



Corrective Feedback in the Teaching of English Language among Federal University Lecturers in South–West, Nigeria

Fatai Ayiki Azeez

Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria
fataiazzez2@gmail.com

Monica N. Odinko

Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

J. A. Abijo

Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria
jaabijo@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examined English grammar and phonology classes. The study made use of Descriptive survey design. The population of the study comprised undergraduate English Language lecturers and their students in South-West, Nigeria. Purposive sampling technique was used to select fifteen (15) English Language University lecturers taking English Grammar and phonology and 350 undergraduate students in South-West federal Universities. Three research questions were answered. Lecturer Classroom Interaction Sheet (LCIS) with reliability co-efficient of 0.76 and Students' Rating of English Language Lecturer Corrective Feedback (SRELLCF) with the reliability co-efficient of 0.78 were the instruments used for data collection. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and T-test. The study revealed that explicit correction is the most (44.4%) commonly use types of reformulation corrective feedback while correcting wrong sentences in absence of communication problem among the lecturers is the least (3.7%) form of reformulation corrective feedback. In terms of prompt corrective feedback, offering some comments without directly correcting the error is the most (41.6%) commonly use while providing brief explanation to allow student to self-correct and asking questions to get the correct form from student (s) are the least (8.3%) patterns of prompt corrective feedback. The study further revealed that there was a significant difference in score between the two groups of lecturers, $t(13.83) = .00, p < .05$, two-tailed where the experienced ($M = 67.38, SD = 7.03$) scoring higher than inexperienced lecturers ($M = 58.43, SD = 4.75$). The magnitude of mean difference is 4.95. There was a significant difference in score between the two groups of lecturers, $t(13.83) = .00, p < .05$, two-tailed where Ph.D. holders ($M = 73.38, SD = 8.03$) scoring higher than MA. holders ($M = 68.43, SD = 5.75$). The magnitude of mean difference is 4.95. The study then recommends that Lecturers should be able to implement a variety of corrective feedback patterns and adapt the specific patterns they use to the particular learners they are teaching.

Keywords: Corrective Feedback, Prompt Corrective Feedback, Reformulation Corrective Feedback.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Azeez, F. A., Odinko, M. N., & Abijo, J. A. (2020). Corrective Feedback in the Teaching of English Language among Federal University Lecturers in South-West, Nigeria. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 13(2), 207-219.

INTRODUCTION

Mistake is natural in human endeavors and error is a natural part of language learning. According to Mohamed (2016), a child learning first language or second language tends to make errors both in comprehension and production. Errors are thus not to be seen as signs of failure or inhibition, but rather as evidence of students experimenting with language. Errors can thus be regarded as useful indicators of learners advancing in their language learning since they provide feedback on their mental processing of new rules and information (Hashemian & Mostaghazi, 2015). In as much as error is part of language learning, corrective feedback is a vital aspect of English Language classroom interaction. Ellis (2006) sees corrective feedback as any response from teacher to learner utterances containing error with the intention of correcting the learner's erroneous utterance. Corrective feedback is an essential input in the classroom interaction.

In classroom interaction, to make complex course content attractive and meaningful to the learners (Tahera, 2007) stresses that corrective feedback build a supportive classroom environment and increases students motivation. It is also use to develop student's criticality. According to Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013), corrective feedback is an essential aspect of language classroom that is use to ascertain current language development of the learners and acts as a tool to diagnose students' problem. Zhang (2012) is of the view that teacher feedback toward students' responses in class encourages and guides the students' inductive or deductive thinking.

