Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies
Print ISSN: 2676-5357
Online ISSN: 2676-5985

"You must be crazy!" Teacher Corrective Feedback and Student Uptake in Two Tanzanian Secondary Schools

Gastor Cosmas Mapunda[1*], Elizabeth Kyara[2]

[1*]Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, University of Dar es Salaam, *mapundag@gmail.com*

[2]Department of Linguistics and Literary Studies, Open University of Tanzania, Dar es Salaam, *elizakyara@gmail.com*

Article Info

Article Type:

Research Article

Received:

18/03/2023

Accepted:

23/04/2023

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at investigating teachers' behaviours that co-occur with the oral corrective feedback strategies and their influence on the students' responses to oral corrective feedback (OCF) in teaching English in Tanzanian secondary schools. The study was qualitative, and applied classroom non-participant observation and interviews to collect data, which were analysed thematically. It involved 901 students from two secondary schools (at the general certificate level) in Form I to Form IV classes and six English language teachers. Using the Vygotskyan Sociocultural Model, the findings of the study showed some teachers' behaviours that frequently accompanied the oral corrective feedback strategies, which then influenced students' uptake in the classrooms. These behaviours include nonverbal actions; oral corrective feedback implementing styles, translanguaging, and the use of negative comments. These behaviours influenced students' uptake by leading to no uptakes, hesitations in response to feedback, repetition of the same errors, random peer responses which subsequently discouraged self-repair of errors. Findings contribute to knowledge on OCF and the students' uptake in to ELT classrooms especially on students' error treatment atmosphere.

Keywords: English Language teaching; errors; feedback; corrective feedback; uptake; behavior

Cite this article: Mapunda, G. C., & Kyara, E. (2023). "You must be crazy!" Teacher Corrective Feedback and Student Uptake in Two Tanzanian Secondary Schools. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies, 10*(4), 1-20.

DOI: 10.30479/jmrels.2023.18556.2188

1. Introduction

Feedback is a crucial component of language instruction that influences learners' learning and achievement. Through feedback teachers and learners meet the instructional goals. As a part of teacher-learner interaction, feedback provides information to learners on how well they are performing as well as correcting errors. Besides, feedback gives information on the progress of students learning about the targeted instructional goals. Studies in classroom language instruction have identified feedback as a means of motivating students to encourage success in the learning process as well as a means of correcting erroneous linguistic features (Ellis, 2009; Herra & Kulińska, 2018; Selvaraj & Azman, 2020). Students receive feedback as motivation in response to the correct linguistic forms they produce during instruction and corrective feedback (CF) as a response to their incorrect language production.

Feedback can be provided orally or in written forms. Written feedback comprises written comments by the teacher on students' written work. It consists of instructive written remarks and correction of different kinds (Bray, 2012). Its purpose is to provide a response from the teacher as a reader and assist with students' improvement in their writing. Oral feedback (OF) entails spoken information provided as a response to learners' utterances in oral activities in the classroom. OF is the expected interaction that happens in the classroom. Thus, it is a usual component of verbal communication between learners and teachers, or amongst learners during instruction (Bray, 2012). The teachers begin a dialogue that results in a student response, and in turn, the student is provided with feedback. In this sense oral feedback is understood as feedback that is immediately given orally by the teacher (Fungula, 2013). The study focuses on the teachers' oral corrective feedback to students' erroneous utterances in classroom interactions during English language lessons.

Since it is normal for language learners to make errors when practicing and understanding the language they are learning, it is also normal for teachers to draw attention to learners' linguistic errors by providing significant corrective feedback to correct and provide a basis for improvement. CF refers to the teacher's actions after student's error that minimally try to enlighten the learner of the error, and consists of statements that indicate the incorrectness of the learner's output. (Ellis, 2007). CF as a teaching technique requires teachers to make sensible decisions including the errors to correct, choice of corrector (teacher or student), choice of CF technique, correcting timing as well as suitable language for providing feedback. Ellis (2013, p. 3) is of the view that students' error correction can be seen as necessary, but can also be seen as potentially unsafe as it can undermine students' interest in learning. Thus, it must be delivered in a supportive atmosphere. This study aimed at investigating teachers' behaviours that accompanied the OCF strategies and their influence on the students' responses to the OCF. It set out to answer two questions, which ware: 1) What teachers' behaviours co-exist with the OCF strategies in the

English language lessons? 2) How do these teachers' behaviours influence the students' response (uptake) to OCF?

