Journal of Language and Translation
Volume 9, Number 3, Autumn 2019, (pp.71-84)

Exploring the Role of Occurring Errors Distribution in the Distribution of Corrective Feedback Targets

Servat Shirkhani *
Assistant Professor of English Department, Khorramabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khorramabad, Iran

Received: 27 January, 2019 Accepted: 24 August, 2019

Abstract
This study attempted to compare corrected linguistic errors in foreign language classrooms and all errors occurring in these classes to see which types of errors are more attended to by teachers in relation to their occurrence in classes. For this purpose, 69 hours of the classes of 34 teachers teaching in different language schools were recorded and the errors corrected by these teachers were identified and categorized into phonological, lexical, and grammatical types. The results of the Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests indicated that the number of phonological errors being corrected was significantly higher than that of lexical errors. However, the results of similar analyses for the proportions of treated errors to occurring errors revealed that the differences among the three proportions were not significant, indicating that the three error types were addressed in accordance with the frequency with which they occurred in the classrooms. The findings can justify the differences in the findings of the studies on the comparison of error types being noticed by teachers and can have implications for future studies on the comparison of corrective feedback targets.

Keywords: Corrective feedback; Corrective feedback targets; Error correction; Error types

INTRODUCTION

Only a few studies related to corrective feedback (CF) have centered on the distribution of linguistic error types receiving CF (e.g., Brown, 2016; Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001; Jabbari & Fazilatfar, 2012; Shirkhani & Tajeddin, 2016) and they have come up with differential results. Some studies (e.g., Brown, 2016; Llinares & Lyster, 2014; Seedhouse, 2004; Sheen, 2004; van Lier, 1988) have attributed the differences in the treatment of errors to various factors, including contextual factors. Another possible factor leading to the inconsistent results might be differences in the distribution of occurring errors. Nonetheless, very few studies (e.g., Kubota, 1991; Lyster, 1998; Jabbari & Fazilatfar, 2012) have considered the initial differences in the frequencies of occurring errors an important factor in determining the frequencies of the errors being treated by CF. Therefore, the present study has looked at the differences in the proportions of treated errors to all errors to see to what extent they match or mismatch the frequencies of different CF targets.

CF, also referred to as negative feedback, has been defined as any teacher attempt to let the

*Corresponding Author's Email: servatshirkhani@gmail.com

learner know an error has been made (Chaudron, 1988) or as the feedback given to learners following their oral or written second language production (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). As stated by Sheen and Ellis, CF can be either written or oral and, as categorized by Ellis (2009), it can be either input-providing or output-prompting and either explicit or implicit. Based on the way it is provided, CF has been classified into six types by Lyster and Ranta (1997). The CF types are labelled request for clarification, recast, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and explicit correction. In their study, Lyster and Ranta used also the term multiple feedback to refer to the employment of more than one type of CF in one teacher turn.

A large bulk of studies on CF has been descriptive centering on what to correct and, more frequently, how to correct. Most other studies have either examined the effectiveness of CF on language learning (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Li, 2010; Lyster, 2004b) or have compared the impact of different types of CF on language learning (e.g., Dilans, 2010; Erlam & Loewen, 2010; Lyster, 2004a). The CF targets have been examined in a number of studies (e.g., Li, 2014; Sato & Loewen, 2018; Yilmaz, 2012); however, the focus of these studies has been quite different from that of the present study. These studies have investigated the effectiveness of CF, specifically certain types of CF, on the acquisition of two different grammatical structures. Ellis (2007), for example, examined the role of recasts and metalinguistic feedback on learning English past tense *–ed* and comparatives and found a comparable effect for recasts on the two structures. Moreover, Yilmaz (2012) compared the effectiveness of two input-providing CF strategies (i.e., explicit corrections and recasts) on the development of Turkish plural and locative structures to see whether target structure salience moderates the effects of CF types. The study found no interaction between salience and feedback types, suggesting that target structure salience does not impact on the relative effectiveness of CF types.

