students about the mistakes later	17	17

Lecturers should react to the content	12	12
Lecturers should use specific codes to highlight the mistakes	8	8
Lecturer should encourage peer correction	4	4
Others (lecturers should write the correct items, concentrate on the mistakes that are related to the language point in question ...)	3	3

The responses presented in Table 14 showed that most of the students responding to the open-ended question would like to receive implicit feedback in the form of implication, reformulation, etc., though some students thought that they should be exposed to explicit feedback in oral and written production. They justified their reasons for demanding explicit feedback as in the following quotations:

> *The teacher must tell the mistake to the class so everybody can learn it.* (Student 23)

> *While our friends are trying to correct their mistakes, they usually make irrelevant explanations so we cannot understand the subject properly. If the lecturer corrects them, we can understand their right forms.* (Student 65)

> *They should direct us to how we can speak correctly.* (Student 3)

14% of the students stated that lecturers should stop the student and correct the sentence. As opposed to this view, 18% of the students noted that lecturers should correct the student's mistake after the student completes her/his sentence. Some students (8%) stated that they forgot what they would say next if they were interrupted in the middle of their sentences for giving feedback. 12% of the students reported that they would prefer feedback written on a card or a sheet. 15% of the students thought that pronunciation mistakes should be corrected. One of these students explained her reason by stating that 'in oral production fluency and pronunciation have a big role. They are more important than the others.' (Student 34).

In relation to feedback in written production, 28% of the students indicated that lecturers should return their written work back by specifying incorrect parts. 27% of the students reported that lecturers should indicate the mistakes, especially grammar mistakes. 17% of the students wrote that lecturers should record the mistakes in a notebook and inform the students about their mistakes later. Several students (8%) made their preferences for specific codes that should be used by the lecturers to highlight the mistakes and few students (4%) wanted to have peer correction.

Not only did the students have the opportunity to indicate their preferences and make comments but also teachers had it. Some of these comments are presented below:

> *It is good if a teacher has a repertoire or variety of strategies for different situations. This also keeps the students 'on their toes' and prevents them from becoming too accustomed to only one or two strategies used over and over repeatedly.* (Teacher 7)

> *In oral production tasks, I prefer to allow students to speak fluently and finish their talk or presentation. As teacher I often make notes during the students' talk and comment afterwards. For example, I might tell the student that I enjoyed their talk, particularly the point made about 'X' and then mention that I had heard them say they 'didn't make to come here', I might ask the class if this is correct and elicit their feedback. If several students make similar errors then it can become a teaching point in future lessons.* (Teacher 11)

> *It is a hard decision to make when and how to correct Ss' errors. I do it very often in written form. Since it is expected to be more formal and accurate, in speech the purpose should be more on fluency rather than accuracy, I assume.* (Teacher 20)

In the focus group activity carried out with the students and the lecturers, apart from the questions connected with the questionnaire items, some questions tackling the issues of the students' awareness of the corrective feedback and the pros and cons of the feedback provision were discussed. The students were asked whether they realized the corrective feedback provided and use it in their later productions. The reply given to this question was striking as Student 8 responded that it depended on the lecturer as well as the nature of teaching and added that if the teacher implied that the student should use a different structure, word, style, etc. in the correction by raising their awareness of mistakes, they recognized the mistakes and made special effort to use them correctly in their later uses; otherwise they missed the corrective feedback.

In relation with the same question, lecturers argued that students could not sometimes realize the correction because of exhaustion, carelessness and over-excitement they experienced while participating in the classroom activities yet they caught the correct form of the sentence or utterance they produced if they were given the chance of repeating the correct form. In the case of overt

feedback they were more alert to produce the correct form in their later uses, when the input provided as formal instruction was absorbed by them.

The advantages and disadvantages of feedback were also discussed in the focus group. The participants argued that feedback they received was really beneficial, especially when they themselves became aware of the corrections and paid attention to the corrected part in their later uses. As a disadvantage, they reported the problem of missing the corrected part in the feedback.

In the lecturers' focus group, except for Lecturer 1, lecturers strongly supported the view that feedback given to the students was beneficial for them as they might learn the correct form and enhance their language proficiency. They thought, on some occasions, that students failed in utilizing the feedback but after having enough exposure to the correct form they started generating the sentences conforming to the rules of the target language. As a disadvantage, lecturers drew attention to the danger that students might not understand the corrected part in the covert feedback provision.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed at to find out whether EFL learners receive adequate and proper feedback in oral and written production. The study also investigated the feedback provision techniques used in classroom language teaching and the students' preferences as regards these techniques of feedback. In the study the perceptions of teachers and students were compared in terms of feedback provided.

