EFFECTS OF WRITTEN RECAST ON THE ACQUISITION OF THE SIMPLE PAST TENSE BY LEARNERS OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

NİHAN YILMAZ

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANA BİLİM DALI

İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLİĞİ BİLİM DALI

GAZİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

TEMMUZ, 2014

TELİF HAKKI ve TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU

Bu tezin tüm hakları saklıdır.Kaynak göstermek koşuluyla tezin teslim tarihinden itibaren 1(bir) ay sonra tezden fotokopi çekilebilir.

YAZARIN

Adı :Nihan
Soyadı :Yılmaz
Bölümü :İngilizce Öğretmenliği
İmza :
Teslim tarihi :

TEZİN

Türkçe Adı : Yazılı Düzeltme Tekniğinin İngilizce'yi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenenlerin Geçmiş Zaman Edinimlerine Olan Etkileri

İngilizce Adı : Effects of Written Recast on the Acquisition of Simple Past Tense by Learners of English as a Foreign Language

ETİK İLKELERE UYGUNLUK BEYANI

Tez yazma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyduğumu, yararlandığım tüm kaynakları kaynak gösterme ilkelerine uygun olarak kaynakçada belirttiğimi ve bu bölümler dışındaki tüm ifadelerin şahsıma ait olduğunu beyan ederim.

Yazar Adı Soyadı: Nihan YILMAZ

İmza:

JÜRİ ONAY SAYFASI

……………………………………. tarafından hazırlanan "………………………..
……………………………………………………." adlı tez çalışması aşağıdaki jüri
tarafından oy birliği / oy çokluğu ile Gazi Üniversitesi
………………………………………........ ……………….. Anabilim Dalı'nda
Yüksek Lisans / Doktora tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Danışman: (Unvanı Adı Soyadı)

(Anabilim Dalı, Üniversite Adı)   ……………………

Başkan: (Unvanı Adı Soyadı)

(Anabilim Dalı, Üniversite Adı)   ……………………

Üye: (Unvanı Adı Soyadı)

(Anabilim Dalı, Üniversite Adı)   ……………………

Üye: (Unvanı Adı Soyadı)

(Anabilim Dalı, Üniversite Adı)   ……………………

Üye: (Unvanı Adı Soyadı)

(Anabilim Dalı, Üniversite Adı)   ……………………

Tez Savunma Tarihi: …../…../……….

Bu tezin …………………………………………………….Anabilim Dalı'nda
Yüksek Lisans/ Doktora tezi olması için şartları yerine getirdiğini onaylıyorum.

Unvan Ad Soyad

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürü   ……………………

Aileme…

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

pieces of advice you have given me and I appreciate each of them. Thank you for always being there for me. I wish all the best for you. Canım abim, I love you soooo much! This thesis also belongs to you as you made it happen.

Canım eşim, ever since we met, you have always supported me and stood by me. Whenever I felt like I could not go on, you always made me feel that I would never walk alone. Knowing that you are always proud of me makes me want to achieve more. Thank you for being such a great husband. My soulmate, my love, my friend till the end. I love you so much. I hope this year will pass quickly and we will be together forever.

Last but not least, I would like to thank everyone who has somehow been involved in this thesis, namely the participants, my colleagues and my friends who have also supported me throughout the whole process. Your help is unforgettable.

YAZILI DÜZELTME TEKNİĞİNİN İNGİLİZCE'Yİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENENLERİN GEÇMİŞ ZAMAN EDİNİMLERİNE OLAN ETKİLERİ

(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)

Nihan Yılmaz

GAZİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Temmuz, 2014

ÖZ

Yarı deneysel olan bu çalışma, bir düzeltici dönüt türü olan yazılı düzeltme amaçlı tekrarın, İngilizce geçmiş zaman fiil çekimlerinin öğrenimine olan etkisini incelemiştir. Bu çalışma ayrıca, yazılı düzeltme amaçlı tekrarın, düzenli ya da düzensiz fiillerde daha etkili olduğunu bulmayı amaçlamıştır. Çalışma son olarak öğrencilerin düzeltici dönüt hakkındaki görüşlerini araştırmıştır. İngilizce öğrenen kırk sekiz Türk öğrenci, ön test, deneyden hemen sonra yapılan test ve geciktirilmiş test desenli bu çalışmaya katılmıştır. Bu öğrenciler rastgele olarak, deney grubu (düzeltme amaçlı tekrar) ve hiç dönüt almayan kontrol grubuna atanmıştır. Sonuçlar, deney grubunun, kontrol grubundan istatistiki anlamda daha başarılı olduğunu ve hem düzenli hem de düzensiz fiil çekimlerinde önemli edinimler kazandığını göstermektedir. Ancak kontrol grubu, hiçbir testte istatistiki olarak gelişme sağlayamamıştır. Çalışmada ayrıca, deney grubunun, düzensiz fiillerde, düzenli fiillere oranla daha başarılı olduğu sonucu çıkmıştır. Deneyin sonunda, deney grubundaki yedi kişiye uygulanan anket ise, katılımcılarının çoğunun düzeltici dönütü tercih ettiğini ve düzeltici dönüt hakkında olumlu fikirleri olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu çalışma, yazılı düzeltme amaçlı tekrar hakkında ümit veren bulgular içermektedir.

Bilim Kodu:

Anahtar Kelimeler: düzeltici dönüt, yazılı düzeltici dönüt, düzeltme amaçlı tekrar

Sayfa Adedi: 88

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Cem Balçıkanlı

EFFECTS OF WRITTEN RECAST ON THE ACQUISITION OF THE SIMPLE PAST TENSE BY LEARNERS OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

(M.A Thesis)

Nihan Yılmaz

GAZI UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

July, 2014

ABSTRACT

This quasi-experimental study examined the effects of written recast, a type of corrective feedback, on the acquisition of English past tense verb conjugations. The study also aimed to find whether written recast helped learners learn regular or irregular past tense verb conjugations to a more significant degree. Forty-eight Turkish learners of English participated in this study with pre-test, immediate post-test, delayed post-test design and were randomly assigned to two groups: experimental (recast) group or control group which received no feedback. Results show that experimental group significantly outperformed control group and had significant achievements on both regular and irregular verb conjugations, while control group was not able to perform significantly on any of the tests. It was also found that the experimental group performed better on irregular verb conjugations than regular verb conjugations. Finally, a questionnaire was administered to seven participants in experimental group to get their perceptions about corrective feedback. The results reveal the fact that the majority of the participants in the questionnaire prefer to be corrected and have a positive image of corrective feedback. Overall, the study has promising results about written corrective feedback.

Science Code :

Key Words   : corrective feedback, written corrective feedback, recast, written recast

Page Number : 88

Supervisor   : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cem Balçıkanlı

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

CF: Corrective Feedback

ELT: English Language Teaching

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching

TL: Target Language

NS: Native Speaker

WCF: Written Corrective Feedback

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Problem Statement

The most efficient form of grammar instruction is one of the hottest debates in current Second Language Acquisition (hereinafter SLA) (Sheen, 2002). According to Long (1988, 1991), grammar instruction can take place in two opposite ways: focus on form and focus on formS. Though these two are discussed in detail in the literature review section, it would be worth touching them here briefly. The difference between these two is that the former induces students to pay attention to linguistic items when students encounter them in lessons where primary focus is on "meaning or communication" (Long, 1991, p. 45); whereas the latter, focus on formS (S is capitalized to show the difference between focus on form and focus on forms in a clearer way) refers to teaching grammar items one by one, in separate sessions like the traditional way of teaching grammar (Sheen, 2002). When it was discovered that neither produced accurate learners, embedding focus on form in focus on formS was suggested and studies were conducted (e.g., Doughty & Varela, 1998). When Doughty and Varela (1998) found that embedding focus on form and focus on formS, namely adding intonational focus and corrective recasting, was effective in terms of grammatical accuracy, whether it is beneficial to provide students with corrective feedback or not in grammar teaching has been questioned by many researchers (e.g., Ellis, 1993, 1994; Long, 1996; Schmidt, 1990, 1993, 1995; Terrell, 1977). Before moving on further, it would be wise to look at one of the most recognized definition of corrective feedback. Lightbown and Spada (1999) define corrective feedback as:

> Any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect. This includes various responses that the learners receive. When a language learner says, 'He go to school everyday', corrective feedback can be explicit, for example, 'no, you should say goes, not go' or implicit 'yes he goes to school every day', and may or may not include metalinguistic

1

information, for example, 'Do not forget to make the verb agree with the subject'. (p. 171-172)

One of main reasons underlying for corrective feedback is that it was suggested that students had to be exposed to correct language use to acquire the language (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). If the importance of corrective feedback is underestimated, these low quality products of learners will last and learners will end up with fossilization (Selinker, 1972) and might not be able to communicate well in the target language. In this sense, scholars turned their attention to corrective feedback and its implications in SLA.

In their study, Lyster and Ranta (1997) found out six different focus on form (corrective feedback) techniques used by teachers and divided them into two categories: implicit and explicit. Recasts and clarification requests are under the category of *implicit corrective feedback* while explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition fall under the explicit category (Davies, 2006). Recasts are the most preferred corrective feedback type by teachers in many settings (Ellis, Loewen & Basturkmen, 1999, 2001; Lee, 2007; Lyster & Mori, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova, 1999; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Tsang, 2004). Recasts first appeared in L1 acquisition studies (Bohannon & Stanowicz, 1988) because these scholars found out the fact that adults tried to correct children's erroneous L1 use by providing them with the correct version of the ill-formed utterance. A child who utters "I go to school yesterday" is corrected by the adult native speaker of English with the reformulated utterance, "You went to school yesterday". When the same correction is applied to SLA, the dialogues are quite the same. For example, if a student or a learner says "She doed her homework two days ago" and after him, the teacher or the interlocutor says "She did her homework two days ago", this shows that the teacher or the interlocutor has used the recast technique as a corrective feedback type, as it is obvious that the teacher or the interlocutor reformulated the ill-formed part ('did' instead of 'doed') and repeated the rest of the sentence, focusing on the erroneous part of the utterance only.

In this study, the researcher would like to investigate the effects of recast (if there is any) on the acquisition of simple past tense. The reason for this is that it has been found to be problematic by many learners (e.g., Çakır, 2011; Wang, 2009). Wang (2009) found out that present and past tense cause problems for learners, and they confuse the conjugations of verbs in the context and tend to use a form of the verb in the inappropriate context.

2

According to Çakır's (2011) study, the past simple is a confusing tense to learn for Turkish learners of English. For Turkish learners, one can also see interferences from present perfect tense in simple past tense, as the differences between present perfect tense and simple past tense are not clear and accurate (Swan, 1982). Turkish learners of English mostly have problems in understanding the functions of present perfect tense in English. As a consequence, they may use the past participle form of a verb instead of the past simple form of that verb. Especially when the past simple and past participle form of a verb is different from each other, students may tend to use each form interchangeably, ending up with an erroneous utterance.

1.2 Research Questions

This study tries to answer three questions:

1. What are the effects of written recasts on the acquisition of irregular and regular simple past tense verb conjugations by adult Turkish learners of English?
2. If written recast has a significant effect on learning simple past tense verb conjugations, is this effect more differential on regular verbs or on irregular verbs?
3. What are the perceptions of adult Turkish learners of English about the use of corrective feedback?

The researcher implements a mixed-method research design to answer these questions. For the first question, a quantitative research design, a quasi-experimental research design with pre-test, treatment, post-test and delayed post-test is used. For the second question, on the other hand, an interview is conducted with a sample (n=7) of participants in the experimental group. Therefore, for the second research question, a qualitative method is designed. This combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in one research design is called *triangulation* (Dörnyei, 2007) and "it is seen as an effective strategy to ensure research validity" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 165). Since validity lies at the heart of a good research, triangulation is needed and applied in this research for this reason.

1.3 Significance of the Study

This study is expected to add up to current SLA research on the effectiveness of recasts, a type of corrective feedback. In their study, Ammar and Spada (2006) found out that "exposure to instruction and large doses of input is less effective than instruction and exposure plus corrective feedback" (p. 566). However, they also add that there is no certainty over which feedback type is more effective than others and they point out to the need of research in

different contexts with different target structures to make sure that one specific corrective feedback type is effective, as their study's title asks: One size fits all?. Russell and Spada (2006) also prompt keen researchers to "consolidate efforts and focus on Corrective Feedback (hereinafter CF) variables that appear to be particularly fruitful for future investigation" (p. 32). Hence, this study will investigate a possible cure (recasts) for a problematic grammar item, irregular and regular simple past tense verb conjugations. These conjugations cause a problem because they appear to rank low in the order of acquisition lists suggested by many scholars (e.g., Brown, 1973; Dulay & Burt, 1974; Klein, 1995; Krashen, 1977). Thus, this study will provide new insights into this issue for adult Turkish learners of English and prospective regulations in teaching simple past tense could be made in accordance with the results of this study.

1.4 Background to the Study

In Foreign Language Teaching history, two extreme views about error correction stand out: According to supporters of Grammar Translation Method, teachers should correct every single error of students; however, supporters of communicative and content-based teaching are opposed to correcting errors. However, when it was clear that the latter approach yielded grammatically inaccurate language use of students, the need for error correction was inevitable (Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013). Though put simply as "responses to learner utterances containing an error" (Ellis, 2006, p. 28), corrective feedback is more of a deeper issue, quoted as "a complex phenomenon with several functions" (Chaudron, 1988, p. 152). It is also worth noting that even 35 years after Hendrickson's list of questions such as Should learners' errors be corrected? When should learners' errors be corrected? Which errors should be corrected? How should errors be corrected? Who should do the correcting?still have no concrete answers (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) and results may vary from one context to another, as Ammar and Spada quotes (2006), "One size does not fit all" (p. 566). Ellis (2012) also holds the opinion that it would be wrong to try to find the most effective corrective feedback type because classrooms around the world have a different classroom culture. Even so, there has been an increasing attention given to the questions *"Should errors be corrected?"* and *"How should errors be corrected?"* by many scholars and many studies have been conducted based on these questions to find out whether corrective feedback did play a role in language learning, and if so, which feedback type yields more efficient results in the contexts they were held (e.g., Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 1999; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Loewen & Philp, 2006; Lyster, 1998; Lyster, 2004; Lyster &

Ranta, 1997; Mackey, Gass & McDonough, 2000; McDonough, 2005; Oliver & Mackey, 2003). After these studies, it was widely agreed that corrective feedback may play an essential role in learning and especially one specific corrective feedback type, recasts, stand out in many studies (e.g., Doughty, 1994; Ellis, Loewen & Basturkmen, 1999; Havranek, 1999; Lochtman, 2000; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mackey, Gass & McDonough, 2000). On the other hand, though, it was questioned whether all recasts were the same in the type of the evidence they provide. Some scholars believe that recasts provide negative evidence (e.g., Doughty & Varela, 1998; Long & Robinson, 1998), showing what is not acceptable in language, whereas some other scholars believe that it provides learners with positive evidence, stating what is acceptable in language (Gass, 1997). Some scholars even narrow it more and state that recasts provide implicit negative evidence (e.g., Long & Robinson, 1998) as recasts tempt students to realize their errors. Furthermore, the delivery of recasts has been questioned, whether they should be delivered with emphasis on the error or without the emphasis, with a first attention taking phrase or not (Calve, 1992; Chaudron, 1977; Doughty, 1999; Lyster, 1998; Netten, 1991). However, it should be noted that implicit and explicit types are not limited to recasts only. They also refer to corrective feedback (hereinafter CF) and types of corrective feedback. The criterion that determines whether a type of CF is implicit or explicit is related to Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1996), which advocates noticing target structures in the input while interacting. In other words, if a learner says something that the interlocutor does not understand, they may negotiate on the meaning and the learner can be provided with corrective feedback on his grammar and productive skills (Ellis, 1997). Thus in this sense, the explicit corrective feedback is more noticeable than the implicit one (Mackey, Gass, & Leeman, 2007); however, some scholars hold the opinion that implicit CF is more efficient in the long term (Mackey & Goo, 2007; Li, 2010).

In CF, not only the type, but also students' and teachers' opinions about CF is essential in choosing whether to use CF or not; and if yes, what type of it will be used. Research shows that students favor CF over the ignorance of their errors (e.g., Jean & Simard, 2011; Plonsky & Mills, 2006). However, studies including teachers' perspectives show that teachers hesitate to correct every error, thinking that providing CF all the time may decrease students' self confidence by correcting them in front of others and also may cause a breakdown in communication by correcting them every time they make an error (Brown, 2009; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005).

All in all, CF and recasts namely seem to be a wide research topic with implicit, explicit types and negative and positive evidence under each from different perspectives, theories, hypotheses like Noticing Hypothesis by Schmidt (1990) and Interaction Hypothesis by Long (1996). These ideas, theories and hypotheses will be discussed in more detail with example studies in the literature review section.

1.5 Limitations to the Study

This study is conducted at Hacettepe University, School of Foreign Languages, Department of Basic English in Ankara, Turkey. As no other students from other universities are involved, the limitation to this study is the student profile. They do not represent other universes; therefore, the study is restricted to Hacettepe University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English context. Another limitation is the number of the target structure in this study. Further studies may include other target structures in English to see on what corrective feedback has the most differential effect, as the actual study only has the simple past tense verb conjugations as the target structure. Also, this study examined the effects of only written recast and this is another limitation to the study, thus further studies may include other types of corrective feedback.

1.6 Definitions of the Key Terms

Corrective Feedback: Corrective Feedback refers to the reaction of the language teacher to the erroneous utterances of the learner. As the name suggests, this reaction aims to correct the error in the utterance. There is no one way to correct the error, though. To give an example, a teacher may correct the learner by giving him the correct version already, or prompting him to say the correct version. However, this study particularly focuses on one type of corrective feedback: written recast.

Written Corrective Feedback: Written Corrective Feedback focuses on the mode of delivery of corrective feedback: it must be in written form; however, the type of corrective feedback does not matter; it may be prompts, recasts, metalinguistic feedback or so. As the literature has generally focused on the effects of oral corrective feedback, the term written corrective feedback is used to distinguish it from oral corrective feedback.

Written recast: Recast is teachers' reformulation of the whole utterance of the student but the erroneous parts (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Though this definition does not necessarily prerequisite that the reformulation should be oral, recast has largely been taken as an oral

way of giving corrective feedback in the literature. Thus, this study uses the term written recast for the written version of recasts.

