

Preference of Corrective Feedback Approaches Perceived by Native English Teachers and Students

Gipyo Park

Soonchunhyang University, South Korea

This study investigated teachers' choice and students' preference of corrective feedback by 24 native English teachers and 51 university students taking English conversation in the EFL context of Korea, utilizing both quantitative and qualitative data. The results of the quantitative data analysis were: 1) all of the groups—teachers, students, the high proficient students (HPSs), and the low proficient students (LPSs)—preferred recast the most out of the five approaches of corrective feedback proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and 2) the explicit correction approach was the only statistically significant variable in the comparison between groups: teachers versus students and the HPSs versus the LPSs. The results of the qualitative data analysis were: 1) both teachers and students showed individual differences as well as group differences of corrective feedback, which might result in statistical insignificance in the overall group comparison in the quantitative data and 2) some of the teachers and students perceived clarification request, elicitation, and repetition as measuring the same construct of implicit correction. This study concludes with teaching implications and future study areas for corrective feedback.

Key words: second/foreign language learning, corrective feedback, error correction, individual difference

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, teaching English in Korea focused on teaching reading skills, grammar, and translation with the influence of the dominant Grammar-Translation Method.¹ However, with the result of in part the paradigm shift in teaching methods from grammar-translation to communication and in part the availability of native English teachers mainly from America, Canada, and Britain, focus on English teaching in Korea has been given recently to teaching listening, speaking, and writing skills as well as reading skills.

One of the hot issues in teaching speaking skills around the world has been the role of corrective feedback in learner uptake defined as learners' reaction to the teacher's feedback. The research on corrective feedback has centered on the types of corrective feedback, the effect of corrective feedback on learner uptake and the role of individual differences in this effect (DeKeyser, 1993; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Schulz, 1996; Tsang, 2004; Yoshida, 2008).

One of the prominent studies on corrective feedback was conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997) who proposed a framework for several different approaches of corrective feedback provided by the teacher. In this framework, six different approaches of feedback were proposed: explicit correction, recast, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. The framework has been used in subsequent studies to disseminate the role of corrective feedback in learner uptake and, in turn, in L2 acquisition (Panova & Lyster, 2002; Tsang, 2004; Yoshida, 2008).

Regardless of many studies on corrective feedback, only a dearth of published studies have investigated the corrective feedback perceived by teachers and students and by high achievement students and low achievement students (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Schulz, 1996, 2001; Yoshida, 2008). Furthermore, to my knowledge, no published studies to date have utilized

¹ I would like to express my deepest thanks to all the participants for their sincere participation in quantitative and qualitative data collection and to Hyun-Mi Park for her assistance in data analysis.

qualitative data to explain quantitative results pertaining to corrective feedback perceived by teachers and students in EFL contexts. Considering that the effects of corrective feedback on learner uptake and L2 acquisition depend on many variables including teachers' and students' perceptions about corrective feedback and student proficiency levels, more studies on corrective feedback in relation to perceptions and proficiency levels should be conducted utilizing both quantitative and qualitative data (Carroll et al., 1992; DeKeyser, 1993; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Lin & Hedgcock, 1996; Schulz, 1996; Yoshida, 2008).

The purpose of this study is to fill this gap by comparing the corrective feedback perceived by native English teachers and EFL university students in English conversation classes, and by attempting to explain the underlying reasons for teachers' choice and students' preference of feedback. Another purpose of this study is to sensitize researchers, material developers, teachers, and students learning English as a second/foreign language to various approaches of corrective feedback. For these purposes, the following research questions were raised to guide this study.

(1) What approaches of corrective feedback do teachers use and students—the high proficient students and the low proficient students—perceive as the most effective in developing speaking proficiency?

(2) Are effective approaches of corrective feedback perceived by teachers different from those perceived by students?

(3) Are effective approaches of corrective feedback perceived by the high proficient students different from those perceived by the low proficient students?

BACKGROUND

Research on corrective feedback has gained prominence in the domain of L2 acquisition because it plays a crucial role in developing L2 acquisition theories as well as in teaching second languages. L2 acquisition researchers

have contended that the role of corrective feedback in L2 acquisition will determine the relative importance of positive input or negative input in L2 acquisition, which, in turn, will provide a framework for choosing teaching methods and materials, the role of teachers and students, and providing the types of appropriate input in class (Krashen, 1985; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Following earlier descriptive studies (Allwright, 1975; Hendrickson, 1978), the experimental research on the role of corrective feedback in speaking has burgeoned. The research centers on exploring error types, the relation of error types to learner uptake and, in turn, L2 acquisition, and the role of individual differences in this relation (Carroll et al., 1992; Carroll & Swain, 1993; DeKeyser, 1993; Lin & Hedgecock, 1996; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Schulz, 1996; Tsang, 2004; Yoshida, 2008).

