

# The Spoken Error Correction Used by the Teachers in English Classroom at Different Level of Education

Widya Sri Wahyuni<sup>1</sup>, Hamzah Hamzah<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Universitas Negeri Padang, School of Languages and Arts, Jalan Prof, Hamka, Padang, 25133, Indonesia

**Abstract:** *This research aims to find, describe, and analyze the correction techniques used by the teachers in English classroom interaction. This research focuses to (1) identify the types of spoken error correction used by the teachers in English classroom, (2) explain the uptake of students toward the types of spoke error correction used by the teachers in English classroom, and (3) describe the preferences of students toward the spoken error correction used by the teachers in English classroom. This research was conducted at junior and senior high schools involving six English teachers and 266 students as respondents. This is a descriptive research which analyzes the teacher-student interaction in the classroom. The findings shows that (1) the most frequently type of spoken error correction used by the teachers at junior high School was recast while at Senior High School was clarification request. (2) The uptake of students highly contributed by recast at Junior High while at Senior High was contributed highly by clarification request. (3) The preferences of students toward the spoken error correction used by the teachers in English classroom at both levels were strongly preferred to the teacher provided correction and recast as the correction technique in correcting the students' erroneous utterance.*

**Keywords:** Error Correction, Students uptake, and students preferences

## 1. Introduction

The teacher-students' interaction in English classroom is the teaching and learning process itself. Teaching commonly happens when the teacher explains information about the material or gives the feedback of the students' error in doing a specific activity in the classroom and learning is fundamental process that involves the making of mistakes. The teacher's explanation and feedback are useful to expend the students' knowledge of English. After the students gain the meaningful information about English through the teacher's briefly explanation then the students would take those information and practice it into their target language system in doing communication of certain activity in the classroom. While this activity the teacher's spoken error correction naturally occurs as corrective feedback to the students' erroneous of their utterance.

In correcting the students' errors, the teachers have their own perspective or tendency to use certain types of error correction. The error correction in this context is often used to ensure that learners use accurately about what they have just been learned. These error corrections are being used by the teachers when they are doing communication and interaction with the students in English classroom. They are classified into several categories such as explicit correction, recasting, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Each type provides specific signal or cue to the students about their error or sometime provide the correct one. Each type has its own sake and purpose and they are used by the teacher depend on his/ her own considerations or tendencies.

Beside the teacher' error correction made in English classroom, it is also need to consider about the students' uptake. The students' uptake refers to the students' reconstruction of their error after receiving correction from

the teachers. It is a crucial factor of error correction used by the teacher because the students' uptake toward the teacher's correction exhibits the effective type of spoken error correction used by the teacher.

As widely range of view, it is better also to consider the students' perception regard to the types of teacher's error correction used because it would reveal the student's belief or preference. By figuring out the preferred types, it indicates the effective uptake and meaningful learning for the students in English classroom. Moreover, the individual factors like the students' belief and preferences in learning would impact the students' motivation to involve actively in English classroom. Consequently, it will increase the effectiveness of teaching and learning process itself.

In fact, the growing evidence about the type of students' errors and the teacher's strategies in correcting them in the same level of education has been available and they are beneficial for English learning. Unfortunately, the teachers' types of error correction used in English classroom at different level of education have not received considerable attention. Further, the focus of this study can be expanded into two aspects - the students' uptake and the students' preferences toward the teacher's type of error correction used in English classroom. Undoubtedly, the schools which have different level of education have distinct students' standard of English capability. Hence, the English teachers at different levels of education have similarities of English educational level and professional degree as it occurs at SMPN 3 Solok Selatan and SMAN 2 Solok Selatan. It was important to give more attention toward these cases whether the English teachers at different levels of education would influence the teachers' option to use certain types of error correction in English classroom.

Volume 8 Issue 7, July 2019

[www.ijsr.net](http://www.ijsr.net)

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

In establishing the more meaningful second language instruction, the language teaching principle makes sure its development with complete consideration in order to facilitate all crucial factors in second language teaching. There are several explanations about two kinds of instruction that commonly adopted in English classroom and how their tendency as goal of language learning. Those instructions can be compiled in English classroom in order to enrich the information and give lavish English input for students' English proficiency.