Hashemian and Mostaghazi (2015) argue that timely and adequate corrective feedback (CF) is a significant medium for teachers to prevent their learners' errors from getting fossilized and assist them progress along with their second language learning process. Han (2004) is of the view that absence of corrective feedback is one contributory factor of error fossilization among second language learners. Park (2010) is of the view that if teacher chooses not to treat an error in one learner's utterance, the other learners in the classroom may assume that the form is correct which could lead some learners to internalize incorrect forms (fossilization). Fossilization is a term that refers to a permanent obstruction of progress in the process of learning a language (Mohamed, 2016). According to Mohamed (2016), fossilization phenomenon could be as a result of learning environment that is far from being suitable to the conditions needed to the learning process. Shastri (2010) adds that fossilization occurs when some errors remain within the language system of learners, who then become unable to correct them due to the internalization of the wrong elements of the language. In English phonology, instances of error fossilization that are prevalent in our society are wrong pronunciation of the voiceless consonant /θ/ often hear people say "Thank /tank/ you" instead of "Thank /θæŋk/ you". Also, "Church" /tsɔ:ts/ instead of /tsɜ:ts/. Church contains the long vowel sound /ɜ:/ not /ɔ:/.

More so (Zhu, 2010) maintained that the information provided by errors and its correction help teachers in several aspects in their teaching. It helps teachers adjust their teaching procedures or materials. It also helps to determine the pace of the teaching progress. Driscoll (2007) stresses that corrective feedback serves two functions during learning process. First, corrective feedback provides learners with information on the correctness of their responses and performances. Second, corrective feedback provides corrective information that can to be used by the learners to modify their performances. According to Chaudron (1986), the information available in corrective feedback allows learners to confirm, disconfirm and possibly modify the proposed rules. These effects are dependent on the learner's readiness for and attention to the information available in feedback. This means that the concept of corrective feedback only

becomes meaningful when the teacher is willing and able to provide it in accordance to the students' language ability and knowledge of the content. It also depends on the learners' willingness to pay attention to the vital information contains in the corrective feedback.

How then should learners' error (s) be corrected to neither get their errors fossilized nor putting the students on defensive? Ur (2000) identifies seven techniques for correcting students' errors. These include:

- Not correcting at all.
- Indicating there is an error, but not provides any further information about what is wrong.
- Saying what is wrong and providing a model of the acceptable version (explicit correction).
- Indicating something is wrong, elicits acceptable version from the learner who commit the error (Self-repair).
- Indicating something is wrong and eliciting acceptable version from another member of the class.
- Asking the learner who commits the error to reproduce the corrected form.
- Providing or eliciting an explanation of why the error is made and how to avoid it.

Patterns of Corrective Feedback

Basically, in language teaching and learning, the corrective feedback taxonomy models that have been proposed for correcting students' errors are:

- Lyster and Ranta (1997) six patterns of corrective feedback
- Ranta and Lyster (2007); Sheen and Ellis (2011) corrective feedback taxonomy model.

The first corrective feedback taxonomy model in language teaching and learning was proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) with six patterns of corrective feedback. The six patterns are; recast, explicit correction, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, request for clarification and repetition. This classification was based on the language classroom observational studies in French immersion classes. However, this corrective feedback taxonomy model fails to account for the distinction between reformulations and prompts corrective feedback patterns and it fails to capture the details in the teacher's corrective feedback patterns.

Therefore, the application of corrective feedback taxonomy model that will capture the details in the teacher's corrective feedback patterns is of paramount importance in classroom interaction. More so, as a result of knowledge gained from research, Ranta and Lyster (2007) further classify the patterns of corrective feedback into two patterns: reformulations and prompts. Then, Sheen and Ellis (2011) distinguish between conversational and didactic recasts and suggest a similar corrective feedback technique which accounts for the distinction between reformulations and prompts. Furthermore, with the common feature in Ranta and Lyster (2007) and Sheen and Ellis (2011) classification of corrective feedback types, another corrective feedback taxonomy model emerged- Ranta and Lyster (2007); Sheen and Ellis (2011) corrective feedback taxonomy model.

