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b. Vowels

I. Short Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic short vowel</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ط (فتحة)</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض (ضمة)</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك (كسرة)</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Long Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Long vowel</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>a:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>o:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>u:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ي</td>
<td>e:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ي</td>
<td>i:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract

This quasi-experimental study was designed to investigate the role and value of two major interactional feedback techniques: recasts and elicitations in communicative Egyptian Colloquial Arabic (ECA) classrooms. A preliminary pilot study based on observing 20 AFL classes suggested to the author of this paper that both recasts and elicitations are widely used in correcting learners' grammatical mistakes, especially subject-verb agreement errors (50%, and 30% for recasts and elicitations, respectively). Accordingly, the purpose of the current classroom-based study is to investigate which of the two feedback strategies, under investigation, could lead to substantial changes in Arabic as a Foreign Language (AFL) learners' inter-language, in terms of the effect these strategies might have on the short-term development of AFL learners' target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms. Pretest-immediate/delayed posttests were used to investigate the impact of recasts (an input-based feedback) and elicitations (an output-based feedback) on 24 AFL low intermediate learners. Four experimental groups were formed: two recasts groups with 10 participants, and two elicitations groups with 14 participants. The results of the immediate post-test, which was carried out on the same day of the treatment, showed no significant effect for both recasts and elicitations on learners' immediate pick-up of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms. However, the two elicitations groups significantly outperformed the two recasts groups on the delayed posttest, which was carried out two days after the treatment. The results of the delayed posttest also showed that the two elicitations groups significantly benefited more than the two recasts groups in terms of their recall of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms, which further added to the learners' inter-language development.
Chapter (1)

Introduction

1.1 Rationale and statement of research problem

The current study is conducted to investigate the value and the role of two forms of interactional feedback that have been the focus of a growing body of observational and experimental research in L2 learning, and L2 learners' inter-language development (e.g. Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Doughty & Varela, 1998; Mackey & Philp, 1998), and which have also been the source of much debate in the context of student-teacher interaction: recasts and elicitations. Although these studies have shown learners might generally benefit from interactional feedback, many of them have produced mixed results. The growing interest over recent years in learning Arabic as a foreign language has, unfortunately, not been appropriately met by Arabic language teachers and scholars in terms of providing adequate Arabic as a second/foreign language literature (Wahba et.al, 2006). To the best of my knowledge, no other study has investigated these two feedback types, elicitations and recasts, in terms of relative usefulness and their relationship to L2 learners’ uptake and language development in the context of learning Arabic as a Foreign Language (AFL). Accordingly, this study is motivated by the increased interest and need to investigate the contributions of recasts and elicitations to AFL learners' inter-language development. The following section of the paper will address the disagreement over the two feedback strategies in terms of the different ways in which each feedback type is provided, their relationship to learners' repair of erroneous utterances, and learners' subsequent retention of the target-like forms provided by the teacher during the interactional feedback process.

By definition, interactional feedback is the "feedback generated implicitly or explicitly through various negotiation and modification strategies that occur in the course of interaction to deal with communication problems" (Nassaji, 2007, p. 511). In explicit correction, the teacher gives the correct form to learners, while clearly stating to them that what they said is wrong. However, in implicit correction, the teacher tends to be more conservative in providing feedback; for instance, errors are not pointed out to the learner by saying: "This is wrong." or "You should say so and so." (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Recasts involve the teacher's reformulation of the learner's erroneous utterance into a more target-like form (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Youssef, 2009). This
implies that the teacher simply provides the learner with a correct model of the target language. The following example (Ammar, 2003) illustrates how recasts are employed in the classroom context:

Student: I have three new toy.

Teacher: You have three new toys.

In elicitations, learners' errors are implicitly corrected as is the case with recasts; instead of reformulating the learner's erroneous utterance, however, the teacher prompts the learner into reformulating it into a correct one using at least three techniques to elicit the target-like form from the learner (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Youssef, 2009). The three techniques are illustrated in the following example (Ammar, 2003)

Student: I have three new toys

Teacher: You have three new………..

Teacher: How do we form plural in English?

Teacher: Can you correct that?