The compilation and collaboration of form and meaning focused instruction in English classroom refers to integrated approach in second language teaching. Despite concern to form of the English structure or grammatical, the teachers or the students also put the attention on when particular language use in certain context or communicative setting. This integration presents the communicative approach in English classroom. The most popular communicative approach in English classroom is Communicative Language Teaching. Esmaeli and Behnam (2014:204) assert that Communicative language teaching made a balance between principles of Audiolingualism and Cognitivism and recognized errors as evidence of learners' interlanguage development, not as a sign of lack of linguistic knowledge which is to be avoided in language classes. It reveals that communicative language teaching as a form of integrated approach which combine the instructional treatment by integrate the form and meaning-focused instruction will make the students focus on language and how it is used in certain context of communication. Furthermore, the balance concern of form and meaning in English classroom also enrich the students' error in their inter-language system which can be useful to develop their linguistic knowledge.

Even, integrated instructions of form and meaning in English classroom established the various errors of the learners in communication and automatically present variety of error correction used or corrective feedback by the teacher. According to Pawlak (2014:9), the provision of corrective feedback is clearly one of the most important techniques in which such a dual focus on form and meaning can be accomplished, with the effect that it has become one of the most promising and vibrant lines of inquiry in form-focused instruction and its adept use in the classroom is regarded as highly conducive to the mastery of the target language. It is caused the teachers desires to achieve meaningful English learning by focusing on form and meaning as known as integrated approach will enrich the various error of the students and the teachers automatically also use various error correction in communication.

Error correction is also known as corrective feedback. Error correction or is the teacher's correction toward the students' errors in their inter-language system. The aim of corrective feedback is the elimination of those errors. It becomes learning process itself. Pawlak (2014:3) defines that the term error correction is applied in the same sense as corrective feedback as well as a number of other expressions that can be drawn upon to describe teachers' response to learners' inaccurate spoken and written output. It asserts that error correction is utilized with such term as corrective feedback

which refers to the responses toward the students' error in their language system, spoken or written.

According to Lyster and Ranta in Safari (2013:1170), the types of error correction are classified into six types. They are *a) Explicit Correction*, when the teacher clearly indicates that the student's utterance is incorrect, so he or she provides the learner with the correct form of the erroneous utterance. *b) Recasts*, a kind of feedback technique in which the teacher implicitly reformulates all or parts of a student's ill-formed utterance minus the error. *c) Clarification Request*, this feedback type carries questions showing the utterance has been ill-formed or misunderstood. Actually, it might be in two different forms including questions like *pardon? What? As well as sorry?* or even the use of utterances with rising tone to show that the learner has committed the error. *d) Metalinguistic Feedback*, this contains either comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form. *e) Elicitation*, it refers to the techniques utilized by the teacher in order to directly elicit the right grammatical form from the learner. *f) Repetition*, in this technique, the learner's erroneous form is repeated by the teacher in order to draw learner's attention to it.

Uptake refers to the learner's notice and response toward the teacher's error correction. Particularly, it is the learner's reconstruction of their error in their inter-language system after receiving teacher's correction toward their mismatch of utterance. According to Campillo (2005:210) when learners are presented with corrective feedback, they have a wide range of responses at their disposal, what has been called uptake. It asserts that uptake is the student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student tries to do with the teacher's feedback.

Furthermore, the learner's uptake also can be categorized into successful uptake, unsuccessful uptake and no uptake (Fu & Nassaji:170). They are: *a) Successful uptake*, it refers to a student's successful correction of the error after teacher feedback. *b) Unsuccessful uptake*, it refers to a student's partial or off-target correction of an error after receiving teacher feedback. *c) No uptake*. It refers to the instances when the students did not produce any verbal response to the teacher's feedback.

The dynamic of learner's perception is valuable over time and needs to be explored. The student's beliefs change over a course of language instruction. There are several factors that influence the students' belief and perception. As English teachers who are expert of English. His or her views whether explicitly or implicitly in teaching practice have a strong influence on the students' own belief. Yoshida (2008:80) states that there is a gap between teachers' choice and learners' preferences of error correction. The reasons of this gap are social and pedagogical events. From social perspective, the students might prefer to receive correction from their peer to avoid the social embarrassment rather than from their teacher. Meanwhile, from pedagogical event, the student might prefer to be given time to do self-generated

correction rather than teacher's provided one and most of the students prefer to be given time to think of the correct form because this could push them to improve and develop their inter-language system.

