TEACHERS' FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IN A SECONDARY EFL CLASSROOM

Qin Ran
(qinran1110@126.com)
Wuhan University, China

Li Danli
(daniealli@126.com)
Wuhan University, China

Abstract

Although researchers have done extensive studies on both scaffolding and the effect of teachers' verbal feedback, not enough attention has been paid to in what way scaffolding affects verbal feedback in English classes of China's secondary schools. Adopting a longitudinal approach, this paper drawing on Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, explored the EFL classroom interaction between two teachers and 20 adolescent EFL learners in a secondary school. Data was gathered through classroom observation. Quantitative analyses were conducted with feedback episodes to see the frequency and distribution of feedback types. Then episodes of scaffolding were analyzed and compared to see the effect. The analysis revealed the fact that evaluative feedback was the most dominant one, and the most frequent type of corrective feedback was repetition. This finding was quite different from previous research, in which the most preferred type was always recast. Moreover, feedback could be more effective when scaffolding was carried out between EFL learners and teachers.

Keywords: classroom interaction; EFL teachers; verbal feedback; scaffolding.

1 Introduction

Feedback refers to informing learners about their work in progress. More specifically, this form of interaction shows learners their errors and guides them to correct their work (Lewis, 2002). According to Boud (as cited in Noor, Aman, Mustaffa & Seong, 2010), "A good feedback is given without personal judgment or opinion, given based on the facts, always neutral and objective, constructive and focus on the future", so the use of appropriate feedback can be seen as an effective tool to improve students' performance.

From a sociocultural theory perspective, Vygotsky perceived a gap that is bridged by assistance from others between the learners' current state and their future knowledge, the distance between the actual and potential level is called the zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Cook, 2011). According to some scholars, ZPD is closely associated with scaffolding since scaffolding operates within ZPD; in other words, sharing or "scaffolding" of knowledge from teachers and /or classmates can assist learners to reach the ZPD while rote copying of language knowledge is not so much affective (Khaliliaqdam, 2014).

2 Literature Review

The study on verbal interaction within the classroom setting dates back to Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), they found that the speaking patterns in the classrooms were highly structured. Then many studies have been conducted on teachers' feedback. For example, Mastropieri and Scruggs (1994) recommend that feedbacks should be outcome-focused and encouraging, while Lenz, Ellis and Scanlon (1996) suggest that feedback should focus what students did wrong and matters to improve future accomplishments. Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) examined how different learners responded to different levels of negative feedback or other-regulation in the learners' ZPD. However, limited research is known about in what way scaffolding affects verbal feedback in English classes of China's secondary schools. The focus of this study is to describe the teacher's verbal feedback of two Chinese teachers from one training school. This research paper sough to answer the following two questions:

1.   What types of verbal feedback are used by the Chinese ESL teachers?
2.   Which types of teachers' verbal feedback is most frequently used?
3.   How do teachers scaffold learners by providing feedbacks?

3 The Study

3.1 Setting and Participants

This study was conducted in two EFL classrooms in a secondary school in Mainland China. The goal of the class was to develop students' English proficiency, especially vocabulary and grammar knowledge. In the class, teachers either taught new words and expressions or explained new grammars in text book.

Twenty adolescent EFL learners and two English teachers from a secondary school in China participated in the study. The students were all middle school students (13 female and 7 male) and have all been studying in China school system. They have been studying English for about five years since primary school. The two teachers (A and B) both had ten-year's teaching experience and held a certificate in Teaching English.

3.2 Data Collection and Analysis

The data were collected by means of classroom observations. Six classes of each teacher were audio taped and transcribed for further analysis, and the duration of each class was approximately 45 minutes. To ensure the authenticity of the data, specific focus of the research was not told to the participants.

After the data being transcribed, episodes of teachers' verbal feedback were identified; the amounts of each kinds of feedback would be presented. Then the episodes were analyzed and compared to see how teachers' verbal feedback could affect students' language learning.

