About Us: http://www.the-criterion.com/about/

Archive: http://www.the-criterion.com/archive/

Contact Us: http://www.the-criterion.com/contact/

Editorial Board: http://www.the-criterion.com/editorial-board/

Submission: http://www.the-criterion.com/submission/

FAQ: http://www.the-criterion.com/fa/

Teacher's Perception and Awareness of Oral and Written Feedback in an EFL Classroom: The Case of Three Selected Schools in Kambata Tambaro Zone, Southern Ethiopia

Tadiwos Hambamo Makebo
Lecturer in Wolaita Sodo University
Department of English Language and Literature

Abstract:

This study aims to examine the different types of oral and written feedback used in the EFL classroom, as well as teachers' own perceptions of feedback. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches were used. Three types of data collection instruments were used for the analysis of the document: three secondary school teachers were interviewed; their English lessons were observed; and their feedback on student essays was collected. The material collected was used in the analysis, which indicated that the teachers used different types of feedback. The most frequent oral feedback types used were recast, elicitation, and praise. The evaluation of different feedback types performed in this study suggests that recast as an implicit feedback type provided orally could be more effective in a communicative classroom setting, as it does not interrupt the communicative flow. In writing, on the other hand, explicit feedback combined with face-to-face sessions could lead to better results.

Keywords: students' perception, teacher feedback, Teacher's perceptions, writing instruction.

1. Introduction

Feedback is one of the fundamental tools used to provide effective interaction in teaching-learning contexts. Narcissi defines the term "feedback" in any teaching context as "the post-response information which informs the learners on their actual states of learning and/or performance in order to help them detect if their states corresponds to the learning aims in a given context (292)".

The scope of feedback has a vital impact on the process of any specific learning situation. The feedback provided by a teacher will determine the progress of learners, the pedagogical and assessment intentions and expectations of the teacher and the institution, the degree of student engagement in the learning process, and the revision responses expected from learners (Parr &Timperley, 2010).

When students make errors, teachers are there to provide them with guidance so that they will be able to produce the correct target form. Teachers need to provide feedback on students' oral and

written performances in order to enhance their target language skills. Furthermore, according to Brookhart (2008:2), feedback can be powerful if done well, and effective feedback gives students the information that they need so that they can understand where they are in their learning and what to do next. In this study, the term feedback is used to refer to feedback given by a teacher to a student in grade 9, 10, and 11 based on his or her utterances and written compositions.

The focus of this study lies on analyzing and evaluating oral and written feedback provided by teachers of English in a secondary schools in the southern part of Ethiopia, in Kambata Tambaro Zone three selected schools. The findings are expected to raise awareness of English teachers' practices. The study focuses on feedback practiced in classes where English is taught as a foreign language. The topic and findings are relevant because not enough information about feedback and/or error correction is provided during teacher education. It is of vital importance for teachers to be aware of the different types of feedback in order to make improvements in their own teaching. Therefore, the findings provided in this study can be significant to both experienced and new teachers.

To begin, the data were collected using classroom observations, teacher interviews, and students says. Based on previous research, different classifications and types of feedback were discussed.

1.1 Objectives of the study

This study aims to investigate teachers and students perceptions of Oral and Written Feedback in EFL Classroom: The case of three selected schools in Kambata Tambaro Zone, Southern Ethiopia as well as to examine their own beliefs and attitudes regarding feedback. The focus is on the kinds of oral and written feedback that the students receive, and on gaining an understanding of any differences between the types of oral and written feedback that are provided by the teachers chosen for this study.

2. Material and method.

2.1 Qualitative and quantitative methods

The aim of this study was to emphasize understanding, produce descriptive data in natural settings with an insider perspective (Ghauri et al.26). A qualitative approach was therefore used to collect data and to investigate different feedback strategies and see how these were used in both oraland written form, together with teachers' own beliefs about oral and written feedback. However, the study also required a quantitative analysis, since it investigated the frequency of different feedback types in the English classroom and the data had to be quantified.

