POSITIVE IMPACT OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN SLA

Ülkü Ayhan
English Department, Faculty of Education
International Burch University
Bosnia and Herzegovina
ulkuayhan@hotmail.com

Muhammed Arikan
English Department, Faculty of Education
International Burch University
Bosnia and Herzegovina
muhammedarikan1988@hotmail.com

Azamat Akbarov
English Department, Faculty of Education
International Burch University
Bosnia and Herzegovina
aakbarov@ibu.edu.ba

ABSTRACT: This paper is aimed to discuss corrective feedback in oral reading skills. It mainly focuses on the role of transitions and conjunctions in texts and questions the conditions of efficacy of corrective feedback for the development of reading skill among 4 language skills. It discusses what corrective feedback is, what kind of types there are, and which type should be preferred mostly for the best result. Swain (1985), Pica (1988) and Pica, Holliday, Lewis and Morgenhaler (1989) provided that corrective feedback techniques lead to modified output and self-repair are more likely to improve learners' ability to monitor their output and lead to IL development.
As it is a very dynamic subject, there are a lot of claims by the leading linguists such as Gass, Long, Krashen, Schachter, Varonis, Ellis and Schmidt. By dealing with their significant approaches to it in the light of various empirical and theoretical researches, its impact and issues related to it will be examined.

Keywords: Corrective feedback, input, error, acquisition, feedback

LITERATURE REVIEW

There are various ways to correct errors it may be directly or after the utterance of the learner. In this paper corrective feedback and related implications are focused in Second Language Acquisition (SLA). There are different definitions in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) by linguists. They are mostly interrelated to each other with the sub concepts.

Feed back given to learner can be positive or negative. If the given feedback indicates that utterance is correct it is called positive feedback. It is the signal of correctness of the response. While pedagogically, positive feedback is seen as both external and internal support to learner and affect him/her to go on learning, in Second Language Acquisition (SLA), positive feedback has not been seen as objective that it may show correctly whether the learner is correct or not. On the other hand, negative feedback directly shows the extent of the learners' correctness linguistically. On that field, the linguists and language educators have been very active, but, they have been in controversies whether or not to correct an error, what errors to correct, how to correct them and when to correct them. (Ellis, R).

In Sla literature, mostly negative feedback and negative evidence or corrective feedback is used interchangeably. Lightbown &Spada (1999) defines corrective feedback (CF) or any indication of incorrectness in learners'' use of the target language, after language learners utterance, corrective feedback given may be explicitly or implicitly.

For example; L: "He go to school everyday".

T:" No, you should say goes, not go.

or implicitly,

T: "Yes, he goes to school everyday" .

Rod Ellis (2009) views corrective feedback as one type of negative feedback. According to him, it is for any form of response a learner's utterance including a linguistic error. The response can consist of any indication that error has been committed, provision of the correct target form or metalinguistic information or any combination of them.

For decades, the role of corrective feedback in SLA has been argued a lot. Nativist believing that language acquisition is possible by Universal Grammar (UG) (Chomsky, 1975, p.29). the system of principles of conditions and rules that are elements of properties in all human languages. Their assertion is that the formation and restructuring of Second language grammar is possible via this innate human linguistic mechanism which works together with positive evidence. (Cook, 1991;Schwartz, 1993). Moreover, Schwartz points out that negative feedback has impact on solely on affecting performance, it doesn't lead any change in language competence, and therefore its effect is minimal.

Francis (2007) attributes to some naturalistic approaches such as Krashen. Krashen (1998) has a tendency to see equal first language (L1) and second language (L2) acquisition processes. He is in favor of viewing them at the same side, more or less, through the same basic mechanisms. For the desired linguistic competence, sufficient positive evidence for first language (L1) is enough also for Second language (L2). But, input factors and social learning circumstances is effective to active acquisition process.

At first, Krashen examined feedback as useless moreover harmful (Krashen,1994:Truscott;1996). He said: "I did not want anxious students, so, I provided very little feedback".

But this approach was different from Chomsky"s rejective manner of corrective feedback but, as complementary or as a bridge towards corrective feedback. He recognized the significance to language learning of comprehensible input which is defined as input in the target language that is understandable in a particular context of use, but slightly more advanced that the learners' current level of ability. He believed that enough exposure immediately brings about progress, but, only if emotional barrier was sufficiently low (Affective Filter).He suggested that if second language learners were exposed to right kind of input, right attitude, target language will emerge naturally.