4 Findings and Discussion

The first purpose of this paper was to investigate the types of verbal feedback used by two Chinese middle school ESL teachers and which type of verbal feedback was most frequently

used. Table 1 showed the analysis of the types and frequency of verbal feedbacks employed by these two teachers in their classrooms.

Table 1. Types of teachers' feedback (N=447)

TYPES OF FEEDBACK	TEACEHRS		TOTAL	%
	A	B		
Evaluative feedback	148	181	329	73.6
Interactive feedback	16	12	28	6.3
Corrective feedback	45	45	90	20.1

4.1 Evaluative feedback

The evaluation feedback refers to that teachers make the evaluation for students' answer from the form of language (Cullen, 2002), and it has been described as forms of 'judgment' made on the learners' performance (Nunn, 2001). As Gattullo (as cited in Noor. et al. 2010) has pointed out that this form of feedback is found to be the most dominant type of feedback used in second and foreign language classrooms, and from Table 1 we could see that evaluative feedback did account for a large percentage, which is 73.6%. In giving evaluative feedbacks, teachers praised students by saying "good", "yes" and "ok", or repeated the answer given by students.

Example 1: (A. 007-009)
T: [007] So "awful" is an adjective, could you please make a sentence "ta shi ge ling ren tao yan de ren". (*He is an awful person.*)
S: [008] He is awful.
T: [009] Yes, he is awful, or we can also say "he is an awful person".

In Example 1 the teacher was introducing a new word 'awful' to the students, in order to check whether students could use this word properly, she asked them to make a sentence with this word. Since it was not a difficult question to answer, after students gave a right sentence the teacher affirmed with a simple 'yes'.

Example 2: (A. 132-134)
T: [132] Here, "answer" is a verb, then what does "answer the letter" mean?
S: [133] hui xin. (*write back to*)
T: [134] Yes, it means write back to.

In the above episode students were required to tell the meaning of the phrase 'answer the letter' and they answered the question in Chinese. The teacher agreed by saying 'yes' and then explained it in English to show students how to interpret the phrase in English.

Example 3: (B. 070-073)
S: [070] They see the film "Left Ear" with TFboys and EXO.
T: [071] Ok, good. Go on. Let's see them how to end the story.
S: [072] Suddenly, people say keep out of the cinema.
T: [073] Good.

Here teacher B and students were playing 'Story Solitaire'. In order to encourage students to use their imagination to create a story, the teacher kept saying 'good' and 'OK'.

Teachers employed this type of feedback to show that the student's answer is acceptable. From the data analysis, it was found that when questions were relatively easy and students gave correct answer, teachers just provided positive signals as "good" and "ok" and move on or change the topic. These positive signals could show teachers' agreement and built up students' confidence of learning a second language. But Nunan (1991) once stated that the effect of this kind simple feedback which was quite general and mechanical was questionable. If teachers give too much simple feedbacks, students' inner expectation toward teachers will reduce. From teachers' angle, their original intention is to protect students' pride and encourage their initiatives in answering questions, but students may take it for granted because of the sameness.

When questions involved important grammatical rules or sentence patterns, teachers tended to repeat the correct response give by students after praise them. As Chaudron (1988, p. 278) suggests, the "repetition of a speaker's utterance can serve several functions, of either a negative (correcting) or a positive nature (agreeing, appreciating, understanding)." Obviously, these repeated forms here were of positive nature. Through repeating the students' responses, teachers not only showed their appreciating, but trying to emphasize the correct response and deepen students' impression.

4.2 Interactive feedback

Interactive feedback has been identified by Richard and Lockhart (1996) as a strategy to expand or modify a student's answer. According to Noor et al. (2010) teachers provide this type of feedback to assist as well as encourage the student and such assistance is not considered a negative feedback.