3.2 Participants

The interviews and observations were conducted at a secondary schools in the KambataTtambaro Zone in Ethiopia. A total of 75 students and six English teachers participated in the research. The

sample students' ages were ranged from 13 to 18 years. The teachers of the grade 9 were interviewed and observed during the delivery of the lesson. Concerning to their qualification, all of them were qualified teachers of English. Most of the teachers were above 27 years old when the study was conducted, with minimum 4 years and maximum 30 years of teaching experience. The teachers of grade 10 and grade 11 were qualified teachers of English & two of them have MA in TEFL. Four teachers hold a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree in teaching English and the remain two with MA in TEFL. The teachers are coded as Teacher A, Teacher B, and Teacher C. The table below represents their code name, age, and experience.

Table 1: Teacher data

Code name	age	experience
Teacher A	48 years old	23 years
Teacher B	32 years old	12 years
Teacher C	27 years old	7 years

3.3 Data collection and analysis

3.3.1 Observations

The observations examined classroom communication between the teacher and learners, focusing on feedback that was given both to validate correct responses and to correct those that were incorrect.

In order to determine the types of feedback that teachers give and how often they do so, feedback data were collected using class observation. Six 40-minute lessons, two by each teacher, were observed over a period of two weeks. The choice of observation as a qualitative technique to collect information was made because of the need to determine the kind of feedback strategies that were used. Data were collected manually by transcribing the feedback instances uttered by teachers during class. When there was an instance of exchange where there was a response and feedback involved between the teacher and the student or between two students, a written note was made of what was being said. These data were later analyzed qualitatively in order to gain an understanding of the different types of feedback used in the classroom, as well as quantitatively since the data had to be quantified according to a scheme.

Before the observation, an observation checklist was made to help the researcher stay focused on aspects that needed to be investigated. The protocol consisted of the different types of feedback that were expected to occur during class, such as praise, recast, meta-linguistic feedback, paralinguistic signals, elicitation, repetition, clarification requests, and others that might occur but that were not included in the list. A tick was made next to each feedback type in order to measure what kind and how often each feedback type was used by each teacher. This was done after the data were collected.

Table 2 presents the tool that was used to map and to measure the different feedback types used by the teachers.

Table 2: Observation protocol

Feed back	Expli cit	Recast	Meta linguist ic	Elicitati on	Repetiti on	Para linguist ic signals	Clarifi - cat ion Reque st	Prais e	Other
Teache r A									
Teache r B									
Teache r C									

The lessons were not recorded, as not to inhibit the communicative flow in the classroom, and this also enabled the researcher to record visual data that might otherwise be lost.

3.3.2 Interviews

The aim of the interviews was to elicit as much information from the teachers as possible. Prior to the interviews, the teachers were asked whether they were willing to answer some questions about feedback. Because they gladly accepted, they were emailed the interview questions and a date was set for each interview. Two days later, the interviews were conducted. The teachers were interviewed in order to gain qualitative information about their thoughts and feelings regarding feedback. The interviews consisted of pre-made questions that were developed from the research questions; these were not affected by the observations, as they were written down before the observations took place. Although they were not based on the observation data, they still covered teachers' thoughts about the particular feedback strategies that were used during the observation, and could yield relevant information that could be compared to the observation data. The insights gained from these interviews provided the researcher with more insight into how each of the teachers approached giving feedback to their students both orally and in their writing. Their answers were written down in English while they were speaking. The choice was made not to record the interviews so as not to distract the interviewees; furthermore, it would not have been practical because the interviews were conducted in a place where students and other teachers could come in. The researcher was also more focused on the answers, since they had to be written down and there was no room for confusion, which might happen if the researcher was recording and relying on the tape recorder to capture all answers. If an answer was unclear, the researcher could ask the interviewee to explain it so that the answers could be as clear as possible. An attempt was made to create an atmosphere in which the teachers could be as honest and open as possible. All teachers were well acquainted with the researcher; therefore, the

observations were made and the interviews were conducted with ease. Immediately after each interview, the interviewer took some time to review her notes and fill in any details, to expand on the note-taking short-hand, and to add important comments or points made. The data collected from the interviews were categorized and analyzed qualitatively according to two different themes; oral and written feedback.

The first part of the interview provided background information about the teachers. The second part consisted of seven questions. The questions regarded the teachers' general opinion about feedback: when they were likely to use it, and how they provided students with feedback in oral and written form. The teachers were given the opportunity to indicate whether they provided written and oral feedback, and how much. The participants had to explain on what they focused when giving feedback, as well as whether they thought that some students received more feedback than others, and if so, why.

