

Developing a Classroom Observation Instrument on Error Correction during Speaking Tasks

DJARI Walid*

University Center of Barika

walid.djari@cu-barika.dz

Date of submission: 03-02-2025

Date of acceptance: 01-06-2025

Abstract:

This paper is a methodological research design that aims at describing the refinement process of a classroom observation instrument on error correction during speaking tasks in EFL classrooms informed by literature and empirical testing. The instrument is designed to capture various aspects of error correction and feedback strategies used. Hence, the data is crucial in the development of the instrument and it is not used for any statistical analysis. Consequently, the success of the instrument is dependent on the accuracy and specificity of the data. The instrument includes sections for categorizing learner errors, evaluating teacher responses, analysing corrective feedback strategies, and exploring student reactions, these sections were improved throughout the different versions of the instrument. The results of the final instrument provide extensive and detailed data on fluency versus accuracy errors, frequency of error correction, types of feedback delivered and reactions of the learners to feedback. Therefore, this study provides a comprehensive structured framework for investigating the dynamics of instrument refinement of targeted empirical pedagogical strategies.

Keywords: Classroom Observational Instrument, Error Correction, Language Learners, Language Teachers, Speaking Tasks

Introduction:

Songxaba and Sincuba (2019, p. 2) describe errors as consistent deviations from the target language that arise due to lack of proficiency, and occur systematically among learners. These errors are defined as the result of learners constantly making the same mistakes in their language acquisition process. Vavilova & Broadbent (2019, p. 529) suggest that learning is an inherent aspect of human nature and always involves errors.

Errors made by language learners are not random, Studies indicate that learners tend to make errors in certain areas where their native language differs from the new language they are learning (Kroll

* Corresponding author

& Schafer, 1978). This is because they may unintentionally transfer grammar or vocabulary from their native language to the new language (Lightbrown & Spada, 2006). Krashen and Terrell (1983) suggest that errors in second/foreign language learning indicate normal developmental processes, regardless of the learner's native language. They advocate a positive perspective on language learning, contrasting it with the occurrence of natural and necessary errors in children's acquisition of their first language. This view emphasizes the nature of errors in the language learning process, emphasizing their role as an essential part of developmental progress.

Additionally, error correction makes most of the interaction between teachers and learners in a foreign language classroom and is often considered the most potent source of improvement (Chaudron, 1988, p. 133). Likewise, Rod Ellis (2009) points out that error correction has a place in most theories of second language acquisition, where it is considered as contributing to foreign language learning and as a tool for fostering linguistic accuracy. Larsen-Freeman (2003, p. 126) emphasizes the importance of corrective feedback by considering errors to be a 'teachable moment' and an opportunity for learning to take place. These views fall in agreement with Vygotsky's concept of Zone of Proximal Development (1978), where learning is based on interaction between learners and teachers, who serve as scaffolders for learners to progress to the next level of linguistic development. In conjunction with the literature available on the importance of corrective feedback, a deeper understanding of its nature and effective delivery could be linked to a clearer understanding of teacher roles, potentially enhancing their effectiveness

However, error correction can pose challenges for teachers when it comes to addressing student errors. Different students have different preferences when it comes to feedback. While some may appreciate prompt, detailed correction, others may prefer a more nuanced approach, focusing on comprehensive understanding rather than minor errors. Furthermore, teachers' talk in teachers' rooms often shows a certain confusion and misconceptions over dealing with errors, mainly what errors should be corrected and how. This reveals a gap between theory and practice, teachers tend to correct errors unconsciously without

assessing how effective their strategies are. Teachers should also consider the appropriate amount of error correction. Inadequate correction may make students feel dissatisfied and, as a result, they may continue to make the same mistakes. Also, error correction can extend beyond classroom settings. Teachers can encourage students to engage in self-correction and peer correction, promoting a collaborative and supportive learning environment.

