

Teachers' Feedback Provision Behaviour and Students' Involvement in EFL Classes in Higher Education Institutions at Wolkite University, Ethiopia

Esubalew Getenet

Department of Foreign Language and Literature, College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Wolkite University, Wolkite, Ethiopia

Email address:

getesu212@gmail.com

To cite this article:

Esubalew Getenet. Teachers' Feedback Provision Behaviour and Students' Involvement in EFL Classes in Higher Education Institutions at Wolkite University, Ethiopia. *English Language, Literature & Culture*. Vol. 7, No. 3, 2022, pp. 66-76. doi: 10.11648/j.ellc.20220703.11

Received: May 27, 2022; **Accepted:** July 11, 2022; **Published:** July 26, 2022

Abstract: The objective of this study was to investigate teachers' feedback provision behaviour and students' involvement in EFL classes in Higher Education Institutions at Wolkite University in Ethiopia. The study was a descriptive case study with a mixed methods approach, but mainly qualitative. Data were collected through classroom observations, interviews and questionnaires. The participants of the study were English language teachers and first-year students of Wolkite University. A simple random sampling technique was used to select and observe seven teachers. Each class was observed twice. A purposive sampling technique was also employed to select the seven sample teachers for interviews. Besides, 31 EFL teachers, who were selected purposefully, filled in the questionnaire. Furthermore, 230 students were taken from the target classes through a stratified sampling technique. Of these, fourteen students (i.e., two students from each observed class) who were randomly chosen were interviewed face-to-face. The findings were analysed qualitatively and quantitatively. The qualitative data were analysed using open Code 4.02 and corpus analysis toolkit (AntConc) software programs, and for the quantitative data, percentages were used. Hence, the findings indicated that EFL teachers' recast frequently in the form of implicit corrective feedback, and learners were not able to comprehend that errors were committed and then repaired by their teachers. Lastly, it was found that teachers dominated students' feedback/correction behaviour. Therefore, findings of the study suggest that curriculum designers, language experts, researchers and teacher training programs should give due emphasis to teachers' on feedback provision behaviours in EFL class alongside the pedagogic activities of students' oral practise. Moreover, teachers should be sensitive enough to know when to intervene and provide scaffolding, and teacher training colleges and/or universities should give training on how to provide feedback for learners.

Keywords: Scaffolding, Recast, Explicit and Implicit Feedback

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study

Feedback has two indistinguishable components: correction and assessment [15]. Inevitably, learners will make mistakes in the process of learning. A learner's errors are significant in that they provide to the teacher evidence of how language is learned or acquired, and what strategies or procedures the learner is employing in the discovery of the language [2, 3]. It is a vital part of the teacher's role to point out students' mistakes and provide correction. Correction helps students to clarify their understanding of meaning and

construction of the language. One of the crucial issues is how the correction is expressed gently or assertively, supportively or as a condemnation, tactfully or rudely. Ur pointed out that teachers should go for encouraging tactful correction [15]. Therefore, teachers have to be careful when correcting students' error. If they do it in an insensitive way, students will feel upset and lose their confidence.

Over the course of the researcher's career in teaching EFL, which has offered him the opportunity to observe critically the instruction that he was delivering while addressing his own daily lesson, he became interested to study the feedback provision behavior in detail. Moreover, when he was an HDP trainer for EFL teachers, he tried to observe trainee

instructors' (particularly EFL instructors') instruction and English language learners' speech, repeatedly. Then, he became interested in how teachers provide feedback, especially to learners who had different educational backgrounds, cultural contexts and learning contexts. Rationally speaking, from the researcher's teaching experience as a student of teaching English as a foreign language, he always appreciates having an encouraging, trusting and caring English language teacher. A teacher who creates and provides different opportunities to practise the language, asks questions of which the response is reasonably long, gives extended time to think, formulates and comes up with certain conclusions and provides constructive feedback on the message towards his/her students explicitly in his/her words without criticising. With such teachers, he found himself eager to learn, willing to work independently and/or cooperatively, and interested in doing whatever task he was required to do.

When the researcher became an English language teacher, his aim was to offer encouraging comments and to reflect constructive and positive ideas verbally to his students since he believes in the profound impact of such things on students' desire to learn and their understanding of what they are learning. From the researcher's teaching experience, it was observed when learners are afraid and feel anxious about the negative comments provided for them; even when learning opportunities, which provide them to talk in EFL classroom, were created to them, the majority of them failed to be involved. Outside the classroom, the researcher tried to have informal discussions with students. Some of them complain about the behaviour of instructors' who discourage them when they respond to incorrectly, who do not provide opportunities to practise the language and who give negative comments. This discussion revealed that the use of this kind of words/phrases resulted in the refusal of some students to listen to the teacher during the teaching-learning process, the loss of interest to participate and sometimes the fear of being criticised or even neglected by the teacher. Besides, the researcher conducted related research works in relation to teachers' and students' classroom behaviour. This, among others, initiated him to investigate teachers' feedback provision behaviour and students' involvement in EFL classes. EFL teachers' feedback either constructs or obstructs students' oral performance development in EFL classroom is dubious. The purpose of this research is, therefore, investigating teachers' feedback provision behaviour and learners' involvement in EFL classes.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Although the students' errors are a natural phenomenon, it is quite difficult to figure out if the EFL teachers should ignore or treat them. If the teachers decided to correct the errors, there should be at least two questions to answer: which errors should be corrected? And how can teachers help the students to make the errors work for them? The answers to these questions are as complex as learning the language itself. It is even generally accepted that for the last two

decades, the language practitioners have had different opinions on how to deal with the students' errors.