Example 4: (A. 160-166)
T: [160] Look at the first sentence of the first paragraph, what's the meaning of this sentence "what's Ron Maston like?".
S: [161] "like" shi xiang shen me yi yang de yi si. (*"like" means similar to*)
T: [162] Ok, let's put it this way, have we seen this sentence pattern before?
S: [163] No…
T: [164] Have we seen "what's … like" before?
S: [165] Yes, what's the weather like!
T: [166] Right!

In Example 4 the student was unable to tell the meaning of the sentence, so he only gave Chinese translation of the word 'like'; therefore, the teacher tried to remind the student of the sentence pattern (line [162] and [163]). In this way the student successfully recalled the sentence he had leant.

Example 5: (B. 144-150)
T: [144] Could you please translate the sentence?
S: [145] ni neng ba … (*can you give me …*)
T: [146] Front door! Door!

S: [147] ni neng ba men de … (*can you give me the key to the door…*)
T: [148] men? (*door?*) Front, in front of.
T: [149] What does "front" mean?
S: [150] qian men. (*front door*)

Teacher B asked one student to translate the sentence 'Can you give me the key to the front door' into Chinese, but the student did not know what 'front door' meant, so he just skipped the word 'front'. Seeing such a case, the teacher mentioned the phrase 'in front of' with the hope that the student could modify his answer.

In the above examples, students were hesitant to give direct responses because they were not quite sure of their answers; therefore, teachers provided extended information by asking the question in other way or using a phrase to remind the meaning of a word. This kind of assistance helped students to complete their response, gave them a sense of achievement and encouraged them to be more active in future classroom interaction as well. What' more, as Noor et al. (2010) pointed out providing such assistant ensures that the flow of discourse will not be interrupted and can promote communicative language use in the classroom.

4.3 Corrective feedback

Ellis (2009) considered corrective feedback as a type of negative feedback, and if there is no frequent use of corrective feedback, learners will not notice the occurrence of the gap between the intermediary and target languages and fossilization. Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorized corrective feedback into explicit correction, recast, clarification request, meta-linguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition.

Frequencies of different types of corrective feedbacks and their percentage in the total sum used by the two teachers were listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Corrective feedback types

CORRECT FEEDBACK TYPES	TEACHERS		TOTAL	%
	A	B		
Explicit correction	0	8	8	8.8
Recast	8	12	20	22.2
Clarification request	2	3	5	5.5
Meta-linguistic feedback	3	3	6	6.7
Elicitation	15	0	15	16.7
Repetition	16	20	36	40

As indicated in Table 2, classroom observation demonstrated that the two teachers utilized repetition most frequently, at a rate of 40%. The other types of corrective feedback were used as follows: recast (22.2%), elicitation (16.7%), explicit corrections (8.8%), meta-linguistic feedback (6.7%) and clarification requests (5.5%). Teacher A did not use explicit corrections while teacher B did not use elicitation.

Example 6: (B. 025-028)
T: [025] What's he doing?
S: [026] I…

T: [027] Not I, he.
S: [028] He take…

In the above example when the student used a wrong personal pronoun, teacher B corrected the mistake directly 'not I, he', and the student immediately got the teacher's point.

According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), explicit correction refers to the method that teachers point out errors in students' answers directly and provides the correct form. As we can see from Example 6 explicit correction is an effective way for students to repair their mistakes because teachers provide the correction. In Lee's study (2013) advanced-level graduate students strongly desired that their teachers correct their errors explicitly and immediately and their teachers did frequently employed explicit correction. However, in the current study, this type of corrective feedback has been used eight times by only one teacher. One reason is that teachers do not want to reduce beginners' interest and confidence in learning English, so they seldom point out their errors directly.

Recast is to reformulate all or part of the incorrect word or phrase, to show the correct form without explicitly identifying the error (Lee, 2013). Han and Jung (2007), Panove and Lyster (2002), and Suzuki (2004) all demonstrated that teachers most frequently used recast in both beginner-level and intermediate-level classes. Although in the current study, recast is not the most frequently-used one, it still accounts for 22.2% of the total sum, just comes after repetition.