Teaching in the Algerian context has shown that students' expectations and cultural beliefs about correcting errors are complex. Learners often seek a high level of feedback, leading to reliance on traditional teacher-centred methods such as grammar translation. This approach tends to prioritize immediate, accuracy-focused feedback, which may have limitations in terms of promoting learner autonomy and deeper understanding. Through this observation, data-driven insights were gathered about alternative error correction strategies in this specific context. The aim of this paper is not to challenge traditional approaches, but the aim is to explore the more effective ways to support student learning and adapt the teaching practices.

Correspondingly, the observation instrument aims to enhance understanding of corrective feedback (CF) in the dynamic context of classroom practice by providing insights from an outside perspective. Key aspects of the tool include:

- Providing a broader perspective on classroom practice, which can help identify areas for improvement.
- Emphasizing the importance of correcting errors in the learning process.
- Providing a strong empirical background to CF strategies, making them more effective.

Therefore, the aims of the study are limited to:

1. The refinement of the instrument to effectively record extensive detailed data on error correction and feedback during speaking tasks.

2. To provide a detailed process of using literature and empirical data to develop practical instruments for teachers to improve error correction strategies during speaking activities.
3. To enhance teachers' awareness of error correction practices and provide a strong empirical background for a more effective corrective feedback strategy.

However, the instrument faces challenges due to the nature of error correction and the nature of errors committed within the classroom. As a result, the instrument is not an in-depth investigation of errors and CF but instead focuses on the most important and observable aspects of classroom practice. This approach allows for efficient data collection, which can be used to improve teaching practices and enhance student-learning outcomes.

1. The Pedagogical Context

This study took place in a private language school during speaking classes. Four groups of B1 intermediate classes totalling 48 learners and 4 teachers were conveniently chosen to participate in this study. The total length of observation time used to record the data of error correction, feedback and the refinement of the instrument was 10 hours.

The rationale behind the choice of B1 intermediate level is related to their ability to speak more fluently than elementary and beginner but make more mistakes than upper-intermediate and advanced levels, making B1 learners the best choice for this study.

2. The Design of the Initial Instrument

The main objective of designing this initial instrument is to better understand the nature of corrective feedback. To achieve that, the design of the initial instrument should focus on the following:

First, the nature of errors, students often make different mistakes that differ according to the task. The instrument will gather basic data on the types of mistakes learners commit such as grammar, lexis and

phonology. This is an elementary basis for the analysis of data gathered from the following sections.

A second focus is the frequency of correcting oral accuracy errors in comparison to oral fluency errors. It is believed that oral accuracy errors such as grammar or any errors that focus on form rather than meaning or content, often get the teachers' focus to correct unlike fluency errors, which are less corrected. However, this might change according to the focus of the task itself, in which teachers focus on correcting accuracy errors during accuracy tasks and fluency errors during fluency tasks. Therefore, this instrument will mainly record the required data concerning what type of oral errors teachers correct or ignore.

Another focus is the teachers' strategies of correcting errors. Teachers often deal with errors in different ways and their strategies change according to the nature of the error, and the aim of the task. The last focus is recording the way learners react to CF in comparison to the different CF strategies that teachers use on the learners. Thus, the initial instrument includes the following sections:

- A section for the type of error learners make.
- A section on whether the activity's aim is fluency or accuracy based.
- Another whether the teacher corrected the error or preferred to ignore it.
- A section on how the teacher corrected it (corrective feedback strategy).
- Finally, a section on how the students reacted.

Developing a Classroom Observation Instrument on Error Correction during Speaking Tasks

Table 1

The Initial Observation Instrument (OI)

Type of Error Made	Aim of the Activity A/F	Error Corrected✓ /Ignored X	How did the teacher correct it?	How did the students react?
--------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------

2.1 The Revision of the initial OI (1&2 hours)

The first instrument (Table 1) is effective in gathering basic data. However, it is sometimes confusing to take notes and observe at the same time, in addition to the difficulty that the researcher faces is to distinguish whether the teacher was aware of the learners making the mistake or ignoring it. This requires the instrument to be modified in order to become more efficient. The teacher used body language, an object (white board) and a change of voice when dealing with errors and that was difficult to record as the initial instrument focuses on language rather than use of equipment and body language. Furthermore, this initial instrument is limited as to who corrected the error, learners sometimes self-correct, or get CF from their peers. This will be modified in the next revisions.