Some other studies have focused on how the targets of CF influence the type of CF chosen for correcting them (e.g., Qiao, 2015) or the efficacy of CF (e.g., Egi, 2007; Iwashita, 2003; Kim & Han, 2007; Li, 2014; Sato & Loewen, 2018; Yang & Lyster, 2010; Yilmaz, 2012; Zhao, 2015). To see to what extent linguistic targets of CF could impact the accuracy of learners' perceptions about CF directed at different aspects of language, Mackey, Gass, and McDonough (2000) involved 10 learners of English as a second language (ESL) and seven learners of Italian as a foreign language (IFL) in dyadic interactional tasks with native speakers and provided them with CF. After showing the recorded interaction to the learners immediately following the task completion, they collected data through a stimulated recall interview. Mackey et al. found that in the ESL context, morphosyntactic errors triggered the most recasts followed by phonological and lexical errors while in the IFL context, lexical errors received the highest proportion of CFs followed by morphological and phonological errors. In addition, they found that the ESL learners' perceptions were in reverse order to the order in which the targets received feedback; however, the IFL learners' perceptions' matched the CF provided. In general, considering the percentages with which the error types triggered feedback and those with which the learners perceived the CF, they concluded that learners' perceptions about lexical and phonological feedback were more accurate than their perceptions about morphosyntactic feedback.

Gass and Lewis (2007) replicated Mackey et al.'s (2000) study with Italian heritage and non-heritage learners. They found that the perceptions of both groups of learners about phonological and lexical feedback were more accurate than those about morphosyntactic feedback. Nonetheless, they reported that the two learner groups were different in terms of their perceptions about semantic feedback. Moreover, as part of her study, Egi (2007) investigated second language (L2) learners' interpretation of recasts as well as the extent to which their interpretation was affected

by three recasts features (i.e., linguistic targets, length, and number of changes). The linguistic targets she studied were morphosyntax and lexis each focusing on a specific number of forms. The results showed that the learners interpreted recasts as both CF and pragmatic discourse moves and that their interpretation was irrelevant of the linguistic targets of CF.

Kim and Han (2007) studied the role of CF targets in learners' recognition of gaps and the results showed a significant role for CF targets. They reported that the rate of the recognition of gaps was different for different error types. In case of simple recasts, the recognition of gaps was the most for phonological errors followed by morphological and lexical errors. For complex recasts, phonological errors had the highest rate of recognition of gaps and were followed by lexical and morphological errors. In addition, Sato and Loewen (2018) studied the moderating role of linguistic targets on the effectiveness of two types of implicit CF. They compared the effectiveness of recast as an input-providing CF type to clarification request as an output-prompting CF strategy on 83 adult English as a foreign language (EFL) learners' development of English third-person singular *–s* and possessive determiners *his/her*. They found that generally CF was more effective in teaching third-person singular *–s* but clarification request influenced only the development of possessive determiners *his/her*. The results thus indicated the dependence of CF effectiveness on the linguistic targets of CF.

Li (2014) studied the interactions between feedback type (recasts vs. metalinguistic correction), proficiency (high vs. low levels), and the nature of the linguistic target (classifiers vs. the perfective *–le*) in 78 learners' learning of Chinese as a foreign language. The results showed that recasts were effective in learning the perfective *–le* by the high-level learners but it didn't influence the learning of low-level learners. However, recasts revealed to be effective in learning classifiers by both high and low level learners. In addition, in learning both linguistic targets, for low level learners metalinguistic correction revealed to be more effective than recasts while for the high level learners there was no significant difference between the effectiveness of the two feedback types.

More closely related to the focus of the present study are the studies on comparing the distribution of linguistic targets of CF. Ellis et al. (2001) examined the targets of both teacher-initiated and student-initiated focus-on-form episodes (FFE) used in classes of two teachers. They studied grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, spelling, and discourse as targets of focus-on-form episodes. They analyzed 448 FFEs used in 12 hours of adult ESL task-based lessons. The findings showed that 60 percent of teacher-initiated FFEs and 66 percent of student-initiated FFEs targeted vocabulary. The next addressed aspect was grammar which received 27 percent of teacher-initiated FFEs and 19 percent of student-initiated FFEs. They reasoned that the teachers focused on vocabulary because, as they had said in their interview, they were more concerned with meaning even when the lesson objective was focus on form. Kim and Han (2007) analyzed the linguistic targets of both simple and complex recasts and found morphosyntactic errors as the error type receiving recasts the most with lexical and phonological errors following morphosyntactic ones. Brown (2016), in his meta-analysis of 28 studies comprising 85 teachers across 11 countries and including seven target languages, analyzed 7,188 CF moves. Based on the results, the highest percentage of all CF addressed grammatical errors (43%), and the lowest percentage was directed at phonological errors (22%). Errors of vocabulary received 28 percent of the total CF. The findings revealed that the frequency of pronunciation errors treated was significantly higher than those for grammar and vocabulary. Brown maintained that the difference in attention to the error types could be attributed to factors such as contextual variables or to the differences in the numbers of errors occurring in the context. Shirkhani and Tajeddin (2016) compared the CF targets (grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation) in around 128 hours of class re-

cordings of 40 teachers. They found pronunciation as the most noticed error type, accounting for nearly 47 percent of all CFs and vocabulary as the least treated error type receiving only 17.5 percent of all CFs.