Carroll and Swain (1993) investigated the relative effects of different types of corrective feedback on grammatical generalizations by ESL learners whose primary language was Spanish. Four different types of feedback were chosen: explicit hypothesis rejection, explicit utterance rejection, modeling/implicit negative feedback, and indirect metalinguistic feedback. Findings showed that the group of explicit hypothesis rejection outperformed all the other groups, providing evidence that explicit correction played more important role in grammatical generalizations than implicit correction.

In a seminal research on corrective feedback, Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorized corrective feedback into six different types after investigating four immersion classrooms at the primary level: explicit correction, recast, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. They found that teachers used recast (55%) the most out of the six different types of feedback, followed by elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and repetition of errors (5%). However, recast was the least likely to lead to uptake which refers to student responses to feedback, whereas elicitation led to student responses the most successfully. Panova and Lyster (2002) confirmed these results in an adult ESL classroom where recast was the most frequently used type of corrective feedback, but

found this led to lower rates of student uptake and repair.

More recently, Tsang (2004) investigated the occurrence of corrective feedback, the relationship between corrective feedback and learner repair, and the relationship between corrective feedback and kinds of learner errors such as grammatical and phonological errors. The participants were 13 teachers and 481 secondary school students learning English in Hong Kong. The results were that the teachers chose recast and explicit correction most frequently. However, the most frequent student-generated repair occurred in repetition and elicitation with the least repair in recast and explicit correction. Another finding of this study was that grammatical repairs resulted from negotiation types such as repetition and elicitation, whereas phonological repairs resulted from recast and explicit correction.

In the investigation into for or against feedback on second language teaching, individual differences in proficiency level along with teacher and student perceptions must be considered because the effect of feedback will be determined as a result of intricate interactions between these individual variables (Carroll et al., 1992; DeKeyser, 1993; Lin & Hedgcock, 1996; Schulz, 1996; Yoshida, 2008). Carroll et al. (1992) investigated the effects of corrective feedback on the learning of morphological generalizations by native English learners of French in Canada. Findings showed that even though the effect of feedback on morphological learning was positive, it was not powerful enough to lead to morphological generalizations. Another finding of this study was that the effect of corrective feedback was more salient to advanced learners than to intermediate learners.

DeKeyser (1993) investigated the effect of error correction on L2 grammar and oral tests by Dutch-speaking high school students learning French as a second language. He found that the effect of error correction was determined by individual learner characteristics including achievement levels and anxiety. For instance, high achievement students did better on a grammar test after error correction than low achievement students.

In a similar vein, Lin and Hedgcock (1996) investigated the effect of error correction on student repair as a function of learners' proficiency levels. The

participants consisted of four high proficient university students with extensive formal training in Spanish and four low proficient Chinese immigrants to Spain. The interview result showed striking differences in error recognition and error repairs between the two groups. The high proficient group of the students noticed error correction and successfully repaired their errors, whereas the low proficient immigrants showed little sensitivity to error correction.

Another variable that can determine the effect of error correction is teachers' and students' different perceptions of corrective feedback (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Schulz, 1996, 2001; Yoshida, 2008). Schulz (1996) investigated students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar by college students enrolled in German language courses in the USA. She found considerable discrepancies between student and teacher attitudes toward error correction. For instance, in a statement of "error correction in speaking the TL," although 90 percent of the students endorsed the statement, only about 40 percent of the teachers indicated endorsement. They also differed significantly in a statement about "whether students disliked being corrected in class." For this item, while 86 percent of the students disagreed with the statement, only 33 percent of the teachers believed that their students want to be corrected in class. Similar findings were also found in a subsequent study where teachers and students showed considerable discrepancies in the roles of grammar and error correction especially in learning to speak a foreign language by teachers and students at the university level (Schulz, 2001).

Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005) compared EFL teachers' and EFL college students' perceptions about error correction by asking them to watch a video about teaching listening comprehension. After watching the video, both groups were asked to detect error correction moves, classify errors, and judge efficiency of error correction. Results showed that even though both the teachers and the students found the same classification of errors, their perceptions of efficiency of error correction strategies were generally different from each other. They also found that the effect of error correction

will be improved if learner errors are corrected with enough time and explanation.

