



التغذية الراجعة في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية  
(أنواعه - خصائصه - استراتيجياته)  
د . رباب عبدالكريم الدرسي - كلية التربية - جامعة درنة  
أ . مرضية أبوبكر الزوكي - كلية الآداب - جامعة طبرق

**الملخص :**

تستكشف هذه الورقة مفهوم التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية من خلال الدراسات البحثية السابقة والتي تعد واحدة من الممارسات الأساسية في فصول اللغة ، كما تظهر تعريفاتها المتنوعة. وتحاول الورقة - أيضاً - رسم تصنيف واضح لأنواع التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية بناءً على نتائج الدراسات السابقة ومناقشة الاستراتيجيات التي يستخدمها معلمو اللغات الأجنبية . وأخيراً فإن الورقة تصف مميزات التغذية الراجعة الفعالة التي إذا تم استخدامها بشكل مناسب، فإنها ستحقق الهدف المتمثل في استخدامها.

**Dr. Rabab Adarasi**

**Miss. Mardiya Abobaker Elzouki**

**Faculty of Education-University of Derna**

**Faculty of Arts-University of Tobruk**

[rabab.aldarasi@gmail.com](mailto:rabab.aldarasi@gmail.com)

[mardiya.elzouki@tu.edu.ly](mailto:mardiya.elzouki@tu.edu.ly)

**Corrective Feedback in EFL Classroom, types, features, and strategies**

**Abstract**

Throughout the previous research studies on corrective feedback, this paper explores the concept of feedback, which is one of the essential practices in the language classroom and shows its various definitions. It also attempts to draw a clear classification of the types of corrective feedback based on the results of the studies in the literature and discusses the strategies used by FL teachers. Finally, the paper describes the feature of effective feedback that if used appropriately, it will achieve the goal of using effective feedback.

**Index Terms:** CF corrective feedback, oral feedback, written feedback, effective feedback, and language acquisition.

**1. Introduction**

Learning a foreign language entails making mistakes, and it is the responsibility of the teacher to offer constructive criticism in a way that promotes language learning and acquisition. Having said that, both teachers

and theorists of second or foreign languages are extremely concerned with the subject of corrective feedback (CF) and its potential beneficial role in language learning. Any educational process strongly relies on CF because it may both sharply boost the performance of both learners and instructors and point out specific areas where both parties' work can be improved. According to Dignen (2014), the ability to provide and receive CF both inside and outside of the classroom is the most important communication skill. Corrective feedback is information provided to students about their performance or the knowledge they have learned throughout a learning experience.

Since CF is an essential part of teaching and learning in L2 classes, CF can be offered orally (for instance, teachers correcting students' spoken mistakes) or in writing (for instance, teachers providing feedback on students' written assignments). CF has been shown to aid second-language acquisition in learners (Ellis, 2009), and it is essential for second-language acquisition in language learning. It can be positive or negative, and as a reaction to a linguistic fault, CF falls under the negative feedback category, as Ellis (2009) finds out.

Despite teachers' regular efforts and endless corrections, some students continue to repeat the same mistakes. Sometimes it is because teachers have unrealistic expectations for their students; other times it is because students are not motivated to improve their language skills; and occasionally, there is a disconnect between what teachers say and what students hear and understand. The exchange of feedback between students and teachers in the classroom, on the other hand, is critical and required, as educators agree that feedback helps students be aware of their errors and promotes learning.

In this paper, the researchers attempt to look deeply at the literature on feedback and consider the main issues related to the topic, such as the definition of CF, types of CF (oral and written), and strategies for giving CF. Furthermore, this paper focuses discussion on the features of effective feedback and appropriate feedback.

## **2. Definition of CF**

Feedback, in general, is conceptualized as information provided to learners following an assessment or a task regarding positive aspects and areas of improvement in their performance or understanding (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Wang (2006: 42) states, "Feedback is the information about current performance that can be used to improve future performance." Ur (1996: 242) also defines feedback as "information that is given to the learner about his or her performance on a learning task, usually with the objective of improving



this performance." According to Lightbown and Spada (2006), CF refers to any feedback that tells learners their target language output is wrong.

Ellis, R. (2009) defines CF as a response to learners' wrong sentences. Others trigger the response, and it includes telling learners their sentences are wrong, offering them the right target language form, as well as offering grammatical explanations for learners' errors.

### **3. Types of Feedback**

Feedback is a notion subjected by researchers to various typologies; thus, they differentiate between oral and written corrective feedback, positive or negative feedback, as well as immediate vs. delayed feedback.