The differential treatment of error types has been justified in a number of ways. Brown (2016), for instance, pointed to the language learning context (i.e., second language vs. foreign language context) as a probable factor in noticing some error types more than others. Mackey et al. (2000) attributed the issue to the difference between the targets in their amount of interference with understanding. In case of their findings, they reasoned that learners' perceptions about morphosyntactic errors are inaccurate because these errors do not interfere with communication as pronunciation and lexical errors do. Moreover, Ellis et al. (2001) maintained that the teachers taking part in their study focused more predominantly on vocabulary because they were mainly concerned with meaning.

The above-mentioned studies have been all concerned with raw frequencies of error types receiving CF. The studies by Kubota (1991), Lyster (1998), and Jabbari and Fazilatfar (2012) are the only studies found on CF targets which include the analysis of errors in relation to their occurrence frequency. Kubota analyzed the corrective behavior of teachers teaching in seven EFL classes at Japanese senior high schools. The findings of the study revealed that the whole number of errors produced by the students were 95 and that 46.3 percent of them (44 errors) were phonological, 45.3 percent (43 errors) were morphosyntactic, and 8.4 percent (8 errors) were lexical errors. Comparison of the proportions of corrected errors to all occurring errors revealed that 79.5 percent (35) of the phonological errors, 65.1 percent (28) of the morphosyntactic errors, and 50 percent (4) of the lexical errors were corrected by the teachers. The results, therefore, suggest that teachers' treatment of errors should be interpreted in accordance with the proportionate number of errors treated to those occurred. Lyster (1998) prepared and analyzed audio recordings of French immersion classes of four teachers teaching at intermediate level. Based on the transcripts of 18.3 hours of recordings, he found that of the 921 error sequences occurring in the classrooms, 558 errors received CF. He further found that the number of errors of each type receiving CF was proportionate to the numbers of occurring errors of that type.

Jabbari and Fazilatfar's (2012) study was the only study in Iran to compare the frequency of corrected errors to all errors; however, they reported this proportion only for the whole errors without attention to the types of errors. They studied the error types, corrective feedback moves, and learner uptake in Iranian classrooms with communication orientation. They transcribed around 12 hours of audio-recordings of the elementary and high intermediate classes of a language institute. To achieve the first purpose of the study, they classified the errors into grammatical, lexical, phonological, and unsolicited use of first language (L1). They found that teachers corrected 90 percent of the errors, concluding that a large percentage of the errors happening in the classes are treated by language teachers. Moreover, their results revealed that grammatical errors were the most frequent error type in the whole database with a frequency twice as many as those for phonological and lexical errors each.

CF has been the focus of quite a large number of studies which have addressed various dimensions of the issue from its effectiveness in language learning to the distribution of various CF types to comparative studies on the effect of different CF types on language acquisition. As the above review of the literature shows, few studies have examined the distribution of error types receiving CF and even much fewer have been concerned with this distribution in relation to the errors in the entire databases. Thus, great need is felt for studies to investigate the frequencies of corrected errors in relation to all the errors occurring in classrooms. To address this concern, this study attempted to compare the corrected errors in EFL classrooms to all the errors occurring to

see which types of errors are more attended to by the teachers in relation to their occurrence in the classrooms. Thus, the study sought answer to the following research questions:

1. Which types of grammatical, lexical, and phonological errors are more targeted by CF in EFL classrooms?
2. Is the number of corrected errors of each type proportionate to all the occurring errors of that type?

METHODS

Participants and Instruments

Totally 34 teachers teaching in two language institutes in Tehran took part in this study. They were selected based on convenience sampling. Two of the teachers were male and 32 were female; 15 held bachelors' degrees and 19 had masters' degrees. The participants' age ranged from 23 to 33 and they had on the average four years of teaching experience. The teachers agreed to let their classes be recorded for the purpose of this study which was stated to focus on some aspects of classroom talk without mentioning CF. On the average, 75.73 minutes of the classes of each teacher were recorded which amounted to 69.42 hours (i.e., 4165 minutes) for all the teachers. The database consisting of the audio recorded materials of the 34 participating teachers' classes constituted the instrument of this study. The errors in the total database were later identified and a table was created to display systematically the information about each error type (i.e., phonological, lexical, and grammatical) and whether it was treated through CF or was ignored by the teacher.