## 2. Methodology

The paradigm of this research was qualitative approach. In this research, the method used in performing the analysis was descriptive method. There were 12 audio and video recordings of teacher-students interaction in English classroom and 266 questionnaires from Junior and senior high School students. The types of spoken error correction and the students' uptake toward them were obtained through the recordings and transcription. Further, the students' preferences were figuring out through questionnaire.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1 The types of the teachers' correction

Regarding with how the teacher correct the students' ill-formed utterance, the teacher used some correction techniques as suggested by Lyster and Ranta (1998). They were explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation. Based on audio recorder analysis and transcript, the frequency and percentage of the types of spoken error correction used in English classroom was presented in table below

**Table 1:** The Types of Error Correction

Types of Error Correction	Junior High		Senior High	
	F	%	F	%
Explicit Correction	8	11.1%	9	6.3%
Recast	59	82%	16	11.1%
Clarification Request	2	2.8%	72	50%
Metalinguistic Feedback	1	1.3%	21	14.6%
Elicitation	2	2.8%	21	14.6%
Repetition	0	0%	5	3.4%
TOTAL	72	100%	144	100%

The table 1 shows that the types of spoken error correction used by the teachers to different level of students are varied. It seems that the types of spoken error correction which most frequently used by the teachers in English classroom at different level of education is distinct. At SMPN 3 Solok Selatan, the teacher mostly used recast (82%) in correcting the students' errors. Meanwhile, the teachers at SMAN 2 Solok Selatan used clarification request (50%) most frequently to correct the students' utterance errors.

The using of recast was mostly found in English classroom interaction at SMPN 3 Solok Selatan. Explicit correction has the high portion in English classroom interaction, but the recast has the highest portion used rather than the other types. Then, the low portion used was clarification request, elicitation, and metalinguistic feedback. This finding was in line with Siddiek (2013) denotes that recast was reported to be the most frequently used types of oral corrective feedback.

Further, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, clarification request, explicit correction and repetition were the five moderately used types of oral corrective feedback.

In using recast to correct the students, the teachers usually replaces the students' error by reformulating the all parts of students' ill-formed utterance as implicitly as possible. The following examples were taken from the data:

*Datum 1*

*S: Wow. Your classroom is clean and tidy /tidi/.*

*T: Wow. Your classroom is clean and tidy /'taidi/.*

*S: ...*

*Datum 2*

*S: Their school yard /yar/ is very large*

*T: Yard /yard/.*

*S: ...*

The data above shows how the teacher used recast in correcting the students' error. On the datum 1, the teacher and the students were practicing the example of dialogue about the classroom. In the sentence "wow, your classroom is clean and tidy" a student incorrectly pronunciation word "tidy" by saying /tidi/. Then, the teacher reformulates all words of the sentence in correct one in order to stimulate the student's awareness of the erroneous.

Then, the datum 2 shows that the teacher reformulated a part of student's ill-utterance with the correct one. On the similar context to data 1 and 4, the students were practicing dialogue with the teacher. They had incorrect pronunciation of word "yard /yar/" of "their school yard is very large". Then, the teacher implicitly corrected the students' error by reformulates the part of the students' erroneous

Moreover, based on table 1.1, the using of clarification request was frequently found in English classroom at SMAN 2 Solok Selatan. It has the highest portion of using. It was 50% using from 100% totally. Then, the average portion was metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and recast. Meanwhile, the low portion of using was explicit correction and repetition. This finding is consistent with the study by Gitsaki and Althobaiti (2010) in which revealed the most frequent types of interactional feedback with intermediate learners were clarification requests, explicit correction, metalinguistic clues, and recasts.

The transcription how the teachers corrected the students' error by using clarification can be seen as below:

*Datum 73*

*S: I have an idol, he really inspires /inspiris/*

*T: Sorry?*

*S: He really inspires /'inspairs/. His name is Jaya Raja. He is a genius teenage.*

*Datum 78*

*S: But he now lives in a house in India with his mother /moter/, father, and brother*

*T: Pardon me?*

*S: mother /moter/, father, and brother*



In datum 73, the student was reading an example of descriptive text. In sentence “*I have an idol, he really inspires*” the student had incorrect spelling of word “*inspires*” then teacher asked the students about their errors by asking “*sorry?*” to the students in order to clarify the error and reconstruct it. Next, in the similar topic with datum 73, on datum 78 the teacher asked question by asking “*pardon me?*” or “*what*” in order to request the students clarified their erroneous spelling of word “*mother*” by saying /*moter*/ while the correct pronunciation is /*mATHəR*/. In short, the teachers have some ways in requesting the students to clarify their error.