Overall, this instrument gathered clear data using the columns which have a clear classification such as the type of errors made, and students' reaction. It also recorded frequent reactions such as staying silent, taking notes and repeating the teacher's correction. Tables 1 and 2 show the gathered data.

2.2 Results of the Initial OI

Table 1

Type of Error

Type of Error	Grammar	Phonology	Lexis
Result	35%	20%	27%

Table 2*Error Correction Frequency*

	Error Correction Frequency	
	Corrected	Ignored
Errors in Total	80%	20%
Fluency Errors	41,60%	58,40%
Accuracy Errors	93,40%	6,60%

2.3 Rationale for the Modification of the 1st OI

Despite the fact that the initial OI gathered some detailed data on the type of error made, and the frequency of correcting fluency and accuracy errors, the initial instrument fell short recording some important details like the time-consuming note taking that required coding. Thus, A system of coding was introduced; G used for grammar, P for phonology, and L for lexis errors in the 2nd COI. Additionally, the initial COI did not provide detailed data on the source of correction as students sometimes self or peer corrected. This 2nd COI includes a section for “who did the correction?” coded as T for teacher, P for peer correction and SC for self-correction. In addition, I added a section of ‘when the error was corrected’ and coded as follows, D for delayed and I for immediate correction (Ellis, 2009). Table 4 clearly shows the observation instrument after modification.

3. The Second Classroom Observation Instrument

Table 3

The Second Classroom Observation Instrument

Type of Error G/L/P	Aim of the Activity A/F	Error Corrected✓/ Ignored X	Who Corrected it? T/P/SC	When was it corrected? I/D	How did the teacher correct it?	Did the teacher use any material s/ equipment?	How did the students react?
------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	-----------------------------

3.1 The Revision of the Second Instrument (3&4 hours)

The second instrument proved to be effective in recording the required data. However, after using the instrument for four hours, it appears that there is another type of error to be added in addition to the already mentioned Lyster's and Panova's (2002) categorization of errors in three categories grammar, lexis and phonology. This type is of a receptive nature where learners struggle to comprehend the target language, the latter will be found as "other" in the results of the first instrument to follow the way the observer recorded it during the OI. Therefore, the next observation instrument will classify four types of errors: grammar, lexis, phonology and comprehension.

In addition, patterns emerged regarding the materials the teacher used to deliver CF. these materials could be listed as WB (whiteboard), IWB (interactive whiteboard), and paper. Likewise, "students' reaction" section recorded some basic patterns for when learners repeat after the teacher, asked a question, nod in agreement, take notes, showed no response or correct themselves as it is shown in Table 8.

3.2 Results of the 2nd OI

Table 4:

Type of Error

Type of Error	Grammar	Phonology	Lexis	Others
Result	42%	18%	30%	10%

Table 5:

Error Correction Frequency

	Error Correction Frequency	
	Corrected	Ignored
Errors in Total	69%	31%
Fluency Errors	39,70%	58,40%
Accuracy Errors	91%	9%

Table 6:

Timing of CF

Timing of CF	Immediate	Delayed
Result	87%	13%

Table 7:

The source of CF

The source of CF	Teachers	Peers	Self-correction
Result	77%	13%	10%

Table 8:

Students' Reaction to CF

Students' reaction to CF	Repeat	Take Notes	Nod/Body language	Asked a question	No response /correct themselves
Result	20%	3%	30%	10%	37%

3.3 Rationale of the Modification of the 2nd OI

Despite the fact that the 2nd OI recorded the needed data and covered the main aims of investigation using the coding method by reducing the time of writing, the data collected was not as detailed as required (especially when dealing with the teacher's way of delivering CF). Thus, after reverting to literature and previous readings, we came upon Ellis' (2009) classification of the different strategies that teachers use to deliver CF. These strategies are the result of descriptive research (Chaudron, 1977; Lyster & Ranta, 1997) where teachers were observed for the different strategies used to deliver CF. These strategies are:

1. **Recast:** the corrector corrects the incorrect utterance by repeating the student's incorrect utterance with the required correction
2. **Repeat:** the corrector repeats the incorrect utterance without correcting it but stresses and highlights the mistake by means of emphatic stress

3. **Clarification Request:** the corrector indicates that s/he did not understand
4. **Explicit Correction:** the corrector directly indicates that an error was committed and provides the correction
5. **Elicitation:** the corrector repeats a part of the utterance but not the incorrect part and waits for the student to finish using a rising intonation
6. **Paralinguistic Signal:** the corrector uses gestures or facial expression to indicate that the learner made a mistake

Overall, this observation instrument will include a classification in which every strategy will be coded as follows: Rec for recast, Rep for repeat, CR for clarification request, EC for explicit correction, Eli for elicitation and PS for paralinguistic signals.

Another earlier suggested modification is the addition of a fourth type of error which is comprehension errors (Lyster & Panova, 2002), learners produce comprehension errors that do not fall in any of the three categories used in the first instrument this will be included as C in the type of error section.

Additionally, concerning the section of the materials teachers use when delivering CF, patterns emerged while observing, and I included more coded details, which are WB for whiteboard, IWB for interactive whiteboard and P for paper in the 3rd OI. Another modification is noting students' reaction to CF using the required coding such as RAT for repeating after the teacher, AQ for asking a question, N for nod, TN for taking notes, and O for showing no response. However, self-correction SC section will be moved from who corrected the error section to become a part of the students' reaction to corrective feedback as it is more practical to be considered a students' reaction to correction than including it as who delivered the CF.

Finally, the headings were edited to become more practical. Other changes were also added such as changing the questions used such as "when was it corrected," to timing of CF, "how did the teacher correct the error to teacher's CF strategy, "what did the teacher use?" to

Developing a Classroom Observation Instrument on Error Correction during Speaking Tasks

materials used and “how did the students react?” to students’ reaction. Table 10 exhibits the changes mentioned.

4. The Third Classroom Observation Instrument

Table 9:

The Third Classroom Observation Instrument

Type of Error	Aim of the Activity	Error Corrected✓/ Ignored X	Corrected by?	Timing of CF	Teacher s’ CF Strategy	Material s used	Students , Reaction
G/L/P/C	A/F		T/P	I/D	REC REP CR EC ELI PS	WB IWB I	RAT AQ N TN SC O

4.1 The Revision of the 3rd OI (5, 6 & 7 hours)

The third instrument is affective in recording the required data especially after the prior adjustments of the headings and the use of the coding system that made it more practical to record the data. However, there was some redundancy in the content to be recorded such as the section related to who corrected the error. This section could be easily divided into teacher, peer and self-correction. The latter two can be considered as students’ reaction to the error and the prior, falls in the third section or column, corrected or ignored. In addition to this, the materials the teacher used section will be included in the teacher’s strategy of giving CF section. However, using a paper will be taken down.

4.2 Results of the 3rd OI:

Table 10

Type of Error

Type of Error	Grammar	Phonology	Lexis	Comprehension
Result	40%	23%	33%	4%

Table 11

Error Correction Frequency

	Error Correction Frequency	
	Corrected	Ignored
Errors in Total	71%	29%
Fluency Errors	32,7%	58,4%
Accuracy Errors	91%	9%

Table 12

Timing of CF

Timing of CF	Immediate	Delayed
Result	91%	9%

Table 13

Teacher's CF Strategy

Teacher's CF	REC	REP	CR	EC	ELI	PS
--------------	-----	-----	----	----	-----	----

Developing a Classroom Observation Instrument on Error Correction during Speaking Tasks