Reviewing the literature on observational studies (e.g. Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Ellis, Basturkem, &Loewen, 2001; Panova & Lyster, 2002) and experimental studies (e.g. Mackey & Philp, 1998; Ammar, 2003; Nassaji, 2007, 2009) that have been conducted to investigate the contributions of these two classifications of interactional feedback to L2 learners' inter-language could be summarized as follows:

**Recasts:**

Erroneous utterance by learner $\rightarrow$ teacher recasts $\rightarrow$ unnoticed by learner $\rightarrow$ no uptake $\rightarrow$ no intake

The issue of "no uptake " in response to recasts was introduced in 1997, in a study conducted by Lyster & Ranta in four French immersion classes in Canada, where they investigated responses to six feedback types (explicit correction, recasts, elicitations, meta-linguistic, repetition, clarification request) employed by their class teachers. The results showed that among the
investigated feedback types, recasts were the most frequently used technique, accounting for 60% of the feedback moves. However, the high frequency of recasts failed to guarantee a high response on the part of the learners; on the contrary, they led to the least response, or what Lyster & Ranta referred to as "Learners' Uptake" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Uptake was generally defined by Silimani, 1992 & Allwright, 1994 (as cited in Lyster & Ranta, 1997) as what learners assume they have learned from a certain lesson. However, Lyster & Ranta (1997) gave the term another operational definition (the one adopted in this study) which is "the student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance" (Lyster&Ranta, 1997, p.49). This implies, according to Lyster & Ranta’s findings, that, while recasts are the most predominant feedback type, they yield the lowest rate of uptake by learners (see also Mackey & Philp, 1998; Panova & Lyster,2002). The findings also imply that a situation may arise where no uptake occurs on the part of learners after the class teacher corrects their non-target-like production using recasts. Lyster & Ranta (1997) attributed this to the notion that recasts are not perceived by learners as corrective moves in the first place (e.g. Carpenter et. al, 2006), Consequently, recasts were referred to as ‘echoes’ since this is how they might be perceived by learners. That is, recasts might be understood to be an echo of what learners have just said as well as serving as a confirmation that the message delivered by them has been understood by the teacher (see, Lyster, 1998). Similarly, Philp (2003) argued that because of the target-like version of language provided by recasts, they are perceived by learners as confirmation checks rather than corrective moves. According to Long (1981 cited in Rutherford, 1984), confirmation checks form a technique used by native speakers of a language to confirm to non-native speakers (in a communicative context) that what they just said has been correctly heard or understood. This verbal interaction takes place by repeating part or all of the non-native speakers’ preceding utterance. It is obvious from the definition provided by Long that recasts could easily be regarded by learners as confirmation checks rather than an attempt to reform their erroneous utterances. The argument about the importance of noticing in learning stems from the "Noticing Hypothesis". Schmidt (1990), who framed this hypothesis, regarded noticing as a major requirement for the conversion of input provided to learners into intake. According to Truscott & Smith (2011), intake is the piece of information that could be used eventually by the learner for acquisition. This implies that intake is the segment of the input that, when noticed by
the learner, becomes intake, a necessary component for subsequent development of the second language (see also Robinson, 1995; Rutherford & Smith, 1985; Gilakjani & Ahmadi, 2011). So, in accordance with the Noticing Hypothesis assumptions, it could be argued that ‘not noticing’ recasts as a feedback move leads to a ‘no uptake’ situation which, in turn, leads to a ‘no intake’ one.

However, in other research, uptake was not proven to be an absolute indicator of noticing, which, as stated above, leads to subsequent language development. An example of this was discussed in a study by Mackey & Philp (1998) on the use of recasts and their impact on learning English as a second language question formats. The students' language development was measured against the 1987 Pienemann and Johnston developmental scale for English questions formats. During the study, only 5% of students receiving recasts repaired their erroneous utterances in response to these recasts. However, the results of the post-test showed that those learners beginning at Level 4 on the developmental scale for questions progressed to level 5 during the time of the study. This implies that the ‘no uptake’ situation did not end up as a ‘no intake situation’. We find another example in a study by Ohta (2000) investigating the private speech (the learner's speech addressed to himself/herself) of seven learners of Japanese as a second language, in a class where the teacher used recasts as a corrective feedback technique. The study showed that the target learners were able to notice and positively utilize recasts that were directly addressed to other peers rather than to themselves. According to Ohta (2000), these findings provide strong evidence that recasts can be utilized in the learners' mental activity and help them notice the contrast between their ill-formed utterances and the teacher's reformulations, despite the absence of ‘overt oral response’ (Ohta, 2000, p.54). In accordance with these views, it could be argued that recasts, despite lack of overt uptake, can contribute to L2 learners' inter-language development. This could be illustrated by the following:

Erroneous utterance by learner ➔ teacher recasts ➔ noticed by learners despite lack of uptake ➔ intake

In the above illustration, the argument that target-like input provided to learners via recasts can be noticed by learners (despite lack of uptake) and internalized into intake originates from Krashen's (1982) "Input Hypothesis, which emphasizes the importance of input in SLA.
According to Krashen, ‘input’ (which he terms as ‘comprehensible input) is both crucial and sufficient for acquisition to take place. The point made by Krashen is that ‘comprehensible input’ requires some level of understanding of input on the part of the learners. Furthermore, if the input is sufficiently clear to learners, language progresses in natural order with no intervention needed on the part of the teacher. Krashen (1981 as cited in Mitchell & Myles, 2006) asserted that acquisition is an implicit subconscious process; thus, noticing the gap between the second language target-like form and the learners' actual L2 production (inter-language) does not really facilitate the process of acquisition. For this reason, the idea of noticing the gap between the target language and the learners' inter-language appeared in the early versions of the hypothesis before being omitted later on (Mitchell & Myles, 2006).

In the feedback approach implemented by recasts, providing the learner with a correct model of L2 (input) is considered a sufficient feedback move on the part of the teacher since it can be a step towards developing L2 learners' inter-language. This implies that providing input to the learner together with the learner's management of this input through interaction (or interactional feedback in case of recasts) forms a basis for language development (Gass, 1997). Within this frame work, the concept of ‘learner's management’ refers to the learner's ‘innate apparatus’. The idea of the innate language system was first proposed by Naom Chomsky in his theory on Universal Grammar. According to Chomsky (1981, 1986a, 1986b, 1995, as cited in Rivera, 2011), people are born ‘hardwired’ for language (Rivera, 2011, p.4). This is because they have an innate device that incorporates the grammars of all languages (thus giving rise the term Universal Grammar), and forms an innate language acquisition system that requires only to be fed by input for acquisition to take place. So, if this input is in a correct form or model of the target language, this system is capable of extracting it automatically and using it for setting the correct routes for target language formation (Gass, 1997; Gass & Selinker, 2001; VanPatten & Benati, 2010):

\[
\text{Erroneous utterance by learner} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{teacher recasts} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{learner's uptake or no uptake} \\
\quad \rightarrow \quad \text{the innate system extracts the linguistic feature} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{automatic internalization of input} \\
\quad \rightarrow \quad \text{intake}
\]

Despite the above claims, however, Miller (2003) affirms that providing input in the form of a target-like model of the language to L2 learners in response to errors can never be adequate for
learning to take place. He argues that unless learners are given the opportunity to repair their language and self-correct their errors, they will not be able to notice the gap between their inter-language and the target-like language. Similarly, White (1987) emphasizes that there are situations where input – as defined by Krashen – will not help learners to abandon some non-target forms produced by them, and, in turn, fail to make a change in learners’ grasp of grammar.

Although a few studies reported high rates of learners' uptake after recasts (e.g. Ellis et. al, 2001; Philp, 2003), other researchers (e.g. Swain, 1995 cited in Panova & Lyster, 2002) assert that even in the limited instances where uptake and /or modification of the target language occur after a recast, this might merely be ‘mechanical repetition’ (Panova & Lyster, 2001, p. 592) of the target like model provided by the teacher. In other words, learners' attention is not consciously drawn to the mismatch between their erroneous utterance and the correct model provided by the teacher. This concept was further emphasized by Sheen (2004), who claims that uptake after recasts is a mere repetition of the interlocutor's (whether a teacher or a native speaker) reformulation of the erroneous utterance. On the other hand, De Bot (1996) emphasizes the importance of pushing learners to self-correct their errors since this strategy allows meaningful connections to take place in their brains, which helps them produce the self-corrected form in the future, thus enhancing their inter-language development. Since recasts do not actually require learners to undertake any kind of re-analysis of information through self-correction, learners cannot experience the deep cognitive processing necessary for their inter-language development (Lyster& Mori, 2006). According to Mackey et.al (2010), these internal processes cannot actually be stimulated if learners only have to parrot reformulations provided by their interlocutors as is the case in recasts. In the light of these views, De Bot (2000) cast doubt on the notion that input provided through recasts could actually lead to significant changes in learners' inter-language. These assumptions are represented in the following illustration:

Erroneous utterance by learner → teacher recasts → learner's uptake (mechanical act) →

Lack of deep cognitive processes necessary for internalizing input → no intake
**Elicitations**

Erroneous utterance by learner $\rightarrow$ elicitation feedback by teacher (pushes learner to self-correct) $\rightarrow$ triggers learner’s attention to the mismatch between the target language and the learner's inter-language $\rightarrow$ modified output requiring deep cognitive processing $\rightarrow$ intake

The above illustration indicates that the learner is given implicit feedback in the form of input, drawing out of the learner a modified output rather than an ordinary one. Hence, the importance of language production (output) is strongly emphasized by elicitations as a means to draw the learner's attention to his/her erroneous utterance. The importance of output in the form of learners' language production forms the core of the "Output Hypothesis" which was first introduced by Merrill Swain in 1985 (cited in Ellis, 1990), affirming the indispensable role played by production of language (i.e. output) in the development of L2 learners' inter-language (Ellis, 1990; Gass, 1997; Gass & Selinker, 2001; Mitchell & Myles, 2006, Jiang, 2010).

According to Swain, the role carried out by output in second language development is achieved through the following functions: noticing function or consciousness-raising, where learners become aware of gaps and problems in their current language system; the hypothesis testing function, where learners test the language structures making up their inter-language against target language structures by feedback received from native speakers of the language; and the meta-linguistic function, where learners are provided with feedback on their output, which helps them to reflect on their problems and analyze them. Swain (1993 as cited in Gass & Mackey, 2006) emphasizes the importance of allowing learners to reflect on their output and "consider ways of modifying this output to enhance comprehensibility, appropriateness, and accuracy" (p. 4). Thus, through production in elicitations – as opposed to comprehension only in recasts - learners are pushed to shift from a mere understanding of meaning to an understanding of form, that is, from semantic to syntactic processing (Ellis, 1990; Izumi et. al, 1999; Gass & Selinker, 2001, Mitchell & Myles, 2006). This implies that attending to the linguistic features (form) in the input provided to learners during interactional feedback might be a sufficient condition for learning to take place (Hulstijn, 1989 as cited in White, 1998).

Accordingly, it could be argued that elicitations, in terms of its implemented approach in providing feedback, could provide an environment that allows learners to notice the gap in their inter-language, and the mismatch between what they actually produce and what they need to
produce, through negotiation. Long, the founder of the "Interaction Hypothesis" (1996 as cited in Gass & Mackey, 2006) claims that "environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner's developing L2 processing capacity, and that these resources are brought together most usefully… during negotiation" (p.4). Similarly, Gass (1997) considers negotiation a way to draw learners' attention to the non-target like linguistic form by making it more salient to learners, thereby drawing their attention to areas of ‘needed change’ (Gass, 1997, p.131) or what she referred to as the "impetus for learners to recognize the inadequacy of their own rule system" (p. 132).

Schmidt (1990) claims that consciousness at the level of noticing is essential for subsequent second language acquisition. For input to be processed into mental registration, that is, to become ‘intake’, a certain level of attention is required for the purpose of selecting input for processing. Although modified output, as mentioned earlier, is supposed to carry out the noticing function consequently leading to acquisition and eventual language development, it may fail to do so:

Erroneous utterance by learner \[\rightarrow\] elicitation feedback by teacher (pushes learner to self-correct) \[\rightarrow\] triggers learner attention to the mismatch between the target language and the learner's inter-language \[\rightarrow\] modified output requiring deep cognitive processing \[\rightarrow\] no intake