In view of the results obtained from the questionnaire, the 'a lot' or 'quite a lot' percentage of feedback learners received was slightly more than 50 percent (i.e. 56). The frequency of providing students with feedback was high but most of this feedback was related to the correction of pronunciation mistakes. Grammar and vocabulary mistakes did not receive the same attention. In oral production, learners marked accuracy frequently as the most important item while learning a language. They believed fluency come after pronunciation.

The results showed that learners were overtly corrected when they could not realize and correct their own mistakes. Another common way of feedback provision was the reformulation of students' utterances. Some types of feedback provision such as the use of gestures, the indication of a mistake by using non-verbal sounds 'mmmmh' and 'errr', and the indication of a mistake verbally without overt correction were not used by the lecturers at all. The implication of this finding was that there was no wide variety as regards different feedback provision techniques.

In the written production a great majority of the students insisted on the necessity of grammar correction. Vocabulary mistakes had the secondary position with regard to the items that should be corrected yet incomprehensible sentences, spelling, punctuation and mistakes of register whose percentages were around 50 or lower than this were regarded as non-significant compared with grammar and vocabulary. The results of the feedback techniques used in the written production demonstrated that students got restricted feedback since most

of the students marked the option 'never' for different feedback types. The feedback type 'marking the incorrect items with a pen and writing down the correct ones' was the most frequent one according to the results.

The analysis of the data gathered from the lecturers showed, parallel to the results obtained from the students, that 54% of the lecturers corrected students' mistakes a lot or quite a lot. However, there was a discrepancy between the students and lecturers as half of the lecturers claimed that they often corrected the students' mistakes. Most of the other half indicated that they sometimes corrected them. They also put emphasis on accuracy rather than fluency while identifying the important item in the correction of mistakes in the students' oral production. The lecturers mostly used reformulation in feedback provision. On the contrary to the students' perception, the lecturers stated that they prefer overt error correction less than reformulations. Besides they marked the feedback type acting as a guide and letting students negotiate the meaning through talking to each other. Since it was a direct form of feedback learners might have considered this feedback type as a classroom activity.

For teachers, structure came earlier than meaning in feedback provision as they specify grammar as the most important aspect in giving feedback on students' written production. Correcting incomprehensible sentences followed the grammar feedback. Lecturers wrote that they frequently identified the incorrect items with a pen and wrote down the correct ones while presenting feedback to learners in written production.

According to the results of the open-ended question most of the students preferred to receive implicit feedback through implication, reformulation, etc. but some wanted to get explicit feedback. Almost one fifth of the students noted that they wanted to be corrected after completing their sentences. Several students wrote that they should receive feedback in pronuncation mistakes. A small group stated that they would like to learn their mistakes in the form of written feedback. The students were quite sensitive about the identification of their mistakes, in particular grammar mistakes. They believed that the written feedback relating their work would help them improve their English and raise their awareness of the common mistakes they make.

In the light of the comments made in the part of 'other comments', a lecturer admitted the importance of exposing learners to various feedback provision techniques. Some of the lecturers emphasized that in oral production fluency had the priority over accuracy. A lecturer drew attention to cultural differences as a source of error.

The data collected from the focus group provided support for some of the findings mentioned above. It also revealed that students received corrective feedback but they did not think its amount was enough. In comparison with written production they obtained more feedback in oral production. Students thought that the corrective feedback they were given was beneficial, especially when they produced their sentences in view of the earlier corrective feedback. Students agreed on the importance and necessity of written feedback, even though there was disagreement as regards the type of written feedback.

In the lecturers' focus group, lecturers confessed that they gave corrective feedback to their students as much as possible through exposing them to the correct form of the language either covertly or overtly but this was not sufficient when considering the fact that classes were overcrowded and a small proportion of the students contributed to class discussion and got the opportunity of receiving feedback for their incorrect items.

Lecturers accepted that they did not have a wide repertoire of feedback provision and they mostly used reformulations in the oral production and marked errors with a pen when providing feedback to learners in the written production. Furthermore, most of the lecturers found feedback beneficial for students.

Considering the findings presented above, the following suggestions can be made. Students should be provided with sufficient corrective feedback to prevent them from producing the incorrect items. If the incorrect items are not corrected students might think that these are possible usages and go on using them repeatedly. This may give way to fossilization of these incorrect items. Not only should the students' pronunciation and grammar mistakes be corrected but also vocabulary mistakes should be corrected. Various feedback provision techniques should be used to direct students' attention to the accurate and proper production of English. Both teachers and students should be given training about the feedback provision techniques to raise their awareness of corrective feedback. This will increase the benefit they can get from the corrections and reduce the risk of missing them.