3.3.3 Essays

In order to analyze the written feedback, a random selection was made of three student essays from each of the three teachers' classrooms. Only three essays were chosen because of limited access to student essays. The comments were then categorized and analyzed qualitatively based on whether the feedback was provided on grammar or content. Feedback provided on grammar was divided into direct/indirect and focused/unfocused. Comments given on content were divided into praise, criticism, or suggestion. An attempt was made to identify different strategies used to provide feedback and to see the differences and similarities in how these teachers provided written feedback. A scheme (Table 3) was made in order to show the different strategies used to provide written feedback. Table 3 presents the tool that was used in order to map written feedback types used by teachers.

Table 3: Written feedback protocol

Essay feedback	Content	Grammar
Teacher A		
Teacher B		
Teacher C		

4. Results.

4.1. Teacher A

4.1.1 Oral feedback

The following observation took place during ninth-grade English lessons. The lessons consisted of different tasks. One of the tasks was to watch a news report and then discuss it. The students

were left to discuss freely without the teacher interrupting. He walked around the groups and added comments to what they were already discussing, but he did not give any corrective feedback.

The results from the interview with the teacher revealed that Teacher A believes feedback is important, but she is against explicit feedback and is generally against correcting her students too often. When asked when she is likely to give feedback, her answer was as follows:

> If it is a presentation they have practiced, I tend not to do it all the time, as soon as they say something that is not correct. I do not want to name and shame anyone.

During the observation, it was noted that the teacher used elicitation and recast at one point. A student was asking a question in Amharic and the teacher did not want to correct him/her by saying,

'*Do not talkin Amharic!*' Instead she used a question, a form of elicitation – "*What?*" – to indicate what the student should be doing instead, and the student understood what the teacher meant, i.e. to ask a question in English. One of the students said, '*I forget it at home*' and the teacher corrected her without directly indicating that the utterance was incorrect. He used recast and provided the correction by saying the correct form, '*You forgot it a home',* which did not lead to self-correction.

As previously stated, some researchers (Lyster and Ranta, 1997) indicate that recast cannot lead to self-correction since the teacher already provides the correct form to the learner. On the other hand, however, recasts are effective in promoting language development since they do not disrupt the flow of communication, which can be important in a classroom setting. This is apparently what the teacher was aiming to obtain in his classroom, and he did not want to interrupt it simply to correct the student.

As previously mentioned, oral feedback can be provided by one student to another student; however, there was only one instance of peer feedback, in which paralinguistic signals were used to show what the meaning of a word was. The students were talking about cappella and one of the students wanted to know what the meaning of the word cappella was. A student provided an incorrect answer, and was followed by another student who, by using gestures, showed the real meaning of the word.

Teacher A also used praise during his lessons in the form of confirmation, such as "*Yes!*",

"*Good!*", and *"Yes, that is true"*. When a mistake was made, he used "*No!*" and tried to obtain the answer from another student, or to explain what the question really was by discussing it in detail and giving the students an opportunity to guess the answers themselves. This could be seen as a form of elicitation.

The teacher used group or collective feedback when the students wrote the answers on the board and they corrected the answers together as a group. Teacher A used so-called collective feedback so as not to single out any individual student. The class then had a chance to correct mistakes without feeling corrected.

According to A, all students receive feedback, and here it is important to stress that even those who do well receive feedback. No student receives more or less feedback than the others.

According to him, it is important to make students understand that although they have achieved a higher level of accuracy, there are still things to learn .He wants to encourage students instead of looking for mistakes. They need to develop their thoughts and ideas, and the only way to help them do so is to motivate them. If they perform a reading comprehension activity, for instance, he collects their answers and corrects them together, by gathering and discussing the tasks that they have done well or have not done so well. He does not want to provide feedback as soon as they make a mistake; instead, he prefers to give feedback after a presentation, or when the students have been practicing a certain grammar form or vocabulary.

4.1.2 Written feedback

During writing tasks, the teacher chose to correct the most important mistakes regarding grammar but omitted others that he did not find relevant. This could be considered as focused, indirect feedback with instances of direct feedback. He would put an -s where there was an omission of the third person singular, underline wrong forms of the past tense, and underline spelling mistakes, for instance, whereas punctuation and wrong use of adverbs were not dealt with. He circled or underlined the mistake made without providing the correct answer or a code, and instead tried to only read the text and mark it as read by signing it.

