

ẢNH HƯỞNG CỦA HÌNH THỨC PHẢN HỒI SỬA LỖI - RECASTS VÀ ELICITATIONS ĐỐI VỚI VIỆC ĐIỀU CHỈNH LỖI TRONG TƯƠNG TÁC HỘI THOẠI

THE IMPACT OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK RECASTS AND ELICITATIONS ON IMMEDIATE REPAIR IN DYADIC CONVERSATION

Trương Thị Kiều Vân

Phân hiệu Đại học Đà Nẵng tại Kon Tum; Email: ttkvan@kontum.udn.vn

Tóm tắt - Phản hồi sửa lỗi đóng vai trò rất quan trọng trong việc học ngôn ngữ thứ hai. Có rất nhiều công trình nghiên cứu-ảnh hưởng của phản hồi sửa lỗi trong giao tiếp bằng lời nói. Bài báo này nghiên cứu ảnh hưởng của hai phương thức phản hồi sửa lỗi “corrective feedback” - recasts và elicitations - đối với việc chỉnh sửa lỗi sai trong quá trình hội thoại của sinh viên học tiếng Anh. Tác giả thực hiện nghiên cứu nhằm trả lời 2 câu hỏi sau đây: 1) Hình thức phản hồi recasts và elicitations có ảnh hưởng gì đến quá trình tương tác sửa lỗi? 2) Hình thức phản hồi trực tiếp hoặc gián tiếp có hiệu quả hơn trong việc học từ trong quá trình tương tác? Kết quả của nghiên cứu cho thấy hình thức phản hồi recasts được sử dụng thường xuyên hơn hình thức phản hồi elicitations và người học thành công hơn trong việc chỉnh sửa hình thức từ sau khi nhận phản hồi trực tiếp hơn là hình thức phản hồi gián tiếp. Hình thức phản hồi tường minh sẽ hữu hiệu hơn hình thức phản hồi ngầm ẩn.

Từ khóa - phản hồi sửa lỗi; recasts; elicitations; sửa lỗi trực tiếp; hội thoại

1. Introduction

Corrective feedback is of critical role in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). Numerous experimental and observational classroom studies have been conducted to examine the effectiveness of these types of feedback in oral interaction. According to Adams, Nuevo and Egi (2011), corrective feedback is defined as “an interlocutor’s reaction to a learner’s non-target-like utterance and is a source of negative evidence for the learner” (p.42). Every type of feedback more or less has its own impact on learners’ immediate repair and language acquisition. Therefore, explicit and implicit forms of those two types of feedback are taken into consideration in the current study.

Recasts were defined as “reformulations of learners’ ungrammatical or inappropriate utterances which maintain their intended meanings” (Mackey and Goo, 2007, p.413). This type of feedback provides learners with another form of correction which supports them to realize their errors implicitly or explicitly. Recasts are demonstrated in sample 1 below.

Sample:

Interlocutor 1: Yesterday, there was a dog was chasing a cat.

Abstract - Corrective feedback plays an essential part in the field of second language acquisition. There are a number of studies examining the impact of corrective feedback on oral conversation. This article examines the effects of corrective feedback recasts and elicitations on immediate repair in dyadic conversation of students who speak English as a second language. Two questions are to be answered in the study: 1) What effect do recasts and elicitations have on learning targeted forms during the interaction through immediate repair? 2) Is explicit form or implicit form of corrective feedback more effective in learning targetlike forms during interaction? The findings of the study show that recasts which outperformed other types of corrective feedback were more frequently used than elicitations and learners were more successful in repairing their utterances after receiving explicit form of feedback than implicit form. Regarding the second research question pertaining to forms of corrective feedback, this study suggests that explicit form of corrective feedback is more useful than implicit form.

Key words - corrective feedback; recasts; elicitations; immediate repair; dyadic conversation

Interlocutor 2: Really? There was a dog chasing a cat.

Interlocutor 1: Yes. There was a dog chasing a cat.

Elicitations were defined as “feedback that did not provide the learner with the correct form but rather elicited implicitly or explicitly a correction from the learner” (Nassaji, 2009, p.428). This type of feedback facilitates learners to self-correct their errors or mistakes while they are speaking. They are illustrated in the sample 2 below.

Sample

Interlocutor 1: When they reached a tree, the dog climbed the tree.

Interlocutor 2: Pardon? The dog climbed?

Interlocutor 1: Sorry. The cat climbed the tree.