More recently, Yoshida (2008) also found that the teachers' choice of corrective feedback in general differed from the students' preference of feedback in the context of learning Japanese in Australia. For instance, teachers chose recast most often for several reasons including limited class hours, whereas students in general preferred to have an opportunity to work out correct forms on their own before receiving correct forms by recast or explicit correction. He also found that teachers chose corrective feedback in accordance with learner characteristics such as students' proficiency levels and learning styles.

Investigating teachers' and students' perceptions about corrective feedback, in depth, is a premier step to providing feedback in class because there are individual as well as group differences in the effect of feedback on uptake and L2 acquisition and because mismatches of the perceptions in corrective feedback between teachers and students can lead to this effect (Horwitz, 2008; Kern, 1995). In addition, understanding the corrective feedback perceived by teachers and students is crucial because students' perceptions about the value and effect of each feedback actually matched with their improvement in speaking skills (Lynch & Maclean, 2003).

PROCEDURE

Participants

The participants consisted of EFL teachers and students in Korea. A total of 24 native English teachers participated in this study. The teachers consisted of 11 Americans, 8 Canadians, 4 British, and 1 Australian, with 15 males and 9 females. The average age of the teachers was 35 with the range between 24 and 62. They have taught English for 5 years on average both inside and outside Korea, with all of them holding bachelor's degrees with

various majors in their home countries.

As for students, a total of 51 university students taking English conversation participated in this study. They were “honors students” at a university determined by the scores of the Korea College Scholastic Ability Test (KCSAT), GPA in college, and the scores of the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC). At the time the data were collected, they were taking English conversation as a required course for the “Honors Program” during the winter vacation. The students consisted of 18 males and 33 females with an average age of 20. They were 16 freshmen, 24 sophomores, and 11 juniors, with 17 in the humanities, 8 in the social sciences, 4 in the natural sciences, 3 in the engineering, and 19 in the medical sciences.

Instruments

Two instruments were used: The Questionnaire for Corrective Feedback Approaches (QCFAs) and the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC). The QCFAs proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) was used to investigate the teachers’ and students’ preference of error correction. The original corrective feedback approaches (CFAs) consist of six different approaches of error correction: explicit correction to provide the correct form explicitly; recast to reformulate all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error; clarification request to indicate to students that the utterance is ill-formed; metalinguistic feedback to provide comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student’s utterance; elicitation to get the students to produce the correct form by asking the student to repeat the utterance in a reformulated version; and repetition to repeat the student’s error.

In order to check whether each CFA is comprehensible to native English teachers and their students, the author asked two native English teachers and two students to choose their preference of CFAs on a five-point scale. As per the recommendation of these teachers and students, the metalinguistic

feedback approach was eliminated because it was similar to other approaches such as clarification request. After assuring that the rest five approaches of corrective feedback were comprehensible to both the teachers and the students, the five CFAs were used in this study.

The QCFAs consist of two different versions for teachers and students, respectively. For the teachers' version, the author asked teachers to write the numbers from 1 (the most frequently used corrective feedback) to 5 (the least frequently used corrective feedback) to each of the five CFAs they had used in class. For the students' version, the author asked students to write the numbers from 1 (the most frequently used corrective feedback) to 5 (the least frequently used corrective feedback) to each of the five CFAs they want their teachers to use in class. The author also asked both teachers and students to explain why they chose number 1 (required) and number 2 (optional) based on their teaching and learning experiences (See Appendix).

The TOEIC test that was developed by Educational Testing Service (ETS) and the Chauncey Group International to measure the English communication skills of people in an international work environment was used to measure the students' English proficiency. The test consists of four parts (one picture, question-response, short conversation, and short talks) of listening comprehension and three parts (incomplete sentences, error recognition, and reading comprehension) of reading comprehension. The Chauncey Group International (2002) reported relatively high reliability and validity of the TOEIC test, with the KR-20 reliability of .96 and the concurrent validity of .74.

Data Collection Procedures and Data Analysis

The researcher explained the purpose of this study to both the director of the Foreign Language Education Center (FLEC) at a university in Korea and the staff in charge of the "Honors Program" of the university in the 2009 winter session, and asked their cooperation in collecting the data. As for the teachers' data, the staff sent emails to native English teachers after the

author's explanation about the QCFAs and how to respond to them at a FLEC meeting. Out of the 32 native English teachers who were teaching English conversation during the winter session, 24 teachers completed the questionnaire and returned it with the return rate of 75%.