Example 7: (A. 152-155)
T: [152] Ok, Penny, go on reading.
S: [153] (read the text and mispronounce a word)
T: [154] Arrived! (correct pronunciation)
S: [155] Then I arrived…

In Example 7, the student mispronounced a word when reading the text. Teacher A did not point out the mistake by saying 'No' or 'you've made a mistake', she just gave the correct pronunciation and the student repaired her error immediately.

Example 8: (B. 031-035)
S: [031] Tom go to…
T: [032] Goes, Tom goes…
S: [033] Tom goes to cinema…
T: [034] Tom goes to THE cinema.
S: [035] Tom goes to the cinema with Bill.

In this example the student first made a mistake in subject-verb agreement then missed the article 'the' in the phrase 'go to the cinema'. Like teacher A in example 7, teacher B did not say 'No' either, instead she provided the student with correct forms.

Compared with explicit correction, recast corrects students' errors in a more indirect way, which can provide students corrections and at the same time protect their self-esteem. Cullen (2002) pointed out that the teacher can provide students implicit feedback by recast answer.

Clarification requests mean that teachers tell the students their answer is difficult to understand or there is an error, then ask them to repeat or correct. Clarification requests are not very specific, because they do not give students useful information about their errors. When teachers say "what" or "sorry", students may feel confused and do not know whether there is something wrong with their answer or the teacher was not carefully listening.

Example 9: (A. 199-202)
S: [199] He said Pauline is typing laters.
T: [200] What?
T: [201] Typing…
S: [202] Letters

In Example 9 when the student made a mistake in pronouncing a word, the teacher said 'what'; however the student did not know what the teacher meant, so the teacher had to show him where the mistake was by saying 'typing', and the student finally understood and correct the mistake.

When the teacher finds the students' answer with a problem, he /she gives technical linguistic information about the error without explicitly providing the correct answer (Lee, 2013), that is meta-linguistic feedback.

Example 10: (A. 015-018)
S: [015] He telephone me.
T: [016] "he" is third person singular, we should add an "s" after the verb.
S: [017] H telephones me.
T: [018] Yes, he telephones me.

Example 11: (B. 183-185)
S: [183] We always enjoying ourselves.
T: [184] We don't need –ing here, it is not present continuous tense.
S: [185] Enjoy ourselves.

In Example 10 and 11, when students made grammatical mistakes, both teacher A and B provided corrections by mentioning the specific grammatical rules. This type of feedback enable students to realize their mistakes immediately, but grammar may make beginners feel boring.

Elicitation means to prompt the student to self-correct by pausing, so the student can fill in the correct word or phrase (Lee, 2013). If teachers hurry to give right answers as soon as students make mistakes or give wrong answers, students will be lazy and feel unnecessary to think about the questions. So teachers need to guide and inspire students to find their own problems and correct them.

Example 12: (A. 204-208)
T: [204] Jerry, please translate this section.
S: [205] … dan shi wo mei you hui da (*but I didn't reply*)
T: [206] dan shi wo mei you…
S: [207] jie dian huan (*answer the phone*)

S: [208] dan shi wo mei you jie dian hua. (*But I didn't answer the phone.*)

Only teacher A used elicitation in the current study. In Example 12 when the student made a mistake in his translation, instead of pointing it out, the teacher chose to repeat part of the student's answer and paused to prompt the student to self-correct. This form of prompting encourages the students to voluntarily look for and correct their answers. Thus, this act can be seen as an effective instructional tool to encourage students to modify their thinking and learning process (Noor et al., 2010).

According to the classroom observation, it was found that students in teacher B's class were introverted and shy, they seldom answered the teacher's questions unless someone be selected by the teacher. This may be the reason why teacher B did not use elicitation in her class. For students who are too shy to answer teacher's question, asking them to find out their own mistakes in front of the whole class will make them nervous and embarrassed, let alone self-correct mistakes.