Since its formal establishment in Tanzania (formerly Tanganyika) in 1921, English language teaching and learning has undergone various historical phases. Initially, English was only taught to a select group of privileged individuals who separated themselves from the majority's lifestyles and formed their own class (Mapunda, 2015). At the time of the British colonial rule (1918–1961), English was the official language. Additionally, English was mandated and adopted as the medium of education. At that time, Swahili was to be used all through the first five years of primary education and English for the next three years of primary education and throughout secondary education (Mapunda & Gibson, 2022; Rubagumya et al., 2021). Swahili had attained a high level of political prominence and broad acceptance by the time the nation attained independence in 1961. It was used by the Government, and in 1967 it was adopted as the major language of instruction in primary education. After Swahili became the language of instruction in primary education, the original plan was to expand Swahili to the first two years of secondary school by 1973. In January 1982, the Presidential Commission of Education suggested that all secondary education should use Swahili as a medium of instruction by 1985, followed by higher education in 1992 (Rwezaura, 1993). However, the country is experiencing a different situation since because it is only at the primary school level where the implementation of these policies has been effected.

Tanzania is currently implementing the 1995 Education and Training policy, which indicates Swahili and English as the official languages of education where Swahili is a major language of instruction in primary schools, with English being a required subject (MoE, 1995). English is the language of instruction for secondary school, and Swahili will be a required subject up to the ordinary level. Following this policy, children in the country start learning English as a subject in primary education but when they join secondary education, they change the MoI from Swahili to English, which does not facilitate effective teaching and learning in classrooms. It has been disclosed that at the secondary level of education students fail to learn successfully through the English language as the sole medium of instruction. (Brock-Utne, 2002). Studies have revealed that both learners and teachers struggle in education concerning language which in the end bring about poor results in the English subject in national examinations, students' communication problems as well as an increase in the number of students who join secondary schools with little English (Mapunda, 2022; Qorro, 2006; Tibategeza, 2009).

The English language situation in secondary school classrooms requires teachers with enough language proficiency and sufficient language teaching skills to make their students more involved in their classrooms and become more effective in their teaching. These abilities encompass the skills in making rigorous pronunciation of the language, speaking the language confidently and

fluently in the classroom, and giving proper feedback on students' class work (Van Canh & Renandya, 2017, p. 68). Feedback is depicted as 'one of the strongest bearings on learning especially when it delivers the information, connecting to the assignment or learning process, that helps to bridge the gap between learner's prior knowledge and what is expected to be grasped. (Hattie & Timperley, 2007.) One of the common forms of feedback in language classrooms is corrective feedback. The provision of appropriate corrective feedback in a proper manner is of vital importance in language learning. Chandler, (2003) states that making learners conscious of the discrepancies between their interlanguage and the target language can promote the development of their second language.

2. Literature Review

Studies on CF (e.g. Ellis, 2017; Hendrickson, 1978; Lyster, & Saito, 2010) have centered mainly on the types of CF strategies, teachers' preferences on these strategies, teachers' and students' and attitude towards learners' uptake. Moreover, several studies (e.g. Faqeih, 2015; Halim, et al., 2021) have focused on teachers' and students' attitudes towards CF. A few other studies (e.g. Divsar & Dolat pour, 2018; Tulis, 2013) have focused on teachers' behaviour in providing CF in the classrooms. Guvendir (2011) for instance, has specifically studied the role of non-verbal behaviour of teachers in providing students with CF and their consequences. According to Yoshida (2010), social and pedagogical demands of classes inform teachers' corrective behaviours. This means that, apart from using corrective feedback strategies, teachers do employ other behaviours in response to students' errors due to the pedagogical and social demands of the class. It was, therefore, considered valuable for researchers to conduct this investigation focusing on the teachers' behaviours that accompany corrective feedback strategies during classroom interaction.

The students' verbal reactions towards a given OCF have been termed Uptake. Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen (2001) view uptake as a learner expression that directly follows the teacher's OCF. It comprises a sort of reaction to the teacher's intention to attract awareness to some feature of the learner's original utterance (this general intention is obvious to the learner, even though the teacher's linguistic orientation may not exactly be specified) CF is strongly connected to student uptake. Students' uptake following CF determines the degree of students' classroom participation in the error treatment episodes in teacher-student interaction. It is also associated with the effectiveness of different forms of CF. Effective CF has been determined by its capacity to trigger uptake, and successful repair of the errors (Tatawy, 2012, p. 14). Previous studies (e.g. Lee, 2007; Lightbown & Spada, 1999; Lyster et al., 2013) have shown that teachers' provision of CF for learners' errors always works properly if it occurs in ways that integrate meaningful and sustained communicative interaction as well as encourage students to play a part in the process of correcting their errors.

The provision of appropriate CF is of vital importance in language learning when it leads to students' uptake, especially self-repair of errors. When learners adjust their erroneous utterances in reaction to CF, learning chances are created through CF given and the construction of improved utterances. (Mcdonough, 2005, p. 79). Studies on the provision of CF in ELT classrooms in Tanzania are not common. Little research has been carried out on what is being practiced in ELT classrooms concerning teachers' CF and the students' uptake. It is then worthy for this study to focus on teachers' OCF accompanying behaviours and their influence on students' uptake in English language lessons in Tanzanian secondary school classroom contexts.