EFL teachers are unaware of certain aspects of their classroom behaviour and their impact on students' lecture comprehension. Seime added that classroom interaction proceeds at a rapid pace, and they rarely get feedback from their students since much of the lesson is dominated by teacher talk [4, 13]. In this regard, Animaw added that the talk is more of recast; teachers are echoing sentences and phrases that are responded/expressed by students in the form of recast [1]. But whether learners understand that the recast is error correction or not, is not clear.

Moreover, according to the MOE survey, some English teachers themselves admit that they are often confronted by their own inadequacy of providing proper feedback in English while teaching the language [8]. The survey added that lack of teachers' competence is one of the identified problems for the decline in the quality of English language. Additionally, many students were often heard complaining about the inadequacy of teachers' competence in feedback provision behaviour in English when teaching the language. Besides, students were often quiet and evidently unresponsive to the teachers' questions, maybe, due to fear of making mistakes, shyness, cultural backgrounds, etc. Unless manifested through scientific study, this is difficult to accept. This means that the issue needs deep scientific investigation.

Therefore, no research has investigated teachers' talk and learners' involvement in EFL classes in Ethiopian higher education contexts. Thus, the purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' feedback provision behavior and students' involvement in EFL classes and its influence on the development of students' oral performance.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective

The general objective of this study was to investigate the nature of English language teachers' feedback provision behaviour in EFL classes at Wolkite University.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study were to:

- 1) find out teachers' oral feedback provision behaviour;
- 2) identify the types of feedback provision (implicit, explicit, recast, etc.) EFL teachers are providing.

1.4. Research Questions

The study attempted to answer the following research questions:

- 1) What kind of oral feedback do teachers provide to students?
- 2) What types of feedback provision behaviour are EFL teachers utilizing?

1.5. The Research Design

The purpose of this research was to investigate EFL teachers' feedback provision behavior and students'

involvement in Communicative English Skills classes in Higher Education institution in Wolkite University, Ethiopia. The study is a descriptive case study. A mixed method (both qualitative and quantitative) was chosen for this study due to the complex nature of issues raised in the study. A mixed methods research involves the collection or analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data in a single study with some attempts to integrate the two approaches at one or more stages of the research process [5]. It also has a practical value when we want to examine an issue that is embodied in a complex educational or social context. Moreover, the rationale for mixed methods is that it offers a potentially more comprehensive means of legitimizing findings than do either QUAL or QUAN methods alone by allowing investigators to assess information from both data types [5].

1.6. Research Site, Population and Sampling

The research site was Wolkite University, which is located in Gurage Zone, Southern Nations and Nationalities, Ethiopia. It is 158 km far from Addis Ababa. The university was established in 2011, and the number of students enrolled during its establishment year was 556. The University began its teaching-learning process in three different colleges. These colleges were college of Engineering and Technology, Informatics and Computational and Natural Sciences. Currently, the number of colleges has increased to eight. These are Social Sciences and Humanities, Agriculture, Health Science and Medicine, Business and Economics and School of Law and Governance. The total number of students enrolled in the 2017/18 academic year was three thousand twelve. The target populations of the study were EFL teachers' who taught Communicative English Skills course in the 2017/18 academic year and their first-year students' of the same year.

1.6.1. Teachers

The total population of English language teachers during the 2017/18 academic year was forty-one. From these, five teachers who were included in the pilot study were excluded from the main study. To determine the sample size of teachers for classroom observation, a simple random sampling technique was employed, and through this sampling technique, seven teachers who were teaching Communicative English Skills course in the University were chosen.

Teachers' classes were recorded, videotaped and observed for an average of forty minutes'. Each classroom was observed twice. Thirty-one teachers were participated. Lastly, there was also interview for teachers, and for this interview, purposively selected seven teachers whose classrooms observed in advance were selected, and they were interviewed face-to-face.

1.6.2. Students

The total population of first-year students in the University in 2017/18 academic year was three thousand twelve. For the interview, fourteen students were randomly selected: two interviewees from each teacher's class. These fourteen students were selected randomly through lottery method.

1.7. Data Gathering Instruments

To collect the necessary data, three different instruments were employed. These were observation, questionnaire and interview. To check the reliability and validity of the data gathering instruments, experts in the field, specifically people who are TEFL scholars, commented on each tool. These scholars were Associate Professors and PhD holders in TEFL. After noticing constructive comments that were given by these experts, the data collecting tools were modified.

1.8. Data Collection Procedures

Data collection endeavors were commenced with classroom observation. After the classroom observation, the questionnaires were distributed to both teachers and students, and finally, interviews were conducted face-to-face.

1.9. Techniques of Data Analysis

The data, as discussed above, were collected through classroom observation, questionnaires and interviews. Before the data were analysed, they were categorised based on themes in connection to the research questions of the study. Then, they were sorted out qualitatively and quantitatively. The data gathered from the classroom observations and interviews were transcribed by the researcher verbatim, and then fellow PhD students checked the transcribed data. Verbatim transcription was made by the researcher to expose him to the data. The data obtained from interviews were coded using open code 4.02 software program, although there are no set guidelines for coding data, some general procedures exist [5]. Besides, corpus analysis toolkit (AntConc) software program, which is from the Corpus Linguistics type, was used to analyse and count specific behaviours needed in relation to the research questions of the study. Thus, this research basically followed *QUAL + quan* procedure to analyse the data obtained from classroom observations and interviews followed by the analysis of the quantitative data.

2. Data Analysis and Discussion

2.1. Findings and Analyses of the Qualitative Data: Feedback Provision Behaviour

The third research question that this study projected to answer was feedback provision behaviour. To see behaviours related to this, extracts were taken from the transcribed classroom observation lessons.