Mackey et. al, 2003( cited in Sheen, 2004), were skeptical about output as a reliable indicator of the long term effect of negative evidence on L2 development. They also doubted the existence of a direct correlation between output and L2 development, emphasizing the lack of empirical research on this issue (see also Lyster, 2001; Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Adams et.al, 2012). In this regard, it is worth mentioning that, although a considerable body of research has focused on the occurrence of modified output, only limited studies have investigated the relationship between modified output and acquisition (Shehdah, 2002). Similarly, Lapkin et.al (2002) asserts that more empirical research is needed to show how noticing L2 language forms can lead to learning. Moreover, the results of a few studies (e.g. Rivera, 2011; Sauro, 2009) showed no significant differences between output-based and input-based feedback strategies, in terms of their effect on learners' inter-language development, adding to the dilemma of mixed results
With these conflicting views on recasts and elicitations, the dilemma could be solved by looking at the outcome of the whole feedback operation in both cases; that is intake (acquisition). In other words, the effect of recasts or elicitations to correct learners’ faulty utterances (non-target forms) needs to be monitored more closely. One pertinent question arises here: Will learners internalize the target forms provided by the teacher, and, in consequence, add to the future development of their inter-language? This question can only be answered through empirical investigation, which might provide evidence on the effect of recasts, as an input-based feedback technique, and elicitations, as an output-based feedback technique, on language development.

Prior to carrying on with this research, however, it seemed of special importance to the researcher to investigate what actually happens in AFL classes in terms of the employed feedback strategies in AFL classes at the American University in Cairo (AUC). Accordingly, the author of the paper conducted a preliminary pilot study, where 20 AFL classes were attended for observation purposes. The classes taught a variety of subjects, such as Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), Egyptian colloquial Arabic (ECA), Media, and translation. The researcher sat in on classes from beginning till end and took detailed observation notes on teacher-student interactions during these classes. Analysis of the notes showed that 293 feedback / correction moves took place. This preliminary study was conducted in order to identify the frequency of the feedback techniques used in AFL classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback type</th>
<th>Recasts</th>
<th>Elicitations</th>
<th>Explicit correction</th>
<th>Clarification request</th>
<th>Meta-linguistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>167/293</td>
<td>112/293</td>
<td>9/293</td>
<td>3/293</td>
<td>2/293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table (1)**

The above table shows that both recasts and elicitations are used extensively in AFL classes (57% & 38% for recasts and elicitations respectively), a finding that increased the researcher’s interest in measuring the effect of these two widely used feedback strategies on AFL learners’ performance in the target language (in this case, Arabic). Moreover, the researcher noticed that recasts were widely used in correcting grammar (82 instances out of 167) while over half the
elicitations moves involved correcting grammar (68 instances out of 112). These findings appear to challenge claims made by several researchers that recasts are more suitable for correcting lexical and phonological errors rather than grammatical ones because they can be better noticed by learners (see Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Hanoaka, 2007). However, this was not the only observation that runs counter to the propositions put forward by some of the previously mentioned studies which showed that recasts led to the lowest uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mackey & Philp; Panova & Lyster, 2001; Silmani, 1992). Although the results cannot be generalized given the limited number of observation sessions the researcher attended, the discrepancy in number raises questions about the results of these studies. The results of the observation sessions showed that out of 167 instances of recasts, there were only 35 occasions when there was no uptake by the learners. This means that 80% of the recasts employed by teachers in the observed classes resulted in uptake (compared to 31% in the study by Lyster & Ranta, 1997 and to 5% in Mackey & Philp, 1998). As for elicitations, there was only one instance where no modified output occurred in response to the elicitation. This implies that elicitations were successful 99% of the time, so the results are similar to those of Lyster & Ranta, (1997) where elicitations were successful 100% of the time. According to Mackey et.al, 2003 (cited in Sheen, 2004), however, there is no definite correlation between modified output and L2 development, thus giving rise to a need for more empirical research to shed light on this issue (see also Panova & Lyster, 2002).