2.1. Theoretical Framework

This study applies Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (SCT). This theory views learning, as a dialog. This is to say that language learning occurs as a result of dialogic interaction. This interaction allows an expert (e.g., a teacher) to make a context in which novices (students) can actively play part in their learning the expert can modify the assistance that the novices are given (Antón, 1999 in Ellis 2009). According to Ellis (2000, p. 209), learning does not occur via interaction, but in interaction. Students first accomplish a new task successfully with the help of another person, and then learn to implement it independently. Thus, social interaction mediates learning.

The key constructs of SCT are Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), scaffolding, mediation, and regulation. ZPD means the gap between the real developmental point which is indicated by solving problems unassisted and the level of possible development as determined through problem-solving under the guidance of an adult or in cooperation with skilled peers. The first level is the one already attained by a learner. At this level, a learner can solve a problem without help. The second level is the one yet to be achieved by a learner. It is a level of potential development that a learner can reach but with the assistance of a teacher or more competent peer. SCT further believes that the transition from the student's actual development stage to the potential developmental stage begins and it also molded by the dialogic interaction between the teacher and the student.

The concept of social interaction in SCT is vital in understanding the OCF behaviours and students' uptake behaviours as elements of classroom interaction. According to SCT, much vibrant knowledge gaining by the child happens all the way through social interaction with an experienced trainer. The trainer may shape behaviour and deliver oral directives to the learner. This process is referred to as collaborative or cooperative dialogue. Participation is the key to cooperation in which the learner and the more knowledgeable others need to work together to reach the target, which is aiming for developing the ZPD. It is furthermore supposed that interaction is the bridge that connects the meaning of the support provided between the more knowledgeable other and the

learner. Social interaction works best in a joint-problem solving to develop the learner's ZPD.

3. Method

3.1. Participants

A total of 901 students from two secondary schools in Ubungu District, Dar es Salaam Region, participated in the study. These were from community-owned secondary schools, and they were at the general certificate level. Besides, six (6) English language teachers from the same schools also participated. The schools are average mainstream public schools that have the same qualities in terms of facilities. For confidentiality, these schools are referred to as School A and school B throughout the paper. School A was established in 2004. It has an English language department, which has ten English language teachers. School B was established in 2008 and has an English language department with six teachers. The study involved Form I to Form IV classes in both schools.

3.2. Data Collection Instruments

The data were collected by classroom non-participant observation and interview methods.

3.2.1 Non-Participant Observation

The study used non-participant observation, and we had a checklist for the observation. Thirteen lessons were observed. The lessons observed involved English Language formal grammar, reading lessons, writing and literature. During classroom observation, the teacher-student interactions in English language lessons were audio-recorded. The classroom observation aimed at capturing mainly teacher-student communicative activities, and how errors were treated, mostly by teachers. Students' uptake was also on the checklist.

3.2.2. Interview

The interviews were carried out with 6 English language teachers and 8 students who were also involved in observation. The interviews aimed to complement the data obtained in the classroom observations.

3.3. Data Analysis

The audio recordings from classroom observation and interviews were transcribed into text files. After transcription was made, all the transcripts were comprehensively reviewed for understanding the data, then coded with the aid of QRS NVIVO 12 software. The process of coding observation data was guided by an error treatment sequence (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). The actual incidents of OCF were defined as a sequence that contains a trigger (student erroneous utterance), the feedback move, and (optionally) uptake (student's response to the feedback). Teachers' behaviours that co-occurred with the CF process were identified and codded. The interview data were coded depending on the

behavioural themes identified in the respondents' answers to the question concerning the ways teachers handle students' errors in the classrooms.

4. Results and Discussion

In this part, the findings are presented according to the two questions which the paper is addressing: (1) What teachers' behaviours co-exist with the OCF strategies in the English language lessons? And 2) How do these teachers' behaviours influence the students' response (uptake) to OCF? We are firstly providing results for question one.

The results from the classroom observation indicate 202 interactional episodes that comprise teachers' oral corrective feedback. Teachers applied at least six OCF strategies, which are explicit correction, clarification request, recasts, metalinguistic feedback, repetition, and a combination of more than one strategy. Out of these feedback sequences, 123 were responded to by students. This means that students responded to 61% of all corrective feedback provided by their teachers in the 13 lessons observed. Seventy-nine turns, equivalent to 39%, were not responded to. The responses from students include repetition of teacher's feedback, incorporation of the correct form provided by the teacher into a longer utterance, peer- repair and Self-repair. There were responses in which errors were not successfully repaired; they include acknowledgements, different errors, hesitations, off-target and the same errors. During classroom observations and the interviews, some teachers' behaviours that frequently co-occurred with the CF strategies were identified. The effects of these behaviours on the students' uptake results in the classrooms were also identified. The behaviours included non-verbal cues, manners of implementing the CF strategies, translanguaging, and the use of negative comments.