Heavy reliance on the restrictive IRE/F limited students' learning opportunities in the 6th observed class. Discourse environments such as the IRE/F (extract 3.2) could have a powerful impact on learners' epistemologies, i.e. their ways of knowing, longitudinally changing the course of their development. The IRF dialogue could be conversational when a broad distribution of turn taking, as well as a degree of spontaneity or Unpredictability, was demonstrated or interactional when the teacher was controlling (in turns 35,

37, 39, 41 & 43) the discussion. This indicates that the dialogue used might restrict learning opportunities in teacher-controlled activity, and it would be better to allow learners to control the dialogue, so teachers were able to observe what learners could do on their own. The extract below illustrates when heavy reliance on the IRF practised in teacher F's class.

Extract 1.1

34. S3: *I want to present about myself, and I would like to thank my teacher who gave me this opportunity*

35. T: *Thank you!*

36. S3: *I want to provide you a description of myself. Today, I have a topic of myself ...*

37. T: *Very good!*

38. S3: *I am very much communicative person. The two topics are my personal qualities and my behaviour.*

39. T: *Very good!*

40. S3: *I have oval shape and pointing, long, and straight nose and black eyes. My lips are purple...*

41. T: *Thank you very much! Very good!*

42. S3: *When I proceed to about my behaviour; I have good behaviour ...*

43. T: *Very good!*

(Extract 1.1 was taken from Teacher F)

The above extract indicates that teacher F's frequent overuse of praise. In every sentence the learner said, it was observed when the teacher evaluated/appreciated the student. This misuse of the IRE possibly limited the student's potential to contribute what he had under triadic dialogues and/or the learner's spontaneous speech was distracted. It might enhance the learning opportunities if the learner could have been offered feedback instead of evaluation. The teacher superbly interfered the learner when he delivered ideas that natter out of his mouth. Such kind of encouragement might discourage him and even the audiences might not listen to him attentively. The teacher did not carefully examine and deem his feedback provision behaviour. If he contemplates it as approval, it distracted and obstructed the presenter's impulsive speech, and the flow of speech was even distracted due to the meddling.

Obstruction was witnessed during the lessons. More specifically, the pervasive use of IRE presumably restricted students learning. Students were disempowered through the IRE pattern in three ways. First, it was the teacher who manipulated the topic, so usually, he was merely able to give passive answers. Second, students were deprived of the responsibility of assessing their output. Last, the teacher dominated the communication by meddling and nominating which student to get involved in the public speech presentation. The extract given above illustrates this type of controlled learning opportunity.

Teacher F took the third part in an IRF exchange automatically to assess learners from ten percent during their presentation. In so doing, he realised his own agenda and did what he believed a teacher was supposed to do. However, he restricted the students' opportunities to participate in classroom discourse (i.e., learners not to deliver their topics 'freely') and in higher order thinking; thus, considerably

diminishing the opportunities for learning when he praised in every learner's utterance. It seemed that the teacher had courtesy; if so, he appeared to be an unscrupulous teacher in error-correction behaviour.

Of course, classroom talk accomplishes many more functions than simply evaluation (like in turns 35, 37, 39, 41 & 43 above). All these evaluation turns potentially could have been better to begin with feedback sequences at the end of any learner's presentation and potentially would lead to much longer sequences and important classroom learning possibilities. IRF sequences looked multi-functional. While they are initiating turns that probe for responses, they may also be bringing new students into a discussion, changing topics, closing down an activity, or leading students incrementally onto a larger thematic point particularly for the next presenters rather than confining the conversation with evaluation which impedes the presenter's continuous speech if meddling has done like teacher F, as the above extract clearly portrayed.

As it could be seen from the extract below, the teacher criticised the respondent in turn 117 when the student replied wrongly (i.e., Never ever; how it could be D?). This may deter the student and others who were ready to involve in the question and answer exchanges. The teacher could have said nothing, or he could have corrected the respondent tacitly so that learners could have been learned circuitously from his colleagues' response or from the proper response, which could be given at the end.

Extract 1.2

115. T: *... Which one is the best? Ehh*

116. S16: *D*

117. T: *Never ever, how it could be D?*

118. S5: *A and C*

119. T: *A and C.*

(Extract 1.2 was taken from Teacher D)

When the strict IRE/F sequence was effective in enabling the teacher to lead students in carefully designed direction and progression, to provide students with immediate feedback on their performances and to maintain an orderly lesson, it reduces the student's initiative, independent thinking, clarity of expression, the development of conversational skills (including turn-taking, planning ahead, negotiating and arguing), and self-determination. In a word, the monologic IRF has its place in language classrooms; however, it should not be made the norm of classroom interaction. A less controlling discourse mode might be used if teachers desire to raise the quality of teacher-student interaction. In turn 118, learners replied in chores. The nature of the daily lesson task depends on either to respond in chunks or not. This classroom discourse infers that learners had done this multiple-choice comprehension question in advance. Therefore, it seemed the reason for they were responding frequently in chunks. Learners were unable to give their justification for the multiple-choice item they chose. Moreover, erroneous responses might not be corrected properly if learners responded in mass. On the contrary, those learners who were shy and anxious to involve in the question

and answer exchanges might get the chance to involve in concealing their voice in mass response.

After learners delivered their public speech topic, teacher E's feedback provision behaviour was deterring. For instance, in the short extract given below, he discouraged the presenter in turn 540, as if the learner was not delivering any point. Of course, it might be, but the way the teacher gave him feedback was inappropriate.