Table 1: Ranta and Lyster (2007); Sheen and Ellis (2011) corrective feedback taxonomy model

Reformulations	Prompts
i. Conversational recasts	i. Clarification requests
ii. Didactic recasts	ii. Repetition
iii. Explicit correction	iii. Metalinguistic clue
iv. Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanations	iv. Elicitation
	v. Paralinguistic signal

Reformulation Corrective Feedback and its Patterns

Shirkhani and Tajeddin (2016), see reformulations as the corrective feedback pattern that supply learners with correct form of their error whereas prompt is a corrective feedback pattern that push learners to repair their own errors. According to Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013), reformulations have the advantage of maintaining flow of communication in the classroom but it has the negative effect of spoon-feeding the learners. On the other hand, prompts push the students to participate actively in classroom discussion but hinder flow of communication in the classroom discussion (Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013). Another difference between reformulations and prompts is that the teacher supplies the correct form of expression in reformulations corrective feedback patterns but in prompts corrective feedback patterns, teacher withhold the correct form of expression and allow the students to supply the correct form of expression.

Recast is the first type of corrective feedback pattern in Ranta and Lyster (2007); Sheen and Ellis (2011) corrective feedback taxonomy model. Recast is teacher rephrasing of the student's utterance that contains error by changing one or more components without changing the central meaning (Ellis, 2008). Sheen (2006) defines recast as teacher partial or total reformulation of a student's utterance, containing at least one error within the context of a communicative activity in the language classroom. According to Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013), recasts are well suited to communicative classroom discourse, because they tend not to interrupt the flow of communication, keep students' attention focused on meaning, and provide scaffolds that enable learners to participate in interaction that requires linguistic abilities exceeding their current developmental level.

Moreover, Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013) differentiate conversational recast from didactic recast. According to Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013), in conversational recast, teacher reformulates the student's error in utterance by saying the correct form of expression in an attempt to resolve a communication problem, for instance, when a student says, "I can running well" and the teacher corrects, you should say "I can run well". On the other hand, didactic recast occurs when a teacher reformulates the student's erroneous utterance in the absence of a communication problem but there is problem with the form of word or expression used (Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013). For instance, when a student says, "The programme will come up on May", the teacher corrects the expression by saying "The programme will come up in May". The teacher also adds that we can say "Rain will start in May not on May". The difference between conversational recast and didactic recast is that in conversational recast, the student's error causes a breakdown in communication whereas in didactic recast, there is no breakdown of communication in the student expression that contains an error.

Explicit correction is another pattern of reformulations corrective feedback that involves reformulation of a student error utterance after a clear indication of an error in the utterance (Lyster, Saito and Sato, 2013). According to Roy (2015), explicit correction occurs when the

teacher clearly indicates that the student's utterance is incorrect and gives the correct form. For instance when a student says "Did you came to school yesterday"? The teacher indicates that "came" is a wrong verb in that expression and therefore, it should be "Did you come to school yesterday? Also, when the teacher says "Oh, you mean", "You should say".

Apart from explicit correction, another reformulations corrective feedback pattern is explicit corrective with metalinguistic explanation. Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013) are of the view that explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation involves teacher indicating an error, providing the correct form and giving comment which provides the rules guiding the expression. Metalinguistic corrections include, provision of the correct form followed by metalinguistic explanation (Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013). For instance, when a student says "She walk to school every day", the teacher corrects the expression by saying "She walks to school every day". The teacher then explains that there is need for -s on the main verb "walk" to make the verb singular verb because "she" is third-person singular and the verb must be singular. This explanation is in accordance with the rule of concord which states that a singular subject takes a singular verb. Rassaei and Moinzadeh (2011) investigated the effects of three types of corrective feedback on the acquisition of English question forms. The study found that explicit correction with metalinguistic feedback and recasts lead to an increase in learners' performance in post-test. Clarification requests on the other hand had no significant effect on learners' performance.