Strategy						
Result	17%	9%	18%	31%	9%	16%

Table 14

Students' Reaction to CF

Students' reaction	RAT	AQ	N	TN	SC	O
Result	11%	17%	7%	9,00 %	21,00 %	35,00 %

4.3 Rationale for the Modification of the 3rd OI

This instrument requires adjustment despite the positive adaptation that it underwent. There are redundant sections that will be included in other sections such as the materials the teacher used, which will go under the section of the teacher's strategy of giving CF. The section of peer correction is now included in students' reaction section. However, the section related to who provided the CF will be omitted because the data will be well recorded without it in other sections. If the teacher corrects the error, this will be recorded in the section of corrected or ignored, on the other hand self and peer-correction (PC) will be included in the students' reaction section. In addition, RAT (repeating after the teacher) will be changed to answering the teacher's question or elicitation (AQ/E) to make it more precise. Finally, the observation instrument design will be modified to include tickable columns for easier data collection in a systematic way as shown in the 4th OI in Table 16.

5. The Final Classroom Observation Instrument

Table 15

The Final Classroom Observation Instrument

Type of Error				Aim of the Activity				Corrected Ignored				Timing of CF				Teachers' CF Strategy				Students' Reaction			
G	L	P	C	A	F	X	✓	I	D	R	R	C	E	E	P	I/	A	A	N	T	S	O	P
										E	E	R	C	L	S	W	Q	Q		N	C		C
										C	P			I		B	/E						

5.1 The Evaluation and Results of the Final Instrument:

This instrument has been edited multiple times during the 10 hours as follows:

- The Initial Pro-forma (1-4 hours)

This stage includes two instruments in which the main interest of the study was investigated as an initial take on the topic to broaden my understanding of the topic. As a result, the data collected was not well detailed.

- A Functional Instrument (5-7 hours)

This instrument was more practical because it gathered basic data in a functional way. Patterns of different CF strategies, reaction to CF and types of error emerged. The references that I read helped reconstruct the design of the instrument. In addition, codes were used and this made it easier to keep up with the lesson and record the needed data.

- The Final Instrument (8-10 hours)

This instrument is the result of a thorough process of construction, thus the process of recording while observing was more practical. In addition, this OI provided enough and well-detailed data to answer the questions of this study in details in the following section.

5.2 Results

- Errors Made and Error Correction Frequency

During the observed 3 hours, there were 39 errors made in total. Fluency and accuracy errors were almost equal, with 20 accuracy errors (14 grammar and 6 phonology errors). On the other hand, the OI recorded 19 fluency related errors with 16 lexis and 3 comprehension errors. Despite the number being almost equal, the frequency of correction radically varies between accuracy and fluency errors. Accuracy errors were 85% corrected, with 14 grammar mistakes 100% corrected, however, only 50% out of 6 phonology mistakes were corrected. On the other hand, fluency errors were less corrected with 68.4% of the errors corrected. The ignored errors were 6, with 3 lexis and 3 comprehension errors. Therefore, we can notice that comprehension errors were completely ignored. In general, and from the data above, it is clear that accuracy errors are often more corrected than fluency errors as it is shown in Table 18.

Table 16

Type of Error

Type of Error	Grammar	Phonology	Lexis	Comprehension
Result	36%	15%	41%	8%

Table 17*General Correction Frequency*

	General Correction Frequency	
	Corrected	Ignored
Errors in Total	30%	9%
Fluency Errors	13%	6%
Accuracy Errors	17%	3%

However, when this data is analysed in relation to the nature of the task, we find that all of the 17 corrected accuracy errors happened during an accuracy-oriented task. The remaining 3 ignored errors happened during a fluency-oriented task. On the other hand, 13 of the corrected fluency errors happened during a fluency-oriented task, with 4 errors that were ignored during a fluency-oriented task and 2 that were ignored during accuracy-based task.

Table 18*Error Correction Frequency in Comparison to the Nature of the Task*

	Accuracy Task	Fluency Task
Accuracy Errors Corrected	17	0
Accuracy Errors Ignored	0	3
Fluency Errors Corrected	0	13
Fluency Errors Ignore	2	4

- **Teacher's CF Strategy and Timing**

The earliest observation instruments did not record categorized patterns that could be used for data analysis, however, after the third instrument which adopted Ellis' (2009) classification of CF strategies'

Developing a Classroom Observation Instrument on Error Correction during Speaking Tasks

patterns emerged and the data was easily recorded. Thus, the final instrument recorded detailed patterns of CF strategies. Explicit correction is the most prominent strategy with a percentage of 30%; the second most used strategy is clarification request with a percentage of 20%. Other less used strategies are recasting and paralinguistic signals with percentages of 13% and 17%, the rest of the strategies had similar tendencies of use as it is all shown in Table 20.