The recasts forming the focus of the current study are the same type employed by Lyster & Ranta (1997) and by Mackey & Philp (1998), known as ‘isolated recasts’ (Youssef, 2009, p. 65). Isolated recasts reformulate learners’ errors without any attempt to use additional techniques, such as rising intonation or adding stress (Youssef, 2009). Vartanian (2011) also referred to this specific type of recasts as “recasts without enhanced salience” (p. 3). During the observation sessions, the researcher made a point of choosing a certain feature of AFL learners’ inter-language to drive this investigation. The results of the observation round showed that recasts and elicitations are widely used by AFL teachers in giving corrective feedback on subject-verb agreement errors (50%, and 30% of feedback moves for recasts and elicitations, respectively). Accordingly, the author of the paper found that choosing a feature
from AFL learners' errors that is widely corrected by employing recasts and elicitations might well serve the purposes of this research.

So, the target of this research is to look into the effect of recasts and elicitations on AFL learners' inter-language development in terms of their accurate production of target-like subject/verb agreement forms, and to investigate how this effect is sustained over time, that is, on how long this development will last. As previously mentioned, no other study has tackled the issue of feedback and its effect on the development of the learners' inter-language in the domain of teaching Arabic as a foreign language. This makes investigating this topic of special value to both teachers and learners of TAFL.

As far as the research setting was concerned, the results of the observation round carried out by the researcher in all AFL classes showed that ECA classes seemed to provide a suitable environment for the purposes of this research. ECA classes are mainly based on the idea of verbal interaction that involves both teachers and learners (teacher/learner and learner/learner). This implies that feedback from teacher and learners always comes in oral form, while in other classes (MSA and media, for instance), feedback varies between oral and written form. Besides, Recasts and Elicitations are mainly oral feedback techniques (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Nassaji, 2007, 2009; Youssef, 2009). As the researcher is interested in teacher-learner verbal interaction, ECA classes seem to provide the researcher with a suitable natural classroom setting and a fertile environment to carry out the research. Accordingly, the current research investigates the effect of recasts and elicitations on ECA learners' inter-language and will also investigate how this effect is sustained over time.

The researcher's main interest is to investigate the rate of immediate response of learners (uptake and modified output) in reaction to both techniques. This could be considered a preliminary indicator that learners have or have not noticed their errors. In addition, the researcher focuses on monitoring the effect of learners' uptake and modified output on learners' immediate pickup of information given to them by their teachers during corrective feedback. These were achieved by administering a post-test to the learners immediately after the treatment. It is also essential to investigate which one of the two techniques could lead to subsequent retention of input leading
to learners' inter-language development. To achieve this target, a delayed post-test was included in addition to the immediate post-test.

For purely empirical reasons, the study focuses on the short term rather than the long term development of learners' inter-language. Two studies (Williams, 2001; Loewen, 2002 as cited in Sheen, 2004) on the relationship between uptake and L2 development estimated that a suitable time interval for measuring the subsequent effect of learners' uptake on their retention of language forms within a short period of time was between one to two days after the treatment. This is later justified in the methodology section of the paper.

**1.2 Research questions**

1- What is the rate of ECA learners' uptake in response to recasts when employed by ECA teacher/researcher as a feedback strategy?

2- What is the rate of ECA learners' modified output in response to elicitations when employed by ECA teacher/researcher as a feedback strategy?

3- What is the effect of recasts as compared to elicitations on learners' immediate pick up of target like ECA subject-agreement forms?

4- What is the effect of recasts on the short term development of AFL learners' target- like ECA subject-verb agreement forms as compared to elicitations?

**1.3 Pilot Study**

In order to test the research questions, the researcher conducted a pilot study during the fall of 2012. Two groups were involved in the study: one for the recasts group, and one for the elicitations group. The recasts group consisted of 5 participants, and the elicitations group consisted of 3 participants making a total of 8 subjects. The purpose of this pilot study was to test the efficiency of the methodology proposed by the researcher in the current study. Accordingly, the pilot study employed the same research steps designed to be carried out in the main study, which are: pretest, treatment, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest. The pretest was used to detect the problematic areas in the subjects' production of ECA subject-verb agreement forms. This was used to design a tailor-made treatment that created a context where the learners are on
the brink of making errors so that the researcher could introduce the researched feedback technique. The immediate posttest was used to measure the immediate recall of target-like subject-verb agreement forms provided during the error correction procedure (treatment). The delayed posttest was used to measure the degree of retention of these forms. The whole procedure was videotaped.