4.1. Nonverbal Behaviours

In this, teachers applied nonverbal signals to the learners to indicate that something was wrong with their utterances. In these cases, teachers pause and display facial expressions to show something is not okay with the students' utterances. These actions were recorded in the observation notes only when they immediately followed a student's error and when they led to students' responses. The responses were the student's attempts to adjust the ill-formed utterances. According to Ellis (2009), paralinguistic signals in corrective feedback take in the use of gestures or facial appearance to show that the student has produced an ill formed utterance. Excerpts 1 and 2 from the classroom observation data demonstrate the actions.

(1) (School A, T5- Expressing Parallel Increase lesson)

S. *Ze smaller ze area ze higher ze plessure *[multiple phonological errors/ze/ for /ðə/ and / plɛʃə/ for /prɛʃə/]*

T. mmmh, *[head shake with a look that showed discontent]*

S. *Ple…plessure */plɛʃə/*

T. Who can say the sentence nicely

(2)(School A, T4-Reading)

T. what is dense forest?

S. *Area scattered trees *[grammatical error]*

T. hiss sound *[combined with sneering]*

S2. Many trees together

T. Class, someone to define correctly?

The teachers in these excerpts presented sounds and facial expressions as a way of signifying to the learners of their incorrect sentences. However, the head shake and discontent looking in (1) and hissing sound combined with sneering in (2) caused discomfort to the students as they showed signs of wary and discomfort. The student in (1) tried to respond but ended up with hesitation and repetition of the second *phonological error / plɛʃə/ for /prɛʃə/]*. In example (2), a peer student responded, leaving the student who made an error silent. However, the errors were not successfully handled.

4.2. OCF Implementation Styles

In this part, we are presenting findings on the second research question which reads *How do these teachers' behaviours influence the students' response (uptake) to OCF?* The classroom observation data discloses different teachers' behaviours in implementing the six OCF strategies which were identified. The way these strategies were executed in the classrooms affected the students' responses. For example, explicit corrective feedback was applied extensively in the classrooms observed in the two schools studied. The strategy also led to a number of no uptake from the students as the table summarizes:

Table 1.
Uptakes in Relation to Explicit Correction

Explicit Correction	Sch. A	Sch. B	Uptake	Sch. A	Sch. B	Total	No Uptake		Sch. A	Sch. B
	42	37	Acknowledgement	1	0	1	34	15	19	
			Incorporation	5	3	8				
			Peer -repair	5	7	12				
			Repetition	10	14	24				
	79			**45**					**34**	

As Table 1 shows, out of 79 explicit corrective feedback provided by teachers, 34 moves were not responded to by the students.

Apart from being applied extensively, the style employed by the teachers in implementing this OCF was corrective feedback as affirmation or encouragement to the students. Although there were moments when teachers instructed students to repeat the correct forms, the oral corrective feedback sequence ended up with teachers' feedback turns. Most of the students received explicit corrections as directives that do not need any action as in the following excerpt from classroom observational data:

(3) (School A, T2-Definite Article lesson)

S. The sea it is blue colour *[Grammatical error]*

T. You have tried to construct a sentence but the sentence it is not in a good grammar, eeh, so we can say ...the sea is in blue colour or the sea is colorless *[Explicit correction]*

The way the CF was presented left the student with nothing to say because the teacher completed it all. This behaviour also led to chances of no-uptake for the students.

Furthermore, the findings revealed another teacher's style of implementing the CF in the classroom which was the tendency of the teachers to address the feedback to the whole class when one student commits an error while speaking. There were cases in the classrooms where teachers turned to the whole class after a student's 'errors. In most cases, this tendency resulted in random peer corrections and other cases remained unresolved because no one in the classes felt responsible to react to the feedback as in extracts 4 and 5 from classroom data:

(4) (School A, T5- Expressing Parallel Increase)

S. *The bigger the National park the bigger animal *[grammatical error]*

T. mmh… Class is the sentence okay? *[clarification Request]*

(5) (School B, T2- Expressing Opinions)

S.* I pay my more salary if were a president *[grammatical error]*

T. Class who can make the sentence correct?

In the two extracts, the teachers tried to give turns to the whole class but everyone stayed silent and the cases remained unsettled. Accordingly, when providing feedback, teachers frequently used phrases that shifted the role of responding from the student who made an error to anybody in the class. These phrases changed the focus of the feedback from the student who initially made an error to the whole class. Consequently, any student who felt like responding to the teachers 'feedback did so which then resulted in such uptakes from peer

students than self-repairs. Table 2 summarizes the phrases used by teachers in the lessons observed which shifted the role of uptaking from the students who made errors to other students of the class.

Table 2.

