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Abstract

When teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), teachers use feedback in order to help students to improve their English skills. They can use both oral and written feedback to encourage students to make progress. Oral and written feedback play a significant role in second language acquisition, and this study could raise teachers’ awareness of the different feedback strategies that can be employed in EFL classrooms. This could benefit their teaching performance and students’ learning. This study aims to examine the different types of oral and written feedback used in the EFL classroom, as well as teachers’ own perceptions of feedback. The approach used to conduct this study was both quantitative and qualitative. Three types of data material were collected in a secondary school (grades 7-9) for the analysis: three secondary school teachers were interviewed; their English lessons were observed; and their feedback on student essays was collected. The material collected was used in the analysis, which indicated that the teachers used different types of feedback. The most frequent oral feedback types used were recast, elicitation, and praise. However, the teachers employed different strategies regarding to how they provide this feedback. Two of the teachers provided feedback in the traditional way by using corrective types of feedback frequently, while one teacher chose not to correct students too often and instead encouraged them by giving them praise. The evaluation of different feedback types performed in this study suggests that recast as an implicit feedback type provided orally could be more effective in a communicative classroom setting, as it does not interrupt the communicative flow. In writing, on the other hand, explicit feedback combined with face-to-face sessions could lead to better results. It would be interesting to investigate in further research the effects of different oral and written feedback types.
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1. Introduction

Making errors is a crucial part of learning. When students make errors, teachers are there to provide them with guidance so that they will be able to produce the correct target form. Teachers need to provide feedback on students’ oral and written performances in order to enhance their target language skills. Furthermore, according to Brookhart (2008:2), feedback can be powerful if done well, and effective feedback gives students the information that they need so that they can understand where they are in their learning and what to do next. In this study, the term feedback is used to refer to feedback given by a teacher to a student in grade 7, 8, or 9 based on his or her utterances and written compositions.

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

To begin, the data were collected using classroom observations, teacher interviews, and student essays. Based on previous research, different classifications and types of feedback are discussed. Subsequently, the collected data were analyzed to determine which type of oral and written feedback was most frequently employed by the teachers. An examination of the differences and similarities, if any, in how different teachers provide feedback is presented. The teachers’ interview answers are also analyzed to determine their thoughts and attitudes regarding feedback. The effects of the different feedback types used by the teachers are evaluated based on previous research.

1.1 Aim and research questions

The primary aim of this paper is to examine the ways in which teachers at a secondary school in the south of Sweden give oral and written feedback to their students, as well as to examine their own beliefs and attitudes regarding feedback. The focus is on the kinds of oral and written feedback that the students receive, and on gaining an understanding of any differences between the types of oral and written feedback that are provided by the teachers chosen for this study. The investigation is focused on feedback provided by the teachers both orally and in written form.
The research questions are as follows.
- What kinds of oral and written feedback do EFL students in a secondary school receive from their teachers?
- Which type of feedback is most frequently employed and why?
- What are the differences and similarities in how different teachers – in this case the three teachers chosen for the study – provide feedback?
- What are secondary school teachers’ opinions of their written and oral feedback practices?

2. Theoretical background

This theoretical background will discuss the most common types of feedback that students receive in the classroom both orally and in written form, and that have been dealt with the most by different researchers. The focus is on gaining an understanding of the different strategies of oral and written feedback that can be provided by teachers to students, and to examine the differences between them. The first section will present a general overview of oral feedback provided in the classroom, as well as examples of oral feedback types, namely praise and corrective feedback. Subsequently, the last three sections will discuss written feedback, its advantages and disadvantages and the different strategies used to provide it.

2.1 Oral feedback in the classroom

When discussing oral feedback in the classroom, any kind of dialogue that provides information that will help students improve their learning can be included. As early as in 1975, Sinclair and Coulthard discovered that speaking patterns in the classroom were highly structured and had distinctive functions. They developed a model that consisted of teaching exchanges called initiation, response, and feedback (IRF). The teachers initiated a conversation that resulted in a student responding, and in turn the student was provided with feedback. Similarly, Sinclair and Coulthard state that, “A typical exchange in the classroom consists of an initiation by the teacher, followed by a response from the pupil, followed by feedback, to the pupil’s response from the teacher [...]” (1992:3). This is a typical interaction that takes place in a classroom. Oral feedback is therefore a natural part of verbal interaction between students and teachers, or students and students. Oral feedback is mostly considered to happen between a teacher and a student, but some researchers (Yang, Badger and Yu, 2006) note that a great deal of verbal feedback also comes from peers. Hattie and Gan (2011:260-263) explain that oral feedback can be group-focused or more individual-focused feedback. So-called collective feedback happens when the teacher collects the most common mistakes and corrects them in class so as not to single out any individual student; this could be consid-
ered to be more group-focused oral feedback. For instance, Yuen Kwong (2001:1-4) states that even though feedback can be provided individually, it is more efficient if the whole class is involved so that students can learn from each other’s mistakes.