Prompt Corrective Feedback and Its Patterns

The second pattern of corrective feedback in Ranta and Lyster (2007); Sheen and Ellis (2011) corrective feedback taxonomy model is prompt which include: clarification request, metalinguistic clue, elicitation, paralinguistic signal and repetition of students' error. Clarification request is any expression that is used to elicit clarification of the preceding utterances (Hassan, 2008). Clarification request is elicitation for reformulation of the preceding utterance by indicating to students that their utterance has either been misunderstood by the teacher or is ill-formed in some way (Ellis, 2008). In classroom interaction, language development occurs when the teacher or the learner requests for clarification in a case of misunderstood communication. Therefore, language input is understood when both the speaker and their listener modify and restructure the interaction patterns by their requests for clarification of each other's' input (Ali, 2008).

Clarification requests foster opportunity for L2 students to clarify their own erroneous utterance by rephrasing or expanding (Hashemian & Mostaghasi, 2015). According to Hashemian and Mostaghasi (2015), clarification requests address problems in understanding and accuracy which indicate to L2 learners and teachers that the utterance is misunderstood or it is ill-formed in some way and reformulation is essential. Clarification request prompts the learner to restructure and self-correct his or her expression. Clarification request is a phrase or word such as "What do you mean by that", "Pardon?", "I don't understand" or "excuse me" following a student utterance to indicate that there is an error.

Again, repetition of student's error is a corrective feedback pattern. Repetition of student's error is a verbatim repetition of a student's utterance that contains an error, often with adjusted intonation, emphasis or stress to highlight the error (Lyster, Saito and Sato, 2013). Russell and Spada (2004), are of the view that repetition with emphasis leads to more immediate reformulations on the part of learners than repetition without emphasis. For instance when a student says, "Did you came to school yesterday? The teacher pushes the learner to self-correct

with adjusted intonation by saying “Did you came to school yesterday?” With the teacher’s repetition, if the learner knows the correct expression, he or she can then self-correct it.

Metalinguistic clue is a pattern of prompt corrective feedback. Metalinguistic clue is a brief statement aims at eliciting a self-correction from the student (Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013). Metalinguistic clue indicates clearly that there is an error somewhere but, through this clue which comes in form of comment, the teacher attempts to elicit the information from the student without providing the correct form (Shirkhani & Tajeddin, 2016). For instance, if a student says “I go for shopping last Saturday” The teacher corrects the student thus “the action you expressed took place in the past so you need past tense form of verb go”. With this metalinguistic clue, the student then corrects the expression thus “I went for shopping last Saturday”. Also, expression like “you should use the definite article “the” because you have already mentioned fox” from a teacher is a metalinguistic clue. Sheen (2007) compared the effects of recasts and metalinguistic clue on the use of English articles. The metalinguistic group significantly outperformed both the recast and control groups. Its positive gain scores were correlated with both language analytic ability and attitudes towards corrective feedback.

Furthermore, elicitation is another pattern of prompts corrective feedback. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), elicitation is a corrective feedback pattern that teacher uses to directly elicit the correct form of expression from the student through pushing. Elicitation involves prompting and pushing student for self-correction. For instance, the teacher pushes the student by asking, “How do we say that in English Language?” or “Can you correct that?” When a student says, “This tea is very warm”, the teacher says “It is very...” The student then self-corrects the expression containing an error “This tea is very hot”. Also, when a student says “I can be able to read the book”, the teacher interjects “Can be able?”. The student then self-corrects the expression “I can read the book”. All these are prompts through elicitation for a student to self-repair his or her expression that contains an error.

Paralinguistic signal is a manifestation of prompts corrective feedback. According to Mackey, Park and Tagarelli (2015), paralinguistic signal is a gesture or facial expression by the teacher to indicate that the learner has made an error. The difference between elicitation and paralinguistic signal is that while elicitation involves verbal prompting of the learner to self-repair the error in the utterance, paralinguistic signal involves non-verbal prompting of the learner to self-repair the error in the utterance.

The Teacher’s year of teaching experience seems to contribute greatly to achievement of students in English Language. According to Adeyemi (2008), teaching is a complex and demanding profession that requires skills in management and fast decision making, patience, empathy, communication, careful planning, stress tolerance, deep subject knowledge and psychological insight. One cannot acquire a high level of expertise within only a few years of teaching. Brown (2006) stresses that experienced teacher appears to prepare and plan classroom activities based on proven techniques and strategies that have worked with students over the years. The experienced teacher also appears to be well-versed in the latest thinking in language pedagogy. Also, according to Clotfelter, Ladd and Vigdor (2007), there is the possibility of little new learning taking place after teachers have been in the profession for a couple of years.