Repetition refers to teacher repeating the student's error while highlighting the error or mistake by means of emphatic stress (Lee, 2013). In the current study repetition was the most preferred corrective feedback of both teachers, which accounted for 40%. This finding was quite different from previous research. In Lochtman's study (2002), among 394 corrective feedback repetition made up 0% of the total, Ahangari and Amirzadeh (2011) found that at elementary level teachers used 8.3% repetition, meanwhile, Lee (2013) found that teachers in advanced-level adult ESL classroom utilized only 1.06%. In their research recast is the most frequently-used feedback.

Example 13: (A. 85-90)
T: [85] How do we say "jie dian hua"? (*answer the phone*)
S: [86] Answer phone.
T: [87] Answer phone?
S: [88] A.
T: [89] A?
S: [90] Answer the phone.

Here the student left out the article in the phrase 'answer the phone', so the teacher repeated her answer in a rising tone. The student realized her mistake but chose the indefinite article; therefore the teacher repeated her answer again. This time the student gave a correct answer.

Example 14: (B. 85-89)
T: [85] Ok, Chinese.
S: [86] jin tian wan shang ni yao qu na er? (*Where are you going to go this evening?*)
T: [87] qu na er.
S: [88] jin wan ni yao gan shen me? (*What are you going to do this evening?*)
T: [89] Correct.

Repetition is an implicit way to remind students their mistakes, and it encourages students to figure out what is wrong with their answer by themselves, rather than providing correction directly. The reason why Chinese teachers prefer repetition over other types of corrective feedback may relate to their characteristic. Compared with westerners, Chinese are introverted

and care more about our face; therefore, Chinese use more repetition than recast, because correct students' mistakes directly may let them lose face, while repetition gives students opportunity to self-correct, in this way they can save face and be proud of themselves. As in Example 14, the student realized his mistake and self-repaired it right after teacher's repetition.

4.5 Scaffolded Feedback

The concept of scaffolded feedback was operationalized based on Vygotsky's concepts of scaffolding and assisted performance (Rassaei, 2014). According to Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994), 'it has three features: it should be graduated with no more help than is needed; it should be contingent on learners needs; and it should be dialogic, with both the learner and the interlocutor collaborating to solve the problem'. To analyze episodes of scafolded feedback, Rassaei's scale (Table 3) was adopted, which consisted of several negotiation moves.

Table 3. Scaffolded Feedback Moves

Level	Negotiation Moves
1	Teachers provide learners with verbal cues (clarification request)
2	Teachers direct learners' attention to the source of the error
3	Teachers provide learners with the explicit rule
4	Teachers provide learners with an example
5	Teachers provide learners with both the rule and an example
6	Teachers provide future explanations and examples

Example 15: (A. 503-510)
S: [503] They still have many beer in the fridge.
T: [504] Any problem? *(level 1)*
S: [505] um… no?
T: [506] Beer is an uncountable noun, right? *(level 2)*
S: [507] Yes.
T: [508] many bu ke yi xiu shi bu ke shu min ci. (*We cannot modify an uncountable noun with the word many.*) *(level 3)*
S: [509] They still have some beer in the fridge.
T: [510] Right, some ji ke yi xiu shi ke shu min ci, ye ke I xiu shi bu ke shu min ci. ('*Some' can be used to modify both countable and uncountable nouns.*) So we can say 'some flowers' and 'some water', both are OK. *(level 6)*

In the episode of Example 15 after student made a mistake, teacher A asked 'any problem', hoping that the student could self-correct. But the student had difficulty in find the mistake; the teacher had to increase her level of scaffolding by directing the source of the error 'Beer is an uncountable noun, right'. Seeing that the student still could not correct the mistake, the teacher moved on to provide the explicit rule, which is *level 3*. Even after the student modified the answer, the teacher gave further explanation with examples, in case the student might misuse the word again.

Example 16: (A. 285-294)
S: [285] I have bought the bag for one year.