2.1.1 Positive feedback: Praise
There are numerous ways of categorizing the oral feedback that takes place in an EFL classroom. Most research focuses on feedback that validates a correct response by providing positive comments, or that corrects a wrong response using some kind of corrective feedback. When oral feedback consists of positive comments such as “good”, “ok”, “yes”, and “well done”, it validated a correct response but it also provides support to the learner and fortifies motivation for learning sustainability (Ellis, 2009). This kind of feedback strategy is also referred to as praise by scholars (Hattie and Timperley, 2007:98). Praise could be defined as “an act which attributes credit to another for some characteristic, attribute, skill, etc., which is positively valued by the person giving feedback” (Hyland & Hyland 2001:186). The drawback of positive feedback could be that it is misleading since it is not specific: praise markers do not indicate exactly what the student has done well. Poindexter (2012, [www]) for instance argues that teachers should make sure that students receive positive, specific feedback on the effort they have made, and that they should show them what they have accomplished. So-called “specific praise” improves learning and is about the students themselves solving the problem instead of having a teacher do it for them. According to Petchprasert (2012:1114), this type of feedback provides the students with the confidence to move forward and focus on achievements, which may help them to feel confident even in the face of a setback. Stenger, 2014, [www]) discusses feedback and mentions that not all feedback is as effective. He believes that feedback can have a negative impact on learning if presented in a negative or only corrective way. The author stresses the fact that students who experience learning English as positive are less likely to suffer from foreign language anxiety.

2.1.2 Corrective feedback
When students make a mistake, teachers provide them with corrective feedback. Scholars have defined corrective feedback in various ways. “[…] the teacher’s response to a student error” is a definition used by Veliz (2013:286), cited from Dekeyser (1993). This type of oral feedback can be provided either explicitly or implicitly. When the teacher provides feedback in an implicit way, s/he corrects the error by repeating the error or by asking for clarification. The explicit way, on the other hand, refers to the teacher telling the student directly that the produced sentence is wrong and providing a reason for this (Veliz 2013:287). Petchprasert (2012:1115) refers to Bitchener and
Knoch (2010), who state that, “Implicit feedback is defined as furnishing the type of error that has been made but not providing the correction”. Explicit correction, on the other hand, comprises direct forms of feedback in which the teacher points out that the learner’s utterance is wrong. Explicit correction consists of grammatical explanation or overt correction, while implicit correction deals with incidental error correction in a response, such as a confirmation check, that reformulates the student’s utterance without interrupting the flow of the conversation (Long, 1996:413). Corrective feedback is further categorized into recast, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, repetition, paralinguistic signals, and clarification request (Lyster, Saito et al., 2013, Russel and Spada, 2006).

**Recast**

Recast falls into the implicit category according to most scholars (Veliz 2013, Rassaei 2013, Sheen 2007), and they agree that recasts “make a complete reformation of learner’s ill-formed utterance and provide relevant information which is obligatory but is either missing or is wrongly used in the learners’ utterance” (Veliz 2013:287). Ding (2012:84) proposes a similar definition, and states that the teacher reformulates all or parts of the student’s utterance, minus the error, when providing feedback in the form of recast. This is illustrated by (1) below.

(1) S: When I go to school yesterday.
    T: You went to school yesterday?
    S: Yes, I went to school yesterday.

In addition, Lyster and Ranta (1997:47) state that “[…] recasts also include translations […]”, because they do not happen frequently and when they do happen they serve the same function as recast.

As mentioned earlier, different types of corrective feedback are referred to as either explicit or implicit; this is a highly popular classification of corrective feedback types. Several researchers have argued that recast that falls into the implicit category can easily go unnoticed (Lyster, 1999b, Loewen & Philip, 2006, as cited in Ding, 2012) whereas “the corrective intention of explicit feedback types are often made more salient by overtly rejecting the erroneous utterance of learners” (Ding, 2012:86). The drawback of recast is therefore that it can be ambiguous (Nassai, 2015:49) because it has a dual function, “both as form of confirmation check and also as negative feedback” (Nassaji, 2015:49). Furthermore, some researchers (Lyster and Ranta, 1997) indicate that recast cannot lead to self-correction since the teacher already provides the correct form to the learner. Conversely, Rassaei (2015) refers to Long (1996), who concludes that recasts are effective in promoting lan-
guage development since they do not disrupt the flow of communication, which can be important in a classroom setting.