Summary of Phrases that Shifted the Role of Uptake

Phrase	Source	Lesson
…Class is the sentence okay? '	School B, T1	Talking about past events
...Class who can make the sentence correct?	School B,T2	Expressing Opinions
..Class do we say '/seŋk ju/ or/θaŋk ju/?	School A,T6	Expressing Future Plans
.... enhee, mwingine... (another one...)	School B,T1	Expressing likes and dislikes
...Class is he right?,	School B,T2	Reading for comprehension
...another one	School B,T2	Reading for comprehension
...someone to try	School A,T5	Expressing parallel increase
...who can repeat it	School A,T2	Definite Article
...someone else...	School B,T3	Seeking and Giving
...another trial..	School A T2	Definite Article

Moreover, whenever a peer student showed an intent of responding by raising up a hand, teachers offered opportunities without waiting for the initial student who made the error try to work on the feedback provided.

Lastly, in the CF implementation manners, the classroom data showed that students were denied chances to respond to feedback. In most cases, teachers did not give enough time to the students who made errors to work on the feedback they provided. For this case, some feedback turns were not worked on with the students. This happened mostly with recasts. Out of the 30 recasts that appeared in the classroom observation data only six (6) received students' uptakes. The opportunities for learner response following recasts were very few in the lessons observed. Teachers frequently denied students chance to respond; so, the students missed enough chances to restructure the flawed expressions using the provided recasts. In the current study, the teachers continued with teaching and writing on the chalkboard after some feedback moves without considering the students who were being corrected, as in the following excerpt:

(6) (School B, T1- Talking about past events)

S. *He is going to cleaning *[grammatical error-wrong tense]*

T. He is going to clean *[Recast]*...enhee, mwingine... *(enhee...another one...) [while writing the correct form on the board]*

4.3. Translanguaging

The findings also reveal the teachers' behaviour of navigating freely between the two languages available in the classroom; that is English and Swahili in the process of providing CF. Whenever translanguaging occurred in the classroom, functioned in the same purpose as other OCF strategies. The translanguaging practices identified were metalinguistic feedbacks and clarification request as in excerpts 7 and 8.

(7) (School A, T3- indefinite articles)

S. * That is an animals *[grammatical error-wrong article]*

T. nimeshasema 'an' inatumika na umoja sio wingi *[metalinguistic feedback]*

(I have already said, 'an' is used with singular not plural)

(8) (School B, T1 Talking about past events)

S. *When I reached there, I see not only her parents but also her brothers *[grammatical error-wrong tense]*

T. Unaongelea tukio la wakati uliopita; tumia past tense

(You are talking about a past event; use the past tense]

These OCF turns ended up with Swahili expressions without taking into account of the target language form being taught.

4.4. Language of Correction

During classroom lessons, there were moments where teachers used language that sounds as scolding students. This type of language was coded as negative corrective comments during data analysis. These comments did not fit to the common strategies of OCF identified in most CF studies. These comments were coded only when they immediately followed a student erroneous utterance and when they indicated to the student who made an error that there is something uncommon. However, these comments did not point to the error directly but they made students detect that there is something wrong with the utterance made and try to respond to the feedback as in excerpts 9 and 10 from the classroom observation data.

(9) (School A, T2-Definite article)

S. *The driver the car every day *[grammatical error-missing verb]*

T. eeeh! You must be crazy*[corrective comment]*

S. aaa…the ...the driver… *[uptake-Hesitation]*

S2: the diver drives the car every day

(10) School B, T3- Business Letters)

S. The letter must have solution *[lexical error–use of the word solution instead of salutation]*

T. You are not serious

S. the …. the... *[uptake-Hesitation]*

S2. salutation

T. Yes, it is salutation not solution

In the examples above the teacher provided comments after the students made the ill-formed sentences as in (9*) you must be crazy (10) you are not serious* immediately after the students made some errors. The students who made errors tried to respond to these teachers' comments but they ended up hesitating which then gave chance to peer students to respond.

The interview findings corroborate the classroom observation data. Teachers and students reported classroom behaviours that accompany teachers' CF in English language lessons. Some teachers' responses to the interview question 'How do you handle students' oral errors in your lessons?' affirm the translanguaging practice presented in Table 2:

Table 2.