As for the students' data, the researcher contacted 5 native English teachers according to the recommendation of the staff in charge of the "Honors Program" and asked them to collect the students' data in class. The teachers explained to the students the nature of this study, the definitions of the five CFAs, and how to respond to the QCFAs, as was described in Appendix. In addition, they asked the students to respond to the questionnaire honestly and sincerely.

The teachers were asked to respond to the questionnaire in English, whereas the students were asked to respond to the questionnaire in Korean because of their limited English writing proficiency. Any questions that arose while responding to the questionnaire were encouraged and welcomed. It took about 50 minutes to collect the data, including the explanation about the five corrective feedback approaches.

For data analysis, the author reversed the scores given to the five corrective feedback approaches by teachers and students, with 5 meaning the most and 1 meaning the least favored corrective feedback by the two groups. Mann-Whitney's U and Wilks' Lamda were performed to analyze the quantitative data using SPSS 17.0. In the qualitative data, the teachers' data were translated into Korean by the author, and all the data were analyzed by the author and a research assistant majoring in English education at the graduate school.

RESULTS

Corrective Feedback by the Teachers and the Students

Table 1 shows the preference of the corrective feedback perceived by the

teachers and the students. The teachers used the recast approach most frequently, followed by elicitation, repetition, clarification request, and the explicit feedback approach. On the other hand, the students chose the recast approach, explicit correction, elicitation, repetition, and the clarification request approach in the order of their preference for error correction. It is interesting to note that both the teachers and the students considered recast the most important in developing oral skills. Another interesting finding was that the students perceived the explicit correction approach as the second most important one out of the five, whereas the teachers perceived it as the least important one. It should also be noted that both groups used the clarification request approach almost least frequently. In the Mann-Whitney test, the explicit correction approach was the only one out of the five that showed significant group differences. However, no significant overall group difference was found in the preference of corrective feedback perceived by the teachers and the students in the MANOVA.

TABLE 1
Preference of the Corrective Feedback by the Teachers (n=24) and the Students (n=51)

Variables	Teachers M (SD)	Students M (SD)	Mann- Whitney's U	Wilks' Lamda
Explicit Correction	2.46 (1.47)	3.25 (1.52)	429*	
Recast	3.79 (1.21)	3.73 (1.15)	584	
Clarification Request	2.47 (1.38)	2.47 (1.25)	604	.919
Elicitation	3.29 (1.12)	3.22 (1.43)	599	
Repetition	2.96 (1.43)	2.51 (1.40)	503	

* $p < .05$

Corrective Feedback by the High Proficient Students and the Low Proficient Students

In order to compare the preferred corrective feedback perceived by the students' proficiency levels, the students were divided into the high proficient students (HPSs, $m=804$) and the low proficient students (LPSs, $m=572$)

based on their TOEIC scores. The Mann-Whitney test showed that the TOEIC scores of the two groups were significantly different from each other ($p < .001$). As shown in Table 2, the HPSs preferred the recast approach the most, followed by the explicit correction approach, elicitation, repetition, and clarification request, whereas the LPSs perceived the recast approach and the elicitation approach as the most important ones, followed by explicit correction, repetition, and clarification request. It is interesting to note that the HPSs preferred the explicit approach more than their counterparts. The mean differences of the five error correction approaches were bigger in the HPSs than in the LPSs, suggesting that the HPSs held more broad perceptions about the corrective feedback than the LPSs. Even though there were no overall group differences in the error correction between the HPSs and LPSs in the MANOVA, the explicit correction approach was significantly different between the HPSs and the LPSs in the Mann-Whitney test.

TABLE 2
Preference of the Corrective Feedback by the High Proficient Students (n=17) and the Low Proficient Students (n=18)

Variables	HPSs M (SD)	LPSs M(SD)	Mann- Whitney's U	Wilks' Lamda
Explicit Correction	3.82 (1.38)	2.89 (1.37)	95*	
Recast	4.00 (.79)	3.28 (1.27)	102	
Clarification Request	2.00 (1.17)	2.72 (1.27)	101	.759
Elicitation	3.06 (1.19)	3.28 (1.60)	138	
Repetition	2.12 (1.27)	2.83 (1.62)	118	

HPSs: high proficient students; LPSs: low proficient students

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Reasons for Choosing Each Corrective Feedback by the Teachers and the Students

In this section, the reasons for choosing each corrective feedback by the teachers and the students will be described on the basis of their self-report

data. The CFAs will be described in the order of the explicit correction approach, recast, clarification request, elicitation, and the repetition approach.