Extract 1.3

540. T: *Okay thank you and you are saying or presenting simply nothing and I told you this is simply a public speech and if you are doing it as if you are a teacher, you are not delivering a public speech rather teaching. All these students are doing the teaching.*

(Extract 3.3 was taken from Teacher E)

In the middle of all these presentations, learners tried to deliver their speech on their own topics the way they prepared; however, in the extract shown below, the teacher discouraged the presenters. He angered and ordered him (presenter 7) to take his seat after he had finished the presentation. The projected tone of the teacher was threatening. As can be seen in turn 550, the teacher criticised the presenter, and he said that the opportunity was given not to teach instead it was given to deliver a public speech. He could have shown them a model speech if he had wanted it to be delivered properly. The next excerpt illustrates this behaviour.

Extract 1.4

548. *Okay thank you but still, you are teaching. Sit down! Wait [when a student tried to stand and present her topic] you are not teaching please this is not the teaching stage. You are not supposed to teach. You are supposed to deliver a public speaking. Next (presenter)*

549. S8: *Okay good morning?*

550. T: *Remember you are not there to teach rather you are there to deliver a public speech on the issues of a public speech which is either on the climate change or on the topic of global warming. Ehh am I clear? So, the next person eh unless you can take your seat!*

551. SS: *Yes*

552. T: *So, do it that way, please. And never write on the board. Never try to write on the board okay the next person*

553. SS: *Okay*

(Extract 1.4 was taken from Teacher E)

Teacher E could have shown students at least a sample public speech like what teacher B did; i.e., displaying President Obama's speech or it could be better if he had presented any model public speech. He allowed them simply to present their topics based on the principles of public speech that they learned previously. Learners at first-year level in a university might not have prior experience about public speech, but in this class, they were coerced to present it in a 'standard' way. In turn 550, teacher E was intimidating the learner who was getting ready to deliver his public speech. Actually, the learner had stage-fright because he was staring at the ceiling and on the floor without observing the audience and his body was trembling. Besides, students were noticed when they wrote points on the board; however, in turn 552 the teacher warned them not to write on it. Shy learners were using this technique (i.e., writing on the board) to avoid eye contact.

Extract 1.5

44. S4: *Hello and hi is {are} informal and good morning and good afternoon are formal.*

45. T: *Yeah expressions written like hello and hi are categorised under the informal ways of greetings and the rest three are indicators of formal greeting. Very good! (2x)*

(Extract 1.5 was taken from Teacher G)

In turn 49, when student 4 made grammatical error (hello and hi is...) with the verb to be, the teacher in turn 50 corrected implicitly in the form of repair. However, the learner did not understand when he was corrected implicitly. When learners were corrected implicitly, the dilemma is that it was not clear whether they understood the recast or not; unless the learner repeated the corrected version of the answer. In the next turn 51 learner was not noticed when he repeated the sentence.

2.2. Findings and Analyses of the Quantitative Data

2.2.1. Findings and Analyses of EFL Teachers' Feedback Provision Behaviour

Tables 4, 5 and 6 under presented the teachers' feedback provision behaviors that they offered to their students during interaction. The items incorporated under this theme were 13 and they are presented in three different tables subsequently.

Table 1. Feedback Provision Behaviour 1.

| How often do you: | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|----|---|----|---|----|--|----|------|
| No. | 1. move on without saying anything when a student answers accurately? | | 2. move on without saying any feedback when a student fails to give the correct answer? | | 3. give feedback on the message (which focuses on meaning rather than on the form/structure)? | | 4. give students negative comments such as you are wrong, quite wrong, emm no, etc.? | | |
| | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | |
| 5 | Always | - | - | 1 | 3.2 | 8 | 25.8 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 4 | Often | 2 | 6.5 | 1 | 3.2 | 16 | 51.6 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 3 | Sometimes | 3 | 9.7 | 4 | 12.9 | 4 | 12.9 | 3 | 9.7 |
| 2 | Rarely | 11 | 35.5 | 11 | 35.5 | 3 | 9.7 | 12 | 38.7 |
| 1 | Never | 15 | 48.4 | 14 | 45.2 | - | - | 13 | 41.9 |
| | Total | 31 | 100 | 31 | 100 | 31 | 100 | 31 | 100 |

When a student answered correctly, instructors never and rarely moved on without giving feedback, (i.e., 48.4% & 35.5%), and the remaining subjects (i.e., 9.7% & 6.5%) reported that they sometimes and often moved on without commenting anything when a student answered correctly. This reveals that instructors are providing the necessary praise when learners respond to teachers' questions correctly. In item 2, whether instructors moved on when a student gave the correct answer without suggesting any feedback was enquired, and 45.2% of the respondents confirmed that they never moved on to the next lesson, and 35.5% of the other respondents replied that they rarely moved on without offering any feedback, and 12.9% of them said, they sometimes practised it. This specifies that most instructors do not move on to the next part of the lesson without commenting when a student failed to respond to a question. Providing feedback either focusing on the message or on the

contents was asked in the third item, and for this, 51.6% and 25.8% of the teacher-respondents successively reacted that they often and always provided feedback on the message. 12.9% and 9.7% of the other respondents responded that they sometimes and rarely gave feedback on the meaning rather than commenting on the structure of the content. This reveals that instructors are providing comments on the message, which is praiseworthy for learners to learn the target language instead of merely focusing on the structure of the language. Questions were raised in the fourth item whether instructors gave negative comments that discourage learners to participate in the question and answer exchanges. For this, 41.9% and 38.7% of them reported that they never and rarely made negative comments that discourage students from participation. On the other hand, the finding obtained from the classroom observations revealed that teachers criticised their students 27 times.