4.2 Teacher B

4.2.1 Oral feedback

The observation of the second teacher took place in tenth grade English lessons. These lessons were particular, since the students' level of English was lower than that of average students in the same grades. The lessons comprised different tasks, such as reading and answering questions as well as grammar exercises.

During her interview, teacher B stated that she believes that oral feedback is important – "*more important than written feedback"*, she added. She tries to provide her students with feedback individually.

She stated that every teacher needs to develop his or her own way of providing feedback and to be aware of what is appropriate for his or her students. She believes in communication and in implicit provision of feedback.

As previously stated, the drawback of recast is that it can be ambiguous. Here it can be seen that is has a dual function: it is both a confirmation check – good – and a reformulation.

When the student has mispronounced the word *nowhere*, the teacher's response consists of a positive reaction, *good,* which may draw the student's attention away from the error since the focus is on the confirmatory function of the recast instead of on its corrective function.

Teacher B also used elicitation; she used questions to elicit the correct form, as shown by examples

(13) and (14) below.(13)

S: It is difficultiest.

T: Can you say difficultiest?

S: No.T: So……?

S: The most difficult.

(14) S. She buyed chips.

T: What did the girl buy?

S: Chips.

T: Tell me the whole sentence.

S: She buy chips.

T: She bought chips. (Writes bought on the board) (Recast)

It can be concluded that with elicitation, the students have the opportunity to think, and can usually think of the correct answer. In the first example (13), it had a positive effect, while in the second example (14) there was a need for recast as well as explicit explanation on the board. Meta-linguistic feedback was used in one instance, depicted below (15).

(15) S: Can you say like this?

T: Can you? Look at the third form .tichilalehi (translation)

S: The most beautiful.

Here it is difficult to determine whether the student produced the correct answer because of the meta-linguistic feedback or because the teacher provided the Swedish form as well.

4.2.2 Written feedback

In writing, the teacher focused on giving the students positive comments such as praise about their written performance. She wrote a note that would show that she had read their story, and it was more than just "*well done!*" One of the comments was "*I really liked your story*". Conversely, when she was not happy with what the student had written, she could write, "*Good, but I need you to write more. Use your imagination.*" This can be seen as a form of suggestion. In addition, the errors were unfocused and corrected by marking them in a direct manner or with a different color, and by providing the correct grammar form, such as in the following.

(16) S: I came to with brothers and mom.

T: I came to with /my two/ brothers and mom.

S: I have no friend.

T: I have/had/ no friends.

As can be seen in this example, direct feedback was provided when a more indirect correction, such as an indirect coded error correction – Gr for grammar and Sp for spelling – could have been offered.

The teacher did focus on both form and content, but more specific comments consisting of constructive criticism to show the student what needed to be improved would have been a better option. Teacher B states that when correcting students' essays she always includes some comments. She tries to avoid direct feedback, instead aiming to make the students understand what the mistake is themselves. It they have a written assignment, she goes through the mistakes in a group, meaning that she collects the most common mistakes.

She also added during her interview that it is of great importance to start with a positive comment.

On an essay about a trip, for instance, she would first give the students feedback about the content, and then focus on the mistakes. Often, students themselves ask for feedback, and how much feedback she can give depends on time. Grammar and spelling are the main aspects on which she focuses. Most importantly, however, students have to learn to use their imagination. Their biggest problem is not the language, but the fact that they do not know what to write.

4.3 Teacher C:

4.3.1 Oral feedback

The lessons observed consisted of all four skills: listening, reading, speaking, and writing. The lessons consisted of a lesson plan that was handed out; the topic was "Everyday Stuff". One of the tasks was listening comprehension, which consisted of a listening sequence and

true/false/does not say answers. When the students had completed their answers, the class went through them together.

Most students answered correctly, and to confirm their answers the teacher used confirmation and praise. In order to encourage the students to provide a more elaborate answer, the teacher used follow-up, open-ended questions, as can be seen in example 17.

(17) T: How do you know?

S: It is what they say.

T: What does he say?

S: I am on the bus.

T: Yes, he is on the bus!