The explicit correction approach refers to the explicit provision of the correct form by the teacher. As shown in Table 1, the teachers preferred to use the explicit correction approach the least. As expected, they used this approach to correct the students' errors explicitly. For instance, one teacher reported that "When I use the explicit correction approach, they [students] will hear the error clearly and then repeat the correct sentence accurately."

Both the HPSs and the LPSs chose explicit correction because they wanted the teacher to correct their errors explicitly and clearly so that they would not make the same errors in the future. One LPS reported that "This approach should be used with other approaches such as recast which is less intimidating because some students feel intimidated when they make errors and are corrected in front of others." However, one HPS, probably a highly motivated learner, was not intimidated by the teacher's explicit correction. He wrote that "If the teacher doesn't correct my errors explicitly, it will make me nervous and nuts. I will never shy away from being corrected in front of peers because making mistakes and learning from it is the reason I take English conversation classes."

The recast approach, the most frequently chosen approach both by the teachers and the students in Table 1, involves the teacher's reformulation of all or part of the students' utterances except the error. The teachers' group chose the recast approach mainly for affective reasons and limited class hours. For instance, a teacher reported that "Recast gives students a safe, non-threatening, and face-saving way to correct themselves, especially in a beginning level class." Other reasons for choosing recast include "not to interfere with the natural flow of speech too much, especially in a conversation class" and "to give students confidence."

Like the teachers' group, the students' groups reported that recast helps the conversation to go smoothly, does not make students shy away from class participation, and helps students to be more confident in developing conversation skills. For instance, one of the LPSs reported that "If the teacher

corrects my errors naturally through recast, I feel comfortable when I speak in English.” One HPS wrote that “Since recast does not pinpoint students’ errors directly, students will not be embarrassed by their errors and learn the correct form by listening to their teachers.” The students also chose the recast approach because of quality input. Another HPS added that “If the teacher corrects only the errors students make, students may uptake only the part of utterances that was corrected. However, if the teacher recast students’ errors, students will uptake correct utterances as a whole.”

Clarification request is used to indicate to students that their utterance has been misunderstood by the teacher. The teachers used this approach mainly because they wanted their students to correct errors by themselves so that students can build their confidence. One of the teachers reported that “I want to let students find on their own that their statement isn’t understandable and they should rephrase it.” Another teacher wrote that “I do this when I genuinely do not fully understand the student.” It is also worth mentioning a third teacher’s comment that clarification request works best with students who have more experience and confidence because they can usually think in more than a single dimension.

As shown in Table 2, both the HPSs and the LPSs chose this approach the least frequently, and there was no one in the LPSs who chose the clarification request approach as their favorite one. However, some students commented that the advantages of this approach are that students can think about their errors deeply and correct them by themselves. One HPS reported that “This approach helps students to find correct expressions by themselves and not to make errors again in similar situations.” Another HPS reported that “This approach will help students to feel comfortable with their errors and to think about the errors and correct expressions in depth.” In addition, a third HPS added that “Both clarification request and elicitation will be more effective than other approaches for error correction because these two approaches will help students to develop English learning as well as their thinking ability.”

Elicitation is used to get the student to produce the correct form, either by completing the teacher’s restatement or by asking the student to repeat the

utterance in a reformulated version. Like the clarification request, the teachers used the elicitation approach in order to allow students to work out their own errors by themselves. In addition, they used this approach to challenge students and for students' creative, and voluntary utterances. A teacher reported that "It helps students to evoke both a spontaneous and creative response. Students will be more successful when they respond creatively in class." Another teacher said that "I use the elicitation method in situations such as playing group games and in a test situation to challenge the students."

As for the students, they liked this approach because it is problem-solving oriented and allows them to think of various ways of expressions without embarrassment. One LPS reported that "I think the elicitation approach is the most effective one because it allows students to try out the correct form by themselves." In the meantime, one HPS wrote that "It will be better to provide the student the opportunity to think about the correct form rather than to provide the correct form immediately after the student's error." Another HPS reported that "This approach provides the student one more opportunity to talk about what he/she intends to talk. If the student is successful in getting the meaning across in the second chance, the student will feel a sense of self-achievement. I like this problem-solving approach. If the student fails to self-correct his or her errors, then the teacher can correct the errors explicitly."

