بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

دانشکده ادبیات و علوم فارسی

بخش زبان های خارجی

پایان نامه تحصیلی برای دریافت درجه کارشناسی ارشد رشته زبان انگلیسی گرایش آموزش زبان انگلیسی

تأ ثیر روشهای متفاوت تصحیحی بویژه روش های دوباره گویی و برانگیزشی بر روی برداشت دانش آموزان ایرانی

استاد راهنما :

دکتر جهانبخش لنگرودی

استاد مشاور :

دکترمحمد شریعتی

مؤلف :

محمد رضا نجفی

بهمن ماه ۱۳۸۹

چکیده:

یکی از مسایل بحث برانگیز در زمینه یاد گیری زبان دوم روشهای متفاوت اگاه کردن دانش آموزان نسبت به اشتباهات دستوریشان می باشد. این تحقیق با دو هدف سعی بر روشن کردن این موضوع را دارد. اهداف این تحقیق عبارتند از: تأ ثیر روشهای متفاوت تصحیحی بویژه روش های دوباره گویی و برانگیزشی بر روی برداشت دانش آموزان ایرانی و اینکه آیا دانش اموزان پسر و دختر تاثیر متفاوتی از روشها تصحیحی می گیرند یا خیر. برای رسیدن به این دو هدف ۶۰ دانش آموزمتوسط از طریق انتخاب خوشه ای انتخاب شدند. این دانش آموزان سه گروه آزمایشی تشکیل دادند که در هر گروه ۲۰ دانش اموز دختر و پسر حضور داشتند برای مشخص شدن تأ ثیر هر کدام از روشهای تصحیحی دانش اموزان هر کدام از گروهای آزمایشی با یکی از روشهای دو باره گویی و برانگیزشی تصحیح شدند سپس در پایان ترم یک امتحان از آنها به عمل آمد. و برای مشخص شدن نتیجه نهایی از نرم افراز spss استفاده شد. نتایج نشان داد که دانش آموزانی که با استفاده از روش دوباره گویی تصحیح شده بودند برداشت بیشتری داشتند. در حالی که دو گروه آزمایشی دیگر که با روش برانگیزشی تصحیح شده بودند نتوانستند برداشت کافی از این روش تصحیحی داشته باشند.

کلید واژه: بازخورد های تصحیحی , دوباره گویی , برانگیزشی , تکرار , برداشت

In the name of God

Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman

Faculty of Letters and Humanities

Department of English Language

The Differential Effects of Prompts and Recast as Corrective Feedbacks on Iranian EFL Learners' Uptake

---

Supervisor:

Dr. Jahanbakhsh Langrudi

Advisor:

Dr. Mohammad Shariati

Prepared by:

Mohammad Reza Najafi

A Thesis Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science In Teaching English As Foreign Language (M.Sc.)

January 2011

Dedicated to

My parents for their unconditional love and care

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Praise be to God who is the source of all knowledge. This thesis would not have been possible without the guidance and the help of several individuals who in one way or another contributed and extended their valuable assistance in the preparation and completion of this study.

First and foremost, my utmost gratitude to Dr. Langrudi who throughout my thesis-writing, provided encouragement, sound advice, incredible teaching, good company, and lots of great ideas. His insight to English language methodology, is second to none.

I would like to highly appreciate Dr. Shariati for his insightful remarks, throughout my M.A study. I was really encouraged by his ideas in teaching methodology.

I wish to thank my best friends Ali Reza Amini and Zoobinshid Arshad for helping me get through the difficult times. This thesis was simply impossible without them.

And last but definitely not least, my deepest gratitude goes to my family for their unflagging love and support throughout my life. I am indebted to my father for his care and love. I couldn't ask for more from my mother as she is simply perfect.

Abstract

One of the hotly debated issues in second language learning is that of providing students with corrective feedback to make them aware of their erroneous utterances. This study tries to shed some light on the matter. The aim of the present study was twofold. Firstly to see the efficacy of recast as input-providing and elicitation and repetition as output-prompting corrective feedbacks regarding students' uptake. Secondly to see if male and female students respond differently to the afore-mentioned corrective feedbacks; therefore, 60 pre-intermediate Iranian EFL students were chosen through cluster sampling for the present study. They formed 3 experimental groups each consisting of 20 male and female students. To find out the efficacy of the corrective feedbacks students of each group were corrected by one of the afore-mentioned corrective feedbacks. A post test was administered after treatment to provide the necessary data for comparison between groups. Then a number of SPSS analyses were run and the results of the study showed that the participants who were corrected by recasts benefited significantly; however, the other groups didn't show a significant difference between the means scores. It is; therefore, concluded that recast are more beneficial than elicitation and repetition for pre-intermediate students.

