Thai Teacher's Corrective Feedback on Adult Learners' Errors in Speaking

Napat Kaewkascholkul and Natjiree Jaturapitakkul*

*Corresponding author's email: natjiree.jat@kmutt.ac.th

School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Thailand

Received: Apr 10, 2023 *Revised: Nov 7, 2023* *Accepted: Nov 15, 2023*

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to investigate the types of corrective feedback used by a Thai teacher with adult learners of different proficiency levels in speaking classes in order to facilitate students' language development, as it is an aspect language teachers need to be aware of when teaching speaking. Three different levels of speaking classes were observed, and the audio-recordings were transcribed and analyzed to find out the corrective feedback strategies used based on the model by Lyster and Ranta (1997). The findings reveal that recasts were the corrective feedback strategy most frequently employed by the teacher across all three proficiency levels because it does not interrupt the flow of communication. As recasts and explicit feedback technique are the two most used strategies in correcting students' errors, it can be said that the teacher in the study usually provided input corrective feedback rather than elicit the correct form from the students. The study suggests that language teachers should be aware of making decisions regarding the types of corrective feedback that would be more appropriate to each student's level in the Thai context of English learning, particularly in an adult learner speaking classroom.

Keywords: adult learners, corrective feedback, errors, proficiency level, speaking class

Introduction

Speaking is generally accepted as an important communication skill these days. Many people are paying a lot of attention to speaking skills for many reasons such as when one is applying for jobs, being interviewed, taking examinations via learning in an academic context, communicating with foreigners, and so on. Speaking seems to be a difficult skill for second language learners to develop because it demands other receptive skills, namely reading and listening in order to have sufficient input then, ultimately, produce the language. Many studies have reported that the learners tend to become more proficient in the target language when they perform the language output by speaking (Goh & Burns, 2012). In order to develop language output, it is essential for learners to have plentiful opportunities to push themselves to produce the language (Sheen, 2011; Yang, 2008).

Being proficient in oral communication in a second or foreign language is not that easy, and it cannot happen within a short time (Devi, 2014). During the period of learning a language, it is undeniable that making errors is a natural part of mastering the target language (Ahangari & Amirzadeh, 2011). This is in line with Dulay and Burt (1974) and Hendrickson (1978) who stated that making errors is the evidence of learning progress which is a sign of language development. Consequently, it seems essential for language teachers to be aware of the important role of feedback in shaping students' speaking output regarding linguistic forms of pronunciation and grammar, and also meaning which primarily focuses on vocabulary to help them achieve the target language successfully in a speaking classroom. The teachers, thus, become error correctors crucial in the error correction process (Harmer, 1991).

In order to provide a proper definition for *error*, the words *error* and *mistake* should first be distinguished between each other. Ellis (2003) defines *errors* as unacceptable utterances from students because they lack knowledge in particular language items. Similarly, Brown (1994) states that *error* comes from insufficient grammatical knowledge in using the language properly, so errors can reflect the current stage of a learner's proficiency. Essentially, they do not realize that error until other people correct it for them. However, the word *mistakes* is also commonly used in many studies but it is slightly different from *errors*. According to Brown (1994, 2001), a mistake is caused by a failure to follow language rules correctly, and the learners already know the rules. Therefore, the mistakes can be corrected immediately by the learners themselves since they recognize the correct form. However, in a real language learning class, it is difficult to differentiate between errors and mistakes because the interaction between teachers and learners occurs continuously in a natural flow of communication. Besides that, it is also difficult to distinguish whether students lack knowledge in using the language correctly or lack performance at the time of speaking. Hence, to simplify the study, the researchers will use *error* and *mistake* interchangeably to refer to learners' deviation from the rules of the language or native speaker norms.

In a speaking classroom, it is unavoidable that students make errors while they are improving their language use. To encourage them to speak and push them to use the language appropriately, teachers' corrective feedback can affect students' speaking performance. It may change students' errors in actual practice in order to develop their spoken language in terms of accuracy and fluency.

According to Lightbown and Spada (1990), corrective feedback is defined as "any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect" (p. 171). More of the definition is given by Chaudron (1977) who defined corrective feedback as "any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance" (p. 31). It needs to be considered that in a communicative language classroom, corrective feedback can have both positive and negative effects on a student's learning (Brookhart, 2008; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). On the positive side, corrective feedback provides useful language input for students in order to reshape their language and become more proficient language speakers. Similarly, corrective feedback could also

facilitate students in noticing gaps in their language learning process when they have plentiful opportunities to speak in the classroom (El Tatawy, 2006). On the other hand, corrective feedback could destroy students' confidence and motivation as well, if teachers give too much feedback or use an inappropriate corrective feedback strategy with them. As a result of this phenomenon, students dare not take risks and will not try using any word, phrase or sentence they are not certain. However, numerous amount of research found that corrective feedback still has the positive effect of improving a learner's oral language proficiency (Alsolami, 2019; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Park, 2012; Phuong & Huan, 2018). Furthermore, the benefits of giving corrective feedback were proven by Chu (2011) in her study where the scores of her experimental group were apparently greater than the controlled group, and interestingly, the results show differences in effectiveness for each type of corrective feedback depending on the students' proficiency levels. Since each student's linguistic knowledge is different, their ability to understand their teacher's corrective feedback and to reshape their speaking is also different. Therefore, teachers' strategies in giving corrective feedback to learners of different language proficiency levels need to be carefully taken into account.