Finally, the repetition approach involves the teacher's repetition of the student's errors. The teachers' group used this approach to help students to correct their own errors by themselves without interfering with natural conversation. For instance, a teacher reported that "I only correct errors that cause a breakdown in communication. Repetition and recast would allow for a more natural flow of conversation when I correct errors." Another teacher wrote that "In conversation classes, I find that students can correct their own errors if I call attention to the errors through the repetition approach. Plus it is generally less disruptive to the flow of the conversation." It is also worth commenting by a third teacher that "I use the repetition approach because the students have had enough instruction on the proper form."

The students' group chose this approach because this approach can correct students' errors indirectly but exactly to the point. For instance, one of the LPSs reported that "If students' errors are corrected by their teachers through repetition, they will think of their errors deeply and remember them for a long time." One of the HPSs also reported that "I can remember the errors I made for a long time when the teacher repeats them." Another HPS added that "The repetition approach is very similar to elicitation in the way of corrective feedback. However, the former sounds more friendly than the latter."

DISCUSSION

This study investigated teachers' choice and students' preference of corrective feedback by native English teachers and Korean learners of English as a foreign language, and produced several important findings through quantitative and qualitative data. One of the most important findings in the quantitative data was that all the groups—teachers, students, the high proficient students (HPSs), and the low proficient students (LPSs)—preferred the recast the most out of the five CFAs, supporting previous studies (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Tsang, 2004; Yoshida, 2008). However, it should be noted that the effect of the recast approach in eliciting uptake and, in turn, in L2 acquisition is controversial. Recast contributed to learner uptake because it provided a model form to learners (Mackey & Philp, 1998), whereas it was not as helpful as expected because learners failed to notice the teacher's reformulation of the students' errors, especially for the low proficient students (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Tsang, 2004). Thus, caution should be exercised in using recast in class despite the finding that all the groups preferred the recast approach the most because it is a less harsh way of error correction.

Another important finding was that the explicit correction approach was the only one showing a significant difference between the comparison

groups: teachers and students, and the HPSs and the LPSs. This was because teachers and the LPSs did not choose explicit correction as much as students and the HPSs, respectively. This finding lends support to previous studies in which the students, in general, wanted their errors to be corrected directly in class, whereas the teachers did not favor the explicit correction approach for affective reasons and limited class hours (Schulz, 1996; Yoshida, 2008). However, considering that the explicit correction approach was more effective than other approaches in the students' uptake in some studies, using explicit correction should be an option, especially for those who are highly motivated for learning and those who do not shy away from being corrected in front of peers (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Tsang, 2004).

A third finding in the quantitative data was that even though the teachers and the students, and the HPSs and the LPSs held different views on the corrective feedback, the overall discrepancies were not statistically significant. This finding was in contrast with previous studies in which the teachers and the students, and the HPSs and the LPSs held different perceptions about error correction in class (Lin & Hedgcock, 1996; Schulz, 1996). One of the reasons for the failure to show statistical significances in the group comparisons may be due to individual differences about error correction, as noticed by previous studies in which learner characteristics such as achievement levels, motivation, and anxiety exert important roles in the effect of error correction on L2 achievement (DeKeyser, 1993; Yoshida, 2008). Another reason might be due to the number of the participants which was not big enough to show significance when it was in fact significant.

In the qualitative data, one of the findings of the current study was that both the teachers and the students held strong reasons for their choice and preference of the corrective feedback approaches, as were found in previous studies where L2 learners held strong beliefs or perceptions about L2 acquisition (Kern, 1995; Schulz, 1996). Some of the reasons were common across four different groups, but others were unique. For instance, both the teachers and the students reported that they liked the elicitation approach because it allowed students to work out errors by themselves. In addition,

both the HPSs and the LPSs perceived that recast was an option to correct students' errors for affective reasons such as making sure that students do not shy away from participation in class. However, it was only the teachers who preferred recast because of limited class hours, and no low proficient students chose clarification request as their favorite error correction approach, supporting the quantitative findings.

Another finding was that there were severe individual differences in the choice of corrective feedback both by the teachers and the students. For the teachers, even though they, in general, did not like the explicit correction approach, some teachers voiced its advantage by providing the correct form to the students explicitly and clearly. For the students, some students were intimidated when they were corrected in the presence of their classmates, whereas others were nervous and annoyed when the teacher did not correct their errors. In addition, even though all the groups chose clarification request least frequently, some HPSs reported the advantages of it in terms of self-correction and thinking about errors more deeply. It should be noted that these severe individual differences in the preference of corrective feedback might lead to marginal differences between groups in the quantitative analysis above.