Key words: Corrective feedbacks, Recasts, Elicitation, Repetition, and Uptake

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS **PAGE**

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.....1
1.0. Introduction.....1
1.1. Preliminaries.....1
1.2. Statement of the problem.....6
1.3. General goal of the study.....7
1.4. statement of the purpose.....7
1.5. research questions.....8
1.6. significance of the study.....8
1.7. Conceptual Framework of the study.....10
1.7.1. Corrective feedback.....10
1.7.2. Error.....11
1.7.3. Error treatment.....12
1.7.4. Uptake.....13
1.8. Definitions and Terminology.....13
. 1.8.1. corrective feedback.....13
1.8.2. Error.....16
1.8.3. Uptake.....17

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....18
2.0. Introduction.....18
2.1. The Dominance of Recasts.....18
2.1.1. Pedagogical Perspective.....19

2.1.2. Theoretical Benefits……..…….....20
2.1.3. Do teachers provide recasts?.....22

2.2. Efficacy of recasts……...26
2.2.1. Are recasts effective?.....26
2.3. Recast implicit vs. explicit……...33
2.4. recasts properties…….…….....38
2.5. Uptake…….…….....44

CHAPTER THREE: DESIGN AND METHODS OF THE STUDY ..... ……..48
3.0. Introduction.....48
3.1. Participants.....48
3.2. Materials.....49
3.3. Data collection procedures 50
3.4. Data analysis procedures.....54
Chapter Four: Results and Discussion 55
4.0. Introduction.....55
4.1 Comparison of groups Pre-tests prior to experiment…….. 56
4.1.1. Comparison of Pre-tests results of the male students of the groups prior to experiment……...…….....57
4.1.2. Comparison of Pre-tests results of the female students of the groups prior to experiment.....58
4.1.3. Comparison of Pre-tests results among groups and between genders of the study groups prior to experiment……...……...59
4.2. Comparison of Post-test results of the groups after experiment…….……...…...60
4.2.1. Comparison of Post-test results of the groups regarding gender……...63
4.2.2. Comparison of Post-test results of the male students of the groups…..……64
4.2.3. Comparison of the Post-test results of the female students of the groups …..66
4.2.4 Comparison of Post-test results of male and female students of the group…….68
4.3. Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test results of the groups……..…….. ..69
4.3.1. Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test of Recast group……. .69

4.3.2. Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test of Elicitation group……70

4.3.3. Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test of Repetition group……71

4.4. Comparing corrective feedbacks after treatment……..……72

4.5 Discussion……..75

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS……..…78

5.0. Introduction……...78

5.1. Summary……...78

5.2. Conclusions……...80

5.2.1.2 Learner factors……...81

5.2.1.1 The saliency of recasts……..82

5.3. Pedagogical Implications……..83

5.4. Suggestions for future research……84

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES **PAGE**

Table 4.1: one-way Anova comparing experimental groups on pre-test……..…...57

Table 4.1.1: One-way Anova comparing male participants of the groups on pre-test……....58

Table 4.1.2: One-way Anova comparing female participants of the groups on pre-test…….59

Table 4.1.3: two-way Anova comparing the groups together along with comparing of genders……60

Table 4.2: One-way Anova comparing the groups on post-test…….61

Table 4.2.2: On-way Anova comparing of the male students of the groups on post test……64

Table 4.2.3: One-way Anova comparing the female participants of the groups on pre-test…66

Table 4.2.4: A two-way Anova comparing the male and female students on post-test …….68

Table 4.3.1: Paired t-test comparing pre-test and post-test of the recast group…….....69

Table 4.3.2: Paired t.test comparing pre-test and post-test of the elicitation group……..71

Table 4.3.3: Paired t.tets comparing pretest and post test of the repetition group……72

Table.4.4: Comparing corrective feedbacks……...……73

CHAPTER ONE

INTODUCTION

1.0. Introduction

The present chapter includes 5 parts. The first part deals with some theories underpinning corrective feedbacks. The problem and the goal of the study will be discussed in parts 2 and 3 respectively. Finally parts 4 and 5 will deal with research questions and significance of the study.