Input's role is the activation of inner capacity or inner structure of language acquisition according to Krashen. In his input hypothesis attributed above, it is central to all acquisition, as he refers to some implications:

1.   "Speaking is a result of acquisition and not its cause. Speech cannot be taught directly but emerges on its own as a result of building competence via comprehensible input.

2.   If input is understood, the necessary grammar is automatically provided. Teacher's main role is to ensure that learners receive right order with right quantity.

In contrast to Krashen, Swain points out that the occurrence if language learning is something more than just an input, it occurs through interaction. So, such a broad subject, language acquisition should need to be faced from a broader aspect.

In contrast to Krashen, Swain points out that the occurrence of language learning is something more than input, it occurs through the interaction. So, language acquisition should need to be focused such a broad subject, language acquisition from a broader perspective. Not only comprehension of input, but also other aspects of interaction plays active role. For instance; Lightbown & Spada (1990), Lyster &Ranta (1997), Doughty &Williams (1998) and others argued how interaction provides opportunities for both message of input and also focus on form as well. Some researchers, for example, Aljaafreh &Lantolf (1994) and Nassaj and Swain (2000) have examined which type of feedback will be most helpful to learners in interactions.

According to Van Lier, interaction is more than a source of comprehensible input or input as feedback. Interaction also provides learners to use the target language (Swain, M.) which is called output. "The meaning of output has shifted from the 80"s till now from output being understood as a noun, a thing, a product to being output as a verb, an action, a process.(Swain, M. The Output Hypothesis: its History and its future).

As Swain argued elsewhere (1995), "output pushes learners to process more deeply with more mental effort than input. It stimulates learners to move from the semantic, strategic processing in comprehension to the complete grammatical processing needed for accurate production. It plays a significant role in language development. For example; one role of input is to promote "noticing". Ellis examines noticing as the basis for the acquisition of linguistic form (1994). Schmidt in his noticing hypothesis (1990, 1995, 2001) points out the significance of noticing for learning. He states that attention or notice to input is crucial for L2 process.

According to Kim, J.H., those subscribing to the noticing hypothesis (Ellis, R. 1991; Gass &Varonis, 1994); Schmidt 1990,1995, 2001) and the supporters of output hypothesis (Harley, 1988; Swain 1985; Swain & Lapkin, 1995; Izumi & Lapkin 1995) strongly attribute crucial importance to corrective feedback . In the light of empirical researches in immersion classes, its absence is seen as effective on the deficiencies in learner performance. They recognize the value of corrective feedback and its facilitative role in drawing learner attention to form. In noticing hypothesis, corrective feedback has a stimulus function and it helps the learner notice the gap between IL and the target form.

Similarly, Long supports the corrective feedback and asserts the interactions including implicit corrective feedback is facilitative in second language (L2) development in his updated version of Interaction Hypothesis (1996) in Kim,J.H.)

At that point, Vygotsky"'s sociocultural perspective of learning can be seen in a strict relationship with the interaction hypothesis (Menti, M.,1972). Because, Vygotsky (1972) examines the occurance of learning through interaction and scaffolding in his ZPD. Scaffolding provides assistance the teacher or other learner, while dealing with the in a communicative task that is impossible without a teacher's assistance. He points out that secong language (L2) learners' progress to higher levels of linguistic knowledge in interactions with speakers of second language (L2). The basic differences between Vygotsky"'s sociocultural theory and interaction hypothesis: Firstly, according to Vygotsky, language acquisition occurs in the interactions of learner and interlocutors, while, interaction hypothesis focuses on the modification and negotiation for meaning. Secondly, Vygotsky attributes greater importance to conservations with learning occurring through social interaction, on the other hand, interaction hypothesis emphasize on the individual cognitive processes in the mind of the learner.

Milani, N. (2009) says that there is variety of correction. The teacher may directly or indirectly can correct errors. Rod Ellis suggests a taxonomy of corrective feedback strategies:

	Implicit	Explicit
Input-Providing	Recasts	Explicit correction
Output-prompting	Repetition	Metalinguistic Explanation Elicitation Paralinguistic Signal