This study is to use the same methodology as Nassaji’s (2007, 2009) study to examine the effects of corrective feedback recasts and elicitations on immediate repair in dyadic conversation. Additionally, the study can be regarded as an investigation whether recasts and elicitations are beneficial for L2 learners in self-correcting their erroneous utterances during the interactive communication. While participants in Nassaji’s (2009) study had more time for preinteraction, during-interaction

and postinteraction tests to measure the effectiveness of corrective feedback, participants in this present study have to provide their immediate repair during their interaction. In addition to this, their correction of erroneous utterances is used to evaluate the benefits that learners can receive from recasts and elicitations.

Nassaji (2009) conducted a research on the effectiveness of recasts and elicitations in both explicit and implicit forms from 42 adult ESL learners in a Canadian university. The results of the study show that although recasts resulted in a more effective consumption for learners than elicitations, learners might recall their corrections made by elicitations rather than those made by recasts. Additionally, explicit forms of feedback seemed to be more beneficial for learners than implicit forms. However, the degree of effectiveness was various due to different types of feedback. Dilans (2010) measured the beneficial results of prompts and recasts to adult learners on L2 vocabulary development. The results showed that L2 vocabulary was improved in the short-term and prompts were slightly more outperformed in the longer term.

To achieve the set goals and values, the following should be delivered to measure the effectiveness of recasts and elicitations with respect to both explicit and implicit forms on second language acquisition through learners' immediate repair.

1. What do recasts and elicitations have effect on learning targeted forms during the interaction through immediate repair?

2. Is explicit form or implicit form of corrective feedback more effective in learning targetlike forms during interaction?

In order to answer the above questions, both recasts and elicitations should be measured to examine whether they are beneficial for learners in dyadic conversation.

Numerous studies examined the effectiveness of different types of feedback pertaining to recasts, elicitations in both explicit and implicit forms. According to Ammar (2008), prompts were more effective than recasts in oral interaction through oral picture-description and a computerized fill-in-the-blank test. Furthermore, the quasi-experimental study by Ammar & Spada (2006) revealed that prompts were more beneficial for learners than recasts and learners' level of proficiency has a great impact on these two techniques of feedback. Whereas Erlam and Loewen (2010) posited that there are no significant differences between implicit and explicit recasts but those types of feedback have great impact on oral interaction. All of those studies provided participants with delayed posttests after the interaction whose findings can result from learners' memorization of the feedback they received during interaction. Thus, the current study is to examine the effectiveness via communication tasks during learner-teacher interaction.

2. Methodology

2.1. Participants and sampling

There are four adult ESL students from the University of Queensland and a non-native English language teacher joining the dyadic conversation. The participants were from different language backgrounds including Vietnamese, Chinese and Indonesian. Four participants are two males and two females and their age range from 25 to 33. They had been studying English for 2 to 7 years. All the information was collected outside classroom where it took them for around 15 to 20 minutes to conduct a conversation through a picture-description task.

The teacher participated in the conversation as an interlocutor to correct erroneous utterances or to give the hints for students to self-correct their erroneous utterances. All conversations were recorded and transcribed to analyze and synthesize for the study.

2.2. Data collection procedures

Each learner conducted a task-based interaction with a teacher through a picture-description task. The interaction was conducted outside classroom and one by one to collect information. The teacher prepared a picture sequencing activities and asked each learner to describe the picture. During the interaction, the teacher interrupted when students made mistakes and used recasts or elicitations in terms of both explicit and implicit forms to reformulate or push students to reformulate their incorrect utterances. Each communication task took 10-15 minutes to complete while it was recorded and then transcribed as examples and evidence for the study.

The main purpose of this study is to examine the effectiveness of corrective feedback on learners' performance through oral interaction. This study just only focused on the way that learners identify and correct their incorrect utterances during interaction.

2.3. Coding and Analysis

There were two components involved in the data analysis procedures including (a) examining the erroneous utterances; (b) types of feedback and immediate repair. Data were analyzed to find out the impact of recasts and elicitations on L2 development in learner-teacher interaction outside classroom.

Data were transcribed to identify errors with regard to syntax and pronunciation. Then the erroneous utterances were categorized as recasts or elicitations to targetlike form repair. Recasts were defined as "reformulated utterances that correct learner errors" (Carpenter, Jeon, MacGregor & Mackey, 2006, p.216) in which teacher gave feedback in the implicit form (Example 1 and 2) or more explicit form as raising intonation (Example 3 and 4).

Example 1: Recast – implicit

Student: There was a woman who watering in the garden

Teacher: Ah, the woman was watering in the garden.

Student: Yes, she was watering. While the cat was

Example 2: Recast – implicit

Student: The man was cutting the tree down.

Teacher: Ah, the man was cutting down the tree.

Student: Ah, yes. He was cutting down the tree. While his wife was

Example 3: Recast – more explicit

Student: The cat was climbing on a tree.