Data Collection and Analysis

A number of steps were taken to collect the data for this descriptive design study. First, steps were taken to persuade a number of teachers so that they would let their classes be audio recorded for research purposes. Thirty four teachers agreed to attend the study and their classes were recorded for an average of 75 minutes. Then, after the recording procedure was over, the recordings were carefully listened to and all instances of errors, whether corrected or ignored, were identified and inserted in a table which was provided to make the frequency computation feasible. The table contained information about each error, including the type of error as well as whether it was treated through CF or was ignored by the teacher. The error type classification in this study was in accordance with Lyster and Ranta's (1997) classification, including phonological, lexical, and grammatical errors as types of CF targets. Instances of these error types, taken from the data of this study, are given here to clarify what is meant by each error type. The exemplars are of two categories, including both corrected errors and ignored ones. The first group of examples are instances of errors being corrected by the teachers. These examples are as follows:

Grammatical errors:

Student: I know what should I do.
Teacher: I know what …?
Student: I know what … what should I do.
Teacher: No, say I know what I should [emphasis] do.

Lexical errors:

Student: Why don't you do any trying?
Teacher: any what?
Student: hmmm, trying [with hesitation]
Teacher: You should say any effort, hmmm anything, but not any trying, OK?
Student: OK.

Phonological errors:

Student: I asked the shoemaker /ˌʃuːˈmeɪ.kər/ ….
Teacher: shoemaker /ˈʃuːˌmeɪ.kər/, you asked the shoemaker /ˈʃuːˌmeɪ.kər/.

All the three errors above were corrected by

the teacher. The grammatical error was corrected through explicit correction after the teachers' attempt to elicit the correct answer from the student failed. The same was done by another teacher in correcting the lexical error above; the teacher tried to elicit the answer through the incomplete sentence, but finally employed explicit correction. In the third example, the teacher corrected the phonological error through repetition. The second set of examples are those ignored by the teachers and are as follows:

Grammatical errors:

Student: There are two bedroom that have a window.

Lexical errors:

Student: I play Celin Dion.
(The student means "I sing Celin Dion's songs.")

Phonological errors:

Student: This is a good idea /ˈeɪdiː.ə/.

These three were examples of many errors made by the students in the classrooms under recording which were ignored (i.e., not corrected) by the participating teachers.

Finally, after all the corrected and ignored errors were included in the table mentioned in this section, the data were fed into SPSS 20 for statistical analyses. To answer the first question, initially descriptive statistics were generated to see the number of errors corrected in each error group in each of the teachers' classes. Then, a Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to examine the significance of the differences among the means of the three error types. Next, three Mann-Whitney tests were run to locate where the significant difference(s) found through the Kruskal-Wallis test were and the results were interpreted based on Bonferroni level of significance. Similarly, to answer the second question, first descriptive statistics were obtained and then a Kruskal-Wallis test was run to check the significance of the differences among the proportions of corrected to occurring errors.

RESULTS

The Distribution of Error Types Corrected in the Classrooms

The first question centered on the comparison of the three error types, that is, grammatical, lexical, and phonological, being treated by teachers through CF. To see the distribution of the error types corrected in the classrooms, descriptive statistics was obtained for the treated errors in each error type. The results are depicted in Table 1.

Table 1.
Descriptive statistics for error types corrected in the classrooms

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Grammatical	55	.00	33	395	7.05	7.28
Lexical	55	.00	15	218	3.89	3.71
Phonological	55	1.00	50	534	9.53	9.26

As shown in Table 1, the highest frequency belongs to phonological errors (534) and the lowest to lexical errors (218), indicating that most of the CFs were directed at errors of pronunciation while lexical error triggered the least CF. These differences, however, needed to be checked for statistical significance. Therefore, a Kruskal-Wallis test was run to see whether the differences among the three means were statistically significant. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2.
Kruskal-Wallis Test[a] for the three error types

	Total
Chi-Square	16.78
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.00

a. Grouping Variable: Error type

According to Table 2, the Kruskal-Wallis test indicates a significant difference among the three means [χ^2 (2, n = 168) = 16.78, p = .00]. Thus, more analyses were needed to locate the differences. As such, three Mann-Whitney tests were run to compare the means in each of the three pairs, that is, grammatical and lexical errors, grammatical and phonological errors, and lexical and phonological errors. Because there were three sets of Mann-Whitney tests, to avoid the risk of Type I error, Bonferroni level of significance was calculated (adjusted level of significance:.05/3= .017) and the results of the Mann-Whitney tests were interpreted based on this level of significance. The results for the comparison between grammatical and lexical errors are shown in Table 3.