Explicit knowledge: This refers to the linguistic knowledge that we learn and are aware of consciously (Ellis, 2005). Explicit knowledge on a grammatical item allows one to determine whether a sentence containing that grammatical item is grammatically correct or not and that person can state explicitly why that sentence is grammatically correct or not.

Implicit knowledge: In contrast to explicit knowledge, implicit knowledge does not allow one to come up with linguistic explanations over a sentence. Yet, implicit knowledge gives a person the intuition one needs to determine whether an item is grammatically correct or incorrect but those people with implicit knowledge may not explicitly state why that sentence is grammatically correct or not, they say that it just does or does not sound right to them (Ellis, 2005).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, definitions of corrective feedback in L2, corrective feedback in L2 from a historical perspective, Focus on Form (FonF), Interactional Hypothesis, Attention and Noticing Hypothesis, Output Hypothesis, types of corrective feedback in L2, recast as a type of corrective feedback and studies concerning corrective feedback and recast are presented respectively.

2.2 Definitions of Corrective Feedback in L2

Corrective feedback is one of the terms given to reaction to language learners' errors. Other terms include negative evidence (White, 1989), negative feedback (Annett, 1969; Oliver, 1995), negative data (Schachter, 1991) and focus-on-form (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Long, 1991; Sheen, 2002). As the major concern here is corrective feedback, definitions of corrective feedback are provided in this section, along with comparisons to the other terms.

To begin with, Chaudron (1977) defined corrective feedback as "any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance" (p. 31). He gives a second concept of correction, namely successful correction, which takes place when learner who did the erroneous utterance comes up with the corrected form of the utterance after the correction provided. In this sense, this second concept is not like the first one as the first one does not guarantee students' correct reformulation immediately after the feedback. The third concept is that the learner gains automaticity in correcting his errors; however, Chaudron (1977) states that the first definition is the most employed one by scholars. In his further study, Chaudron (1988) restates the definition of corrective

feedback as "a complex phenomenon with several functions" (p. 152). In the same study, he also states that a true correction happens when learner's erroneous interlanguage rule has changed so that the learner will not do the same error again.

Schachter (1991) holds the opinion that such terms as corrective feedback, negative evidence and negative feedback can be used for one another. The only determiner in using which term is the stance of the researcher. For instance, schoars in the field of applied linguistics tend to use the term corrective feedback, while scholars in the field of language acquisition are likely to use the term negative evidence and psychologists use the term negative feedback. In other words, these aforementioned terms have more or less the same function, providing the learner with the correct form of the utterance by using implicit or explicit correction types. DeKeyser (1993) thinks that error correction is generally under the broader term negative evidence.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) divide negotiation in classroom into two sub-categories: negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form, the latter being related to corrective feedback because in this case the teacher probably negotiates the form of the utterance, not the meaning of it. Russell and Spada (2006) define corrective feedback as "any feedback provided to a learner, from any source that contains evidence of learner error of language form" (p. 134). They include oral, written, implicit and explicit corrective feedback in their definition. Similarly, Ellis (2006, p. 28) also defines corrective feedback as: "responses to learner utterances containing an error". In her meta-analysis, Li (2010, p. 309) states that corrective feedback is "the responses to a learner's nontargetlike L2 production". As can be seen, there are numerous definitions and corresponding terms for corrective feedback, proposed by different scholars. Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013) have pointed out the difficulty to define corrective feedback in one sentence that could be applicable in any context and that corrective feedback is "seemingly simple yet complex phenomenon" (p. 1). What one should bear in mind is that researchers have employed relatively different definitions of corrective feedback and each study related to corrective feedback should be examined under the definition of that researcher has given for corrective feedback.

2.3 Corrective Feedback in L2 From a Historical Perspective

There has been an increase in studies concerning the effects of corrective feedback, which shows that the role of corrective feedback in SLA has become more attractive for researchers (Li, 2010). However, due to some variables such as learner's age, learner's

proficiency level, the use of implicit or explicit corrective feedback, treatment lengths, the settings (classroom, laboratory or group settings) and many others, studies on corrective feedback yielded different results and scholars have had opposing ideas about corrective feedback. In this section, these ideas are presented.

Advocates of both Grammar-Translation Method and Audio-lingual Method, two of the earliest approaches in English Language Teaching (hereinafter ELT) dating back to 1940's and 1950's, believed in error correction and these language teaching methods attributed linguistic errors to either not knowing, not remembering a rule of the language or not being able to apply it to a specific linguistic function. As those advocators of these methods believed in Skinner's behavorist view of language, a more accurate language could be possible with habit formation and this could be supplied by error correction according to them. However, it did not take long to see that habit formation itself could not be the ultimate key to second language acquisition. Especially after generative linguistic theory (Chomsky, 1979) that contradicted with behaviourism in language acquisition, things also started to change in language teaching. It was now believed that errors were natural and actually trying to avoid them was useless, because somehow people seem to acquire their first language without explicit instruction or error correction. It was of no use for an adult to correct his child's speech as the child would not listen to his corrections (Baker, 1979; Fromkin, Rodman & Hyams, 2013). Schachter (1991) points out children do not seem to need negative data; but adult learners of a second language do. The possible conclusions that could be drawn from the fact that children do not need negative data in L1 acquisition are as follows (Gold, 1967, as cited in Schachter, 1991):

a)   Children start with more information than previously assumed in terms of language and therefore they do not need negative data,

b)   Children get the negative data in a way that is not recognized yet,

c)   Children learn what is not acceptable in a language by observing that it never occurs in that language.

Therefore, some scholars (e.g.; Baker, 1979; Chomsky, 1979; Gold, 1967) got interested in what may go in the brain when children acquire their first language without the need for negative data. Chomsky's Universal Grammar theory claimed that a big part of language acquisition was innate, therefore corrections would not work. Therefore, beginning in 1970's and 1980s, explicit grammar teaching and error correction lost its importance and

Communicative Language Teaching (hereinafter CLT), which believed in the need for communication for language acquisition, saw daylight and became popular worldwide. According to this view, error corrections could be ignored as long as they did not cause a breakdown in conveying the message. Explicit grammar teaching was extremely avoided as it was believed not to yield good results. Thus, the trend was to provide an environment as close as possible to the first language acquisition environment to maximize second language learning, the idea which is especially supported by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) and Krashen and Terrell (1983) in their *Natural Approach*, form-focused instruction was highly avoided in many parts of the world. Researchers supporting this idea of second language learning suggested that error correction be prohibited as they could jeopardize the learning process and they sometimes did not work at all (Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Truscott, 1999). They believed that the case for error correction in L1 was valid for L2, too. However, when form-avoided instruction turned out to yield fluent but not accurate learners, Hammerly (1987) stated that it was obvious that CLT was inadequate in developing accuracy in learners. Hence, the role of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback was again questioned in SLA. Immersion programs in Canada were thought to be perfect for second language acquisition as the environment Krashen and Terrell (1983) suggested for optimal language learning was like of the immersion programs. However, learners of these programs turned out to be fluent speakers of French but their grammatical accuracy was relatively low (Swain, 1989). In this sense, Lightbown and Spada (1990) studied the impacts of form-focused instruction on second language items. They examined four different teachers and classroom language. What they meant by form-focused instruction was to attend to learner errors in communicative language learning setting. They found out that the classroom where teacher used form-focused instruction most had learners who could use the progressive –ing and possessive determiners in a more accurate way than the other classrooms in the study, whereas the teacher who avoided form-focused instruction had learners who could use the mentioned structures in the least accurate way. However, they do not suggest that CLT be abandoned completely, they suggest an integration of form-focused instruction for grammar in CLT (Lightbown & Spada, 1990). With this important study, the role of form-focused instruction, attending learner errors was recognized. In a similar study, Doughty and Varela (1998) also asked the question whether focus on form was effective in CLT context. Their findings were similar to Lightbown and Spada's (1990). They found that the treatment group, which they provided

with corrective recasting, did far better at past tense than the control group, which also suggests the need of focus on form in CLT settings.

All in all, it is very easy to find contradictory opinions about corrective feedback throughout SLA history. Even today, one cannot draw a plain conclusion because the type of knowledge to be learned, the kind of evidence presented, the setting where the learning takes place and the cognition level of learners all determine the effects of corrective feedback (Schachter, 1991). Schachter (1991) says that depending on the situation, corrective feedback may be needed or not. For example, the ill-formed utterance may be automatically replaced by the acceptable form and there corrective feedback is not needed. On the other hand, with cases of fossilization, corrective feedback may be the best solution to fix the ill-formed utterance, as the learner will not obviously learn from the positive evidence only. Studies addressing corrective feedback are conducted in different settings with different participants with different target structures, making the whole issue too big to say something universal about. Finally, corrective feedback from a historical perspective can be summarized in one sentence: "Each study is a piece of the puzzle, and it will take a while to see what the final picture looks like" (Schachter, 1991, p. 100).

2.4 Focus on Form (FonF)

Focusing on linguistic forms in the communicative context is called Focus on Form or FonF (Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001; Long, 1991). It was proposed by Long (1991) as an alternative to methods in ELT. Long (1991) presents four reasons for the need to avoid the "methods trap" (p. 39). The first reason he puts is that methods generally overlap. For example, many methods in fact support error correction (Krashen & Seliger, 1975) but they claim to be different from each other, like providing the feedback with hands or signals. In other words, many methods support same things, though they claim the opposite. Another reason is that methods have been found to be no more effective than one another (Long, 1991). With these and other reasons, Long (1991) concludes that methods do not exist and even if they do, it does not matter because they do not work. Two main theories behind the methods make them ineffective (Sarandi, 2009). These are the branches of form-focused instruction (Long, 1996): a) methods with focus on forms, which is different from focus on form in the way that focus on forms treats language as an object and has a linear syllabus with the thought of one language item at one time. In focus on forms, language items are separately treated in non-communicative activities (Ellis,

Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001). However, this is not the way languages are learned. Language learning is way more complex with U-shaped behaviors (Kellerman, 1985) and some structures disappear completely on the way to acquisition (Long, 1991). When focus on forms was found to be ineffective and with the emergence of the need for fluent speakers, b) methods with totally communicative orientations emerged. However, the other side of the coin also couldn't manage to produce both fluent and accurate users despite heavy exposure to input in L2 (Lightbown & Spada, 1990) because White (1987, 1989) argued that learning from positive evidence only was impossible. To illustrate, both "I go to school everyday" and "I go to everyday school" may be effective in communication, and the latter is probably ignored in CLT; however, to avoid fossilization, learners need negative input, error correction, at this point (Long, 1991). Hence, the need to include both communication and form arose. The way to do this was to provide corrective feedback, aimed at learners' linguistic errors (Sheen, 2007). In other words, focus on form, (abbreviated as FonF) is to "draw learners' attention to form in the context of communication" (Sheen, 2007, p. 256). Focus on form has been found to be effective in SLA in many studies (e.g., Ellis et al., 2001; Loewen, 2005; Nassaji, 2010, 2013; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Zhao & Bitchener, 2007). However, one should bear in mind that the efficacy of FonF can vary even in the same classroom context, depending on the interaction of FonF in the classroom (Nassaji, 2013).

Though the definition of focus on form first indicated an incidental focus on form that arose spontaneously (Long, 1991; Spada, 1997), without prior planning, consecutive studies (e.g., Ellis, 2001; Loewen, 2005) expanded the definition to include planned focus on form under the same cover term. Planned focus on form targets predetermined linguistic items through input or output (supplying corrective feedback on target structures), whereas incidental focus on form happens spontaneously without a specific linguistic item in mind beforehand (Loewen, 2005). Planned focus on form has been found to be effective in many settings (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Long, Inagaki & Ortega, 1998). As planned focus on form is aimed at one linguistic item at one item, the actual study falls into planned focus on form since it targets the simple past tense verb conjugations only.

2.5 Interaction Hypothesis

Few human development aspects can be attributed solely to innate or environmental factors and language acquisition is no exception. These aspects require the interaction of these

two, innate and environmental factors, which can change themselves or each other as a result of the interaction (Bornstein & Bruner, 1989). For the second language acquisition, in this sense, it can be said that "neither the environment nor the innate knowledge alone suffice" (Long, 1996, p. 414). Therefore, it is an objection to Krashen's (1985) comprehensible input model which claims to be essential and actually enough for second language acquisition. There is ample evidence that exposure to the Target Language (hereinafter TL), in this case to comprehensible input, does not necessarily lead to a native-like proficiency, as can be seen in immersion programs. For example, thirty eight Italians living in Scotland developed less relative clause formation abilities in English than 48 Italian EFL learners in Italy did (Pavesi, 1986). Other researchers (e.g., Schmidt, 1983; Swain, 1991) also found similar conclusions from their studies, the input alone cannot provide the learners with the acquisition of especially grammatical items in a language. Students of French immersion programs also turned out to lack basic vocabulary items (Harley & Swain, 1984; Harley & King, 1989, as cited in Long, 1996). Hence, a language instruction solely based on input (positive evidence) is necessary, but may not be enough for language acquisition and interaction in the form of error correction, which Long (1996) calls *negotiation for meaning,* is needed. This negotiation may be made by the Native Speaker (hereinafter NS) in the conversation or a more competent speaker of the TL. Long (1996) presents a number of reasons for the need of negotiation for meaning. First, it gives the learner a chance to reformulate what he has said in a grammatically more correct way, increasing the salience of target structures. Second, negotiation for meaning, or interaction increases the level of attention of learners and this leads to the awareness of new forms and the mismatches between the learner's product and the input, giving the learner the idea that what he said is not allowed in the TL. As a result, the focus is shifted to form without getting away from the focus on meaning (Long, 1996). To sum up, the so-called Interaction Hypothesis supports the need for negotiation for meaning, rather than providing positive evidence only, with focus on form in communicative activities. Involving the learner in the conversation and getting his output and shaping it in accordance with the meaning is facilitative of L2 acquisition and interaction is definitely needed in doing this. In the actual study, the researcher applies the Interaction Hypothesis in the following sense: Does interaction, provided by written corrective feedback, have a significant role in acquiring the target structure, simple past tense verb conjugations? To put it the other way round, is positive evidence, which is provided by the teacher talk only in the classroom

15

enough to acquire the mentioned target structure? To what extent is Interaction Hypothesis validated in the current study?

2.6 Noticing Hypothesis

The role of consciousness in SLA has been questioned for decades by many scholars. On the one hand, some scholars claim that language acquisition takes place unconsciously (Seliger, 1983). Holding this view, Krashen and Terrell (1983) believe that there is a distinction between acquiring and learning a language, the former being very close to first language acquisition without formal grammar instruction, and the latter being consciously aware of the linguistic rules of a language. They claim that explicit instruction of a language and correcting errors will not enhance and even jeopardize second language acquisition, and even if they help, they will lead to learning, not to acquisition. Thus, explicit instructions, error corrections and grammar teaching should be avoided. However, this view has been criticized on the grounds that consciousness and awareness are essential for language learning (e.g., Baars, 1997; James & Garrett, 1991; Long, 1991; van Lier, 1991). Schmidt (1983, 1984) conducted a longitudinal study in which a Japanese person in the US with the pseudonym Wes ended up being able to communicate in English but lacking basic grammar forms like possessive pronoun "our". Schmidt (2010) says that he does not still know the reasons for sure, but he is convinced that this is because Wes did not pay attention to, or notice those grammatical features. In another study, Schmidt recorded his Portuguese learning and he realized that though communicative activities in that course were very helpful, he did not learn specific forms in input until he noticed them (Schmidt & Frota, 1986). This was the base for the Noticing Hypothesis, "an hypothesis that input does not become intake for language learning unless it is noticed, that is, consciously registered" (Schmidt, 2010, p. 721). Consequently, the Noticing Hypothesis is a start point to learn a grammatical item. Schmidt and Frota (1986) also developed another concept called noticing the gap, which suggests that the way to eliminate errors is to make conscious comparisons between one's output and the TL input (Schmidt, 2010). Corrective feedback, in this sense, is one of the tools used so that learners can notice the gap (Sarandi, 2009). This hypothesis, therefore, is applied in this study to test whether noticing, attending to errors, could lead to more accurate use of simple past tense verb conjugations.

2.7 Output Hypothesis

Comprehensible Output (CO) or Output Hypothesis is a response to Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis. It was developed by Swain (1985) when she theorized that learning takes place when the learner produces output, then becomes aware of the gap between his output and the target language. Put like this, Output Hypothesis looks similar to the Noticing Hypothesis, as they both attribute the first step of learning to noticing one's non-targetlike utterance. Swain (1993) claims that learners need to be pushed to produce outputs so that they notice the gap and modify their output in accordance with the targetlike output. Ignorance of these gaps will refrain learners' Interlanguage from developing (Swain, 1993). Swain (1985) presents three functions of output:

a. Noticing function: Learners notice the gap between what they *want to* say and what they *can* say, so they notice what they *need to* know to say what they want to say.

b. Hypothesis-testing function: When learners try to say what they want to say, they test a hypothesis and they expect feedback from the native speaker or the interlocutor and reshape their utterances if they see the need.

c. Metalinguistic function: Learners make a reflection on their output and they can internalize the ultimate form of the utterance.

However, Swain (1985) does not hold CO fully responsible for language acquisition, she just emphasizes that CO may play a facilitative role. Nevertheless, Krashen (1998) has arguments against this Output Hypothesis. For the first reason, he states that student production is rare (Krashen, 1994, 1998) and comprehensible output is even rarer. He puts acquisition without output as the second reasons for his being against CO. He puts several studies (Ellis, 1995; Ellis, Tanaka & Yamazaki, 1994; Krashen, 1989; Pitts, White & Krashen, 1989) showing that the acquisition of linguistic features may be possible without the necessity of student output. In this study, however, Swain's (1985) CO hypothesis and views are applied as student outputs are pushed throughout the treatments in the study.

2.8 Types of Corrective Feedback in L2

In this section, the researcher presents types of corrective feedback types suggested by some scholars. To begin with, Lyster and Ranta (1997) found out six corrective feedback types in their study. These are *explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation* and *repetition*.

1. Explicit correction: It refers to the "explicit provision of the correct form" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 46). In other words, teacher provides learner with the correct form of the utterance explicitly (by using expressions such as "You should say …", emphasizing that the learner said the utterance incorrectly.

