

سلامی



**Kharazmi University
Faculty of Literature and Humanities
Department of Foreign Languages**

**THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENT FOR MA DEGREE IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A
FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TEFL)**

**A STUDY OF IRANIAN EFL TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE BASE
THROUGH TEACHERS' REFLECTION ON REACTIVE
FOCUS-ON-FORM**

Supervisor: Dr. Mahmood Reza Atai

By: Zahra Shafi'i

September 2013



دانشگاه خوارزمی
دانشکده ادبیات و علوم انسانی
گروه زبانهای خارجی

پایان نامه جهت اخذ درجه کارشناسی ارشد رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی

مطالعه دانش تدریس معلمان زبان انگلیسی در ایران از راه تفکر معلم ها در باره
تمرکز بر فرم بازخوردی

استاد راهنما: دکتر محمودرضا عطایی

استاد مشاور: دکتر عصمت بابایی

محقق: زهرا شفیعی

شهریور 1392



بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

تاریخ: ۹۴۷۲۱
شماره: ۴۰۲۵۶۴
پیوست: ۱
واحد: ...

صورت جلسه دفاع از پایان نامه

با یاری خدای متعال جلسه دفاع از پایان نامه کارشناسی ارشد خانم زهرا شفیعی (۹۰۳۳۵۱۵۱۷) در رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی
تحت عنوان:
مطالعه دانش تدریس معلم های زبان انگلیسی در ایران از راه تفکر معلم ها در باره ی تمرکز بر فرم بازخوردی.
عنوان انگلیسی:

A Study of Iranian EFL teachers' Knowledge base through teachers' reflection on reactive focus-on-form.

باحضور هیات داوران در ساعت ۱۰:۳۰ مورخه ۱۳۹۲/۶/۳۰ در دانشگاه خوارزمی تشکیل شد. پس از ایراد
خطابه دانشجو و پاسخگویی به سوال های حاضران، هیئت داوران با توجه به کیفیت و کمیت تحقیق و نحوه
ارائه کتبی و شفاهی؛ «پایان نامه» نامبرده را با نمره ۱۸٫۷۵ و با درجه *M* پذیرفت.

۱- استاد راهنما: دکتر محمود رضا عطائی

۲- استاد مشاور: دکتر عصمت بابایی
استادان داور:

۳- مدعو:

۴: داخلی: دکتر محمد نبی کریمی

مدیر گروه آموزشی



رئیس دانشکده ادبیات و علوم انسانی

تهران: خیابان شهید مصبح برسد به خیابان انقلاب - شماره ۴۳ - دانشگاه خوارزمی. کد پستی: ۱۴۹۱۱-۱۵۷۱۹. تلفن: ۳ ۸۸۳۲۹۲۲۰
کرج: خیابان شهید بهشتی - میدان دانشگاه - دانشگاه خوارزمی. کد پستی: ۳۷۵۵۱-۳۱۹۷۹. تلفن: ۰۲۶-۳۴۵۷۹۶۰۰

Kharazmi University, No. 43, Shahid Mofatteh Ave., Tehran, Iran

Tel: +98 21 88329220-3 www.khu.ac.ir



**Kharazmi University
Faculty of Literature and Humanities
Department of Foreign Languages**

**THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENT FOR MA DEGREE IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A
FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TEFL)**

**A STUDY OF IRANIAN EFL TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE BASE
THROUGH TEACHERS' REFLECTION ON REACTIVE
FOCUS-ON-FORM**

Supervisor: Dr. Mahmood Reza Atai

Advisor: Dr. Esmat Babaii

By: Zahra Shafi'i

September 2013

... To all reflective teachers who never cease to learn; those who perennially and dynamically revise, reformulate, and reconstruct their knowledge which empowers them in transforming into and always remaining agents of change; the teachers who perpetually try to become more fully humans...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis was developed over an extended period of time and wouldn't have been possible without the help, patience and support of many people whose contributions to the making of this thesis deserve special mention.

First and foremost, I would like to record all my gratitude to **Dr. Atai**, my dear research supervisor, for his invaluable supervision and support throughout this study whilst allowing me the opportunity to work on the area of research occupying my interest. For sure, this thesis wouldn't have come to fruition without his constructive comments, thoughtful criticisms, critical feedback, and meticulous corrections.