Students should be provided with feedback in written production as well as oral production due to the fact that written language production is an important part of the language learning. This might help them to be more attentive to the mistakes they make. Teachers should commit themselves to treat students' written errors. They should prepare themselves to the identification of the errors and give feedback to them by taking classes. Students can be given training on grammar and editing strategies through mini lessons. In providing feedback, teachers should take students' needs and background as well as the instructional context into consideration (Ferris, 2004:59). In case of difficulty students face to grasp the correction, explicit or overt instruction should be given. Instead of pinpointing the students who make mistakes, feedback should be given to the whole group to reduce the risk of having offended students who refrain from the classroom activities.

REFERENCES

Ashwell, T. (2000). "Patterns of Teacher Response to Student Writing in a Multiple-draft Composition Classroom: Is Content Feedback followed by Form Feedback the Best Method?", **Journal of Second Language Writing,** 9/3, pp:227-257.

Bartram, M., & Walton, R. (1991). **Correction.** Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

Brown, H. D. (1994). **Teaching by Principles.** Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall Regents.

Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). "Explicit and Implicit Negative Feedback: An Empirical Study of the Learning and Linguistic Generalizations", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 15/3, pp:357-386.

Chandler, J. (2003). "The Efficacy of Various Kinds of Error Feedback for Improvement in Accuracy and Fluency in L2 Student Writing1, **Journal of Second Language Writing,** 12, pp:267-296.

Ferris, D. R. (2004). "The "Grammar Correction" Debate in L2 Writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime...?)" **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 13, pp:49-62.

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). "Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes. How Explicit does it Need to be?" **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 10, pp:161-184.

Gaskell, D., & Cobb, T. (2004). "Can Learners Use Concordance Feedback for Writing Errors?" **System**, 32, 301-319.

Han, Z. (2002). "A Study of the Impact of Recasts on Tense Consistency in L2 Output", **TESOL Quarterly**, 36/4, pp:543-572.

Havranek, G. (2002). "When is corrective feedback most likely to succeed?" **International Journal of Educational Research,** 37, pp:255-270.

Lee, I. (2003). "L2 Writing Teachers' Perspectives, Practices and Problems Regarding Error Feedback", **Assessing Writing**, 8, pp:216-237.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). "Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, 19, pp:37-66.

Mackey, A., Oliver, R., & Leeman, J. (2003). "Interactional Input and the Incorporation of Feedback: An Exploration of NS – NNS and NNS – NNS Adult and Child Dyads", **Language Learning**, 53/1, pp:35-66.

Mayo, M. P. G., & Pica, T. (2000). "Interaction Among Proficient Learners: Are Input, Feedback and Output Needs Addressed in a Foreign Language Context?", **Studia Linguistica**, 54/2, pp:272-279.

McDonough, K. (2004). "Learner – Learner Interaction during Pair and Small Group Activities in a Thai EFL Context", **System**, 32, pp:207-224.

McPherson, K. (1998). "Feedback on Oral Performance: Some Insights from Adult Learners", **Prospect: An Australian Journal of TESOL.** 13/2.

Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2001). "Recasts as Feedback to Language Learners", **Language Learning**, 51/4, pp:719-758.

Oliver, R. (2000). "Age Differences in Negotiation and Feedback in Classroom and Pairwork", **Language Learning**, 50/1, pp:119-151.

Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2003). "Interactional Context and Feedback in Child ESL Classrooms", **The Modern Language Journal,** 87/4, pp:519-533.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). "Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom", **TESOL Quarterly**, 36/4, pp:573-585.

Polio, C., Fleck, C., & Leder, N. (1998). "If I only had more time' ESL Learners' Changes in Linguistic Accuracy of Essay Revisions", Journal of Second Language Writing, 7/1, pp:43-68.

Puchta, C., & Potter, J. (1999). "Asking Elaborate Questions: focus Groups and the Management of Spontaneity", **Journal of Sociolinguistics**, 3/3, pp:314-335.

Rosa, E. E. & Leow, R. P. (2004). "Computerized Task-based Exposure, Explicitness and Type of Feedback on Spanish L2 Development", **The Modern Language Journal**, 88, pp:192-217.

Schulz, R. A. (2001). "Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback: USA-Colombia", **The Modern Language Journal,** 85/2, pp:244-258.

Semke, H. D. (1984). "Effects of the Red Pen", **Foreign Language Annals**, 29, pp:343-364.

Sheppard, K. (1992). "Two Feedback Types. Do they Make a Difference?", **RELC Journal,** 23, pp:103-110.

Truscott, J. (1996). "The Case against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes", **Language Learning,** 46/2, pp:327-369.

Todd, R. W., Mills, N., Palard, C. & Khamcharoen, P. (2001). "Giving Feedback on Journals", **ELT Journal,** 55/4, pp:354-359.