Table 3.
Mann-Whitney test [a] for grammatical and lexical errors

	Total
Mann-Whitney U	1204
Wilcoxon W	2800
Z	-2.12
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.033

a. Grouping Variable: Error type

As shown in Table 3, the Mann-Whiney U test shows no significant difference between grammatical and lexical errors at .017 level of significance, that is, the Bonferroni level of significance, (U = 1204, z = -2.13, p = .033). In other words, although based on Table 1 the frequency of grammatical errors corrected in the classrooms is higher than that of lexical errors, this difference is not statistically significant. The next analysis (presented in Table 4) is related to the comparison of means of grammatical and phonological errors.

Table 4.
Mann-Whitney test [a] for grammatical and phonological errors

	Total
Mann-Whitney U	1256
Wilcoxon W	2852
Z	-1.82
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.069

a. Grouping Variable: Error type

The results in Table 4 show that the difference between grammatical and phonological errors corrected by the teachers is not significant (U = 1256, z = -1.82, p = .069. That is, though the frequency of phonological errors is higher than that of grammatical errors (as shown in Table 1), this difference is not statistically significant. The next Mann-Whitney test compares the means for lexical and phonological errors. The results are depicted in Table 5.

Table 5.
Mann-Whitney test[a] for lexical and phonological errors

	Total
Mann-Whitney U	856
Wilcoxon W	2452
Z	-4.16
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.00

a. Grouping Variable: Error type

As the results in Table 5 show, there is a statistically significant difference between the mean frequencies of lexical and phonological errors being treated by CF at .017 level of significance (U = 856, z = -4.16, p = .00). Therefore, based on Table 1 and Table 5, the frequency of phonological errors is significantly higher than that of lexical errors.

The Proportion of Treated Errors to All Occurring Errors

The second question centered on the comparison of the proportion of treated errors of each type to all errors of that type. Of the 1,716 errors in the entire database, 1,147 errors which constitute 67 percent of the total errors occurring in the classrooms had been corrected. To examine the proportion of treated errors to occurring errors for each error type and then compare them with each other, first proportions of treated to occurring errors in the classes of each teacher were computed. Then, descriptive statistics were generated for these proportions. Table 6 contains the results of the analysis.

Table 6.
Descriptive statistics for proportions of corrected to occurring errors

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Grammatical	55	.00	1	32.31	.58	.34
Lexical	55	.00	1	36.70	.65	.37
Phonological	55	.20	1	40.59	.72	.25

Based on the results of descriptive statistics, as depicted in Table 6, the proportion was the highest for phonological errors (40.59) and the least for grammatical errors (32.31). It thus showed that in comparison to all the errors occurring in each of the three error categories, phonological errors were corrected the most while grammatical errors were treated the least. The next step was to examine the significance of these differences. To do so, a Kruskal-Wallis Test was run. The results are depicted in Table 7.

Table 7.
Kruskal-Wallis Test[a] for proportions of corrected to occurring errors

	Proportions
Chi-Square	4.66
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.097

a. Grouping Variable: Error type

As shown in Table 7, the Kruskal-Wallis test showed that the differences among the three proportions were not significant [χ^2 (2, n = 168) = 4.66, p = .097], indicating that the three error types were addressed in accordance with the frequency with which they occurred in the classrooms. Thus, the answer to the second research question asking whether the treated errors are proportionate to occurring errors is positive.

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to compare the amount of attention given to each linguistic error type by comparing the number of errors corrected in each error category and then comparing with each other the proportion of corrected errors in each category to all happening errors of that category. It was revealed that although there were significant differences among the error types being corrected, when the frequencies of these errors were considered in relation to the number of errors occurred, the differences were not significant.