In contrast, the inexperienced teacher appears to experiment with different strategies wondering whether they will work or not (Brown, 2006). It is not uncommon for new teachers to take some time developing an understanding on how best to support student learning and this may determine their students’ level of performance (Douglas, 2017). Some studies have established that inexperienced teachers (those with less than five years of experience) are

typically less effective than senior teachers, those with higher years of experience (Onabanjo, 2004; Adeyemi, 2008; Akinsolu, 2010). Clotfelter, Ladd and Vigdor (2007) reported that teachers with more experience were more successful at raising student achievement than teachers with less experience. The most consistent and frequent result reported in the literature review indicated when teacher experience is positively related to achievement gains (Clotfelter, Ladd & Vigdor, 2007).

Teacher qualification is a factor that may affect the achievement of students in English Language which is one of the variables in this study. Teacher qualification is considered in this study as a factor that may influence classroom interaction pattern which may eventually impact learning. Unanma, Abugu, Dike and Umeobika (2013) observe that teachers with higher qualifications are in a better position to lead students to achieve effectively, as they are equipped with the pedagogical content knowledge to teach their subject areas. According to Unanma et al. (2013), teachers who continually update their knowledge by further degrees are able to manipulate the learning environment and process to make learning easier for their students. Arubayi (2009) asserts that lecturers' qualification in higher institutions, to a great length is a determinant of the quality of the products of the institutions.

Researchers like Asikhia (2010) and Olaleye (2011) find that teachers' qualification has influence on student achievement. So also, Unanma et al. (2013), find a perfect positive relationship between teacher qualification and students' academic achievement. Brewer (2000) and Stigler and Hiebert (2007) argue that increased teacher qualification promotes teaching effectiveness which subsequently translates to students' achievement. Adriano et al (2016) found that teacher educational level was found to have influenced the use of paraphrases. Owoeye (2000) also observes that teacher educational level turns out to be the most powerful determinant of academic achievement of students.

Contrarily, Zuzovsky (2003) investigates the impact of teachers' qualifications on students' achievement. The study reveals that most of the teacher variables commonly regarded as desired qualifications such as advanced academic degrees, securing a major in the subject being taught do not show positive relationships with students achievement. Also, Richardson (2008) carries out an examination of teachers' qualifications and students' achievement in Mathematics. The study indicated that a significant relationship does exist between teachers' qualifications and students' achievement. Chidolue (1996) finds a significant but inverse relationship between teacher qualification and students achievement. However, Adeola (2011) and Simbo (2003) find no significant difference in student achievement based on teacher qualification.

Statement of the Problem

In classroom interaction, corrective feedback is crucial for students learning. However, despite the classroom instructions received by the undergraduate English students, the quality of undergraduate English students produced in the Nigerian universities seems to be deteriorating at an alarming rate. It appears that the poor academic achievement of the undergraduate English students may be as a result the deficiency coming from the classroom interaction in terms of the quality and quantity of corrective feedback patterns provided by the course facilitators.

The available literature on the corrective feedback patterns from the western world adopt earlier corrective feedback taxonomy model which fails to account for the distinction between reformulations and prompts corrective feedback patterns. However, it appears that

there is a dearth of study conducted in Nigeria that examined lecturers' corrective feedback patterns using the latest corrective feedback taxonomy model. Therefore, this study assessed corrective feedback patterns in the teaching of English Language among federal University lecturers in South-West, Nigeria using latest corrective feedback taxonomy model which accounts for difference between reformulations and prompts corrective feedback patterns.