These CF strategies could be categorized into two categories: the first includes recasting and explicit correction in which the teacher is the source of the correction, these two strategies combined make up 43%. The second category includes the remaining strategies in which the learners are encouraged to correct themselves; this category makes up 57% in total. The positive outcome of using this second category is fostering learners' autonomy and self-correction, which explains why the teachers used these strategies more.

However, it was difficult to categorize the use IWB because it was sometimes used to stimulate the students to correct, or to give explicit correction.

Additionally, if the timing of CF to the strategies used was compared, which is shown in Table 21, it could be notice that the majority of errors were corrected immediately even when using the second category that encourages the learners to be the source of CF. This is quite significant because learners often require time to reflect on their learning. Nevertheless, this could be related to the nature of the task, dominant learners peer correcting and target language being taught. During these observations, most of the teachers used delayed correction when teaching grammar and used it less during oral activities.

Table 19*CF Strategy*

CF Strategy	RE C	REP	CR	EC	ELI	PS	I/WB
Result	13%	6%	20%	30%	7%	17%	7%

Table 20*Timing of CF*

Timing of CF	Immediate	Delayed
Result	83%	17%

- **Learners' Reaction to CF**

Similarly, to the section above, learners' reaction to CF section did not record well-detailed data until after the patterns emerged during the observation process. Table 21 details the most frequently occurring reactions were answering the teacher's elicitation 23%, asking a question 20% and peer correction 13% and nodding in agreement 14%.

These numbers could be explained in relation to the CF strategy used. The most frequent reactions are answering the teachers' questions and elicitation, also self and peer-correction with a total of 65% which is the result of the teachers' use of the second category of strategies such clarification request, paralinguistic signals and elicitation...etc. All of these strategies make up 57% of the used strategies. However, it was difficult to record as students' body language was not always clear as students' seating and their number made it unclear, and it was often confused with staying silent.

Table 21

Students' Reaction to CF

Students' reaction to CF	AQ/ E	A/Q	N	TN	SC	O	PC
Result	23%	20%	14%	7,00 %	20,00 %	3,00 %	13,00 %

6. Conclusion and Reflection on the Effectiveness of the Final Instrument

To conclude, this instrument is the result of a thorough process of improvement, which makes it the most effective in recording the required data. However, despite the complex nature of error correction, this final instrument was successful in providing well-detailed answers to the investigated questions and aims as shown by the results. These answers could be summarized as follows:

- Fluency errors are less corrected than accuracy errors, and grammar errors are always corrected. This could be a confirmation of the belief that Algerian teachers have, a good teacher is a teacher who corrects all grammar mistakes immediately.
- Errors are corrected according to the focus of the task, if the latter is fluency, fluency errors are corrected and vice versa. Yet, relating this to the Algerian context, we can still notice that accuracy-focused and instant correction is the most dominant.
- The observed Algerian teachers use more strategies that encourage the learners to self-correct and use less teacher-centered strategies.
- Learners' reactions to CF vary according to the strategies the teachers use to correct errors.

Finally, despite the fact that this instrument is successful, it has weaknesses where more adjustments are needed such as combining it with a questionnaire for teachers to gather more qualitative data on the results. Overall, this observation study gives teachers an empirical background, which makes delivering corrective feedback more effective. Additionally, it gives the teachers a practical guide on refining observation instruments using available literature.

7. Discussion

The findings recorded using the final instrument provide significant insights into the practices of error corrections during speaking tasks in Algerian EFL classrooms. Nevertheless, these findings require deeper interpretation to align them within the broader research aims and research context.