In particular, my most sincere gratefulness would also go to **Dr. Babaii**, my dear research advisor, for her scholarly guidance and insightful advice. Indeed, her kind concern, consideration, encouragement, and assistance greatly contributed to the successful realization of this thesis.

It's a pleasure to pay attribute to **Dr. Karimi** for taking the burden of reading this thesis, and for adding more value to it by including his scholarly insights and comments.

My thankfulness would also go to **Dr Ahmad Goli**, our dear dean of department, and to the administration and management of the institute and the school in which this study was conducted. Without their permission and generous cooperation this research wouldn't have come to a desirable end.

Indeed, I cannot stop revering the phenomenal dedication of the three teachers who participated in this research. Their patience and cooperation throughout the research in

admitting me to their classrooms every session of a semester, and in the devotion of their free time to this research constituted one of the major drives for the pursuit of this work.

Last but not least, I would like to express my special gratitude to my kind parents, my beloved husband, Faraz, and also my two lovely children, Fatemeh and Amir Mohammad, whose emotional support, patience, and push for tenacity played a major part as a catalyst to keep me motivated and inspired all through the process of conducting this thesis.

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of the present study was to investigate the knowledge base guiding EFL teachers' reactive approach to form-focused activities during oral classroom interactions, i.e. oral corrective feedback provision. More specifically, this study addressed: first, identifying a consistent set of thought categories guiding the participants' oral corrective feedback provision; second, exploring the potential variations in the patterns of reported pedagogical thought categories across the participants; third, investigating the potential variations in the patterns of reported pedagogical thought categories within the participants during the course of study; and fourth, investigating the manifestation of pedagogical knowledge base, as proposed by Gatbonton (1999), in the participants' oral corrective feedback provision. To this end, the study was conducted in three intact ELT classrooms within a 10-week long semester (20 sessions). The data sets for this longitudinal, multiple case study emerged from the classroom observations, audio-taping and video-taping of the observed lessons; application of stimulated recall techniques after observation of the lessons; and pre-course and post-course interviews. The three Participant Teachers' audio-taped accounts of stimulated recall sessions and the two sets of interviews were later transcribed and subjected to content analysis. Subsequently, the emerging themes and the results of correlation tests among the three participants' patterns of reported thought categories provided the answer to the first research question. The answer to the second research question, i.e. exploring the potential variations across the participants' knowledge base, required running Chi-Square procedures and measuring rate of reported pedagogical thought units. As led by the third research question, potential variations within the participant's knowledge base for oral CF provision during the course of study were examined through comparing the results of content analysis of the two sets of interviews both qualitatively and through conducting McNemar's test. Moreover, frequencies and rates of reported pedagogical thought units of each participant during the

course were compared. Finally, as guided by the fourth research question, the pedagogical knowledge base guiding oral CF provision was investigated. Thus, the transcripts of stimulated recall sessions were analyzed based on the model introduced by Gatbonton (1999), and were subject to correlation tests to reveal the potential common pattern across the participants.

Key Terms: Pedagogical Knowledge Base (PKB), Corrective Feedback (CF), Pedagogical Thought Category (PTC), Pedagogical Thought Unit (PTU), Reflective Practice

Table of Contents

Title Page	I
Dedications	II
Acknowledgements	III
Abstract	V
Table of Contents	VII
List of Tables	XV
List of Figures	XVIII
List of Abbreviations	XIX
Chapter I: Introduction	1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Introduction	1
1.3. Statement of the Problem	4
1.4. Significance of the Study	8
1.5. Research Questions	11
1.6. Definition of Key Terms	12
1.6.1. Corrective Feedback (CF)	12
1.6.2. Form-Focused Instruction (FFI)	12

1.6.3.	Focus-on-Form (F-on-F)	13
1.6.4.	Pedagogical Knowledge Base (PKB)	13
1.6.5.	Pedagogical Thought Unit (PTU)	13
1.6.6.	Reflective Teaching (RT)	14
1.6.7.	Stimulated Recall Technique	14
1.7.	Limitations and Delimitations of the Study	15
1.7.1.	Limitations	15
1.7.2.	Delimitations	17
Chapter II:	Review of Literature	19
2.1.	Overview	19
2.2.	Theoretical Framework	19
2.2.1.	Second Language Acquisition	19
2.2.1.1.	Major Approaches of SLA	20
2.2.1.2.	Recent Trends of SLA	21
2.2.1.3.	Second Language Acquisition Research	22
2.2.1.4	Instructed SLA.	25
2.2.1.5.	Grammar Instruction	26
2.2.2.	Form-Focused Instruction	28
2.2.2.1.	Formation of Focus-on-Form	30