This finding is illuminating to the few studies conducted on the distribution of error types corrected in language classrooms. It shows that one probable reason for finding significant differences in these studies might be that the total number of errors in each error category is significantly different from that of the other error categories. Furthermore, it shows that the differential findings of the few studies done on the distribution of CF targets may be due to differences in the total number of errors occurring in these studies. As these studies have reported, the studies comparing the raw frequencies of errors treated through CF with no reference to the total number of errors in each error category are unidimensional and, thus, comparisons among the findings of these studies should be done with caution.

The results of the first question showed that phonological errors were corrected with a significantly higher frequency than that of grammatical errors. Only a few previous studies (e.g., Brown, 2016; Ellis et al., 2001; Jabbari & Fazilatfar, 2012; Shirkhani & Tajeddin, 2016) were in line with the present study comparing the linguistic aspects as targets of CF. The results found by Shirkhani and Tajeddin (2016) are confirmed by the present study. As part of their study, they investigated the focus of CF in EFL classrooms. The findings revealed that pronunciation errors received the highest frequency of CF and errors of vocabulary received the lowest frequency. The results of the current study, however, contrast the findings by Brown and those by Ellis et al. In his meta-analysis, Brown found that grammar received the highest frequency of CFs. In contrast, Ellis et al. reported vocabulary as the error type receiving the highest number of CFs. Some studies (e.g., Llinares & Lyster, 2014; Seedhouse, 2004; Sheen, 2004; Van Lier, 1988) have attributed these differences in findings of different studies to the characteristics of instructional contexts. One of these differing attributes may be the

proportion of each error type to all errors happening in each context and this is exactly what was addressed in the second part of this study.

What inspired this study was differential findings in studies by, for example, Ellis et al. (2001), Brown (2016), and Shirkhani and Tajeddin (2016). A number of moderating factors have revealed to effect the differences. One possibility is that the differential attention might have been related to possible differences in the frequencies of occurring errors. The second question of this study focused on this probable reason. The answer to this question justifies the result of the first research question of the present study and the results of a few other studies on the comparison of error types treated through CF (e.g., Brown, 2016; Ellis et al., 2001; Shirkhani & Tajeddin, 2016). The finding for the first question showed that errors of phonology were treated significantly more than lexical errors. Based on the results of the second question, these differences in treating errors can be justified by the differences in frequencies of errors happening in the classrooms because the study showed that total number of errors in the three error categories were different from each other and that the differences in the proportion of each error type to the total number of errors in that error category were not significant. This may be true of the other similar studies, for instance, reported by Brown (2016) finding grammar as receiving the highest frequency of CFs and Ellis et al. (2001) reporting vocabulary as the error type being most corrected by the teachers. The present study suggests that these studies might have had different conclusions if they had considered the total number of errors occurring in the classes studied. These studies, like the first part of the present study, have reported significant differences among the error types being corrected. What their findings suggest is that the teachers give more attention to one or more types of errors than the other(s). However, the consideration of the total number of errors happening in each category could have changed the results of these studies as it has done in the present study. In this study the results revealed that the differential attention given to the three error types is proportionate to the occurring errors of these types.

Attempts were made to conduct this study as systematically as possible. Notwithstanding, the study has a number of shortcomings which should be acknowledged. First of all, this study was carried out in language institutes in Tehran. Therefore, it is logical to expect different findings with similar studies in other instructional contexts, such as schools and universities and even institutes in other cities of Iran because the role of contexts cannot be neglected in the treatment of errors. Second, around 94 percent of the participating teachers in this study were females because the teachers were selected based on accessibility as the nature of the study required the researcher's observation and recording of the classes which cannot be tolerated by most language institutes and teachers. Third, this study targeted only one of the probable factors (i.e., treated to occurring error proportions) in having differential findings in studies on CF targets. However, factors other than the total number of occurring errors, such as teacher characteristics, teacher perceptions, learners' reaction to CF, and the context of instruction may influence the frequency with which each error type receives CF.

CONCLUSION

This study compared the linguistic error types in terms of the frequency with which these error categories were addressed through CF. It was found that the differences among the error types were statistically significant. Thus, this study addressed a question faced with after reporting the results of some descriptive studies on the comparison of the error types corrected through CF. The findings revealed that the differences in the frequencies with which the error types were treated through CF may be due to the differences in the number of error types occurring in the classrooms. This finding weakens the conclusion that differences among error types might be because of teachers' attention to some linguistics aspects more than others.