2. Recasts: Recasts involve "the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 46). For example, if the utterance "She goed to school yesterday" is responded with the utterance "She went to school yesterday", this is a recast. However, the definition and perception of recast varies greatly, therefore, it would be wiser to discuss it in detail with references to studies further, under the section of *Recast: A type of Corrective Feedback.*

3. Clarification requests: When utterances are responded with a *clarification request,* such as "Pardon me?", "I do not understand?", "Excuse me?", an indication that the utterance is somehow ill-formed is made by the teacher. This leads students to rethink about their utterance.

4. Metalinguistic feedback: This type of feedback tells student directly that he has made an erroneous utterance via the expressions "You made an error", "Can you spot the error?", "No", "No, not what you said"; however, it does not clearly state where the error is. However, it may give an idea about the source of the error. For example, when a student uses a masculine article in French incorrectly, instead of a feminine one, the teacher might say: "Is it masculine?" and this counts as a metalinguistic feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

5. Elicitation: When students are prompted to supply the correct form when they make an erroneous utterance, this is called elicitation. The teacher uses some elicitation techniques to indicate where the student went wrong. For example, if the teacher waits for the student to provide the correct form after saying the utterance: "No, not that one. This is a …", this is elicitation. One should note that elicitation and metalinguistic feedback look very similar to each other; however, a question that could be answered with a simple "Yes" or "No" (for example, "Do we say that in English?) is metalinguistic feedback. Elicitation prompts students to come up with the correct reformulation of the utterance.

6. Repetition: As the name says it, repetition refers to teacher's repetition of the utterance, without any change. However, to take student's attention, teacher may use intonation, raise her voice where the error takes place.Student: "I talked to the girl, he was

lovely."Teacher: "He was lovely?"Though this is just a repetition, this feedback type could give a lot to the student about his error.

After 10 years, Lyster and Ranta (2007) grouped mentioned-above feedback types into two general categories: reformulations and prompts. Reformulations are composed of recasts and explicit correction; while prompts are elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests and repetition. The first group, reformulations, already gives the target structure while the second group, prompts, pushes students to think about the correctly formulated utterance.

Sheen and Ellis (2011) came up with a similar grouping, under two main titles: implicit and explicit corrective feedback. They also divided recasts into two sub-groups: conversational recasts and didactic recasts. Conversational recasts take place when there is a communicational breakdown; while didactic recasts can be applied even when there is no communicational breakdown. Thus, conversational recasts, repetition and clarification requests are implicit corrective feedback, whereas didactic recasts, explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and paralinguistic signal are explicit corrective feedback.

From the studies above, one can see that corrective feedback types are basically grouped in accordance with their content, whether they include the target utterance or somehow ask the student to find the target utterance.

2.9 Written Corrective Feedback

Written corrective feedback (WCF) has been a much studied and a controversial issue since the mid 90's, when Truscott (1996) claimed that correcting grammatical errors in students' writings is time-consuming, ineffective and even harmful on the grounds that correcting grammar deals with "surface manifestations of grammar, ignoring the processes by which the underlying system develops" (p. 344). For time concerns, Truscott (1996) states that it takes a lot of time for teachers to correct every grammar mistake and this is not practical. What's more, correcting grammar could be harmful because it intervenes with the natural acquisition of a language. Truscott (1996) shows many studies that show no significant change and even harmful change caused by CF (e.g.; Kepner, 1991; Semke, 1984; Sheppard, 1992). After the response article by Ferris (1999), though, Truscott (1999) admitted that his claims in his paper in 1996 were too strong and too broad and more research is needed to make a concrete conclusion. What both Ferris and Truscott did

together was calling out researchers to conduct research in this area and there have been numerous studies since then (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010b) and most researchers do not question whether written CF should be provided or not, rather they are interested in how they can provide a better written CF (Ferris et al., 2013). And one thing is for sure: "written error correction leads to improved accuracy in writing" (Shintani & Ellis, 2013). As Shintani and Ellis (2013) go on, they state that no studies which addressed the effects of written CF on explicit knowledge have been conducted yet. This actual study, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, is one of the first studies that totally focus on explicit knowledge.

Research concerning CF has mostly been about oral corrective feedback and written CF studies are relatively few (Sheen, 2007). Even though it seems that only the name changes (oral or written), there are more differences than the name (Bitchener, 2008). To begin with, written CF is delayed while oral CF is immediate (Sheen, 2007). Written CF also demands less cognition and less reliance on memory than oral CF does, which could be a result of the first difference. Another difference could be about the attitude of teachers towards writing: Some teachers evaluate writings on overall criteria, rather than focusing one linguistic item at a time, which oral CF does. As many studies (e.g.; Doughty & Varela, 1998; Han, 2002; Iwashita, 2003) show, CF that focus on one language item at one time can contribute a lot to learners' interlanguage development. This has led to the conclusion that oral CF may be superior to written CF in the efficiency CF has, but as can be seen, there is an ambiguity here (Ferris, 2004; Sheen, 2007). In this sense, the aim in this actual study is to take the focus of oral CF, one linguistic item at one time, and apply it with the design of written CF. Before moving on to the studies, it would be important to note that many studies with written CF are limited in some ways and concrete conclusions about the effectiveness of written CF may not be possible. Some studies do not have a control group to compare the effectiveness of written CF (e.g.; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 1995, 1997). Some studies have a control group that receives another type of written CF, like comments on content of the writings (e.g.; Fazio, 2001; Lyster & Yang, 2010). It shouldn't be forgotten that control groups should receive no feedback to actually understand the effectiveness of corrective feedback. Some studies lack delayed post-tests, which can illuminate whether learning has taken place, because learning can be said to take place over delayed post-tests or when learners can apply what they learned in their future writings (Ellis et al., 2008; Truscott, 1999). As Bitchener (2008) puts it, researchers should design their studies carefully and they should examine the target structures over time and

they should have a control group, which receives no feedback, in their studies. This is the only way to get a clearer idea of the effectiveness of written CF. The main concern with this design, however, is that the question whether it is ethical to leave control group students with no feedback while others get feedback (Ferris, 2004). This concern is the actual reason why some studies lack control groups which receive no feedback.

When it comes to the types of written CF in aforementioned studies, one sees that scholars part according to the categorization they make. Some tend to divide written CF into two categories: direct and indirect CF, the former referring to supplying the student with the correct form, the latter referring to taking attention to the errors without stating explicit reasons why they are erroneous (Ellis et al., 2008). As indirect CF does not point the error explicitly, it may be used to strengthen learners' knowledge, not to teach them something new. Direct CF, on the other hand, may be used both to strengthen knowledge and teach them something they do not know, as direct CF presents the correct form already (Ellis et al., 2008). Direct CF tends to facilitate the learning process when learners have no or ill-formed of a grammatical feature (Shintani & Ellis, 2013). This is why the actual study uses direct CF, not only because some students may not have ever gotten acquainted with simple past tense verb conjugations, also because many students have problems with simple past tense verb conjugations, even at upper-intermediate or advanced levels (Ellis et al., 2006; Lyster & Yang, 2010). Another categorization of written CF is dividing it into two: direct and metalinguistic feedback. In this categorization, direct CF refers to the direct CF in the categorization in the paragraph above, whereas metalinguistic feedback refers to the provision of grammar rules. The last categorization is in accordance with the focus of the written CF: Is the focus on specific items, or is every error corrected irrespective of their types (morphological, syntactical, lexical etc)? If the focus is on specific and pre-determined items like "only grammatical errors", then it is focused CF, if every error is treated, then it is unfocused CF (Ellis et al., 2008). As the focus is on one specific item, one can say that the actual study uses focused CF. And because it directly and explicitly gives the correct form without any further explanations, the researcher callsthe way of written feedback in the study as written recast.

2.10 Studies Addressing Written Corrective Feedback

In this section, backbone studies addressing written corrective feedback and its effects are presented. Contradictory results have been found in these studies, whereas some support

the efficacy of written CF, some do not. Since one of the variables that determine the efficacy is the target structure; therefore, only the studies that focus on the effects of written CF on grammatical items are presented in the table below.

Table 1: Summary Of Some Studies Addressing The Effect Of Written Corrective Feedback (hereinafter WCF) On Grammatical Items

Author(s) (Year)	Setting and Participants	Target structure	Design	WCF type	Findings
Bitchener, Young & Cameron (2005)	53 Chinese EFL learners	Prepositions Simple past tense Definite article	Quasi-experimental with pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test 4 writing tasks over 12 weeks	direct WCF direct + oral control group	direct + oral outperforms others
Sheen (2007)	91 ESL learners in the US	Articles	Quasi-experimental with pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test 2 narrative tasks Speeded dictation test Error correction test	Direct only group direct metalinguistic group control group	Both treatment groups outperform the control group on immediate post-test Direct metalinguistic group outperforms others
Sheen, Wright & Moldawa (2009)	80 ESL learners in the US	Definite and indefinite articles Copula 'be' Regular and irregular past tense Prepositions	Quasi-experimental with pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test 2 writing tasks Written narrative, exit questionnaire	Focused CF Unfocused CF Writing practice Control group	Focused CF more effective than unfocused CF Unfocused CF not better than C.G. Writing practice outperforms C.G.
Bitchener and Knoch (2010a)	63 advanced L2 learners in the US	English articles use	A pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test design 3 pieces of picture description	Direct CF Indirect CF Direct + Metalinguistic explanation & oral review Control group	All treatment groups outperform the control group, but only the direct CF groups outperform the indirect one.
Van Beuningen, De Jong, Kuiken (2012)	268 secondary school learners of English in the Netherlands	(The aim is to examine whether written CF can function as an editing tool and can have a learning effect)	A pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test design Receptive vocabulary test, background questionnaire, 3 writing tasks	Direct CF Indirect CF Control group 1: Self correction Control group 2: Writing practice	CF improves learners' accuracy regardless of their proficiency level, in contrast to Truscott (1996)'s arguments
Shintani and Ellis (2013)	49 low-intermediate ESL learners in the US	The English indefinite article	Quasi-experimental with pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test 3 picture composition tasks, background questionnaire, error correction test	Direct CF Metalinguistic explanation Control group	M.E more effective than DCF on explicit knowledge This effect not in new writings

As can be seen from the table above, many studies show advantages of CF over no CF. However, it should be kept in mind that results may vary in accordance with the setting, participants, target structure, treatments and the learners' learning strategies and preferences. This actual study, in this sense, will contribute to literature with the setting and participants in Hacettepe University, Turkey.

2.11 Recast: A type of Corrective Feedback

Though recast in the actual study means recast in L2, recasts were first used in parent-child dyads and studies (e.g., Bohannon & Stanowicz, 1988; Farrar, 1990, 1992). Recast is defined as utterances that reformulate an ill-formed utterance by changing one or more components in the utterance while keeping the actual meaning (Long, 1996). With a more well-known definition, recasts are "teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 46). Recasts are one of the corrective feedback types proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), the other types being explicit correction, clarification requests, metalinguistic information, elicitation and repetition. However, none of these types have taken attention as much as recasts have (Ellis & Sheen, 2006). As for the reasons, Ellis and Sheen (2006) propose that recasts occur frequently in SLA classrooms and they put forward theoretical issues (implicit vs. explicit and positive vs. negative evidence).

Scholars basically examined the frequency and effect of recasts in SLA and learners' reactions to and interpretations of recasts (e.g., Ammar & Spada, 2006; Ellis, Loewen & Erlam; 2006; Han, 2002; Ishida, 2004; Leeman, 2003; Lyster, 2004; Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster & Yang, 2010; Mackey, Oliver & Leeman, 2003; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Philp, 2003; Sheen, 2004). However, as Sheen (2006) states "These studies have utilized a variety of operational definitions of recasts, making comparison of the findings difficult and generalization problematic" (p. 362). Recasts have not necessarily meant the same thing to all scholars by its definition, which created a controversy about the nature of recasts. Ellis et al. (2006) claimed that recasts are not defined clear enough in many studies. To begin with, recasts are generally regarded as implicit as they do not point out explicitly that the learner has made an error (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Ammar & Spada, 2006; Long, 2007). For instance, Long (2007) emphasized the implicitness of recasts by the statement: "implicit negative feedback in the form of corrective recasts seems particularly promising" (p. 76). Though recasts do not necessarily state that the learner has made an error, some scholars hold the opinion that recasts can also be quite explicit (e.g., Ellis &Sheen, 2006;

Lyster, 2002; Nassaji, 2009; Zhuo, 2010). Lyster (2002) points out, for example, that the recast in Doughty and Varela's (1998) study contained *corrective recasting,* with repetition and stress, which made the recast more explicit than its 'implicit' nature. To illustrate, Doughty and Varela (1998, p. 124) give the example below as a recast:

S: I think that the worm will go under the soil.

T: I *think* that the worm *will* go under the soil? (think and will stressed)

S: (no response)

T: I thought that the worm would go under the soil.

From the dialogue above, it is clear that the teacher used repetition and stress as components of recast. This shows that recasts stand on a "implicit/explicit continuum" (Sheen, 2006, p. 364) or Doughty and Williams's (1998) "unobtrusiveness/obtrusiveness" continuum. Therefore, it would be wrong to take it for granted that all recasts are implicit.

The second blurry issue is that the type of evidence recasts provide the learner with. To begin with, it would be wise to define positive and negative evidence. According to Long (2006), positive evidence entails what is acceptable in a language, and negative evidence is what is not. In this sense, recasts first alert the learner that his utterance is not acceptable in the target language (negative evidence) and then provide him with the acceptable form of the erroneous utterance (positive evidence). Therefore, recasts both provide positive and negative evidence (Leeman, 2003; Loewen & Philp, 2006; Swain & Suzuki, 2010).

2.12 Studies Addressing The Effects of Recast

Scholars have contrary views about the effectiveness and efficiency of recasts, or in a more general term, corrective feedback. There are scholars who believe in corrective feedback (Ferris, 2003, 2004). However, some scholars like Krashen and Terrell (1983), Schwartz (1993) and Truscott (1996, 1999, 2007, 2008) are totally against corrective feedback and they do not see the need for it, as, according to their studies, corrective feedback barely contributes to SLA. Krashen and Terrell (1983) supports the idea that foreign language acquisition should be as close as to first language acquisition as possible, therefore, correcting learners' errors does not work as it does not work in children's first language errors. Schwartz (1993) states that the change brought by corrective feedback is temporary and it does not go beyond the surface. As one of the harshest critics of corrective feedback, Truscott (1996) states that irrespective of the origin of the study, whether it's based on German L1, Spanish L1 students, EFL or ESL context, corrective feedback is ineffective in developing grammatical accuracy. Truscott (1996) presents many studies (Cohen

&Robbins, 1976; Knoblauch& Brannon, 1981; Krashen, 1984; Semke, 1984; Kepner, 1991; Sheppard, 1992) with the same conclusion, that is, grammar correction (that is what he meant by corrective feedback) does not help at all, either in L1 or L2 studies and it may even jeopardize the acquisition process, therefore should be avoided.

Despite the studies against corrective feedback, meta-analyses of corrective feedback, which are compiled of ample studies, show that corrective feedback is beneficial in SLA (Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Russell & Spada, 2006). However, it should also be noted that there is a variety in corrective feedback, such as the type of corrective feedback (implicit vs. explicit), the setting (laboratory or classroom) (Russell & Spada, 2006). Another thing is that the effectiveness of corrective feedback rely on many factors like the target linguistic structure and learners' ages (Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013).

In this section, in accordance with the actual study, milestone studies that have investigated the effects of recast are discussed with their research questions, methodologies and findings. To begin with, Long, Inagaki and Ortega (1998) examined the effects of recast and models on Japanese adjective ordering and locative constructions. They used a pre-test, treatment, post-test design with 24 learners of Japanese. They divided 24 participants into four treatment and one control group. Two treatment groups received recasts for adjective ordering and models for locative, taking turns for the other group. The other two treatment groups received recasts for locative and models for adjective ordering, again taking turns for the other group. The control group received no treatment at all. They concluded that recasts were more helpful for the mentioned structures, even if for a short term.

Mackey and Philp (1998) also examined the effects of recast and additionally, the responses of learners to recast. Thirty five beginner and lower intermediate learners of English participated in this three-week study. They were asked to perform picture drawing, story completion and story sequence tasks. Mackey and Philp (1998) found out that recasts were beneficial and recasts are "a worthwhile issue for further research" (p. 353). For their second research question, response to recast, they found that 26% of recasts were repeated and 53% of them was recognized by the learner but not repeated. Nonetheless, they conclude that lack of repetition does not necessarily mean lack of acquisition.

Han (2002) examined the effects of recast on tense consistency in L2. He studied 8 adult learners of English, four of them assigned to a recast group and four of them were the

control group with no recast. He applied a pre-test, post-test and delayed post-test design, with recasts for the recast group and no recast for the control group. He collected the data through cartoon strips and narrations by the participants. He found that both in written and oral performances, the recast group did far better than the control group. However, he concluded in his study that conditions like intensity, focus, attention and readiness should be met for the recasts to be more effective.

Leeman (2003) examined the effects of recast, negative evidence and positive evidence during communicative interaction. She had four research questions in her study: a) effects of recast, "negative evidence and enhanced salience of positive evidence" (p. 46) on L2 development, b) effects of negative evidence without enhanced salience of positive evidence on L2 development, c) effects of enhanced salience of positive evidence on L2 development, d) if recasts contribute to L2 development, is this effect attributable to negative evidence or enhanced salience of positive evidence? She studied 74 English learners of Spanish, divided into four groups in accordance with the research questions. Each participant was object to three tests, a pre-test, treatment and immediate post-test. Leeman (2003) coded and transcribed the data and analyzed it with the help of ANOVA and Schiffe post hoc and found out that the recast group and enhanced salience groups performed better than the other groups, suggesting that recast is effective in L2 development.

Ishida (2004) used a longitudinal research design to investigate the effects of recast on Japanese aspectual form *–te i-(ru)*. Four participants attended 8 sessions and two of the participants also attended a delayed post-test. She found that recasts were effective but there may be limitations such as difficult language items or the readiness of the learner that can affect the efficiency of recasts.