2.2.2.1.1. <i>Input Hypothesis</i>	31
2.2.2.1.2. <i>Interaction Hypothesis</i>	32
2.2.2.1.3. <i>Noticing Hypothesis</i>	32
2.2.2.1.4. <i>Output Hypothesis</i>	34
2.2.2.1.5. <i>Skill-Acquisition Theory</i>	34
2.2.2.2. Pedagogical Considerations of F-on-F	35
2.2.3. Corrective Feedback and Focus-on-Form	39
2.2.3.1. Typology of Corrective Feedback	40
2.2.3.2. Medium of Correction	44
2.2.3.2.1. <i>Self-Correction</i>	45
2.2.3.2.2. <i>Learner-Learner Correction</i>	46
2.2.3.2.3. <i>Teacher-Correction</i>	47
2.2.4. Second Language Teacher Education (SLTE)	47
2.2.4.1. Teacher Cognition	50
2.2.4.2. Teachers' Pedagogical Knowledge Base	52
2.2.4.2.1. <i>PKB across Subject Matters</i>	54
2.2.4.2.1. <i>Development of PKB</i>	54
2.2.4.3. Reflective Teaching	56

2.3. A Selective Review of Related Empirical Literature	61
2.3.1. Focus-On-Form and Corrective Feedback	61
2.3.2. Pedagogical Knowledge Base	71
2.3.3. Reflective Teaching	75
2.4. Chapter Summary and Concluding Remarks	77
Chapter III: Methodology	78
3.1. Overview	78
3.3. Context of the Study	78
3.4. Participants	79
3.5. Instrumentation and Data Collection	80
3.5.1. Stimulated Recall Technique	82
3.6. Design	85
3.7. Procedure and Data Analysis	85
3.7.1. Stimulated Recall Sessions	87
3.7.2. The Two Sets of Interviews	90
3.7.3. Pedagogical Knowledge Base	93
3.7.4. The PTUs and oral CF Utilized in Data Analysis	95
Chapter IV: Results and Discussion	97
4.1. Overview	97

4.2. Restatement of the Research Questions	97
4.3. Research question 1: A Consistent Set of Pedagogical Thought Categories (PTCs)	98
4.3.1. Results of the Research Question 1	98
4.3.1.1. The Three Major Themes	98
4.3.1.1.1. <i>Theme One: Professional Knowledge</i>	101
4.3.1.1.1.1. <i>Knowledge about Language and Language Learning</i>	101
4.3.1.1.1.2. <i>Knowledge about Language Teaching</i> ...	107
4.3.1.1.1.3. <i>Knowledge of the Learners</i>	114
4.3.1.1.2. <i>Theme Two: Procedural Knowledge</i>	118
4.3.1.1.3. <i>Theme Three: Personal Knowledge</i>	128
4.3.1.2. Occurrences of PTUs across Major Themes	134
4.3.1.3. Categories Corresponding to Each Theme	136
4.3.1.4. Inter-Teacher Correlation among Patterns	139
4.3.2. Discussion of Research Question 1.....	142
4.3.2.1. Teachers' Knowledge Base	143
4.3.2.1.1. <i>Professional Knowledge</i>	143
4.3.2.1.2. <i>Procedural Knowledge</i>	146

4.3.2.1.3. <i>Personal Knowledge</i>	148
4.3.2.2. The Dominant Pattern of the Reported PTUs	150
4.4. Research Question 2: The Variations among Patterns of PTUs	151
4.4.1. Results of Research Question 2	151
4.4.1.1. The Analysis of Account of Verbal Protocol	151
4.4.1.2. The Variations in the Rating of PTUs across the Participants	152
4.4.2. Discussion of Research Question 2	154
4.4.2.1. The Variations in the Pattern of PTUs across the Participants	155
4.4.2.2. The Variations in the Frequencies and Rates of PTUs across the Participants	155
4.4.2.3. Research Question 3: The Variations Each Pattern of PTUs	157
4.4.3. Results of Research Question 3	157
4.4.3.1. The Pre- and Post-Course Interviews	157
4.4.3.1.1. <i>Particularities</i>	158
4.4.3.1.2. <i>Practicalities</i>	161
4.4.3.1.3. <i>Possibilities</i>	165