It is worth mentioning here that the pilot study helped the researcher identify a few necessary changes that were needed in the study methodology. For instance, the activity used in the pilot study in the treatment was too simple to result in learners' errors, with the result that the researcher was unable to employ the researched feedback technique. This occurred with the first group to be tested, which happened to be the recasts group. Accordingly, the researcher modified the activity to make it more complex. This will be further emphasized in the methodology chapter. Further changes in the main study included supplementing the video-taping with audio-taping in order to ensure more accurate data. The current study is interested in the learners' oral production; since there were some instances where the video-recording could not provide a clear enough sound, making use of a digital recorder allowed the researcher to double check the learners' oral production.

1.4 Definition of terms

a. Theoretical definition of constructs

The terms used in this study are defined as follows:

Elicitations: a type of implicit negative evidence feedback used by the teacher with an attempt to elicit the correct form from learners when they produce a non-target like utterance. This occurs by a number of ways: asking the learners questions: (e.g. How do we say so and so….?) or by pausing to give the learner the opportunity to complete the teacher's utterance (e.g. He is a………. ) (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) or by asking the learners to correct / rephrase what they just said (Can you correct that?) (Ammar, 2003).

Errors: are non-native uses of a language by its learners. Errors can be phonological, lexical and / or grammatical (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) and “reveal the patterns of learners’ development of inter-language systems” (Ferreira & Atkinson, 2009, p. 497).
Explicit Feedback: giving learners a clear and overt indication that they have committed an error (Ellis et. al, 2006).

Feedback: is the information that second language learners receive from their interlocutor (teacher or a native speaker) about their language production, thus giving them the opportunity to modify their erroneous utterance/output (if any). Feedback could be provided implicitly or explicitly (Bentalebi, 2011)

Immediate Uptake: the learner's immediate response to the teacher's corrective feedback (recast) in reaction to the teacher's attempt to draw the learner's attention to his / her erroneous utterance by reformulating it into a correct one (Lyster&Ranta, 1997)

Immediate pick-up: Learners' immediate incorporation of the teacher's corrective feedback, which is provided on their errors, in subsequent utterances.

Implicit Feedback: through interaction and negotiation, learners get to know that they have committed an error, and are also able to recognize what the correct form could be, all of which take place in an inexplicit fashion (Gass & Mackey, 2006)

Input: is language that is made available to the learners, either through listening, reading, and gestures in case of sign language (Gass & Mackey, 2006)

Intake: "That part of the language input that is internalized by the learner" (Gass & Selinker, 2001, p.455)

Inter-language: the language produced by non-native speakers of a language who are in the process of learning a second or foreign language. This language represents the learners' output in L2 (Gass & Selinker, 2001)

Modified output: is the learners' immediate response to the teacher’s correction (elicitation), which comes in the form of learners' self-correction/modification of their erroneous utterances.

Negative Evidence: it is the type of feedback that gives them an indication that there is a non-target feature in their utterance that is not acceptable in the target language (Iwashita, 2003)

Output: is the language that is produced by the language learners (Gass & Mackey, 2006)
**Recasts**: a teacher's rephrasing / reformulation of a learner's erroneous utterance to eliminate the error (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)

**Repair**: a learner's correct utterance in reaction to a teacher's feedback / correction on the learner's faulty utterance, that is, it is not a self-initiated repair (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)

**Second Language Acquisition**: "the acquisition of another language or languages after the first language acquisition is underway or completed (Fromkin et al, 2007)

**Short-Term Development**: monitoring and / or investigating the learner' development in a certain feature of the target language within a short period of time (from to seven days).

**Target Language**: the language that forms the goal of learning for learners of foreign and second languages.

**Uptake**: "the student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p.49)

**b. Operational definition of constructs**

**Elicitations as output-based feedback technique**: in reaction to their non-native-like utterances, elicitations provide learners implicitly with feedback that tells them what is not acceptable in the target language. This technique thus helps learners notice the mismatch between their utterance and the target language. In the process, learners are somehow pushed to produce a repaired utterance (output), or what can be described as modified output, with the help of some cues provided by the teacher.