Ammar (2008) studied the effects of recasts and prompts on the acquisition of third person possessive determines, *his* and *her*. A total of 64 students were involved in this quasi-experimental study with the pre-test, immediate and delayed post-test design and were assigned to three groups: prompts, recasts and no corrective feedback. What Ammar found in the end was that prompts were more effective than recast and no corrective feedback in a better-formed use of the target structure.

Lyster and Yang (2010) conducted a study whose target structure was the same as this actual study, the irregular and regular simple past tense verb conjugations. They divided 72 Chinese learners of English into three groups: prompts, recasts and no corrective feedback,

similar to the study of Ammar (2008). After conducting ANOVA and Post hoc tests, they also found that prompts were more effective than recasts in terms of regular past tense verb acquisition; however, for irregular past tense verbs, effects of recast and prompts were similar to each other.

Finally, Lyster and Saito (2012) studied the effects of form focused instruction (FFI) and corrective feedback (CF) on the acquisition of /ɹ/ by Japanese learners of English. They divided 65 Japanese learners of English into three groups: FFI + CF, FFI only and the control group with neither FFI nor CF. They found that the FFI + CF group outperformed the other two groups not only in the accuracy but also in the fluency of the mentioned consonant. However, there was not a significant difference between the performances of FFI only and the control group.

The studies above can illustrate much of the effects of recasts; however, it should be kept in mind that because there are so many variables, results may vary. To illustrate, it can be seen that participants in the studies below are of mixed L1 backgrounds, there were Cantonese, Korean, Japanese, Spanish, Chinese and English, to name a few. This is where this actual study contributes, with Turkish learners of English. There are also other variables like setting, students' background and study strategies, students' attitudes towards English and so on, so more studies on the effect of recast with Turkish learners of English are needed.

2.13 Studies Addressing Recast and Corrective Feedback in Turkey

Though corrective feedback has been of great interest in SLA all around the world, studies in this field in Turkey fall short of expectations. In this section, studies done in Turkey concerning corrective feedback are discussed.

One of the earliest studies in this sense, Erten (1993) examined how learner errors were responded by three EFL teachers. He used Chaudron's (1986, 1988) definitions of error types and corrective feedback types. His first research question was how often errors were corrected and when corrected, which errors were corrected. He found that 57% of all errors were corrected. Of these errors, content errors and discourse errors were the most frequently corrected error types. His second research question was which corrective feedback types were used by those three EFL teachers. Ignore, acceptance, delay, provide and 14 other corrective feedback types were found out to be used. Regarding his third and fourth research question, Erten (1993) also found that the teacher varied in correcting

errors, one corrected 50% of the errors, the other two corrected 55% and 66% respectively. Their corrective feedback type also varied for content and discourse errors, one teacher used negation (27%), one teacher used questions (25%), the other teacher used delay (33%) more than the other feedback types for content and discourse errors. Erten (1993) addes another finding, for other types of errors, corrective feedback types employed by teacher do not show great variety.

Es (2003) focused on the implementation of focus on form in EFL classes. He examined which focus on form was more effective in SLA: Input Flood, Input+Output or Input+Output+Feedback? He conducted a quasi-experimental research design with pre-test, post-test and delayed post-tests to see the relationship between focus on form types and SLA, if there is any. He aimed the acquisition of Type 2 and Type 3 conditionals. Sixty five Turkish intermediate learners of English at Anadolu University, divided into three experimental groups, were exposed to a six-hour instruction for two weeks with pre-tests and post-tests. Es (2003) concluded that Input+Output or Input+Output+Feedback type of focus on form were more effective in acquisition than Input Flood only. However, he did not find any statistical significance between Input+Output or Input+Output+Feedback types in the efficiency ($p > .05$).

Mutlu (2006) wrote her thesis on the effects of corrective feedback on young children. She applied pre-test, post-test, delayed post-test quasi-experimental research design and she drew data from 75 Turkish young learners of English. She divided the participants into three groups to see the effects of implicit and explicit correction versus no correction: implicitly corrected group, explicitly corrected group and the control group (no correction). She found that both groups that were corrected did better than the control group; however, there are some differences in implicit and explicit corrective feedback results. For example, though explicit corrective feedback group did better than implicit corrective feedback in immediate post-test, in delayed post-tests, implicit CF group did better than explicit CF group. Mutlu (2006) states that her study complies with other studies showing a positive correlation between CF and language development. Her study also is in compliance with other studies in terms of the statement that explicit CF works better in immediate post-test than it does in delayed post-tests.

Şahin (2006) conducted his study to examine corrective feedback and uptake relation in EFL classrooms. He videotaped four different classes. Four EFL teachers and 85 EFL

learners participated in his study. He then transcribed the videos in accordance with Lyster and Ranta's (1997) taxonomy of corrective feedback. Şahin (2006), like Lyster and Ranta (1997) found that recasts were the most used corrective feedback type (36%) and elicitation (24%) and metalinguistic feedback (22%) follow recasts. However, recasts did not turn out to yield student generated repairs. Metalinguistic feedback, on the other hand, was the most effective one in learner uptake with the percentage of 38.88%. His results show that instead of providing learners with the correct utterance, making them come up with the correct utterance is far more effective in learner uptake.

Ergünay (2008) studied the effects of written direct corrective feedback and written indirect corrective feedback on the acquisition of state verbs. His study had an experimental design with pre-test, post-test and delayed post-test. He gathered data from 71 intermediate learners of English, divided into three groups, two experimental and one control group, for a 29-day-period. At the end, he found that both of the two experimental group learners did better on post-tests than the control group who received no corrective feedback. He also found direct corrective feedback helped learners to perform better both on immediate post-tests and delayed post-tests. He suggested that error correction not be ignored as it leads to better production.

Sarandi (2009) examined the effects of recasts and prompts on the acquisition of third person "-s". He employed a quasi-experimental study design with pre-tests, post-tests and delayed post-tests. There were 39 participants in his study, divided into three groups: two experimental groups, one of which being treated with recasts and the other with prompts, and one control group, who received no corrective feedback. In immediate post-tests, the recast group outperformed the others; however, in delayed post-tests, there were no significant difference between any of the groups in the perfomance. Therefore, it could be said that recasts had a temporary effect in this study.

Demirci's (2010) study is one of the most related studies to the actual study. She investigated the effects of written implicit and written explicit corrective feedback on past tense marker in English. She collected data from 41 pre-intermediate learners of English in 14 weeks. She used a quasi-experimental research design with two experimental groups, one with written implicit and the other with written explicit feedback, and one control group with no corrective feedback. She found out that in long term, written corrective feedback does not have a huge impact on the acquisition of past tense markers; however,

explicit corrective feedback and interestingly, no corrective feedback help students to perform better than implicit corrective feedback on immediate post-tests.

The studies above can shed light on corrective feedback studies conducted in Turkey. As all the studies above have been conducted in different settings, with different target structures, with different foci, their results vary and may even conflict with each other. However, in most studies it was concluded that providing corrective feedback was, even if slightly, better than providing no corrective feedback and the effects are long-term as delayed post-tests show.

In conclusion, this study aims to find out whether written recast helps students acquire simple past tense verb conjugations or not. To the researcher's knowledge, there are very few studies that solely focus on simple past tense verb conjugations and implementation of corrective feedback into the acquisition of those verb conjugations. Hence, this study intends to fill this gap by this research and contribute to the literature.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The actual study is a mixed methods study with both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. To answer the first and second research question, "What are the effects of written recast on the acquisition of irregular and regular simple past tense verb conjugations by adult Turkish learners of English?" and "If written recast has an effect on learning simple past tense verb conjugations, is this effect more differential on regular verbs or on irregular verbs?", a study with pre-test, two treatments, immediate post-test and delayed post-test was employed. Because the participants were chosen by the researcher, the study is a quasi-experimental study. Initially, sixty A2 level participants were reached for the study, but as forty eight of them completed all the stages of the study, those who did not finish all the parts were excluded from the analysis. These 48 participants were equally and randomly divided into either the experimental or control group. All participants underwent the same process throughout the study except for one thing: Participants in the experimental group received written corrective feedback on what they wrote after the treatments, whereas participants in the control group did not. Pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test were all the same Untimed Grammaticality Judgment Test (UGJT) (Ellis, 2005), designed by the researcher herself. One expert in ELT was asked to check the test in terms of validity and he approved the test. The treatments, two in total, were composed of a fill-in-the-gaps activity and a question-answer activity. To answer the third research question, "What are the perceptions of adult Turkish learners of English about the use of corrective feedback?", a questionnaire taken from Lyster and Yang (2010), Exit Questionnaire, was used. The questionnaire was translated into Turkish so that participants could express themselves better. The questionnaire was consulted to an expert in ELT and

his approval was obtained. As this part of the study is qualitative and the actual aim in qualitative studies is to go further in a small scale of samples (Dörnyei, 2007), 30% of the participants (n=7) in the experimental group took the questionnaire. Participants were told that the interview was in Turkish and voluntary, so the seven volunteers filled in the questionnaire.

The main reason behind including both quantitative and qualitative methods, in other words having a mixed methods research design, was to get most of the advantages of a mixed methods research. First of all, mixed method research design decreases the weakness of running only one method. In fact, Onwuegbuzie and Leech (2005) state that holding onto one method is the biggest obstacle for improvement in social sciences. To avoid such a risk, the researcher has employed both qualitative and quantitative methods and it is believed to strengthen the study. However, when one talks about combining quantitative and qualitative methods, he can ask *how and why* these methods are combined. Greene, Caracelli and Graham (1989) proposed four different functions of mixed methods research, which as follows:

1. Complementary function: In this function, qualitative and quantitative methods complement each other. For example, a theory may be developed first with the help of qualitative method, and then tested with the help of quantitative method.

2. Development function: Qualitative and quantitative methods are conducted one after another so that the former one can give information about the shape of the latter. To illustrate, a questionnaire may yield opinions about the questions of an interview to be conducted later. So the former method helps the latter one *develop*.

3. Initiation function: Results from qualitative and quantitative methods may not always overlap, but this is also a finding and can propose further suggestions. In this function, therefore, the aim is to *initiate* new perspectives on contradictory results.

4. Expansion function: This function expands the scope of a study and adds new dimensions to it. For example, in the actual study, the effects of written recast are sought by a quantitative method (experiment) and the perceptions of corrective feedback, another dimension of the whole issue, is sought by a qualitative method (interview). Therefore, the researcher uses this function of mixed methods research in the study.

One cannot skip the concept of triangulation while talking about mixed methods research. Triangulation in social sciences is defined as "combining data sources to study the same social

phenomenon" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 43). Looking at one thing from just one perspective may not give the ultimate results and one may need to employ different approaches to the same thing. These different approaches contribute to a deeper understanding of the concept. Lazaraton (2005) points out to this fact by saying: "Qualitative and quantitative methods highlight reality in a different, yet complementary way" (p. 219). As mentioned above, the actual study looks at two different points in the whole issue, therefore it is essential to employ a mixed methods research design and make use of triangulation to minimize the possible risks that may be brought about by employing only one method.

3.2 Setting and Participants

The study is conducted at Hacettepe University, the School of Foreign Languages, Department of Basic English in Ankara, Turkey in the spring term of the 2013-2014 academic year. The students at Hacettepe University who are admitted to departments where English is 30% or 100% the medium of instruction have to pass the proficiency exam conducted three times a year (in January, June and September) by Hacettepe University, the School of Foreign Languages. Students can also present TOEFL or IELTS exam results, if they have taken one of these internationally recognized exams, to be exempt from this preparatory program. For students who do not present any legal documents to be exempt, a proficiency exam and a placement test are conducted to put those students into the right proficiency levels. After these exams, students are divided into classes in accordance with their scores on the proficiency exam and the placement test conducted after the proficiency exam. As Hacettepe University the School of Foreign Languages uses the Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, English proficiency levels range from A1 to C2. As "pre-intermediate" students fall into the A2 level, participants were chosen from this level only. The proficiency levels of the students are based on the scoring of the proficiency exam and the placement test conducted by Hacettepe University.

3.3 Target Structures

The target structures in this study are regular and irregular simple past tense verb conjugations. There is one main reason for choosing them and it is the fact that simple past tense verb conjugations seem to be one of the most problematic areas for learners of English, irrespective of their proficiency level, even at intermediate or upper stages (Ellis et al., 2006; Lyster & Yang, 2010; Çakır, 2011). In other words, even students with higher proficiency levels in English may have problems with the simple past tense verb

conjugations. This may be also related to the sequence of acquisition (Ellis, 2003), or order of acquisition (Brown, 1973), which states that some linguistic items are acquired before others while learning English as the native language. Below is a list that shows the order of acquisition, taken from Clark and Clark (1977):

Table 2: Order of Acquisition of English Morphemes As L1 (Clark & Clark, 1977)

1.	Present progressive –ing
2.	Prepositions "in" and "on"
3.	Plural –s
4.	Irregular past tense verb forms
5.	Possessive 's
6.	Articles "a" and "the"
7.	Past regular –ed
8.	Third person regular –s
9.	Third person irregular verb forms like "has, does"
10.	Copula "to be"

As can be seen clearly from table 2, the acquisition of simple past tense verb conjugations even by native speakers of English takes time. For L2 learners of English, Krashen and Terrell (1983) revised the list and proposed another order of acquisition by EFL learners, and it can be seen below:

Table 3: Order of Acquisition of English Morphemes As L2 (Krashen & Terrell, 1983)

1.	–ing
2.	Plural –s
3.	Copula "to be"
4.	Auxiliary verbs
5.	Articles "a" and "the"
6.	Irregular past tense
7.	Regular past tense
8.	3rd person singular
9.	Possessive 's

What can be drawn from the two tables above is that irregular past tense acquisition occurs before regular past tense acquisition both in L1 and L2 acquisition. Knowing before that past tenses are acquired relatively late by native speakers of English, one should not be surprised to see that the same case is valid for L2 learners of English. What is surprising,

though, is that irregular past tenses are acquired earlier than regular past tenses, even though it is thought to be the other way around.

From the discussion above, it is crystal clear that simple past tense acquisition is time-taking both for native speakers of English and naturally for L2 learners of English. This study tries to display whether written recast can lead to a more rapid acquisition of such a challenging linguistic item by Turkish learners of English.

3.4 Untimed Grammaticality Judgment Test (UGJT)

Pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test in this study are all the same Untimed Grammaticality Judgment Test (UGJT), which is proposed by Ellis (2005) and which is very close to Error Correction Test employed by Shintani and Ellis (2013). Before moving on further, it would be worthwhile to discuss the terms "implicit" and "explicit" knowledge. The difference between them could be simply given with the "wug test" example (Berko, 1958). Wug is a made-up word and used to assess first language acquisition. When the question: "You have one wug. What have you got if you have two of them?" was asked to English native children, they immediately responded "two wugs", which shows that they internalized the rule to make plurals, though the word "wug" did not mean anything and though these children had not been taught explicit instruction of grammar. As children did not explicitly know how they pluralized the word wug, it can be said that implicit knowledge is dominant in this case. However, when asked the same question to a language learner with dominant explicit knowledge, he immediately tries to recall the form to pluralize nouns in English and comes up with the answer "two wugs" by thinking and formulating.

Scholars who side with Chomsky (e.g., Gregg, 1989; Hulstijn, 2002; Paradis, 1994) believe that the former, implicit knowledge, is the one that is associated with acquisition, and no transition between implicit and explicit knowledge is possible and explicit knowledge is only superficial. These scholars hold the opinion that the two types of knowledge, implicit and explicit, exist in different parts of brain and transitions between each are almost impossible. However, according to connectionist scholars (e.g., DeKeyser, 1998; Ellis, 2005), transitions are possible. One can convert his explicit knowledge into implicit knowledge; for example, he can learn a linguistic rule explicitly and then internalize it by using it appropriately and then it becomes automatic and implicit after a while (DeKeyser, 1998). In this study, what the researcher is trying to do is exactly this: helping students internalize simple past tense with the help of corrective feedback, namely written recast in

the actual study. Written corrective feedback is already explicit in nature (Shintani & Ellis, 2013), thus one needs to look at the ways how to assess it. Ellis (2005) proposed some metrics to assess implicit, explicit and mixed type knowledge. UGJT is one of the ones he proposed for explicit knowledge. The reason why it is untimed is that when there is a time limit, one appeals to his implicit knowledge, to what sounds right to him implicitly; therefore, time limits should be abolished when assessing explicit knowledge. The studieswhich have UGJT as a testing instrument are very few in number (e.g., Goo, 2012; Li, 2013; Rassaei, 2014). The UGJT in the current study consists of 30 sentences, 11 of which address the regular past tense verb conjugations, and another 10 of which address the irregular past tense verb conjugations. The other 9 sentences focus on different grammatical items like third person singular and thus function as distractors to avoid students from over-focusing on the target structures. Of these 30 sentences, 15 of them are grammatically incorrect and the other 15 are grammatically correct. Participants are supposed to read each sentence and decide whether they are grammatically correct or incorrect. In regular UGJT, there is a Likert-5 scale in answers, from "this sentence is definitely incorrect" to "this sentence is definitely correct". But since the research questions in this study do not include examining whether there is a shift from probably correct to definitely correct or vice versa; options in this UGJT is limited to three: a) correct b) I am not sure c) incorrect. In case a student marked "incorrect", he should also provide the possible correction of that sentence. This idea was inspired by Sarandi (2009) who stated that this is necessary to minimize the "chance" risk. A student may just choose "incorrect" without knowing that the verb conjugation in that sentence is wrong; therefore, a correction space is put in the UGJT. Rassaei (2014) also does not have students give the corrections when they choose the option "ungrammatical". In this sense, the current study may give a clearer idea of participants' real knowledge on the target structure. Another reason for diminishing the numbers of the options has to do with face validity. Face validity is one subcategory of validity and is the outlook and relevance of a test as the test appears to the test takers (Holden, 2010). To increase face validity, researchers need to make sure that irrelevant items and items not answering the research questions should be omitted. This opinion led the researcher to limit the options to three.

3.5 Treatment Instruments

There are two treatment instruments in this study, the first one is "Story Fill-in", and the second one is "Question-Answer Activity", respectively adapted from Sheen (2007) and Lyster and Yang (2010).