In addition, the researchers believe that speaking teachers' corrective feedback contributes significantly to ELT/TESOL in the Thai EFL context by promoting error awareness, enhancing language accuracy, boosting motivation and confidence, enabling individualized instruction, fostering interactive fluency, and developing error correction strategies. These contributions collectively support students' overall language proficiency and their ability to communicate effectively in English. Even though research on speaking teachers' corrective feedback is not novel, it is still beneficial and worth exploring the different types of corrective feedback used with adult learners, who are typically university-student age and above. Oliver and Grote (2010) asserted that adult learners tend to take more of an advantage from a teacher's corrective feedback than young learners. This is because adult learners learn a foreign language with a specific goal in mind, particularly studying at a language institute that is not part of the compulsory education system. Therefore, adult learners are likely to be more motivated to speak as much as possible. This would give more opportunities both for a teacher to correct students' errors and for students to learn from their teacher's corrective feedback. Furthermore, there are also very limited studies with regards to corrective feedback on speaking particularly for Thai adult learners. Therefore, it would be very interesting to find out what types of corrective feedback are used by Thai teachers for Thai adult learners of different proficiency levels in a speaking classroom. It is hoped that the findings will contribute to ELT in helping to raise awareness among language teachers of the importance of making a decision regarding types of corrective feedback that would be appropriate to each student's level in the Thai learning context, particularly in an adult learner speaking classroom.

Literature Review

Oral corrective feedback strategies have been proposed by many scholars such as Lyster and Ranta (1997), Ahangari and Amirzadeh (2011), Devi (2014), Ozturk (2016), and Solikhah (2016). One

of the most influential frameworks which is still used in several recent studies is by Lyster and Ranta (1997) who suggested six types of corrective feedback, i.e. explicit feedback, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Their framework is selected and replicated as it is based on empirical research and classroom observations which share the same context as in this present study. In addition, it is practical and helps inform instructional decisions and assist teachers in selecting the appropriate feedback strategies based on learners' needs and the specific language task. In order to illustrate each type of correction in this selected framework, the researchers will use the following dialogue as an example (Park, 2010):

T: Where did you go yesterday?

*S: I **go** to the park.*

T: ……

1. **Explicit feedback:** the teacher explicitly indicates that their utterance is incorrect and provides the correct form, perhaps with a grammar explanation.

   T: *Go* is in the present tense. You need to use the past tense *went* here.

2. **Recasts:** the teacher reformulates the students' error in the correct form without directly indicating the errors.

   T: I went to the park.

3. **Clarification requests:** the teacher indicates that the utterance was not understood, or that it included an ill-form in some way by using phrases such as *Pardon me?* or *Could you say that again?*

   T: Could you say that again?

4. **Metalinguistic feedback:** the teacher provides comments, information, or questions related to the formation which is needed to be corrected without explicitly providing the correct form.

   T: How does the verb change when we talk about the past?

5. **Elicitation:** the teacher elicits the correct form directly by pausing to allow students to fill in the blank.

   T: Yesterday, I …

6. **Repetition:** the teacher repeats the students' erroneous utterance and adjusts intonation to highlight the error.

   T: I go?

Most of the findings revealed that recasts were the most dominant correction technique. Originally, the findings from Lyster and Ranta (1997) showed that recasts were found to be the most widely used in giving corrective feedback despite having the least of students' uptakes—an immediate student's utterance that follows the teacher's feedback. The study of Devi (2014) examined the types of corrective feedback used by a teacher on students' spoken errors, where the results showed that the teacher used recasts 85.9% to treat the errors. This is in line with Solikhah's study (2016) in which the findings revealed 26.83% of recast use, the highest use of correction strategy among the six types.

However, they also showed none of the students' repairs from the recasts because the teacher had already provided the correct answer. In addition, the study of Phoung and Huan (2018) indicated that with a recorded 45% in usage, recasts were the most frequently used strategy by the two teachers in treating errors for their students' speaking performance in EFL classes. Moreover, Ozturk (2016) reported that the teachers used recasts much more frequently than the other types of corrective feedback, 49 times out of 125 erroneous utterances to be exact, which can be calculated as 39% in usage. In most studies, the reason for using recasts is that they do not interrupt the flow of communication when students are speaking. In other words, recasts are considered completely implicit feedback as the teachers do not indicate the errors. However, there are inverse results in some cases.

According to Ahangari and Amirzadeh (2011), who studied teachers' use of corrective feedback with students at different proficiency levels, the results revealed that two language teachers applied the recast technique at the elementary level with 73.3% usage, the intermediate level with 65%, and the advanced level with 59.2%. This means that as the learners became more proficient, the teachers reduced the frequency of using recasts. In this case, the teachers probably believe that advanced learners have sufficient linguistic knowledge to correct themselves, so they were given more opportunities to do so. Additionally, from the observation of Lange (2009), teachers in two lower proficiency level classes mostly used explicit feedback to correct the students but did not use corrective feedback at the highest level. In addition, the study of Fan (2019) also revealed that the instructor of a listening and speaking class utilized different types of corrective feedback, and elicitation with questions had the highest frequency while recasts were used with the second lowest frequency for proficient students.

Many studies investigated the use of corrective feedback strategies and explained the effects they had on learning speaking. Interestingly, they claimed that recasts were not the most effective strategy in correcting students' errors, especially for low proficiency students. It is because they are not yet able to notice what is needed to be changed from the teacher's feedback. For example, Ammar and Spada (2006) revealed that low proficiency learners could not develop their second language (L2) further when receiving corrections in the form of recasts. This was similar to the study of Panova and Lyster (2002) who compared perceptions between learners of higher and lower proficiency. Their results showed that recasts were still used most frequently, but low proficiency learners noticed recasts less so than the high proficiency learners. According to Muhsin (2016), students highly valued explicit feedback because explaining errors explicitly would open more opportunities for them to modify their errors. Similarly, the results of Zhai and Gao (2018), who examined the effects of corrective feedback on speaking task complexity, revealed that clarification request had the largest positive effects on promoting simple speaking tasks rather than more complex tasks. In contrast, it is indicated that the implicit feedback techniques such as recasts and repetitions had negative effects and the learners easily overlooked their own errors.