1.1. Preliminaries

Classroom interaction has been widely studied in the field of second language acquisition (Allwright & Bailey, 1991; Wells, 1996; Lyster & Ranta 1997; Mackey, Gass & McDonough, 2000; Sheen, 2004; Barkhuizen & Ellis, 2005; Sheen, 2006; Lyster & Mori, 2006) and the most common interaction exchange found in the studies on the classroom discourse consists of moves which are normally divided into three as follows: (1) Initiate, (2) Response, and (3) Follow-up. The follow-up moves, referring to all the

moves following a student's response, fall into two categories, namely positive feedback and negative feedback (Long, 1996).

Positive feedback affirms that a learner response to an activity is correct. It may signal the veracity of the content of a learner utterance or the linguistic correctness of the utterance (Ellis, 2009). In pedagogical theory, positive feedback is viewed as important because it provides affective support to the learner and fosters motivation to continue learning.

Negative feedback signals, in one way or another, that the learner's utterance lacks veracity or is linguistically deviant. In other words, it is corrective in intent (Ellis, 2009).

Such information (positive and negative feedback) can be conveyed before incorrect use occurs through rule presentation – a preemptive strategy – or afterwards to indicate and/or correct non-target like forms in learner output – a reactive strategy (Long & Robinson, 1998).

Corrective feedbacks (henceforth CF) as reactive pedagogical strategies, constitute one type of negative feedbacks. They have widely been the center of interest in classroom language learning since Swain's (1985) Output Hypothesis. She contended that comprehensible input is necessary but not sufficient for learners' L2 development, stating the importance of output opportunities in L2 development. Her claims stem from a number of studies on French Immersion (Harley, 1988; Swain, 1985) where learners

received plenty of comprehensible input, but still showed far from native-like performance. Therefore, Swain attributes considerable importance to CF, in effect blaming the deficiencies in learner performance on its absence in the immersion classrooms.

Similarly, Long (1996) in his updated Interaction Hypothesis, suggested the beneficial role of CF. He claimed that it provides not only direct and indirect information about what is grammatical but also additional positive evidence which may otherwise be absent in the input. According to him, "negotiation for meaning and especially negotiation work that triggers interactional adjustments by the teacher" facilitates L2 development since it "connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways" (Long, 1996).

To sum up, the term CF is used as an umbrella term to cover implicit and explicit negative feedback occurring in both natural conversational and instructional settings. There has been considerable interest in CF in SLA on both theoretical and pedagogical grounds (Sheen, 2004). On the theoretical side, there has been a debate over whether CF, which is a type of 'negative evidence', is necessary, or even beneficial, for language acquisition. As mentioned above, those who advocate CF (Long, 1996 ; Swain, 1995) through Interaction Hypothesis and Output Hypothesis respectively, argue that negative evidence plays a facilitative and perhaps even crucial role in acquisition ; besides, Schmidt's (1990; 1995) 'noticing' hypothesis suggests that negative feedback helps

learners to notice the gap between interlanguage forms and target forms, and 'noticing the gap' (Schmidt & Frota, 1986) has been hypothesized to assist in interlanguage development.

Hence the present research aims to find out the efficacy of some corrective feedbacks, namely, recast as input-providing CF and elicitation and repetition as output-prompting.

CF may serve the function of making learners notice the mismatch between the input they are exposed to and their output and this mismatch may be enhanced in an implicit or in an explicit way. Lyster & Ranta, (1997) observing and documenting18.3hours of immersion classroom interactions, categorized teacher feedback into six types: explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic clues, elicitation and repetition.

According to Lyster & Ranta (1997) recasts and explicit feedback provide learners with a reformulation either implicitly or explicitly; whereas, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, repetition, and clarification requests never do so. Rather, they push the learner to self-correct.