Related to the types of error correction used in English classroom interaction at different level of education, the teachers at SMPN 3 Solok Selatan and SMAN 2 Solok Selatan tended to use different type of spoken error correction in correcting the students’ error. It was assumed that the teachers considered the students’ level of education in using certain types. The findings indicated that the teachers at SMAN 2 Solok Selatan estimated the students on the higher level of education also have the high English proficiency level rather than the students at SMPN 3 Solok Selatan. Thus, the teachers tended to use clarification request as type of error correction in English classroom by figuring out this factor. The teachers presumed that the students who are on high level of education are capable to do repairing their erroneous of utterance because they were supposed have more linguistic resources to use in reconstruction the erroneous. Therefore, the teachers at SMAN 2 Solok Selatan frequently used clarification request as the technique in correcting the students’ erroneous which encourage self-repair and expect to become more proficient students.

Meanwhile, based on the finding of observation at SMPN 3 Solok Selatan, the teachers tended to use recast in correcting the students’ error. The teachers at SMPN 3 Solok Selatan speculated that the students still on lower education level than SMAN 2 Solok Selatan. They inferred that the students were on low English proficiency level. The students were considered need more assistance in correcting the erroneous and rehearsal to avoid incorrect fossilization. Consequently, the teachers at SMPN 3 Solok Selatan preferred to use recast frequently rather than other types because recast provided the correct form.

However, the students’ level of education is not similar with the students’ English proficiency level. The different level of education does not imply the students’ English proficiency level. The teachers have to understand this fact. The teachers need to enhance the awareness of the students’ English proficiency level. Not the level of students’ education. The teachers are proposed to consider the students’ English proficiency in using certain type to correct the students’ error. This was in line with Bargiela (2003), the teachers have to take account the students’ level of L2 proficiency when making decision about feedback. It is important aspect in giving error correction. In English teaching and learning, the types of error correction used by the teachers are important. The teachers properly need to understand each correction techniques’ functions in correcting the students’ error. The teachers are educated and professional in English. They are the ones who correct students’ errors and determine

the effective teaching process. Ghazo (2016:157) states that error correction helps teacher to determine their classroom teaching practice and their teaching methodology to improve their students’ oral proficiency. Refers to the finding, the teachers have the right to use certain types of error correction such as explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition to correct the students’ error by considering the students’ English proficiency level.

### 3.2 Students’ uptake on the teachers’ correction

Dealing with how the students notice and reconstruct their utterance errors after receiving the correction from the teacher. The correction technique is succeeded if the students notice to the teacher’s correction and repair their erroneous. Schmidt (2010:1) denotes that noticing hypothesis, input does not become intake for language learning unless it is noticed. The frequency and percentage of the students’ uptake toward the teachers’ types of spoken error correction at Junior and Senior High Schools are stated as follows.

**Table 2:** Students’ uptake

The Students’ Uptake	JHS		SHS	
	F	%	F	%
Successful Uptake	24	33.3%	80	55.5%
Un-successful Uptake	9	12.5%	46	32%
No Uptake	39	54.2%	18	12.5%
TOTAL	72	100%	144	100%

Table 2 shows The students’ uptake on the teachers’ spoken error correction used in English classroom at different level of education. Regarding to the finding, the types of spoken error correction used by the teachers at Junior and Senior High Schools also gave various impacts toward the students’ uptake categories. Based on the findings, no uptake category had the highest percentage rather than successful uptake and unsuccessful uptake at SMPN 3 Solok Selatan. All of error correction types gave the contribution to the successful uptake. Even the recast had the highest contribution to the students’ successful uptake. Hence, recast was the most frequently numbers of no uptake. It means that recast gave higher contribution to no uptake rather than successful uptake. It might be caused by limited chance of reconstruction after receiving correction with recast technique from the teachers. This finding was in line with study of Asari (2012) denotes the total number of recasts detected in the data collection, those episodes where teachers provided recast that were followed by a topic continuation move and allowed no chance for learner uptake. Moreover, the successful uptake by the students toward the types of spoken error correction used by the teachers in English classroom at SMAN 2 Solok Selatan had the highest portion rather than other categories. It was contributed by all types of error correction. Hence, clarification request most frequently resulted in the successful uptake of the students rather than other types. It also contributed the unsuccessful uptake and no uptake. It seems that the number of types error correction used by the teachers impact the frequency of the successful uptake.