Research Questions

- What are the types of corrective feedback commonly used by English Language lecturers in South-West, Nigeria?
- Is there any significant difference in the lecturers' corrective feedback patterns based on teaching experience?
- Is there any significant difference in the lecturers' corrective feedback patterns based on teacher qualification?

METHODOLOGY

The study made use of Descriptive survey design. The population of the study comprised undergraduate English Language lecturers and their students in South-West, Nigeria. Purposive sampling technique was used to select fifteen (15) English Language University lecturers taking English Grammar and phonology and 350 undergraduate students in South-West federal Universities. Three research questions were answered. Lecturer Classroom Interaction Sheet (LCIS) with reliability co-efficient of 0.76 and Students' Rating of English Language Lecturer Corrective Feedback (SRELLCF) with the reliability co-efficient of 0.78 were the instruments used for data collection. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics of Frequency count, percentage, mean and T-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question One: What are the types of corrective feedback commonly used by English Language lecturers in South-West, Nigeria?

Table 2: Frequency of reformulation corrective feedback patterns and the percentage in the total sum

reformulation corrective feedback patterns		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Direct correction by giving the correct form	444	44.4%
2.	Correct error and explain what was wrong and why	148	14.8%
3.	Change wrong sentence to solve communication problems	148	14.8%
4.	Correct wrong sentences in absence of communication problem	37	3.7%
5.	Clarify meaning	222	22.2%

The study shows that explicit correction is the most (44.4%) commonly use types of reformulation corrective feedback. This means that the lecturers indicate error and directly give correct form. The finding negates Walton (1994) submission that when explicit correction is frequently used in communicative activities, it interrupts the learner's intent to communicate,

makes the learner feel uncomfortable, and impedes learner's willingness to communicate in English language.

The study further revealed that changing wrong sentence to solve communication problems (recast) and correct error by explaining what was wrong and why both took (14.8%) in order of corrective feedback used. Lecturers clarifying meaning of words or expression took (22.2 %) of corrective feedback pattern. The finding is in line with Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013) submission that recasts are well suited for communicative classroom discourse, because they tend not to interrupt the flow of communication. However, the finding contradicts Sheen (2006) and Kennedy (2010) who found that recasts were the predominant technique of error correction used by the various teachers.

The study revealed that the frequency of the lecturers using corrective feedback is low. This might be as a result of the large classes we have in some of the English Language classes which does not give much room for student-teacher interaction. However, the least (3.7%) commonly reformulation corrective feedback pattern is correcting wrong sentences in absence of communication problem.

Table 3: Frequency of prompt corrective feedback and the percentage in the total sum

prompt corrective feedback patterns	Frequency	Percentage
1. Repeat the error by changing intonation for student to self-correct.	74	16.6%
2. Provide brief explanation to allow student to self-correct uses	185	41.6%
3. facial expression to indicate error for student to correct	37	8.3%
4. Ask questions to get the correct form	37	8.3%
5. Offer some comments without directly correcting the error	111	25%

The study revealed that the most commonly use pattern of prompt corrective feedback is providing brief explanation to allow student to self-correct with (elicitation) 41.6%. This is followed by offer some comments without directly correcting the error with 25%. This finding is in line with Bartran and Walton (1994) who submits that elicitation is very effective corrective feedback because having learners to do the correction themselves helps them feel more motivated and it create learners' autonomy in learning. Also, Lyster and Ranta (1997) support elicitation as the most effective way of addressing learners' errors because it involves the learner in the correction process, which in turn leads to the most amount of uptake. However, using facial expression to indicate error for student to correct and asking questions to get the correct form from student (s) are the least (8.3%) patterns of prompt corrective feedback.

Generally, the finding further revealed differences in the use of corrective feedback patterns. The descriptive statistics show that lecturers used more of reformulation corrective feedback patterns which are teacher input-providing (teacher-centred) corrective feedback than prompt corrective feedback patterns which are output-prompting (learner-centred approach) corrective feedback. The reason might be because the lecturers adopt more of lecturer-centered pattern of interaction than student-centered interaction pattern. It can be concluded that reformulation corrective feedback pattern is entirely lecturer input-providing pattern and prompt corrective feedback pattern is more of output-prompting pattern (learner-centred approach) corrective feedback.