Regarding adult learners in speaking classes, it seems that they have more of an intention in developing their speaking skills for a certain purpose than young learners. The findings of Roothooft

and Breeze (2016) demonstrated that most adult learners expected that their errors needed to be corrected and believed that the best person to correct those errors is a teacher. Moreover, Oliver and Grote (2010), who compared uptakes between child and adult learners from a teacher's corrective feedback, concluded that adult learners are more likely to benefit from uptake opportunities from a teacher's corrective feedback because of their cognitive and linguistic maturity. Hence, the age of learners is also a factor affecting the use of different corrective feedback techniques by teachers. Oliver (2000) found that teachers of adult learners tend to provide corrective feedback in the form of negotiations rather than using recasts which is the preferred method for teaching young learners.

Based on these previous studies, the findings seem to be inconsistent across classroom-based contexts. Even though the literature review confirms the impact of corrective feedback on student success in language learning, it necessitates teachers in particular contexts to know what may work best for their students. In addition, relevant research on giving corrective feedback to adult learners specifically in the EFL context is still limited. Therefore, this paper provides insights into a Thai teacher's practices in providing oral corrective feedback specifically to adult learners at different proficiency levels in English speaking classrooms.

Objective of the Study

This study was conducted to investigate the types of corrective feedback used by a teacher with adult learners of different proficiency levels in English speaking classes. Thus, the research question was formulated as follows:

What types of corrective feedback are used with adult learners of different language proficiency levels in speaking classes at an English language school?

Research Methodology

Setting

This study was conducted at one of many English language schools in Bangkok, Thailand. Essentially, it is a private language institute where adult learners are a target group, and the focus is placed on improving their speaking abilities in order to communicate more naturally in real life situations. This school is fairly well-known and has served many high-profile corporate clients in Thailand, namely, Honda, Nestle, Ajinomoto, Italian-Thai Development, Loxley and Red Bull among others. The school offers speaking courses specifically for Thai adult learners at the average age of undergraduate students and above. The course focuses on speaking English naturally and fluently in various situations that would be useful in everyday life. Moreover, the school emphasizes on language accuracy, and grammar points are included in each class. Therefore, learners who apply for the course are expected to gain more confidence in speaking English with the correct grammar rules.

The teachers in the school are all native speakers of Thai, but they are proficient in speaking English and have experiences in teaching English. Mostly, they graduated with an English Major while some of them graduated from ELT faculties, for instance, with an M.A. in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), an M.A. in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), or an M.A. in Linguistics from an accredited university either in Thailand or overseas. Every teacher in the school also has to teach students of all levels of English proficiency.

There are five levels of language proficiency denominated at the school. Each level is different in terms of the amount of the English language used as a medium of instruction in the class and they are classified as follows: Start-up (S) 10%, Pre-beginner (PA1) 30%, Beginner (A1) 50%, Pre-intermediate (A2) 80%, and Intermediate (B1) 100%. Furthermore, the difficulty of the topics and language focus increases with each level. Each class generally lasts 90 minutes and the number of students does not exceed 15 students with a Thai teacher. The students have the option of booking the class they are interested in on the school's website. Thus, every class they attend will not be the same in terms of the topic and language focus, and even their classmates.

Participant

This study was based on a volunteer sampling in which the researchers had no control over. The participant was a female teacher who volunteered to participate in this study. The teacher graduated with a Bachelor of Arts from Chulalongkorn University (Thailand), a Master of Science in Marketing from Huddersfield University (UK) and a Master of Arts in Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL) from Thammasat University (Thailand). In terms of teaching experience, she has been teaching English at all levels especially to adult learners and many corporate clients since 2012. For this study, she had to teach three classes of different English proficiency levels; Start-up, Beginner and Intermediate.

Research Instrument

In order to investigate whether the participant used different types of corrective feedback with adult learners of different language proficiency levels in speaking classes, a classroom observation was utilized as a key instrument.

In this study, three proficiency levels: the lowest level—Start-up (S), the middle level—Beginner (equivalent to A1 of the Common European Framework of Reference or simply, CEFR A1), and the highest level—Intermediate (equivalent to CEFR B1) were selected to represent the three different English proficiency classes that were investigated. The following descriptions provide the background for each class observation.

Start-up level (S).

There were two students in the Start-up level class. They were taught tenses for the whole class which consisted of the simple present, simple past, and simple future tenses. As they were beginner students, the teacher focused on learning the sentence structure. Most of the time, the teacher used translations whereby she gave a Thai sentence first and then let the students translate it into English. She spoke very slowly and always helped students create sentences. If this proficiency level was to be compared to the CEFR, it would approximately be below A1.

Beginner level (A1).

This class also consisted of two students. The topic was about checking in a hotel. So, the language focuses for this class were phrases and expressions that were useful for making a hotel reservation. The teacher started with warm-up talk in which she provided some questions for the students to ask and answer about travelling. After that, when the students were familiar with the topic, they practiced conversations about checking in a hotel by conducting a role-play activity between a customer and a receptionist. Nevertheless, the conversations were mostly done following the pattern in their handouts. So, when it came to the speaking session, they basically followed the pattern of the conversations but still had some optional utterances that they could decide what sentence should be used in each situation appropriately. If this proficiency level was to be compared to the CEFR, it would be approximately A1.