Generally, the effectiveness of error correction types in English classroom depends on how to measure the students' uptake and where the context is. However, classroom interaction utilized the students' uptake to measure developmental changes resulted by the error correction used by the teachers. Based on the findings, there was recast which had highest contribution to the successful uptake at SMPN 3 Solok Selatan and clarification request of SMAN 2 Solok Selatan. This finding was inconsistent with study by Bargiela (2003), elicitation is the most successful learning for uptake. Elicitation is for the largest numbers of uptake rather than other types of error correction. It means that the students' uptake by certain types resulted different contribution. It depends on where they were applied and to whom they refer to. It is safe to infer that the students' English proficiency level influences the students' uptake.

### 3.3 Students' preferences on the type of correction

The students' preferences are very important for successful language learning. The students' preferences were influenced by their learning styles, beliefs, proficiency level and their native language. The teacher attains the effective language learning through understanding of the students' preference. According to Schulz (2001:245), the view that matching the preferences of students and practices of teacher is important for successful language learning.

The students' Preferences toward who will initiate the correction and the types of correction provided by teachers in Junior and Senior High School are presented in the following tables.

**Table 3:** Student's preference on who initiated the correction

No	Correction initiate	JHS		SHS	
		F	%	F	%
1	Self-generated correction	1817	73.9	2277	79.6
2	Teacher correction	1897	77.1	2425	84.8

Based on the analysis, the researcher found that the students at SMPN 3 Solok Selatan and SMAN 2 Solok Selatan had similar option toward spoken error correction and the types of spoken error correction used by the teachers in English classroom interaction. At SMPN 3 Solok Selatan, the students preferred teacher provided correction and recast. Moreover, at SMAN 2 Solok Selatan, the students also preferred the teacher provided correction and recast. It elucidates that the teachers of both schools were recommended the teacher provide the correct one and use recast frequently in English classroom.

Regarding with the finding, the students at SMPN 3 Solok Selatan and SMAN 2 Solok Selatan preferred the teacher provide the correct one rather than do self-generated in correcting their error. It is indicated that the students still on the low English proficiency level. They were considered need more assistance and rehearsal to enrich their linguistic resources. Consequently, the students at SMPN 3 Solok Selatan and SMAN 2 Solok Selatan preferred the teacher provided correction. It was proved by the higher percentage response of the teacher provided rather than self-generated.

This finding was contradictive with Lyster and Ranta (1997) which proposed that the students-generated is important in second learning because it allows the students to retrieve their second language that they belong. Then, it also allows the students to revise their second language.

**Table 4:** Student's preference on the types of correction made by the teachers

No	Types of Correction	JHS		SHS	
		F	%	F	%
1	Explicit correction	829	84.2	1006	87.9
2	Recast	888	90.2	1038	90.7
3	Clarification request	818	83.1	942	82.3
4	Metalinguistic feedback	830	84.3	1028	89.9
5	Elicitation	812	82.5	967	84.5
	Repetition	724	73.6	916	80.1

Table 4 denotes the students' preferences to the types of spoken error correction in English classroom. Students at Junior and Senior High School preferred the teachers to use recast strategy in correcting their errors. This preference is in line with the dominant strategy used by the teacher in Junior High Schools in correcting the students' error. On the other hand, the teachers in Senior High Schools frequently used clarification request in correcting the students' error. It means that the teachers Junior High Schools were more aware and sensitive to the students' English proficiency level rather than the teachers in Senior High School. It implies that the students at Senior High Schools were treated as if they were still on low English proficiency level. In spite of the fact that it does not imply that there is impossibly recommended to use other types in correcting the students' errors.

Briefly, the discussion above shows that different level of education plays role of the teachers' spoken error correction used in English classroom interaction. The certain types of teachers' spoken error correction used in English classroom also variously contributed to the students' uptakes.. Meanwhile, the students at different level of education had similar preferences toward the spoken error correction and the types of error correction used in English classroom interaction.