Teacher: No. The cat was climbing a tree. (raising intonation)

Example 4: Recast – more explicit

Student: The dog was parking under the tree.

Teacher: No. The dog was BARKING under the tree. (raising intonation).

While elicitation was defined as “feedback that did not provide the learner with the correct form but rather elicited implicitly or explicitly a correction from the learner” (Nassaji, 2009, p.428). This type of feedback created conditions for learners to self-correct their ill-formed utterances implicitly as in example 5 because in this case teacher did not indicate the wrong information. While in a more explicit form of elicitation, the teacher did show the wrong information by raising intonation without correcting them (Example 6).

Example 5: Elicitation – implicit

Student: And, she brought a fish for the police.

Teacher: Sorry, a fish for

Student: Ah, yes a fish for the cat.

Example 6: Elicitation – more explicit

Student: The cat was went out Mary’s house.

Teacher: Pardon? The cat was went out? (raising intonation)

Student: Oh, the cat went out of Mary’s house.

Another important thing in this study was to differentiate full correction and partial correction. Full correction is the correction made by learners for the whole sentence (Examples 7 and 8) while partial correction is that made just only one part in the whole thing (Examples 9 and 10). In addition, the erroneous utterances which were not repeated or corrected at all after receiving feedback were calculated in the no correction section (Example 11 and 12).

Example 7: Recast – full correction

Student: Mary were very happy when playing with her cat.

Teacher: She WAS very happy. (stress)

Student: Oh, I’m sorry. She was very happy

Example 8: Elicitation – full correction

Student: The man came to her house and helped her took back cat.

Teacher: Sorry? The man?

Student: He came to her house and helped her take back the cat.

Example 9: Recast – partial correction

Student: The cat, er...uhm unfortunately keep run down into the street.

Teacher: It keeps running down the street? (raising intonation)

Student: Yeah, running down the street.

Example 10: Elicitation – partial correction

Student: The cat ..er.. were went out Mary’s house and he’s was dead.

Teacher: Pardon? What happened with the cat?

Student: He was dead.

Example 11: Recast – no correction

Student: The man helped her took back the cat.

Teacher: The man helped her take back the cat.

Student: Yeah.

Example 12: Recast – no correction

Student: The woman thanked the man for help her.

Teacher: The woman thanked the man for helping her.

Student: Oh, right.

3. Results

This section provides data of corrective feedback including recasts and elicitation of both explicit and implicit forms. The data were first examined the number of incorrect utterances in oral communication. Incorrect grammar structures – tenses, verb forms and pronunciation are all taken into consideration as incorrect utterances. As shown in table 1, there were total 44 instances of corrective feedback used in learner-teacher interaction which were appropriate for each instance for learners to self-correct immediately after receiving feedback. It turned out that recasts were more frequently used to aid learners to self-correct their errors during oral interaction rather than elicitation.

Table 1 Frequency of types of feedback following erroneous utterances

Types of feedback	N	%
Recast	28	63.6
Elicitation	16	36.4
Total	44	100.0

Regarding explicit and implicit forms of the above mentioned corrective feedback, correction of previous utterances were taken into account whether these utterances were fully, partially or not corrected at all. Table 2 provides the percentage of recasts and elicitation of fully, partially or none corrected. 22 (50%) instances were fully corrected of the 44 total instances of feedback, while partial correction and no correction of erroneous utterances were 9 (20.5%) and 14 (29.5%) instances respectively. Additionally, the percentage of recasts pertaining to corrected types were higher than that of elicitation. Furthermore, recasts were double utilized than elicitation with respect to full correction of utterances.

Table 2 Immediate interaction effects of recasts and elicitations

	Recasts		Elicitations		Total	
	N	%	N	%	n	%
Full correction	15	53.6	7	43.8	22	50.0
Partial correction	6	21.4	3	18.7	9	20.5
No correction	7	25.0	6	37.5	13	29.5
Total	28	100.0	16	36.4	44	100.0

Table 3 Immediate interaction effects of implicit and explicit forms of recasts and elicitations

	No correction	Partial correction	Full correction	Recasts		Elicitations	
				Implicit	More explicit	Implicit	More explicit
				N	%	N	%
Total	4	2	5	11	100.0	9	100.0
	36.4	18.2	45.4	17	100.0	5	55.6
	3	4	10	7	100.0	2	28.6
	17.6	21.5	58.8	7	100.0	4	44.4
	2	3	2	7	100.0	2	28.6
	28.6	42.8	28.6	9	100.0	5	55.6

The second analysis was on the effectiveness of the implicit and more explicit forms of feedback. The results in table 3 showed that the full correction percentage of the more explicit forms was higher than that of implicit forms for both recasts and elicitations. More specifically, the more explicit forms were slightly higher than the implicit forms in full correction of recasts accounting for 58.8% and 45.4% respectively. For elicitations, whereas, the more explicit forms doubled the implicit forms occupying 55.6% and 28.6% respectively.