Intermediate level (B1).

There were seven students attending this class. The topic was about giving advice which led to the grammar point of forming a second conditional sentence. Additionally, the issue of generation gaps was brought in to be a discussion point and a grammar practice opportunity among students. The students had lots of opportunities to discuss with their classmates in pairs. During the discussion period, the teacher walked around the room and observed the students talking. She mostly listened and responded to the students' talk in each pair and provided some useful vocabulary for them to use in context. If this proficiency level was to be compared to the CEFR, it would be around B1.

An observation sheet (see Appendix A) was used along with the class observation in order to obtain a frequency count of the corrective feedback used across three classes. The observation sheet was validated by a language expert and developed based on the framework by Lyster and Ranta (1997). On the observation sheet, examples from Park (2010) for each corrective technique were included to make them easier to understand during the observation.

Data Collection

One of the researchers was given permission by both the school director and the participant to collect data by signing a consent form. Both were informed about the purpose and data collection of the

study. The appointment of the three classes was also based on the participant's availability. On the observation day, the researcher attached a microphone to the participant before the class began and sat in one corner of the classroom without interfering with the lesson or the learners to ensure that the class would run naturally. For each class, the observation sheet was continuously filled in throughout 90 minutes of class time to illustrate the frequency for each corrective feedback strategy used and details of what the teacher corrected. Moreover, the researcher also noted down the important stages of teaching as a complementary resource to capture all activities that occurred in the class that might not be recorded such as the group discussion, the teacher's monitoring actions, and the teacher's corrective feedback for the whole class or each individual student.

Audio recordings were also used as a tool to gather all the interactions between the teacher and the learners. The objective of using audio recordings is to cross-check them with the notes from the observation sheet to increase the reliability of the study. Before the observation began, the participant was also informed that the class would be taught normally but a small microphone would be attached near where she speaks in order to record every utterance.

Data Analysis

All data obtained from the audio recording was transcribed and checked in parallel with the observation sheet. Then, the data was categorized into different types of corrective feedback used based on the framework by Lyster and Ranta (1997), namely, explicit feedback, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. The frequency for each technique used in each teacher's correction was summarized, calculated and then presented in percentages in a table. Additionally, the results were cross-checked and validated by a native English teacher who has had teaching experiences with Thai students for four years in order to strengthen the validity and reliability of the study. The observation sheet and the transcript were also used to provide examples of the feedback techniques used in class if it was necessary to provide more details that might be considered factors affecting the techniques used. Finally, corrective feedback techniques within each proficiency level and across the three different levels were both compared and analyzed.

Findings

This section presents an analysis of the data derived from the three speaking classes by means of observation in order to answer the research question, "What types of corrective feedback are used with adult learners of different language proficiency levels in speaking classes?" The following table presents the frequency count and respective percentages for the teacher's corrective feedback strategies that were used in treating the students' speaking errors across three different classes.

From Table 1, the total results show that recasts were the most frequently used corrective feedback strategy by the teacher, bearing 56.12% of all corrected errors, followed by explicit feedback at 24.46%, repetition at 7.19%, metalinguistic feedback at 6.47%, and clarification requests and

elicitation at 2.88% each. It is evident from the total results that recasts and explicit feedback were the two most dominant correction types, and this is consistent with the results at each proficiency level. At the Start-up level, recasts were the most widely used at 48.78%, followed by explicit feedback at 26.83%. At the Beginner level, the teacher used recasts 56.14% of the time, while explicit feedback was 22.81% of the time. At the Intermediate level, recasts were still the most favored type of corrective feedback at 63.41% and 24.39% for explicit feedback. From this phenomenon, it can be concluded that the teacher treated students' errors in the same direction across all proficiency levels. Also, she often corrected them by providing the right form using recasts and explicit feedback; feedback techniques where students do not have an opportunity to notice their errors and correct them by themselves. The following extracts illustrate cases where such recasts and explicit feedback were used by the teacher.

Table 1

Frequency and Percentages of Corrective Feedback Strategies in Three Proficiency Levels

Types of corrective feedback	Start-up level	Beginner level	Intermediate level	Total
1. Recasts	20 (48.78%)	32 (56.14%)	26 (63.41%)	78 (56.12%)
2. Explicit feedback	11 (26.83%)	13 (22.81%)	10 (24.39%)	34 (24.46%)
3. Repetition	5 (12.20%)	4 (7.02%)	1 (2.44%)	10 (7.19%)
4. Metalinguistic feedback	4 (9.76%)	3 (5.26%)	2 (4.88%)	9 (6.47%)
5. Clarification requests	0 (0.00%)	3 (5.26%)	1 (2.44%)	4 (2.88%)
6. Elicitation	1 (2.44%)	2 (3.51%)	1 (2.44%)	4 (2.88%)
Total	**41 (100%)**	**57 (100%)**	**41 (100%)**	**139 (100%)**

Extract 1:

Original interaction

T: ไหนลองแต่งภาษาอังกฤษว่า เขาผู้ชายเล่นเปียโน ภาษาอังกฤษว่ายังไง

S1: เขาผู้ชายเล่นเปียโน เอ่อ ... He is play piano.

T: ... ถ้าเป็น present tense นะคะ จะเอาไว้ใช้อธิบายกิจวัตรประจำวัน เขาไม่ได้ใช้ He is play แต่เขาใช้ He plays...เพราะ he เป็นบุคคลที่สามที่เรากล่าวถึง subject เป็นเอกพจน์ verb ต้องเติม s หรือ es ตามกฎของมัน...