Table 2. Feedback Provision Behaviour 2.

| | | How often do you: | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--|------|--|------|--|------|--|------|--|--|
| No. | | 5. give a student positive reinforcement such as excellent, very good, well done, good, etc., when s/he replies correctly? | | 6. give a student a chance to re-correct his/her errors himself (herself)? | | 7. praise a student when s/he answers exactly to a question? | | 8. give opportunities for peer correction? | | | |
| | | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | | |
| 5 | Always | 12 | 38.7 | 11 | 35.5 | 17 | 54.8 | 8 | 25.8 | | |
| 4 | Often | 18 | 58.1 | 14 | 45.2 | 9 | 29.0 | 9 | 29 | | |
| 3 | Sometimes | 1 | 3.2 | 4 | 12.9 | 3 | 9.7 | 10 | 32.3 | | |
| 2 | Rarely | - | - | 2 | 6.5 | - | - | 3 | 9.7 | | |
| 1 | Never | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3.2 | 1 | 3.2 | | |
| | Total | 31 | 100 | 31 | 100 | 30 | 96.7 | 31 | 100 | | |

In item 5, 58.1% and 38.7% of the participants reacted that they often and always gave positive reinforcement when a student responded correctly in that order. The result gained from the classroom observations showed that teachers praised their students 906 times. For the second item, 45.2% and 35.5% of the respondents replied that they often and always provided learners chances to re-correct their own errors successively, and the remaining respondents (i.e. 12.9%) and 6.5%) said that they sometimes and rarely gave students chance to re-correct their own errors. This reveals that instructors are commonly providing learners' chances to re-correct their own errors.

When students correctly respond to a question, instructors were inquired the frequency that they cherished students in item 7, and the majority of respondents (54.8% & 29%) responded that they always and often praised learners whenever they answered correctly. The other 9.7% and 3.2% replied, sometimes and rarely. This reveals that instructors are inspiring learners when they provide the right answer, which in turn enriches their upcoming involvement. The frequency of peer correction opportunities was also asked, and 32.3%, 29% and 25.8% of the raters showed that they sometimes, often and always carried out peer correction feedbacks.

Table 3. Feedback Provision Behaviour 3.

| No. | | How often do you: | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|---|------|--|------|--|------|---|------|---|------|
| | | 9. redirect the question to another student when a student produces the wrong answer? | | 10. provide scaffolding (i.e. fill in the missing language)? | | 11. correct error(s) quickly and directly? | | 12. interrupt learners for correction while a student is giving a response? | | 13. provide the right answer when a student fails to reply correctly? | |
| | | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % |
| 5 | Always | 11 | 35.5 | 2 | 6.5 | 7 | 22.6 | 2 | 6.5 | 9 | 29 |
| 4 | Often | 12 | 38.7 | 13 | 41.9 | 3 | 9.7 | 1 | 3.2 | 10 | 32.3 |
| 3 | Sometimes | 7 | 22.6 | 13 | 41.9 | 9 | 29 | 9 | 29 | 7 | 22.6 |
| 2 | Rarely | 1 | 3.2 | 3 | 9.7 | 10 | 32.3 | 12 | 38.7 | 4 | 12.9 |
| 1 | Never | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | 19.7 | 1 | 3.2 |
| | Total | 31 | 100 | 31 | 100 | 29 | 93.5 | 31 | 100 | 31 | 100 |

For item 9, the majority of teacher-respondents (i.e., 38.7% & 35.5%) reacted that they often and always

redirected questions to another student when a learner replied wrongly. It was 22.6% of them, who replied sometimes. With regard to scaffolding, 41.9% of them independently rated, they often and sometimes supported their learners to arrive at the exact answer. Rarely teachers corrected learners' wrong answer directly and quickly comprising 32.3% and the rest 29% and 22.6% of them indicated that they sometimes and always corrected quickly and directly. Concerning interruption for error correction, 38.7% and 29% of the participants confirmed rarely and sometimes, and 19.7% of the others reported that they never interrupted their learners for correction. Lastly, participants replied the provision of a

correct answer when their learners failed to give the right answer, and 32.3% and 29% of them respectively rated often and always. This shows that teachers provide a correct answer for a partially and/or totally unanswered question.

2.2.2. Findings and Analyses of Students Feedback Recognition Behaviour

To crosscheck and validate the teachers' response given previously, attempt was made to ask students about the nature of teachers' feedback provision behaviours as well as how they corrected errors made. Thus, Tables 4, 5 and 6 under reported feedback provision behaviours.

Table 4. Feedback Provision Behaviour 4.

| | | How often does the instructor: | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|---|------|---|------|---|------|---|------|
| No. | | 1. move on without saying anything when you answer correctly? | | 2. give feedback on the message (which focuses on meaning) rather than on the form/structure? | | 3. give you negative comments such as you are wrong, quite wrong, emm no, you are not right etc. (criticise when you give an incorrect answer?) | | 4. give you positive reinforcement such as: excellent, very good, well-done, good, etc. when you reply correctly? | |
| | | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % |
| 5 | Always | 53 | 24.3 | 60 | 27.7 | 30 | 13.8 | 93 | 42.7 |
| 4 | Often | 35 | 16.1 | 52 | 23.9 | 35 | 16.1 | 37 | 17.0 |
| 3 | Sometimes | 36 | 16.5 | 42 | 19.3 | 32 | 14.7 | 48 | 22.0 |
| 2 | Rarely | 14 | 6.4 | 25 | 11.5 | 40 | 18.3 | 13 | 6.0 |
| 1 | Never | 79 | 36.2 | 37 | 17.0 | 79 | 36.2 | 23 | 10.6 |
| | Total | 217 | 99.5 | 216 | 99.1 | 216 | 99.1 | 215 | 98.6 |

Moving onto the next part of the lesson without saying any comment was observed during classroom observations, and it was tried to get learners reactions by the questionnaire. For this, 24.3, 16.1 and 16.5 percent of the participants respectively rated that their teachers always, sometimes and often moved on to the next part of the lesson without commenting on anything. Related to this, 36.2% of them said that their teachers never moved on to the next lesson without providing feedback.