One major finding is that accuracy errors were corrected more excessively and frequently than fluency errors. This can be interpreted in light of the traditional emphasis on linguistic accuracy within the Algerian educational context, where grammatical and phonetic accuracies are regarded as the basis of language mastery. Teachers may feel culturally imposed to focus on accuracy which aligns with the previous findings of Ellis (2009).

Additionally, it can be observed in the data collected that comprehension errors were frequently ignored. One probable explanation is that they often reveal difficulties in understanding the input rather than errors in language production, and possibly a limitation of the language abilities of B1 classes. This results in comprehension errors being regarded as less amendable to correction during speaking tasks. Also, teachers often prioritize the pace of interaction rather than interrupting it to mend receptive issues, reinforcing a belief that comprehension difficulties are better addressed in different tasks that allow scaffold input rather than corrective feedback.

Furthermore, the dominance of explicit corrective strategies (31%) proves a particular practice in the Algerian context. This kind of correction is a direct model for learners that is often found in traditional teacher-centred approach. However, there is a relatively high use of

Developing a Classroom Observation Instrument on Error Correction during Speaking Tasks

strategies that encourage autonomy, for instance clarification requests and elicitation (27%), which proves a gradual shift towards communicative approaches. This reflects Lyster and Ranata's (1997) focus on promoting input through prompts.

The results also help teachers enhance their awareness of their corrective feedback practices, a routinely practice that teachers often perform unconsciously, by highlighting their tendencies and trends such as the balance between accuracy and fluency or the focus on one when it is necessary, and providing immediate feedback. This allows teaching practice to become an informed pedagogical practice. Also, the instrument proves valuable for refining corrective feedback strategies by providing a structured and systematic method to observe and analyse error correction behaviours. When comparing the findings to previous studies, many similarities arise such as the excessive use of explicit feedback that aligns with Lyster and Ranata's (1997) findings, but the particular use of prompts and fostering learners' self-correction reveals high learner engagement than traditional methods.

Conversely, the practical implications of this study are significant, the teachers can develop observation instruments relating to speaking, error correction, feedback or other various empirical teaching practices not merely as an instrument for research but as a tool for self-assessment, development, and peer assessment and observation. By becoming familiar with their observable dominant teaching practices, teachers can make more conscious, informed choices about their teaching techniques and strategies.

Another area is teacher training programs, educators and teacher trainers can incorporate and refine observation-based reflection and feedback for other trainees or peers by using literature and empirical data to improve teacher training programs and workshops.

Nonetheless, the limitations of this study must be acknowledged. The study only relied on classroom observations which can be biased and often difficult to keep up with. Some aspects of classroom observation can also be difficult to interpret especially when dealing with silence and gestures for instance. Also, the instrument refinement process proved to

be successful in the limited scope of private schools speaking tasks and B1 level, and may not be as effective in other contexts.

Finally, the observation instrument could be adapted and validated for use in other cultural and educational settings such as advanced proficiency classrooms and conversation classes. Additionally, pairing the observational data with qualitative interviews with teachers could reveal more insights into their beliefs regarding feedback strategies. Learners' perceptions could also be valuable to enrich the understanding of the effectiveness of numerous correction techniques.

References

- Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 27(1), 29–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1977.tb00290.x>
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on language teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L2.V1I1.9054>
- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kroll, B. M., & Schafer, C. J. (1978). Error analysis and the teaching of composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 29(3), 242–248. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356050>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Boston, MA: Thomson/Heinle.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lyster, R., & Panova, I. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573–595. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588241>

- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Songxaba, S. L., & Sincuba, L. (2019). The effect of social media on English second language essay writing with special reference to WhatsApp. *Reading & Writing – Journal of the Reading Association of South Africa*, 10(1), a214. <https://doi.org/10.4102/rw.v10i1.214>
- Vavilova, Z. E., & Broadbent, J. T. (2019). Fossilization, communicative rationality and communication strategies in second language learning. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 10(2), 318–334. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2019-10-2-318-334>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Developing a Classroom Observation Instrument on Error Correction during Speaking Tasks