Therefore, it was observed that there is inadequate in the use of output-prompting (student-centred) corrective feedback patterns. This finding is in line with Othman (2012) who found that classroom teaching tends to be teacher-centred with teachers having the authority in

their teaching; students are left with less opportunity for classroom interaction. Teacher-centred lessons also affect the nature underlying the discourse in teaching of English generally and the way students' errors are corrected particularly. However, this finding negates Lyster and Ranta (2013) who submit that output-prompting feedback pushes the learner to reflect on his/her own language use, involves deeper cognitive processing and is better at consolidating and automatizing previously learned linguistic knowledge. The finding also negates Kulič in Tomková (2013) who stresses that self-correction, especially in cases of higher and in more complicated learning processes will not only corrects the result, but also the process which led to such result, and increases active participation of the learner in this phase of learning.

Research Question Two: Is the observed corrective feedback pattern based on Lecturers' years of teaching experience?

Table 4: T-test statistic, mean and standard deviation of the lecturer on the use of corrective feedback patterns based on qualification

Variables	N	Mean	SD	df	t	p-value
Experienced	181	67.38	7.03	348	13.83	.000
Inexperienced	169	58.43	4.75			

- $P < .05$

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the corrective feedback of experienced and inexperienced lecturers. There was a significant difference in score between the two groups where the experienced lecturers, $t(13.83) = .00$, $p < .05$, two-tailed with $(M = 67.38, SD = 7.03)$ scoring higher than the inexperienced lecturers $(M = 58.43, SD = 4.75)$. The magnitude of mean difference is 4.95. The study revealed a significant difference in the corrective feedback patterns of the experienced and inexperienced lecturers. This finding is in line with Brown (2006) who stresses that experienced teacher appears to prepare and plan classroom activities based on proven techniques and strategies that have worked with students over the years. Besides, the experienced teacher also appears to be well-versed in the latest thinking in language pedagogy. However, inexperienced teacher appears to experiment with different strategies wondering whether they will work or not (Brown, 2006).

Research Question Three: Is the observed corrective feedback pattern based on Lecturers' qualification?

Table 5: T-test statistic, mean and standard deviation of the lecturer on the use of corrective feedback patterns based on qualification

Variables	N	Mean	SD	df	t	p-value
PhD	181	73.38	8.03	348	13.83	.000
MA	169	68.43	5.75			

- $P < .05$

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the corrective feedback pattern of lecturers based on their qualifications. There was a significant difference in score between the two groups where the Ph.D. holders lecturers, $t(13.83) = .00$, $p < .05$, two-tailed with $(M =$

73.38, SD =8.03) scoring higher than the MA. Holders (M =68.43, SD = 5.75). The magnitude of mean difference is 4.95. This finding is in line with Unanma, Abugu, Dike and Umeobika (2013) who observe that teachers with higher qualifications are in a better position to lead students to achieve effectively, as they are equipped with the pedagogical knowledge. Also, Unanma *et al* (2013) submit that teachers who continually update their knowledge by further degrees are able to manipulate the learning environment and process to make learning easier for their students.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The finding of the study revealed that explicit correction is the most (44.4%) commonly use types of reformulation corrective feedback while correcting wrong sentences in absence of communication problem among the lecturers is the least (3.7%) form of reformulation corrective feedback. In terms of prompt corrective feedback, offering some comments without directly correcting the error is the most (41.6%) commonly use while providing brief explanation to allow student to self-correct and asking questions to get the correct form from student (s) are the least (8.3%) patterns of prompt corrective feedback. Therefore, Lecturers should be able to implement a variety of corrective feedback patterns and adapt the specific patterns they use to the particular learner they are correcting. Also, corrective feedback training should be prioritized in the training of teachers.