3.5.1 Story Fill-in

The first instrument used in the treatment, adapted from Sheen (2007), is a story fill-in activity. The specific procedures for this instrument are as follows: Participants are given a story and told to read it carefully. The story is about the bad holidays that two different people took. It includes 11 regular and 10 irregular past tense verb conjugations. After 5 minutes, the researcher takes the story away and gives participants a summary of the story but without the conjugations of verbs. There are 11 regular and 10 irregular past tense verbs, so there are 21 questions in total. Students are expected to complete the gaps with the simple past tense conjugations of the verbs given. After ten minutes, the researcher collects all the papers.

This instrument is different from the one in Sheen (2007) in the sense that it does not ask the students to rewrite the story with their own words. As the focus here is on the verbs only, but not the ability to make a summary of the story, students are given everything about the story but the conjugations of verbs. The researcher thought that students may simply forget to include some verbs in their summaries even if they know the correct past tense conjugation of them. To avoid this risk, only the verbs are left blank and the bare forms of these verbs are provided.

3.5.2 Question-Answer Activity

Adapted from Lyster and Yang (2010), this instrument also just asks for the simple past tense verb conjugations. Participants and interlocutors sit face to face. The interlocutor asks the question in his card and the participant is given a card at the same time. On the card that the participant receives, there are some clues that would guide the participant to give the answer, for example if the interlocutor asked a question like "Did you like your cat?", then the participant might get a card with "A lot" written on it. It is expected from the participant to give the full answer by using the target structure. But this type of activity may lead students to give the adverb only as an answer and this would be correct. To avoid this, students in the actual study are provided with the rest of the sentence and asked only

to conjugate the verbs in parentheses into simple past tense. Thus, the only thing they were asked to do was to conjugate the verbs in the instrument. There are 21 questions in this instrument, in parallel to the verbs in the first instrument and they are in the same order for analysis purposes.

3.6 Scoring

For UGJT, if a participant answered a question right, he got 1 point. For the questions that required correction, students had to both choose the option "this sentence is grammatically incorrect" and provide the correction to get the 1 point. The idea of writing the correct form was inspired by Sarandi (2009), who pointed out to the ambiguity when a participant just chooses the option "incorrect". The student may mark the sentence incorrect just by chance. To avoid such coincidences, this additional writing part was used.

For the first treatment instrument, students got one point if they provided the correct simple past tense forms of the verbs. No spelling errors were tolerated, so even answers with one incorrect letter were marked as zero. For the second treatment instrument, the same scoring was applied and only the wholly correct answers were marked as one point, the others were marked as zero. The total scores were calculated by adding the scores of each item in the treatments, separately. To answer the second research question, participants' scores on both regular and irregular verbs were calculated separately for the analysis.

The Exit Questionnaire used in this study consists of four questions that aim to assess the perceptions of the participants regarding corrective feedback. The questions tried to examine both perceptions about corrective feedback in general and perceptions about the corrective feedback procedure followed in the actual study. There are three open-ended questions and one multiple choice question in the questionnaire. However, the open-ended questions are yes/no questions and ask participants to elaborate on their yes's or no's. Hence, the analysis of the questionnaire involves seeking the yes or no answer, and then examining the details that the participant has written.

3.7 Procedures

First, students in three classes were informed about the whole study and given a consent form and 60 volunteer participants signed the form and got involved in the study. However, as stated before, twelve of them did not complete other parts of the study, therefore were excluded from analysis. These 48 Turkish pre-intermediate adult learners of

English participants were randomly divided into two groups, experimental (written recast) and control group and there were 24 people in each group. Every participant took the same tests from the beginning to the end; however, only the experimental group participants received written recast after the two treatments. Below is the of the whole study timeline to show the process more clearly.

Table 4: Timeline of Data Collection

Stage	When is it conducted?	Who took it?
Consent form and Pre-test	May 2, 2014	All participants (n=48)
Treatment I	May 5, 2014	All participants (n=48)
Written recast on Treatment I	May 6, 2014	Experimental group (n=24)
Treatment II	May 6, 2014	All participants (n=48)
Written recast on Treatment II	May 7, 2014	Experimental group (n=24)
Immediate post-test	May 7, 2014	All participants (n=48)
Short questionnaire	May 7, 2014	Seven participants from the experimental group
Delayed post-test	May 16, 2014	All participants (n=48)

For data analysis, two different ways were employed because the data consist of both quantitative and qualitative parts. For the quantitative part, which was gathered through UGJTs and Treatments, the research employed the software IBM SPSS Statistics 21. For the qualitative part, which was gathered through the Exit Questionnaire, the answers to the questionnaire were transcribed.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the data received through treatments, Untimed Grammaticality Judgment Tests (UGJT) and exit questionnaires are analyzed in accordance with the research questions. Results of UGJTs present the overall score of both experimental and control groups to answer the first research question: "What are the effects of recast on the acquisition of English simple past tense verb conjugations?". Then, the results are divided into two groups, irregular and regular verbs, to answer the second research question: "If written recast has an effect on learning simple past tense verb conjugations, is this effect more differential on regular verbs or on irregular verbs?". Finally, to answer the third research question, "What are the perceptions of adult Turkish learners of English about the use of corrective feedback?", the data gathered through the exit questionnaires are analyzed. As for the qualitative part, the answers given to the questionnaires are transcribed. First, information about the pilot study results will be given, followed bythe treatment instruments in the study. The study was piloted to another group of Turkish learners of English at Hacettepe University, School of Foreign Languages in Ankara, Turkey. A total number of 18 people participated in the pilot study and each procedure of data collection was the same with that of the actual study. Then, the results of the actual study are presented and these results are compared. In the next section of the chapter, a summary of the results of the actual study could be found. This chapter finishes by discussing the three research questions of the study by comparing the results with those of other studies and stating the probable reasons for the matches and mismatches.

4.2 Results of the Pilot Study

To see any challanges and problems that the actual study may face, a pilot study was conducted with another group of 18 adult Turkish learners of English at the same institution, Hacettepe University School of Foreign Languages. To ensure that they employ more or less the same proficiency level in the target structure, Levene's test for equality of variances was conducted.

Table 5: Levene's Test For Equality Of Variances

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
								95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	3,762	*,070*	,378	18	,710	,70000	1,85084	-3,22361	4,62361
Equal variances not assumed			,351	9,447	,734	,70000	1,99710	-3,78540	5,18540

Table 5 shows that the p value of Levene's test is higher than 0,05 (p=0,70) and this proves that both groups, experimental and control, are not significantly different from each other. Then, a normality test was conducted to see whether the data are normally distributed or not.

Table 6: Normality Test For The Pilot Study

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre-test	,126	18	*,200*[*]	,983	18	*,975*
Immediate	,128	18	*,200*[*]	,949	18	*,659*
Delayed	,127	18	*,200*	,962	18	*,758*

As table 6 shows, the p values of both Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests are higher than 0,05, implying that the data are normally distributed in each step of data

collection. Therefore, a parametric test was employed for the analysis. To answer the research questions, a Paired Sample T-test was conducted.

Table 7: Paired Samples Test for Experimental Group (Pilot Study)

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | Sig. (2-tailed) |
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	T	df	
Pair 1	Pretest - Immediate	-1,11111	2,20479	,73493	-2,80586	,58364	-1,512	9	,169
Pair 2	Pretest - Delayed	-,44444	4,15665	1,38555	-3,63953	2,75064	-,321	9	,757
Pair 3	Immediate - Delayed	,66667	4,44410	1,48137	-2,74937	4,08270	,450	9	,665

Table 7 shows that there is no significant difference between pre-test and immediate post-test, between pre-test and delayed post-test or between immediate post-test and delayed post-test for the experimental group. This is very surprising as the actual study revealed significant differences in experimental group.

Table 8: Paired Samples Test for Control Group (Pilot Study)

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | Sig. (2-tailed) |
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	
Pair 1	Pretest - Immediate	-2,33333	2,12132	,70711	-3,96392	-,70274	-3,300	9	,011
Pair 2	Pretest - Delayed	-1,55556	2,69774	,89925	-3,62922	,51811	-1,730	9	,122
Pair 3	Immediate - Delayed	,77778	2,86259	,95420	-1,42261	2,97816	,815	9	,439

Table 8 uncovers Paired Sample Test results for control group. As can be seen from the table, participants in the control group managed to make a significant difference between pre-test and immediate post-test but there is no other significant difference between pre-test and delayed post-test or between immediate post-test and delayed post-test. This is another different finding from the actual study as the control group in actual study was not

able to make a significant difference at all. As for the Exit Questionnaire, the results are very similar to each other as 100% of the participants (n=4) in the questionnaire stated that they liked the tests and they prefer to be corrected by their teachers.

When results of UGJTs are compared, it can be seen that pilot study revealed similar patterns of findings by Truscott (1996), who is against error correction and blames error correction for deteroiating grammar skills. However, even if that is the case, the control group cannot be assumed to have acquired the target structures in the study, as the significant effect is temporary and this effect did not succeed in lasting over the delayed post-test. As a consequence, what could be the reason for both groups, experimental and control, not acquiring the target structures in the pilot study? First of all, the small sampling must be recognized (n=18). Small samplings may not reflect a universe to the full extent. Second, when this study was conducted, the participants were going to take an exam soon; so especially participants in experimental group may not be motivated enough to look carefully at their feedback. Third, some of the participants in control group were so enthusiastic about the study that they looked at the correct versions of the verbs in the study, hence they learned the correct version before the immediate post-test, if not via feedback but via their dictionaries. In the actual study, on the other hand, the control group did not ask or look for the correct versions of the verbs to the researcher's knowledge. All these reasons may account for the difference between actual and pilot study.

4.3 Results of the Main Study

4.3.1 Treatment Instruments

As stated before, there are two treatment instruments in this study. The first instrument is a "Story Fill-in" activity which contains 11 regular and 10 irregular English simple past tense verb conjugations and 21 questions in total. Participants were asked to conjugate the verbs in brackets in questions in simple past tense. They got one point for each correct answer, so the maximum score in each treatment is twenty-one. The second instrument is a "Question-Answer" activity which also contains the same 11 regular and 10 irregular English simple past tense verb conjugations. Again, all participants were asked to conjugate these verbs in the simple past tense. After the first instrument, the participants in the experimental group received their instruments back, corrected with written recast, to have a look before the second treatment and they received their second instruments again with written recast on them before the immediate post-test, while the control group just answered the questions in the treatments without going back to previous treatments.

Consequently, they did not receive any corrective feedback. To make things clear, a descriptive statistics was run for both treatments.

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics For Treatment I And Treatment II

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minim um	Maxi mum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Treatment_1	Recast	24	17,3333	3,00241	,61287	16,0655	18,6011	8,00	21,00
	Control	24	16,9583	4,64832	,94883	14,9955	18,9211	4,00	21,00
	Total	48	17,1458	3,87567	,55941	16,0205	18,2712	4,00	21,00
Treatment_2	Recast	24	17,5417	2,32153	,47388	16,5614	18,5220	12,00	21,00
	Control	24	13,4167	5,57882	1,13877	11,0609	15,7724	4,00	21,00
	Total	48	15,4792	4,71300	,68026	14,1107	16,8477	4,00	21,00

As is easily seen from table 9, while the mean score of the experimental (recast) group increased from 17,333 to 17,5417; the mean score of control group decreased from 16,9583 to 13,4167. The minimum score of the recast group increased by 4 points whereas the minimum score of the control group did not change over the two treatments. This gives an idea of the positive change in the simple past tense acquisition of the participants in the experimental group.

4.3.2 Untimed Grammaticality Judgment Test (UGJT)

Before the actual analysis of the actual study, a normality test was conducted to determine whether the data are normally distributed or not.

Table 10: Normality Test Results

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pretest	,093	24	*,200*	,962	24	*,490*
Immediate	,189	24	*,027*	,925	24	*,075*
Delayed	,250	24	*,000*	,806	24	*,000*

Table 10 shows that though pre-test UGJT data are normally distributed, (p value of Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov, under the Sig. column, is greater than 0,05), data of the other two UGJTs are non-parametric ($p < 0,05$); therefore, a non-parametric analysis

should be held. In this sense, Wilcoxon Signed Rank test and Mann-Whitney U test, the non-parametric versions of Paired Sample T-test, were employed.

Below is the general descriptive statistics of both experimental and control groups for the pretest, immediate posttest and delayed posttest.

Table 11: General Descriptive Statistics of Pretest, Immediate Posttest and Delayed Posttest (Experimental and Control Group)

Experimental Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Percentiles		
						25th	50th (Median)	75th
Pretest	24	20,8750	5,15256	10,00	29,00	17,2500	21,0000	25,2500
Immediate	24	23,8333	2,98790	19,00	30,00	21,0000	24,0000	26,7500
Delayed	24	24,0000	4,34391	10,00	29,00	23,2500	25,5000	26,0000
Control Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Percentiles		
						25th	50th (Median)	75th
Pretest	24	16,7500	7,43815	2,00	28,00	11,0000	17,5000	22,7500
Immediate	24	18,2500	5,53448	7,00	28,00	13,5000	19,5000	21,7500
Delayed	24	18,5000	7,08949	7,00	28,00	13,2500	18,0000	25,0000

To make sure that participants are no different from each other to a significant degree in terms of the target structure, the means of pre-test UGJT scores of all participants were compared through Levene's test for equality of variances.

Table 12: Levene's Test For Equality of Variances

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Pre-test	Equal variances assumed	2,396	,128	1,158	46	,253	2,12500	1,83447	-1,56759	5,81759
	Equal variances not assumed			1,158	43,698	,253	2,12500	1,83447	-1,57284	5,82284

As the p value, under the Sig. column in Levene's test, is greater than 0,05 (p=0,128, p>0,05), one can say that both the experimental and control group are not significantly different from each other in terms of simple past tense verb conjugations at the pre-test UGJT level. Having met the prior conditions, the researcher conducted the actual analysis, Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test and Mann-Whitney U test to show the effects of written recast

in pre-test UGJT, immediate post-test UGJT and delayed post-test UGJT on simple past tense verb conjugations.

Table 13: Statistical Differences of Experimental and Control Group over Pretest, Immediate Posttest and Delayed Posttest

		Immediate - Pretest	Delayed - Pretest	Delayed – Immediate
Experimental Group	Z	-3,162[c]	-3,324[c]	-,981[c]
	Asymp.Sig.(2-tailed)	,002	,001	,327
Control Group	Z	-,697[c]	-1,015[c]	-,401[c]
	Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed)	,486	,310	,688

Table 13 shows that the experimental group was able to make a significant difference both between pre-test and immediate post-test and between pre-test and delayed post-test ($p < 0,05$). However, the difference between immediate post-test and delayed post-test is not statistically significant ($p > 0,05$). It means that participants sustained their significant performance on immediate post-test over delayed post-test. This is important as the aim in this study is to help participants acquire the target structures and the significant effect on the immediate post-test has not diminished over the delayed post-test. It is worthy to note that this table reflects only the experimental group scores. It is also clear from table 10 that control group was not able to make a statistically significant score on any of the tests. P-values in between the tests are respectively 0,486 ; 0,310 and 0,688, none of them is under 0,05, the clear-cut point in social sciences to be significant. Therefore, one can say that the control group was not able to reach a significant level of acquisition of simple past tense verb conjugations. As the next step, the researcher compared all the tests by grouping the groups as experimental and control. In short, it can be said that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group in immediate and delayed post-test. Participants in experimental group got a statistically significant score on both immediate and delayed post-tests ($p = 0,002$; $p = 0,001$ respectively), whereas participants in control group did not achieve such a statistically significant score in any of the tests ($p = 0,486$; $p = 0,310$; $p = 0,688$).

To answer the second research question, the answers given to the tests are divided in accordance with their target verbs: irregular or regular. Wilcoxon Signed Rank test is again employed to see the difference within the experimental and control groups and between these two groups.

Table 14: Regular Verbs Test Statistics[a,b,c]

	Immediate - Pretest	Delayed - Pretest	Delayed – Immediate
Z	-1,168[c]	-2,104[c]	-1,261[c]
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	*,243*	*,035*	*,207*
a. Group = Experimental			
b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test			
c. Based on negative ranks.			
	Immediate - Pretest	Delayed - Pretest	Delayed – Immediate
Z	-1,639[c]	-,749[c]	-,526[d]
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	*,101*	*,454*	*,599*
a. Group = Control			
b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test			
c. Based on negative ranks.			
d. Based on positive ranks.			

What can be seen in table 14 is that there is a statistically significant difference between delayed post-test and pre-test (p=0,035 ; p<0,05) for the experimental group. Nevertheless, the difference between pre-test and immediate post-test and between immediate post-test and delayed post-test are not statistically significant (p=0,243 ; p=0,207 respectively, p>0,05). As a conclusion, one can say that the difference between pre-test and delayed post-test in experimental group in terms of regular verbs is statistically significant (p=0,035). Table 14 also shows that there is no significant difference between any of the three tests for the control group. Control group could not reach to a statistically significant difference in regular verbs.

The regular verbs have been covered and it has been seen that the only significant difference is in the experimental group between pre-test and delayed post-test. Now it is time to move on to irregular verbs for experimental group and control group respectively.

Table 15: Irregular Verbs Test Statistics[a,b]

	Immediate – Pretest	Delayed - Pretest	Delayed - Immediate
Z	-2,895[c]	-2,460[c]	-,347[d]
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	,004	,014	,728

a. Group = Experimental

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

c. Based on negative ranks.

d. Based on positive ranks.

	Immediate - Pretest	Delayed - Pretest	Delayed – Immediate
Z	-,423[c]	-,414[c]	-,071[d]
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	,672	,679	,944

a. Group = Control

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

c. Based on negative ranks.

d. Based on positive ranks.

Table 15 confirms that the experimental group participants had a statistically significant difference in immediate and delayed post-tests compared to pre-test. As the p values are lower than 0,05, one can easily arrive at the conclusion that irregular verbs are learned by experimental group participants to a significant degree. One can clearly see that there is no significant difference between any of these tests in terms of irregular verbs in control group.

In short, the control group did not perform to a statistically significant degree in either irregular or regular verbs in any of the three tests, pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test. On the other hand, the experimental group had a statistically significant success in immediate and delayed post-test for irregular verbs, and in delayed post-test for regular verbs.

4.3.3 Exit Questionnaire

To answer third research question, Exit Questionnaire was employed to 30% of experimental group participants (n=7). The reason for choosing only experimental group participants is that the questions on the questionnaire are related to corrective feedback in general and these students' opinions on how it feels to be corrected. Therefore, the questions are not applicable for the control group participants so they are excluded from participating in this questionnaire.