4.4.3.2. The Variations in the Frequencies and the Rates of PTUs within the Participants	168
4.4.3.3. The Variations in the Reported PTUs within the Participants	172
4.5.1. Discussion of Research Question 3	173
4.5.1.1. Variations across Pre- and Post-Course Interviews	174
4.5.2.1.1. <i>The Principle of Particularity</i>	175
4.5.2.1.2. <i>The Principle of Practicality</i>	176
4.5.2.1.3. <i>The Principle of Possibility</i>	177
4.5.1.2. The Variations in the Reported PTUs within the Participants	178
4.6. Research Question 4: Manifestation of PKB in CF Provision.....	180
4.6.1. Results of Research Question 4	180
4.6.1.1. Correlation among Patterns	182
4.6.1.2. Dominant Pedagogical Thought Categories	183
4.6.2. Discussion of Research Question 4	185
4.6.2.1. Manifestation of Participant Teachers' PKB in CF Provision	186
4.7. Comparing the overall Findings of the Present Study and the Existing Literature	187

Chapter V: Conclusion, Implications, and suggestions for Further Research	189
5.1. Overview	189
5.2. Summary and Conclusion	189
5.3. Implications and Applications of the Findings.....	191
5.4. Suggestions for Further Research	193
References	196
Appendices	223
Appendix 1: Questions of the Pre-Course Interview	223
Appendix 2: Questions of the Post-Course Interview	224
Appendix 3: Form of the Participants' Informed Consent	225
Appendix 4: Definition of PTUs corresponding to Theme 1	226
Appendix 5: Definition of PTUs corresponding to Theme 2	231
Appendix 6: Definition of PTUs corresponding to Theme 3	234
Appendix 7: Definitions of Pedagogical Knowledge Categories	237
Appendix 8: Ranking, Frequencies, and Percentages of PTCs in the Study of Gatbonton (1999)	242

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Types of form-based instruction	29
Table 2.2. Principal options of F-on-F	36
Table 2. 3. Corrective feedback strategies	40
Table 2.4. Taxonomy of error types based on implicit/explicitness	42
Table 3.1. Summary of the Specifications of the Context of Study	79
Table 3.2. Summary of Participants' Biographical Profile	80
Table 4.1. PTCs Corresponding to each Major Theme and the Three Sub-Themes of Theme1...100	
Table 4.2. Categories and Sub-Categories Corresponding to 'Knowledge about Language and Language Learning'	102
Table 4.3. Categories and Sub-Categories Corresponding to 'Knowledge about Language and Language Learning'	107
Table 4.4. Categories and Sub-Categories Corresponding to 'Knowledge about Language Learners'	114
Table 4.5. Categories and Sub-Categories Corresponding to 'Procedural Knowledge'.....	120
Table 4.6. Categories and Sub-Categories Corresponding to 'Personal Knowledge '	128
Table 4.7. Frequency and Percentage of PTUs Regarding CF Provision across Major Themes	135
Table 4.8. Frequency and Percentage of PTUs Regarding CF Provision across Categories	137

Table 4.9. The Frequencies and Ranks of Pedagogical Categories Guiding CF Provision	140
Table 4.10. The Results of Inter-Teacher Correlation Tests among Rankings of Pedagogical Categories	141
Table 4.11. Percentages of occurrences of the Ten First Dominant Thought Categories ...	150
Table 4.12. Results of the Chi-Square Tests among Patterns of PTUs between Participants	152
Table 4.13. Variations among the Rating of PTUs across Participant Teachers	154
Table 4.14. The Results of McNemar's Tests for Interviews of Participant Teacher 1.....	169
Table 4.15. The Results of McNemar's Tests for Interviews of Participant Teacher 2	170
Table 4.16. The Results of McNemar's Tests for Interviews of Participant Teacher 3	171
Table 4. 17. Variations among the Rating of PTUs across Participant Teachers	173
Table 4.18. Ranking, Frequencies, and the Percentages of the Pedagogical Thought Categories	180
Table 4. 19. Inter-Teacher Correlation Tests among the Participants Teacher	182
Table 4. 20. Ranking of Dominant Pedagogical Thought Categories for CF provision	184
Table 4.21. The First Ten Dominant Pedagogical Thought Categories Involved in oral CF Provision	185