Students confirmed that their teachers always and often offered them feedback on the message comprising 27.5 and 23.9 percent respectively, and 19.3% of them indicated that they were sometimes provided such type of feedback from their teachers. Whereas, 17 and 11.5 percent of the remaining rated that they never and rarely experienced feedback on the message, in a row. The question of offering feedback is, after

all, a decision that is to be adequately made by teachers in the classroom. In giving priority to oral communication, teachers may ignore the overall correction of students' errors like grammatical and pronunciation aspects. If the main concern of the exercise is to enhance learners' linguistic abilities or language performance before communication, teachers may provide feedback whenever an error is committed.

In the third item above, 36.2 and 18.3 percent of repliers confirmed that they never and rarely received negative comments from their teachers, sequentially; while, 16.1% and 13.8% of the other respondents also said that they often and always received negative comments correspondingly. For the fourth item, 42.7% of the respondents specified that they had got from their instructors always positive praise whenever they replied correctly and 22 and 17 percent of the others rated sometimes and often in the same order.

Table 5. Feedback Provision Behaviour 5.

| | | How often does the instructor: | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|---|------|---|------|---|------|--|------|
| No. | | 5. give hints/clues to re-correct your own error when you commit? | | 6. give you chance to re-correct your error when you fall to reply correctly? | | 7. move on without saying any feedback when you give an incorrect answer? | | 8. fill in the missing gap when you miss some aspects of the answer to a question? | |
| | | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % |
| 5 | Always | 105 | 48.2 | 81 | 37.2 | 57 | 26.1 | 39 | 17.9 |
| 4 | Often | 54 | 24.8 | 54 | 24.8 | 51 | 23.4 | 35 | 16.1 |
| 3 | Sometimes | 36 | 16.5 | 41 | 18.8 | 46 | 21.1 | 49 | 22.5 |
| 2 | Rarely | 15 | 6.9 | 19 | 8.7 | 21 | 9.6 | 22 | 10.1 |
| 1 | Never | 8 | 3.7 | 16 | 7.3 | 42 | 19.3 | 69 | 31.7 |
| | Total | 218 | 100 | 211 | 96.8 | 217 | 99.5 | 214 | 98.2 |

For item 5, respondents rated that teachers always and often gave hints for their students to re-correct their own

errors, which comprises 48.2% and 24.8% sequentially. Sometimes was also rated by 16.5% of the respondents.

This shows that the majority of learners had clues to arrive at the exact answer when they made an error. This result is in harmony with the students' interview finding. Besides, learners were asked to rate the frequency they had chance to re-correct errors when they made. For this item, 37.2% and 24.8% of them said that they always and often got this chance and 18.8% of them rated sometimes. This shows that teachers most frequently offer students opportunities to re-correct their own errors before they answered themselves. The frequency that teachers moving on without saying any feedback when students gave an incorrect answer was asked, and for this question, 26.1%, 23.4% and

21.1% of the repliers replied that teachers always, often and sometimes moved on without offering feedback. The findings of the observations result showed that teachers moved on to the next lesson without providing any feedback, or they answered it themselves. For item eight, 31.7% of the preponderance respondents reacted that teachers never filled in the missing gap when they missed some aspects of the answer to a given question. Likewise, 22.5% and 17.9% of the other respondents rated that teachers sometimes and always filled in the missing gap. This reveals that learners did not get the necessary scaffolding from their teachers.

Table 6. Feedback Provision Behaviour 6.

| No | How often does the instructor: | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|---|------|--|------|---|
| | | 9. correct quickly and directly after you commit error? | | 10. interrupt or intervene you for correction when you express ideas or give a response to a question? | | 11. nominate someone else to provide the correct answer when you fail to reply correctly? |
| | | F | % | F | % | F % |
| 5 | Always | 58 | 26.6 | 67 | 30.7 | 78 35.8 |
| 4 | Often | 41 | 18.8 | 44 | 20.2 | 43 19.7 |
| 3 | Sometimes | 56 | 25.7 | 39 | 17.9 | 33 15.1 |
| 2 | Rarely | 26 | 11.9 | 27 | 12.4 | 27 12.4 |
| 1 | Never | 30 | 13.8 | 32 | 14.7 | 35 16.1 |
| | Total | 211 | 96.8 | 209 | 95.9 | 216 99.1 |

In table 6, direct and immediate error correction was asked; 26.6% of repliers answered to this always, and 18.8% and 25.7% of them rated that their teachers often and sometimes corrected their errors directly and immediately. In item 10, 30.7% and 20.2% of the repliers said that teachers always and often interrupted them, consistently. The remaining repliers (i.e., 17.9%, 14.7% & 12.4%) reacted, sometimes, never and rarely. This indicates that intervening learners when they reply answer is the trend in the classes. Besides, student-respondents were inquired to rate whether their instructors nominated someone else to provide the correct answer when they failed to reply correctly was asked, and for this item, 35.8% and 19.7% of them respectively indicted, always and often. Furthermore, 15.1, 12.4 and 16.1 percent of them reacted, sometimes, rarely and never, which is almost nearly similar. This indicates that the extent of teachers' nomination of another respondent when learners failed to give a reply to a question is experienced by EFL teachers, and it may be due to the need that they give further opportunities for learners to express the language items.