Exit Questionnaire was developed by Lyster and Yang (2010). The questionnaire was originally in English and to adapt it to the Turkish context, it was backtranslated into Turkish and an expert in ELT confirmed the translation, because the flexibility to write in one's native language allows him to express his ideas to the maximum. It consists of four questions, three of which are yes/no questions and one question asking the content of the treatments and tests.

For the first question, "Bu çalışmada yaptığınız testlerin, neyi ölçtüğünü düşünüyorsunuz?" (What do you think the tests you did assess?), 85% of the participants (n=6) stated that those tests assess their English grammar skills. The one participant stated that those tests assess his English reading skills. For the second question, "Bu testlerden öğrendiğiniz dilbilgisi konusunu, birkaç cümleyle yazınız." (Please write a couple of sentences on the grammatical item you have learned from these tests), 57% stated (n=4) that the grammatical item was past simple tense and past simple tense verb conjugations. One participants left the question blank, and the other three stated irrelevant grammatical items (e.g., present simple and present continuous and tenses in general) as the answer.

For the third question, "Uygulanan bu testler hoşunuza gitti mi? Neden?" (Did you like the tests? Why?), 100% said (n=7) yes and commented on the fact that they were corrected and this was a practice for them. Then, for the fourth question, "İngilizce öğretmeniniz tarafından, İngilizcenizin düzeltilmesi hoşunuza gidiyor mu? Neden?" (Would you like your English to be corrected by your English teacher? Why?), 100% said (n=7) yes. This question was the key question of the whole questionnaire as it directly looked into the perception of these participants about corrective feedback in general, and it has become clear that most of the participants have a positive perception of corrective feedback.

4.4 Summary of the Results

At the beginning of data analysis, a normality test was applied on the whole data to see whether the data had a normal (parametric) or abnormal (non-parametric) distribution. As the normality tests revealed that the tendency goes to the abnormality in the distribution of data, the non-parametric tests were applied. To see whether there was a difference between both groups, experimental and control group, one-way ANOVA was conducted at pre-test UGJT and the p value was higher than 0,05. This implies that there was not a significant difference between groups.

When one compares the data of pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test using non-parametric tests Mann-Whitney U and Wilcoxon Signed Rank test, he can see that the control group never achieved a statistically significant score on any of the tests whereas the experimental group did significantly well in regular verbs on delayed post-test (p=0,035) and in irregular verbs on both immediate and delayed post-tests (p=0,004 ; p=0,014 respectively). There were also significant differences between the experimental group and control group in both immediate and delayed post-tests (p=0,003 ; p=0,012 respectively).

In the treatments, while the minimum score of control group did not show a move upwards and on the contrary showed a move downwards, the minimum score of experimental group increased by four points. This implies the effect of corrective feedback as these groups were not statistically different from each other at the beginning.

The Exit Questionnaire applied to 30% of experimental group participants (n=7) revealed that all of these participants are in favor of error correction and they perceive corrective feedback as a chance to practice and revise their English. All participants in the questionnaire liked the tests that were applied and they said the tests allowed them to see their mistakes in simple past tense verb conjugations and correct them.

4.5 Discussion of the Research Question One

The first research question of the actual study is "What are the effects of recast on the acquisition of simple past tense verbs by learners of English as a foreign language?". To answer that question, participants in the study were randomly divided into two groups: experimental and control. Both groups received the same tasks at the same time; however, the experimental group received written recast, a type of corrective feedback, on their written production. When the results are compared, it is obvious that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group and more importantly, this effect is not temporary. Results of delayed post-tests also confirm that there has been a significant performance of experimental group from the beginning of the study. Therefore, it can be said that the answer to the first question is probably "[written] recast has a significant effect on the acquisition of simple past tense verbs by learners of English as a foreign language".

When one looks back in the literature to compare and contrast these findings with the most relevant studies to the actual study, s/he can see that one of the most common target structures is articles (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Sheen, 2007; Sheen, Wright, &

Moldawa, 2009; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Ellis & Shintani, 2013). However, many of these studies also included other target structures in addition to articles. For instance, Bitchener, Young and Cameron (2005) examined the efficacy of four different written corrective feedback types on three grammatical items (prepositions, simple past tense, and the definite article) with 75 learners of English and they found that the combination of written and conference feedback led to a significant performance on simple past tense and definite article. Similarly, Sheen, Wright and Moldawa (2009) found that experimental groups which received feedback outperformed the control group on target grammatical items such as articles, simple past tense, copula "be". Last but not the least, Lyster and Yang (2010) found the superiority of experimental group over the control group in terms of the acquisition of simple past tense both in the short and long term.

It is noteworthy to keep in mind here, though, that not all studies that are in favor of corrective feedback are conclusive. It is because of the fact that some studies include different types of corrective feedback in their studies but no control group, which allows no space to assess the true effect of feedback (Ferris, 2004). Scholars who want to come up with a solid answer about the effects of corrective feedback should include a control group that receives little or no corrective feedback (Truscott, 2004). This accounts for the answer being yes to the first research question. If this study had not had a control group, one could not have claimed a true significance of recast. Moreover, the fact that the actual study investigates the long-term effects of recast through delayed post-test, instead of focusing only on short-term effects, and the fact that the actual study includes two treatment instruments instead of just one, gives the study credit, as "one-shot treatments have generally gotten little respect in this literature" (Truscott, 2007, p. 257). However, Bitchener and Knoch (2010) claim that for advanced students, one treatment for one target structure may help learners get their writings more accurate.

While discussing the first research question, it would be important to match the nature of the corrective feedback used in the study with the nature of the target structures. Though some scholars (e.g., Long, 1996; Long & Robinson, 1998) believe that the nature of recasts is implicit; other scholars believe that it is explicit (Egi, 2007; Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Lyster & Yang, 2010). In the actual study, the nature of corrective feedback tends to be explicit as the researcher clearly showed that an error has been made by crossing the erroneous utterance and provided the correct form next to the cross. Thus, this has been a combination of both explicit rejection (rejecting the erroneous utterance) (Carroll, 2001)

54

and providing the correct form (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, 2010). As stated in the methodology section, UGJT also assesses explicit knowledge (Ellis, 2005). To sum up, one can say that the nature of the corrective feedback in the study and the testing instrument (UGJT) match, which is another side of the design that strengthens the actual study.

As can be seen in the literature, there is a debate on the effectiveness of corrective feedback. In this sense, it will be noteworthy to discuss the actual study and the studies of scholars who are against grammar correction (e.g., Truscott, 1996, 1999, 2007). In his study, Truscott (2007) examined eleven studies that claim that error correction is not helpful and may even be harmful in language learning. One of his reasons for this is that error correction does not help in L1 (Truscott, 1996). Though he admits the fact that error correction does not help in L1 does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that it does not help in L2 either; he says there is a resemblance. However, he seems to underestimate the power of "input" that a child receives while learning his native language. Though a child does not benefit from error correction explicitly, he takes advantage of the language input around him. He is exposed to the correct versions of what he erroneously says and he might implicitly learn the correct version. Therefore, error correction might not work in L1 but maybe it is because error correction is not needed as there is plenty of input out there for L1. However, in the context of the actual study, error correction is definitely needed because adult Turkish learners of English in Turkey do not have access to the input in English as much as native speakers of English do. Hence, one of the limited ways to the correct language is corrective feedback for them. While a child might ignore an adult that tries to correct him, participants in the actual study examined their corrected written productions very carefully and some of the participants in the control group even asked why they did not receive such a correction. To sum up, the relative "value" of corrective feedback may change from L1 to L2. As there are a lot of ways to be exposed to authentic language, explicit error correction may not work in L1; however, it worked in the actual study, in L2, as the access to authentic language of adult Turkish learners of English in Turkey are relatively fewer than native speakers of English.

Another thing to discuss is the designs of the studies against error correction. Many of these studies (e.g., Fazio, 2001; Robb, Ross, & Shortreed, 1986; Sheppard, 1992) do not include a control group that receives no feedback. These studies, instead, have a group that receives feedback on the structures other than the target structures, like content. However, this cannot replace the function of a control group as the control groups in those studies

received corrective feedback, if not on the target structure but on other structures. Even this situation counts for learning as it exposes students to their products and this might prompt them to check their other errors. Hence, it leads to the benefits of error correction. In this sense, one may expect that those studies cannot find a significant difference between groups as all groups are exposed to corrective feedback somehow. Therefore, a study without a true control group that receives no feedback cannot claim that corrective feedback is truly harmful or important in language learning.

The efficacy in the study is not only limited to immediate post-test, as the participants in the experimental group sustained their performance on target structures over the delayed post-test. This result matches with the results of some other studies on written corrective feedback (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Sheen, 2007).

4.6 Discussion of the Research Question Two

Though introduced early in textbooks, past tense verb conjugations in English have been problematic for many learners, irrespective of their proficiency levels in English (Ellis et al., 2006; Lyster & Yang, 2010). Even so, few studies (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Lyster & Yang, 2010) in the literature focused on whether corrective feedback has an effect on the acquisition of past tense verb conjugations and to the researcher's knowledge, there are almost no studies that necessarily focus on whether regular or irregular past tense verb conjugations are learned to a more significant degree. Although its target structure is past tense, Doughty and Varela's (1998) study uses recast as an implicit way of corrective feedback and it has been excluded from discussion in this study as the current study examines explicit knowledge and explicit recast.

In this sense, to answer the second research question, "If written recast has an effect on learning simple past tense verb conjugations, is this effect more differential on regular verbs or on irregular verbs?", the data were separated in accordance with the type of the verb, either regular or irregular, and then the analysis was conducted. The results show that while the control group was not able to perform either on regular or irregular verbs to a significant degree; the experimental group performed significantly both on regular and irregular verbs. However, though the significant performance on regular verbs was only in delayed post-test, irregular verbs were performed significantly twice – both in immediate and delayed post-tests. This result is similar to what Lyster and Yang (2010) found in their study, where the recast group performed significantly well on irregular verbs in both short and long term. The study of Lyster and Yang (2010) differs from the current study in the

finding that the recast group performed significantly on regular verbs in the short term, in other words, in immediate post-test; however, the case is that the recast group performed significantly well in delayed post-test in the current study. This shows that irregular verbs in this study are learned to a more significant degree than the regular verbs in the study. Two reasons might account for this. First, one can see that the acquisition of irregular simple past tense verbs precedes the acquisition of regular simple past tense verbs, according to the order of acquisition in L1 tables proposed by many scholars (e.g., Brown, 1973; Dulay & Burt, 1974; Clark & Clark, 1977). The order of acquisition in L2 does not differ much from the order of acquisition in L1, as well. To illustrate, Krashen and Terrell (1983) proposed an order of acquisition for learners of English as a second language and the acquisition of irregular past tense verbs comes before the acquisition of regular past tense verbs on that list, too. Makino (1980) also found that order of acquisition does not differ significantly across learning of English as first or second language. In brief, the better performance of participants on irregular past tense verbs can be explained by the order of acquisition. Second, focus on form is assumed to have a deeper effect on specific language items than others, for example, it takes the most intensive focus on form to treat pronunciation while vocabulary treatment may be done with little focus on form (DeKeyser, 1998). In this sense, regular past tense verbs are seen as less treatable by corrective feedback, in other words, immune to corrective feedback which is a way of focus on form, than irregular past tense verbs because of the low communicative, highly regular nature regular past tense verbs have (DeKeyser, 1998; Ellis, 2005; Lyster & Yang, 2010; Lyster & Xu, 2014). This highly regular nature, caused by the simplicity of adding the suffix –ed to most verb stems (Chomsky, 1959; Pinker, 1984), makes regular past tense verbs less salient, more difficult to notice (Lyster & Yang, 2010). Lyster and Yang (2010) also suggest that recasts for lexical errors, like irregular past tense verb forms in the actual study, are easier to notice than recasts for morphosyntactic errors. For example, Mackey (2006) conducted a study to see the relationship between feedback and the grammatical item and he found that the least noticed grammatical item was regular past tense. On the other hand, irregular past tense verbs are more like any other vocabulary words in the way they are acquired because of their irregularity, but with the grammatical function of past tense (Pinker & Ullman, 2002; Lyster & Xu, 2014). This brings one back to the comparative effect of focus on form. The researcher stated in the beginning that vocabulary treatment does not need an intense amount of focus on form. As the irregular past tense

verbs can be treated by corrective feedback mainly as vocabulary words (Pinker & Ullman, 2002), this may explain the reason why they are learned to a more significant degree than regular past tense verbs in the same time amount with the same treatment instruments and tests.

When one looks back in the literature to compare these results with those of previous studies on the same topic, s/he can see that studies which examine only the effects of written recast on simple past tense verbs are quite rare. Studies on corrective feedback differ in their foci: Some include more than one corrective feedback type in the same study like prompts, meta-linguistic feedback and elicitation along with recast (e.g., Carroll & Swain, 1993; Lyster, 2004; Ammar & Spada, 2006; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Lyster & Yang, 2010; Ellis, Shintani, & Suzuki, 2013), while others examined the efficacy of one type of corrective feedback (Han, 2002). The main difference, though, is the mode of delivery of corrective feedback: Oral or written. The majority of studies on corrective feedback are about oral corrective feedback and studies on written corrective feedback (WCF) are much fewer (Lyster & Guenette, 2013). The closest WCF studies on simple past tense to the actual study are ones of Bitchener et al (2005) and Lyster and Yang (2010). When one compares the results to these studies, the actual study complies with many of the findings of those studies. For instance, Bitchener et al. (2005) found that the effect of combined written and conference feedback led to a significantly better use of simple past tense. However, as they did not divide the verbs into regular and irregular; that study does not say anything on whether regular or irregular verbs are learned to a more significant degree. When one looks at Lyster and Yang (2010)'s study, he sees a resemblance between results of that study and those of the actual study. In both studies, recast groups significantly performed on irregular verbs both in short and long term while they significantly performed on regular verbs only in short term in Lyster and Yang (2010)'s study and only in long term in the actual study. Lyster and Yang (2010) explained this result with the bigger salience of irregular simple past tense verb forms, compared to regular simple past tense verb forms. Salience may also be associated with noticing, the base of Noticing Hypothesis, which claims that noticing is vital in language learning (Bitchener et al., 2005; Egi, 2010; Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000; Schmidt, 1990, 1994). Briefly, the second reason for the better performance on irregular past tense verb forms may be explained by salience, the fact that irregular verb forms are more salient,

more obvious to the learner and therefore easier to treat than regular past tense verb forms, which probably may have increased the performance on irregular past tense verb forms.

Still, even these studies, which are closest to the actual study in terms of target structures and research design, do not totally match with the actual study in terms of their foci, as Bitchener et al. (2005) included two other grammatical items in addition to simple past tense. Also, Lyster and Yang (2010) had three groups in their studies: recast, prompt, control groups, in contrast to the actual study, which has two groups, experimental (recast) group and control group. Moreover, to the researcher's knowledge, little or no study has questioned whether regular or irregular past tense verb conjugations are acquired by the help of corrective feedback. To sum up, the answer to the second research question is: "The effect is more differential on the irregular verb conjugations". Finally, the actual study differs from these aforementioned studies by its target structure being only simple past tense and by examining the acquisition of regular and irregular past tense verb conjugations separately.

4.7 Discussion of the Research Question Three

The third and last research question is: "What are the perceptions of adult Turkish learners of English about the use of corrective feedback?". The phrase "perception about corrective feedback" has meant "participants' ability to interpret the corrective feedback they received in the study" to many scholars and they designed their research accordingly (e.g., Carpenter, Jeon, MacGregor, & Mackey, 2006; Egi, 2010; Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000; Rassaei, 2013; Yoshida, 2008). However, what the researcher means by perception is the perception Schulz (2001) and Lyster and Yang (2010) mean: *attitudes and preferences* about corrective feedback. In his study, Schulz (2001) conducted a questionnaire to a total number of 1431 EFL students (607 Colombian, 824 American) and 214 EFL teachers. As that study revealed, most students in the study prefer to be corrected in class, and they would rather their both written and oral work to be corrected. This finding complies with the finding in the current study. Interestingly, Colombian and American students did not differ significantly in their attitudes toward error correction and corrective feedback. Adding the current study, it can be said that Turkish students do not differ from American or Colombian students in this sense. This tells the international reputation of corrective feedback and students' preference for it, irrespective of their nationalities. Lyster and Yang (2010), whose Exit Questionnaire is adapted and used in the current study, also found that the majority of participants (75%) were in favor of error

correction. Similar results were also found in earlier studies, where most participants chose to be corrected over no correction (e.g., Chenoweth, Day, Chun, & Luppescu, 1983; McCargar, 1993). The main difference between these studies and the current study is that the current study administered the questionnaire to participants from the experimental group only. This might also be an alternative answer to the first question indirectly. Because these participants are in favor of error correction, they may have made the most use of it. Their beliefs in corrective feedback may have helped them look at their feedback very carefully and internalize it. The first and second questions in the questionnaire are about the content of the tests in the study and try to see whether participants are aware of on what they have been tested. Questions that assess the perceptions were the third and fourth question. As the answers to the first and second question were analyzed in the methodology section, the third question and fourth question are analyzed in this part. To begin with, to the third question in the questionnaire, (Did you like the tests [in the study]? Why?), 100% of participants (n=7) said yes and gave more or less similar answers. For instance, one participant wrote: "İngilizce'yi öğrenirken yaptığımız hataları tespit noktasında çok faydalı ([Corrective feedback] is very useful in determining the errors we make while learning English". Similarly, another participant wrote: "Bir önceki test ile kıyasladığımızda bir şeyler öğrendiğimizi görüyorum (When we compare this test with the previous test, I see that we have learned)". These comments show that participants are *aware* of the functions of corrective feedback and they have ideas of why they are corrected, which may have prompted them to make the most use of corrective feedback.