Translation

T: Can you try to make an English sentence for "He plays a piano."?

S1: umm ... He is play piano.

T: … It is "the present tense". We use it to describe daily activities. So it is wrong to use "He is play", but "He plays" instead because "he" is the third person we refer to. Also, the subject used is singular. "s" or "es" must be inserted to the main verb as a rule of thumb.

Extract 1 shows the use of explicit feedback at the Start-up level. The teacher explicitly indicated that *He is play* was wrong in the simple present tense, and provided the correct form of *He plays*, accompanied with a grammar explanation.

Extract 2:
S: If I were you, I would go to the gym to exercise a lot. After that I would…tried
T: You would be tired.
S: …and you would sleep well

Extract 2 shows a recast strategy that was used in an Intermediate class. The teacher did not indicate directly where the incorrect form was but reformulated *I would tried* as *You would be tired* instead. At this level, even though recasts were used most frequently, the teachers also often used explicit feedback when giving an explanation to the whole class. She also walked around the class and tried to catch common errors while the students were discussing in pairs. Then she would explicitly explain correct grammatical rules to the students.

At the Start-up level, the most dominant corrective feedback strategies were recasts and explicit feedback, respectively. The other types of corrective feedback strategies have the following frequencies: repetition at 12.20%; metalinguistic feedback at 9.76%; and elicitation at 2.44%. However, clarification requests were not used at all by the teacher. Although recasts were the most widely used technique in the Start-up class, its percentage was the lowest among the three proficiency levels. On the other hand, while the technique of explicit feedback was the second most used technique at the Start-up level, it had the highest percentage when compared to classes at the Beginner and Intermediate levels. Recasts remained the most popular type of corrective feedback used in the Beginner level class, followed by explicit feedback. Repetition was used with a frequency of 7.02% and then 5.26% each for clarification requests and metalinguistic feedback. The least used technique was the elicitation technique at 3.51%. At the Intermediate level, the data revealed that recasts were still the most prominent corrective feedback strategy used by the teacher, and it had the highest percentage when compared to the other levels. Then explicit feedback was employed as the second most popular type. Metalinguistic feedback was also used at 4.88%, as well as clarification requests, elicitation and repetition at 2.44% each.

Another interesting result is that the teacher gave the highest amount of corrective feedback at the Beginner level at a staggering 57 times compared to the other two levels. The reason is that the students kept making the same errors so the teacher had to correct them multiple times even though they were provided with the same patterns of conversation in their worksheets. When the students

performed a role-play activity of reserving a hotel room between a customer and a receptionist, they had to create sentences by themselves to speak suitably within the given context. Interestingly, even though the teacher kept treating the same errors, she applied a variety of corrective feedback strategies. The following is an example of the teacher using multiple feedback strategies to correct the same error of using the verb *book*.

Extract 3:

Original interaction

S1: Do you reserve a duplex room for three nights?

S2: I'm sorry. I booking for a single room for three nights.

T: Ah...I booking? (high intonation) I'm sorry. I...

S2: book (S hesitated)

T: ในชีทเขาเขียนไงคะ ทำไมอันนี้ถึงต้องเติม ed *เพราะว่ามันเป็นอดีตใช่ไหมคะ ทีนี้ค่ะถ้าหากอันนี้เติม* ed *จะอ่านว่า* booked (/t/) *เรา ไม่ /book-ked/ นะ booked (/t/) ...repeat after me ...booked*

S1, S2: booked (/t/)

Translation

S1: Do you reserve a duplex room for three nights?

S2: I'm sorry. I booking for a single room for three nights.

T: Ah...I booking? (high intonation) I'm sorry. I...

S2: book (S hesitated)

T: What is written in the handout? Why does the word "book" need to have "ed"? Because it is the past verb form. If there is "ed" in the verb, we pronounce it as booked (/t/), not /book-ked/. booked (/t/) ...repeat after me ...booked (/t/)

S1, S2: booked (/t/)

From the extract, the teacher used three corrective feedback strategies in a single instance to treat a single error. First, she used the repetition strategy by repeating the error *booking* and using high intonation to highlight it. At this stage, the students could have known that there is an error that should be repaired. Then, the teacher continued immediately by eliciting in order to let the students fill in the blank. When the teacher saw that the students did not understand, she finally decided to explain explicitly by giving a long explanation, treating both grammar and pronunciation errors. At each turn, she usually used self-correction strategies first such as repetition and elicitation, and then she would always end by giving explicit feedback.

In order to analyze the use of recasts and explicit feedback in more detail, these two most favored types of corrective feedback strategies from the observation can be further categorized into

three types of errors—grammatical errors, vocabulary errors, and pronunciation errors (Ozmen & Aydin, 2015).