The individual differences of corrective feedback might be due to different teaching and learning styles, achievement levels, motivation, and so on (DeKeyser, 1993; Yoshida, 2008). Considering the hot issue of individual differences in the domain of L2 acquisition, the individual differences of corrective feedback perceived by teachers and students were expected (Horwitz, 2008; Skehan, 1989). The logical next concern is how to deal with individual differences in corrective feedback. Teachers can cope with individual differences by investigating their students' preference of corrective feedback and by using multiple approaches of feedback such as recast and explicit correction together to compensate for each other.

A third finding in the qualitative data was that some of the teachers and students perceived the clarification approach, the elicitation approach, and the repetition approach as similar to each other. In other words, they perceived that these three approaches describe the similar construct of implicit

correction compared with explicit correction. In implicit correction, the teacher does not provide corrective feedback explicitly but implicitly by helping students elicit the correct form on their own. Then, the six frameworks for corrective feedback proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) can be simplified into three frameworks: explicit correction, implicit correction, and recast. It is worthy of note that even though the elicitation and repetition approaches were not generally favored by the students in the current study, the uptake rate of these two approaches was higher than other approaches in previous studies (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Tsang, 2004). This is because compared with the recast and explicit correction approaches, the elicitation and repetition approaches helped the students to think about their errors and to do self-correction by themselves, which, in turn, made it possible for the students to repair their errors more effectively.

CONCLUSION

In consideration of the paradigm shift from teaching reading skills and grammar to teaching listening and speaking skills, this study investigated native English teachers' choice and their students' preference of corrective feedback in the EFL context of Korea and produced several important findings by analyzing quantitative and qualitative data. These findings provide teaching implications to second/foreign language teachers in three points: to investigate corrective feedback perceived by students, to use multiple feedback approaches which compensate for each other, and to evaluate the effect of feedback on learner uptake and L2 acquisition.

First, the teacher should provide corrective feedback to students in order to help them to facilitate L2 acquisition, especially using multiple feedback approaches. Some teachers have not provided feedback to their students for several reasons including the importance of positive input in L2 acquisition, the fear of playing an authoritative role in class, and limited class hours. However, considering that most students wanted their errors to be corrected,

the teacher's attention should be switched from ignoring students' errors to providing appropriate feedback on the errors. The logical next concern is how to provide corrective feedback to students more effectively. What the findings of this study imply is that the teacher should use multiple corrective approaches, say explicit correction and recast approaches, and elicitation and explicit correction approaches so that each approach can compensate for each other and, in turn, fits into individual differences in students' preference of corrective feedback.

Second, the teacher should investigate students' preference of feedback which is dependent on many learner characteristics including learning styles, proficiency levels, motivation, and so on. As was found in this study, the teacher should expect and work out individual differences as well as group differences in the preference of corrective feedback perceived by various students.

Third, the teacher should evaluate the effect of feedback on learner uptake and L2 acquisition. The effect of corrective feedback on learner uptake and L2 acquisition has been lower than expected. One of the reasons for this lower-than-expected feedback effect might be that for some, explicit correction was more effective than other CFAs, whereas for others, elicitation and repetition were more effective (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Tsang, 2004). Another reason might be that teachers' choice of corrective feedback conflicted with students' preference of feedback (Schulz, 1996; Yoshida, 2008). Thus, the teacher should evaluate the effect of feedback on learner uptake and L2 acquisition, keeping up with current theories of L2 acquisition and teaching in general and corrective feedback in particular in order to maximize the effect.

Even though this study produced several important findings, generalization of these findings should be made with caution because this study was conducted by limited numbers of teachers and students learning English at the university level in Korea at one point in time. Thus, more studies should be explored by different participants across ages and learning contexts in time as well as over time utilizing both quantitative and qualitative data, with a focus on the diagnosis of the perceptions about corrective feedback held by

teachers and students and the students' uptake and L2 acquisition after the treatment of corrective feedback. This study and subsequent studies on corrective feedback will shed further light on corrective feedback, which will in turn contribute to developing more complete L2 acquisition theories and teaching methods and activities.