Similarly, to fourth question in the questionnaire, (Would you like to be corrected by your English teacher? Why?), 100% of them (n=7) said yes and wrote reasons for this like "İngilizce'yi iyi öğrenmeme yardım ediyor (It helps to learn English better)", "Hatalar düzeltilmezse kalıcı olur (If you do not correct the errors, they fossilize)", "Correction is essential to learn the correct versions". Two participants also determined some prior conditions such as "Hocanın üslubuna bağlı, eğer sınıf içi iyi bir iletişim sağlanmış ve kimse İngilizce aksanı noktasında rencide olmuyorsa hocanın düzeltmesi önemli (It depends on the attitude of the teacher, if there is a healthy communication in the classroom and nobody is humiliated because of their English accent, it is important that the teacher corrects" and "Telaffuzum düzeltilmezse yardımcı olamaz (If my pronunciation is not corrected, [corrective feedback] will be of no use)".

For the control group participants, on the other hand, clear-cut conclusions cannot be made since the control group participants did not fill in the questionnaire; nevertheless, it actually does not matter, even if they have positive perceptions about corrective feedback, it is of no use since they did not receive any corrective feedback in the current study.

To sum up, the answer to the third research question may be: "Adult Turkish learners of English have a positive perception about the use of corrective feedback". 100% of participants have positive perceptions of corrective feedback in general and they like the tests applied in the study. As they see the necessity of corrective feedback in determining and healing the grammatical errors, they may have made the most of corrective feedback. It is vital for teachers of English, then, that they sustain this positivist approach towards corrective feedback of learners by choosing the appropriate type and providing corrective feedback and letting learners see their erroneous utterances, together with the corrected versions of them.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter gives a summary of the whole study by stating the research questions and it summarizes possible reasons for the answers to those questions. Next, suggestions for further studies are given. The last section of this chapter is about possible implications of this thesis for practice.

5.2 Summary of the Study

The actual study had three aims: (1) to assess the effects of written recast on the acquisition of simple past tense verb conjugations, (2) to examine if regular or irregular past tense verb conjugations are learned more significantly with the help of written recast and (3) to understand the perceptions of learners of English about corrective feedback. To answer these questions, a quasi-experimental research design with pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test was employed. To teach 11 regular and 10 irregular simple past tense verb conjugations, two treatments were applied to all participants but only participants in the experimental group received written recast on their work, while control group directly moved on to the next stage of the study, without getting any feedback at all. Results reveal the fact that there *is* a significant effect of written recast on the acquisition of simple past tense verb conjugations as experimental group significantly outperformed the control group. When regular and irregular past tense verb conjugations are divided to answer the second research question, it becomes clear that written recast has been more effective on irregular past tense verb conjugations as the performance is significant on both immediate and delayed post-test. Meanwhile, the control group was not able to perform significantly on any of the tests. Finally, the fact that the majority of participants in the questionnaire favored error correction answered the third research question in the study.

The reasons why the findings of the current study and previous studies in literature match could be explained via these arguments: First, the current study had a control group which received no feedback, so that the researcher could actually compare the real effects of written recast. Some studies in the literature (e.g., Chandler, 2003; Haswell, 1983; Iwashita, 2003) did not include a control group, which made it hard to make a solid discussion of the effects of corrective feedback (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Truscott, 2007). Second, the order of acquisition of English morphemes, corrective feedback saliency and noticing could be explanations for the results of second research question. Irregular past tense acquisition precedes the regular past tense acquisition according to many order of acquisition lists (e.g., Clark & Clark, 1977; Krashen & Terrell, 1983). Furthermore, another reason might be saliency. Rule-based items do not require as much noticing as irregular items, therefore the latter are more salient, obvious and more easily treatable by corrective feedback (DeKeyser, 1998; Lyster & Xu, 2014). Irregular past tense verb conjugations are acquired more or less the same way any other vocabulary items (Pinker & Ullman, 2002), therefore the reason why irregular past tense verb conjugations are learned more significantly could be these three: order of acquisition, saliency and noticing. The last two could be grouped into one as they are pretty close to each other.

The third research question uncovered the perceptions of students about corrective feedback. It is important to remember that by perception, the researcher does not mean the ability of learners to interpret corrective feedback. She uses the term perception the way Lyster and Yang (2010) uses: attitude. The Exit Questionnaire, which was translated from the one in Lyster and Yang (2010)'s study and used in the current study, showed that the majority of participants who took the questionnaire were in favor of corrective feedback, which is another finding that complies with the findings of relevant studies in literature (e.g., Schulz, 2001).

5.3 Suggestions for Further Studies

Though the current study answered its research questions, some limitations and suggestions for further studies should be acknowledged. First, because it investigated the effects of only one corrective feedback type, further studies may include more than one corrective feedback types to compare the effects of each. Future studies may also compare the effectiveness of written and oral versions of the same corrective feedback type and may even include online corrective feedback types and compare and contrast the effectiveness of each mode of providing corrective feedback.

Another problematic linguistic area could be a new topic for further studies, for example, some participants in the actual study stated that they had problems in present perfect tense and it would be great to have the same experiment on that topic, in an informal talk with the researcher.

This actual study was conducted with adult Turkish learners of English. It could have included young learners as well to compare the results and see if there is a difference between adults and young learners.

The combinations of corrective feedback types, student profiles and target structures are infinite. Hence, researchers may conduct a lot of studies in accordance with target structures, participants and corrective feedback type(s) they are interested in.

Even though the actual study tried to illustrate one side of corrective feedback, there is still a lot to do. As Russell and Spada (2006) put it, "the wide range of variables examined in corrective feedback research is spread rather thin; more work is needed to consolidate efforts and focus on those corrective feedback variables that appear to be particularly fruitful for future investigation" (p. 156).

5.4 Implications for Practice

This study humbly suggests that corrective feedback be used as much as possible as it turns out to be very effective in teaching simple past tense verb conjugations. English teachers should not turn their backs against error correction. However, one thing to note here is that teachers should make sure that students examine their feedback carefully. Quick looks may not work. Another thing to remember is practice itself. The participants in the study took the same UGJT three times and experimental group participants saw their erroneous products twice with the correct versions of them. Therefore, seeing the correct and incorrect versions a few times may have contributed to the better performance of the experimental group. To sum up, teachers should increase their use of corrective feedback, monitor students while they receive feedback and make sure that students are exposed to the correct versions of their erroneous utterances.

REFERENCES

Ammar, A. (2008). Prompts and recasts: Differential effects on second language morphosyntax. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(2), 183-210.

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts and L2 learning.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28,* 543-574.

Annett, J. (1969). *Feedback and human behaviour.*Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Baars, B. J. (1997). In the theatre of consciousness: Global workspace theory, a rigorous scientific theory of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies, 4,* 292-309.

Baker, C. L. (1979). Syntactic theory and the projection problem.*Linguistic Inquiry, 10,* 533-581.

Berko, J. (1958). The child's learning of English morphology. Retrieved on April 4, 2014 from http://childes.psy.cmu.edu/topics/wugs/wugs.pdf

Bitchener, J. & Ferris, D. R. (2012).*Written corrective feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing.*Routledge: New York.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback.*Journal of Second Language Writing, 17,* 102-118.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010a). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback.*Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*(4), 207-217.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010b). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics, 31*(2), 193-214.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005).The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing.*Journal of Second Language Writing, 14,* 191-205.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005).The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL students.*Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), 191-205.

Bohannon, J. N., & Stanowicz, L. (1988). The issue of negative evidence: Adult responses to children's language errors. *Developmental Psychology, 24,* 684-689.

Bornstein, M. H., & Bruner, J. S. (1989). *Interaction in human development.*Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brown, R. (1973). *A first language: Early stages.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, R. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal, 93,* 46-60.

Calve, P. (1992). Corriger ou ne pas corriger, là n'est pas la question [To correct or not to correct: That is *not* the question]. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 48,* 458–471.

Carpenter, H., Jeon, K. S., MacGregor, D., & Mackey, A. (2006).Learners' interpretations of recasts.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(2), 209-236.

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.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing.*Journal of Second Language Writing, 12,* 267-296.

Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors.*Language Learning, 27,* 29-46.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning.* New York: Cambridge University.

Chenoweth, N. A., Day, R. R., Chun, A. E., & Luppescu, S. (1983). Attitudes and preferences of ESL students to error correction.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6,* 79-87.

Chomsky, N. (1959). A review of B. F. Skinner's Verbal Behavior.*Language, 35,* 26-58.

Chomsky, N. (1979). Principles and parameters in syntactic theory.In Hornstein, N. and Lightfoot, D. (Eds.), *Explanations in Linguistics.*London: Longman.

Clark, H., & Clark, E. (1977).*Psychology and language: An introduction to psycholinguistics.* San Diego, CA: Harcourt.

Cohen, A.D., & Robbins, M. (1976). Toward assessing interlanguage performance: The relationship between selected errors, learners' characteristics and learners' explanations. *Language Learning, 26,* 45-66.

Council of Europe. (2011). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment.* Council of Europe. Retrieved from: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf

Çakır, I. (2011). Problems in teaching tenses to Turkish learners.*Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1,* 123-127.

Davies, M. (2006). Paralinguistic focus on form. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(4), 841-855.

DeKeyser, R. (1993). The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency.*Modern Language Journal, 77,* 501-514.

DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42–63). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Demirci, P. (2010). *The effect of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on learner intake of past tense marker.*Unpublished MA thesis, Hacettepe University, Turkey.

Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Doughty C., & Varela, E. (1998).Communicative focus on form. In Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition.* (pp. 114-138). Cmabridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. (1994). Fine tuning of feedback by competent speakers to language learners.In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Strategic Interaction and Language Acquisition: Theory, Practice and Research.*Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Doughty, C. (1999). The cognitive underpinnings of focus on form.*University of Hawaii Working Papers in ESL, 18,* 1-69.

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998).Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (eds.).

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998).*Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dulay, H, & Burt, M. (1974).A new perspective on the creative construction process in child second language acquisition.*Language Learning*, *24*, 253–278.

Dulay, H. C.; Burt, M. K., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two.*University of Michigan: Oxford University Press.

Egi, T. (2010). Uptake, modified output, and learner perceptions of recasts: Learner responses as language awareness. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 1-21.

Ellis, R. (1993). Second language acquisition and the structural syllabus.*TESOL Quarterly, 27,* 91-113.

Ellis, R. (1994). A theory of instructed second language acquisition.In N. C. Ellis (ed.), *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages.*San Diego: Academic Press.

Ellis, R. (1995). Modified oral input and the acquisition of word meanings.*Applied Linguistics, 16,* 409-441.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition.*Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction.*Language Learning, 51*(supp. 1)*,* 1-46.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Second Language Acquisition* (9th impression).Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Ellis, R. (2005). Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge of a second language: A psychometric study.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27,* 41-72.

Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition.*AILA Review, 19,* 18-41.

Ellis, R. (2012). A lifetime of grammar teaching. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 40*(1), 7-19.National Council of Teachers of English.

Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006).Reexamining the role of recasts in Second Language Acquisition.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28,* 575-600.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (1999). Focusing on form in the classroom.*Occasional Paper 13,* Institute of Language Learning and Teaching: University of Auckland.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Preemptive focus on form in the ESL classroom.*TESOL Quarterly, 35,* 407-432.

Ellis, R., Loewen S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28,* 339-368.

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y.; Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *SYSTEM, 36,* 353-371.

Ellis, R., Tanaka, Y., & Yamazaki, A. (1994). Classroom interaction, comprehension and L2 vocabulary acquisition.*Language Learning, 44,* 449-491.

Ellis. R., Shintani, N., & Suzuki, W. (2013).Effects of written feedback and revision on learners' understanding and use of two English grammatical structures. *Language Learning, 64*(1), 103-131.

Ergünay, O. (2008). *The effects of written corrective feedback on Turkish EFL learners' use of state verbs: An experimental study.* Unpublished MA thesis, Anadolu University, Turkey.

Erten, I. H. (1993). *The relationship between learners' oral errors and teachers' corrective feedback in three EFL classes.* Unpublished MA thesis, Bilkent University, Turkey.

Es, S. (2003). *Applying focus on form in EFL classes: Focus on form through input flood, output and corrective feedback.* Unpublished MA thesis, Anadolu University, Turkey.

Farrar, M. J. (1990). Discourse and the acquisition of grammatical morphemes.*Journal of Child Language, 17,* 607-624.

Farrar, M. J. (1992). Negative evidence and grammatical morpheme acquisition. *Developmental Psychology, 28,* 90-98.

Fazio, L. (2001). The effect of corrections and commentaries on the journal writing accuracy of minority and majority language students. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10,* 235-249.

Ferris, D. (1995). Can advanced ESL students be taught to correct their most serious and frequent errors?. *CATESOL Journal, 8,* 41-62.

Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly, 31,* 315-339.

Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 1-11.

Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ferris, D. R. (2004). The "Grammar Correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime…?). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13,* 49-62.

Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2013). *An Introduction to Language (10th edition).* Cengage Learning: United Kingdom.

Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction and the second language learner.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gold, E. M. (1967). Language identification in the limit.*Information and Control, 10,* 467-474.

Goo, J. (2012). Corrective feedback and working memory capacity in interaction-driven L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 34*(3), 445-474.

Greene, J.C.; Caracelli, V.J., & Graham.W.F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11*(3), 255-274.

Gregg, K. R. (1989). Second language acquisition theory: The case for a generative perspective. In S. M. Gass & J. Schachter (Eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 15-40). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hammerly, H. (1987). Language, linguistics, and linguistic technology: A personal view. *The Journal of Educational Techniques and Technologies, 20*(2), 2-10.

Han, Z. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on tense consistency in L2 output.*TESOL Quarterly, 36,* 543-572.

Harley, B., & King, M. L. (1989).Verb lexis in the written compositions of young L2 learners.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11*(4), 415-439.

Harley, B., & Swain, M. (1984).The interlanguage of immersion students and its implications for second language teaching.In A. Davies, C. Criper, & A. Howatt (Eds.), *Interlanguage.*Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Haswell, R. H. (1983). Minimal marking.*College English, 45*(6), 600-604.

Havranek, G. (1999). The effectiveness of corrective feedback: Preliminary results of an empirical study. *Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Etrangere, 2,* 189-206.

Ishida, M. (2004). Effects of recasts on the acquisition of the aspectual form of *–te i (ru)* by learners of Japanese as a foreign language. *Language Learning, 54,* 311-394.

Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction (Differential effects on L2 development).*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*(1), 1-36.

James, C., & Garrett, P. (1991). *Language awareness in the classroom.* London: Longman.

Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). An exploration of L2 teachers' use of pedagogical interventions devised to draw L2 learners' attention to form. *Language Learning, 61,* 759-785.

Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second language writing skills.*Modern Language Journal, 75,* 305-313.

Klein, W. (1995).The acquisition of English.In R. Dietrich, W. Klein and C. Noyau (Eds.). *The Acquisition of Temporality in a Second Language.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Knoblauch, C.H., & Brannon, L. (1981). Teacher commentary on student writing: The state of the art. *Freshman English News, 10*(2), 1-4.

Krashen, S. (1977). Some issues relating to the Monitor Model. In H. Brown, Yorio and R. Crymes (Eds.).*TESOL 77,* Washington DC: TESOL.

Krashen, S. (1981).*Second language acquisition and second language learning.*London: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1984).*Writing: Theory, research and applications.* Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.

Krashen, S. (1985).*The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* London: Longman.

Krashen, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and speaking by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal, 73,* 440-464.

Krashen, S. (1994).The input hypothesis and its rivals.In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 45-77). London: Academic Press.

Krashen, S. (1998).Comprehensible output.*System, 26,* 175-182.

Krashen, S., & Terrell, D. (1983).*The Natural Approach.*New York: Pergamon.

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2005). What do students think about the pros and cons of having a native speaker teacher? In E. Llurda (ed.), *Non-native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession,* 217-241. New York: Springer.

Lazaraton, A. (2005). Quantitative research methods.In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning.*Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lee, J. (2007). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in English immersion classrooms at the primary level in Korea.*English Teaching, 62*(4), 311-334.

Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and L2 development: Beyond negative evidence. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27,* 361-386.

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 309-365. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x

Li, S. (2013). The interactions between the effects of implicit and explicit feedback and individual differences in language analytic ability and working memory.*Modern Language Journal, 97*(3), 634-654.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus on form and corrective feedback in Communicative Language Teaching: Effects on second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12,* 429-448.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1999).*How languages are learned.* Oxford University Press.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated? *TESOL Quarterly, 42*(2), 181-207.

Lochtman, K. (2000). The role of negative feedback in experimental vs. analytical foreign language teaching. Paper presented at the Conference on Instructed Second Language Learning. Brussels, Belgium.

Loewen, S. (2005).Incidental focus on form and second language learning.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27,* 361-386.

Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult English L2 classroom: Characteristics, explicitness and effectiveness. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(4), 536-556.

Long, M. (1988). Instructed interlanguage development. In L. Beebe (ed.). *Issues in Second Language Acquisition: Multiple Perspectives.* New York: Newbury House.

Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In Bot, Coste, Ginsberg & Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-51). Rowley, USA: Newbury House.

Long, M. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In Ritchie, W. C & Bhatia, T. K. (Eds.), *Handbook of Language Acquisition: Vol. 2. Second Language Acquisition.*(pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.

Long, M. (2006). Recasts: The story so far. In M. H. Long (Ed.), *Problems in SLA* (pp. 75-116). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Long, M. (2007). *Problems in SLA.*Mahwah. NJ: Erlbaum.

Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research and practice. In C. Doughty, J. Williams.*Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal, 82*(3), 357-371.

Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20,* 51-81.

Lyster, R. (2002). The importance of differentiating negotiation of form and meaning in classroom interaction. In P. Burmeister, T. Piske, A. Rohde (Eds.), *An integrated view of language development: papers in honor of Henning Wode* (pp. 381-397).

Lyster, R. (2004). Different effects of prompts and effects in form-focused instruction.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26,* 399-432.

Lyster, R., & Guenette, D. (2013).Written corrective feedback and its challenges for pre-service ESL teachers.*The Canadian Modern Language Review, 69*(2), 129-153.

Lyster, R., & Izquierdo, J. (2009).Prompts versus recasts in dyadic interaction.*Language Learning, 59,* 453-498.

Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006).Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(1), 37-66.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997).Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(1), 37-66. doi:10.1017/S0272263197001034

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral language abilities: The Awareness-Practice-Feedback sequence. In DeKeyser, R. (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (pp. 141-160). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32,* 265-302.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2012).Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of /ɹ/ by Japanese learners of English.*Language Learning, 62*(2), 595-633.

