



SCHOOL OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

THE ROLE OF TEACHERS' EXPLICIT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN GRAMMAR LEARNING OF THE INTRINSICALLY AND THE EXTRINSICALLY MOTIVATED ADVANCED ENGLISH FEMALE LEARNERS

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

By NAJMEH RASTGAR CHALESHTOREI

Supervisor DR. GHOLAM REZA ZAREI

SEPTEMBER 2013

Sheikhbahaee University

School of Foreign Languages

Department of English



THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT, FORMAT AND QUALITY OF PRESENTATION OF THE THESIS SUBMITTED BY

NAJMEH RASTGAR CHALESHTOREI

ENTITLED:

THE ROLE OF TEACHERS EXPLICIT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN GRAMMAR LEARNING OF THE INTRINSICALLY AND THE EXTRINSICALLY MOTIVATED ADVANCED ENGLISH FEMALE LEARNERS

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

M.A. IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING IS ACCEPTED AND

APPROBATED IN THE THESIS COMMITTEE.

SUPERVISOR: DR. G. R. ZAREI

INTERNAL EXAMINER: DR. A. ALIBABAEE

EXTERNAL EXAMINER: DR. M. KOOSHA

DEAN OF GRADUATE SCHOOL: DR. S.M. H. FEIZ

I declare that this thesis was composed by me, that the work contained herein is my own except where explicitly stated otherwise in the text. This work has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification except as specified.

The present work is dedicated to my parents who were patient during my education and helped me to do this project and played a major role in finishing it by providing an appropriate situation for me at home.

Table of Contents	Page
List of Figures	XIV
List of Tables	XV
Abstract	XVII
Abbreviations	XVIII
Chapter 1 -Introduction	
1.1. Preliminaries	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.2.1. Research Questions	3
1.3. Significance of the Study	4
1.4. Definition of the Key Terms	5
1.5. Outline of the Study	6
Chapter 2 -Literature Review	
2.1. Overview	7
2.2. English as a Foreign Language: EFL Learning	8
2.2.1. Learner's motivation toward learning language	9
2.2.1.1. Gardner's Socio-Educational Model of Motivation	11
2.2.1.2. Dornyei's Multi-Level Model of Motivation	12
2.2.1.3. The Foundation of Integrative and Instrumental Moti	vations 13

2.2.1.4. Behaviorist Perspective on Motivation14
2.2.1.5. Skinner's Operant Conditioning Theory of Motivation15
2.2.1.6. Albert Bandura's Persuasive Model of Motivation
2.2.1.7. Cognitive Perspective on Motivation16
2.2.1.8. Humanistic Perspective on Motivation18
2.2.1.9. Maslow's Theory of Motivation19
2.2.1.10. A social-Constructivist Model of Motivation23
2.2.2. Factors Related to the Teacher25
2.2.2.1. Two Different Types of Teacher's Corrective Feedback
Strategies: Explicit and Implicit Feedbacks26
2.2.2.1.1. Recast
2.2.2.1.2. Explicit Feedback
2.2.2.1.3. Clarification Request
2.2.2.1.4. Metalinguistic Feedback30
2.2.2.1.5. Elicitation
2.2.2.1.6. Repetition
2 2 2 1 7 Translation 32

2.2.2.1.8. Prompt32
2.2.3. The Place of Grammar and Corrective Feedback in the GTM, DM,
ALM, TPR, CA, and TBA:34
2.2.3.1. The GTM34
2.2.3.2. The DM
2.2.3.3. The ALM34
2.2.3.4. The TPR
2.2.3.5. The CA
2.2.3.6. The TBA
2.2.4. A Short Review on Two Studies Done on Corrective Feedbacks on
Grammar35
Chapter 3 -Methodology
3.1. Overview
3.2. Participants
3.3. Instrumentation
3.3.1. Placement Test38
3.3.2. Motivation Questionnaire Items