Teachers' responses on translanguaging

Teacher	Response
T1A	....When I am teaching I try to translate vocabularies into Swahili to help them though it is not allowed ...
T6A	To tell you the truth, I speak to them in Swahili when they make errors. ..They don't know English.
T1B	.... I translate to Swahili, sometimes I call them in the office and help them. I give them correction by telling them right sentences
T4B	….when they speak wrong English sometimes I change to Swahili to make it clear…otherwise they will not understand the correct answer
T3 A	I give correction in Swahili kuweka msisitizo maana wanarudiarudia kosa hilo hilo (I give correction in Swahili to emphasize because they always repeat same error)
T5A	I have to translate to Swahili they don't have good English

The findings from the interviews with students also revealed how their teachers correct their errors in the English language lessons. The second interview question asked the students to say how their teachers corrected their

errors in the classrooms during instruction. Apart from showing the methods that their teachers use in correcting their errors some reported their teachers' behaviours such as being denied a chance to respond to their teachers' feedback as the following student narrates:

> *Mmm.. mimi pale niliposema ze...ze... pursue… (pronounced as /pʊrsʊ/ instead of /pəsjuː/) kanikata jicho... kaona anipotezee… kamchagua mwingine aongee (there, when I said ze pursue (/pʊrsʊ/) … she gave me a stern look, ignored me, and picked another one to speak)(S4 school A)*

This scenario happened in a reading lesson where the student was reading a story brought to the class by teacher. The excerpt below shows the scenario drawn from the class :

(11) (School A, T4-Reading)

S....Though the antelopes were running at a high speed...he managed ze...ze.. *(here the student was supposed to read the word'to')* ....pu..pursu *....[phonological error /pʊrsʊ/ instead of /pəsjuː/]*

T. na wewe !...Asome mwingine *(...you..let another one read)*

In addition, the student's response reveals the nonverbal behaviour of bad look which was also observed in the classroom.

4.5. Discussion

The study focuses on the teachers' behaviours that accompany the OCF strategies and their influence to the students' response to the CF. It answers two questions which are (1) what teachers' behaviours that co-exist with the CF strategies in the English language lessons? (2) How do these behaviours influence the students' response to CF? The results exposes behaviours such as nonverbal actions (head shake, discontent look and sneering); OCF implementation manners (corrections as affirmation, denying students chance to respond to feedback, addressing the feedback to the whole class when one student commits an error); translanguaging and negative corrective comments. These findings are consistent with the results of Herra, & Kulińska, (2018) research which indicated that teachers also rely on comprehensible forms of behaviors in providing them with corrective feedback. Moreover, on extensive use of explicit correction, the results are consistent with Sebonde and Biseko's (2013) findings on the techniques that Tanzanian English language teachers use to handle students' morpho-syntactic errors. The findings on the absence of chances for students to respond to feedback concur with Panova and Lyster (2002) study which shows that the use of recasts provided very little opportunity for learners to respond, leading to low rates of learner uptake and immediate error repair. However, with regard to the teachers' behaviour of translanguaging, the results contradict Uddin (2021) findings that CF with language switching

can be effective in leading to uptakes and repairs. For the case of this study, OCF of this kind did not invite responses from the students who were being corrected.

The use of nonverbal behaviours and corrective negative comments, requires extra attention for the students to realize that their teachers are notifying them about their erroneous utterances. However, the way the teachers offered the signals just made students feel that there was something wrong with their utterances but could not specifically identify the errors and correct them. For the side of students there were signs of discomfort and upset which caused them to try fix their utterances unsuccessfully. Such kinds of corrective feedback can have very low worth for the learners concerning their errors because the aim of corrective feedback is to make students improve their flaws in using language and not otherwise. Students might fossilize errors that teachers have certainly not attempted to correct by simply offering unseemly signals and comments. Normally, it is understood that Corrective feedback must be clear as well as effective on the students' learning instead of causing disappointments and distress. For this to be possible, the teachers need to know to some extent about the students' prior level of understanding, capacity to apply the feedback provided and at least a little about what emotional response the student might have to the corrective feedback (Chudowsky & Glaser 2001). Hattie and Timperley (2007) state that, feedback becomes more successful when it does not bring damage to students' self-esteem. The findings with the nonverbal behaviours and negative corrective comments have evidenced how ignoring this fact can affect the student's feelings as student 4 of school A expressed being unsatisfied with her teacher's feedback in the interview:

These behaviours left students unsatisfied with the feeling of being ignored, a situation which made students passive in class. These behaviours limited the social interactions in the lessons hence high chances of no uptake.

In the case of the OCF implementation manners, the behaviours affected the rate of uptake to the students also by restraining the response chances. Nonetheless, studies have emphasized the importance of providing opportunities for students to act upon the given feedback. Lyster (1998) makes it clear that teachers need to offer chance after providing the corrective feedback for learners to respond. Also, Tataway (2012), depicts that providing students with time and opportunity for self-repair benefits language development. Further, Amalia and Marmanto (2019) add that students are likely to respond to the corrective feedback when they are vigorously involved in the teaching and learning process. Allowing students to react to the teacher's OCF will encourage them to participate in class activities. Additionally, the tendency of the teachers to address the feedback to the whole class when a student committed an error or appointing another student to correct before even the one who made an error tried to respond to the feedback, triggered several peer-repair uptakes.