1.   Recast: The corrector incorporates the content words of immediately preceding incorrect utterance and changes, and corrects the utterance in some way(e.g. Morphological, syntactic, lexical)(Braidi, 2002)
Example: L: I went there two times
         T: You have been. You have been there twice as a group?
2.   Repetition: Corrector repeats the incorrect utterance and provides the correct answer. It is used often by teachers with metalinguistic feedback. "Why was it wrong? We don't use "more" with fast. It is faster."
   S: The dog is more fast.
 T: More fast or faster? The dog is faster.
2.   Clarification Request: The corrector indicates that He/She has not understood what the learner said.
L: What do you spend with your wife?
T: What?
3.   Explicit Correction: The corrector indicates that an error has been committed, indentifies the error and provides the correction.
L: On May.
T: Not on May, In May. We say "it will start in May".
4.   Elicitation: The corrector repeats part of the learner utterance but not erroneous part and uses rising intonation to signal the learner should complete it.
L1: My teacher always come late to the class.
T: Say that again.
L1: My teacher always come late to class.
T: My teacher always...?
L1:Comes? Comes late to class.
5.   Paralinguistic Signal: The corrector uses a gesture or facial expression to indicate that the learner has made an error.
L: Yesterday, I go cinema.
T: Gestures with right forefinger over shoulder to indicate past.
Tatatwy(2002) states that the effectiveness of different types of feedback is determined whether or not it results in uptake and whether or not it results in successful repair. Slimoni (1997) defines uptake as "what the learners report that they have learnt from a particular lesson. In addition, Lyster & Ranta (1997) defines it as " a student's utterance immediately follows the teacher's feedback(p. 49)
Tatatwy points out that in order to meet Ll development, for corrective feedback, certain conditions should be met.
1.   Teachers need to be systematic and consistent in their provision of feedback.
2.   Corrective feedback should be clear enough.
3.   The techniques employed should allow for time and opportunity for self and peer repair and modified

output.

4.   Feedback should be fine tuned in the sense that there should be as close a match as possible between teacher's intent. The targeted error, learners' perception of the given feedback.

5.   Feedback provided should focus on one error at a time, over a period of time. i.e. the feedback should be intensive and consistent in intent.

6.   The learners" developmental readiness to process the feedback provided should be taken into consideration.

Conclusion

This paper aims to show the positive effects of corrective feedback and related implications. As we all know language acquisition is one of the most complicated topics in the field and what makes it difficult is not because its hard to study but because every human being is a different world in him or herself. And it is hard to find something that you can give as an universal rule or method to this case. But so far as we have seen from the current studies done show that there are positive results of corrective feedback. These results indicate that corrective feedback more important that thought and shows us that more research on corrective feedback is needed to be done.

References

Lightbown, P.M & Spada, N.(1999). How languages are learned- Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.(CF tanimi)

Elli, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. L2 Journal, volume 1, pp. 3-18 http:/respositories.cdlib.org/ucclt/l12/vol1/iss1/art2/ (CF tanimi)

Chomsky N.(1975). Reflections on Language. Newyork: Pantheon

Schwartz B. (1993). On explicit and implicit data effecting and affecting competence and linguistic behavior. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 15, 147- 163

Cook, V.(1991). Second Language Learning And Second Language Teaching. London: Edward Arnold.

Swain, M., The Output Hypothesis and Beyond: Mediating acquistion throught collaborative dialogue.

Francis, N., (2007) Corrective Feedback in l2 Assesment: Negative Evidence and Interaction Practice, Selected paper from the 16th International Sysmposium an English Teaching (2007)

Swain, M. The output Hypothesis: Its history and its future

Schmidt, R., (1995), Consciouness and Foreign Language Learning.Applied Linguistics, 11, 129-158

Schmidt, R. (1995), Consciouness and Foreign Language Learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R, Schmidt (Ed.) Attentćon and Awareness in foreign language learning (pp.-63) Honolulu: Universtiz of Hawai Press

Schmidt, R.(2001), Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.) Cogniniton and second language acquisiston (pp.3-32) Cambridge University Press.

Kim.J.H., Issues of corretive feedback in SLA, Teachers College, Columbia University Working papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, Vol.4 no.2

Long, M.H (1996), The role of Linguistic environment in SLA. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds) Handbook of Second Language Acquisiston, (pp.413-468) San Diago : academic Press.

Menti, M.M., Factors affecting Efl teachers` Choice for different types of corrective feedback, LINGUA-ABMM,APIRS

VYGOTSKI, L. Thought and Language. Cambridge, Massachusetts Institute of Technology 1972

Milani, N. (2009), An analysis Of CF in Speaking Classroom At English Department Of Muhammediyah University OF Surakarta

Ellis, R., Corrective Feedback In Theory, Research And Pratice, University Of Auckland

Slimani, A.(1992). Evaluation Of Classroom Interaction. In C. Anderson &A. Bretta (Eds.), Evaluating Second Language Education (pp. 197-221). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Unversity Press.

Lyster. R., & Ranta,. L.(1997). Corrective Feedback And Learner Uptake. Studies in Second Language Acquisiston19,37-66.