2.3. Discussions

The main research question was about the oral feedback provision behaviour of EFL teachers for their students' response and/or reactions, in this regard, the analysis of the classroom observation results indicated that teachers recast most frequently in the form of feedback. It was realised that learners did not understand as they made errors, and their teachers repaired their errors. Recast was the most frequently used type of oral corrective feedback. This also indicates that teachers in communicative classroom contexts avoid giving

direct corrective feedback because they might fear to hearten the morale of the learners and prefer to mitigate their corrective feedback by using implicit types of move. The analysis of the interview data also showed that teachers corrected their learners' errors implicitly focusing on the message of the response. The result is inconsistent with [12] and [9] findings. They found that students preferred direct error correction. Besides, feedback on the form of the language dominated. The result obtained from both teachers' and students' questionnaires revealed that teachers did not criticise learners when they reply incorrectly. This implies that teachers did not disapprove the wrong response gained from students, but from the analysis of the observation result, it was rarely noticed (i.e., 27 times) when teachers criticised learners when they missed points.

Feedback, which can be considered as positive, is claimed to increase learners' sense of confidence and simultaneously it decreases their language anxiety, which is very common in FL classrooms. When teachers provide feedback, they may repeat their students' output when the latter is relevant. Besides to repetition, they may rephrase their speech as a way of offering positive evidence. Studies in error treatment have pointed that the best thing the teacher can do is to ignore the error, in circumstances where students do not seem to have reached a stage in interlanguage development where they will benefit from the oral corrective feedback provided by the teacher [7, 12].

Oral corrective feedback might be given implicitly in the form of comprehension and confirmation checks and recast or explicitly in the form of expositions of correct target structures [3]. In relation to this, there are several types of error correction behaviours available to the teacher. The basic

options he could have face to correct learners' errors includes first, ignoring the error completely if the fault did not affect the meaning of the message. Second, he could have shown that an error has been made and can correct the error himself/herself; he/she can also show that an error has been made and getting the learner who made it correct, and last, indicating that an error has been made and let other learners correct it. In other words, in a naturally happening conversation, there are options for a teacher to correct errors. These are self-initiated and self-correction, self-initiated and other repairs, other-initiated and self-repair, and finally, other-initiated and other repairs. In line with this, Ur concluded that teachers should go for encouraging tactful correction; they have to be careful when correcting students' error [15]. If they do it in an insensitive way, students will feel upset and lose their confidence [6, 10, 11].

In this study, the common signals given as a form of feedback were 'good', 'very good', 'yes', 'correct' and 'ok'. These markers are essential for learners to follow the unraveling interaction and navigate their way through the classroom discourse. From the observation data analyses, it was commonly found that the teachers' feedback could follow two patterns: i) the teacher repeating the answers (responses) given by the students, and ii) the teacher praising the students after giving a correct response. In all the observed classes, the teachers provided different forms of feedback. However, before the signals were given, the teachers repeated the forms spoken by the students. These repeated forms could also be identified as 'recasts' which involves the teachers' reformulation of part or all of the students' utterance. The "repetition of a speaker's utterance can serve several functions, of either a negative (correcting) or a positive nature agreeing, appreciating, understanding", etc. This indicates that by repeating the students' responses, teachers are approving these responses as well as showing interest in the contents of the answers so that they can get space to involve. In this regard, Walsh stressed that learners need space for learning to involve in the discourse, to contribute to class conversations and to receive feedback on their contributions [16].

The observation result revealed that teachers' reliance on positive feedback made a few students feel so at ease while producing their output especially when teachers nodded, smiled and used smooth facial expressions to confirm their acceptance about what was stated by their learners. In many cases, the result also indicated that some learners were somehow shy and even uncertain to finish their utterances. When they noticed their teachers', for instance, teacher F's, gestures and frequent appreciation, they were coerced to terminate their output.

The interview results of the analyses also disclosed that learners want to receive positive feedback from their teachers. When this feedback is absent, students know that there must be something wrong or unsatisfactory with their answer [14]. The kind of feedback that a teacher provides affects students learning as well. Tsui added that teacher's feedback, apart from evaluating and providing information

related to students' responses, has many other functions [14]. For instance, it could be used to acknowledge information or provide personal comments on students' responses.

In line with this, teachers' interviews result revealed that if a student lost the answer and if other students answered it, the first student who lost the answer would be disappointed. They added, if one student could not reply soon then they would shift to another student, and if that student again could not reply, finally teachers themselves could give the correct answer.

3. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

3.1. Summary of the Findings

This study aimed to investigate teachers' talk and students' involvement in EFL classes. The study employed mixed research methods, and the data were collected using classroom observations, questionnaires, and interviews. The qualitative and quantitative data obtained through these research instruments were analysed, interpreted and presented in the preceding chapter. The study was conducted in Wolkite University. The participants of the study were EFL teachers and the 2017/18 academic year first-year students of Wolkite University.

It was found that teachers were recasting frequently in the form of corrective feedback. During this time, the problem was that learners were not able to comprehend that an error was committed and then repaired by their teachers. This finding is consistent with Animaw's study [1]. Based on the findings of the study, it is possible to say that recast was used most frequently in the forms of implicit correction. On the contrary, explicit correction feedback was rarely practised. When teachers interfered to offer feedback, they influenced their learners' oral contribution. The result showed that teachers in the classes avoid giving direct corrective feedback; even if they made the correction, possibly they did it implicitly by using recast.

When teachers took the floor to give direct and explicit corrective feedback in the form of repetition, learners lost the flow of their ideas that they were conveying. This was recurrent, especially when the teacher took a long time to explain the type of committed error before correcting it then some learners were reluctant to take the floor again. Moreover, feedback focusing on the form of the language rather than on the message was the dominant feature. Even learners preferred their teachers to their classmates for correction and/or feedback.