3.4. Data Collection	9
3.4.1. Pre/Posttest	9
3.4.2. Procedure	0
3.4.2.1. Explicit Corrective Feedbacks	3
3.5. Data Analysis45	5
3.5.1. Analyzing the Data Obtained from the Placement Test40	6
3.5.2. Analyzing the Data Obtained from the Motivation Questionnaire4	7
3.5.2.1. The Intrinsically Motivated Group49	9
3.5.2.2. The Extrinsically Motivate Group49	9
3.5.2.3. The Control Group50	0
Chapter 4 - Results	
4.1. Overview	1
4.2. Normality/Abnormality Distribution of the Variables	2
4.3. Students' Performance on Pre-test	4
4.4. Students' Performance on Post-test	6
4.5. Intrinsically Motivated Students' Performance on Pre/Posttest59	9
4.6. Extrinsically Motivated Students' Performance on Pre/Posttest	1
4.7. Control Group's Performance on Pre/Posttest	3

4.8. Comparison between Experimental and Control Group's Performance	.65
Chapter 5 -Discussion, Conclusion, and Implication	
5.1. Overview	.69
5.2. The Summary of the Findings	.70
5.3. Discussion	.71
5.4. Conclusion	.73
5.5. Implications	.74
5.6. Limitations	.74
5.7. Suggestions for Further Researches	.75
References	.76
Appendixes	.83
Appendix A -Placement Test	.83
Appendix B -Motivation Questionnaire Items	.88
Appendix C -Grammar Pre/Posttest	.94
Appendix D -The Records of Students' Utterances	.101
Appendix E – The Grammar Part Taught to the Learners	.106
Appendix F – Teachers' Examples of Conditional Sentences	.108

Acknowledgements

I thank the Almighty God who gave me the power and the opportunity to do the present work. It is hard to name all those who played major roles in the process of doing this research project.

But foremost, I am heartily thankful to Dr. G. R. Zarei whose guidance and supports enabled me to develop an understanding of different concepts of the present thesis and finally bring it to an end. I also deliver my deepest gratitude to all my professors in Shehkbahaee University and thank all of them for their guidance and thoughtful comments.

Finally, I thank all the teachers specially Mr. R. Izadi and Mr. S. Nejati who provided me with an appropriate situation in which I could do this project in the institutes of Jahad-Danshgahi in Shahrekord.

List of Figures Page
Figure 2.1. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1943b; as cited in Nina Rakowski, 2008,
p.4)
Figure 4.1. The Mean Ranks of the Three Groups for the Pretest61
Figure 4.2. The Mean Ranks of the Three Groups for the Posttest65
Figure 4.3. The Mean Score in Pre/posttest for the Intrinsically Motivated Group67
Figure 4.4. The Mean Score in Pre/posttest for the Extrinsically Motivated Group69
Figure 4.5. The Mean Score in Pre/posttest for the Control Group71
Figure 4.6. The General Results on Pre/posttest for the Three Groups72

List of Tables	Page
Table 3.1. Descriptive Results of Primary Population on the Placement Test	50
Table 3.2. General Results on the Placement Test	51
Table 3.3. The Scores of 45 Participants Related to Intrinsic Items	52
Table 3.4. The Scores of 45 Participants Related to the Extrinsic Items	52
Table 3.5. Intrinsic Items Answered by the Intrinsically Motivated Group	53
Table 3.6. Extrinsic Items Answered by the Intrinsically Motivated Group	53
Table 3.7. Intrinsic Items Answered by the Extrinsically Motivated Group	54
Table 3.8. Extrinsic Items Answered by the Extrinsically Motivated Group	54
Table 3.9. Intrinsic Items Answered by the Control Group	55
Table 3.10. Extrinsic Items Answered by the Control Group	55
Table 4.1. The Results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z Test	57
Table 4.2. Descriptive Statistics of the scores of the Three Groups	59
Table 4.3. The Results of Kruskal-Wallis Test for the Pretest	60
Table 4.4. The Results of Kruskal-Wallis Test for the Posttest	62
Table 4.5. The Results of Mann-Whitney Test for the Posttest	63
Table 4.6. The Results of Ranks and Test Statistics in Pre/posttest for the Intri	nsically
Motivated Group	66

Table 4.7. The Results of Ranks and Test Statistics in Pre/posttest for the Extrinsically
Motivated Group68
Table 4.8. The Results of Ranks and Test Statistics in Pre/posttest for the Control Group
70
Table 4.9. The Results of the Posttests Related to the Experimental Groups and the
Control Group
Table 4.10. The Results of the Posttests Related to the Two Experimental Groups74