#### **3.1 CF Oral**

Oral corrective feedback is the act of a teacher correcting errors in a student's speech. In one of the earliest publications on the subject, Chaudron (1977, p. 31) defined "corrective feedback" as "any reply of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly alludes to, or requests improvement of the learner's utterance." According to Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam's (2006) definition of corrective feedback, corrective comments are made in reaction to incorrect learner utterances. The answers may include one or more of the following: (a) a declaration that a mistake has been made; (b) the presentation of the appropriate target language form; (c) meta-linguistic details regarding the nature of the mistake; or (d) any combination of these. (p. 340). Explicit corrections, recasts, elicitations, repetition, requests for clarification, and metalinguistic feedback were the six main types of feedback identified by Lyster and Ranta, as will be explained below in detail.

##### **3.1.1. Explicit Correction**

It points out the explicit requirement of the right form. While demonstrating the proper form, the teacher makes it very clear that what the student said was erroneous as the teacher changes the errors into the correct form.

##### **Example of express correction:**

S: The day . . . yesterday. (Lexical error)

T: Yes. No, the day before yesterday. (Express correction)

##### **3.1.2. Recast**

Recast with regard to FLT could be defined as "the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 48). The psycholinguistic idea behind it is that FL learners make an immediate cognitive comparison between their own erroneous utterance and the target language, recast by the discourse partner (Mackey & Philp, 1998; Saxton). A recast entails the teacher rephrasing all or a portion of a student's statement while eliminating the mistake. Some recasts are more noticeable

than others are, since they may simply change one word, whilst others add the grammatical or lexical change to a longer passage of dialogue. Although recasts are not provided with the aid of using such phrases as "you mean," "use this word," and "you ought to say the error" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 48). The psycholinguistic idea behind it is that FL learners make an immediate cognitive comparison between their own erroneous utterance and the target language, recast by the discourse partner (Mackey & Philp, 1998; Saxton). A recast entails the teacher rephrasing all or a portion of a student's statement while eliminating the mistake. Some recasts are more noticeable than others are, since they may simply change one word, whilst others add the grammatical or lexical change to a longer passage of dialogue. Although recasts are not provided with the aid of using such phrases as "you mean," "use this word," and "you ought to say," they are commonly used in EL classrooms.

**An Example of a Recast:**

S: . . . I searched out my pen.

T: You reformulation is required.

**An example of clarification requests**

S: my class now here

T: I don't understand.

**3.1.4. Metalinguistic Feedback**

Metalinguistic feedback is the type of feedback that is presented without are searching for your pen. (Lyster & Panova, 2002, p. 575).

**3.1.3. Clarification requests**

Using phrases like "pardon, Excuse me?" or "I don't understand," by a teacher, indicates that the speech has not been comprehensible, or that the student's utterance contained some type of errors and that a repetition or a specifically stating the proper form; it either provides remarks, details, or concerns about the "well-formedness" of the student's utterance. Lyster and Ranta (1997) referred to this type of feedback as "comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form" (p. 47). This type of feedback provides the students with a diversity of clues related to possible reformulations of the target forms that contain errors. On the other hand, a word definition in the case of lexical errors (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

**An example of metalinguistic feedback**

S: I have two sister

T: It's plural



### 3.1. 5. Elicitation

It indicates at least three methods that instructors employ to ask students directly for the right form. First, teachers purposefully pause to give students a chance to "fill in the blank" before finishing their own sentences, for example (he... to the school by car). Second, instructors use questions to draw forth the appropriate forms (for instance, how do we say X in English?). Such inquiries avoid using yes-or-no questions. Third, teachers occasionally request that students revise their statements.

### 3.1.6. Repetition

It refers to the teacher's isolated repetition of the student's incorrect statement. Teachers typically change their intonation to emphasize the mistake.

#### **Example of repetition:**

S: Are you understand?

T: Are you understand? (Changing intonation)

### 3.2 Written Feedback

Because written feedback is a considerable element of teaching and learning a foreign language, researchers in pedagogy have explored the different types of written feedback and labeled them into various types. First, local feedback and global feedback Local feedback refers to the teachers' focus on the form of students' writing, i.e., local issues such as grammar and spelling. While global feedback concerns global issues such as ideas and content (Montgomery & Baker 2007), Hyland (2003) points out that teachers' feedback focusing on the form could have an immediate influence on the revision of learners' drafts, yet it had no considerable impact on writing development. On the other hand, other researchers such as Ferris & Roberts (2001) concluded that learners who received feedback from teachers were better in content than those who received no feedback. The second type of written feedback, as Varnosfadrani and Basturkmen (2009) indicate, is explicit feedback. The researchers define it in general as "the process of providing the learner with direct forms of feedback" (p. 83). In their writing scheme, Bitchener and Knoch (2010) argued that explicit correction offers for the correction of linguistic form or structure or of linguistic errors, and it could be extended to the crossing out of a word, phrase, or morpheme, the provision of grammar rules.