It was also found that comprehension for implicit oral correction was unclear, perhaps due to the inherent nature of recasts that made it difficult for students to notice. The majority as acceptance might take the recast, and this recast may go unnoticed by the learners since they might think that the teacher is repeating just what they said simply for confirmation. Repetition by the teacher of a student's error, usually with a rising tone, to alert the student to the problem

so that s/he can do something about it was not practised. When teachers tried to correct the trivial mistakes, the student could be demoralised, and it could be time consuming, though IRE is mainly employed. The result obtained from the interviews revealed that teachers were running out of time when they tried to correct these mistakes committed by learners. However, the minor mistakes could be time wasting and even frustrating to most of the students in the classes. Therefore, teachers recast mistakes made by learners predominantly.

3.2. Conclusions

It was found that teachers were recasting frequently in the form of corrective feedback, and learners were not able to comprehend that an error was committed and then repaired by their teachers. It was concluded that recast was used mainly in the forms of implicit correction. On the contrary, explicit correction feedback was rarely practised in the classes. When teachers meddled to offer feedback, they influenced their learners' oral contribution. It was found that teachers in the classes avoid giving direct corrective feedback when they made the correction; probably they did it implicitly by using recast.

The result proved that when teachers rarely took the floor to give direct and explicit corrective feedback in the form of repetition, learners lost the flow of their ideas that they were conveying. Feedback focusing on the form of the language rather than on the message was the dominant feature. Besides, learners preferred their teachers to their classmates for correction and/or feedback.

3.3. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations were made:

Most EFL teachers gave evaluative feedback, which usually took the form of accepting/rejecting the answer, repeating it or reformulating it. Such a move by teachers lacks the elements of reflection, discussion or interaction. In order for teachers to extend student output and engage them, they should adapt their use of the feedback move by using more probes to ask for elaboration on an answer and more uptakes, where they build their subsequent questions on students' answers.

Before offering feedback, teachers should determine initially and define the objective of the lesson they give to learners, or it is very important for teachers to define what an error is, whether it has to be corrected on the spot, who has to do the correction and what type of correction is suitable for learning purposes. It is not advisable to interrupt learners when they are practising orally; correction can take place systematically after they finish either individually with the other students in the group or with the whole class. Moreover, it is very essential to organise seminars, workshops or there should be an ongoing training for EFL teachers especially on the concept of how to provide feedback to learners or treat their errors and on the value of

enhancing self-correction to make the students gain confidence in their oral practise and to go in line with recent and updated teaching-learning methodologies.

It would be appropriate to recommend that EFL teachers should use their feedback in order to extend the dialogue, and they should be encouraged to use more explicit forms of corrective feedback so that learners can easily understand where they went wrong. This will reduce the number of premises learners form about a certain language item before they arrive at the wrong-structure of the target language. However, this does not mean that explicit correction should be used predominantly. Moreover, teachers must be sensitive to the errors learners make and act upon them in ways that will not disrupt interaction. Teachers must be sensitive enough to know when to intervene and provide the missing language, by means of modeling, paraphrasing and prompting. Interrupting students' contributions causes learners to miss chances for interactional adjustments. Teachers can provide the missing language by means of scaffolding. The support is provided to ensure that the learners can manage the task at hand. Thus, the elements in the task should be modified, changed or deleted depending on how the learners react to them.

During communicative activities, it is generally felt that teachers should not interrupt students in mid-flow to point out a grammatical, lexical or pronunciation error since it could interrupt the communication and drag an activity back to the study of language form. It is concluded that teacher intervention in such circumstances could raise stress levels and stop the learning process in its tracks. Lastly, they should use their feedback to extend the dialogue instead of confining the thread of the learners' spontaneous speech. Based on the findings of the study, the current study also recommends the following areas for future research. It is recommended that a replication of this study should be done wherein a replication of this study at elementary level would be done, and inherent results may be gained.

References

- [1] Animaw Anteneh. (2011). Oral Corrective Feedback: An exploratory Case of the interplay between Teachers' Beliefs, Classroom Practices and Rationales (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa.
- [2] Brown, H. D. (1994b). Teaching by Principles. An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. London: Prentice Hall Regents.
- [3] Brown, H. D. (2001). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. Longman. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- [4] Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Dornyei, Z. (2007). Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- [6] Ellis, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar: Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28 (11), 339–368.
- [7] Kumaravadivelu, B. (1993). Maximizing learning potential in the communicative classroom. *ELT Journal*, 47 (1), 12–21.
- [8] MOE. (2009). English Language Training Module Preparation: A Letter written to College and Universities concerning the preparation of a training program intended to upgrade teachers' English language competence. Addis Ababa.
- [9] Hamid A. (2012). Teacher Talk and Learner Involvement in EFL Classroom: The Case of Iranian Setting: Islamic Azad University: Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 11, (2), (pp. 2262-2268).
- [10] Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness*, 9 (1), 34–51.
- [11] Nuru Muhammed. (2000). Feedback in the EFL Classroom: An Exploration of its role in the Communication of teacher expectations. A PhD thesis Unpublished. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- [12] Seedhouse, P. (1996). Classroom Interaction: Possibilities and Impossibilities. *ELT Journal*, 50 (1), 16–24.
- [13] Seime Kebede. (1999). An Exploration of the Relationship between Uptake and Classroom Questioning (A case study PhD Thesis Unpublished). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- [14] Tsui, A. (1995). *Introducing classroom interaction*. London: Penguin.
- [15] Ur, P. (2000). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- [16] Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. Oxon: Routledge.