T: [286] Is this a correct sentence? *(level 1)*
S: [287] um… I think so.
T: [288] Can we use the word buy in present perfect? *(level 2)*
S: [289] (Silence)
T: [290] wan cheng shi biao shi dong zuo chi xu, mai zhe ge dong zuo ke yi chi xu yi nian ma? (*Present perfect means the action continues for a period of time, can we keep buying for a year?*) *(level 3)*
S: [291] No. I bought the bag for one year.
T: [292] The sentence is still problematic, 'for one year' cannot go with past tense. I'll show you two sentences and you'll know the difference. *(level 4)*
(*Write on the blackboard: I have moved here for ten years. I moved here ten years ago.*)
S: [293] I bought the bag a year ago.
T: [294] Yes, correct. But what if we keep the present perfect? We can change the sentence into 'I have owned the bag for a year'. *(level 6)*

In Example 16 after realizing the student could not spot mistakes, the teacher went on to give more explicit hint 'Can we use the word buy in present perfect?' *(level 2)* and tried to remind the student the rule of present perfect tense *(level 3)*. Yet the student was not able to provide a satisfactory answer. The teacher had no choice but to show the student the difference between present perfect and simple past tense with two sentences *(level 4)*. With the teacher's assistance, the student modified the earlier answer. With the hope that students could avoid similar errors, the teacher also provided future example *(level 6)*.

Example 17: (B. 95-104)
S: [95] This is most interesting book I have ever read.
T: [96] Is that a correct sentence? *(level 1)*
S: [97] um…
T: [98] zhe er yong dao le xing rong ci zui gao ji, dui ba? (*Here we have adjective superlatives, right?*) *(level 2)*
S: [99] Yes, most interesting.
T: [100] Yes, but what's about the article? Listen to me: you are the most beautiful girl I have ever seen. *(level 4)*
S: [101] This is the most interesting book I have ever read.
T: [102] Yes. Give me another sentence: zhe shi wo du guo zui wu qu de yi ben shu. (*This is the least interesting book I have ever read.*) *(level 6)*
S: [103] This is the least interesting book I have ever read.
T: [104] Good!

This episode is about the usage of adjective superlatives. With teacher's assistance (*level 1. level 2*), the student still thought that the answer was without any problem 'Yes, most interesting'. So the teacher went on by giving a model and the student immediately added the missing definite article. Then the teacher asked him to give another sentence with the same sentence pattern to check whether the student had truly mastered the language point.

From the above examples we could see that by using scaffolded feedback teachers provided guidance to assist learners' learning, and this kind of assistance was 'increasingly elaborated until the learner shows signs of responsiveness' (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994, p. 470). When learners made mistakes, both teacher A and B tried to cue them in hope of self-correction

(*level 1*). Learner's hesitation showed that self-correction was beyond their current level, so teachers implicitly directed learners' attention to the source of the error, such as 'Beer is an uncountable noun, right?' (*level 2*). As soon as teachers found that implicit implication did not work, they gave further assistant by pointing out the explicit rules or giving examples or both (*level 3. 4. 5*). In most cases, learners were able to correct the mistake when teachers provided them with explicit rules and examples; however, sometimes teachers would go on with further explanations and examples (*level 6*) to make sure whether learners have mastered the specific language point. In this way learners are enabled to draw on knowledge they have learned to revise their answers.

Compared with other kinds of feedback, scaffolded feedback was more effective. First, scaffolded feedback led learners to pay more attention to their mistakes. If teachers corrected mistakes directly, such as explicit correction and recast, learners may even have difficulty identifying the correction. It was possible that they just repeated the correct answer without thinking it through. When giving scaffolded feedback teachers guided learners step by step during the dialogic process, from implicit implication to explicit rule and example. Thus learners would be quite clear why their answers were problematic and be more familiar with the grammatical rules. Second, scaffolded feedback provided learners with assistance according to their needs. Teachers always started with a clarification request by asking 'are you sure' to hint learners, if the learner was proficient enough to identify the mistake at this level; there was no need to go on with feedback. If the learner was still confused, teachers need to provide further scaffolding. Therefore scaffolded feedbacks not only allow learners to play an active role in correcting their own mistakes, but also provide them with different levels of assistance they need.