**Metalinguistic feedback**
Rassaei (2015:88) refers to Nassaji and Fotos (2010) and discusses another type of corrective feedback: metalinguistic feedback. This provides metalinguistic information or comments about an error uttered by the learner, and falls into the explicit category. The author also explains that metalinguistic feedback is an explicit corrective feedback type that increases the students’ understanding of target forms by providing metalinguistic information such as, "Do we say it like that?", "That's not how you say it in French", and "Is it feminine?" (Sheen 2007, as cited in Rassaei 2015:89). Ding (2012:83-85) also discusses metalinguistic feedback and states that it provides comments, information, or questions related to the students’ utterances, as seen in (2).

(2)   S: She speak two languages.
     T: Use the third person singular -s.
     S: She speaks two languages.

**Elicitation**
Elicitation (Lyster and Ranta, 1997) is another form of corrective feedback, and is used directly to elicit the correct form from the student. The teacher can pause to let the student “fill in the blank”, or use a question to elicit the correct form, or even ask students to reformulate their utterance, as in “Can you say that again?” Example (3) illustrates elicitation used when the teacher repeats the utterance up to the error.

(3)   S: When I went to Australia, I met a girl who name is Amy.
     T: I met a girl……
     S: whose name is Amy.

According to Darn (2015,[www]), questioning assists in self-discovery, which makes information more memorable and can help to develop a “learner centered classroom and a stimulating environment, while making learning memorable by linking new and old information”. The author further states that elicitation involves prompts, and prompting learners to correct themselves may demand processing of language at a deeper level, which may in turn result in more efficient learning.

**Repetition**
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As another form of corrective feedback, repetition involves the repetition of a student’s erroneous utterance. In most cases, teachers adjust their intonation so as to “highlight the error” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997:48) as illustrated by (4) below.

(4) S: I wake up early this morning.  
     T: You WAKE up early this morning?  
     S: I woke up early this morning.

**Paralinguistic signal**
Paralinguistic signal is a non-verbal form of corrective feedback used to elicit the correct form from the learner, for instance by using a facial expression or gesture to show that the student has made an error. This is illustrated by (5) below.

(5) S: Yesterday, I go to the library.  
     T: Gestures with hands to indicate past.

**Clarification requests**
Finally, clarification requests (Lyster and Ranta, 1997) are used when the teacher wants to indicate that the message has not been understood or that the student’s utterance contained some kind of error, and that a repetition or reformulation is required. The teacher uses phrases like "Excuse me?" or "I don't understand" to stress the fact that something is wrong with the student's utterance, as in the following example.

(6) S: I got yob.  
     T: Pardon?

### 2.2 Written feedback
In contrast to oral feedback, which is natural part of a classroom setting and happens naturally, written feedback is sometimes considered as optional because it is slightly different from oral feedback in that it requires written comments and a correction of a different kind. Written feedback involves feedback given to students’ written work. This type of feedback is usually not immediate and the teacher has time to think about how to give feedback and on what. Therefore, there are different strategies used when providing students with written feedback. For instance, a teacher can provide feedback that is related to the content and the organization of the writing, as well as to the grammar.
and vocabulary (Weigle 2002). According to Weigle (2002), the purpose of teachers’ feedback lies in providing guidance in writing.

2.2.1 Advantages and disadvantages of written feedback

The most important question that researchers have dealt with so far is the issue of the effectiveness of written feedback, as some believe that correcting students’ essays does not lead to better results. According to Bitchener et al. (2005), who refer to Truscott (1998), grammar correction in writing is not necessary since it is harmful and ineffective. Truscott believes that error correction diverts energy from other productive aspects of writing; however, many other researchers (Swain 1995, Ferris 1999, as cited in Bitchener et al., 2005) believe the contrary. Bitchener et al. (2005) explain that according to Ferris (1999), Truscott’s conclusions are premature, and more well-designed research needs to be conducted before any conclusions can be drawn. Han (2000:6) indicates that feedback informs, regulates, strengthens, sustains, and eliminates errors in language learning. Sheen et al. (2009: 567) support corrective feedback and its contribution to writing development and learning. They state that, “corrective feedback may enhance learning by helping learners to (1) notice their errors in their written work, (2) engage in hypotheses testing in a systematic way and (3) monitor the accuracy of their writing by tapping into their existing explicit grammatical knowledge”. However, there are scholars who disagree; for example, Hyland and Hyland (2006:76) refer to Truscott (1998) and conclude that the time spent dealing with errors in class is better spent on additional writing practice.

2.2.2 Direct and indirect feedback

There are different strategies of feedback provided in written work and most researchers divide written feedback into direct and indirect feedback. Direct teacher feedback means that the teacher provides the students with the correct form of their errors or mistakes, and involves crossing out a word, phrase, or morpheme and providing the correct form. Direct feedback clearly states what is wrong and how it should be written, which means that the students do not themselves have to identify the error and how it should be corrected. On the other hand, indirect error correction in written form includes underlining or circling an error. This method gives the opportunity to the student to identify and correct the error (Petchpasert 2012:1115). Indirect written feedback can further be divided into coded indirect feedback and uncoded indirect feedback. In coded indirect feedback, the errors are underlined and the teacher writes a symbol above the error in order to help the student determine what the error is. In the second type, i.e. uncoded indirect feedback, the teacher underlines or circles the error and does not write the correct answer or a symbol to indicate the error. Both direct feedback and indirect feedback are commonly practiced by writing teachers to correct
students’ errors; teachers are free to use only one or a combination of the two. Ko and Hirvela (2010), as cited in Elshirbini and Elashri (2013), indicate that, whether directly or indirectly, students’ errors should be corrected modestly. Teachers should be selective and should not correct every mistake. They also state that correcting every mistake may lead students to adopt a negative attitude towards writing and negative feelings about themselves as writers as well. Another important aspect to which teachers need to pay attention is that when using codes in indirect feedback, they need to be consistent and use symbols that are supported by systematic grammar instruction so as not to confuse both teachers and students (Ferris, 2002; Robb et al., 1986, as cited in Purnawarman, 2011).

Another strategy regarding direct written feedback is to use it in combination with an individual five-minute conference between a student and a teacher. Bitchener et al. (2005) suggest that student-teacher conferences should be incorporated into feedback provided on their students’ written work. The authors claim that this could be beneficial, since in their study the effects of a combination of direct, explicit, written feedback, and five-minute individual student-teacher conferences had a positive effect on the accuracy levels of the use of the simple past tense and the definite article.

2.2.3 Focused and unfocused feedback
Written feedback can also be focused and unfocused. Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, and Takashimi (2008) as cited in Lertcheva (2014) categorize written feedback into two different groups: focused and unfocused. Focused feedback refers to feedback that is provided on specific and pre-selected mistakes. This could mean that the teacher focuses on pre-selected errors displaying incorrect usage of prepositions, for instance. Unfocused feedback, on the other hand, refers to a range of mistakes. The teacher then corrects different types of mistakes, such as tense, vocabulary, spelling, and pronoun mistakes, without a clear distinction. Purnawarman (2011) also explains that teachers may decide to focus on common grammatical errors made by ESL (English as a second language) students, such as articles, prepositions, and past tense verbs, and to ignore errors on adjectives, adverbs, or pronouns; this is still seen as focused feedback. The author refers to Ellis et al. (2008), who state that highly focused corrective feedback usually focuses on a single error type or category, or on a single linguistic feature, such as errors in the use of prepositions; conversely, less focused corrective feedback may concentrate on more than one type of error, but correction is still restricted to a limited number of error categories, such as articles, prepositions, and past tense verbs.

2.2.4 Written comments
Positive comments or praise can also be provided in writing. Poindexter (2012, [www]) indicates that praise is not only a comment such as “well done”, but is instead a particular comment that will make a difference in the student’s learning. For instance, “content/grammar/vocabulary is good” is an example of praise provided in written work. According to Hyland and Hyland (2001:186), criticism is another type of feedback that can be provided on students’ written work. This includes “poor grammar”, for instance, but the authors also explain that suggestion, or as some may call it “constructive criticism”, is also an option. This option consists of an explicit recommendation regarding what the student needs to do, such as “you need a more general topic sentence”.

If comments tend to be only negative and only point out problems then the comments are of little use to students (Fathman and Walley, 1990). To reinforce good habits and point out weak ones the teacher could also comment the general quality of the writing and make some references to grammar, usage and style. According to Williams (2003), teachers tend to provide vague and unclear comments which leads to confusion and passive action. Teachers need to develop a systemised and consistent form of written feedback.

3. Material and method
This chapter provides information about the method and the material used to conduct this study. Section 3.1 discusses the different approaches used for this study, while Section 3.2 explains the selection of participants followed by a description of the procedure of data collection and data analysis.

3.1 Qualitative and quantitative methods
There are two methods of research: qualitative and quantitative research. Qualitative research focuses on a process of examining and interpreting data in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge (Corbin and Strauss, 2008:1). According to Boeije (2009:11), qualitative methods produce rich, descriptive data that need to be interpreted through identification and coding of themes and categories. This may lead to findings that can contribute to theoretical knowledge and practical use. In quantitative research (Bryman and Bell, 2007), on the other hand, data are analyzed and quantified through statistics and mathematics.

The aim of this study was to emphasize understanding, produce descriptive data in natural settings with an insider perspective (Ghauri et al., 1995). A qualitative approach was therefore used to collect data and to investigate different feedback strategies and see how these were used in both oral and written form, together with teachers’ own beliefs about oral and written feedback. However, the study also required a quantitative analysis, since it investigated the frequency of different feedback types in the English classroom and the data had to be quantified. The use of both a qualitative and
quantitative research method was complementary, provided an understating of the research questions, and fulfilled the aim of this study.

3.2 Participants

The interviews and observations were conducted at a secondary school in the south of Sweden. A total of 67 students and three English teachers participated in the research. The students’ ages ranged from 13 to 16, and two of the classes were identified as classes for students with special needs in English. The teacher of the ninth grade (henceforth Teacher A) is a qualified teacher of English, Spanish, and Swedish and was 38 years old when the study was conducted, with 12 years of teaching experience. The teacher of the seventh and eighth grades (henceforth Teacher B) is a qualified teacher of English and Swedish as a second language. She was 57 years old at the time of the study, and had 30 years of teaching experience. The teacher of the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades (henceforth Teacher C) is also a qualified teacher of English and Swedish. He was 43 years old when the study was conducted. All three teachers hold a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree in teaching English and work full time. Because of ethical aspects, the teachers’ privacy will be respected, and therefore no names will be mentioned in this thesis.

The teachers are coded as Teacher A, Teacher B, and Teacher C. The table below represents their code name, age, and experience.

Table 1: Teacher data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>38 years old</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>57 years old</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td>43 years old</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Data collection and analysis

3.3.1 Observations

The observations examined classroom communication between the teacher and learners, focusing on feedback that was given both to validate correct responses and to correct those that were incorrect. In order to determine the types of feedback that teachers give and how often they do so, feedback data were collected using class observation. Six 40-minute lessons, two by each teacher, were observed over a period of two weeks. The choice of observation as a qualitative technique to collect information was made because of the need to determine the kind of feedback strategies that were
used. Data were collected by manually transcribing the feedback instances uttered by teachers during class. When there was an instance of exchange where there was a response and feedback involved between the teacher and the student or between two students, a written note was made of what was being said. These data were later analyzed qualitatively in order to gain an understanding of the different types of feedback used in the classroom, as well as quantitatively since the data had to be quantified according to a scheme. Before the observation, an observation protocol was made to help the researcher stay focused on aspects that needed to be investigated. The protocol consisted of the different types of feedback that were expected to occur during class, such as praise, recast, metalinguistic feedback, paralinguistic signals, elicitation, repetition, clarification requests, and others that might occur but that were not included in the list. A tick was made next to each feedback type in order to measure what kind and how often each feedback type was used by each teacher. This was done after the data were collected.

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

### Table 2: Observation protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback types</th>
<th>Explicit</th>
<th>Recast</th>
<th>Metalinguistic</th>
<th>Elicitation</th>
<th>Repetition</th>
<th>Paralinguistic signals</th>
<th>Clarification Request</th>
<th>Praise</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### 3.3.2 Interviews

The aim of the interviews was to elicit as much information from the teachers as possible. Prior to the interviews, the teachers were asked whether they were willing to answer some questions about feedback. Because they gladly accepted, they were emailed the interview questions (see Appendix A) and a date was set for each interview. Two days later, the interviews were conducted. The interviews with teachers A and C were conducted in Swedish, while the interview with teacher B was conducted in English, as the teachers could choose the language with which they felt most comfortable. The teachers were interviewed in order to gain qualitative information about their thoughts and
feelings regarding feedback. The interviews consisted of pre-made questions that were developed from the research questions; these were not affected by the observations, as they were written down before the observations took place. Although they were not based on the observation data, they still covered teachers’ thoughts about the particular feedback strategies that were used during the observation, and could yield relevant information that could be compared to the observation data. The insights gained from these interviews provided the researcher with more insight into how each of the teachers approached giving feedback to their students both orally and in their writing. Their answers were written down in English and Swedish while they were speaking. The choice was made not to record the interviews so as not to distract the interviewees; furthermore, it would not have been practical because the interviews were conducted in a place where students and other teachers could come in. In addition, this way there was no need to think about technology that cannot always be trusted and that could have interrupted the flow of the conversation. The researcher was also more focused on the answers, since they had to be written down and there was no room for confusion, which might happen if the researcher were recording and relying on the tape recorder to capture all answers. If an answer was unclear, the researcher could ask the interviewee to explain it so that the answers could be as clear as possible. An attempt was made to create an atmosphere in which the teachers could be as honest and open as possible. All teachers were well acquainted with the researcher; therefore, the observations were made and the interviews were conducted with ease. Immediately after each interview, the interviewer took some time to review her notes and fill in any details, to expand on the note-taking short-hand, and to add important comments or points made. The data collected from the interviews were categorized and analyzed qualitatively according to two different themes; oral and written feedback.

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

3.3.3 Essays

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

Table 3: Written feedback protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay Feedback</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Results
This section presents the results of this study. Sections 4.1 - 4.3 introduce the results of the lesson observations and student essays, as well as what the interviews revealed about teachers’ thoughts on oral and written feedback. Since three different teachers were observed, the results for each teacher are presented separately and are divided into results regarding oral and written feedback. Finally, Section 4.4 provides a summary of the observations, interviews, and written feedback.

4.1. Teacher A
4.1.1 Oral feedback
The following observation took place during ninth-grade English lessons. The lessons consisted of different tasks. One of the tasks was to watch a news report and then discuss it. The students were left to discuss freely without the teacher interrupting. She walked around the groups and added comments to what they were already discussing, but she did not give any corrective feedback.

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

If it is a presentation, if they have practiced. I tend not to do it all the time, as soon as they say something that is not correct. I do not want to name and shame anyone.
During the observation, it was noted that she used elicitation and recast at one point. A student was asking a question in Swedish and the teacher did not want to correct him/her by saying, ‘Do not talk in Swedish!’ Instead she used a question, a form of elicitation – “What?” – to indicate what the student should be doing instead, and the student understood what the teacher meant, i.e. to ask a question in English. One of the students said, ‘I forget it at home’ and the teacher corrected her without directly indicating that the utterance was incorrect. She used recast and provided the correction by saying the correct form, ‘You forgot it at a home’, which did not lead to self-correction.

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

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

Teacher A also used praise during her lessons in the form of confirmation, such as “Yes!”, “Good!”, and “Yes, that is true”. When a mistake was made, she used “No!” and tried to obtain the answer from another student, or to explain what the question really was by discussing it in detail and giving the students an opportunity to guess the answers themselves. This could be seen as a form of elicitation.

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

According to the teacher herself, all students receive feedback, and here it is important to stress that even those who do well receive feedback. No student receives more or less feedback than the others. According to her, it is important to make students understand that although they have achieved
a higher level of accuracy, there are still things to learn. She wants to encourage students instead of looking for mistakes. They need to develop their thoughts and ideas, and the only way to help them do so is to motivate them. If they perform a reading comprehension activity, for instance, she collects their answers and corrects them together, by gathering and discussing the tasks that they have done well or have not done so well. She does not want to provide feedback as soon as they make a mistake; instead, she prefers to give feedback after a presentation, or when the students have been practicing a certain grammar form or vocabulary.

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

As previously stated, scholars such as Truscott (1998) go as far as to state that error correction in writing should be abandoned, while others (Ferris 1999) claim the opposite. Teacher A does not always abandon correction but tries to keep it to a minimum.

With regard to writing, she stated in her interview that she tries to encourage the students to write as much as possible, and then she tries to mark the most prominent mistakes. She writes an overall comment about the content, but she is again careful not to inhibit their writing process by marking everything in their essay. Her main aim is to give them feedback on the most important points, providing qualitative rather than quantitative feedback, as she noted. When she focuses on error correction, the focus is on grammar, and especially on the past tense and spelling, since these are the most important mistakes. When asked about how much feedback she provides, she answered as follows:

It depends, but not too much. I choose the most important and the things that are the most important ones at that certain point.

She believes that all students should be or are able to speak and write in English, and she believes that the main problem lies in insecurity. In order to make her students talk and write more, she tries not to correct them directly or too often.
4.2 Teacher B

4.2.1 Oral feedback

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

During her interview, teacher B stated that she believes that oral feedback is important – “more important than written feedback”, she added. She tries to provide her students with feedback individually. She stated that every teacher needs to develop his or her own way of providing feedback and to be aware of what is appropriate for his or her students. She believes in communication and in implicit provision of feedback.

Teacher B used feedback in many different instances during the observation. She used recast nine times; some examples are shown by (9) and (10) and (11) below. In addition, she used confirmative comments, reformulations of the students’ utterances, and translation. Furthermore, she sometimes used a comment as a joke to focus the students’ attention on the real answer.

(7) T: Yes, where is Vienna?
   S: In Somalia.
   T: Yes, it is in Somalia.

(8) T: Tropical, remember tropical. What does it mean?
   S: Very hot, it is very hot.
   T: Correct, it is very hot.

She used recast when she reformulated students’ errors and provided the correct form of the error.

(9) S: The next day they all come….
   T: They all CAME to school. Why did the boys wear mini skirts?
   S: Because they could not wear cool shorts.
   T: Yes, very good. Correct!

(10) S: Nohere to be seen.
   T: Nowhere to be seen, good.
(11) T: What does lazier mean?
    S: Lat.
    T: Latare.

As previously stated, the drawback of recast is that it can be ambiguous. Here it can be seen that is has a dual function: it is both a confirmation check – good – and a reformulation, as illustrated by example (10). In this example, it can be noticed that the student has mispronounced the word nowhere. The teacher’s response consists of a positive reaction, good, which may draw the student’s attention away from the error since the focus is on the confirmatory function of the recast instead of on its corrective function.

Teacher B also used elicitation; she used questions to elicit the correct form, as shown by examples (13) and (14) below.

(13)  
S: It is difficultiest.
T: Can you say difficultiest?
S: No.
T: So……?
S: The most difficult.

(14) S. She buyed chips.
    T: What did the girl buy?
    S: Chips.
    T: Tell me the whole sentence.
    S: She buy chips.
    T: She bought chips. (writes bought on the board) (recast)

It can be concluded that with elicitation, the students have the opportunity to think, and can usually think of the correct answer. In the first example (13), it had a positive effect, while in the second example (14) there was a need for recast as well as explicit explanation on the board. (7)

Metalinguistic feedback was used in one instance, depicted below (15).
S: Can you say like this?
T: Can you? Look at the third form. Den vackraste. (translation)
S: The most beautiful.

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

### 4.2.2 Written feedback

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

(16) S: I came to with brothers and mom.
    T: I came to with /my two/ brothers and mom.
    S: I have no friend.
    T: I have/had/ no friends.

As can be seen in this example, direct feedback was provided when a more indirect correction, such as an indirect coded error correction – Gr for grammar and Sp for spelling – could have been offered. The teacher did focus on both form and content, but more specific comments consisting of constructive criticism to show the student what needed to be improved would have been a better option.

Teacher B states that when correcting students’ essays she always includes some comments. She tries to avoid direct feedback, instead aiming to make the students understand what the mistake is themselves. If they have a written assignment, she goes through the mistakes in a group, meaning that she collects the most common mistakes.

She also added during her interview that it is of great importance to start with a positive comment. On an essay about a trip, for instance, she would first give the students feedback about the content, and then focus on the mistakes. Often, students themselves ask for feedback, and how much feedback she can give depends on time. Grammar and spelling are the main aspects on which she focus-
es. Most importantly, however, students have to learn to use their imagination. Their biggest problem is not the language, but the fact that they do not know what to write.

4.3 Teacher C:

4.3.1 Oral feedback

The lessons observed consisted of all four skills: listening, reading, speaking, and writing. The lessons consisted of a lesson plan that was handed out; the topic was “Everyday Stuff”. One of the tasks was listening comprehension, which consisted of a listening sequence and true/false/does not say answers. When the students had completed their answers, the class went through them together. Most students answered correctly, and to confirm their answers the teacher used confirmation and praise. In order to encourage the students to provide a more elaborate answer, the teacher used follow-up, open-ended questions, as can be seen in example 17.

(17) T: How do you know?
    S: It is what they say.
    T: What does he say?
    S: I am on the bus.
    T: Yes, he is on the bus!

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

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

(18) S: It does not say.
    T: Very good, it does not say.

(19) T: What produces energy?
    S: The water.
    T: Yes, that is what happens.
(20) T: What else is in the pictures, what feeling?
   S: It looks creepy.
   T: Good, good choice of word.

In the following examples, he provided the students with recast since he supplied the correct translation. At the same time, he also used elicitation in (22) by asking, “Because hire means…?”

(21) T: Have you heard the term?
   S: Is it not about people committing suicide?
   T: Not really. (explains the meaning of the term by translating the word)

(22) T: He wants to hire a movie?
   S: He says he wants to hire it.
   T: Because hire means?
   S: Hyra.
   T: Låna. (provides an explanation of the meaning)

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

(23) T: Will he go by bike?
   S: False.
   T: Is it ….?
   S: It does not say.
   T: What does it say….?
   S: That he went by bus.
   T: Very good!

When the answers were not correct, he combined the different strategies and used elicitation to encourage the students to reconsider their answers.

During their reading session, he did not correct the students too often. When an error in reading was made, he used praise after the reading sequence, as in the following example.

(24) Good work, you dropped a few words, but otherwise very good.
Teacher C did not interrupt the students’ flow while they were reading in order to draw their attention to a particular error.

The speaking session consisted of a description of a picture. He used praise markers and elicitation in this exercise as well.

(25) T: What is it?
    S: A kind of watermill.
    T: Good, more specific, what does it do?
    S: It turns around.
    T: Very good, it turns around!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Although he feels that all students need to be seen and heard, he still believes that some students are provided with more feedback than others. This is due to the fact that some students are more receptive to feedback, he added.

4.4 Summary of the results

In summary, the comments that the participants made in the interviews usually corresponded with what that they actually did in the classroom. Teacher A was clear about the fact that she does not like to give explicit feedback or “on the spot” correction, and that she tries not to overuse feedback. Teacher A used praise on six occasions and recast on seven. The teacher has a highly specific way of teaching in the classroom. She tries to implement a sense of confidence in her students, and she believes that this will have a positive impact on their learning abilities.