Table 2

Frequency and Percentages of Recasts and Explicit Feedback in Three Proficiency Levels

	Start-up level		**Beginner level**		**Intermediate level**	
	Explicit feedback	**Recasts**	**Explicit feedback**	**Recasts**	**Explicit feedback**	**Recasts**
Grammatical error	6 (54.55%)	5 (25%)	6 (46.15%)	17 (53.13%)	5 (50%)	16 (61.54%)
Vocabulary error	2 (18.18%)	4 (20%)	1 (7.69%)	4 (12.50%)	3 (30%)	6 (23.08%)
Pronunciation error	3 (27.27%)	11 (55%)	6 (46.15%)	11 (34.38%)	2 (20%)	4 (15.38%)
Total	**11 (100%)**	**20 (100%)**	**13 (100%)**	**32 (100%)**	**10 (100%)**	**26 (100%)**

At the Start-up level, the data shows that the teacher used explicit feedback up to a frequency of 54.55% to treat grammatical errors, and only 27.27% and 18.18% to treat pronunciation errors and vocabulary errors, respectively. Regarding recasts at the Start-up level, recasts were the most widely used technique for correcting pronunciation errors at 55% and were also used to correct grammatical errors and vocabulary errors at 25% and 20%, respectively. At the Beginner level, it can be seen that the teacher provided explicit feedback for grammatical and pronunciation errors equally at 46.15% each, and vocabulary errors at only 7.69%. The teacher used recasts to treat grammatical errors up to a frequency of 53.13%, followed by pronunciation errors and vocabulary errors at 34.38% and 12.50%, respectively. Lastly, at the Intermediate level, the students received 50% of explicit feedback from grammatical errors, 30% from vocabulary errors, and 20% from pronunciation errors. Moreover, it is shown that the teacher used recasts to correct students' grammatical errors most frequently at 61.54%, followed by vocabulary errors at 23.08%, and pronunciation errors at 15.38%.

Discussion

It is evident from the findings that the teacher used recasts a lot more than the other corrective feedback strategies, and it shows parallelism with several studies (Devi, 2014; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Ozturk, 2016; Phoung and Huan, 2018; Solikhah, 2016; Yoshida, 2008). The data indicated that a major

percentage of the corrective feedback used across each proficiency level consisted of recasts and explicit feedback. Based on this number, it could be concluded that the teacher usually provides the correct form of speaking rather than waiting for students' responses to their own errors. This result is related to the taxonomy of oral corrective feedback strategies (Maolida, 2017) in that recast and explicit feedback are input-providing types since learners are given the correct form, while the other strategies are output-prompting types because the teacher has to elicit the correct form from the students. It can also be said that the teacher normally provides the correct form to the students because of Thai culture. Thai learners tend to perceive that making errors in class is something that should be avoided, so they do not want to take the risk of speaking out. It is supported by Charles at al. (2016) who mentioned that it is normal in Thai EFL classrooms that Thai teachers commonly provide correct answers without giving the students a chance to correct their own errors. Regarding this point, the teacher in this study might have perceived that in order to not disrupt the Thai classroom culture, it is the teacher's responsibility to provide the right answers directly to Thai English learners. Otherwise, Thai learners would feel uncomfortable to speak and be negatively affected in speaking English. Moreover, providing the correct form could also be the teacher's common practice based on her own teaching preferences, beliefs and learning experience, as it is quicker and easier to provide correct forms than eliciting answers from the students.

On the other hand, the results also reveal that clarification requests and elicitation were used minimally. This is similar to the findings of Ahangari and Amirzadeh (2011) where teachers used few clarification requests and did not use elicitation at all for elementary students. Because these two strategies require a student to self-correct and possess sufficient linguistic knowledge to repair their own errors, the teacher probably perceived that the students, particularly less advanced students, are not linguistically proficient enough yet to repair these errors by themselves.

Corrective Feedback at the Start-up Level

As the students in this class had little background knowledge about tenses, the teacher had to explain the grammar rules repeatedly. Consequently, there is no doubt that explicit feedback is one of the most common strategies used by the teacher when compared to the other levels, especially when treating grammatical errors. As low proficient learners have less linguistic knowledge, they might need more explicit explanations from teachers to understand the language. This is supported by Kennedy (2010) who mentioned that it would be a difficult task for a low proficiency learner to notice their own errors without metalinguistic explanation. Additionally, this is in line with the study of Lyster and Ranta (1997) who stated that explicit correction is typically more useful for beginner students.

Regarding the use of recasts at the Start-up level, it was also used more frequently to correct students' pronunciations because the students mispronounced many simple words. The words were often too obvious to be ignored even though the topic of the class emphasized only on grammar rules. Correcting by using recasts is not usually noticed by learners, especially low proficiency learners, but in this case, the students did acknowledge by themselves that there was something wrong with their

utterances because the teacher would stress and repeat words as a hint for them. Similarly, the study of Lyster (2002) also found that recasts were used widely and were an effective strategy in treating phonological errors.

On the contrary, the teacher did not use clarification requests. As their utterances were often short and easy, they were easily understood by the teacher. Thus, the teacher had no need to ask the students to clarify those ill-formed sentences because they probably did not have enough linguistic knowledge to explain them anyway. Besides clarification requests, elicitation was also rarely used to correct students' errors either because it might be too difficult for the students to notice and repair errors by themselves. Without relying on the students noticing their errors by themselves, the teacher used more of the repetition strategy instead. Through this technique, the teacher was able to help the students notice their own errors first by repeating them and then letting them think and fix the errors later. However, it should be made aware that repetition is worthless for learners who cannot perceive a teacher's repetition as erroneous, especially for elementary learners as asserted by Allwright and Baily (1991).