Furthermore, the results disclose translanguaging by the teachers in the classrooms observed and in the interview responses. Although studies (Cunningham & Graham, 2000; Echevarría et al., 2010; Jiménez et al., 2015; and Pacheco, & Miller, 2016) have insisted on the benefits of translanguaging such as strengthening understanding of structures of the language, or ability to focus on language rules as well as encouraging students to use all of their linguistic resources, the process of implementing it in the teaching of language needs to be systematic and careful. For the case of this study, teachers reported to use the two languages English (the target language) and Swahili because of low English proficiency of their students. However, the teachers’ fear on their students’ level of proficiency may constrain students’ opportunity to learn the target language. The incidents identified in the classrooms as in excerpts (7) and (8) ended in Swahili without considering the target language form being discussed. Also, the feedback did not invite responses from the students who were being corrected. Burton and Rajendram (2019) assert that the use of translanguaging in the ESL lessons cannot be seen as a resource but rather as a barrier to maximizing the use English during instruction. This is because the use of any other language other than the target language can destruct students from their drive of improving their TL competence.

5. Conclusion and Implication

This study discloses the teachers' behaviours that go with the OCF strategies and their influence on the students' uptake. Our research reveals that when teachers are correcting students' errors do deliver some behaviours with the OCF strategies, which, in one way or another, influences the students' uptake. The study discovers nonverbal behaviours such as head shake, eye contact, and sneering. These behaviours resulted in unsuccessful students' responses as they ended up hesitating without knowing what to do while some resulted in peer repair. In addition, CF implementation manners for example corrections as affirmation, denying students the chance to respond to feedback, and addressing the feedback to the whole class when one student commits an error, affected the learners' uptake by creating chances for no uptake and random peer repairs. This happens also to translanguaging and negative corrective comments.

Given the prevalence of more or fewer teachers' behaviours that happen throughout corrective feedback in English language classrooms, further research is desirable to study the entire atmosphere that surrounds error correction processes in the classroom. This is because these behaviours have significant effects when it comes to classroom learning and students' participation in the process of error correction. It is understood that the manner of delivering CF to learners needs to increase learning progress without destructing their motivation and language development.

Pedagogically, language teaching practitioners are commended to reconsider and manage their oral corrective behaviours and reactions in the course of providing corrective feedback in ELT classrooms. As well, instructors must observe the amount of anxiety caused by OCF in learners and adopt methods that facilitate rather than debilitate learning.

References

Amalia, Z. D. H., Fauziati, E., & Marmanto, S. (2019). Male and Female Students' Preferences on the Oral Corrective Feedback in English as Foreign Language (EFL) Speaking Classroom. *Humaniora*, *10*(1), 25-33. https://doi.org/10.21512/humaniora.v10i1.5248

Antón, M. (1999). The discourse of a learner-centered classroom: Sociocultural perspectives on teacher-learner interaction in the second-language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *83*(3), 303-318. https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00024

Bray, L. (2012). *Teacher as Foreigner in an English as a Foreign Language Classroom in Thailand*. Doctoral dissertation Project Linnaeus University Sweden.

Brock-Utne, B. (2002). *Language, Democracy and Education in Africa (15)*. Nordic Africa Institute. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2652-1_7

Burton, J., & Rajendram, S. (2019). Translanguaging-as-resource: University ESL instructors' language orientations and attitudes toward translanguaging. *TESL Canada Journal*, *36*(1), 21-47. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl. v36i1.1301

Chandler, J. (2003). The Efficacy of Various Kinds of Error Feedback for Improvement in the Accuracy and Fluency of L2 Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*, 267-296. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9

Chudowsky, N., Glaser, R., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2004). *Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment*. National Academy. Press.

Cunningham, T.H., & Graham, C. (2000). Increasing native English vocabulary recognition through Spanish immersion: Cognate transfer from foreign to first language. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*(1), 37–49. https://doi.org/org/10.1037/0022-0663.92.1.37

Divsar, H., & Dolat pour, E. (2018). Error Management Behaviors in EFL Classrooms: Teachers' Responses to Students' Errors (Research Paper). Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 6(2), 86-99. Available at http://journalscmu.sinaweb.net/article

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E. & Short, D. (2010). *Making content comprehensible to elementary English learners: The SIOP model*, Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Ellis, R. (2007). Corrective feedback in theory, research and practice. In *The 5th International Conference on ELT in China & the 1st Congress of Chinese Applied Linguistics, May* (pp. 17-20). Beijing Foreign Language Studies University, Beijing, China. Available online at http://www.celea.org.cn/2007/keynote/ppt/Ellis.pdf.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, *1*(1), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054

Ellis, R. (2013). Corrective feedback in teacher guides and SLA. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *1*(3) 1-18. Available at http://www.urmia.ac.ir/ijltr.