THE AUTHOR

Gi-Pyo Park is a professor in the Department of English Language and Literature at Soonchunhyang University. In general, I am interested in L2 acquisition, teaching, and testing. More specifically, my research areas of interest have included critical period in L2 acquisition, language learning strategies, anxiety, teaching listening, reading, and speaking skills, corrective feedback, reliability, validity, and differential item functioning.

Email: gipyop@sch.ac.kr

REFERENCES

- Allwright, R. (1975). Problems in the study of the language teacher's treatment of learner error. In M. Burt and H. Dulay (Eds.), *On TESOL '83: The question of control* (pp. 231-252). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Carroll, S., Roberge, Y., & Swain, M. (1992). The role of feedback in adult second language acquisition: Error correction and morphological generalization. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 13*, 173-198.
- Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of the linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*, 357-386.
- DeKeyser, R. (1993). The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal, 77*, 501-514.
- Hendrickson, J. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *The Modern Language Journal, 62*, 387-398.
- Horwitz, E. (2008). *Becoming a language teacher: A practical guide to second*

- language learning and teaching*. Allyn & Bacon: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Kern, R. (1995). Students' and teachers' beliefs about language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28, 71-92.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. London: Longman.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. (2005). Error correction: Students' versus teachers' perceptions. *Language Awareness*, 14, 12-127.
- Lin, Y.-H., & Hedgecock, J. (1996). Negative feedback incorporation among high-proficiency and low-proficiency Chinese-speaking learners of Spanish. *Language Learning*, 46, 567-611.
- Lynch, T., & Maclean, J. (2003). Effects of feedback on performance: A study of advanced learners on an ESP speaking course. *Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 12, 19-44.
- Lyster, L., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 338-356.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, L. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 573-595.
- Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schulz, R. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 343-364.
- Schulz, R. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Columbia. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 244-258.
- Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second-language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- The Chauncey Group International. (2002). *TOEIC technical manual*. Retrieved March 20, 2003, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.toEIC.com/pdfs/TOEIC-Tech-Man.pdf>.
- Tsang, W. K. (2004). Feedback and uptake in teacher-student interaction: An analysis of 18 English lessons in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Regional Language Center Journal*, 35, 187-209.
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, 17, 78-94.

APPENDIX

Please read carefully 5 different Types of corrective feedback and the description of each corrective feedback in the table below. Then, write down the numbers from 1 to 5 according to the corrective feedback type you have used in class (for the teacher's version) or you want your teacher to use in class (for the student's version) the most frequently (1) to the least frequently (5).

Approach	Description	Frequency
Explicit Correction	<p>It refers to the explicit provision of the correct form.</p> <p><u>Student's Error</u>: I go to Seoul yesterday. <u>Teacher's Explicit Correction</u>: You should say "I went to Seoul yesterday." <u>Student's Error</u>: The man climbed the ladder up carefully. <u>Teacher's Explicit Correction</u>: The correct expression is "The man climbed up the ladder carefully."</p>	
Recast	<p>It involves the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error.</p> <p><u>Student's Error</u>: There are two book on the desk. <u>Teacher's Recast</u>: There are two books on the desk. <u>Student's Error</u>: A bat flew into the room last night. <u>Teacher's Recast</u>: A bat flew into the room.</p>	
Clarification Request	<p>It indicates to students that their utterance has been misunderstood by the teacher or that the utterance is ill-formed.</p> <p><u>Student's Error</u>: I don't know who are you? <u>Teacher's Clarification Request</u>: Pardon? <u>Student's Error</u>: I enjoyed eye-shopping last</p>	

Preference of Corrective Feedback Approaches Perceived by Native English Teachers and Students

	weekend. <u>Teacher's Clarification Request:</u> What do you mean by eye-shopping?
Elicitation	It is used to try to get the student to produce the correct form, either by completing the teacher's restatement or by asking the student to repeat the utterance in a reformulated version. <u>Student's Error:</u> The baby bird has fall from the tree. <u>Teacher's Elicitation:</u> The baby bird has _____ from the tree. <u>Student's Error:</u> The man allowed his son watch TV. <u>Teacher's Elicitation:</u> Please say your sentence again, considering "let."
Repetition	It involves the teacher's repetition, in isolation, of the student's error. <u>Student's Error:</u> Mommy is making cookies for we. <u>Teacher's Repetition:</u> for we? <u>Student's Error:</u> He went the home after the party. <u>Teacher's Repetition:</u> went the home?

Please write down the reason(s) why you chose number 1 (required) and number 2 (optional) above: