PROFESSORS AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM

Diana Milena Echeverri Corrales

Sandra Lorena Díaz Ocampo

Universidad tecnológica de Pereira

Facultad de Bellas Artes y Humanidades

Licenciatura en Lengua Inglesa

2016

PROFESSORS AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS ORAL CORRECTIVE
FEEDBACK IN AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM

Diana Milena Echeverri Corrales

Sandra Lorena Díaz Ocampo

Trabajo de grado presentado como requisito parcial para obtener el título de:

Licenciado en lengua Inglesa

Asesor:

Dolly Ramos Gallego

Universidad tecnológica de Pereira

Facultad de Bellas Artes y Humanidades

Licenciatura en Lengua Inglesa

2016

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to highlight the perceptions that professors and students of an English Language Teaching program had regarding oral corrective feedback in language classes. The research was carried out in a Colombian T-state University in Pereira with 7 male and female professors that teach language courses, and 15 male and female students. The methods implemented for collecting data were individual interviews, observations, and virtual questionnaires in order to gather strong evidence from classroom events, and students and professors' perceptions. The question that guided the investigation was what can be said about professors' perceptions and students' attitudes in regards to the oral corrective feedback given in the language courses of an English Language Teaching program in Pereira?

The results demonstrated that although the professors demonstrated to be aware of the importance of corrective feedback to improve speaking skill, the provision of it is not given in a conscious way; besides, the results also showed professors' concern in the negative effects that corrective feedback can produce on students.

As a final point, this study intended to show the importance that corrective feedback has in the academic preparation of the future English teachers with the purpose to help their future learners to improve their speaking language competence within a friendly and collaborative class environment.

Key words: Perceptions, Corrective Feedback, Implicit Correction, Explicit Correction, awareness and unawareness.

RESUMEN

El propósito de este estudio fue resaltar las percepciones que tienen los profesores y estudiantes de un programa de licenciatura en lengua inglesa hacia la retroalimentación correctiva en clases de lengua. El estudio fue llevado a cabo en una universidad pública de la ciudad de Pereira en Colombia, en el cual participaron 7 profesores entre hombres y mujeres, como también 15 estudiantes del programa de diferentes sexos a los que se les aplicaron entrevistas individuales. Diferentes observaciones, entrevistas y cuestionarios virtuales fueron usados como métodos de recolección de datos con el propósito de obtener evidencias de los eventos de clase y las percepciones de los profesores y estudiantes. La pregunta que orientó esta investigación fue: ¿qué se puede decir acerca de las percepciones de los profesores y las actitudes de los estudiantes hacia la retroalimentación correctiva oral dada en cursos de lengua en un programa de Licenciatura en Lengua Inglesa en Pereira?

Los resultados obtenidos indican que aunque los profesores mostraron ser conscientes de la importancia de la retroalimentación correctiva para mejorar la habilidad del habla, la provisión de ésta no se da de una manera consciente, además los resultados muestran la preocupación que los profesores tienen por los efectos negativos que la retroalimentación corrección puede producir en los estudiantes.

Como parte final, este estudio quiso demostrar la importancia que tiene la retroalimentación correctiva en la preparación académica de los futuros profesores de inglés con el propósito de ayudar a sus futuros aprendices a mejorar la competencia del habla dentro de un ambiente colaborativo y amigable.

Palabras claves: Percepciones, Retroalimentación correctiva, Corrección Implícita, Corrección Explícita, Conciencia e inconciencia.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Though only our thesis committee appears on the cover of this bachelor thesis, a great many people have contributed to its production. I owe my gratitude to all those people who have made this thesis possible because of whom my graduate experience has been one that I will cherish forever.

Most importantly, none of this would have been possible without the love and patience of my family, to whom this dissertation is dedicated to, has been a constant source of love, concern, support and strength all these years. I would like to express my heart-felt gratitude to my parents Luz Marina Ocampo and Gustavo Díaz. I also have to give a special mention to my sister Jeny Alejandra Díaz who has helped me stay sane through these difficult years. Her support and care helped me overcome setbacks and stay focused on my graduate study.

Likewise, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Professor Dolly Ramos Gallego for the continuous support of my bachelor study and research project, for his patience, motivation, enthusiasm, and immense knowledge. Her guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. I could not have imagined having a better advisor and mentor.

Besides my advisor, I would like to thank the rest of my thesis committee: Diana Milena Echeverri, Miguel Antonio Caro and Nathalia Marin, for their encouragement, insightful comments, and hard questions.

I thank my fellow colleague Diana Milena Echeverri, not just for being my thesis committee as I mention above, I thank her for the stimulating discussions, for the sleepless nights we were working together before deadlines, for all the fun we have had in the last five years and for her friendship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

This qualitative descriptive case study aimed at exploring professors and students' perceptions and beliefs in regards to oral corrective feedback from an English Language Teaching Program, taking into consideration corrective feedback, it has an important place in learning a second or foreign language, so professors usually seek to help students to identify their language errors in the speech, and thus, to improve their language proficiency.

For this study, the theoretical background, methodology and results will be explored in detail in this document. In the first place, the document will state the importance of the study by contextualizing the reader and justifying the reasons to conduct the current research; in this case, the question that guided the investigation was what can be said about professors' perceptions and students' attitudes in regards to the oral corrective feedback given in the language courses of an English Language Teaching program in Pereira?

After that, a theoretical framework, based on the contributions provided by Corder (1967), Ellis (2009), Krashen (1983) among some other authors, will be presented and key concepts will be classified as an antecedent for conducting this project, as well as related studies that have been made in the field. Furthermore, the section of the methodology describes the instruments used to collect data (observations, interviews and questionnaires), the participants (professors and students' from ELT program) and context of the study. Next, the findings are presented and are divided into three findings, being these called Awareness and unawareness of the oral feedback strategies implemented by the Professors, Immediate or delayed time to provide oral corrective feedback during oral activities and Professors' perceptions about the use of corrective feedback in speaking activities, which will show

evidence collected from the different methods, along with a discussion supported by related authors in the field.

For the first finding, the results indicated that professors implement corrective feedback strategies in a random and unconscious way since although they have the intention to use most of the types, in certain cases the purpose of each strategy is not achieve. The second finding illustrated the reasons why professors select the specific time to provide corrective feedback; they categorize the activities in which correction does not affect students' performances. The last result demonstrated students and professors' perceptions in regards to the use of correction in speaking activities. Affective factors and students' personality have an important place in feedback's provision due to they determine the effects that each of the strategies will have on students.

Moreover, the limitations of the study are discussed in order to share some of the challenges found during the development of this project. Some of these dealt with the unavailability of time, students' lack of knowledge about some concepts needed to conduct interviews and students as well as professors' unwillingness to participate in the study. Besides, the conclusions are presented with the purpose to answer the research question and an examination. Lastly, the implications of this study suggest avoiding overcorrection during oral activities as a way to promote participation and decrease anxiety and frustration in learners. In the same line of ideas, professors are recommended to be aware of students' personality, as well as to be cautious at the moment of providing explicit corrective feedback.

1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In the last thirty years, Colombia has been involved in the creation of new economic and commercial alliances with different countries, such as United States of America, China and the European Union that has arisen as consequence from the *Apertura económica* leaded by César Gaviria Trujillo's Government or *Tratado de Libre Comercio* during Juan Manuel Santos' government campaign. Based on this situation, the necessity of training Colombian people in a foreign language has grown, especially English which can be used as *lingua franca* for international negotiations. Therefore, the Colombian Government has been requiring well- trained teachers with a C1 English proficiency level. This means according to the CEFRL (2001) a high proficiency level, in which a person feel fully comfortable, has the ability to be creative with the language, has broad lexical repertoire and can use language flexibly and effectively for social purposes.

Due to the fact that the majority of instructors scarce with this professional profile, the Ministry of Education (MEN) has designed a project called "Colombia very well" where Colombian high school students are expected to have a B1+ level proficiency in the foreign language in 2025; in other words, the language user has an intermediate level in which he is aware of the salient politeness conventions and acts appropriately, can produce continuous writing which is generally intelligible, and has a clearly intelligible pronunciation. is within this project four main lines are stated, (i) training and support for teachers; (ii) pedagogical aspects (iii) assessment and monitoring; and (iv) management for institutional strengthening, but it is relevant to mention that training and supporting teachers should be the main area of concern for contributing to Colombian public education since it is necessary to support professionals with pedagogical tools in order to enhance praxis in classroom events.

Given the fact that providing support to public high school English teachers is required to improve English level student, one of the challenges in Colombia very well is that about 3.000 teachers can embrace and participate in the program; this means, motivating English teachers to attend to training programs in order to improve their language skills, as well as, their classroom management skills, but at the same time, providing them the support and constant accompaniment with the purpose to assess and guaranteeing the quality in their performance. However, it has been demonstrated that there are not enough teachers to cover the necessities of Colombian education, and their language level tends to be below the standards proposed by the government. Indeed, according to statistics, just the 48% of the new high school graduates have B1 level. In this way, Sanchez (2013) argues the deficiency in the teachers' level of proficiency is caused by the lack of quality in pedagogical programs in which they were form since the results of the test saber pro showed that just 36% of the pre-service teachers had a language level above B1, showing that most graduates of English Language Teaching degrees are at low level. In this manner, he suggests that the solution for low results in students from public and private schools is to improve the linguistic competences in English teachers. In the same line, one of the solutions provided by the MEN is to improve English language level in Colombian EFL teachers to a minimum of B2+ level (based on CEFRL standards) through continuous support of tutors and provision of pertinent incentives from now to 2025.

Furthermore, a study carried out by Arias, Ramos & Cárdenas (2013) in 12 out of 13 towns of Risaralda, which has as a purpose to meet the most common attitudes, perceptions and beliefs of the educational community towards the learning and teaching of English, has demonstrated the flaws in the methodological practices of EFL classes due to the special

emphasis in the linguistic competence (strengthening solely vocabulary, syntax and grammar), and the lack of reinforcement of the sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence,which do not allow students to adjust the discourse according to the context. In addition, English classes have a tendency to develop only Low Order Thinking Skills, such as identifying, memorizing, repeating, among others, which indirectly underuse other students' cognitive capacities that can be exploited depending of students' ages, such as analyzing, contrasting and creating. Moreover, students have few expositions to authentic materials and pedagogical tools, limiting the receptive skill to the teachers' voice, and the production skill is linked primarily to the written language, reporting few attempts to encourage the speaking skill. Based on the authors aforementioned, Al Jawi (2010) recommended the use of different methodologies within a communicative purpose, involving the integration of the four language skills in EFL classes.

Taking the previous statements into consideration, the speaking skill in Colombian classrooms tends to be limited to foster participation and drilling activities; one of the reasons why English teachers can experiment some difficulties to rehearse this skill in language classrooms is contemplated by Dinçer, Yesilyurt, & Göksu, (2012), who explain that speaking is an intricate skill involving the complexity of deciding what and how should be expressed an intended message and at the same time, involving some aspects, such as: accuracy, fluency, pronunciation and vocabulary. Considering these aspects at the moment of teaching speaking, it is needed to add that some errors and mistakes can arise, so the teacher has the duty to choose the correct strategy in order to provide a corrective feedback that can be appropriate for students' errors. Therefore, some studies suggest that corrective feedback does not affect university learners' motivation given the fact that the role university students have as active

learners is to look at the feedback as a beneficial instrument to identify and reflect upon errors and mistakes that should be overcame in order to improve their productive language skills (Kavaliauskienė & Anusienė, 2012). In addition, a study conducted by Abukhadrah (2012) to 20 Arab males students enrolled in an advanced English program in a Midwestern University, as well as, 10 native English language teachers, where he was exploring the attitudes and perceptions of teachers and advanced language students regarding oral error correction, concluded that both populations have different opinions towards error correction and feedback; based on this result, it is evident that there is a need for further research in different types of students population, such as basic level students, and students from ELT programs, taking into the account the assumption that, how can the awareness about suitable feedback strategies improve, if the students, being the main characters of the feedback process, are not involved in them?

Considering, on the other hand, particular differences embedded in each society, the mentioned study suggests that socio cultural aspects can influence considerably perceptions and beliefs in language learners about preferred ways to be corrected in oral interaction. In this sense, it is not accurate to believe that a study conducted in Saudi Arabia has the same repercussions and results in the Colombian setting since Arabian culture and their beliefs commonly differ vastly from the Colombian perspective; thus, producing the need to execute new research in Colombia about the attitudes prospective language teachers and ELT professors have regarding types of errors that need to be corrected, and the most effective types of feedback to be arranged in class.

Regarding corrective feedback, some studies have been carried out searching the most recognized types and strategies that teachers use to correct learners in the aural perform

(Chu, 2011) and (Hernandez, Reyes and Murrieta, 2010). Bearing in mind teachers'

performance in EFL classes, Chu (2011) researched the effectiveness of corrective feedback

in communicative teaching method and in task-based method examining whether corrective

feedback has a positive effect on improving oral English accuracy. Having this purpose in

mind, the author explored which types of corrective feedback have better effect on

improving accuracy and whether the group's language level (low- medium- high) can or

cannot interfere with the outcomes. The results in this study showed that feedback has

significant effects in learners' accuracy improvement in the case where students were

exposed to explicit correction; furthermore, corrective feedback had influence depending on

students' language level; in this sense, low and medium level students had more opportunity

to improve in their process.

Following the same line, a study developed by (Hernandez, Reyes and Murrieta,

2010) reported that implicit correction is the strategy that teachers preferred to use since they

have positive effect on students in terms of fluency. Another important aspect considered is

that corrective feedback should be done at the beginning of a language process in order to

avoid fossilization. However, a common problem found in the current study is the lack of

pedagogical sources teachers have in order to correct speaking activities; in other words,

teachers usually have difficulties in order to know when and how a speaking activity should

be interrupted for giving suitable feedback; at the same time, undergraduate students from

English language teaching (ELT) programs do not have a solid background in teaching to

make the decision of giving certain type of corrective feedback in a defined context. Thus,

the significance of the current research consists on collecting enough information through

surveys and observations to help teachers to be aware of what type of feedback they will use according to the context and the population.

In summation, considering the lack of research found regarding perceptions and attitudes towards error correction conducted in different EFL students' and teachers' populations, this provoke the need of embracing new populations, such as ELT pre-service teachers and university professors for a deeper understanding of the area. Furthermore, studies in the field of perceptions towards correcting errors in the oral production have not been carried out in the country, creating the need to develop this research, taking into account that social conceptions regarding feedback in Colombia can differ from other cultures where similar studies have been conducted. Moreover, the few opportunities Colombian students have for improving their speaking skill, and the lack of background EFL teachers in the country have about corrective feedback, makes the implementation of a research necessary to show in their findings the most appropriate ways for correcting mistakes in language learners, and this can lead to strategies that can help language teachers to have a better performance in their classes and to grow professionally. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to identify the different perceptions and beliefs students from ELT programs, as well as university professors have regarding corrective feedback, and which strategies are the most effective in EFL scenarios.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explore deeply the different concepts that will give support to the current research. In this sense, the four language skills will be addressed, focusing on the productive skills, defined as the language outcomes produced by human beings during daily life interactions; these at the same time encompass speaking and writing skill which differ for the mode of communication (oral and written). Bearing in mind the project will be emphasized on the speaking skill, this will be broadly described, embracing the different characteristics that are indispensable to develop this skill, such as fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, comprehensibility, among others. Next, oral interaction will be defined as an interactive process where participants construct meaning, involving the specific characteristics oral interaction has (Thornbury, 2007) and some recommendations made by some authors to enhance this ability in EFL classrooms.

On the other hand, interlanguage will be categorized as the biological counterpart of universal grammar (Lennenberg, 1967, cited in Selinker 1972). Errors and mistakes will be defined and contrasted by (Corder,1967), mentioning the multiple types of errors, such as linguistic, morpho syntactic, comprehension errors, among others and the sources of these errors, being psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic. In addition, fossilization will be addressed by Selinker (1972) as the process in which linguistic rules tend to keep in L2 learners' interlanguage, no matter the amount of explanation they receive. Furthermore, corrective feedback will be conceived by (Ellis, 2009) as the provision of suggestions that encourage students to correct errors and mistakes in order to improve their proficiency level.

In this way, the characteristics of a good feedback practice will be revealed, as well as, the different types of feedback coined by Lyster and Ranta (1997), such as explicit correction, recast, metalinguistic cue, echoing and some other strategies that can be used in the language classroom for correcting learners' mistakes. Finally, some techniques to give feedback in the oral skill and some controversies which have taken place in regards to the effectiveness of corrective feedback will be displayed.

2.2 Introduction to language skills

In daily life, people use the four language skills- listening, speaking, reading and writing- in a communicative, mixed way without being aware of it. This becomes a challenge for language teachers as they need to encourage students to use the four skills of the language in an integrated way, using them in real life scenarios and with high proficiency level; as a matter of fact, Davies & Pearse (2000) assure that "real success in English teaching and learning is when the learners can actually communicate in English inside and outside the classroom" (p. 99). However, it is common in English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms expose students to traditional language teachers which practice these skills in a separate way, focusing materials and activities in one specific skill at a time (Jing, 2006).

The separation of these skills of the language is produced as a result of two main components, the mode of communication (oral or written) and the directions of communication (receptive and productive). These are represented in the following chart according to SIL International (1999):

	Oral	Written
Receptive	Listening	Reading
Productive	Speaking	Writing

Table 1: Language skills

Even though all language skills are closely related in human interactions, the productive skills, as the name indicates, permit people to produce language and allow humans to express their ideas, feelings and contributions to society. This document will emphasize in these skills, being widely explained below.

2.2.1 Productive skills

Productive skills are human beings abilities to generate outcomes or ways in which people use the language they have learned or acquired to produce a message represented by *speaking* and *writing* (Al-Jawi, 2010). Productive skills have an important role in the language learning process since "they permit learners to perform in communicative aspects, such as oral presentations, written studies and reports among others" (Alvarado, 2013; p.1). The focus of this project is on the productive speaking skill, which is not only the ability of uttering words through the mouth, but it also involves the transmission of an oral message (Bashir, Azeem & Hussain, 2011).

2.2.1.1 Speaking

Learning speaking in the first language (L1) is given in a natural way, where listening and repeating are essential to be able to produce language. These same patterns can be brought into the classroom with a foreign language although it requires more practice and attention (Bashir, Azeem & Dogar, 2011 p. 35).

Speaking is a process that could happen in any time, making relations between speaker and hearer. In fact, during this interaction speakers should make decisions about what things they should say and how to say them (Dinçer, Yesilyurt, & Göksu, 2012). In this sense, there are some aspects that involve the act of communication, as the type of interaction, the message, the speakers' personalities, among others. In fact, Richards (2008) states that "different speech styles reflect perceptions of the social roles of the participants in a speech event"(p. 21). This means that depending on how participants express themselves, they can show their social role, age, status and politeness, allowing the hearer to make judgments of their personality.

Taking into consideration the different functions speaking can include, the previous author used an expanded three-part version of Brown and Yule's framework (1983), where he made the distinction between interactional and transactional functions of speaking; he refers to these terms as *talk as interaction, talk as transaction and talk as performance:*

Talk as interaction refers to the primary social function in a conversation, for example a greeting; *talk as transaction,* on the other hand, is the one that is focused on the meaning of the message; that is, the talk has a specific purpose where understanding is the most important part; and *talk as performance* means the discourse for an audience in which the speaker prepares the speech to transmit certain information.

Within the message transmitted by speaking, there are certain aspects that can or cannot affect the performance in real life, for communication or in the educational setting. They involve fluency, accuracy and comprehensibility (Heaton 1988 cited in Rahman, 2011).

2.2.2 Aspects that intervene in speaking performance

The speaking skill encompasses several aspects that can allow or stop communication. These aspects may help to achieve the competence and the proficiency level in the speaking skill. Some of these are:

2.2.2.1 Comprehensibility

In an excellent comprehensible EFL environment, the intentions for communicating a message should be clear in the way that the listener understands the general idea. According to Bin (2011), comprehensibility avoids interruptions during the interaction and prevents interlocutors for formulating requests of clarification. To illustrate, if in a conversation there are two people talking and each of them have different information that want to share, they should be clear enough that the other get the message correctly, avoiding clarification questions and interruptions to take place.

2.2.2.2 Fluency

Fluency is conceived as the production of the language reserved to the speech, where the person links units of speech quickly, smoothly and without hesitation (Hedge, 1993). In addition, fluency is the ability that influence students to use the language spontaneously and confidently; this skill should be guided by the language teacher, providing spaces and a wide range of expressions in order to allow students to use the language that they are learning (Brown, 2001). Fluency should be given in a natural way, where students can express their knowledge about grammar and vocabulary in a communicative context or just expressing what they want to say. Scrivener (2011) proposes that teachers should reduce their talking

time in the classroom to allow students to develop the speaking skill, and so, enhance their fluency. He also argues that teachers must not interrupt students when they are talking because they will lose the flow and they will feel demotivated to continue with their intervention, and the goal of the class, in terms of fluency, will not be achieved.

To continue with the aspects of the speaking, accuracy is another ability that involves the precision in the productive skill as the next lines will present.

2.2.2.3 Accuracy

Accuracy copes with the correctness of the speech, influencing the speaking skill inasmuch as Rahman (2011) states that "speaking means someone can produce correct sentences in pronunciation, grammar and word choice so can be understood" (p.3). In this sense, Gower's (1995) cited in Bashrin (2013) assures accuracy is the integration of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary in the speech. These aspects will be defined in the following paragraphs:

a) **Pronunciation:** For many years, pronunciation has been defined as a set of sounds for a specific language, in which aspects, such as stress and intonation take place. Pronunciation can be classified in two aspects as Yates (2002) quoted in Lane (2010) indicates: *segmental aspects* that are shaped by vowels and consonants; these can be produced either by a group of sounds or voice vibrations, which allow words and utterances to be formed, and the *suprasegmental aspects* that are features of speech that go beyond of the individual sounds including stress, tone, duration, rhythm among others that give sense and efficacy at the moment to transmit a message.

Kerr (2010) describes in a document at the ELICOS (English Language Intensive Courses for Overseas Students) conference, in Melbourne, Australia: how she was able to help a Cantonese speaker of English achieve considerably greater intelligibility by working on his point of articulation (changing his focus of resonance). She also states that almost all English language teachers get students to study grammar and vocabulary when they take part in productive skill activities, but unfortunately some of these teachers make little attempt to teach pronunciation, and its settings, such as particular sounds, stress, intonation, spelling, connected speech, and fluency. In other words, pronunciation does not only make students aware of different sounds and sound features, but it can also improve their speaking. This knowledge can give students extra information about spoken English and help them to improve comprehension and intelligibility. Even though pronunciation is an important part to determine whether our speech is accurate or not, a fundamental aspect in the construction of our oral message is the grammar use.

b) Grammar: The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR, 2011) defines the grammatical competence as "the ability to understand and express meaning by producing and recognizing well-formed phrases and sentences." (p. 113). In other words, grammar deals with the correct structure of sentences and expressions of the language. Although there are few recognized authors that provide a concrete definition of grammar, many authors discuss the importance of grammar in teaching a foreign language; some show to be in favor of rehearsing and strengthening grammar in EFL classroom while others prove to be against its explicit instruction.

Neupane (2009) and Thornbury (1999) highlight in their studies the relevance of grammar instruction in ESL classes, arguing that "research suggests that learners who receive

no [grammar] instruction are at the risk of fossilizing sooner than those who receive"
(Thornbury,1999: 16). To contrast, Krashen and Terrell (1983) insist that teaching grammar
should not be included in ESL classes because it does not allow the learners to acquire the
language in a natural form. In spite of the constant debates made for researchers in the area,
grammar prove to be a fundamental aspect in second language learning, being this another
ability involved in EFL users. The grammatical competence cannot be developed without
having a great amount of words to build sentences and expressions. That is why; vocabulary is
the base of accuracy.

  c) Vocabulary: Vocabulary has been defined by different authors according to their
interests or the language area in which they are working on. Antonacci & O`Callaghan (2012)
argue that vocabulary is more than a simple dictionary definition, given the fact that it
includes a conceptual knowledge of the words which makes a strong relation with student's
comprehension. Supporting this, Johnson (2012) declares that "vocabulary is such a powerful
indicator of concept knowledge" (p.29). In other words, vocabulary knowledge is a
manifestation of great command in understanding and creating relationships between concepts
and the meanings; therefore, vocabulary is a fundamental base to build knowledge.

  Considering the contribution of vocabulary knowledge in English language learning,
McCarthy & 0`Dell (2012) highlight that the best way of introducing vocabulary to the
students is to give them language input through listening and speaking to recognize the words
in action since whenever teachers ask students to read or listen, they will want them to see
how words are used.

  To conclude, accuracy involves different areas of attention, such as pronunciation,
grammar and vocabulary which should be taken into account in order to measure the degree of

correctness in students' speech. These areas should be constantly assessed in order to improve

student's language level. In this way, Scrivener (2011) recommends that when evaluating

students, teachers should make clear in which of the aforementioned areas accuracy will play

the most important role. This advice is primarily provided for enhancing students' accuracy in

speaking in second language learning.

2.2.3 Speaking in second language learning

In educational settings, the development of the speaking skill is seen as priority since

learners tend to evaluate their progress in their language course according to how much they

can speak. Richards (1990) cited in Richards (2008) indicates that the appropriate approach to

teach oral skills is a point of discussion in methodological debates since teachers and

textbooks use a variety of them. The approaches could be focused on specific features of oral

interaction like turn-taking, topic management, and questioning strategies, or they can be

focused on creating conditions for oral interaction through group work, task work, and others.

He also argues that at the moment of designing speaking activities in the classroom, having a

specific purpose to learn the speaking skill and recognizing speaking's functions from real

communication are fundamental aspects to increase students' speaking level.

2.3. Oral interaction

Oral interaction is a productive language skill that deals with daily life social

interchanges. However, this concept is more complex than the mere aspect of speaking as it is

evidenced in the definition given by Brown and Yule (2003) where oral interaction is "an

interactive process where you can construct a meaning that you can produce in every situation,

at least at the moment, taking into account those aspects which are participants, context, experiences and the purpose of the communication" (p.4). In other words, the act of communication involves a purpose, an interaction among participants, a shared context and some other aspects that characterizes a daily conversation; these will be expanded in the coming paragraphs.

2.3.1. Characteristics of conversation

Oral conversation is considered as the major portion of daily life's language made by humans around the world; in fact, human beings produce around 7,000 words by hour in a normal fluent conversation, making the aural/ oral channel the fastest and most used mean for communication (Thornbury & Slade, 2007). The oral productive skill joins a set of features that make it different from other types of discourse, such as written language; in this sense, the aforementioned authors established seven elements of oral conversation, such as:

1. *Being spoken*: The interlocutor can take meaning from prosodic features, such as sentence stress, intonation, tempo and articulation rate, rhythm and voice quality.

2. *Happening in real life:* This is evidenced in the disfluency effects that normally occur in a conversation such as hesitations, word repetition, repairs, false starts, among some others.

3. *Taking place in a shared context:* In a conversation, where the context is shared, speakers can take for granted that listeners will identify deictic forms, ellipsis and pronouns.

4. *Being interactive:* It is reciprocally constructed and multi-authored, so no one talks more than appropriate.

5. *Being informal:* conversation is spontaneous and has interpersonal function. Also, it is basically structured in an informal register in which is evidenced the use of slang expressions and colloquial language.

6. *Expressing identity:* the presence of vernacular language reflects that a conversation is a resource, in which the social characteristics of an individual are demonstrated, such as *social status, profession, or economic stratification.*

7. *Conversation is interpersonal:* People exchange information, feelings, and meaning through verbal and non-verbal messages given the fact that it is face-to-face communication.

These characteristics take into account the role of setting, personality and time in oral conversations as it is exposed by the author, this type of interaction occurs in an immediate context where the participants share information, and it allows language errors to arise since there is not much time for preparing a discourse; furthermore, the topics of the speakers are not arranged during an informal conversation.

Taking into account the previous statements, conversation is considered the informal counterpart of the oral interaction, involving feelings, personal opinions and identity. These interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects are linked to the differences that exist between the monologue and dialogue, described in the following lines.

2.3.2. Types of oral interaction

As it was seen previously, the oral interaction has certain features that define the quality and the structure of a discourse. In this sense, Nur Fikri (2012) states a distinction between two types of oral discourse: *monologue* and *dialogue.* This author asserts that monologue is "the speech of one person who expresses his thoughts and feelings in a particular situation and shows his definite conclusion. Monologue is generally prepared speech"; and dialogue involves two or more speakers that can be subdivided into interpersonal and transactional dialogue (Nur Fikri, 2012, p. 1). That is to say, in monologues there is not frequent interaction whilst in dialogues the content is co-created reciprocally.

Another subject involved in oral interaction is the issue of *formality* or *informality* of the discourse and the setting; in this sense, Swarthout (nd) mentions the settings where a formal communication occurs (Presentations at business meetings, classroom lectures and commencement speech given at a graduation ceremony), and informal situations happen (Face-to-face conversations, telephone conversations, discussions at business meetings) that take place in daily life oral interchanges.

Oral interaction is also a necessity in foreign language classrooms, in which the main goal is to apply communicatively through social interchanges what was taught during a series of lessons; so this fact makes pertinent have an insight about how pair and group work can enhance the oral interaction in EFL learners.

2.3.3. Students' preferences regarding pair and group work:

Oral interaction is a complex process which involves several factors that can alter students' performance in both educational and daily life context. In fact, Guerrero (2004) assures that, the accuracy and speed of speech, the variety of words and the complexity of foreign language students' utterances are vastly influenced by several factors, such as the anxiety they feel as they speak, the cognitive complexity of a task , and their proficiency level.

However, learners can rise their language proficiency while those negative factors are dissipated when students work together and collaboratively with their partners since according to Richards & Lockhart (2007), is "through interacting with other students in pairs or groups, students can be given the opportunity to draw on their linguistic resources in a nonthreatening situation and use them to complete different kinds of tasks. Indeed, it is through this kind of interaction that researchers believe many aspects of both linguistic and communicative competence are developed" (p. 152).

In other words, grouping students for the accomplishment of specific tasks incorporating cooperative/collaborative learning and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles, promotes oral interaction improving speaking proficiency.

Nevertheless, taking into consideration that every educational action carries both, positive and negative repercussions, the pro's and con's of grouping will be analyzed.

2.3.4. Advantages and disadvantages of group and pair work in oral interaction:

Regarding the advantages of the interactional atmosphere that is created at the moment of arranging group and pair oral discussions, Lightbown and Spada (2006) have found when

learners take the initiative to express themselves, they are more spontaneous. Also, in asking questions and responding exercises students use more language functions.

Dividing the class into different groups also facilitates several opportunities to practice and to interact in the target language between learners. In fact, Ur (2009) recommends that teachers working with large classes should divide them into five groups which is the most effective organization for practicing speaking as they will have more opportunities to talk than in full- class organization, as well as develop a sense of independence, cooperation and warmth in class.

Talking about disadvantages of working in pairs and groups in oral performance, Haines (1995) explains that being forced to speak a second language with someone who shares your first language is artificial inasmuch as talking in a foreign language in a context where that language is not used; do not reproduce the learner's natural setting. Nonetheless, it can become quite natural when the teacher talks only in the second language, specify certain parameters and make students use the L2 in communicative tasks.

Furthermore, when the learner works in pairs or groups, it is impossible for the teacher assessing and giving feedback when they are talking. However, it can reduce the number of mistakes once students begin to demonstrate the activity for the whole class since they have the opportunity to practice previously (Doff, 1988). That is to say, although pair and group work do not give enough chances to instructors to correct learners' mistakes, if students' products are then exposed to the whole group, the instructors will have sufficient opportunities to correct language errors.

Finally, the most frequent teachers' fear in grouping is uncontrolled classes, where students begin to make a lot of noise, to speak their native language indiscriminately, or making their assigned task wrongly. In this case, Ur (2009) suggests that losing control of classes is normal, but an analysis of how habituated is the class to make group activities is required, as well as, the selection of an engaging, interesting task for the class.

The relevance of the topics mentioned for this project leads with the need to clarify concepts that the researchers will require for knowing what to observe in the classes, and involving different authors' perspectives in theory will allow to arrive to unbiased conclusions. Besides, theory about errors and oral interaction will permit to contrast EFL theory in the Colombian context, allowing the researchers to know whether the theory adopted have similar implications or not. Finally, the analysis of data and results need a theoretical support that can concede the project reliable and verifiable outcomes.

2.4. Inter language

Throughout the process of learning a second language, some psycholinguistic structures are activated in the brain, allowing language learners to create connections among their first language and the second one. Thus, the learner can create semantic, phonological or grammatical relationships in two languages that usually lead to the improvement of their language competence; according to Weinreich (1953), these cognitive processes are called "interlingual identifications" and despite the controversy caused by this affirmation, some theories highlight and accept the existence of similar cognitive processes occurring in a foreign language learner's brain. To illustrate, Lennenberg (1967) suggests a *latent language*

structure subsisting as "an already formulated arrangement in the brain, considered as the biological counterpart to universal grammar, and it is transformed during certain maturational stages" (Lennenberg, 1967, cited in Selinker 1972, p. 33)

These structures created the basis for the formulation of a theory in which a foreign language learner, who is not completely competent in the second language (L2), create a dynamic system where he preserves some items of his first language, overgeneralize target language rules and create new language forms as a part of his experience with L2; this system was called *Inter language* coined by Selinker (1972).

This premise assures a language learner during his process of learning creates a code between the two languages that produce different type of linguistic outcomes in comparison to a native speaker. In other words, it is a transitive status that occurs when a language user is learning a foreign or second language, so this person creates a new language system mixing the first and the target language structures. In fact, this theory was generated in the observation of a given situation where a native speaker and a foreign language learner had to convey the same sort of utterances, having different results.

Besides, the development of an inter language can produce errors in L2 learners' performance, what makes necessary to review the concepts and specifities of language errors.

2.5. Errors and mistakes: A general overview

The errors and mistakes treatment has been a topic of concern by many researchers, mainly in second language teaching. In the same way, a variety of theories exist supporting

and rejecting who, where and how correction should take place. However, some definitions seem to have a similarity among scholars involved in the topic. Some of these related with the concepts of *mistake* perceived as a deviation in language that occurs when learners fail to perform their competence, *and error* that is described as a deviation in learner language which results from lack of knowledge of the correct rule as it is proposed by Corder (1967). Nevertheless, in errors and mistakes' research, the role of mistakes is not primarily discussed since they are seen as temporary slips that can be auto-corrected by the learner, and in general, they do not interfere with communication.

Taking into consideration the distinction between errors and mistakes, Edge (1997:9) classified mistakes into *slips,* defined as mistakes that can be corrected by the language learner, and *attempts* as mistakes made by the language user since he does not know how to organize the idea they want to produce. However, for effects of clarity, this project will place an emphasis on *errors* and their classification as the following lines will propose.

2.5.1. Types of errors for lack of knowledge of language rules

Considering the research made about the topic, some errors characteristics have been added in order to identify errors stages and type of errors with the intention of providing an adequate treatment. In this way, Corder (1967) stated that there are three types of errors: *pre-systematic errors*, referring to those which occur when the learner is unaware of the specific norm in the target language; for example, using *I have 30* years without being aware of the *verb to be* rule.

Systematic errors characterized for the awareness that the learner has about the rules, but still uses the wrong one; in this case, lack of practice can be the main reason why this sort of error usually appears in language learners. To illustrate, although an English language student can be conscious of the conjugation of the third person in singular, he often does not conjugate correctly the form.

Finally, *post- systematic errors*, occur when learners know the target language rules, but they do not use them consistently. For instance, when a language user knows the sociolinguistic difference between the terms *teacher* and *professor* (the first one to address school tutors, and the second one for addressing University instructors), but he randomly uses them for the same individual.

 According to this theory, language teachers should deal with these errors in the first two stages (*pre-systematic and systematic stages)* in order to avoid fossilization as it was addressed previously.

Errors should occur in any of the previously mentioned stages affecting or not the comprehension. The next paragraphs will illustrate the classifications and characteristics of those errors which affect and do not affect the overall understanding of a message.

2.5.2. Types of errors for comprehension

One important aspect that leads to research in the area is the overall comprehension of the message. In this sense, Burt (1975; p. 56) indicated two terms in order to emphasize errors and their relation with comprehension; *global errors* are those that "affect overall

comprehension". For instance, the sentence "*It is good to reason around,*" makes impossible to grasp the meaning (or intention) of the speaker whereas *local errors* "affect single elements and not the comprehension" as in "*a newspapers*" *(*where *"a"* is unnecessary if it is followed by a plural noun)*, that does not break down communication between speakers.

In this sense, global and local errors can embrace other error classifications which might be reflected in the phonological, syntactic, lexical and propositional structure of the utterance. These categories will be explored in the following paragraphs.

2.5.3. Varieties of linguistic errors

Errors can arise during the oral and written discourse process through non meaningful units of language. That is to say, there are linguistic errors presented in daily communication that focus on single units of language. These classes are clearly stated by Jaeger (2005) as *Phonological, Syntactic, Lexical* and *Propositional.*

Phonological errors refer to phonological and prosodic units that do not carry semantic content; some of these errors are represented in consonants and vowel sounds, but also in utterances stress or rhyme. For instance, in the utterance *this is a developmental process* / ðiz iz ə dɪˌvel·əpmen'·təl proʊ·'ses / ˌ there is an error of stress compared with what *Cambridge Dictionaries Online* suggests   / ðiz iz ə dɪˌvel·əpˈmen·təl ˈproʊ·ses /.

Syntactic errors, on the other hand, involve the organization of phrases and sentences, including misplacement of lexical items, such as words and morphemes, and phrase mixtures. For example, in the sentence *I have a car yellow,* there is a displacement of the word *yellow* given the fact that the adjectives should be located before the noun.

Oppositely, lexical errors are substitutions or blends of meaningful lexical items; some categories of lexical errors incorporate functional and content words, as well as affixes. To illustrate, in the expression "*I am stressing"* the affix "ing" needs to be replaced by the "ed" form.

Finally, propositional errors indicate utterances that a language user elaborates with one intention, but it differs from what he intended to say. That is to say, in the sentence *I brought my carpet, sorry my folder;* the person had an intention which was not reflected in the first utterance, so he instantly corrected himself. In this case, the user could confuse the Spanish false cognate *carpet (carpeta)* that in English means folder.

 This type of misunderstandings usually can take the form of slips since as it is stated by Jaeger (2005), speakers usually correct themselves when they identify the message do not reflect what they wanted to say; thus, they are the less common type of linguistic error due to the uncertainty of the language user intention.

Last but not least, propositional errors can encircle different error categories at the same time. For example, in the sentence *I have one cats, sorry two dogs*, it is evident a propositional error, as well as, a local and a morpho syntactic error, showing the multiple facets that a single sentence can hold. As it is stated in the example, morpho syntactic errors focus on single linguistic units as is going to be explained in the next lines.

2.5.4. Classification of morpho syntactic errors

Multiple language errors can be formed by single elements; one of the most common are the morpho syntactic, consisting on the lack of accuracy in the structure of single linguistic items, as well as, whole sentences, both in aural and written way. Based on this Krashen, Burt

& Dulay (1982) listed the most common morpho syntactic errors in language learning which are omission, addition, misformation and misordering.

Omission errors are described as the "absence of an item that must appear in a well formed utterance"; for example, non-pronouncing the particle –*ed* in the verb *started.* In the contrary, addition errors are characterized by "the presence of an item that must not appear in a well formed utterance". For instance, *they plays the guitar since they were five. M*oreover, misformation errors consist on "the wrong form of the morpheme or structure"; in particular, *the cat eated a fish.* Finally, misordering errors are defined as "the wrong placement of a morpheme or group of morphemes in an utterance". For example, *have ever you seen my car*? (Krashen, Burt & Dulay ,1982, p. 150-163).

These varieties of errors can occur in any moment of a learner's performance; however, where these errors come from is another interesting area that the following extract attempt to explain to the reader.

2.5.5. Sources of errors

The origin of language errors has been also an area of inquiry and research. Regarding the topic, Taylor (1997) proposes three sources of error in which learners' lack of knowledge make interactions likely to commit errors: *Psycholinguistic* refers to the difficulties learners have when producing language, *sociolinguistic* indicates learner´s disability to adjust their language in a social context, involving aspects like cultural expressions, sayings and behavior's, *discourse,* on the other hand, denotes difficulties in the organization of ideas constituting incoherent productions.

That is to say, *psycholinguistic errors* refer to language cognitive disorders, such as dyslexia or dysgraphia; *sociolinguistic errors* meaning the lack of knowledge of how to use the language according to the context, such as talking in an informal speech to the boss and finally, *discourse or pragmatic errors* in which learners do not provide precise, relevant information to the listener, such as talking about your friends' mates in a job interview.

Other sources of errors have been classified regarding their origin. In this sense, Dulay and Burt (1973) identified four types of error based on L1 interference and their psycholinguistic origins as they are: *Interference-like errors*, mentioning those errors that take place when learners try to reflect their first language structure in the second; *developmental errors,* indicating errors that the learner makes also in their native language; Besides, *ambiguous errors*, suggesting errors that cannot be categorized as either interference-like or developmental; and *unique errors*, those that are neither developmental nor interference, in other words, personal errors (e.g. saying *upon* instead of saying *weapon).*

Regarding this topic, Harmer (2007) defines *L1 interference* as a phenomenon that occurs when the native language comes into contact with the target language, and this aspect elicits confusion in the second or foreign language learner's use. This can appear as a consequence of a syntactic, phonological or semantic discrepancy between the mother tongue and the target languages. In particular, a Spanish learner who is learning English as foreign language could confuse the meaning of a false cognate word, such as *embarrassed* since it is quite similar in its writing, tense and part of speech with the word *embarazada* that means pregnant.

Furthermore, the author supported that *developmental errors* are presented as a result of "overgeneralization phenomenon" which is presented when the child begins to over-use a new linguistic pattern that has been unconsciously learnt. To illustrate, a foreign language learner has noticed that adding the particle –er to some adjectives may compare two objects, and he starts to apply it in every adjective he knows, such as this example: *Mike is intelligenter than his father*.

To sum up, according to Corder (1967) errors are deviations in learner's language resulting from lack of knowledge of the correct rules. Errors can encircle multiple classifications depending on the aspects that errors rely on. In this sense, global and local errors enclose the overall or partial comprehension of the message; in addition, Phonological, Syntactic, Lexical and Propositional errors deal with linguistic units in both spoken and written language. Sources of errors, on the other hand, refer to where errors come from, and they are classified in: psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic error sources.

The relevance of error's theory can expand the researchers' perspectives of how and why language errors are produced in language users. In addition, the knowledge of this topic will provide support to the collection of data in the project, identifying language learners' errors throughout the observations, giving as a result an easier analysis of students' outcomes in order to compare which corrective feedback methods normally fit with the students' errors. However, not in all cases errors can be easily corrected, given mental and emotional limits that produce mistakes to set in learners' brain. This process is called fossilization.

2.5.6 Fossilization

Every language learner has dealt with mistakes in their performance that remain almost impossible to correct and assimilate as a part of his L2 learning; in fact, the knowledge of linguistic rules in L1 sometimes obstruct the acquisition of L2 rules when those language codes differ in their production of phonemes, organization of syntactic units, etc. In this way, Selinker coined the term *fossilization* for the process in which linguistic items and rules tend to keep in L2 learners' inter language, no matter the amount of explanation they receive in the target language (1972). In other words, language learners use to fossilize errors in their target language in spite of the amount of correction obtained. For that reason, the correction of errors promptly is a valuable action in foreign language classes. However, according to the aforementioned author, fossilized structures tend to re- emerge even when seemingly eradicated.

Certainly or not, the fossilization of errors is an aspect that can vary among individuals, involving emotions, cognitive abilities and language aptitudes. In this sense, a continuous self-monitoring and provision of feedback can be the solutions to lessen the consequences of fossilizing an error. That is why; the next excerpt will talk deeply about error treatment and feedback.

2.6 Oral corrective feedback

2.6.1. What is feedback?

The role of feedback is important during a learning process (Brown, 2007). As a matter of fact, feedback is the tool that can guarantee understanding and generate changes in

the way students speak through a process of learning a foreign language. That is to say, feedback is the provision of suggestions, encouraging students to correct errors and mistakes in order to improve their proficiency level. Brookhart (2008) argues that success in learning is based on practice and in the manner teachers provides error correction in the areas in which students have more difficulties, in order to improve the language proficiency and achieve the goal that teachers requires at the end of the lesson.

2.6.2 Principles of good feedback practice

In a synthesis of the self-regulation model and research literature on formative assessment presented by Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006), seven principles of good feedback practice are mentioned:

1. *Good feedback helps clarify what good performance is*: Students need to know and understand the goals to achieve them, for that reason the role of feedback is to help to clarify what teachers or courses want. The best way to ensure that the goals are clear is to provide a written paper which includes the criteria and the standards with a specific definition of the level of achievement.

2. *Good feedback facilitates the development of self-assessment (reflection) in learning*: an effective way of encouraging reflection on the process of learning is self-assessment tasks; for this matter, teachers need to facilitate students' opportunities to monitor between them in order to recognize and be aware of their own errors. Peer process help to get the ability to make objective judgment.

3. *Good feedback delivers high quality information to students about their learning:* the information given by the teacher is a tool that students must use to solve problems in their learning, helping them to visualize in which level they are and in which level they must be.

4. *Good feedback encourages teacher and peer dialogue around learning*: feedback should not be seen as a transmission of information; it should promote dialogue between teachers and students to ensure that errors were understood by the student and at the same time they know how they can be corrected.

5. *Good feedback encourages positive motivational beliefs and self-esteem:* feedback does not mean to talk about failures, it refers to the provision of information about progress and achievement; in that sense, the way in which teachers provide feedback can or cannot affect internal factors that have effect in learning. The students need to know that feedback is an evaluation about a performance instead of the person.

6. *Good feedback provides opportunities to close the gap between current and desired performance*: Feedback supports the students during the process, guiding the performance to be better in the future since students have the opportunity to see what and how the next step is.

7. *Good feedback provides information to teachers that can be used to help shape the teaching:* Feedback is also important for the teachers because it helps to know what students need and what their deficiencies are to reflect on and take actions to improve the progress in their students.

These principles show the importance that this item has in education, and how a good managing of them can produce positive effects in students and also in learning, but it is also important to mention that feedback can be provided in written or aural way and can be presented in two different ways.

2.6.3. Types of feedback

There are different situations in which feedback can be placed either *positive* or *negative.* Ellis (2009) points out that feedback shows signals which appreciate or not the students' effort. In other words, feedback is not only used to highlight the aspects that students need to improve, but also to indicate that students are doing something good.

Positive feedback shows that students' job is done in a correct way, for instance, teachers express positive signals that appreciate students' work, some examples of these signals are "good job", "all right" and "excellent". These kinds of signals are supposed to affirm the response of the students in the activity, motivating them to improve their skills. However, in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) it does not receive the same importance because in some cases the expressions of "right" or "yes" gives learners the understanding that everything is correct, and they do not need to change anything in the utterance.

On the contrary, negative feedback emphasizes the mistakes students usually make in the process of learning a foreign language. Negative signals as "that's incorrect", "that does not sound right" and "it does not make sense" have the intention that the learner corrects the mistake in order to improve in the language. Negative feedback involves corrective feedback, which is recognized for giving clues to repair errors.

2.6.4 Corrective feedback

Corrective feedback is focused in the negotiation of meaning, and it develops accuracy in second language since "corrective feedback may help learners to notice linguistic forms that they might otherwise ignore and to identify how their deviant utterances differ from the linguistic norms of the language" (Ellis, 2005:19). In other words, in some cases students are not aware of the mistakes they made, but through corrective feedback provided by the teacher or their peers, they can notice that the utterance or the expression used has something wrong.

The aforementioned author also declares that corrective feedback is the learners functional provider of guidance in order to help students in their language learning process when they are not aware of their errors, mistakes or lack of certain knowledge. To put it in another way, corrective feedback is the information provided by the teacher or peers to help students to improve their language competence through the use of language analysis and reflection. In order to have good results, it is important for the teacher to inspire credibility on students, so that they will trust in his comments, and they will receive it in a positive way. Within corrective feedback, Ellis (2009) considers five main controversies that have taken place in pedagogy.

2.6.4.1. Controversies Regarding Corrective Feedback

As corrective feedback has their supporter in the educational field, retractors also express their discrepancies and talk about the controversies in the field of second language learning in both oral and written form. "The controversy concerning CF centers in a number

of issues: (1) whether CF contributes to Second Language (L2) acquisition, (2) which errors to correct, (3) who should do the correction (the teacher or the learner him/herself), (4) which type of CF is the most effective, and (5) what is the best timing for CF (immediate or delayed)" (Ellis, 2009a:4). In other words, the previous features should be taken into account at the moment of providing feedback, resulting for language teachers complicated to know how to provide effective corrective feedback. In spite of multiple studies made within this area, (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005) (Abukhadrah, 2012), (Kavaliauskiené & Anusiené,2012) among some others, there is not a conclusive answer for all these previous issues given the fact that they vary among the culture, the specific setting (primary, secondary, university learners, etc.) students' personalities, etc. Nevertheless, knowing the types of corrective feedback existent, teachers can found the most suitable way to correct students according to their personality. In the next session, the different ways to provide corrective feedback will be explained.

2.6.4.2. Types of corrective feedback (CF)

According to Lyster and Ranta (1997) there are six different types of corrective feedback to use in speaking skill in which teachers can be based to correct students' errors according to the need of the situation. They are grouped in a table to facilitate understanding.

Table 2

Type	Definition	Example
Explicit correction	To provide the correct form of the error.	S: I work in my com…..ter. (phonological error) T: Computer, we say computer.

Recast	Implicit way to provide correction.	S: I have class in Monday T: On Monday? S: oh yes on Monday, I have class on Monday.
Clarification request	To use phrases to indicate that something is not understandable.	S: I go to the swimming pool last weekend. T: Excuse me? I do not understand.
Metalinguistic clues	To ask question or make metalanguage comments without providing the correct form.	S: My father are a mechanic. T: If we are talking about third person, we say My father ….
Elicitation	To get the correct form by asking the students to complete the sentence or asking question to elicit the correct form.	S: the womans are at the spa T: Do we say womans or women? T: if you are talking about more than one woman we say the…..
Repetition	To repeat the student's errors emphasizing intonation.	S: I have a teeth ache (toothache) T: Teethache?

The types of corrective feedback in Table 2 helps the teacher to classify the mistakes and at the same time students can analyze the language and correct the mistakes by themselves, according to Tafani (2009) "Feedback is done to attract the attention of the students for the type of the mistakes and for repeated mistakes." p. 51.

A further study has added two more types of corrective feedback that are prompt and translation; in which Lyster and Mori (2006) (as cited in Rezaei, Mozaffari & Hatef, 2011) define prompt as a category of feedback that consists in the use of the compilation of four of

the different types of prompting moves mentioned beloved in Table 2, that includes:

elicitation, metalinguistic clue, clarification request, and repetition; offering learners the

opportunity to correct themselves and thus retain the right form. This type of corrective

feedback allows students to be aware of their errors in order to correct them by themselves.

The other type, Translation is seen as a way of showing a well-formed sentence of the

learner in another language that is not the target language. At the beginning it was seen as a

subcategory of recast but (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) cited in Rezaei, Mozaffari & Hatef (2011)

argue that recast is a way of showing an ill-formed sentence of the learner although both

recast and translation, have something in common and it indicates that there is an error in the

language's production of the learner. It provides positive evidence to the learner to correct the

error making a good comparison with another language. All this types of corrective feedback

can ensure the success in second language acquisition of a person.

2.6.4.3. Strategies of corrective feedback

Over the time, several studies have been conducted on how teachers provide corrective

feedback, and the results have shown a list of strategies, but these have led to development

strategies` taxonomy in a hierarchical order based on how corrective feedback operates in

language acquisition. In terms of oral corrective feedback two main distinctions are made;

implicit corrective feedback which refers to attract the learner's attention without overtly

informing that they made an error or without interrupting the flow of interaction vs **explicit**

corrective feedback that overtly draw learner's attention to the errors committed, and **input-

providing** in which teacher provides the correct form vs **output-prompting** in which students

have the opportunity to self-correction: the distinctions can be combined as Ellis (2009)

suggests in the table below:

Table 3. Taxonomy of corrective feedback strategies

	Implicit	Explicit
Input-providing	Recast	Explicit correction
Output-prompting	Repetition Clarification request	Metalinguistic correction Elicitation Paralinguistic signal

As we can compare between table 1 and 2 Ellis (2009) adds one different type of

feedback which is Paralinguistic signal, which consists in that the learner knows there is

something wrong through the uses of gestures and facial expressions. Example, learner says:

Tomorrow I go to dance. Teacher with the fingers shows that the sentence must be in future,

leaving one finger quiet and moving the other beyond.

In terms of teaching, the instructor should be aware of the strategy and the specific

type of corrective feedback. Ellis argues that most of the teachers believed that Input-

providing, specifically recast, is the most effective way to provide feedback because the

correction is given to the student; in contrast, the author cites Lyster (1998, 2004) who states

that output-prompting is better, because the students can correct themselves and it allows

students to control their own linguistic errors.

Brookhart (2008) claims other strategies to take into account at the moment to provide

good feedback; they can vary:

·   Timing: when and how often to give feedback.

·   Amount: what to correct.

·   Mode: Oral, written or visual/demonstration.

·   Audience: Individual or group class.

To summarize, there are many elements that can help or affect the process of giving feedback; for example, the most important aspect to highlight is that depending on the situation corrections can or cannot be effective.

2.6.4.4. Corrective feedback in speaking

In terms of **oral correction**, Thornbury (2007) agrees with Harmer (2007) that giving speaking feedback is not an easy job for teachers since they must select the aspects they will be focused on. In addition, Thornbury considers that interrupting learners in oral activities might disturb accuracy and fluency and students cannot be autonomous because correction is always given. That is to say, the flow of the interaction is important for the students in order to avoid frustration in the speaking activities; for that reason corrective feedback is recommended to be given at the end of the oral activity.

Besides, Harmer claims that feedback is not only for students but also for teachers, while students can see how easy they find speaking activities and what they need to improve, teachers can see how well their class is doing and what problems students are having. In speaking the teacher interruption is appropriate when students are repeating sentences or trying to get the right pronunciation; nevertheless, teachers must be careful in the way they make recommendations to do not produce negative effects in the student's attitude and motivation towards learning.

To summarize, giving feedback in speaking is an essential aspect in the process of learning a foreign language; the clue is to know how to give it in a correct way, what kind of feedback is more compatible with each kind of error and which of them show better results in

students' proficiency level. For the elements that speaking cover, as pronunciation, accuracy, fluency among others, there are some strategies that help teachers to give feedback in a better way.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Some studies have stated that there is a discrepancy between students and language professors regarding the preferred ways of providing corrective feedback. In fact, there is also a mismatch among the expected emotional reactions that students can experiment after being corrected from the professors' and students' points of view. In the following lines, the development and conclusions of some case studies regarding preferences and attitudes that language professors and university language learners have towards error correction in the oral interaction will be explained.

Kavaliauskienė and Anusienė (2012) examined two hypotheses in their quantitative case study of university students who were taking a course of English for Specific Purposes. The first hypothesis studied whether criticism has a negative impact on student confidence. The second hypothesis reviewed whether perceptions of feedback depend on professional specialization. Kavaliauskienė and Anusienė (2012) explored both hypotheses by investigating students of specialization in either penitentiary law or psychology that were currently studying English for Specific Purposes at the Faculty of Social Policy, Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius.

In this research, there were 24 students of psychology and 26 students of penitentiary law; they were predominantly females at intermediate English levels. In this case, learners spent 4 hours per week for 2 semesters in the foreign language learning process, which amounts to about 130 hours of English instruction. The authors collected the data by handing in a survey which was made on the basis of the standards for Surveys in Social Sciences (Dornyei, 2003). The obtained data was statistically processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

Kavaliauskienė and Anusienė (2012) reported in their results that the majority of participants felt that mistakes in learning are inevitable. In fact, 67% of the psychology students versus 86% of the penitentiary law students accepted that awareness of mistakes leads to language proficiency development. Secondly, 74% of the first group of students supported that they preferred professor's immediate correction of errors, as well as the 48% of the second group. The authors reckoned that this method seems to be evaluative rather than formative, and the false discernment of helpfulness of immediate correction probably shows respondents' experience at school, where some teachers feel it is their duty to make corrections as soon as possible.

Thirdly, the 97% of psychology learners and 91% penitentiary law participants agreed with the idea of effectiveness of correction; this clearly demonstrated learners' positive perception of correction. Fourthly, over half of respondents agreed with the point that it was hard to notice their mistakes (57% versus 55%); based on the authors, these results demonstrated the different natural point of view towards perception.

Fifthly, learners' attitudes to develop writing skills are predominant among other language skills inasmuch as statistics of responses reflected that: 88% of the first group and 94% of the second were aware of writing difficulties and potential pitfalls that they encountered in writing activities, so feedback seemed extremely important. Sixthly, students did not seem to worry about undermining their self-esteem: their responses were 39% versus 44%. Therefore, authors believed that it was good news for teachers due to the fact that error correction is not expected to affect the learners' motivation or willingness to improve the language skills.

Seventhly, the vast majority of students (94% against 98%) felt positive about usefulness of individual error correction as it facilitated personal learning. Finally, students did not find peer feedback beneficial—only a minority of students supported this statement.

During the development of the study, the authors determined a set of implications. To illustrate, they considered that there were a limited number of respondents. Thus, it might raise a question about the reliability of the findings, so the researchers recommended to do a further study into this issue. Moreover, they found out that the main implications of classroom management for professors are to monitor each student's performance in class activities closely, to give individual feedback for spoken and written product in order to avoid negative feedback all times.

As conclusion, Kavaliauskienė and Anusienė (2012) stated from their results that students of penitentiary law and psychology believed that in order to improve writing skills, learners should receive corrections of written work both on paper or submitted electronically. Finally, they affirmed that although participants were from different specialization programs, attitudes to feedback did not differ significantly.

Similar results were obtained from another study conducted by Abukhadrah (2012) in which 20 Arab male students were examined; they were over 23 years old, studied in a graduate program and were enrolled in an advanced English class at a Midwestern university; as well as, 10 native English teachers with certifications in TEFL.

For collecting data, he conducted some in-depth interviews to students and teachers, and observations of selected classes from the teachers interviewed throughout the study. The findings suggested students and teachers had a positive attitude about corrective feedback.

Also, both students and professors expressed that error correction is important for meaningful communication. However, 60% of the teachers thought corrective feedback raised learner's anxiety, whereas 80% students referred anxiety has no influence.

On the other hand, most of the students preferred grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary errors to be the main focus of correction; different from teachers that reported that semantic, grammatical pronunciation and syntactical errors should receive more attention. As a final point, students chose their favorite types of corrective feedback, being *metalinguistic* the most preferred type of correction (90%), then, *explicit feedback* (80%), next *elicitation* (65%), and lastly, *recast (*60%). In contrast, teachers had a preference for *recasts* (80%), and *elicitation* (70%).

This led the author to the conclusion that Arab male students have good attitudes concerning corrective feedback given the fact that they consider it as part of the process of learning. Furthermore, the study indicates that there is a mismatch between students' expectations and teachers' interpretations on the topic of types of errors that needs to be the center of correction and the most preferred types of corrective feedback. In this sense, the researcher proposes that the main reasons why those discrepancies arise are associated with teachers' beliefs considering the communicative approach as the best technique to develop learners' competencies, and the lack of awareness of students' real needs and objectives for learning the language.

Last but not least, the implications mentioned by the author indicate that more research about different types of population as beginners or intermediate language learners is required to carry out. In the same path, involving students' cross cultural differences, as well

as, other characteristics, such as age, gender, level of education and beliefs can smooth the

progress in order to achieve a more globalized perspective.

Following the line of attitudes towards corrective feedback, Hernandez, Reyes and

Murrieta (2010) determine the role of corrective feedback and the best way to provide it. As

they say that although the provision of corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom

seems natural in the process of learning a language, teacher's perception about it has been

changing through the time, and it is now an area of research.

The authors analyzed the role of corrective feedback and the techniques used in EFL

classes in an English language program at Universidad de Quintana Roo, Mexico. They

developed an exploratory study which integrated documentary and qualitative research.

Researchers interviewed five language instructors from the English language bachelors

program, which were selected according to the language level they teach and their

predisposition to participate in the study; all of them have a Master's program focused on

different areas of teaching English language and they also have a teaching experience from 4

to 10 years. The interviewer's questions were made based on the five main controversies

concerning corrective feedback highlighted by Ellis (2009) which Hernández, Reyes and

Murrieta reformulated in questions: does CF contribute to second language acquisition?,

Which errors need to be corrected?, who should correct? (The teacher or students themselves),

which type of CF is more effective? And when is better to give CF? But they focused in the

first three that cover the main issues of the paper. The semi-structured interview with about 20

questions was used. The interviews were recorded and analyzed to obtain the data collection.

The findings reported by the authors were divided in four sessions. The first, talk about the importance of corrective feedback in learning a foreign language, this must be at the beginning of the process in order to avoid fossilization in beginners, it is also important to consider students' attitudes toward corrective feedback to avoid harming the rapport in the classroom. In the second session, the attention is on the types of feedback that the instructors perceive in their lessons, which were classified into morphosyntactic and lexical errors. The two last sessions are about corrective feedback techniques used by the instructors and the effectiveness of corrective feedback; the study reveals that the instructors preferred the use of explicit correction (repetition, recast and metalinguistic feedback). Although most of the corrections are given to the whole class at the end of the speaking activities showing positive results; they are not planned and organized by the teacher. The implication that the researchers have is to think about whether teachers' intentions overlap with the learners' attitudes and emotions since they showed to pay attention to students' reactions at the moment to be corrected.

In fact, researchers concluded that there is a need for the instructors to be aware about the provision of corrective feedback, in order to use the different strategies in the way students perceive them clearly since the provision of this seems inconsistent, ambiguous or unsystematic because instructors are worried about students' feelings and emotions, and they do not want students to be demotivated; then, it becomes a need to find a way to provide corrective feedback in a systematic and conscious way.

As the previous study focus the professors' perceptions towards corrective feedback, Chu (2011) wants to emphasize the effects of corrective feedback in accuracy, as different studies have examined the effectiveness of corrective feedback in the communicative teaching

method and in task-based method, but they emphasize the effects on fluency, leaving aside accuracy and complexity; believing that they belong to fluency and they are not an important part of speaking (Chu, 2011).

The author points out the relevance that communicative teaching method and task-based teaching method have in English language classrooms now days, but at the same time he criticizes that both methods are more emphasized in fluency rather than accuracy and that many Second Language Acquisition researchers advocate eliminating corrective feedback in classroom interaction. For this reason, an experimental study is used to know if corrective feedback is an essential part in a foreign language teaching. To carry out this hypothesis, some questions are formulated: 1.Whether corrective feedback has a positive effect on improving oral English accuracy? 2.Two types of corrective feedback, which types have a better effect on English accuracy? 3.If corrective FB can improve oral English accuracy, but for the high\medium and low group of students, does it have the same improving effectiveness? The researcher analyzed the development of oral production, in three different groups of Second-year English majors guided by the same English teacher at Binzhou College in Shandong China, through the analysis of a pre-test, a post-test, classroom observation and interview during sixteen weeks; each participant have learned English for about 8 years, but they were located in different levels (high-medium-low) based on their linguistic accuracy.

The groups were named as control, experimental 1 and experimental 2. The control group did not receive corrective feedback during the study, the experimental 1 group received the types of corrective feedback that facilitates peer and self-repair called implicit correction such as (elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request and repetition), and the experimental 2 group was exposed to explicit correction and recast where the teacher just

rephrases learner output without pushes peer- or self- correct. According to the oral achievement each week three different participants were selected to be observed, recorded and assessed. The instructional treatment for data collection was based on Tohkyn & Wigglesworth′s (2000) "As-unit" (the Analysis of Speech Unit) for the material recorded, The SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) for the statistical analysis and One-Way ANOVA Analysis for the tests.

Chu, 2011 reported that the data of the two experimental groups showed a considerable improvement in the accuracy of oral English in post-test; the best result was evident in experimental 1 group which was focused on peer or self-correction given the fact that the descriptive statistics reported a lower ratio of error, in that way the results proved that the use of implicit corrective-feedback cause an important effect in learners speaking skill. On the other hand, the effectiveness of this study related to the level of each group is different because the low and the medium group had more time to improve during the process.

To conclude when students have the opportunity to compare and to be aware about their errors they can learn better, it is evident that corrective feedback has positive effects on improving oral accuracy. This study also proved the hypothesis that error correction during oral communicative activities has an important effect on students' oral achievement or proficiency. Finally, according to the two types of corrective feedback, the one that encourage learners' self-correction (implicit) is the most effective one in accuracy because it makes learners aware of their own errors.

4. METHODOLOGY

The research study was conducted with the purpose of highlighting the perceptions that professors and students of an English Language Teaching program have regarding oral corrective feedback in language classes. In order to carry out the mentioned research, the type of study that was selected, the context and setting where it was done, the participants involved, the methods considered to collect the data, the analysis of the information and the ethical considerations will be explained in the following chapter.

4.1. Type of Study

This research project was elaborated by the frame of a qualitative, descriptive, case study that for effects of clarity and comprehension will be divided into three different classifications that will be explained individually. The concepts will be presented respectively.

4.1.1. Qualitative research study

The present research is a qualitative study, considering that the educational scenario implies an analysis of the population, in matters of actions and perceptions. As proposed by Marguerite et al. (2006), qualitative research is based on the study of social factors where the considerations, beliefs and thoughts of the participants are taken into account (p.697).

Therefore, the data collection included the interpretation of the events happening inside the classroom, taking into consideration that a qualitative research study is based on the meticulous description of situations (Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun 2012). This type of study includes five characteristics that defines its core:

a. *The natural setting of the study as the main source of data where the researcher is an essential instrument*. In other words, the environment and the context of the study can supply valuable data for the project.

b. *The use of words instead of numbers in the data collection*, as behaviours, attitudes and actions makes unfeasible the collection of data through quantities, numbers or mathematical processes.

c. *Involving the researcher in the process and the result.* That is to say, the observer-researchers in this project should be engaged and attentive during the whole procedure since their observations will provide the conditions to get the most relevant findings for the case.

d. *The data collection examined during the study.* In this case, the information collected should be analyzed throughout the process, not at the end.

e. How the researcher reports people's thinking. This is precisely the main area of concern, which proceeded by its complexity, become a challenge for novice researchers (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, cited by Fraenkel, Wallen & Helen, 2012).

All these aspects were relevant at the moment to conduct this qualitative study given the fact that this project placed an emphasis on the interpretation of perceptions and actions of English language professors and students that belongs to an English Language Teaching Program at Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira, regarding corrective feedback in speaking skill taking into account lexical, phonological, syntax, sociolinguistics and pragmatic errors present in language courses.

Given these five characteristics concerning the use of a natural setting, the employment of words instead of numbers, the role of the researcher as an observer, the analysis of the data

during the process, and the researcher's ability of capturing the people's thinking can provide a trace to explain the characteristics of a descriptive study.

4.1.2. Descriptive research study

A descriptive research study was developed from the assumption that it is necessary to observe and describe events in order to collect educational evidences.

According to Best and Kahn (2006), a "research study describes and interprets conditions or relationships that exist, processes that are going on, effects that are evident, or trends that are developing" (p.118). In this sense, a descriptive research study helped to systematize students' reactions and teachers' actions regarding the performance of language errors and the provision of corrective feedback, in order to identify how can a thick description of events helped researchers to arrive to multiple conclusions.

Describing events enhanced new inquiries and solutions as it is explained by Simon (2012) a great part of educational descriptive studies have a relation cause and effect, in which is necessary to describe phenomena with the purpose to change instructional methods and practices. However, this project could not describe and analyze deeply all the population implied; that is why, a study where a small portion of the students was examined is going to be approached.

4.1.3. Case study

As this qualitative research study involved the analysis of contextual conditions, the research method addressed a case study which according to Lodico et al (2006) "has the intention to understand deeply what happens in one particular situation, group or an individual, looking for the meaning and the process" (p.237). In this sense, a small group of participants was analyzed in

detail, including all the specific elements which structure the social individual characteristics that at the end of the process were holistically jointed in this method.

To summarize, this research study integrated different types of studies including the qualitative study which considers that the observation of human actions requires the usage of words instead of numbers in both, collecting and analyzing data; furthermore, a descriptive type was approached in order to provide a detailed description of classroom events; and finally, a case study is contemplated on the grounds that just a small portion of the target population was analyzed throughout the project.

All these types of study were required to develop this research since their implementation supplied a thick perspective in the analysis of students' errors and English teachers' provision of corrective feedback. In this sense, a deep understanding of the environment in which the study was carried out, provided the sociocultural factors that encircle the target population and thus new corrective feedback perspectives in a specific domain.

4.2. Context and setting

This study took place inside of the sessions of Licenciatura en Lengua Inglesa program (LLI), from Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira in Pereira, Colombia. This program has as central objectives to train EFL teachers- researchers that can be integral in the pedagogical and the research practice, and to enhance professionalism capable to adapt to educational, cultural and social demands proposed by the Ministry of Education and other regional educational entities.

The program involve 10 semesters where the first five semesters are focalized in the improvement of English communicative competence, and the other five semesters are implemented a content based instruction model. In this case, the current research focalized on

language subjects from first to fifth semester, enclosing the following subjects: Basic English, Pre-intermediate English, Intermediate English, Upper intermediate English, Advanced Grammar and Academic Discourse I and II; departing from the assumption that university students taking these courses are expected to commit errors and mistakes frequently that language teachers are more willing to correct, emphasizing the form and not in the content of the discourse.

Considering the pedagogical tools present in this program, the pedagogical models become from general concern. In this sense, the ELT degree is formed by the humanistic, constructivist, reflective- critical pedagogy model in which students are expected to be integral professionals, willing to apply the knowledge conceived in the program in a Colombian context, to be aware of social problematic and to reflect upon their performance, and their strategies to fit with realistic problems.

Finally, each language course is guided, generally by teachers- authorities in the field and educational directors of different academic areas in the program. However, following institutional policies, sometimes professors should guide new subjects, involving them in constant professional challenges.

4.3. Participants

For this study, three types of participants were involved: professors and students, in order to understand the different perspectives of each population, and the researchers who assumed the role of complete observers as stated in the following paragraphs.

4.3.1. Professors

The participants of this study were seven male and female professors that teach language courses in an English Language Teaching program from a T-state University in Pereira,

Colombia. These candidates were professors with ages ranging between 24 and 55 years old; they were selected through non-random sample since the selection was determined by the courses instead of the professor as Fraenkel & Wallen (2009) suggested, non random sample is when in the population not all the participants have the same possibility to be selected.

The method use in non-random sample is the purposive, in which the authors said that the population is selected by the specific purpose of the research adding a personal judgment. According to this study, the prior knowledge of the subjects to be selected within the English Language Teaching program determined that method.

4.3.2. Students

The current research included a group of undergraduate students from a 10 semesters English Language Teaching program (ELT). The target population was composed by the whole group of each subject, where their interventions were used for collecting the data to fulfill the observation grids . However, 15 students were selected for conducting individual interviews, including men and women, ranging between first and fifth semester, and their ages oscillated among 16 and more than 23 years old.

The participants were chosen through non-random sample, also called purposive sampling which consists of selecting the population according to a set of rules or participants' profile rubrics, pursuing the main purpose of the study, so the general population do not have the same possibilities to be selected. In this sense, the factor which provided a precedent to the selection of a specific population was the choice of a group of language courses in the program and not the students' or teachers profiles.

In addition, the current researchers composed by a man and 3 women from the same ELT program offered by a State University were seen also as other type of population, and their function in the project was to adopt the role of researchers- observers as it will be explained further in the next session.

4.3.2. Researchers' role.

The researchers' role refers to the function or responsibility researchers performed during the collection of data; in this study the role assumed was as an observer, in which there is not any opportunity to participate in classroom events, nor suggest activities to be executed during the observations. This role required to implement some aspects mentioned in Merriam (2009), these included: the manner to notice issues going beyond seeing things which were not revealed solely by the interviews, the use of knowledge and experiences to analyze what was observed.

Based on the previous statement, the researcher's role in this study was focused on the direction of patterns of communication used by professors to correct errors in oral interaction. To develop this, the researchers did not do any intervention, remaining the intention of not affecting the situation; for that reason, they were complete observers as Fraenkel and Wallen (2009) declare, the complete observer is the one that does not have many opportunities to affect the process or activities of the observed group.

The researchers in this study were observing and taking notes in detail of what happened in the group or with an individual to collect data. Therefore, the following paragraph will specify the instruments of data collection that were used in the study.

4.4. Methods of data collection

The methods were instruments used in a research process in order to collect data and information that will be used as evidence for further analysis to arrive to findings. In the current research, the methods assembled included observations, questionnaires, interviews and observation grids. Besides this, observations of classroom events were an important method to collect data due to the fact that this provided evidence about individual and social reactions towards the correction of spoken language mistakes within a class.

4.4.1. Observation

According to Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun (2012) most qualitative research projects require observing people or objects patterns; for that reason, one of the methods of data collection for this study was the observation. In addition, there are different ways to observe according to the particularity of each situation. These are divided into participant and nonparticipant observation, as well as, naturalistic and simulating observations; in order to carry out this study, nonparticipant and naturalistic observations were developed.

Nonparticipants observation refers to the one in which the observers are not involved in the activities (Fraenkel and Wallen; 2009). In this way, the researchers just observed what happened in the classroom without interventions of any kind, so the role of nonparticipants was focused on the different kinds of errors that were presented in oral activities, and also on the kind of feedback provided for each of them.

Naturalist observations, on the other hand, are the ones where the researcher does not modify the situations in the classroom or the actions of the observed people; thus, the classroom events were observed as they occurred by themselves; it means the classes that were analyzed in

this project, were prepared by professors and were carried out without any intervention from the observers.

In this way, seven language courses were observed twice, in which two researchers examined students' interventions and the professor's performance. The observation sessions took from one hour to one hour and a half. These participants were analyzed through an observation grid, looking for the types of errors committed in the foreign language, the students' reactions and the use or overlooking of corrective feedback provided by professors and classmates as it is going to be explained in the next lines.

4.4.2. Observation grid

The observation grid, as it is stated by Burke (1993), is an instrument for examining specific abilities, behaviors or attitudes of particular students or all the learners in a class. This technique is commonly used in language classrooms as a way of testing formative assessment tasks. However, the observation grid was used to gather information during and after the observation of classroom events.

This grid consisted of two charts, one for examining error performance and the other for describing the type of corrective feedback given. The first chart included error codes, which are symbols that express different language mistakes committed by EFL learners, in order to let researchers know which language items students failed to perform, including some error categories, such as: Lexical, Phonological, Syntax, Sociolinguistic and Pragmatic errors; these main divisions involved subcategories suggested by Corder's taxonomy (1973), such as: Addition, Omission and some others with certain adaptations made through some pilot tests implemented in different language courses.

In addition, the second chart included feedback codes, consisting of symbols that stated the clarification or correction of the errors committed in the oral interaction; they were described in order to determine the most common types of feedback made during oral interaction activities, and explore the different reactions students normally showed when they were corrected. Finally, a third piece was added to this grid, involving guided questions about the physical environment, type of activities made in class, and others that enhanced the researcher to write descriptively; furthermore, there was a space for comments used for special remarks and relevant events, that could become pertinent for the study. Thus, each observer had this tool during each observation. (See appendix 1)

Observations provided to the project a great understanding of feedback practices and students' reactions within a class; however, given the fact that this method might include researchers' inferences that sometimes can lead to partial points of view, other methods that involve researchers - participants direct interaction were implemented with the purpose to gather students' and professor's personal criterion. In this case, interviews and questionnaires were chosen to meet this necessity.

4.4.3. Interviewing.

Interviewing can be described as "an important way for a researcher to check the accuracy of-, to verify or refute-, the impressions he or she has gained through observation" (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012, p. 450). In this sense, interviews are ways to complement the information collected through observations.

Interviewing is defined as a set of formal questions that are designed to obtain specific responses; so a face to face interview was conducted to 15 students individually during the research process in order to obtain enough information about students' preferences, and reactions

towards error correction (See appendix 2). These interviews were recorded with the purpose to have access to the information in any time of the process, being this method reliable in contrast to taking notes or filling forms. This aspect was notified to participants as it is mentioned in the ethical considerations.

4.4.4. Virtual questionnaire

According to Meho (2006) virtual questionnaire is a type of interview categorized as "interview Online, asynchronous and in- depth interviewing" (p.1284), which is responsible for collecting information that participants voluntarily share and which will not be seen or influenced by other participants. This type of interview was done in order to help people who prefer to be interviewed virtually instead of face-to-face, as well as, people who live in geographically far away places. For the implementation of this study due to professors' multiple occupations, and the difficulty to find them in a specific time, virtual questionnaire were used; one virtual questionnaire was sent to each professor's e-mail to be developed through Google questionnaire platform (7 virtual questionnaires as a total) with the purpose to meet professors' beliefs, perceptions and experiences towards corrective feedback (See appendix 3 & 4).

Taking into account this project is a qualitative research, the methods for collecting data were based on the observation of attitudes and reactions towards feedback, as well as, interviews that permitted a clear approximation of populations' beliefs and feelings from previous English language courses experiences. Nevertheless, the analysis of this information collected was required in order to arrive to findings and conclusions of the study. The following session will discuss the methods for examining the data collected.

4.5. Data analysis.

Once the researchers have collected the data, it was necessary to interpret and analyze it correctly in matters of reliability in the study. Indeed, according to Northern Illinois University (n.d.), data analysis consists on a process where logical and statistical methods are used to interpret and evaluate data. In this scenario, the following techniques were used to reflect upon collected information. In this study, the data analysis was examined through priory theory and grounded theory.

4.5.1. Grounded theory

The concept of grounded theory has evolved along the years. Strauss and Corbin (1993) conceived it as a way for understanding a specific situation with the purpose to elaborate interpretations that will lead to the analysis of collected behaviors of individuals which will supply the basis for building up a theory ; in other words, this method is executed with the purpose to comprehend a specific issue through the analysis of the population's acts, behaviors and reactions that can be analyzed through what the researcher observes, reads or hears in order to create an hypothesis. In this sense, grounded theory was perceived either as a method for collecting data or as a data analysis instrument.

In contrast, Scott (2009) conceived grounded theory as a data analysis method "that will enable you to develop a theory which offers an explanation about the main concern of the population of your substantive area and how that concern is resolved or processed" (p.1). That is to say, through the grounded theory method the researcher will construct a theory that could provide an explanation to the area of concern.

The grounded theory developed in this project followed the steps suggested by Glaser

and Strauss (1967) based on their qualitative analysis model called the "Constant Comparative

Method" consisting of a combination of constant comparisons were all relevant data is coded to

generate "new categories and their properties, hypotheses and interrelated hypotheses" (p. 101-

102). That is, the data collected is divided, joining similar situations and characteristics into

patterns, and those patterns are arranged in categories in order to create suitable hypotheses,

seeking for describing what happens and explaining the possible reasons to those situations. The

next stages were followed during data analysis.

4.5.2.1. Transcriptions

The information collected through observations was first hand written in the observation

grid, and then written digitally. In this case, two observers per class wrote their own versions,

incorporating individual detailed descriptions of each class event, leaving as a result 28 class'

transcriptions (7 classes observed twice, by two observers). The next picture shows how one of

the researchers filled out the observation grid after the second observation of the Conversation II

class:

Table . Sample data collected from observations (Handwritten in the observation grid).

Transcriptions of questionnaires, on the other hand, consisted of the compilation of the opinions given by professors, in a platform created specially for the questionnaire, in which six transcriptions were the result of the professors' answers. The following table represents how the information gathered through this method looked like:

	F	G	H
1	How long have you been teaching	What type of errors do you correct in class?	Which do you consider more important to correct?
3		Syntactic, Lexical, Sociolinguistic, Pronunciation	I would say it probably depends on the topic at har
4	10 years	Lexical, Pronunciation	Grammar mistakes and pronunciation
5	3 years	Syntactic, Lexical, Pronunciation	Missing words, collocation errors and pronunciatio
6	1 year and two months	Syntactic, Lexical, Pronunciation	Pronunciation beucase that is the way people can

Table   . Sample data collected from questionnaires (Taken from Google Forms)

Finally, recorded interviews were transcribed digitally, where each question was followed by the answers of each participant as the next sample will show:

> **2. Which errors do you think teachers should correct?**
>
> **P1:** "It also depends of the semester, but in the first learning stages is important to correct the pronunciation. Other errors are also important, but I think phonological errors should be corrected".
>
> **P2:** "All of them. Emphasize just in one? Like pronunciation. You can know all the grammar, but if you go into a classroom as a teacher, and you do not know how to pronounce well, I don't matter your studies, you won't get respect from me".
>
> **P3:** Pues yo creo que todos, pero en si los sintácticos porque los lexicales si ya uno… eso es muy autónomo.

Table . Sample data collected from recorded interviews (Transcriptions).

4.5.2.2. Coding and categorizing:

For this second stage, observations transcripts were read for finding similarities between them; thus, these similarities were highlighted with specific colors and then, categories were created fitting with the multiple variables. According to Glaser and Strauss (1967), the first step to analyze the data is to "compare incidents applicable to each category" where the researcher should begin to code each incident into as many categories as possible, doing it with as much information as it emerges from data (p.105). Therefore, several categories related to the errors' performance, feedback provision and omission, students' and professors' reactions, and some others were created as soon as researchers saw there were similar patterns found in data. The next example taken from the analysis of questionnaires demonstrates the way categories were shaped:

Corrections at the end of the activity

P3 85: After the activity finishes

P2 97-99: In some activities such as oral presentations or role plays, I consider feedback shouldn't be provided at the moment but rather after the activities have finished since in such activities fluency tends to be favored over accuracy.

P4 105-107: Because it is important and necessary to let students produce speech without any constraint. After speech has been produced, specific errors may be pointed out as they can be contextualized to specific situations that may involve sociolinguistic issues.

Table . Coding and categorizing of questionnaires.

In that way, for organizing and facilitating the analysis of the information taken from observations, different codes were created in order to know the evidences' origin. Codes for the triangulation of the observations were built from the initial of the first name of each observer (S= Sandra, D= Diana,etc.), followed by the initials of each course (AD= Advanced Discourse, C2= Conversation II, etc) and finishing in the number of the observation (O1= Observation I, O2=

Observation II); the following is a complete example of the codification from observations' transcriptions:

Example: MBEO1:Miguel Basic English Observation I

The following are all the variables for the codes:

1. (M= Miguel, S= Sandra, D= Diana, N= Nathalia)

2. (BE= Basic English, PE= Pre-intermediate English, IE= Intermediate English,   AD= Academic Discourse, P1= Pronunciation I, P2= Pronunciation II, C2= Conversation II)

3. (O1= Observation I, O2= Observation II)

Questionnaires, on the other hand were grouped into categories where a code was created, which represented the number of the professor, signalling the order in which the professor answered the questionnaire (P1= Professor 1,... until P6= Professor 6), and the page where the answer was found.

Example: P3 189: Participant #3/ page #189

Interviews were also grouped into categories, and a series of codes were created, representing the number of the participant (S1= Student 1, S4= Students 4, etc.).

4.5.2.3. Grouping and integration of categories.

 Categories already existent were joined with other categories that presented similarities; thus, there were less categories with broader content. In this sense, Glaser and Strauss (1967) mention for this stage of analysis, different categories and their properties become integrated through constant comparisons to other categories, emerging a theory.

This analysis reduced the quantity of categories, creating broader titles that encompassed more related information from multiple categories, first for the observation method, and then

gathering resemblances among interviews and questionnaires. The next sample shows how

grouping was made with interviews:

TITLES	CATEGORIES
Common errors corrected by professors in oral activities	Phonetic errors are one of the most corrected in language classes
	Lexical errors are one of the most corrected in language classes
	Syntactic errors are one of the most corrected in language classes
	Sociolinguistic or pragmatic errors are one of the most corrected in language classes

Table . Sample of grouping for interviews

4.5.2.4. Delimiting the theory.

Once a group of defined titles were found, a reduction of terminolog lead to an

integration of titles and the creation of a broader title that could embrace the aforementioned into

a general pattern. Reduction of terminology is explained by Glasser and Strauss (1967) as "the

discovery of underlying uniformities in the original set of categories, and can then formulate a

theory" (p.108). In other words, a reduction of terminology is made as a result of finding more

commonalities between categories, where a theory can arise. In this sense, a theory emerged

through the triangulation of information taken from the different methods for collecting data, and

the information obtained from the theoretical framework, getting as a result sufficient evidences

for defending the theory found by researchers, generating a finding.

4.6 Ethical Considerations

The current research followed and respected the ethical considerations proposed by Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun (2012) for a qualitative study. These are: first, to protect the identity of people involve in the study, ensuring that the information collected was carefully used to avoid shamefulness or prejudice. This purpose could be achieved through the use of pseudonyms or names, such as *participant one, participant two*. Besides, participants were notified that If at any time the investigation needed to use their names, they had the right to withdraw the participation in the study whenever the participant considered it prudent.

Secondly, people who participated in the study were treated with respect and had clear their role in the study, as well as, the purposes and interests of the project. In this sense, a previous notification- in this case a consent letter- was handed in during interviews and questionnaires, mentioning the participants' rights, benefits, their tasks, what the project is about, and other aspects that could allow them to have complete knowledge of what they had to do to contribute to the project (See appendix 4); in the same manner, devices for recording voice during interviews, were reported and showed previously to participants, so based on this, they could take the decision to take part or withdraw of the project in the moment they decided it.

Finally, participants were ensured that under no circumstances, they would encounter situations that promote physical or psychological aggression. Thus, participants could freely contribute to the project's development, respecting their rights and their information in order to have a good experience as objects of research.

The development of this project depended on a thorough analysis of the data collected from students and professors' answers, expecting all the aspects taken into consideration in the

methodology could solve the inquiries existing in regards to this topic. In this sense, the

following section will describe the findings related to the purpose of this study

5. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, three findings categorized in different sections which aim at developing and answering the main research questions and its two sub-questions are going to be presented. Each finding will be supported and presented with data provided by the researches from the different instruments of data collection.

5.1 Awareness and unawareness of the oral feedback strategies implemented by the Professors

This finding refers to the types of feedback strategies professors from language courses provide learners when errors are presented in oral activities. The strategies used are either consciously or unconsciously used; consciously professors know exactly when and how to correct and unconsciously they use them but do not use them appropriately. Some of the strategies that will be presented in this finding were suggested by Lyster and Ranta (1997) Elicitation, Metalinguistic cue, Explicit correction, Repetition, Clarification request and Recast which are used by professors at the moment to correct students syntactic, lexical, pronunciation, sociolinguistic and pragmatic errors produced by the learners when developing different types of oral activities. These feedback strategies were later divided into explicit or implicit by Ellis (2009) in the following way. The explicit corrections refer to correction given by the professors using strategies such as: Elicitation, Metalinguistic cue and Explicit correction, and the implicit strategies are Repetition, Clarification request and Recast.

During the data collection process in the language courses at an English Teaching Program it was evident that professors are not familiar with the use of all these strategies; therefore they were classified in two categories, as mentioned above consciously and

unconsciously. Firstly, we will start by presenting the results obtained where professors show the lack of awareness on the implementation of some feedback strategies, such as Elicitation and Metalinguistic cue, then we will continue with professor's awareness on the provision of feedback strategies including Explicit and Recast.

5.1.1 Unawareness of oral feedback strategies implemented by the Professors

The following results focus on the provision of two types of explicit correction given by professors, Elicitation and Metalinguistic cue in which the intention at the beginning was to overtly draw learners' attention to the errors committed, but at the end, the professors provided the correct form of the error taking away the real intention of the strategies which was the self-repair, in these cases the professors had difficulties providing implicit corrections.

5.1.1.1 Unawareness of the Elicitation Corrective Feedback

Elicitation feedback or direct Elicitation, as called by Nassaji (2015); has the purpose to get the correct form of language from the learner by asking him/her to complete a sentence or to reformulate it, in order to give him/her the opportunity to identify the error and to correct it by him/herself. Nonetheless, through the data analysis, some examples of elicitation strategies were used mistakenly by the professor when she tried to provide feedback to the students to make him see his mistake when he was in a discussion in groups; this example was seen in BE course:

DBEO1- The professor asked the question "She study or studies?"

- The professor said: "remember she studies".

In this case, the professor questioned the student, providing the wrong and the right form of the word, with the intention to allow the student to recognize his grammar error, and select the correct form; however, after the professor asked the question, she did not give the student the opportunity to analyze and respond the question, instead she immediately provided the correct form "remember she studies". Based on this, it can be said that even though the professor uses the strategy to correct learner's mistakes, the professor may not be familiar with the right way to implement it. The professor tried to elicit the right answer from the learners; however, she did not give him enough time to process and analyze what she had said.

Other samples of the use of Elicitation were evidenced in the professor of P2 course in which students were involved in a group discussion activity about the stress of some words given by the professor.

SP2O2 – The professor asked "Concurrent", how do you pronounce it? Some

students said: con<u>cu</u>rrent others: con<u>cu</u>rrent

- Then the professor said: it's con<u>cu</u>rrent.

SP2O2: The professor gave the word "register",

- The students acted it, but the stress varied in each group between <u>re</u>gister and re<u>gi</u>ster.

- The professor asked them: is it right or wrong? pointing to <u>re</u>gister,

- Some students hesitated

-The professor also said: and is it the stress of the verb or of the noun?

-Students did not answer,

-then the professor provided the answer: as a noun or as a verb it is the same <u>register</u>,

-And student said: ahhh! Ya.

Both samples presented above show professor use of Elicitation to point out learners stress errors. The data reveal that professor used this strategy, as she gave students some words they may have doubts in the stress. At the beginning this strategy was used properly, as the professor directly elicits the correct form from the student by asking questions, as the professor gave students the opportunity to discuss and perform how they thought was the correct form of each word; nevertheless as some of them were not sure, the professor provided the correct form, for instance as the final result was not the students correct form of the word; then the learners were not given the opportunity to reflect upon their mistakes, using other strategies as looking in their dictionaries or in their notebooks.

5.1.1.2 Unawareness of the Metalinguistic cue Feedback

Metalinguistic cue is another kind of explicit feedback used by professors of that program; it refers to the use of questions or comments to indicate that there is an error. Although the purpose of this strategy is to give students the opportunity to discover their

errors by providing them a metalinguistic signal or cue; the professors denied the students the possibility to self-repair their mistake, due to that the professors did not provide this type of feedback correctly as they gave the correction to the learners before they even had the chance to answer.

Data showed other samples of incorrect feedback; the first sample was taken from PE where the professor pointed some students who should read a sentence from a worksheet.

SPE01: - The student said "e-ve-ning" (evening)

-The professor explained that it is just one syllable at the beginning of the word, saying "/ˈiv·nɪŋ/"

-The student repeated it "/ˈiv·nɪŋ/".

In another sample taken from P1 class, the professor asked learners to provide examples with a specific phoneme:

DP102- the students said birthday /ˈbə:deɪ/ instead of ˈ/bə:θdeɪ/,

-the professor explained the error, in which phoneme was.

-Later the professor said: /bə:θdeɪ/, showing the pronunciation of the phoneme.

Both samples presented above show professors use of metalinguistic cue to point out learners pronunciation errors. The data reveal a clear evidence of how the professors from different language courses used this strategy, as they emphasize the error by cutting the word into syllables and by modeling the correct form of the word; again, the learners were not given the opportunity to reflect upon their mistakes. As it is evident the professors had the intention to give the learners the chance to repair their mistakes. Nevertheless, the objective of the strategy was deviated as self-correction was not achieved due to that the student lacked time to assimilate the error because the professor immediately gave the right answer.

Another sample of the use of Metalinguistic cue was evidenced in the professor of BE course in which students were involved in a post reading activity, answering some questions:

DBE02-Student said: castle /ˈkaːstel/

- The professor wrote the phonemes /ˈkæs·əl/ and explained that the word has a silent letter "t" that they should omit at the moment to pronounce it.

In this case, the professor gave the learner a clear explanation using phonetic symbols, this type of explanation belongs to the metalinguistic cue since he intended for the student to identify the error by him/herself, understand it and correct it, with the analysis that he had provided; instead the professor gave the answer that is to say, the focus of the strategy was left out in the sense that the student should be given space to interpret which was the error.

Through the data analysis, it was perceived that Elicitation and Metalinguistic cue correction were not given appropriately owing to professors' lack of certain attention about the use of this two specific feedback strategies. To illustrate this, it was found that Elicitation correction was given at the beginning as it should be done, asking the student to reformulate the sentence just as suggested by Lyster and Ranta (1997), nonetheless it failed when the professor did not give the student an opportunity to repair the error by him/herself. Following the same line, it was commonly perceived that professors did not only provide the metalinguistic comment or cue, but they also gave the correct form of the word, excluding the student's error recognition and self-repair. It is important to go deeper into the knowledge that professors have about the use of these correction strategies.

Furthermore, Lyster and Ranta (1997) cited by Chu (2001) in a study concerning effects of teachers' corrective feedback in accuracy, they make a distinction between two different categories of feedback correction: peer and self-repair (elicitation, metalinguistic cue, clarification request and repetition), and the one that does not push peer and self-repair (explicit and recast) demonstrating that the category in which peer and self-repair have better effects on students accuracy, called negotiation of form in which metalinguistic and elicitation correction are including. According to the observations and the data analysis of the current study it was evident that in these two types of feedback the students did not achieve the purpose of self or peer correction strategy due to the fact that the professor did not allow a negotiation but instead they gave the learner the solution. Therefore, the result of this finding Elicitation and Metalinguistic cue strategies, the professor who implemented them are not totally aware of the use of these strategy and even though they invite students to correct their

errors and reinforce their language deviations, they incorrectly use the feedback strategies and thus they do not comply with its objective.

5.1.2 Awareness of the oral feedback strategies implemented by the Professors

During the data collection and data analysis it was found that some professors are conscious of how to provide certain types of feedback and they use them often in the classes. This finding will be divided into two different types of strategies that professors use, explicit correction feedback itself and Recast.

5.1.2.1 Awareness of the Explicit Corrective Feedback

The data collected through the analysis showed that professors use Explicit correction accurately, which is based on the provision of the correct form of a learner's language error in a direct way; the purpose of this type of feedback provided by the professor is to indicate the learners that they have made a mistake and thus call their attention on that specific error. In the following samples, can be identified the professor's explicit correction provided to the learner with correct form plus additional comments to avoid confusions. This was taken from the observation in BE class:

DBEO2- the student said: Near to the beach;

The professor said: "you do not say near to, just near, ok?"

In this sample the professor provided the correct form and clarified the error to make sure that the learner understood the difference between one and the other, in this case he provided the correct usage of a preposition. We may say that in this type of feedback, in which the professor corrects the learner, the learners do not have to worry about making any effort the students are focused on the correction and they can repair it easily.

This same Explicit corrective feedback was also seen in an observation of the AD class, where students were describing some elements using fillers:

SAD02- Student had a stress error saying repeatedly: b<u>u</u>ttons /bɔːt'əns/

- And the professor said: Carolina is buttons /ˈbʌt.ən/ be careful with that.

In the previous sample, the student mispronounce a word several times, and the professor of AD course, provided the correction in the way that the student was able to recognize what the error was; for that reason, the professor called the student's attention by calling out her name and staring at her. Based on the observation we can infer that the professor realized that the student had fossilized the wrong pronunciation of the word, he called out her named, modeled the right pronunciation and advised her to be attentive, in order to correct her mistake. Another example of explicit correction was retrieved from AD observation in which students were involved in an oral presentation:

MADO1- the student said: I take into account (the student was speaking about past

actions)

The professor said: You took into account (making stress in the past tense verb)

The data suggest that the student committed a tense error; the professor indicated the

learner that his utterance was incorrect by showing him the specific error then he directly told

him the correct way to say it. We identified that in this kind of explicit correction if the

professor makes the clarifications and gives the correct form of the words or expressions the

student tries to quietly articulate the right way.

Finally, an evidence of explicit feedback was retrieved from P1 where the students

should give examples of a specific phoneme:

DP102- the student said /tɪŋk/ instead of /θɪŋk/

-the professor gave the correct pronunciation of the word showing the position of the

tongue in the phoneme /θ/.

In this situation where the student confused the pronunciation of the phonemes, the

professor both, modeled and showed the students how to articulate it with the tongue position,

asking indirectly students to do it. As P1 is part of the first semester curriculum, we can say

that professor are concerned with students' pronunciation errors and also to provide a type of correction in which students can assimilate and internalized it.

From the examples above, it is possible to see the effectiveness of these types of corrective feedback. In agreement, students in the interview argue that explicit correction is a very useful strategy, because it avoids ambiguity and clearly allow them to recognize their errors. Next, some samples are given:

Interviewer: How do you prefer being corrected explicitly or   implicitly?

S1.I1: "explicit because when it is in the other way around, I am not sure of what the professor is correcting. I cannot even notice if the teacher is giving feedback, but explicitly, you know exactly what is your error and how is the correct way".

S9.I1: "la corrección explícita es la mejor, porque uno ve el error de una y no se pone uno a echar cabeza si lo corrigen a uno o simplemente le complementaron la respuesta. Usted sabe que cuando lo corrigen a uno por los laditos o indirectamente, siempre queda uno confundido y sin poder saber si dijo algo malo o el profesor le gustó lo que usted dijo".

In these samples, it is clear that students' prefer explicit correction on the grounds that it draws their attention and they can easily detect or notice the error and also to correct it,

different from the implicit correction that sometimes it can be obscure and leave the student

with doubts and would not be able to correct it by themselves or it may take too much effort

and time. According to Ellis (2009) and the information presented above, explicit corrective

feedback is essential and effective in the speaking skill; since this correction directly allows

the student to recognize the error made. Based on the previous results, explicit correction

showed positive results in the sense that students have the possibility to identify immediately

the correction. Then, it was seen the acceptance of this strategy by students of the program, in

the way that it is clear and it is well done by professors. As Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006)

argue that good feedback "delivers high quality information to students about their learning"

(p.15). That is to say, the information given by the professor is a tool that students must use to

solve problems in their learning, helping them to visualize in which level they must be and

how to overcome these problems.

5.1.2.2 Awareness of Recast feedback

Recast is a corrective feedback strategy that was given in a suitable way during the

data analysis, it consists in an indirect way to provide correction; in which the professor

reformulates the error or provides the correction in a way that students can deduce it, Nassaji

(2015) argues that recast does not provide a clear and explicit indication that the learner's

utterance contains an error. One example of this is evident in C2 class, where the professor

asked questions and students answer them:

   SC201- Student said "Words short",

-The professor: restated the whole idea that the student said including the words well

organized "short words" and continued with the topic.

In this sample, the student committed a word order error in which professor provided the correction rephrasing student's idea well organized, in the way the student could notice the error committed without explain what was wrong. In this case, the teacher assumed that the learner got the idea since he continue explained his topic, but there was no specific reactions of the learner to demonstrate that it was taken or not. Another example, retrieved from AD class where they were performing a role play:

MAD01- S*tudent said: noun phrases as / nɔːʊn ˈfraːses/,*

Professor: immediately corrected him by saying /naʊn ˈfreɪzɪz/.

Student: repeated the word / nɔːʊn ˈfraːses/, but committed the same mispronunciation

and continue speaking without realizing his error.

In this sample, it could be observed that the provision of the feedback was made correctly, but it was not effective, in the sense that the student committed the same pronunciation error after professor's feedback; this happened because the provision of this feedback is made in isolation, without error's clarification, for that reason this type of correction was ambiguous for the learner to understand. We can deduce that sometimes this implicit correction is not enough for the learners if it is not followed by clarification on the

error; but here it is important to highlight that AD is from sixth semester, for that reason students must be able to identify all those kinds of feedback strategies, in that sense, students are not taking advantage of the different types of feedback uses to improve and to enrich their professional teaching development.

This finding reveals that also professor conducted a well implementation of this type of feedback; students' recognition is not evident in most of the cases talking about Recast as the implicit strategy. Base on previous studies conducted about the use of corrective feedback in oral activities, implicit correction is one of the commonly used types of correction although this cannot have positive results on the students recognition; Hernandez et al (2010) find in one of their studies that teachers are aware that with the use of implicit feedback strategies such as recast, some students do not even notice the correction; however, they insisted in using this type of correction over more explicit ways of corrective feedback; this is supported by Lyster and Ranta (1997) who argue that implicit correction is not always appreciated by the learners as an attempt of correction given the fact that it is much more subtle than explicit.

On the other hand, it was found the lack of studies that analyze this specific aspect of correction, the awareness and unawareness in the use of corrective feedback has not been a topic of study, Elsaghaye (2014) analyzed many studies in corrective feedback to conclude that research on the effectiveness and the possible effects of each type of corrective feedback individually is a need.

5.2 Immediate or delayed time to provide oral corrective feedback during oral activities.

This finding refers to the specific time in which the professor decides to give corrective

feedback in oral activities; this can be done during or after the presentations or discussion.

Brookhart (2008) states that time is another feedback strategy that can be considered in the

way that when and how often feedback should be provided.

5.2.1 Immediately feedback provision

Immediately feedback refers to the provision of corrective feedback at the time the

error is made interrupting students' performance. Data from our analysis showed that

professor tended to provide the correction at the moment in which the error has been made

interrupting students' oral performance. To illustrate this, some examples were taken from

professors' questionnaire in which they answer to: *"When do you consider errors need to be*

corrected?"

.

> *P2: "During class discussion or students' participation in class (because a question*
>
> *was asked or were asked to read or respond any sort of question) feedback should*
>
> *be given right after students' intervention because corrections on the spot seem to*
>
> *have a greater impact"*

P1. The moment of error correction is completely linked to the objectives of the lesson, if the aim of the session is to use a complex sentences accurately, I will be giving feedback at the same time that the student is performing

The previous examples showed that professors from language courses select to correct the students' errors at the time based on the activities they are developing, it shows that the time of feedback provision depends on the activity; to support this, there are some examples taken from observation of P1 class, and from BE class, in which students were discussing in groups about the pronunciation of a list of words and how to performance a monologue:

DP101- the students said: genie /dʒe:ˈni/,

Immediately the teacher gave the correct form: /ˈdʒiːni/.

DBE01- The student said: she study and the teacher

Immediately made the correction: She study or studies?

In these examples, the professors provided the correction at the time that the errors were made; in that way, the professors interrupted the student's performance to provide the correct form without generate negative effects in their performance since students were part of a discussion opposed when they are in a role play or in an oral presentation; Brookhart

(2008) claims that "Feedback needs to come while students are still mindful of the topic, assignment, or performance in question"(p.10); it means that when feedback is provided it is important that the students are yet involved in the oral activity to assimilate the origin of that feedback in order to hear it. Another example about immediately feedback provision is taken from P1 where students were reading aloud the lyrics of a song:

DP101: the students said: /le:st/ instead of /læst/, immediately students committed the error the teacher said the correct pronunciation of the word and repeated it three or four times.

Based on previous professors' statements, in this example it is possible to analyze that professor provided immediately feedback because students' performance could not be affected in the fact that the activity they were developing was a reading activity and it does not produce damage on fluency. Opposite to immediate feedback, we will continue with delayed feedback strategy.

5.2.2 Delayed feedback provision

Delayed feedback refers to the provision of corrective feedback at the end of student's performance to do not affect the students' flow during the presentation. To support the previous statement, some extracts taken from the transcriptions from BE and IE, where in the first students were presenting a classmate's biography, and in the second, students were

involved in a role play; demonstrated that professors prefer to provide correction at the end of the oral performance:

> *DBE01- Students: She likes really travel cooking, She has twenty years old, it is a small city?*

> *-The correction for those errors was at the end of the oral presentations because during the student's presentation any intervention to correct errors had place.*

> *-Professor: When you talk about likes the verb is with ing: traveling, working, etc.*

> *-Professor: for the age is not she has, is: she is, he is, in Spanish is: ella tiene pero en ingles no.*

> *-Professor: is not it is, is: is it or remember the auxiliaries Do and Does to make questions*

> *NIE02- Student: people doesn't matter if help the planet or not.*

> *-The professor at the end of the intervention explained students the use of the expression "matter", and its difference with "care about".*

> *-Professor: Do you know what matter means?*

> *-Students: sin importancia*

> *-Professor: yes but in this situation it is better to say: care about.*

For these situations, the students were involved in oral presentations which were developed in front of the class; the provision of the feedback was at the end of the oral presentation making emphasis on each of the errors committed by the students, it was observed that the professor was paying carefully attention on their performance and taking notes to later provide an adequate correction.

Based on the previous data, professors did not interrupt students' presentation, because they did not want to disturb the flow of their performance as Thornbury (2007) considers that interrupting learners in certain oral activities might disturb accuracy and fluency, and also if the correction is always given, the development of the student's autonomy is not allowed.

In concordance with the analysis of the data, a study carried out at Universidad of Quintana Roo, Mexico (2012) demonstrates that professors stipulate the correction time based on fluency or accuracy; it means, if professors point out to encourage fluency, they prefer to delay the correction, but if their intention is to encourage accuracy, both immediate or delayed corrective feedback can be used. This fact demonstrates that professors from this language teaching program have a clear purpose at the moment to decide when to provide oral correction, they are aware of the benefits of immediate and delayed correction time to improve the speaking skill.

Another important fact is that studies as Quinn (2004) reported that immediate and delayed feedback can affect students emotions in both positive and negative ways, since they can feel embarrassed to be corrected during certain types of activities or if they are corrected

or not in front of their classmates. The results of this study coincide with the previous fact in which professors expressed concern about students' emotions and feelings, they avoid this kind of situation to do not affect their language motivation, and also because they said that it is too complicated to repair a student's damage.

5.3 Professors' perceptions about the use of corrective feedback in speaking activities

The following finding reports professors' perception about the use of corrective feedback in oral activities in different language courses, how important consider student's feelings at the moment to correct them is, and also what students' preferences and reaction towards correction are from professors' perspective. The instruments used for the analysis were the professors' questionnaire, the students' interview and class observations.

5.3.1 The impact of oral corrective feedback in students' emotional factors

The provision of corrective feedback varies according to the way professors perceive their students' emotions and attitudes, since the manner in which students receive feedback may affect the results of the correction, as students can assume that it is made just to see their errors and not the language production, or in other cases they can assume it in a positive way in order to improve their failures. For this reason, professors want to prevent negative reactions towards correction and make students feel confident and comfortable during the process of assimilation of their errors.

5.3.1.1 Consideration of students' personality

This result revealed that professors who participated in this study considered that students' personality to be a relevant aspect to be considered before and at the moment to provide oral correction since students' personalities vary and they perceive correction in different ways, positive or negative. To illustrate this, the following excerpts were analyzed considering professors' awareness on the topic.

These excerpts were taken from professors' questionnaires in which they replied to: "Do you consider students personality before correct him/her?And Explain".

P4 "*YES, Not all students have the cognitive or emotional maturity that critical thinking requires for accepting corrections*"

P4 "*Most of them have the tendency to take error correction as a personal threat rather than as an opportunity to grow*"

In the previous sample, the professor was conscious that student' age and the maturity degree affects the manner students receive correction, the professors clearly express that if students are not aware of their learning process, and the benefits that corrective feedback has for their professional development, they can perceive correction as a negative act. As mentioned by one the professors critical thinking plays an important role in the way learners see and reflect in their process. This state is concordance with the definition given by the Critical Thinking Community (2013) which states that critical thinking is the process in which

people analyze, evaluate and reconstruct the mode of thinking. From the professors point of view students are not aware of the impact of correction since they have not internalized this disciplined process considering that the nature of correcting is no other than to aid students to progress and to reduce the risk of fossilization. When students are mature, they can internalized and evaluate the impact of what the professor is transmitting to improve their language learning.

Another important aspect to highlight is the fact that the professor relates emotional maturity to the way students perceive and feel the correction; Brown (2000) states that "affecting domain is the emotional side of human behavior that may be juxtaposed to the cognitive side" p 1. In that way, during the correction, students may feel threatened and the professor may be criticized, judging their performance instead of helping and supporting them and their language improvement.

Taking into consideration the negative affective factors, some researchers have discussed this topic; an example of this is Krashen (1982:75) who argues that in the speaking skill corrective feedback has not opportunity, because it is harmful to language learning as it "has the immediate effect of putting the student on the defensive". But in other studies it reveals that corrective feedback can benefit second language learning (Lyster, 1998), also as Ellis (2009) argues, corrective feedback is a reinforcement to provide the learner some motivational tools to continue learning, and it cannot works as a punishment because it can cause a negative effect in the learning process. Following the same line, the last two samples also support the importance of student's personalities in oral corrective feedback:

P6 "personality factors are key on the way they receive feedback"

P3 "Insecure students must be corrected wisely not to be offended or not to create low self-esteem."

Here the professors proposed that personality has an important place in the provision of feedback, it means that oral corrective feedback is given tactfully to prevent students' negative responses which can lead a lack of motivation to learn. As Ellis cited by Siddiqui (2009) noted that it should be given neither in an exaggerated way nor in a limited way, given the fact that great amounts of feedback tend to lower self-esteem since students will notice the intention of the teacher to correct all the mistakes. On the other case, restrict the use of feedback denies the opportunity to learn from the mistakes students make. Linking with students' personality from the professors' point of view at the moment to be corrected, their preferences will be taken in the next part.

5.3.1.2 Professors' perception about students' preferences towards oral correction

Professors use different strategies to provide feedback and also they do it in different ways. Corrective feedback can be given individually, pointing one of the students but in front of the group, collectively provided to the whole group regardless of who committed the error; or face to face a personalized correction. During the analysis of the data, we can see that professors are aware on how their students prefer to be corrected; as the following examples:

P2 *"Students expect to be corrected individually rather than collective feedback, they seem to prefer corrections that focus on their individual needs"*

P5 *"Most of the students I have worked with have a high level of motivation towards learning, and are the students who ask for feedback and correction. I know* students prefer face to face because they feel somehow ashamed and embarrassed when corrections are given in front of the rest of the class"

In the first previous sample, the professor perception was that students are concern in their individually development, for that reason their priority is to know what they specially need to be in charge in their learning improvement since collective correction can be ambiguous avoiding errors and feedback recognition by the students. Another sample of this also supports the previous statement about students' feelings and the reason of their corrective preferences:

From this data analysis of the second sample, we deduce that the professor used their previous experiences working on correction to work in favor of the students avoiding to put them on the spot, in the correction it is important to know what students prefer in order to help them to assimilate it in a positive way. In general, professors think that students prefer to be corrected in an individual and confident manner, since according to the professor, students refuse to be exposed or ridiculed in front of their classmates and for that reason their preferences towards how corrective feedback must be given is face to face, or also called personal correction. In the same way, data analysis supports this statement from the students

point of view, since most of the students agree on to be corrected face to face and individually

instead of in front of their classmates; as the following samples show:

 S4: *"Prefiero la segunda. Cara a cara pero sin la presencia de mis compañeros, que*

 sea de forma aislada".

 S5: *"Yo preferiría cara cara no en medio de la clase porque eso sería algo*

 vergonzoso".

 S6: *"No me gusta en frente de la clase porque delante de los compañeros es muy*

 maluco porque todo mundo se da cuenta que cometió un error y usted sabe que hay

 compañeros muy burleteros".

The previous examples showed that face to face is the way that students prefer to be

corrected but at the same time they demonstrated that student's' preference for this specific

way to be corrected is based on their feelings, they do not want to feel ridiculed or judged by

their classmates, it is something unexpected and it is given because the Colombian culture

tend to scoff the others; students are concerned what others can say about their proficiency

level since when corrective feedback is collectively given, weaknesses are exposed affecting

emotional factors. On the other hand, some students express to pay attention on how the

professors provide the correction instead of what strategy they use:

S9: "Yo diría que eso va en la seguridad de la persona y de cómo lo corrijan a uno,

Es que hay profesores que le dan el feedback a uno de manera muy directa y como

cortante, entonces eso afecta y pues yo me siento maluco o incomodo cuando es así".

S15: "Pues yo no tengo problema con que sea al frente de la clase o cara a cara

siempre que lo hagan de una manera respetuosa porque siempre hay profesores que

son muy rudos, no miden sus palabras para corregir al estudiante".

The previous statements showed that the professor's actions at the moment to provide

correction affect the way how students perceive oral correction, students are conscious about

their errors and on the fact that they must be corrected in order to improve their speaking skill,

but they refused the idea to be exposed to judgment with the use of feedback; if they perceive

the correction in a cordial and subtle way they will feel comfortable with their position, and

the correction will have positive reactions in students' perception during individually or

collectively correction; besides, through the data analysis, we discovered that students started

to be concern about their personal improvement in the way that they want to know which are

their specific errors and to know how overcome them, for that reason they prefer to be

corrected individually; as these examples:

S9: "yo prefiero individual porque es más personal el feedback. Porque

colectivo es maluco porque uno no sabe que dijo bien y que dijo mal"

S15: "Yo lo prefiero individualmente, porque muchas veces dan el feedback colectivo y uno no es consciente del error que uno cometió y entonces hasta a veces uno ignora".

S5: Yo creo que ambas maneras tienen sus ventajas y desventajas, una de las ventajas de hacerlo individualmente es que es directo y entonces ella le dice a usted sus errores específicos entonces usted podría trabajar para mejorar en ellos.

This showed that students are responsible for their learning process and they are looking for strategies to reinforce their language weaknesses. Related to professors, although the data revealed that they are aware of students' preferences, in most of the cases they provide corrective feedback collectively, to the whole group or in front of the whole class in which students know who committed the error, something that students avoid to do not feel embarrassed; as an example:

DBEO1: immediately students committed the error the teacher said the correct pronunciation of the word and repeated it three or four times.

DBE01: The socialization of those error was at the end of the class, where students and teacher socialized each of the error committed.

DIE02: When the students finish their presentation, the professor provide the correction in an explicit way.

Hernandez and Reyes (2012) stated in one of their studies that individual corrective feedback is more effective due to the fact that students are more awareness of their own error and notice what the correction is, but they also found that teachers see individual feedback as an inhibitor, something that prevent students' participation causing damage in students' feelings, for that reason they are in favor of group correction. Following the line of students' preferences, the next part will treat the students' reactions towards the correction according to the professors' experiences.

5.3.1.3 Professors' perception about students' reaction towards correction received in oral activities

The way how students receive corrective feedback generates positive or negative experiences in the learning process given the fact that it can or not stimulate the desire of improve language skills more even in speaking skill where students need to acquire a good proficiency level to be competent using the language orally. This study demonstrated that professors from the licenciatura program are aware of how their feedback is received by students:

P2: "Most of times students' reactions are positive and feel thankful about it. Some others learners feel "guilty" and less confident"

In this specific case, the professor wanted to show that not all the students perceive the correction in the same way since the grade of confidence vary in each person and also because some of the students are more aware that correction is necessary in learning and for that reason their response is more positive than the others who received this as a judgment. The following example supports this:

P1: "some of the students accept and respect the feedback; some others feel that there is a personal issue between the teacher and them"

Here the professor expressed that students can perceive corrective feedback as a confrontation; in that way, their reaction could be negative because they are not conscious on the benefits and effects that it can cause in their process of learning. It means that those students are not familiarized with the term corrective feedback and for instance they make difficult for the professor to provide a good and fruitful feedback. Another example about is:

P3: "most of them are aware of the importance of learning through error correction"

The following example showed that the provision of corrective feedback is not completely received in a positive way. Here it is important to highlight that the students from this program will be English teachers and for that reason the acceptance of correction should be taken professionally and it should be seen as a great learning tool.

Opposite to professor's perception, students interviewed expressed that they receive corrective feedback in a positive way, they also demonstrated to have knowledge about the importance of be corrected. The following examples illustrate this contrast:

P7: always when I'm corrected I try to do things better, to study more.

P11: I take it into account for a next opportunity. I try to don't repeat the mistakes.

P14: Me pasan dos cosas. Una, le agradezco al profesor y segunda, si es un error que fue muy grande, ahí sí me siento un poco frustrada, pero siempre le agradezco al profesor. Pues tomó en cuenta el error.

P5: Primero que todo, le agradezco al profesor y lo tomó en cuenta para una próxima ocasión. Pues, claro, eso depende de cómo lo corrijan a uno. Eso es demasiado importante.

The previous samples demonstrated that students are conscious about the importance of corrective feedback; they showed the desire to improve their speaking skill taking into account the corrections and recommendations that professor provided them. Students also showed gratitude and respect to professor's' intention to help them to improve in the learning process.

Something important is that in the last example the student expressed that her reaction towards correction depends on the way how it is given by the professor, it is the statement that we have been detecting through the whole study.

A study developed in China by Ni (2012) supports this finding because it illustrates the importance of learners' affective factors in second language acquisition to improve the methods of English teaching. Ni analyzes the psychological factors in psycholinguistic field to apply them to English teaching in order to find that affective factors decide the proportion of language learners' input and intake, since good students usually have low anxiety, high motivation and much self-confidence than others who need teacher's better correct guidance on their affective factors. This study also states that in terms of learners' attitudes toward teacher's feedback, there is a positive attitude, but there is a concern about the specific way of corrective feedback adopted by teachers given the fact that feedback and guidance contribute greatly to students' emotional states, especially their motivation, self-confidence and anxiety; the author suggests that an appropriate teacher guidance and advice will encourage high willingness to participate, better students' effort to learn, and also greater general success in language performance.

Following the same line, a study carried out in Misurata, Lybia aimed to analyze how learners emotionally respond to the oral feedback process in L2 classrooms and to what extent teachers' oral corrective feedback may influence their motivations and attitudes towards L2 learning, Elsaghaye (2014) supports what we found since the author states that EFL learners emotionally respond to teachers' oral corrective feedback in different ways due to most of the learners find teachers' oral corrective feedback helpful; they expect and wish to be corrected regularly in classroom settings in contrast to others who are worried about making oral

mistakes and to be corrected, they feel that corrective feedback is embarrassing. The author

suggests that the way teachers provide oral corrective feedback may influence on learners'

feelings and attitudes, especially when they are unable to understand the type of correction

that the teacher is providing; for that reason, based on several studies developed in corrective

feedback Elsaghaye (2014) states that there is a need to study the effectiveness or rather the

possible effects of each type of corrective feedback separately.

   Finally, Zhu (2010) found in his study that Chinese college students are accustomed to

teacher correction and most of them prefer that the teacher correct them every mistake since

if the teacher is strict with them, they would make greater progress in their language learning;

however, these students demonstrated to be afraid of being laughed at by others at the moment

to be corrected, they do not like that the teacher makes the correction aloud; Zhu Argues that

this behavior can make them lose their confidence, he also mentioned that students would like

that the teacher appreciates their progress and makes some positive comments on their

performance instead to recognize their errors, although individual students differ from each

other in their attitudes towards errors and error correction.

6. LIMITATIONS

This study was conducted in a public university which implies certain situations that could interfere or limit its development. Firstly, this research was made in a T-state University in Pereira, Colombia with a selected number of participants, professors and undergraduate students enrolled to a language teaching program. Hence, the findings from this study could not be used to other university programs in the area since they are specific to English Language Teaching programs.

Taking into account the aforementioned, there were several inconveniences in terms of the availability of time and willingness of participation when collecting data from students and professors' responses. To illustrate, taking into account professors' multiple occupations have, a virtual questionnaire was sent to their personal email with two weeks in advance; the transcription of data had to be postpone due to the delay of some professors' responses. On the other hand, researchers reckoned that students had more availability of time, so they sent formal emails inviting students to be part of face to face interviews. Nevertheless, only 3 out of 20 students replied to the email invitation and just those who were called by phone attended the appointment.

Secondly, although each instrument was piloted before, some of them presented difficulties, so they had to be modified at the last moment. In particular, the observation grid instrument was complex to fill since the spaces for writing were too narrow to widely describe some details, such as: class activities and student's reactions. Hence, a second chart containing feedback codes and students' reactions cases were added, as well as a third page,

involving a space for special remarks and guided questions that enhanced the researcher to write descriptively; in addition, the virtual questionnaires and the face to face interviews had some issues regarding the specificity of participants' responses since the questionnaire did not allow professors to provide wide information given the fact that some multiple choice questions were not configured to allow the expansion or explanation of the answers, so these responses were limited to a single word. For interviews, on the other hand, researchers noticed there was some information missing that could be relevant for the triangulation with the observation data, so some extra questions were added to fit this necessity during the process.

Thirdly, some students' misconceptions regarding definitions of items during interviews altered the perceptions of some of the participants. To illustrate, students in lower semesters have unclear or do not have depth knowledge in regards to the concepts of sociolinguistics and pragmatics; therefore, only students from fifth semester gave a special value to the role of these concepts at the moment of correcting errors. Moreover, some interviewees perceived the explicit correction as cutting, impolite or rude, so their responses reflected this type of feedback as disrespectful whilst some of them made the distinction that this sort of feedback should be given in a polite form. Thus, the misunderstanding of the explicit or direct correction affected the students' responses. Finally, although observations attempted to explore communicative language errors, such as linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic errors, there was little evidence in matters of sociolinguistic and pragmatic skill. Therefore, the first finding just could focus on the linguistic component.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Undoubtedly, corrective feedback has a special place in teaching and learning a second language, the success of it depends on how teachers use the different types of feedback to help students' recognition of their errors. Speaking is one of the most demanding productive parts of the language in which students have to take into account several aspects to be competent in this skill. To consider the context in which this study was developed, professors have the responsibility to encourage students to self-repair being conscious of their errors and also the appropriate correction, given the fact that they are going to be English teachers, for that reason, they need to identify what corrective feedback is and its different types.

The instruments used in this research study help us to identify the inconsistencies that arise in the provision of corrective feedback into the language courses involved in this study. Although in the questionnaire professors demonstrated to be aware of the importance of that corrective feedback has in learning a language, the observations showed that corrective feedback provision is not given in a conscious way because it was possible identify that some corrective feedback' types are not used during the classes, and also that some of them are not provided in an appropriate way. However, something to highlight is that professors have stipulated the appropriate time in which correction cannot affect students' performance based on the speaking activity that students are facing, in that sense, they are concern on students' feelings and reactions towards correction.

Considering the aim of our study, the perception that professors from this language teaching program have about corrective feedback is not compatible with what it is perceived

into the classrooms. Nevertheless, this fact could be the result of professors' concern on students' feelings at the moment to be corrected, they demonstrated to be aware of the negative effects that correction can produce in the language learning process, avoiding students' participation in class; however, it is necessary to highlight that the students mentioned by the professors are not language' learners, those students are involved in a language teaching program, for that reason they should be familiar with the term Correction.

At this point, corrective feedback by professors is seen in an overall way, it is basically divided into implicit and explicit. The different types of feedback in which both explicit and explicit are divided are not taking into account as they require; in that sense, the findings of this study evidence similar problems found in previous studies developed by (Hernandez, Reyes & Murrieta, 2010; Hernandez & Reyes, 2012) in which corrective feedback seems to be random and unsystematic, inconsistent and ambiguous. In that sense, the overview that students have towards correction had been restricted, they did not have the opportunity to explore and accept each of them to understand their individual purpose.

To conclude, professors perceive corrective feedback in a positive way, they are conscious of the effects that it produces during the process of learning and they also know how their students perceive the correction that they are providing. However, they need to know the purpose of each type of feedback, to plan and organize their feedback sessions in the way that the students of this language teaching program assimilate them as part of their professional growth instead of their language learning process.

8. PEDAGOGICAL AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

8.1 Pedagogical Implications

This chapter will explore the different pedagogical implications that professors and language teachers can take into consideration in their teaching practices. Secondly, the research implications can lead researchers to figure out possible subjects that can be addressed in further research.

First of all, EFL professors should avoid correcting all the mistakes students commit due to the fact that overcorrection can provoke negative reactions, such as anxiety, frustration, lack of motivation and unwillingness to participate. In this case, correcting just deviations related to the subject matter can let students to express their message without any constraint, enhance participation and make them focus on the purpose of the task rather than on linguistic forms.

Another feature that is worth to mention is the fact of considering the personality and feelings of students when correcting errors in oral activities. In this sense, professors should be tactful to provide feedback, especially when giving explicit correction given the fact that this kind of feedback is very direct, and once it is given on the spot, students may feel vulnerable and their affective filter can increase. Therefore, analyzing students' personality can lead professors to determine whether to use explicit correction with a specific individual or not.

Another relevant pedagogical implication is that professors can avoid oral feedback provision in determined situations. That is, overlooking errors deliberately specifically when

they want students to develop fluency rather than accuracy through oral tasks, when they want to give more relevance to the message or to the following of instructions instead of the language form or when they plan in advance to provide delay feedback in an oral performance task.

8.2 Research Implications

The results of this project suggest that for further research, investigators can inquiry about the consequences of the transference of oral errors by professors or by classmates. In other words, during some classes there were inaccurate corrections provided by the professor as well as by classmates that may lead students to assimilate these errors in the speech as correct. Therefore, investigators could explore the source and the influence of oral error transfer over students in EFL classes.

Future research should also investigate which are the students and professors' perceptions about group and peer correction. For instance, during the observations of classes, there were some activities which included peer and group feedback provision among learners. Thus, researchers could analyze why professors implement this kind of feedback in class, and also they could interpret the students' feelings and thoughts toward feedback provision given by their classmates.

As a final recommendation, researchers might consider to conduct this study with other target population including undergraduate students from different programs, learners from secondary schools, or students from English language institutes. Particularly, the participants of this research differ from other populations as they are enrolled on a language

teaching program where they have been exposed to different pedagogical subjects that have made them aware of their future role as language teachers from the beginning, so their perspective towards error correction can be as a teacher in development rather than a EFL student. Thus, replicating this study involving other type of populations can lead to different results given the fact that their perspectives and reactions may not be the same as the participants of this study.

.

9. REFERENCES

Abukhadrah, Q. A. (2012). *Arab male students' preferences for oral corrective feedback a case study* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ohio University, March.

Al-Jawi, F. D (2010).*Teaching the receptive skills*. Listening & Reading skills. Umm Al Qura University,Saudi Arabia. Retrieved from: https://old.uqu.edu.sa/files2/tiny_mce/plugins/filemanager/files/4281126/lectures_of_Methodology_2/receptive_skills.pdf

Alvarado, L. (2013). Identifying factor causing difficulties to productive skills among foreign language learners. *Opening Writing Doors, 10*(2), 55-55. Retrieved February 25, 2015. http://revistas.unipamplona.edu.co/ojs_viceinves/index.php/OWD/article/view/376/392

Arias, E., Ramos, D., & Cárdenas, C. (2013). Retos y realidades de la enseñanza del inglés en Colombia [Challenges and Realities of Teaching English in Colombia].

Antonacci, P. A., & O`Callaghan. C. M. (2012). *Promoting Literacy Development: 50 Research-based strategies for K-8 learners*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Bashir, M., Azeem M., & Hussain A. (2011). Factor Effecting Students' English Speaking Skills. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences.* 2 (1) 35-50 Retrieved, May 15, 2015, from: http://www.bjournal.co.uk/paper/bjass_2_1/bjass_02_01_04.pdf

Bashrin, S. D. (2013) *Productive skills: Teaching beginners in English medium school*. (Unpublished report) BRAC University, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

Best, J., & Kahn, J. (2006). Descriptive Studies: Assessment, Evaluation, and Research. In *Research in Education* (3rd ed., Vol. 1, p. 118). Boston, Massachusetts: Pearson Education.

Bin, Z. Saidna (2011) *Teaching Speaking Effectively*. Teaching English As Foreign Language (TEFL)*.* (Unpublished master's thesis) State University of Makassar. Retrieved, May 15, 2015, from: http://www.academia.edu/8491040/TEACHING_SPEAKING_EFFECTIVELY

Birch, B., M. (2014). *English grammar pedagogy. A global perspective* (1st ed.). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Brookhart, Susan M. "Feedback: an overview". *How to give effective feedback to your students* (pp 4-7): Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2008. Retrieved March 7, 2015, from: http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/108019.aspx

Brown, D. H. (2000). Personality Factors. In *Principles of language learning & teaching.* (4th ed, pp.142-152) New York:Longman.

Brown, D. (2000). Cross-Linguistic Influence and Learner Language. In *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (4th ed., pp. 216-226). New York: Pearson Education

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (2003). Linguistic forms and functions. In *Discourse Analysis* (13th ed., pp. 4-9). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H. Douglas (2001) Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy. 2nd ed.White Plains, NY: Longman. Retrieved May 15, 2015, from: https://pedufopenglish.files.wordpress.com/2014/06/teaching-by-principles-douglas-brown.pdf

Brown, S. (2007). Feedback & feed-forward.Bulletin, 22, Centre for Bioscience. Retrieved March 7, 2015, from: www.bioscience.heacademy.ac.uk

Burke, K. (1993). What are observation checklists? In *How to Assess Authentic Learning* , (1st ed., p. 106). California: IRI/Skyiight Publishing.

Burt, M. (1975). Error Analysis in the Adult EFL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly,, 9*(1), 56-57.

Chu, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in oral English accuracy development.*Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(5), 454-459. Foreign language college of Tianjin polytechnic university, Tianjin, China. Retrieved from http://www.ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/tpls/article/viewFile/010545445 9/3074

Corder, S. (1967). The Significance of Learners` Errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 5*(4), 167-167.

Corder, S.P. (1973). *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. (PP. 274-277). Harmondsworth: Penguin Education.

Council of Europe (2011). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Council of Europe.

Davies, P., & Pearse, E. (2002). *Success in English Teaching*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

DeWald, K. M., & DeWald, B. R. (2011). *Participant Observation; A Guide For Fieldworkers*. Lanham,MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Dinçer, A., Yesilyurt, S., &Göksu.A. (2012). Promoting Speaking Accuracy and Fluency in Foreign Language Classroom: A Closer Look at English Speaking Classrooms. *Journal of Education Faculty*. 14 (1) Erzincan University, Turkey.

Dinero, R. (2013, August 21). La apertura económica. Retrieved March 17, 2015. (Translation made by authors) Retrieved from: http://www.dinero.com/edicion-impresa/caratula/articulo/la-apertura-economica/ 182405

Doff, A. (1988). Peerwork and group work. In *Teach English Teacher's Workbook* (p. 57). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dulay, H. & M.K. Burt. (1973). "Should We Teach Children Syntax?". *Language Learning* 23/2: 245-258.

Dulay, H., M.K. Burt & S. Krashen. (1982). *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Edge, J. (1997). Mistakes of form. In *Mistakes and Corrections* (7th ed., pp. 9-11). New York: Longman pearson.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2005). *Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Ministry of Education. Available online at http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/__data/assets/ pdf_file/0008/6983/instructed-second-language.pdf

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1): 3-18. Retrieved from: http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2504d6w3#page-1

Elsaghayer, M (2014). Affective Damage to Oral Corrective Feedback among Students in Libyan Secondary Schools. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 4. 6, 74-82.Retrieved from: http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jrme/papers/Vol-4%20Issue-6/Version-2/L04627482.pdf

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. 1983. Strategies in interlanguage communication. London: Longman.

Fernández Planas, A. M. (2005). *Así se habla. Nociones fundamentales de*

fonética general y española. Barcelona: Horsori Editorial. (Translation made by authors)

Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N. (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th ed.).* San Francisco State University: McGraw-Hill.

Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (8th ed.).* San Francisco State University: McGraw-Hill. p. 438

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis. In *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-111). Aldine Transaction.

Guerrero, R. (2004). Introduction. In *Task complexity and L2 narrative oral production* (p. 1). Barcelona.

Haines, S. (1995). Peer work. In *Modern English teacher* (1st ed., Vol. 1, p. 55, 58). Cambridge University Press.

Harmer, J (2007). How to teach speaking. In *How to teach English an Introduction to the Practice of English Language Teaching* (pp. 87-94). Cambridge UK: Person Logman.

Harmer, J. (2011). Mistakes and feedback. In *The practice of English language teaching* (7th ed., pp. 137-138). Cambridge: Pearson Longman.

Hedge, T. (1993) Key concepts in ELT: Fluency. ELT Journal Volume 47(3) (pp.275-277) Oxford University Press

Hernández, E., & Reyes, M. (2012). Teachers' Perceptions About Oral Corrective Feedback and Their Practice in EFL Classrooms. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 14(2), 8. Retrieved May 03, 2016, from *http://www.revistas.unal.edu.co/index.php/profile/article/view/34053/40664*

Hernández, E., Reyes, M., and Murrieta, G. (2012).Oral corrective feedback by EFL teachers at Universidad de Quintana Roo. *Memorias del VI foro de estudios en lenguas Internacional, 6,* 240-253 Retrievedfrom: http://fel.uqroo.mx/adminfile/files/memorias/hernandez_mendez_edith_et_al_2.pdf

Zhu, H. (2010). An Analysis of College Students' Attitudes towards Error Correction in EFL Context. *English Language Teaching* ELT, 3 (4), 127-131. doi:10.5539/elt.v3n4p127 Retrieved from: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1081995.pdf

Hussein, A. (2010) Learner's error and errors analysis. [slides share format] Taken from: http://es.slideshare.net/ahmedhussein192/error-analysis-22882508

Jaeger, J. (2004). Chapter 1.4 Classification of system. In *Kids' slips: What Young Learners Children's Slips of the Tongue Reveal About Language Development* (Vol. 1, pp. 22-25). Psychology Press.

Jing, W.U. (2006). Integrating skills for teaching EFL—Activity design for the communicative classroom. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 3(12).

Jonhson, E. R. *Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. RTI strategies for content learning.* Sacramento, 2012. Print.

Karimi, M. (2014). The Impact of Teacher's Implicit versus Explicit Corrective Feedback on Learning L2 grammar by Iranian English learners. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 4*(4), 232. Retrieved April 29, 2016, from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download;jsessionid =D6F6D4A931F350150F531B24D2567277?doi=10.1.1.685.2629&rep=rep1&type =pdf

Kavaliauskienė, G., &Anusienė, L. (2012). Case study: learner attitudes towards the correction of mistakes. S*ocial technologies,1*(2), 88–101-88–101. Retrieved February 17, 2015, from http://www.mruni.eu/en/mokslo_darbai/st/archyvas/dwn.php?id=326546

Kerr, J. (2010). ELICOS conference Melbourne Australia.

Krashen, S., Burt, M., & Dulay, H. (1982). Errors. In *Language Two* (1st ed., pp. 150-163). New York: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practices of second language acquisition.*   Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S.D. (1988) *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning.* Prentice-Hall International.

Lane, L (2010). Tips for Teaching Pronunciation. *Person education. Methodology in Language Teaching: And Antology or Current Practice.* In Richards, J. & Rendya , W (2012) (Eds) Teaching pronunciation (pp. 175-188). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lee. (2008). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 144-155. Retrieved April 12, 2016, from http://www.fed.cuhk.edu.hk/~aflwrite/article/Student reactions to teacher feedback.pdf

Lei, C. (2012). Relations among Peer Feedback, Writing Performance and Writing Improvement: Evidence from a Writing Class in China. *Reflecting Education, 28*(1), 10. Retrieved April 5, 2016.

Lyster, R. and Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66. Retrieved from: http://people.mcgill.ca/files/roy.lyster/Lyster_Ranta1997_SSLA.pdf

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning,* 48, 183-218. Retrieved from: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-9922.00039/pdf

Lodico, Marguerite G., Spaulding, Dean T. & Voegtle, Katherine H. (2006) *Methods in educational research: from theory to practice* (3rd ed., Vol. 1, p. 237- 697). United states of America: Jossey-Bass.

Loewen, S. & Reinders, H. (2011). *Key concepts in second language acquisition* (1st ed). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Madhu N. (2009) Processing Instruction: An Input Based Approach for Teaching Grammar. *Journal of NELTA.*   1, 4 (1-2) (pp.111-118)

Maicusi, T., Maicusi, P., &Carrillo, M.J. (2000).The error in the Second Language Acquisition. *Encuentro. Revista de investigación e innovación en la clase de idiomas. (*pp. 168-173) Taken from: http://www.encuentrojournal.org/textos/11.17.pdf

Martínez, J. (2013). An investigation into how EFL learners emotionally respond to teachers' oral corrective feedback. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 15*(2). Retrieved from: http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext &pid=S0123-46412013000200009

McCarthy, M., & O`Dell. (2012). *English Vocabulary in Use Upper-intermediate*. Cambridge University Press.

Meho, L. (2006). E-mail interviewing in qualitative research: A methodological discussion. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology,* 1284-1295. doi:doi:10.1002/asi

Méndez, N. (2008). *Teorías sobre el error en el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras y las actitudes de los estudiantes hacia el tratamiento del error en el aula de español* (Unpublished master's thesis). Universidad de León. Retrieved in May 18, 2016, from: http://www.mecd.gob.es/dctm/redele/Material-RedEle/ Biblioteca/2010_BV_11/2010_BV_11_1er_trimestre/2010_BV_11_17Mendez.pdf? documentId=0901e72b80e1951b

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San
         Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

MinEducación (2014). Programa Nacional de Inglés 2015-2025. Colombia very well.

Montgomery Coalition for Adult English Literacy: MCAEL teacher toolkit: Teaching the
         Four Skills. p. 8. Retrieved, May 15, 2015, from:
         http://www.mcael.org/uploads/File/instructor_library/tt-ch4-teaching-four-
         skills.pdf

Nadhani, S. (2009, September 30). Selecting the Right Chart Type for your Data. Retrieved
         April 15, 2015, from http://www.tutorial9.net/tutorials/web-tutorials/selecting-the-
         right-chart-type- for-your-data/

Nassaji, H. (2015). Interactional feedback: Types and subtypes. In *The interactional feedback
         dimension in instructed second language learning: Linking theory, research, and
         practice* (1st ed., Vol. 1, pp. 44-65). Bedford square, London: Bloomsbury
         Publishing.

Ni, H (2012). The Effects of Affective Factors in SLA and Pedagogical Implications. In
         Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 2, No. 7, pp. 1508-1513. Retrieved
         from: http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol02/07/25.pdf

Ochoa, O. C. (2014). *Desarrollo de las habilidades comunicativas en el docente*.
         [Development of teacher communicative abilities] (1st ed., p.21). Mexico: Edition
         Rodio.(Translation made by authors)

Northern Illinois University. (n.d.). *Data Analysis*. Retrieved April 15, 2015, from
         http://ori.hhs.gov/education/products/n_illinois_u/dfront.html

Peterson, E. and S. Irving (2008) Secondary school students' conceptions of assessment and feedback.In *Learning and Instruction, 18(3), 238–250.*

Proyecto educativo del programa. Licenciatura en Lengua Inglesa [Program's educational project. English Language Teaching]. (2014). Pereira, Risaralda.

Quinn, P. (2014) *Delayed Versus Immediate Corrective Feedback On Orally Produced Passive Errors In English*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Graduate Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. Retrieved from: https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/65728/1/Quinn_Paul_201406_PhD_thesis.pdf

Rahman. A. (2011*.). Improving speaking skill by jigsaw*. (Unpublished thesis). Indonesia. Retrieved May 15, 2015, from http://www.academia.edu/5611079/Improving_speaking_skill_by_jigsaw

Reyes, T. (2013). *The use of face- to- face and e- letters peer correction techniques to improve informal writing* (Unpublished master's thesis). Universidad de la Sabana.

Rezaei, Mozaffari & Hatef (2011) Corrective Feedback in SLA: Classroom Practice and Future Directions. *International Journal of English Linguistics. 1 (1), 21-29.*

Richards, J. (2008). *Teaching Listening and Speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press. USA.

Richards, J., & Lockhart, C. (2007). Interaction in the second language classroom. In *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms* (p. 152). Hong Kong: Cambridge University Press.

Scriverner, J. (2011). *Learning Teaching, The Essential Guide to English Language Teaching.* Macmillan Education.

Scott, H. (2009). *What is grounded theory.* Retrieved April 15, 2015, from http://www.groundedtheoryonline.com/what-is-grounded-theory

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*. 10: 209-231.

Sergio Arboleda, U. (2009). La apertura económica. Retrieved March 17, 2015, from http://www.usergioarboleda.edu.co/tlc/tratados-libre-comercio-colombia.htm

Sharp, D. (1987). The introverted attitude. In *Personality Types: Jung's Model of Typology* (Vol. 31, p. 65). Inner City Books.

Siddiqui, M.,H. (2009). *Techniques of Classroom Teaching*. APH publishing corporation.

SIL International. (1999). The Four basic language skills. Available from: http://www-01.sil.org/lingualinks/languagelearning/otherresources/gudlnsfralnggandcltrlrnngprgrm/FourBasicLanguageSkills.htm

Simon, Y. (2012, January 1). The Purpose of Descriptive Research. Retrieved April 14, 2015, from http://openphd.blogspot.com/2012/01/purpose-of-descriptive-research.html

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (2006). Second language learning in the classroom. In *Hpw languages are learned* (3rd ed., p. 137). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stern, H.H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1993). Grounded Theory Methodology: An Overview. In Strategies of inquiry.

Swarthout, D. (n.d.). Oral Communication: Definition, Types & Advantages. Retrieved October 30, 2014, from http://education-portal.com/academy/lesson/oral-communication-definition-types-advantages. html#lesson

Tafani, V (2009). Correcting or not Errors and Mistakes. *Linguistic and Communicative Performance Journal. 2.(2), 49-57.*

Tomczyk, E. (2013). Perceptions of Oral Errors and Their Corrective Feedback: Teachers vs. Students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research,* 4(5), 928. Retrieved February 24, 2016.

Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Harlow, England: Longman.

Thornbury, S (2007). Towards Autonomy. *How to teach speaking* (pp. 91-93).   Pearson Logman.

Thornbury, S., & Slade, D. (2007). The nature of conversation. In *From Description to Pedagogy* (p. 8). United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Ur, P. (2009). Classroom Interaction. In *A Course in Language Teaching* (17th ed., p. 232). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

VanPatten, B., 1988, How juries get hung: Problems with the evidence for a focus on form in
          teaching, Language Learning.

Varnosfadrani,& Basturkmen (2008).The effectiveness of implicit and explicit error
          correction on learners' performance. *Science Direct*, 37, 8.

Walsham, G. (2005). Doing interpretative research. *European Journal of
          Information   Systems, 15*, 320-320. Retrieved April 13, 2015, from
          http://www.uio.no/studier/emner/matnat/ifi/INF3290/h12/undervisningsmateriale/
          artikler/walshamdoing-interpretiveresearchejis2006.pdf

10. APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 Observation format

Name of the observer:	Fecha:	Hour:	Subject:

ERROR						
Syntax	A	Addition				
	B	Word order				
	C	Omission				
	D	Concordance				
	E	Tense				
Lexical	F	Vocabulary				
	G	Expressions				
Sociolinguistic & Pragmatic	H	Meaning				
	I	Register				
Pronunciation	J	Intonation				
	K	Stress				
	L	Mispronunciation				

Type of activity

(1) Participation in class [s – T interaction)	(2) Dialogues (ss interaction)	(3) Oral presentations	(4) Plenaries, debates (ss & T interaction)
(5) Discussion groups	(6) Role plays	(7) Other:	(8) Other:

Feedback's code							
EC: Explicit correction	CR: Clarification Request	R: Recast	E: Elicitation	MC: Metalinguistic clue	Rep: Repetition	SC: Self correction	G/ I/ P: Group/ Individual/ Peer

	FEEDBACK							
	Type of feedback	Ss and T reaction	Type of feedback	Ss and T reaction	Type of feedback	Ss and T reaction	Type of feedback	Ss and T reaction
A								
B								
C								
D								
E								
F								
G								
H								
I								
J								
K								
L								

MATERIAL	INSTRUCTIONS	SETTING
-Is the material appropriate to students' proficiency? -Did students use appropriately the worksheets, readings or any kind of material?	- Did they ask for clarification to a classmate? -Did the students understand the instruction given by the teacher? -Did the teacher correct non-verbally the students? --What kind of actions did she/he do?	-How is the classroom organized? Be descriptive. -How is the temperature inside of the class? Is it hot? Cold? -How long was each activity? -How did the students react when they were doing the activity?

Comments:

Observation Grid filled out

ERROR						
Syntax	A	Addition				
	B	Word order				
	C	Omission		(1) Ungrammatical		
	D	Concordance			(1) keep talk	
	E	Tense				
Lexical	F	Vocabulary	(1) Full start			
	G	Expressions				
Sociolinguistic & Pragmatic	H	Meaning				
	I	Register				
Pronunciation	J	Intonation				
	K	Stress	(1)'Bureau ʊ ɔː			
	L	Mispronunciation	(1) Chi(iː)ldhood	(1) Bo(ɔː)dy language	(1) U(ʊ)tterance	

Type of activities			
1. Participation in class [s – T interaction)	2. Dialogues (ss interaction)	3. Oral presentations	4. Plenaries, debates (ss & T interaction)
5. Discussion groups	6. Role plays	7. Other:	8. Other:

Feedback's code						
EC: Explicit correction	CR: Clarification Request	R: Recast	E: Elicitation	MC: Metalinguistic clue	Rep: Repetition	SC: Self correction	G/ I/ P: Group/ Individual/ Peer

	FEEDBACK							
	Type of feedback	Ss and T reaction	Type of feedback	Ss and T reaction	Type of feedback	Ss and T reaction	Type of feedback	Ss and T reaction
A								
B								
C	EC: Unfinished utterance	No possible to see	R: Yes, ungrammaticality (T wrote on the board)	She opened a little bit her eyes and streched her lips				
D	R: Yes, we engage	She noded her head and smile	R: it's like redundant	He ignored it and continued writing	R: Exactly, keep talking	No possible to see		
E								
F	R: A false start is...	He showed attention						
G								
H								
I								
J								
K	EC: yes, b(iʊ)' r(ɔː	She noded her head						
L	CR: Ch(ai)ldhood?	No possible to see	R: Exactly, b(aː)dy language	No reaction	EC: U(aː)tterance	She struggled to move her head and repeat correctly the word		

APPENDIX 2: Interview format

Students interview (English version)

Good (morning, afternoon, evening), my name is _____

Thank you for accepting this invitation to a small survey about your perception towards error correction. My partners Miguel Antonio Caro, Diana Milena Echeverry, Sandra Lorena Díaz, professor Dolly Ramos Gallego and I are conducting a research project called *Professors and Students' Reactions Towards Oral Corrective Feedback in an English Language Teaching* Program. It is needed to clarify that the purpose of this instrument is not evaluate, but to know your insights about error correction. This project is executed as a requisite of graduation for the students previously mentioned. Remember that the information provided in this survey is confidential, just for research purposes. If in any moment of the development of this project you wish to withdraw, you may do so. Finally, this interview will be recorded just to facilitate the analysis of data; it will not be used for other purposes without the previous permission of the participant.

General information

Which semester are you taking?

Errors

1. What kind of errors are more corrected in classes by the teacher?

   - Lexical   **Example:** *I am stressing* (the affix "ing" instead of the "ed" form)

   - Phonological   **Example:** *Voicing* ("vehetabols" instead of "vedjtabls")

   - Syntactical   **Example:** *I have a house red* (Displacement of the word)

- Sociolinguistic or pragmatic   **Example:** *What?* (to ask for repetition)

2. Which errors do you think teachers should correct?

- Lexical

- Phonological

- Syntactical

- Sociolinguistic or pragmatic

3. Which type of errors do you normally commit in classes?

- Lexical

- Phonological

- Syntactical

- Sociolinguistic or pragmatic

Feedback

1. How do you prefer being corrected?

- Explicitly   Example: It is not "carpet", It is "folder"

- Implicitly   Example: **student:** I not like eat

    teacher: You <u>do not</u> like <u>to</u> eat (Doing stress in the highlighted words)

2. When do you prefer being corrected?

- At the moment

- After the activity finishes

- After class

3. Which way do you prefer being corrected?

a. In front of the class   b. Face to face   c. Both

a. Collectively   b. Individually   c. Both

a. By your teacher   b. By your classmates   c. Both

4. a. Have you ever had a bad experience when being corrected? Explain.

  b. Have you ever had positive experiences when being corrected that have encouraged you to study more? Explain

5. a. Does your teacher promote peer correction? Yes__ No__ b. In which activities are they more evident?

- Self-recording

- Debates
- ral presentations

- Role plays

- Dialogues

- Participation in class

6. a. Does your teacher implement the direct correction teacher- learner? Yes __ No __

  b. In which activities are they more evident?

- Self-recording

- Debates

- Oral presentations

- Role plays

- Dialogues

- Participation in class

7. a. Does your teacher implement group correction? Yes __ No __ b. In which

   activities are they more evident?

- Self-recording

- Debates

- Oral presentations

- Role plays

- Dialogues

- Participation in class

8. Which of these types of feedback are commonly used in class?

a. Self- correction

b. Peer correction

c. Student- teacher correction

d. Group correction

Personal case

9. What do you usually do when you made a mistake, you are aware of it, but you do not receive correction from your professor or your classmates?

- You correct yourself automatically or say *sorry…*

- You get stuck or frustrated.

- You make a gesture/ a facial expression / a particular movement/ a change in your posture, etc.

- You ignore it, and you continue talking.

- You take it into account for a next opportunity.

- Other.

10. What do you normally do when you are corrected?

- You correct yourself automatically or say *sorry/ I mean.*

- You acknowledge the professor/ classmate for the correction.

- You get stuck or frustrated.

- You make a gesture/ a facial expression / a particular movement/ a change in your posture, etc.

- You ignore it, and you continue talking.

- You take it into account for a next opportunity.

- Other.

11. Do you usually correct your classmates when they commit a mistake? Yes__ No__ b.

   How do you do correction?

   a. You do it individually

b. You do it in front of your classmates{

c. In which way do you do correction?

   a. Implicitly

   b. Explicitly

d. When do you give feedback?

   a. Immediately

   b. After the partner give you the floor

   c. At the end of the class

Entrevista a los estudiantes (versión en español)

Buenas (Tardes, días, noches), mi nombre es _____

Gracias por aceptar esta invitación a una pequeña entrevista acerca de sus percepciones sobre la corrección de errores. Mis compañeros Miguel Antonio Caro, Diana Milena Echeverry, Sandra Lorena Díaz, professor Dolly Ramos Gallego y yo estamos orientando un proyecto de investigación llamado

Reacciones de profesores y estudiantes frente a la retroalimentación correctiva oral en un programa de licenciatura en inglés. Es necesario aclarar que el propósito de este instrumento no es evaluar, sino conocer sus pensamientos con respecto a la corrección de errores. Este proyecto es ejecutado como requisito de graduación para los estudiantes previamente mencionados. Debemos recordar que la información recogida por medio de esta entrevista es totalmente confidencial y solo con propósitos investigativos. Si durante el desarrollo de este proyecto usted desea retirar su información, le será respetada su decisión. Finalmente, esta entrevista será grabada para facilitar el análisis de la información, mas no para otros propósitos sin el permiso previo del participante.

Información general

¿Qué semestre cursa actualmente?

Errores

1. ¿Qué tipo de errores son más corregidos en su clase por su profesor?

- Lexicales   **Ejemplo:** *I am stressing* (usar el afijo *ing* en vez de *ed)*

- Fonéticos   **Ejemplo:** *Voicing* (Decir *vejeteibols* en vez de *vedjtabls*)

- Sintácticos**Ejemplo:** *I have a house red* (Desorden en la oración)

- Sociolingüísticos o pragmáticos **Ejemplo:** *What?* (cuando se pide repetición)

-

2. ¿Cuáles errores piensa usted que los profesores deberían corregir o dar más énfasis?

- Lexicales

- Fonéticos

- Sintácticos

- Sociolingüísticos o pragmáticos

3. ¿Qué tipo de errores usted normalmente comete en clase?

- Lexicales

- Fonéticos

- Sintácticos

- Sociolingüísticos o pragmáticos

Retroalimentación

1. ¿Cómo prefiere ser corregido?

- ExplícitamenteEjemplo: No es "carpet blue", es "blue carpet"

- ImplícitamenteEjemplo: Do you have a "blue carpet"?

2. ¿Cuándo prefiere ser corregido?

- En el momento

- Luego de que la actividad termina

- Después de clase

3. ¿De qué manera prefiere ser corregido?

a. Al frente de la clase	b. Cara a cara	c. Por ambos
a. Colectivamente	b. Individualmente	c. Por ambos
a. Por tu profesor	b. Por tus compañeros	c. Por ambos

4. a. ¿Ha llegado a tener alguna mala experiencia al ser corregido? Explique.

   b. ¿Ha llegado a tener alguna experiencia positiva que lo haya inspirado a estudiar más o a mejorar? Explique

5. a. ¿Su profesor incita a la corrección en parejas o grupos? Si __ No __ b. ¿En

   cuáles actividades es más evidente?

- Debates

- Presentaciones orales

- Diálogos

- Participación en clase

- Obras de teatro

6. a. ¿Su

7. profesor implementa la corrección directa profesor- alumno? Si __ No __

   b.¿En cuáles actividades es más evidente?

   - Debates

   - Presentaciones orales

   - Diálogos

   - Participación en clase

   - Obras de teatro

8. a. ¿Su profesor implementa la corrección grupal? Si __ No __

   b. ¿En cuáles actividades es más evidente?

   - Debates

   - Presentaciones orales

   - Diálogos

   - Participación en clase

   - Obras de teatro

   8. ¿Cuáles de estos tipos de retroalimentación es más usada en su clase?

   a. Auto corrección

   b. Corrección en parejas

   c. Corrección profesor- alumno

   d. Corrección grupal

Caso personal

9. ¿Qué hace usted normalmente cuando usted comete un error, es consciente de ello, pero no recibe ningún tipo de retroalimentación?

- Usted se autocorrige o dice *lo siento…*

- Usted se bloquea o se frustra.

- Usted hace un gesto/ una expresión facial/ un movimiento en particular/ un cambio en su postura, etc.

- Usted lo ignora y sigue hablando.
- Usted lo toma en cuenta para una próxima ocasión.

- Otro.

10. ¿Usted qué suele hacer cuando es corregido?

- Usted se autocorrige o dice *lo siento…*

- Usted agradece a su profesor o a su compañero por la corrección.

- Usted se bloquea o se frustra.

- Usted hace un gesto/ una expresión facial/ un movimiento en particular/ un cambio en su postura, etc.

- Usted lo ignora y sigue hablando.

- Usted lo toma en cuenta para una próxima ocasión.

- Otro.

11. a. ¿Usted corrige usualmente a sus compañeros cuando cometen un error? Sí__ No__

b. ¿Cómo haces generalmente las correcciones?

    a. Lo hace individualmente con él/ella

    b. Lo hace en frente de sus compañeros c. ¿De

qué manera corriges?

    a. Implícitamente

    b. Explícitamente

d. ¿Cuándo das retroalimentación?

    a. Inmediatamente

    b. Después que tu compañero deja de hablar

    c. Al final de la clase

APPENDIX 3. Questionnaire format

Professors' perception about error correction

Hello, LLI professors!
Thank you for accepting this invitation to a small survey about your perception towards error correction. We are Miguel Antonio Caro, Diana Milena Echeverry, Sandra Lorena Díaz and Nathalia Marín and professor Dolly Ramos Gallego. The aforementioned researchers are conducting a study called Professors and Students' Reactions Towards Oral Corrective Feedback in an English Language Teaching Program. It is needed to clarify that the purpose of this instrument is not to evaluate but to know your insights about error correction. This project is executed as a requisite of graduation for the students previously mentioned. Remember that the information provided in this survey is confidential, just for research purposes. If in any moment of the development of this project you wish to withdraw, you may do so.

What is your bachelor degree? If you have a master or PhD, indicate it so.

How long have you been teaching?

Where have you taught?

What language course do you currently teach?
You may tick on one or more answers

☐ Basic English
☐ Pre intermediate English
☐ Intermediate English
☐ Upper- intermediate English
☐ Advanced Grammar
☐ Academic discourse I or II

How long have you been teaching language courses?

What type of errors do you correct in class?

This section will examine your perceptions towards errors. For this question, you may tick on one or more answers.

- ☐ Syntactic
- ☐ Lexical
- ☐ Sociolinguistic
- ☐ Pronunciation

Which do you consider more important to correct? why?

When do you consider errors need to be corrected?

Select one option

- ○ At the moment
- ○ After the activity finishes
- ○ After the class
- ○ After the student's intervention
- ○ Otro: [   ]

Why?

Can you distinguish between the student who knows the rule, but commits a mistake, and the student who does not know the rule?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

What do you do when you notice it?

What do you do when a learner has fossilized an error?

How much corrective feedback do you think you provide in class?

Select one option

- ○ 0% - 25%
- ○ 25% - 50%
- ○ 50% - 75%
- ○ 75% - 100%

Explain

How much importance do you think you give corrective feedback in class?

- ○ 0% - 25%
- ○ 25% - 50%
- ○ 50% - 75%
- ○ 75% - 100%

Explain

How do you think errors should be corrected?

Select one option

▼

Through explicit feedback
Through implicit feedback

How do you think students prefer to be corrected?

You may tick on one or more answers and support.

- ☐ In front of the class
- ☐ Face to face
- ☐ Collectively
- ☐ Individually
- ☐ By your teacher
- ☐ By your classmates

Explain

What do you think are students' reactions towards errors' correction?

[text box]

Do you consider students personality before correct him/her?

Select one option

▼
Yes
No

Explain

[text box]

What kind of activites do you use when implementing self, peer and teacher feedback?

○ Oral presentations
○ Group discussions and dialogues
○ Debates
○ Role plays
○ Otro: [_____]

Have you ever avoided correcting your students for any purpose? Why?

[text box]

Have you seen a student negative reaction towards feedback?

If the answer is positive answer the following questions

▼
Yes
No

Why did it happen?

Answer the following questions in case you selected "Yes" in the last question.

[text box]

What type of feedback was given?

What did you do?

Enviar

APPENDIX 4: E-mail sent to professors

Invitation to participate in a research study   ↑ ↓ x

CONSENTLETTER.d...

Download as zip   Save to OneDrive

Good evening, professor ~~Mentor.~~

I hope you are well.

In the attached document, I am sending you the consent letter (that you already signed) for the participation to the project *Professors and Students' Reactions Towards Oral Corrective Feedback in an English Language Teaching Program* in order to let you have your own copy. The idea is that you will be part of our research with the **Academic Discourse I class**, so our partners looked for the schedule of this course, and we can conduct the observations in the following date:

Monday, september 7th from 10 to 12 .(The observations will take from one hour to one hour and a half)

I hope this date is appropriate for you, so in case of having any problem with the schedule, please contact me.

Thank you in advanced for your participation.

Regards,

Nathalia Marín

APPENDIX 5: Consent letter

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Teachers at the English Language Program at a public university in Pereira

INTRODUCTION

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Professor Dolly Ramos Gallego, Master in English Didactics and four students from English Language Teaching Program Diana Milena Echeverry, Sandra Lorena Diaz, Miguel Antonio Caro and Nathalia Marín. This research study will contribute to the student's' thesis as one of the graduation requirements. For this study, you were identified as a possible candidate as our research concerns undergraduate students and English professors guiding language subjects at the English Language Teaching Program offered by Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:

Identifying the different perceptions, attitudes and beliefs students from ELT programs, as well as university professors have regarding corrective feedback, and which strategies are the common in EFL scenarios. In this sense, this project intends to answer the research question, what can be said about University professors' perceptions and students' attitudes regarding oral corrective feedback in language courses within a language teaching program in Pereira?

PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES

1. The teachers who participate in this research study will be observed to notice what kind of feedback they use; students, on the other hand will be observed in order to recognize the most frequent types of language mistakes they do during oral interaction. The observer will choose a small students' population during the observation.

2. Some observations will be recorded to get complete information that the research study requires.

3. The language classes will be observed just one time.
4. Teachers will receive an online questionnaire after the observations.
5. Three students from the course will be interviewed after the observations.
6. Some of the students' interviews will be recorded just for data collection purposes.
7. There is no payment incentive to participate in this study.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

1. The English Language Teaching Program will be benefited as the results of this study will be shared with the academic community in order to reveal teacher's' preferences towards oral corrective feedback and learners' reactions when they receive it and its impact in the teaching and learning process.

2. Teachers will be familiarized with students' preferences towards oral error correction and thus enhance rapport and learners' participation in the classroom.

3. The students can benefit as it will contribute to their teaching development by becoming aware of the types of feedback they should provide learners.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.

1. Pseudonyms will be used in all documentation related to this research project. All the data, and information gathered will be used solely for this research project and for no other purpose. The data and information (with pseudonyms) will only be furnished to the Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira as the thesis (research) component required for graduation.

2. If activities are to be recorded, only the research aforementioned will have access to them. the information gathered will only be used or shown to meet the research requirement and for no other purpose. Once, the research is complete, all recordings will be erased.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose to participate in this study you may withdraw at any time without penalty or loss. You may also refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer and still remain in the study.

IDENTIFICATION OF RESEARCHERS AND REVIEW BOARD

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact: Dolly Ramos Gallego at (c) 321 642 2266, email dollytam@utp.edu.co, Diana Milena Echeverry at (c) 3127067013, email dimiecheverri@utp.edu.co, Sandra Lorena Diaz at

(c) 3143952697, email salodiaz@utp.edu.co, Miguel Antonio Caro at (c) 3185269965, email macaro@utp.edu.co or Nathalia Marín at © 3177186574, email namarin@utp.edu.co

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been provided copy of this form.

_____

Name of Participant   (please print)

_____   _____

Signature of Participant   Date

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

In my judgment the participant is voluntarily and knowingly providing informed consent and possesses the legal capacity to give informed consent to participate in this research study.

Dolly Ramos Gallego

_____

Signature of Investigator or Designee