Teacher C believes that feedback should happen naturally. He wants the students to feel as if "*we are developing together*" and he manages to do so by always providing follow-up, open-ended questions. He further believes that a teacher should provide praise more than negative feedback, since he thinks that this is important for other students who are listening, and not only for those who are provided with the feedback.

In the same example (17), the teacher confirmed the answer with "yes, he is on the bus". He used this type of confirmation six times, together with a praise marker related to the topic, as can be seen in the following examples.

(18) S: It does not say.

T: Very good, it does not say.

(19) T: What produces energy?

S: The water.

T: Yes, that is what happens.

Page 24

(20) T: What else is in the pictures, what feeling?

S: It looks creepy.

T: Good, good choice of word.

In the following examples, he provided the students with recast since he supplied the correct translation.

At the same time, he also used elicitation in (22) by asking, "Because hire means…?"

(21) T: Have you heard the term?

S: Is it not about people committing suicide?

T: Not really. (explains the meaning of the term by translating the word)

(22) T: He wants to hire a movie?

S: He says he wants to hire it.

T: Because hire means?

S. Hyra.

T: taqaxara (Provides an explanation of the meaning)

Elicitation was also used together with praise in the following example.

When the answers were not correct, he combined the different strategies and used elicitation to encourage the students to reconsider their answers. During their reading session, he did not correct the students too often. When an error in reading was made, he used praise after the reading sequence, as in the following example.

(24) Good work, you dropped a few words, but otherwise very good.

Teacher C did not interrupt the students' flow while they were reading in order to draw their attention to a particular error. The speaking session consisted of a description of a picture. He used praise markers and elicitation in this exercise as well.

When asked how often he uses feedback, he answered that it happens often, whenever he finds it necessary, but also stressed the fact that using praise such as "*thank you*" and "*beautiful*" is equally important as providing other types of feedback. If there is a grammatical problem that needs to be addressed, he believes that the perfect opportunity to do so is while providing feedback. Teacher C also believes that it is crucial to provide immediate feedback instead of delayed feedback, or at least to do so in a time interval close to the erroneous utterance.

4.3.2 Written feedback

When correcting the written errors, teacher C used two markers in two colors and underlined the mistakes or whole text sequences. Pink indicated that the text was correct, while yellow indicated a mistake. Furthermore, he provided students with comments in the form of praise and somewhat suggestive criticism.

(26) An elaborate answer to the question, which shows that you have understood the topic in depth. Good work.

(27) You have to elaborate your answer, what do you mean by x?

He circled the spelling mistakes and he provided oral feedback as well. Whenever possible, he ensured that the students had understood his written feedback. He marked the mistakes both directly and indirectly and the corrections were focused. If the word was difficult to spell, he provided direct feedback, such as for "acquaintance", but if there was one letter missing he offered indirect feedback by underlining the error to indicate that there was a problem.

He also provided students with oral feedback whenever possible to discuss the mistakes made in their written work. When it comes to written feedback, he is of the opinion that it is important to write comments. He states that students are provided with comments, errors are underlined, and he also writes in the margins when he needs a clarification. He corrects spelling, verb forms, and word order. The focus is on their individual level, and he corrects their mistakes according to their level. When asked whether it is important to provide written feedback, he made the following comment:

It is important to let the students know that they are seen and heard. Not correcting their mistakes may give them the impression that I have not read or heard what they have said or written.

We need to show that we take what they are doing seriously. Although he feels that all students need to be seen and heard, he still believes that some students are provided with more feedback than others. This is due to the fact that some students are more receptive to feedback, he added.

4.4 Summary of the results

In summary, the comments that the participants made in the interviews usually corresponded with what that they actually did in the classroom. Teacher A was clear about the fact that he does not like to give explicit feedback or "on the spot" correction, and that he tries not to overuse feedback.

Teacher A used praise on six occasions and recast on seven. The teacher has a highly specific way of teaching in the classroom. he tries to implement a sense of confidence in her students, and he believes that this will have a positive impact on their learning abilities.

When analyzing what teacher A said and actually did in terms of correcting the students' written performance, it was clear that her feedback simply consisted of confirming that he had read what they had written, while only a few grammatical mistakes were corrected. In writing, two essay slacked comments, while one was corrected using focused and indirect correction. Her goal was to make them write something, anything, and it was important to his not to intimidate them by correcting them too much.