Corrective Feedback at the Beginner Level

Recasts are still the main corrective feedback strategy used at this level. It can be observed that a majority of the errors, particularly grammatical errors, that the students made were from the warm-up talk activity because they had to respond to their own utterances, giving them more chances to make errors as they had not been taught anything yet. So, the teacher mostly corrected them by using recasts because it did not interrupt the flow of communication when the students were speaking during the warm-up activity. Moreover, the teacher often employed many techniques to treat a single error. Lyster and Ranta (1997) also added *multiple feedbacks* in a category which referred to providing a combination of corrective feedback types for the same error. The same errors were often corrected due to the role-play activity where students were instructed to keep practicing the same roles multiple times. It is noticeable that at each turn the teacher corrected the errors, she would usually apply self-correction strategies first such as metalinguistic feedback, repetition, and elicitation, and then would always end with providing explicit feedback. This might be because when the students were given a chance to correct themselves, they could not repair their own errors because they were not proficient enough yet to understand what needed to be corrected. This finding is supported by Park (2010) who stated that despite using various strategies to help learners notice errors, sometimes such feedback is ineffective and ambiguous. This is more apparent in this case where even though the teacher had already provided the correct answer explicitly, the students still made the same error in the next turn.

Corrective Feedback at the Intermediate Level

As the students in this level are more fluent in speaking than students in the other levels, they are able to discuss topics over a long conversation with their partners. They also had ample

opportunities to practice using the second conditional sentence, but made quite a lot of errors as it was a new grammar point that was being taught. Therefore, the teacher mostly corrected them by using recasts because it did not break the flow of conversation, whereas the other strategies would have, considering they require the teacher to elicit the correct form and interrupt students' utterances. Recasts are more noticeable for the learners of this level due to having more linguistic knowledge than their low proficiency counterparts. Panova and Lyster (2002) also affirmed particularly that more advanced learners tend to notice recasts better than less proficient learners. Also, the experiment of Mackey and Philip (1998) supported that giving intensive recasts to more advanced learners was a very effective strategy.

According to the results of this study, it is interesting to point out that recasts were more widely used in a more advanced proficiency class than classes in the lower levels. This result seems to contradict the results of Ahangari and Amirzadeh (2011) and Fan (2019), all of whom found that teachers used less recasts as learners become more proficient. This is because teachers would usually incorporate more self-correction techniques with more proficient learners as they had the necessary linguistic knowledge to repair their own errors. However, in this study, recasts were still the most frequently used technique despite teaching students that were at the highest proficiency level. This might be a result of the learners being given a lot of opportunities to speak in class. Hence, the possibility of making errors increased and in turn, led to more corrections by the teacher. In addition to that, the teacher also probably perceived that it was her role to treat these errors and subsequently, tried to correct the students each time an error occurred.

Conclusion and Implication

From this study, it is evident that the most frequently used type of corrective feedback across all proficiency levels was recast, while explicit feedback was the second most favoured strategy employed by the teacher. From this standpoint, it can be concluded that the teacher treats spoken errors in the same direction across all levels of proficiency, but there are also few differences when it came to using the other correction strategies. Furthermore, it can be said that, as recast and explicit feedback are the most frequently used strategies, the teacher mostly provides input corrective feedback by reformulating students' errors and giving the correct answer instead of providing opportunities for students to sort out their errors. Recasts were used in high frequency across the board primarily because the strategy does not interrupt students and their flow of communication, which proved useful particularly in speaking activities. However, language teachers should be aware that recasts are usually unnoticeable for learners and are sometimes ambiguous, especially for less proficient learners. This would affect students' language development if they are not able to recognize what it is wrong with their utterances.

When the class particularly focuses on speaking skills, it seems that it is a teacher's responsibility to be an error corrector because a teacher's corrective feedback could help provide the

foundation students need to shape their linguistic knowledge. Therefore, using the appropriate corrective feedback strategy is essential since it influences the way the students improve in the target language. As can be seen in past literature and this study, the results are dynamic because there are external factors and concerns that would affect the use of strategy and language that teachers should take into consideration. The first factor to consider is the number of students in the class. If there are only a few students in the class such as in the Start-up and Beginner classes, the teacher would have more chances to listen to every utterance and correct their errors. This means that the centralization of the class is with the teacher so the strategy use is probably different from treating students in pairs or individually. Secondly, the topic and language focus of the class could dictate the way the teacher corrects. For example, one topic in the Start-up level class focuses on language accuracy where students begin by first building easy sentences. Therefore, more explicit feedback was used to explain the necessary grammar points. On the other hand, the students at the Intermediate level had a discussion topic instead where they could produce language more freely as the topic encourages them to express their opinions. The teacher also provides ample time for them to speak with their friends, so in this particular class, the teacher used the recast strategy more frequently because the fluency of the learners was more developed and hence, less explicit feedback was required.

Making errors is a part of the learning process so it is a natural step towards becoming a proficient L2 speaker. As a result, teacher training is suggested in this study to decide not only what corrective feedback technique is the most appropriate to treat students at each level of proficiency, but also how to treat students' errors gently and not destroy their confidence in speaking. The teacher might also take into consideration the possibility of carrying out a survey with their classes at each proficiency level. The results would then help the teacher in knowing students' preferences and beliefs better, and then deciding what type of corrective feedback would be most suitable to their L2 development.

Limitations and Future Studies

One of the limitations of this study is that the participants consist of only one teacher at all proficiency levels, so the result cannot be generalized in any way. It is suggested that future studies should include more participants with an expanded period of observation to increase data size and enhance the generalization capabilities of the study. Moreover, the results in this study are not meant to imply that any one corrective feedback is the most effective strategy for each proficiency level. Thus, it would be interesting if future ELT researchers could investigate the effectiveness of each type of corrective feedback at each level or perhaps interview either language teachers or students to study their perceptions on the use of corrective feedback strategies. Finally, as this study was conducted with a Thai teacher and adult learners, it would be meaningful if researchers could explore whether a native teacher uses the same corrective feedback strategies as a Thai teacher does or examine whether a language teacher gives the same corrective feedback to learners belonging to different age groups.