REFERENCES

- Adeyemi, T. O. (2008). Teachers' teaching experience and students' learning outcomes in secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Educational Research and Review*, 3(6), 204-212.
- Asikhia, O. (2010). Students and Techers' Perception of the Causes of Poor Academic Performance in Ogun State Secondary Schools: Implications for Counseling for National Development. *European Journal for Social Sciences*, 13(2), 229-242.
- Brown, A. V. (2006). Students' and Teachers' perceptions of effective teaching in the foreign language classroom: a comparison of ideals and ratings. Ph.D. Thesis University of Arizonapp.
- Chaudron, C. (1986). The Role of Error Correction in Second Language Teaching. Craig Chaudron Department of ESL and Center for Second Language Classroom Research.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2007). Teacher credentials and student achievement: Longitudinal analysis with student fixed effects. *Economics of Education Review*, 26(6), 673-682.
- Douglas, O. B. (2017). Relationship between teacher effectiveness and student achievement: an investigation of teacher quality. Ph.D. Thesis. Ball State University Muncie, Indiana.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. In K. Bardovi-Harlig and Z. Dornyei (Eds.), *Themes in SLA Research (AILA Review 19)*, 18-41. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Han, Z. H. (2004). *Fossilization in adult second language acquisition*. Clevedon: Cromwell Press.
- Hashemian, M., & Mostaghasi, H. (2015). Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences in Iranian L2 Learners with Different Proficiency Levels. *English Language Teaching*, 2(3). 1-19.

- Hassan, A. S. (2008). Making Input Comprehensible for Foreign Language Acquisition. *Damascus University Journal*, 24(2), 31-53.
- Tehera, A. (2007). Giving Feedback and Correcting Errors in ESL Classroom. B.A. Project. Department of English and Humanities of BRAE University.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 37-66.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Journal Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1-40.
- Mackey, A., Park, H., & Tagarelli, K. M. (2014). Errors, corrective feedback and repair Variations and learning outcomes. 499-512.
- Mohamed, H. (2016). Algerian Arabic Varieties Speakers' Errors in English Writings "A Contrastive Error Analysis Study" Ph.D. Thesis School of Education College of Social Sciences University of Glasgow.
- Park, H. S. (2010). Teachers' and Learners' Preferences for Error Correction. M.A Project Thesis. At California State University, Sacramento Spring. xii+85pp.
- Rassaei, E. and Moinzadeh, A. 2011. Investigating the Effects of Three Types of Corrective Feedback on the Acquisition of English Wh-question Forms by Iranian EFL Learners. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 97 -106.
- Ranta, L., & Lyster, R. (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral language abilities: The Awareness–Practice–Feedback sequence. In R. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (pp. 141–160). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, A. R. (2008). An Examination of Teacher Qualifications and Student Achievement in Mathematics. Ph.D. Thesis. Graduate Faculty of Auburn University.
- Roy, J. E. (2015). An Exploratory Study of Teacher's Oral Corrective Feedback in the Government Secondary Schools of Bangladesh. MSc. Project. Institute of Languages BRAC University.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2004). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching*, 133-164.
- Shastri, P. D. (2010). Communicative approach to the teaching of English as a second language. Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 593-610). New York: Routledge.
- Shirkhani, S., & Tajeddin, Z. (2016). Second Language (L2) Teachers' Explicit and Implicit Corrective Feedback and Its Linguistic Focus. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 181-206.
- Ur, P. (2000). A Course in Language Teaching Practice and Theory. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Unanma, A. O., Abugu, H. O., Dike, R. C., & Umeobika, U. C. (2013). Relationship between Teachers Educational Qualifications and Student's Achievement in Chemistry: A Case Study of Owerri West LGA. *IOSR Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 3(11), 5-10.

Zhang, P. (2012). Interactive Patterns and Teacher Talk Features in an EFL Reading Class in a Chinese University. A case Study with Communicative Teaching. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(5), 980-988.

Zhu, H. (2010). An analysis of college students' attitudes towards error correction in EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 127-130.

 © JSRE