They believed that recasts are generally implicit. To illustrate, according to Ellis et al. (2006) implicit feedback retains the focus on meaning by implying the existence of an error rather than overtly stating. Besides, they are not introduced by phrases such as "You mean", "Use this word", and "You should say". but by teacher's reformulation of

all or part of a students' utterance, minus the error" and explicit corrective feedbacks such as explicit correction, metalinguistic explanation, and elicitation overtly states that an error has been committed in the learner's utterance, while.

Ellis (2009) managed to categorize CFs under two distinctive rubrics: input-providing and output-prompting. Recast, as an implicit feedback, is seen as an input-providing source referring to ways which provide students with a correct reformulation of their non-target utterance and needs to be reformulated, while output-prompting CFs (prompts henceforth) like metalinguistic explanation, elicitation, repetition, and paralinguistic signals push learner to self-correct, i.e., they provide signals that prompt learners to self-repair.

Thus, corrective feedback can be categorized as 1) input-providing vs. output-prompting CF and 2) explicit vs. implicit CF which have been combined into a taxonomy shown below (Ellis, 2009, p.8).

	implicit	**explicit**
Input-providing	Recast	Explicit correction
Output-prompting	Repetition	Metalinguistic explanation
	Clarification request	Elicitation paralinguistic signals

1.2. Statement of the problem

The effectiveness of each CF strategy has been examined through many lines of research (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 2001; Nicholas, Lightbown & Spada, 2002; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Ammar, 2003; Iwashita, 2003, Philip, 2003; Sheen 2004; Sheen, 2006; Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Ammar & spade, 2006).

Researchers such as Lyster & Ranta (1997), Lyster (1998), and Panova & Lyster (2002) concluded that "those students who received recast did not demonstrate subsequent gains in their L2 accuracy. Nevertheless, several research studies (Ayoun, 2001; Braidi, 2002; Doughty & Varela, 1998; Han, 2002; Havranek, 2002; Iwashita, 2003; Leeman, 2003; Mackey & Philip, 1998; Oliver & Mackey, 2003) have found the opposite findings that intensive recasting increases learners' noticing and the development of morphosyntactic features.

To be more specific two descriptive studies of ESL instructional contexts, namely, Ellis et al. (2001) and Panova & Lyster (2002) present conflicting results on the efficacy of recasts in relation to uptake,

Ellis et al. (2001) investigated focus-on-form practices (including teachers' provision of CF), learner uptake, and subsequent repair (i.e., successful uptake) in an intensive adult ESL classrooms in New Zealand. They reported that recasts were the most dominant type of feedback (75%), leading to the highest amount of uptake (75%). The high rate of uptake and repair found in Ellis et al. (2001) contrasts sharply with the

findings of Panova & Lyster (2002) which in turn are strikingly similar to Lyster & Ranta's results.

Since there have always been some controversies over the effectiveness of each regarding students' uptake, the present study intends to examine the effectiveness of each in an Iranian EFL context.

1.3. General goal of the research

The primary aim of this study is to examine the error treatment patterns, involving the relationship between CF strategies, recast and prompts, and how learners respond to them in an adult EFL classroom. The findings of the present research will familiarize Iranian EFL teachers with different CF strategies especially recasts as input-providing types, and elicitations and repetitions as out-put prompting CFs along with their efficacy. Therefore, Iranian EFL teachers will be enabled to provide their students with the most appropriate CFs which may be led to highest uptake.

1.4. Statement of the purpose

With respect to the relationship between the types of CF and learner uptake, the present study aims to find out the efficacy of prompts (elicitation, repetition) and recast

as available corrective strategies regarding Iranian EFL students' uptake; Furthermore, it tries to find out if there is a significant difference between males and females uptake.

1.5. Research question

This study seeks answers of the following research questions:

1) Do recast and prompts have different effects on the students' uptake?

2) Do male and female EFL learners respond differently to recasts, elicitations and repetitions (prompts) via uptake?

1.6. Significance of the study

As a famous saying goes, "To err is human." In the process of language development, this is also the case. When the utterances produced by learners are examined and compared with target language norms, they are often found to be full of mistakes. There is also another saying that "A fall into the fit, a gain in one's wit." Since it is inevitable that learners make mistakes in the process of language learning, as teachers, we should try to provide students with various forms of feedbacks so that they would not make the same mistakes repeatedly to avoid the internalization of erroneous utterances; however, it doesn't mean that every error ought to be pointed out and corrected.