5 Conclusion

The present study investigated the types of verbal feedbacks used by two ESL teachers in their classroom. Based on the analysis of classroom observation, the study provided the following results.

First, the findings revealed that the most frequent type of verbal feedback used by the two teachers is evaluative feedback. Praise is valuable in classroom interaction as it conveys positive information. However, if excessively given, it may indicate that teachers have little confidence in their abilities (Thompson, 1997), and the encouragement will be reduced. The study revealed that 73.6% of the type of feedback used in the classrooms consisted of evaluative feedback, it is necessary for teachers to pay more attention. Instead just praise students by saying 'good', it is better to give some specific comments, which will let students know exactly what they did is worth praising.

Although teachers did not utilize corrective feedback as much as evaluative feedback, it was an important pedagogical technique teachers use to draw attention to students' erroneous utterances (Lee, 2013). In this study it was discovered that Chinese teachers preference of corrective feedback were different from foreign teachers, which may cause by Chinese's characteristic. Compared with other kinds of feedback, scaffolded feedback was more systematic and progressive. It not only led learners to pay more attention to their mistakes, but also provided learners with assistance according to their needs.

Another finding was that due to the focus on the grammatical syllabus, teachers' talk still accounted the majority time of class time and teacher-initiated exchanges still dominated the interaction in the English language classrooms. Therefore, teachers needed to provide more chances to facilitate students' communication in the classroom. The effect of verbal feedback was obviously important because there were more and more evidence that it could enhance student learning. This would implied that teachers need to reflect on the use of feedback in their own classrooms, and adjusted it according to students' reaction.

The present study has some limitations. First of all, the number of teachers who participated was too small to generalize the results. And classroom observation was the only method used to collect data, which could not provide sufficient explanations and reasons why teachers most preferred one type of feedback. Further research could include more teachers and have in-depth following-up interviews with both teachers and students, which can help researchers to understand both sides and to discover the most effective feedback types in second language learning.

Reference

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation: Second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 465-483.

Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011). Exploring the Teachers' Use of Spoken Corrective Feedback in Teaching Iranian EFL Learners at Different Levels of Proficiency. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1859-1868.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching & Learning*. Cambridge: CUP.

Cook, V. (2011). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching (Fourth Edition)*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive Teacher Talk: the Importance of the F-move. *ELT Journal*, 56, 117-127.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1, 1-18.

Han, J., & Jung, J. (2007). Patterns and preferences of corrective feedback and learner repair. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 23, 243-260.

Khaliliaqdam, S. (2014). ZPD, Scaffolding and Basic Speech Development in EFL Context. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 891 – 897.

Lee, E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learners repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41, 217-230.

Lewis, M. (2002). *Giving Feedback in Language Classes.* Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Center.

Lochtman, K. (2002). Oral corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom: how it affects interaction in analytic foreign language teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37, 271-283.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: negotiation of form in communicative classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.

Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (1994). Text-based vs. activities-oriented science curriculum: Implications for students with disabilities. Remedial and Special Education, 15, 72-85.

Noor, N. M., Aman, I., Mustaffa, R., & Seong, T. K. (2010). Teacher's Verbal Feedback on Students' Response: A Malaysian ESL Classroom Discourse Analysis. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 398-405.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573-595.

Rassaei, E. (2014). Scaffolded Feedback, Recasts and L2 Development: A Sociocultural Perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98, 417-430.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1992). *Toward an Analysis of Discourse: the English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Suzuki, M. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classroom. *Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 4, 1-21.

Tompson, T. (1997). Do we need to train teachers how to administer praise? Self-worth theory says we do. *Learning and Instruction*, 28, 49-64.