Ellis, R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in language teaching: A historical perspective. *Avances En Educación y Humanidades*, *2*(2), 7-22. https://doi.org/10.21897/25394185.1482

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, *51*(2), 281–318. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00156

Faqeih, H. I. (2015). Learners' attitudes towards corrective feedback. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *192*, 664-671. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.101

Fungula, B. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in the Chinese EFL Classroom: Methods employed by teachers to give feedback to their students. Dissertation. Karlstad University. Available at http://kau.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:693017/FULLTEXT01.pdf**.**

Guvendir, E. (2011). The role of non-verbal behavior of teachers in providing students corrective feedback and their consequences. *Sino-US English Teaching*, *8*(9), 577-591. Available at https://www.researchgate.net**.**

Halim, T., Wahid, R., & Halim, S. (2021). EFL students' attitudes toward corrective feedback: A study conducted at undergraduate level. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, *1*(1), 40–49. https://doi.org/10.1108/sjls-03-2021-0004

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, *62*(8), 387–398. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1978.tb02409.x

Herra, A., & Kulińska, A. (2018, December). The role of feedback in the process of learning English as a foreign language. In *Forum Filologiczne ATENEUM* (Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 127-143). Ateneum-Akademia Nauk Stosowanych w Gdańsku.

Jiménez, R. T., David, S., Fagan, K., Risko, V. J., Pacheco, M., Pray, L., & Gonzales, M. (2015). Using translation to drive conceptual development for students becoming literate in English as an additional language. Research in the Teaching of English, 49(3), 248-271. Available at https://library.ncte.org/journals**.**

Lee, J. (2007). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in English immersion classrooms at the primary level in Korea. *ENGLISH TEACHING (영어교육)*, *62*(4), 311-334. https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.62.4.200712.311

Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(01), 37–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263197001034

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language*

learning, *48*(2), 183-218. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00039

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 265-302. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language teaching*, *46*(1), 1-40. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444812000365

Mapunda, G. 2015. "The Changing Roles of English in Tanzania: Past and Present." In *Changing Roles of English in Eastern Africa*, edited by M. Michieka and Y. Elhind, (pp. 34–57). Common Ground Research Networks.

Mapunda, G. (2022). Revisiting the English-Swahili debate on Tanzania's medium of instruction policy at secondary and post-secondary levels of education. *Journal of African Languages and Literatures*, (3), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.6093/jalalit. v3i3.9141

Mapunda, G., & Gibson, H. (2022). On the suitability of Swahili for early schooling in remote rural Tanzania: Do policy and practice align? *Journal of the British Academy*, *10*(s4), 141-168. https://doi.org/10.5871/jba/010s4.141.

McDonough, K. (2005). Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners' responses on ESL question development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *27*(1), 79-103. doi: doi:10.1017/s0272263105050047.

Pacheco, M. B., & Miller, M. E. (2016). Making meaning through translanguaging in the literacy classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, *69*(5), 533-537.doi:10.1002/trtr.1390.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *36*(4), 573-595. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588241.

Qorro, M. (2006). Testing Student's Ability to Learn through English during the Transition from Primary to Secondary Schooling. In: B. Brock-Utne et al (eds.). Focus on Fresh Data on the Language of Instruction Debate in Tanzania and South Africa. African Minds.

Rubagumya, C., Sane, E., & Ndabakurane, J. (2021). Vignette: Implementing language supportive pedagogy to support content learning in Tanzania. In *Multilingual Learning and Language Supportive Pedagogies in Sub-Saharan Africa* (pp. 170-174). Routledge.

Rwezaura, B. (1993). Constraining factors to the adoption of Kiswahili as a language of the law in Tanzania. *Journal of African Law*, *37*(1), 30–45. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0021855300011098

Sebonde, R. Y., & Biseko, J. M. (2013). Handling of Morphosyntactic Learners Errors in Tanzanian English Language Classrooms. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *4*(6), 1191-1199.

Selvaraj, A. M., & Azman, H. (2020). Reframing the Effectiveness of Feedback in Improving Teaching and Learning Achievement. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *9*(4), 1055-1062. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i4.20654

Tatawy, M. El. (2012). Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition. *Journal of Education and Humanities*, *2*(2), 171–172. https://doi.org/10.7916/salt.v2i2.1645

Tibategeza, E.R. (2009). Language-in-Education Planning in Tanzania: A Sociolinguistic Analysis. A Thesis submitted for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics at the University of the Free State

Tulis, M. (2013). Error management behavior in classrooms: Teachers' responses to student mistakes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *33*, 56–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.02.003

Uddin, N. (2021). *Switching Between the L1 and L2: Teachers' Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake*. The University of Memphis

Van Canh, L., & Renandya, W. A. (2017). Teachers' English Proficiency and Classroom Language Use: A Conversation Analysis Study. RELC Journal, *48*(1), 67-81. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690935

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978) *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.

Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom?. *The modern language Journal*, *94*(2), 293-314. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01022.x