References

Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011). Exploring the teachers' use of spoken corrective feedback in teaching Iranian EFL learners at different levels of proficiency. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29*, 1859–1868. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.435

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

Alsolami, R. (2019). Effects of oral corrective feedback on language skills. *Theory and Practices in Language Studies, 9*(6), 672–677. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0906.09

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(4), 543–574.

Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students* (2nd ed.). Alexandria.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). Addison Wesley Longman.

Charles T., Tangkawanit W., Ketnarongrattana S., & Soontornwipast K. (2016). Native English speaking teachers' use of corrective feedback in a Thai speaking oriented ESL context. *Rangsit Journal of Educational Studies, 3*(1), 48–57.

Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning, 27*(1), 29–46.

Chu, R. (2011). Effects of teacher's corrective feedback on accuracy in the oral English of English-majors college students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1*(5), 454–459.

Devi, A. P. (2014). *Teacher's corrective feedback on students' spoken errors in an EFL classroom* [Paper presentation]. The 61th TEFLIN Conference UNS Solo 2014, Solo, Malaysia.

Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 8*(2), 129–136.

El Tatawy, M. (2006). Corrective feedback in second language acquisition. *Studies in Applied Linguistics & TESOL, 2*(2), 1–19.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Understanding second language acquisition.* Oxford University Press.

Fan, N. (2019). An investigation of oral corrective feedback in an ESL listening and speaking class. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 10*(1), 197–203. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1001.22

Goh, Christine C. M., & Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach.* Cambridge University Press.

Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). Longman.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81–112.

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

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1978.tb02409.x

Kennedy, S. (2010). Corrective feedback for learners of varied proficiency levels: A teacher's choices. *TESL CANADA Journal, 27*(2), 31–50.

Lange, C. F. (2009). *Corrective Feedback during communicative activities: A study of recasts as a feedback method to correct spoken English* [Master's thesis, Karlstad University]. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:231776/FULLTEXT01.pdf

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus on form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effect on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*(4), 429–448.

Lyster, R. (2002). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning, 48*(2), 183–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00039

Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(1), 37–66. DOI:10.1017/S0272263197001034

Mackey, A., & Philip. J. (1998). Recasts, interaction and interlanguage development: Are responses red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal, 82*(3), 338–356.

Maolida, E. H. (2017). Relating teacher's oral corrective feedback to young learners' uptake: A case study in a young learner EFL classroom. *Indonesian EFL Journal, 3*(2), 181–192.

Muhsin, M. A. (2016). The effectiveness of positive feedback in teaching speaking skill. *Lingua Cultura, 10*(1), 25-30. DOI:10.21512/lc.v10i1.873

Oliver, R. (2000). Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pairwork. *Language Learning, 50*(1*)*, 119–151.

Oliver, R., & Grote, E. (2010). The provision and uptake of different types of recasts in child and adult ESL learners. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 33*(3), 26.1–26.22. http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11937/36543

Ozmen, K. S., & Aydın, H. U. (2015). Examining student teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: Insights from a teacher education program in turkey", *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(12), 140–164.

Ozturk, G. (2016). An investigation on the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 12*(2), 22–37.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 573–595. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588241

Park, E. S. (2012). *Effects of recasts on different morphosyntactic features* [Paper presentation]. The 10th Asia TEFL International Conference, Delhi, India.

Park, H. S. (2010). *Teachers' and learners' preferences for error correction*. [Master's thesis,

California State University]. https://dspace.calstate.edu/bitstream/handle/10211.9/302/thesis_pdf.pdf?sequence=1

Phuong, T, & Huan, N. (2018). Teacher corrective feedback on students' speaking performance and their uptake in EFL classes. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *3*(3), 110–131. https://zenodo.org/record/1321246

Roothooft, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness, 25*(4), 318–335.

Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language Learning.* Springer.

Solikhah, I. (2016). Oral corrective feedback in speaking class of English department. *Lingua, 13*(1), 87–102. DOI:10.30957/lingua.v13i1.14

Yang, Y. (2008). *Corrective feedback and Chinese learners' acquisition of English past tense* [Doctoral thesis, McGill University]. https://escholarship.mcgill.ca/downloads/zs25xb404.pdf

Yoshida, R. (2008) Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness, 17*(1), 78–93. https://doi.org/10.2167/la429.0

Zhai, K., & Gao X. (2018). Effects of corrective feedback on EFL speaking task complexity in China's university classroom. *Cogent Education, 5*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1485472

APPENDIX A

Classroom Observation Sheet

Thai Teacher's Corrective Feedback on Adult Learners' Errors in Speaking

Classroom Observation Sheet for _____ Level

Date: _____ No. of students: _____

Topic:_____ Language Focus:_____

Types of Corrective Feedback	Frequency	Notes
1. Explicit feedback *"Go" is in the present tense. You need to use the past tense "went" here. (correct form +grammar explanation)*		
2. Recasts *I went to the park. (correct without pointing out the error)*		
3. Clarification requests *Could you say that again?*		
4. Metalinguistic feedback *How does the verb change when we talk about the past? (give a clue)*		
5. Elicitation *Yesterday, I… (Teachers ask students to complete the sentence)*		
6. Repetition *I go?*		

About the Authors

Napat Kaewkascholkul is a graduate student of the Master of Arts Program in Applied Linguistics for English Language Teaching at the School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi. Her interests involve English language teaching methodology, and English language learning.

Natjiree Jaturapitakkul, Ph.D., is an assistant professor at School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi in Bangkok, Thailand. She has presented and published papers on English language teaching and learning, language testing, test development and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) testing.