This study has a number of implications for researchers working on CF, especially CF targets, and for readers of their studies. First, it suggests that the findings of the studies on CF targets might come up with different results. Second, the implication is that the differences found with raw frequencies should be cautiously interpreted since they may lose meaning if considered along with proportions of treated to occurring errors. Third, the study implies that the conclusions made due to these differential results need further scrutiny for the sources of such differences. Only hypothesizing that one or another factor may be a reason is not sufficient for these studies and, therefore, more studies should follow to examine the probable reasons.

Further research is needed to shed light on other aspects of the issue of CF targets. There is a need for other descriptive studies to investigate the CF targets in instructional contexts other than language institutes and also in other parts of the country and for comparative studies to compare the error treatment in different contexts. It is also suggested to conduct similar studies with participants selected through stratified sampling to represent the population of teachers in Iran both in terms of teacher characteristics, such as gender, and in terms of their teaching contexts. In addition, the need is felt for other studies to use other categorizations of error types, including pragmatic errors and to comparatively study the proportions of linguistic and pragmatic treated errors to all occurring errors of the type. It was found that the error types receiving different proportions of CF might be different in their occurrence rate.

The study showed that the error types receiving different proportions of CF might be different in their occurrence rate. On the other hand, different studies have shown that some error types receive more CF than the other types of errors. This finding suggests the need for further studies on the factors leading to differences among different types of errors occurring in the classrooms. Future studies can address other factors, including second versus foreign language teaching contexts and teachers' and/or learners' perceptions of the error types needing more CF or error types leading to more effectiveness of CF. The differences might also be directly related to contextual factors. For example, higher occurrence of errors of pronunciation might be more expected from an EFL context than an ESL context in which the learners have more contact with oral English. Therefore, in our Iranian context, more CF directed at pronunciation errors might be closely related to more occurrence of this error type. Thus, the need is felt for studies to address various factors having the potential to contribute to the issue of CF targets.

References

Barnes, N. (2014). *Ideology in Translation* Retrieved from Johannesburg, South Africa.: http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/16983

Bocock, R., & Thomson, K. (1985). *Religion and Ideology: A Reader*. Manchester: Manchester University Press in Association with the Open University.

Diaz-Cintas, J. (2003). Audiovisual translation in third millennium. In G. Anderman & M. Rogers (Eds.), *Translation today: Trends and perspectives* (pp. 192-204). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Diaz-Cintas, J., & Remael, A. (2014). *Audiovisual translation: Subtitling*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. london: longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. UK: Longman Group Limited.

Farahzad, F. (2012). Translation criticism: A three dimentional model. *Translation Studies, 9*(36), 39-44.

Fois, E. (2012). Audiovisual Translation: Theory and Practice. *Between, 4*, 1-16.

Ghaemi, F., & Benyamin, J. (2010). Strategies used in the Translation of Interlingual Subtitling. *Journal of English Studies, 1*, 39-44.

Hawkins, B. (2001). Incorporating tension: On the treatment of ideology in cognitive linguistics. In B. H. R. Dirven & E. Sandikcioglu (Eds.), *language and ideology:Theoretical cognitive approaches* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-22). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Khoshsaligheh, M., & Fazeli-haghpanah, E. (2015). The process and features of unprofessional subtitling in Iran. *language and translation studies 2*, 67-95.

Luyken, G. M., Herbst, T., Langham-Brown, J., Reid, H., & Spinhof, H. (1991). *Overcoming Language Barriers in Television: Dubbing and Subtitling for the European Audience*. Manchester: European Institute for the Media.

Matkivska, N. (2014). Audiovisual Translation: Conception, Types, Character's speech and Translation Strategies Applied. *Studies About Languages, 25*, 38-44.

Mousavi, M. (2010). *Strategies in Subtitling of Black English Movies*. thesis. Azad University Tehran, Iran.

Munday, J. (2008). The Relations of Style and Ideology in Translation: A case study of Harriet de Onís In L. en Pegenaute, J. Decesaris, & M. y. B. Tricas, E (Eds.), *Actas del III Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Ibérica de Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación.La traducción del futuro: mediación lingüístca y cultural en el siglo XXI.* (pp. 57-68). Barcelona: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias.

Nedergaard-Larsen, B. (1993). Culture-bound problems in subtitling. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology, 1*(2), 207-240. doi:10.1080/0907676X.1993.9961214

Panda, K. A. (2013). Politics and Translation. The Criterion. *An International Journal in English, 4*(2), 1-7.

Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2013). *Research methodologies in translation studies*. Manchester, UK

Kinderhook, USA: St. Jerome Publishing.