Abstract

The present study attempted to examine the relation between teachers' explicit corrections of learners' errors and their grammar learning, on the one hand, and tried to specify if these explicit corrections showed any relationship with the motivation of learners, on the other hand. To this end, 45 English female learners at the advanced level of language proficiency were assigned to two experimental groups of 20 intrinsically and 15 extrinsically motivated learners, 10 participants also formed the control group of this study. All the three groups received the same grammatical instruction on simple and mixed-time frames conditional sentences from the book Summit 2B (Saslow & Ascher, 2006). During a week (three sessions), the two experimental groups received explicit feedbacks- as the treatment- from the teacher on their grammatical errors, and the control group did not receive any explicit correction and followed the usual process of learning grammar. The data collected through a pre-posttest assessment analyzed by Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests using SPSS demonstrated that teachers' explicit corrections had a positive relation with grammar learning of the two experimental groups especially with grammar learning of the extrinsically motivated group.

Abbreviations

ALM The Audio-Lingual Method

AMTB Attitude Motivation Test Battery

CA The Communicative Approach

CF Corrective Feedback

CLT Communicative Language Teaching Approach

DF Degree of Freedom

DM The Direct Method

E The Extrinsically Motivated Learners

EFL English as a Foreign Language

ESL English as a Second Language

GTM The Grammar Translation Method

H0 The Null Hypothesis

H1 The Alternative Hypothesis

I The Intrinsically Motivated Learners

L2 A Learner's Second Language

Sig. Level The Significance Level

TBLT The Task Based Language Teaching

TEFL Teaching English as a Foreign Language

TPR The Total Physical Response Method

ZPD Zone of Proximal Development

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1. Preliminaries

In the context of education, learning, and classroom, teachers are constantly facing unending occurrence of the errors by the learners. To correct the errors and to prevent the fossilization of the errors, in the mind of the learners, the teachers are always looking for the most appropriate corrective feedbacks. There are many different kinds of corrective feedbacks, and the explicit feedback is one of those which are applied by many teachers in classrooms and other contexts in order to correct the students' errors, also is one of the main concerns of the present study (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

According to Ellis (2009), explicit corrective feedback takes place when the corrector indicates an error has been committed, identifies the error and provides the correction. Another concept that is important here and has been under study for many years is motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Dornyei, 1998; Collin, 2008). Many learners of English language in Iran-like other countries- may be intrinsically or extrinsically motivated toward learning. So, two new terms here are intrinsic motivation that according to Leonard, Beauvais, and Scholl, (1999) can be defined as the situation in which individuals are motivated by intrinsic processes and only engage in activities which they consider fun. These individuals are often diverted from tasks that are relevant to goal attainment in order to pursue tasks which are intrinsically more enjoyable (Leonard, Beauvais, & Scholl, 1999).

Another term is extrinsic motivation that is defined again by the above mentioned psychologists as a situation in which instrumental rewards are part of motivating source when individuals and organizations constitute an exchange relationship. The question that here remains unanswered, what is the object of the present work, is whether these two kinds of motivation can have any relation with grammar learning of advanced learners of English language or not. Since each of intrinsically and extrinsically motivated language learners achieves different views toward learning languages, here specially toward learning English grammar, this study used these two views of students and investigated their amount of grammar learning in the case that the errors which they make on the grammar will be corrected by their teachers' explicit feedbacks.

In the process of learning another language, when learners are learning in different contexts, they make different errors and mistakes. These mistakes are seen as a natural phenomena in many approaches of teaching like the communicative approach that tries to correct students errors indirectly (Bowen, 2005) and some teachers also prefer to choose an explicit manner in some methods like the audio lingual method (Nunan, 2000). When teachers choose the first option, they usually try to correct learners' errors in an indirect way and in the case that they follow an explicit manner, they prefer to correct their learners errors straightforward and in a direct way.

From past to the present, teachers have made use of many different methods and approaches for teaching languages to their learners. Each of these methods also takes a different view toward applying corrective feedbacks. Some of these methods make the teacher to correct students' errors implicitly or even not paying attention to the errors but