Teacher B, on the other hand, did write comments as she said she did in the interview, and these comments mostly consisted of praise and direct, unfocused grammar correction. She also believes that oral feedback is important, and indicated that she does not give feedback explicitly; however, the observation showed that she did do this in the written work. She used recast nine times and during the interview she said that she likes to make her students understand what the mistake is themselves, as recast is one way of implicitly correcting students. She did tell the students to use their imagination several times during the observation, which was also confirmed by the interview.

Teacher B further indicated that she always starts with positive comments when giving written feedback, and this could be seen in the students' essays.

Teacher C is well aware of the feedback types, and the feedback types he used most frequently were elicitation and praise. Elicitation was used seven times, and praise six. He indicated that he provides written feedback in combination with oral feedback, and this was noticed during the observation period. He provided both direct and indirect grammar correction and his feedback is focused.

Teacher C also stressed the fact that feedback happens naturally and unconsciously for the most part, which is also true as he used questions in the classroom to make the errors more implicit. The table below (table 2) summarizes the analysis of the types and frequency of oral feedback used by the teachers in their classrooms. Table 3, on the other hand, summarizes the analysis of the types of written feedback used by teachers on students' essays.

5. Discussion

5.1 Discussion of the findings

5.1.2 Oral feedback

This study has considered the most common feedback types used by teachers in general secondary school. All three teachers used several oral feedback types during one lesson. Almost all feedback types were used except for repetition. It was also noticed that the teachers did not manage to correct students all the time. It is difficult to determine whether this was done intentionally, except for teacher A who clearly indicated that this was the case. The teachers used recast, elicitation, and praise most of the time during their lessons as forms of oral feedback. They may not always be aware of the strategies that they use to provide oral feedback, as it happens spontaneously. Furthermore, they are clearly not aware of the impact of these choices, and that recast, for instance, may have a dual function and may be misleading if used with praise. They all used praise but they did not seem to be aware of the fact that general praise is not as effective as specific praise.

.There are many differences in how teachers provide feedback. Even though recast, elicitation, and praise were the most common types of feedback given by all three teachers during the observation, it cannot be stated that they were provided in an identical way in all cases. This could be related to the type of students that they were teaching, regarding their level of English but also the topic of the lesson. The feedback provided could also reflect the teachers' own individual strategies that they have learned through experience. Teacher A provided feedback in a way that was not typical. His way of teaching is not based on correcting mistakes; it is instead based on encouraging students to use the language. Teacher B, on the other hand, used a more typical method of correcting mistakes, a more traditional way that is easier to analyze. Conversely, Teacher C tried to provide feedback as naturally as possible by asking follow-up questions. This is a strategy used to make the students feel that they are not being corrected explicitly. All teachers tried to use as much praise as possible which shows the importance of building a healthy classroom environment.

While conducting the interviews with the teachers in order to find out their thoughts and feelings about oral feedback, it became clear that, like the researcher, the teachers had not been introduced to the different types of feedback during their education. Teachers seem to rely more on their own experience than they do on theories. They believe that oral feedback is important and the students need oral feedback in order to improve and move forward in their learning. The three teachers have different opinions on the kind of oral feedback that is suitable for their teaching but they all stress the importance of praise, motivation and encouragement.

5.1.3 Written feedback

Feedback types used by the teachers in written form were positive comments, suggestions as well as focused/unfocused and indirect/direct feedback. Written feedback depends on how much time they have to their disposal, as well as how much they believe should be corrected. In some cases the feedback given was inconsistent. Teacher B for instance, used both indirect and direct feedback when correcting grammar which might confuse the student. The comments provided were usually positive comments which is favorable since these comments reinforce good habits. The amount of feedback given in written form was considerably less than the feedback provided orally. Since teachers are advised to be selective when correcting mistakes a focused method of correcting is more suitable.

There are clear differences in how these three teachers provide written feedback. One of the teachers used less feedback on student essays than the other two. As previously mentioned, many researchers have also tried to implement the idea of no corrective feedback in writing (Truscott 1998,Kepner 1999, Fazio 2001), while others (Ferris 1999) have argued that there is not enough valid evidence for a conclusion to be drawn in this regard. Teacher B gave more feedback on written essays than the other teachers did and her feedback was not focused. Teacher C preferred to talk to his students about their essays and provide them with oral feedback as well as written

feedback. Even though teachers use different methods of providing written feedback they should focus on the consistency of written comments and error correction.