However, there was a significant difference between the effect of explicitness of recasts and elicitations in this case. While the correction rates of the more explicit forms and implicit forms of recasts was not much different, there was a significant difference between that of elicitations. This finding suggests that elicitations might

lead to greater effect of explicitness than recasts.

4. Discussion

The current study examined the effectiveness of recasts and elicitations on learners' immediate repair. Both recasts and elicitations were used to correct erroneous utterances and considered whether recasts or elicitations are more or equally effective to targetlike forms of language. The results of the study showed that recasts were more frequently used than elicitations and learners were more successful in repairing their utterances after receiving explicit form of feedback than implicit form.

The first research question is to measure the effectiveness of recasts and elicitations on corrections of targetlike forms. The findings are consistent with the findings of previous classroom and form-focused interaction research which shows that recasts outperformed other types of corrective feedback. Nassaji (2007, 2009) posited that recasts were more advantageous than elicitations in dyadic interaction because there was a higher percentage of errors corrected by recasts than elicitations. However, this finding is slightly contradictory to Ammar & Spada's (2006) finding in which they claimed that recasts were not as effective as prompts with low-proficiency learners but both of them were equally effective with high-proficiency learners. This can be accounted for learners' performance on the tasks and teachers' reformulation on their errors. According to Ellis and Sheen (2006), "Recasts supply learners with data on new as well as old forms" (p.595).

Regarding the second research question pertaining to forms of corrective feedback, this study suggests that explicit form of corrective feedback is more useful than implicit form. This finding is similar to that of Carrol and Swain (1993) when explicit metalinguistic feedback was more beneficial for learners in grammatical corrections than other types of feedback. Additionally, according to Ellis and Sheen (2006) "explicit feedback might only appear to be more effective than implicit feedback in that it serves to develop learned linguistic knowledge but not true competence" (p.595). Therefore, explicit feedback can be deployed in dyadic interaction to push opportunities for learners to correct their previous utterances.

This study suggests that both recasts and elicitations can be applied to L2 teaching and learning in classroom. The important thing is that teachers should base on learners' proficiency level and consciousness in identifying their erroneous utterances to give an appropriate type of feedback for learners to repair. In addition to this, it can be applied to learner-learner interaction where the interlocutor can give feedback to student. Both teacher-learner interaction and learner-learner interaction result in higher degree of recognition and L2 acquisition via form-focused tasks.

However, there are some limitations of this study with respect to the methodology and the number of participants engaged in the study. The result would be more objective

if there were a larger number of participants engaged. Additionally, this study just collected immediate repair after receiving corrective feedback then assess its effect on targetlike forms for language learning. The finding cannot be measured whether the effectiveness sustained for a long time or not. Therefore, it is more likely that future research should concentrate on exploring larger samples and longer time for delayed posttests to assess the effectiveness of corrective feedback efficiently.

5. Conclusion

In summary, this study suggests that although explicit and implicit forms of both recasts and elicitations, to some extent, have great impact on learners' immediate repair during interaction, it somehow shows that explicit form of feedback seems to outperform implicit form in identifying and repairing errors. However, the finding only focuses on immediate repair in dyadic interaction. Thus, it also imposes some difficulties in measuring the effectiveness of corrective feedback in delayed time.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adams, R., Nuevo, A. M. & Egi, T. (2011). Explicit and implicit feedback, modified output, and SLA: Does explicit and implicit feedback promote learning and learner-learner interactions? *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 42-63.
- [2] Ammar, A. (2008). Prompts and recasts: Differential effects on second language morphosyntax. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 183-210.
- [3] Ammar, A. & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 543-574.
- [4] 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.
- [5] Carpenter, H., Jeon, K. S., MacGregor, D. & Mackey, A. (2006). Learners' interpretations of recasts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 209-236.
- [6] 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. doi: 10.1353/cml.2010.0029.
- [7] Ellis, R. & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 575-600.
- [8] Erlam, R. & Loewen, S. (2010). Implicit and explicit recasts in L2 oral French interaction. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66(6), 887-916. doi: 10.1353/cml.2010.0022.
- [9] Mackey, A., & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (p. 407-453). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [10] Nassaji, H. (2007). Elicitation and reformulation and their relationship with learner repair in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning*, 57(4), 511-548.

(BBT nhận bài: 20/12/2016, phản biện xong: 15/1/2017)