Schaffner, C. (2003). Third ways and new centers: Ideological or difference? In M. Calzada Pereze (Ed.), *Apropos of ideology* (pp. 23-43). Manchester: St. Jerome.

S*okoli, S.(2009). Subtitling Norms in Greece and Spai. In J. Diaz Cintas, & G. Anderman (Eds),*

Audiovisual Translation. Lan-guageTransfer on Screen (pp. 36-49).Basingstoke, UK:

Palgrave Macmillan.

Tejerina, A. M. (2014). Subtitling for Film Festivals: process, techniques and challenges. *TRANS: revista de traductología, 18*, 215-225.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies-and beyond*. Amesterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Ideological discourse analysis. *Special issue Interdisciplinary approaches to Discourse Analysis, 4*, 135-161.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage Publication.

Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research, 20*(4), 1-23.

Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*, 357-386.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dilans, G. (2010). Corrective feedback and L2 vocabulary development: Prompts and recasts in the adult ESL classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 66*(6), 787-816.

Egi, T. (2007). Interpreting recasts as linguistic evidence: The roles of linguistic target, length, and degree of change. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 29*, 511-537.

Ellis, R. (2007). The differential effects of corrective feedback on two grammatical structures. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies* (pp. 339-360). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal, 1*(1), 3-18.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Preemptive focus on form in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(3), 407-432.

Erlam, R., & Loewen, S. (2010). Implicit and explicit recasts in L2 oral French interaction. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 66*(6), 877-905.

Gass, S. M., & Lewis, K. (2007). Perceptions of interactional feedback: Differences between heritage language learners and non-heritage language learners. In A. Mackey (ed.) *Conversational interaction and second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction: Differential effects on L2 development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*, 1-36.

Jabbari, A. A., & Fazilatfar, A. M. (2012). The role of error types and feedback in Iranian EFL classrooms. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 2*(1), 135-148.

Kim, J., & Han, Z. (2007). Recasts in communicative EFL classes: Do teacher intention and learner interpretation overlap? In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies* (pp. 269-297). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kubota. M. (1991). Corrective feedback by experienced Japanese EFL teachers. *Institute for Research in Language Teaching Bulletin, 5*, 1-25.

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*, 309-365.

Li, S. (2014). The interface between feedback type, L2 proficiency, and the nature of the linguistic target. *Language Teaching Re-*

search, 18(3), 373-396.

Llinares, A., & Lyster, R. (2014). The influence of context on patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake: A comparison of CLIL and immersion classrooms. *The Language Learning Journal, 42*(2), 181-194.

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning, 48,* 183-218.

Lyster, R. (2004a). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *SSLA, 26*, 399-432.

Lyster, R. (2004b). Research on form-focused instruction in immersion classrooms: Implications for theory and practice. *French Language Studies, 14*, 321-341.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37-66.

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*, 471-497.

Qiao, Z. (2015). *Oral corrective feedback and the acquisition of Chinese rule-based verb constructions* (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Iowa, Iowa. Retrieved from https://ir.uiowa.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5782&context=etd.

Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2018). Metacognitive instruction enhances the effectiveness of corrective feedback: Variable effects of feedback types and linguistic targets. *Language Learning, 68*(2), 507-545.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective.* Malden: Blackwell.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research, 8*(3), 263-300.

Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning.* Vol. II. (pp. 593-610). New York: Routledge.

Shirkhani, S., & Tajeddin, Z. (2016). L2 teachers' explicit and implicit corrective feedback and its linguistic focus. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19*(1), 181-206.

Van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner.* London: Longman.

Yang, Y., & Lyster, R. (2010). Effects of form-focused practice and feedback on Chinese EFL learners' acquisition of regular and irregular past tense forms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 235-263.

Yilmaz, Y. (2012). The relative effects of explicit correction and recasts on two target structures via two communication modes. *Language Learning, 62*(4), 1134-1169.

Zhao, Y. (2015). *The effects of explicit and implicit recasts on the acquisition of two grammatical structures and the mediating role of working memory* (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Biodata

Dr Servat Shirkhani holds a PhD in Applied Linguistics and is a faculty member at Islamic Azad University, Iran. She has presented articles at national and international conferences, and has published a number of books and papers. Her areas of interest include interlanguage pragmatics, language assessment, teacher education, and technology- assisted language learning.
Email: servatshirkhani@gmail.com