During the interview, Teacher B, mentioned that, to her, it was more important to give oral feedback than written feedback. Teacher A believes that it is important not correct all mistakes in students written composition and does not seem to be bothered by the lack of comments in students' written composition. Teacher C believes that written feedback should be accompanied with oral feedback and that the teacher and students should develop together..

6. Conclusion

This study investigated the kinds of oral and written feedback that EFL students of a secondary school receive from their teachers. It also investigated the feedback types that are found most frequently in the EFL classroom, and why this is the case. The study examined three teachers' opinions and thoughts regarding oral and written feedback as well as the differences and similarities in how they provide feedback.

Based on the data analysis, it can be concluded that EFL students receive almost all corrective feedback types except for repetition and clarification requests. It can also be concluded that recast and elicitation as ways of correcting oral errors are the most commonly used feedback types. The teachers use recast because they do not want to correct the students explicitly, and they therefore choose an implicit method of providing feedback. Elicitation is used to provide students with some time to think about their answers and to promote self-correction. In addition, it can be concluded that the teachers use praise not only to validate correct answers, but also in combination with other corrective feedback types in order to encourage and motivate their students.

Regarding written feedback, they use both direct and indirect ways of correcting the students' mistakes and their correction can be both focused and unfocused. Depending on time, they sometimes write comments, praise, or suggestions. The results of this study indicate that there is a lack of written comments and that all mistakes are not corrected or underlined. There are differences in the way in which the three teachers provide feedback. Teacher A prefers not to correct students too often. Teacher B, on the other hand, uses corrective feedback frequently while Teacher C focuses on asking questions in order to elicit answers.

Many studies have been conducted on how effective feedback types are, but they have all come to different conclusions. However, more studies seem to be in favor of feedback in any form than those that are against it. Studies show that recast can be misleading since it is often followed by a comment about the content, or confirmation. However, in oral performances it is important not to interrupt the communicative flow, and therefore implicit feedback such as recast is preferable. On the other hand, in writing or in grammatical types of exercises, direct, explicit correction together with a face-to-face five-minute session between the teacher and student could lead to a more desirable effect.

It would be interesting to investigate in further research whether recast, elicitation, and praise truly are effective, and why teachers tend to employ them so often, as well as to see more empirical research on feedback on written work.

Works Cited:

Brookhart, S. M. *How to give effective feedback to your students*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2008.

Fathman, A.K., Whalley, E. T*eacher response to student writing: Focus on form versuscontent*. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second Language Writing, pp. 178-190. Cambridge, UK: CambridgeUniversity Press, 1990.

Ferris, D. *The case of grammar correction in L2 writing classes: a response to Truscott(1996)*. Journal of Second Language Writing *8*(1), pp. 1-11, 1999.

Ghauri, P., Grønhaug, K. and Kristianslund, I. *Research methods in business studies: Apractical study*, New York: Prentice Hall, 1995.

Grimsholm, E., Poblete L. *Internal and External factors hampering SME growth – Aqualitative case study of SMEs in Thailand*. Master thesis in business administration. Gotlanduniversity. Retrieved from:http://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:323837/FULLTEXT01.pdf,Accessed:8 February, 2016.

Lyster, R., &Ranta, L. *Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form incommunicative classrooms*. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19, pp. 37–66*,* 1997.

Lyster, R. *Relationships among error type, feedback type, and learner repair in classroominteraction*.Language Learning, 48, pp. 183–218. Academic Press, 1998b.

Mayer, R. E., & Alexander, P. A. *Handbook of research on learning and instruction*. NewYork, Routledge, 2011.

Narciss, S. Feedback strategies for interactive learning tasks. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. Van, 2008.

Parr, M. J., & Timperley, H. S. Feedback to writing, assessment for teaching and learning and studentprogress. *Assessing Writing*, *15*, 68-85, 2010.

Truscott, J. *Noticing in second language acquisition: A critical review*. SLA Research14,pp. 103-135. 1998.

Truscott, J.*Evidence and conjecture on the effects of correction: A response to Chandler.Journal of Second Language Writing 13*(4), pp. 337-343, 2004.