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

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

Teacher C is well aware of the feedback types, and the feedback types he used most frequently were elicitation and praise. Elicitation was used seven times, and praise six. He indicated that he provides written feedback in combination with oral feedback, and this was noticed during the observation period. He provided both direct and indirect grammar correction and his feedback is focused. Teacher C also stressed the fact that feedback happens naturally and unconsciously for the most part, which is also true as he used questions in the classroom to make the errors more implicit.

The table below (table 2) summarizes the analysis of the types and frequency of oral feedback used by the teachers in their classrooms. Table 3, on the other hand, summarises the analysis of the types of written feedback used by teachers on students’ essays.

### Table 2: Observation protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback types</th>
<th>Explicit</th>
<th>Recast</th>
<th>Metalinguistic</th>
<th>Elicitation</th>
<th>Repetition</th>
<th>Paralinguistic signals</th>
<th>Clarification Request</th>
<th>Praise</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>III (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>II (2)</td>
<td>I (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIIII (6)</td>
<td>III (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher B</strong></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I (1)</td>
<td>III (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher C</strong></td>
<td>II (2)</td>
<td>IIIIII (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Written feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay Correction</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher A</strong></td>
<td>Lack of comments/ few unspecific comments made</td>
<td>Indirect/Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher B</strong></td>
<td>Positive comments/Praise, suggestions</td>
<td>Direct/Unfocused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher C</strong></td>
<td>Praise, suggestions, constructive criticism</td>
<td>Indirect/Direct/Focused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Discussion

The aim of this study was to examine the ways in which EFL teachers give oral and written feedback to their students and teachers’ attitudes towards feedback. This chapter will discuss the findings as well as the limitations of the present study. The discussion of the findings is divided into oral and written feedback.

5.1 Discussion of the findings

5.1.2 Oral feedback

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

There are many differences in how teachers provide feedback. Even though recast, elicitation, and praise were the most common types of feedback given by all three teachers during the observation, it cannot be stated that they were provided in an identical way in all cases. This could be related to the type of students that they were teaching, regarding their level of English but also the topic of the lesson. The feedback provided could also reflect the teachers’ own individual strategies that they have learned through experience. Teacher A provided feedback in a way that was not typical. Her way of teaching is not based on correcting mistakes; it is instead based on encouraging students to use the language. Teacher B, on the other hand, used a more typical method of correcting mistakes, a more traditional way that is easier to analyze. Conversely, Teacher C tried to provide feedback as naturally as possible by asking follow-up questions. This is a strategy used to make the students feel that they are not being corrected explicitly. All teachers tried to use as much praise as possible which shows the importance of building a healthy classroom environment.
While conducting the interviews with the teachers in order to find out their thoughts and feelings about oral feedback, it became clear that, like the researcher, the teachers had not been introduced to the different types of feedback during their education. Teachers seem to rely more on their own experience than they do on theories. They believe that oral feedback is important and the students need oral feedback in order to improve and move forward in their learning. The three teachers have different opinions on the kind of oral feedback that is suitable for their teaching but they all stress the importance of praise, motivation and encouragement.

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

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

During the interview, Teacher B, mentioned that, to her, it was more important to give oral feedback than written feedback. Teacher A believes that it is important not correct all mistakes in students written composition and does not seem to be bothered by the lack of comments in students’ written composition. Teacher C believes that written feedback should be accompanied with oral feedback and that the teacher and students should develop together. As previously mentioned, Bitchener et al. (2005) suggest that student-teacher conferences should be incorporated into feed-
back provided on their students’ written work. Teacher C clearly tries to do this, and he believes that it is important to have a conversation with students about their written errors. This leads to another aspect of feedback: oral feedback on students’ essays, which could be a different strategy that could be applied by teachers.

5.2 Limitations
There are some limitations within this study. The first being a limited number of teachers who could participate. The teachers were chosen after availability and after the time constraints. Three teacher were available and with more teachers the results could have been different. It would also have been possible to investigate other aspects such as the differences and similarities between different teachers and their feedback type preferences. The limited number of essays is another limitation and more essays would have offered more accurate results about written feedback. Nevertheless, this study provides teachers with useful information of current teacher practices concerning oral and written feedback and an opportunity to reflect on their own ways of providing feedback.

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

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

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

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

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

Background:

How old are you?

______________________________

What is your education?

______________________________

How long have you been teaching?

______________________________

How long have you been working at this school?

______________________________

What grades do you teach?

______________________________

Questions:

1. What do you think about the use of oral feedback in the classroom?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

2. When are you likely to use feedback in your classroom?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

3. How do you provide students with feedback, in oral and written form?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________
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4. Do you provide students with written feedback?

________________________________________________________________________________
5. How much feedback do you provide?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

6. In your opinion, what is the most important thing to focus on when giving feedback. What areas do you most focus on and why?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

7. Do some students receive more feedback than others. If so, why?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________