## 4. Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the finding of the research at Junior and Senior High Schools, it can be concluded that the most frequently types used by the teachers at Junior High Schools were recast. Recast was the highest percentage used as compared than other correction types. Meanwhile, the types of error correction used by the teachers junior high Schools were clarification request. It is safe to conclude that the teachers at different level of education used different type of error correction. Next, The successful uptake was most frequently done by the students when it lead by recast in Junior High Schools meanwhile in Senior High School frequently occurred by clarification request. It can be inferred that the students with different level of education have different ability to notice and respond the types of error correction used by the teachers in English classroom. Lastly, the students' preferences at Junior High School and Senior High

School strongly preferred to teacher provided correction and recast as preferred type. It means that the students with different levels of education expected the teachers provide the correct one and use recast frequently in correcting their error.

There are some recommendations that are needed by the English teachers related to understanding the teachers' strategies in correcting the students' error, such as the teacher can apply the other types in correcting the students' error. Secondly, the students' uptake successfully occurred when the teachers aware of the students' English proficiency level and the activity followed or sequence stage after the students' receiving the correction. So, it implies that the teachers have to give more understanding of the students' condition and ability in receiving what the teachers inform. Thirdly, when the teachers choose and use certain types of correction in correcting the students' error, the teachers have to give the students chance to do reconstruction. Lastly, the students at this different level have the same desire for the type of error correction used in English classroom. The students strongly preferred the teacher to use recast.

## References

- [1] Al-Ghazo, A. (2016). Error Correction Strategies for the Classroom Oral Proficiency Used By Jordanian Teachers at Secondary Level. *International Journal of Learning and Development*. Vol. 6(3) pp.156-167.
- [2] Asari, Y. (2012). Types of Recast and Learners' Uptake. *Dilaogue*. Vol.11.pp.1-20..
- [3] Bargiela, M.M. (2003). Teacher Feedback and Learner Uptake. *Liguagem em letras*. Vol.4, No.1, pp.81-96
- [4] Campillo, P.S.(2005). An Analysis of Uptake Following Teacher's Feedback in the EFL Classroom. *REISLA*. 17. 209-22.
- [5] Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge and instruction. In *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching*, eds. R. Ellis, S. Loewen, C. Elder, R. M. Erlam, J. Philp and H. Reinders, 3–25. Bristol–Buffalo–Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- [6] Fu, T., & Nassaji, H. (2016). Corrective feedback, learner uptake, and feedback perception in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. Vol. 6(1).pp.159-181.
- [7] Gitsaki,C. & Althobaiti, N. (2010). ESL Teachers' Use of Corrective Feedback and its effect on Learner's Uptake. *The Journal of ASIS TEFL*. Vol.7, No.1, pp. 197-210.
- [8] Laufer, B. (2005). Focus-on-form in second language vocabulary acquisition. *EUROSLA Yearbook* 5, 223-250.
- [9] Littlewood, W. (1980). Form and Meaning in Language Teaching Methodology. *The Modern Language Journal*, 64:4, 441-445.
- [10] Loewen, S. (2004). The occurrence and characteristics of student-initiated focus on form. *Proceedings of the Independent Learning Conference 2003*. Retrieved from [www.independentlearning.org/1a03/ila03\\_Loewen%20](http://www.independentlearning.org/1a03/ila03_Loewen%20).
- [11] Loewen, S. (2007). Error correction in second language classroom. *Clear News*. (pp. 1-8). Michigan State University.
- [12] Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- [13] Pawlak,S. (2014).Error Correction in the Foreign Language Classroom. New York: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- [14]Safari, P. (2013). A Descriptive Study on Corrective Feedback and Learners' Uptake during Interactions in a Communicative EFL Class. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. Vol. 3(7) pp. 1165-1175. Finland: Academy publisher manufactured.
- [15]Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 3-32.
- [16]Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 244–258.
- [17]Siddiek, A.G. (2013). Techniques used by the techers in Correcting Students' Oral Errors in an Omany Boys School. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. Vol.3 no.10, pp. 1770-1783.
- [18]Sung, K.Y, & Tsai, M.T. (2014). Exploring Student Errors, Teachers' Corrective Feedback, Learner Uptake and Repair, and Learners' Preferences of Corrective Feedback. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, Vol.4 (1), 37-54.
- [19]Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 78-93