Sarosdy et al. (2006) explain that written work is to be manifested according to its purpose. That is to say, if the aim is communication, the focus of feedback should not be marked according to e.g., spelling. Sarosdy, et. al. (2006) assert that " the basic principle is that controlled writing is to be corrected tightly, but in the case of guided or free compositions, when the aim is fluency and comprehensibility rather than strict accuracy, we should correct

less and react to it as communication". Nevertheless, Harmer (1991) indicates the importance of accuracy, yet he advises that learners' writing work should not be covered with red ink and that teachers should lessen the number of corrections to avoid learners' discouragement.

#### 4. Feedback Strategies

Feedback strategies can be seen from different perspectives. Teachers can use a system of abbreviations or symbols to show where the mistake occurs and the nature of the mistakes, for example (Sp for spelling; Gr for grammar; WO for word order; T for tense, etc).

| <b>Examples of students' writing errors</b>                     | <b>Correction Abbreviation or symbol</b> |
|---|--|
| There <u>is</u> <sup>Gr</sup> new students in my class.         | Gr instead of grammar error              |
| Some <u>beople</u> <sup>Sp</sup> work hard to get food.         | Sp instead of spelling error             |
| She did not talk, nor <u>she</u> <u>did</u> <sup>WO</sup> move. | WO instead of word order error           |
| My friends and I <u>play</u> <sup>T</sup> football yesterday.   | T instead of tense error                 |

Using correction codes as a substitute for forgiving full correction is a common practice. The reason behind it is that it promotes students to think about their errors and correct them themselves individually. Another applicable strategy is exchanging students' written work, in which students can work and discuss in small groups and then correct each other's errors.

In addition to the strategy given above, Lee (2017) suggests two types of feedback strategies: direct and indirect feedback. The direct strategy refers to the provision of straight corrections to errors, whereas the indirect strategy points to the identification and indication of errors without giving corrections, such as coding. Realizing the type of strategy varies with the feedback focus (Geng, 2017). When addressing global problems directly, teachers can:

- Make overt corrections or provide reasonable suggestions about how to solve them.
- Present correct answers directly in terms of direct feedback on linguistic errors.
- Delete redundant or erroneous items.
- Insert omitted items (Sheen, 2011; Lee, 2017).



Concerning global issues indirectly, merely identifying and indicating the errors without corrections or suggestions for improvement is a widely used strategy (Geng, 2017). In addition to the formulation, highlighting the errors with or without metalinguistic clues or explanations (Sheen, 2011; Lee, 2017).

## **5. Features of Effective Feedback**

Not every piece of feedback students receive is effective. As Allman (2019) demonstrates, good FL teachers should understand the significance and value of substantive effective feedback for both the students and the teachers. The value of understanding the meaning of feedback for students lies in their realization of their performance and adjustments to the target language. The feedback that students receive cannot be effective unless it encourages and promotes a growth mindset. This allows the students to see errors as opportunities for learning and improving. The importance and worthiness of feedback for teachers provide them with an opportunity to investigate and evaluate student growth in terms of objectives they are trying to meet. Furthermore, effective feedback notifies teachers about their students' strong and weak points, which will help them to work on and improve the weak ones. Ultimately, the genuine reason for effective feedback is to be targeted, specific, and timely. (Allman, 2019).

### **5.1 Targeted**

Effective feedback must be targeted. That is to say, goal-referenced and consistent. Goal-referenced feedback is constantly connected to a previously learned objective or an established goal. It warns students whether they are on course or off track. In some cases, students are uncertain about specific task objectives and even about overall content, language, and literacy goals. Therefore, it is important to clarify the goals and learning objectives at the onset of the activity and remind students along the task of the objectives to help them see a clear path in mind. This enables students to self-evaluate if they are completing the task successfully and make necessary corrections. When the students receive feedback tied to the goals and objectives, they will be informed of their progress and the need for adjustment. Consistent feedback means affording direction and feedback that is constant, accurate, and trustworthy. Instead of using general comments like "well done" and "fabulous", a well-designed rubric refers to the teachers' focus on learning goals. Making use of good rubrics and pre-and post-assessments to measure language improvement makes feedback more goal-oriented and consistent, and thus more targeted.

## **5.2. Specific**

Effective feedback is specific in that it is tangible and transparent, actionable, and user-friendly. Tangible and transparent feedback makes certain that the direction students receive is considerable and concrete enough and that they comprehend what it means. In addition, feedback requires actionable results, which means it leads to action. It must be clear enough that the students understand what they should do to correct their errors. Effective feedback is, moreover, specific in the way that it regards the recipient and, as a result, is user-friendly, which makes it more meaningful. User-friendly feedback suits the learner's level, which means it does not include overly or insufficient information or information beyond or below their level of understanding. For instance, if a teacher uses editing marks (codes), as mentioned above, on a student's paper, they need to make sure that their editing marks are all understood; otherwise, such feedback is not user-friendly and therefore ineffective.

## **5.3. Timely**

Effective feedback must be timely, which means it must be well-timed and ongoing. Effective feedback must be provided while the learning process is still happening so that the students do not develop misconceptions and will be invested in the subject matter throughout the class. This requires a teacher's expert judgment. Based on the learning task and knowing the student, a teacher must decide how much feedback to provide and if a learning situation entails written comments, conversation, demonstration, or another option. Teachers also need to recognize when to abstain from giving feedback in order to permit students time to negotiate, practice, and self-correct as they work in a group.

## **Conclusion**

Making language errors is natural in any language classroom, and providing students with feedback is one of the teacher's roles that must be practiced appropriately. When teachers give effective feedback to their learners, they show their understanding that language students have unique learning requirements and need individualized support. The errors that students make vary. They could be oral or written errors. Both kinds of errors meet different types of feedback that help students improve their language acquisition if they are used correctly at a suitable time. Language learners should be given feedback that is targeted, specific, and timely in a particular way to ensure that the learning process is successful. For further research, there is a need to investigate why language acquisition remains weak and slow for some FL learners, although expert teachers provide effective feedback.





## References

1. Allman, B. (2019). Effective and Appropriate Feedback for English Learners. In B. Allman, Principles of Language Acquisition. EdTech Books. Retrieved from [https://edtechbooks.org/language\\_acquisition/effective\\_ell\\_appropriate\\_feedback](https://edtechbooks.org/language_acquisition/effective_ell_appropriate_feedback)
2. Allwright, R., Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all?: Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 28(4), 543-574.
4. Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. *Applied linguistics*, 31(2), 193-214.
5. Chaudron, C. (1977). A DESCRIPTIVE MODEL OF DISCOURSE IN THE CORRECTIVE TREATMENT OF LEARNERS' ERRORS 1. *Language learning*, 27(1), 29-46.
6. Chiu, C. M., Hsu, M. H., & Wang, E. T. (2006). Understanding knowledge sharing in virtual communities: An integration of social capital and social cognitive theories. *Decision support systems*, 42(3), 1872-1888.
7. Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
8. Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talks. The importance of the F- move. *ELT Journal*, 56(2), 117-127.
9. Dignen, B. (2014). Five reasons why feedback may be the most important skills. Available at <http://www.cambridge.org/elt/blog/2014/03/five->
10. Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*, 3, 197-262.
11. Ellis, R. 2009. Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3-18.
12. Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 28(2), 339-368.
13. Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of second language writing*, 10(3), 161-184.
14. Geng, H. (2017). *The effects of written feedback and revision-focus direction on student revision and writing improvement* (Doctoral dissertation, ResearchSpace@ Auckland).
15. Harmer J. (1991), *the Practice of English Language Teaching*, New York: Longman Publishing. Lee (2017)
16. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.
17. Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing other in forms: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, 31(2), 217-230.

18. Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Singapore: Springer Singapore.
19. Lee, J., & Kim, A. (2005). Development of an academic achievement goal orientation scale. *The Korean Journal of Educational Psychology*, 19, 311–325.
20. Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. 1997. Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.
21. Lyster, R. (2002). Negotiation in immersion teacher-student interaction. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3-4), 237-253.
22. Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(01), 1-40.
23. Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 338-356.
24. Mackiewicz, J., & Thompson, I. (2013). Motivational scaffolding, politeness, and writing center tutoring. *The Writing Center Journal*, 33(1), 38-73.
25. Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82-99.  
reasons-feedback-may-important-skill/(accessed on 6 December 2014)
26. Sárosdy, J., Bencze, T. F., Poór, Z., & Vadnay, M. (2006). Applied linguistics I for BA students in English.
27. Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*. New York: Springer.
28. Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*. New York: Springer.
29. Tunstall, P., & Gsipp, C. (1996). Teacher feedback to young children in formative assessment: A typology. *British educational research journal*, 22(4), 389-404.
30. Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
31. Varnosfadrani, A. D., & Basturkmen, H. (2009). The effectiveness of implicit and explicit error correction on learners' performance the systemic, 37(1), 82-98.
32. Zaleski, J., & Pietraszko, A. (1996). Structure at 200 and 298 K and X-ray investigations of the phase transition at 242 K of [NH<sub>2</sub> (CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] 3Sb<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>9</sub> (DMACA). *Acta Crystallographica Section B: Structural Science*, 52(2), 287-295