Lyster, R., & Xu, H. (2014).Differential effects of explicit form-focused instruction on morphosyntactic development.*Language Awareness, 23*(1), 107-122.

Lyster, R., & Yang, Y. (2010).Effects of form-focused practice and feedback on Chinese EFL learners' acquisition of regular and irregular past tense forms.*Studies in Se cond Language Acquisition, 32,* 235-263.doi: 10.1017/S0272263109990519

Lyster, R.; Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013).Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms.*Language Teaching, 46,* 1-40. doi: 10.1017/S0261444812000365

Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing, and second language development: An empirical study of L2 classroom interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, *27*, 405-430.

Mackey, A., & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational Interaction and Second Language Acquisition: A series of empirical studies* (p. 377-419). New York: Oxford University Press.

Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal, 82,* 338-356.

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & Leeman, J. (2007). Feedback in L2 learning: Responding to errors during practice. In R. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology.* Cambridge University Press.

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*(4), 471-497.

Mackey, A.; Oliver, R., & Leeman, J. (2003). Interactional input and the incorporation of feedback: An exploration of NS-NNS and NNS-NNS adult and child dyads. *Language Learning, 53,* 35-66.

Makino, T. (1980).*Acquisition order of English morphemes by Japanese adolescents.*Tokyo: Shinozaki Shorin Press.

McCargar, D. F. (1993). Teacher and student role expectations: Cross-cultural differences and implications. *The Modern Language Journal, 77,* 235-247.

McDonough, K. (2005). Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners' responses on ESL question development.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27,* 79-103.

Mutlu, M. (2006).*The differential effects of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on foreign language development of young learners.*Unpublished MA thesis, Abant Izzet Baysal University, Turkey.

Nassaji, H. (2009). Effects of recasts and elicitations in syadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness.*Language Learning, 59,* 411-452.

Nassaji, H. (2010). The occurrence of and effectiveness of spontaneous focus on form in adult ESL classrooms.*Canadian Modern Language Review, 66,* 907-933.

Nassaji, H. (2013). Participation structure and incidental focus on form in adult ESL classrooms. *Language Learning, 63*(4), 835-869.

Netten, J. (1991). Towards a more language oriented second language classroom. In. Malave, L. & Duquette, G. (Eds.), *Language, culture and cognition,* (pp. 284-304). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversation.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17,* 459-481.

Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2003).Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms.*Modern Language Journal, 87,* 519-533.

Onwuegbuzie, A., & Leech, N. (2005).On becoming a pragmatic researcher: the importance of combining quantitative and qualitative research methodologies.*International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 8*(5), 375-387.

Panova, I. (1999). *Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom.*Unpublished master's thesis, McGill University, Canada.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002).Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom.*TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 573-595.

Pavesi, M. (1986).Markedness, discoursal modes and relative clause formation in a formal and informal context.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 8*(1), 38-55.

Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on "noticing the gap": Non-native speakers' noticing of recasts in NS-NNS interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25,* 99-126.

Pienemann, M., & Johnston, M. (1987).Factors influencing the development of language proficiency. In Nunan, D (Ed.), *Applying second language acquisition research* (pp. 45-141). Adelaide, Australia: National Curriculum Resource Center.

Pinker, S. (1984).*Language learnability and language development.*Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pinker, S., & Ullman, M. (2002).The past and future of the past tense.*Trends in Cognitive Science, 6,* 456-463.

Pitts, M., White, H., & Krashen, S. (1989). Acquiring second language vocabulary through reading: A replication of the Clockwork Orange study using second language acquirers.*Reading in a Foreign Language, 5,* 271-275.

Plonsky, L., & Mills, S. V. (2006). An exploratory study of differing perceptions of error correction between a teacher and students: Bridging the gap. *Applied Language Learning, 16,* 55-74.

Rassaei, E. (2013). Corrective feedback, learners' perceptions and second language development.*SYSTEM, 41*(2), 472-483.

Rassaei, E. (2014). Scaffolded feedback, recasts and L2 development: A sociocultural perspective.*Modern Language Journal, 98*(1), 417-431.

Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research. In Norris & Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (p. 133-164). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sarandi, H. (2009). *Corrective recast and prompt in learning L2 grammar in EFL setting.* Unpublished PhD thesis, Hacettepe University, Turkey.

Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective.*Second Language Research, 7,* 89-102.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning.*Applied Linguistics, 11,* 129-158.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics.In G. Kasper, & S. Blum-Lunka (Eds.).*Interlanguage Pragmatics* (21-42). New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (ed.). *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (1-63). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching Center.

Schmidt, R. W. (1983). Interaction, acculturation, and the acquisition of communicative competence.In N. Wolfson & J. Manes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 137-174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schmidt, R. W. (1984). The strengths and limitations of acquisition.*Language Learning and Communication, 3,* 1-16.

Schmidt, R. W. (2010). Attention, awareness and individual differences in language learning. In W. M. Chan, S. Chi, K. N. Cin, J. Istanto, M. Nagami, J. W. Sew, T. Suthiwan, & I. Walker, *Proceedings of ClaSIC 2010,* Singapore, December 2-4 (pp. 721-737). Singapore: National University of Singapore, Centre for Language Studies.

Schmidt, R. W., & Frota, S. N. (1986).Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese.In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schulz, R. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(2), 244-258.

Schwartz, B. (1993). On explicit and negative data effecting and affecting competence and linguistic behaviour.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15,* 143-145.

Seliger, H. (1983). The language learner as linguist: Of metaphors and realities. *Applied Linguistics, 4,* 179-191.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 10*(3), 209-232.

Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the red pen.*Foreign Language Annals, 17,* 195-202.

Sheen, R. (2002). 'Focus on form' and 'Focus on forms'. *ELT Journal, 56*(3), 303-305.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings.*Language Teaching Research, 8,* 263-300.

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake.*Language Teaching Research, 10,* 361-392.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles.*TESOL Quarterly, 41*(2), 255-283.

Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011).Corrective feedback in language teaching. In Hinkel, E. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning, Vol. 2* (pp. 593-610). New York: Routledge.

Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009).Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners.*SYSTEM, 37*(4), 556-569.

Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal, 23,* 103-110.

Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013).The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article.*Journal of Second Language Writing, 22,* 286-306.

Spada, N. (1997). Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language Teaching, 30,* 73-87.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S. & Madden, C. (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition,* (pp. 235-252). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1991). French immersion and its offshoots: Getting two for one. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 91-103). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 50,* 158-164.

Swain, M., & Suzuki, W. (2010).Interaction, output and Communicative Language Teaching. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics* (pp. 557-571). Blackwell Publishing, UK.

Swan, M. (1982). *Practical English Usage.*Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Şahin, C. (2006). *Teachers' oral corrective behaviour and learners' reaction to the feedbacks received in grammar lessons.* Unpublished MA thesis, Anadolu University, Turkey.

Terrell, T. (1977).A natural approach to the acquisition and learning of a language.*Modern Language Journal, 61,* 325-336.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 classes.*Language Learning, 46,* 327-369.

Truscott, J. (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction? *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 55,* 437-455.

Truscott, J. (2004). Evidence and conjecture on the effects of error correction: A response to Chandler. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13,* 337-343.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately.*Journal of Second Language Writing, 16,* 255-272.

Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. Y. (2008).Error correction, revision and learning.*Journal of Second Language Writing, 17,* 292-305.

Tsang, W. (2004). Feedback and uptake in teacher–student interaction: An analysis of 18 English lessons in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Regional Language Centre Journal, 35,* 187–209.

Van Beuningen, C., De Jong, N., & Kuiken, F. (2012).Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing.*Language Learning, 62*(1), 1-41.

Van Lier, L. (1991). Inside the classroom: Learning processes and teaching procedures. *Applied Language Learning, 2,* 29-68.

Wang, W. (2009).*The Noticing and Effect of Teacher Feedback in ESL Classrooms.*Unpublished PhD dissertation. Michigan State University, USA.

White, L. (1987). Against comprehensible input: The input hypothesis and the development of L2 competence. *Applied Linguistics, 8*(1), 95-110.

White, L. (1989). *Universal Grammar and Second Language Acquisition.*Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types.*Language Awareness, 17*(1), 78-93.

Zhao, S., & Bitchener, J. (2007).Incidental focus on form in teacher-learner and learner-learner interactions.*SYSTEM, 35,* 431-447.

Zhuo, C. (2010). Explicit recast, implicit recast and the acquisition of English noun plural: A comparative study. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 33*(6), 55-70.

APPENDIX A: CONSENT FORM

BİLGİLENDİRİLMİŞ ONAY FORMU

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'nda İngilizce okutmanı olarak görev yapmaktayım. Aynı zamanda, Gazi Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi bölümünde Yüksek Lisans öğrencisiyim. Size, "Effects of Recast on the Acquisition of Simple Past Tense" başlıklı tez çalışmam için yaptığım araştırma hakkında bilgi vermek istiyorum. Bu araştırmaya katılıp katılmama kararını vermeden önce, araştırmanın neden ve nasıl yapılacağını bilmeniz gerekmektedir. Bu nedenle bu formun okunup anlaşılması büyük önem taşımaktadır. Eğer anlayamadığınız ve sizin için açık olmayan şeyler varsa, ya da daha fazla bilgi isterseniz, bana danışabilirsiniz.

Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır. Çalışmaya katılmama veya katıldıktan sonra herhangi bir anda çalışmadan çıkma hakkına sahipsiniz. Çalışmayı yanıtlamanız, araştırmaya katılım için onay verdiğiniz biçiminde yorumlanacaktır. Bu formlardan elde edilecek bilgiler tamamen araştırma amacı ile kullanılacaktır.

Verdiğiniz destek için şimdiden çok teşekkür ederim.
Nihan Yılmaz
E-mail: nihand@hacettepe.edu.tr

1. **Araştırmayla İlgili Bilgiler:**

   a. **Araştırmanın Amacı:** Bir düzeltici dönüt tekniği olan düzeltme amaçlı tekrarın, İngiliz dilbilgisi basit geçmiş zaman fiil çekimlerine olan etkisini araştırmak.

   b. **Araştırmanın İçeriği:** Araştırma, Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test (UGJT), Treatment I, Treatment II ve 6 kişi için uygulanacak olan anket olmak üzere dört ayrı bölümden oluşmaktadır. Ancak, aynı UGJT, üç kez uygulanacaktır.

   c. **Araştırmanın Nedeni:** Tez çalışması

   d. **Araştırmanın Öngörülen Süresi:** 4 ayrı gün

   e. **Araştırmaya Katılması Beklenen Katılımcı Sayısı:** İlk aşama icin 60 kişi, anket icin 6 kişi

   f. **Araştırmanın Yapılacağı Yer:** Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu

2. **Çalışmaya Katılım Onayı:**

   Yukarıda yer alan ve araştırmadan önce verilmesi gereken bilgileri okudum ve katılmam istenen çalışmanın kapsamını ve amacını, gönüllü olarak üzerime düşen sorumlulukları tamamen anladım. Çalışma hakkında yazılı ve sözlü açıklama, araştırmacı tarafından yapıldı. Bana, çalışmanın muhtemel riskleri ve faydaları sözlü olarak da anlatıldı. Bu koşullarda söz konusu araştırmaya kendi isteğimle, hiçbir baskı ve zorlama olmaksızın katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Katılımcının (Kendi el yazısı ile)
Adı-Soyadı: Mehmet KOÇ
İmzası:

81

1

Instructions: Complete the sentences using the verbs in parentheses. **Do not** write negative sentences or questions. All sentences must be in the simple past tense.

a. Joe, 28, a flight attendant

1. The holiday _began_ (begin) well.
2. We _spent_ (spend) two days in Bangkok.
3. We _saw_ (see) the Floating Market and the Royal Palace.
4. We _left_ (leave) Bangkok.
5. I _wanted_ (want) to stay in basic and clean hostels but Mia didn't like them.
6. So we _stayed_ (stay) at expensive hotels.
7. Mia also _talked_ (talk) to other men all the time!
8. I _knew_ (know) Mia very well, but you don't know a person until you travel with them.
9. We _argued_ (argue) about everything.
10. We _arrived_ (arrive) at Heathrow Airport.
11. We _decided_ (decide) to break up.

b. Laura, 26, a nurse

12. My best friend Isabelle and I _booked_ (book) a holiday in Venice.
13. We _rented_ (rent) a small apartment.
14. At the last moment, Linda _asked_ (ask) if she could come too.
15. We _said_ (say) yes.
16. We _went_ (go) to have lunch or dinner..
17. Linda _bought_ (buy) pizzas.
18. Linda _ate_ (eat) them in the flat!
19. I _invited_ (invite) Linda and Isabella on my birthday.
20. Linda _picked_ (pick) the most expensive things on the menu!
21. Linda never _thought_ (think) she should pay for something!
22. Isabella and I _paid_ (pay) for the apartment, not Linda!

APPENDIX C: TREATMENT II WITH WRITTEN RECAST

Treatment II – Question and Answer Activity

Instructions: You are supposed to write the verbs in parantheses in the simple past tense. You cannot change the verb once you have written it. Good luck!

1. Did school begin well for you?

~~began~~
Yes, it _~~begun~~_ (begin) well for me.

2. Did he spend a lot of money yesterday?

Yes, he _spent_ (spend) a lot of money.

3. Did you see your teacher after school?

~~saw~~
Yes, I _~~saw~~_ (see) my teacher after school.

4. Did your friend leave university?

Yes, he _left_ (leave) university.

5. Did he want to be a singer when he was a child?

Yes, he _wanted_ (want) to be a singer when he was a child.

6. Did they stay in an expensive hotel in Tokyo?

Yes, they _stayed_ (stay) in an expensive hotel in Tokyo.

7. Did the manager talk to you about this?

Yes, he _talked_ (talk) to me about this.

8. Did he know the school rules?

~~knew~~
Yes, he _~~known~~_ (know) the school rules.

9. Did their parents argue yesterday morning?

Yes, they _argued_ (argue) yesterday morning.

10. Did she arrive in New York yesterday?

Yes, she _arrived_ (arrive) in New York yesterday.

11. Did she decide to do sport?

Yes, she _decide_ (decide) to do sport because she is fat!

12. Did you book the tickets to Amsterdam?

Yes, I _booked_ (book) the tickets. We are ready to go!

13. Did you rent a house when you were on holiday?

Yes, I _rented_ (rent) a house when I was on holiday.

14. Did your teachers ask you why you didn't do your homework?

Yes, my teachers _asked_ (ask) me why I didn't do my homework.

15. Did they say bad things to you?

Yes, they _said_ (say) bad things to me.

16. Did you go to school two days ago?

Yes, I _goed_ (go) to school two days ago.

17. Did your sister buy a dress for the party?

Yes, she _bought_ (buy) a dress.

18. Did your friends eat pasta last week?

Yes, they _ate_ (eat) pasta last week.

19. Did your friend invite you to her birthday party?

Yes, she _invited_ (invite) me to her birthday party.

20. Did your father pick you up from the airport yesterday?

Yes, he _picked_ (pick) me up from the airport yesterday.

21. Did you think you could pass the proficiency exam?

Yes, I _thought_ (think) I could pass the proficiency exam.

22. Did your girlfriend/boyfriend pay for the dinner last night?

Yes, he/she _paid_ (pay) for the dinner last night.

84

APPENDIX D: UNTIMED GRAMMATICALITY JUDGEMENT TEST

4   P

Untimed Grammaticality Judgement Test (UGJT)

Instructions: Decide whether the sentences below are grammatically correct or incorrect. If they are incorrect, correct them in the space provided. Good luck!

1. The film began two minutes ago.
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

2. They spend their holiday in Izmir last summer.
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

3. I saw Istanbul in 2012.
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

4. She leave school two months ago.
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

5. We wanted to study in the library yesterday.
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

6. My friend stay at Hilton Hotel in 2011.
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer: staied

7. My teacher talked to my parents in the last meeting.
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

8. I know these things in the past, but now I do not.
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

9. Her brother and she argued a lot when they were children.
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

10. Lisa arrived in Spain yesterday.
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer:

11. John decided to leave his job two days ago.
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer:

12. We book our holiday last week!
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer: booked

13. My sister rented a house when she
    was in Ankara.
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer:

14. Yesterday, I ask my friend a
    question.
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer: asked

15. She said something two days ago
    and I cried.
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer: something said

16. Ross and Rachel go on holiday
    together in 2010.
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer: went

17. I bought Coca-Cola for the party
    last night.
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer:

18. I only eat pizza and hamburger last
    weekend!
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer: ate

19. My best friend invited me to his
    office three days ago.
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer:

20. Her sister pick a dress for her last
    year.
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer: picked

21. Oh, I thinked she was in London
    last month!
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer: tought

22. Are she wearing make-up today?
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer:

23. Do you have a car?
    a) Grammatically correct
    b) I am not sure
    c) Grammatically incorrect

    Answer:

4

24. He go out twice a week.
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

25. Do they have children?
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

26. My brother does not know me very well.
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

27. Why are you wearing sunglasses? It's cloudy today!
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer: because I need it.

28. What do he usually do at the weekend?
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

29. She have a lot of hobbies.
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

30. What is they studying at the moment?
   a) Grammatically correct
   b) I am not sure
   c) Grammatically incorrect

   Answer:

THANK YOU VERY MUCH! ☺

APPENDIX E: EXIT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Bu çalışmada yaptığınız testlerin, neyi ölçtüğünü düşünüyorsunuz?

a) İngilizce dinleme becerilerimi
b) İngilizce konuşma becerilerimi.
c) İngilizce dilbilgisi becerilerimi.
d) İngilizce okuma becerilerimi.

2. Bu testlerden öğrendiğiniz dilbilgisi konusunu, birkaç cümleyle yazınız.

Past tense fiillerin ikinci hallerinin kullanma

3. Uygulanan bu testler hoşunuza gitti mi? Neden?

Evet. Çünkü dil bilgisi becerilerinin ölçülmesi açısından faydalı buldum. Buna göre etsikliklerimizi görebilme fırsatı yaratılmış oldu.

4. İngilizce öğretmeniniz tarafından, İngilizcenizin düzeltilmesi hoşunuza gidiyor mu? Neden?

Tabiiki. Yanlışlar düzeltilmezse öyle kalır. Bunun ingilizce eğitimim açısından faydalı olduğunu düşünüyorum.

88

GAZİ GELECEKTİR...