**Recasts as an Input-based feedback technique**: in reaction to their non-native-like utterances, recasts provide learners implicitly with a correct model of the target language, that is, input. The learner is expected to extract the information (the correction) from the given model.
1.5 Abbreviations used in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Foreign Language Learners</th>
<th>AFL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrective feedback</td>
<td>CF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian Colloquial Arabic</td>
<td>ECA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Language</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Language Acquisition</td>
<td>SLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Language</td>
<td>TL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (2)
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Stances on the Role of Input and Output in SLA

There has been considerable debate regarding the role assigned to input and output in the process of SLA, and consequently, L2 learners' inter-language development. Actually, the concept of input and output has formed the focus of two major hypotheses; the "Input Hypothesis" proposed by Stephen Krashen in 1981 (Ellis, 1990), and the "Output Hypothesis" put forth by Merill Swain in 1985 (Ellis, 1990).

According to Krashen (1982, 1985), there is only one way for humans to acquire language, which is by either understanding messages, or by receiving ‘comprehensible input’. If clear and sufficient input is provided, language progresses along the natural order with no intervention needed on the part of the teacher. The reason for this, according to Krashen, is that learners understand the language, including un-acquired grammar, with the help of three tools: context, world knowledge, and previously acquired language competence. This means that a certain level of understanding is required on the part of the learners in order for acquisition to take place. It should be pointed out, however, that understanding here means an understanding of the meaning rather the form. Krashen (1982) asserts that acquisition of the meaning is a prerequisite for acquiring the structure, that is, form. Besides, Krashen considers speaking (as a productive skill) an outcome, but not a cause, of acquisition. This implies that the learners should not be pushed to speak, that is, produce output, because speech emerges as a result of building competence via comprehensible input. And since the acquisition process, in Krashen’s view, occurs unconsciously and without awareness, the idea of noticing the gap between the target-like form and the learners' IL becomes insignificant in terms of language acquisition. (Mitchell & Myles, 2006). This implies that, in cases where grammar is being taught, for instance, what counts is giving students an abundance of input, since this would be enough to make them deduce the rules themselves with guidance from their innate apparatus. This idea of the innate language system was first proposed by Naom Chomsky in his theory on Universal Grammar. According to Chomsky (1981, 1986a, 1986b, 1995, as cited in Rivera, 2011), people are born
‘hardwired’ for language (Rivera, 2011, p.4). This is because they have an innate device that incorporates the grammars of all languages (thus giving rise to the term Universal Grammar), and forms an innate language acquisition system that requires only to be fed by input for acquisition to take place. So, if input is in a correct form / model of the target language, this system is capable of extracting it automatically and using it for setting the correct routes for target language formation (Gass, 1997; Gass & Selinker, 2001; VanPatten & Benati, 2010). For this reason, proponents of input-based feedback (recasts and models) use the concept of the innate system + input in the form of target language model as a crucial component in providing corrective feedback for learners. At the same time, this concept serves as a means to refute the claims by supporters of output based feedback on the importance of pushing learners to produce target like language in the form of modified output.

The opposing side of the argument rests on the “Output Hypothesis". This hypothesis, in fact, is an outcome of a study carried out by Swain in 1985, 1995, on 175 Grade Six immersion students learning French as a second language in Ottawa, Canada (Ellis, 1990). An investigation of the proficiency of learners revealed that what was lacking in their development was an ability to produce native-speaker like grammatical competence in French. This was attributed to a deficiency in their productive skills, but definitely not to the comprehensible input, since they were exposed to plenty of it in their immersion classes. This led Swain to realize the indispensible role played by production of language (output) in the development of a second language (Ellis, 1990; Gass, 1997; Gass & Selinker, 2001; Mitchell & Myles, 2006, Jiang, 2010). According to Swain & Lapkin (1995), the role carried out by output is achieved through the following functions: noticing function and /or consciousness-raising role; the hypothesis testing function, where learners test language structures making up their inter-language against the target language ones aided by feedback received from native speakers of the language. Once learners are provided with feedback on their output, they can reflect on their problems and analyze them (meta-linguistic function). In other words, it is through production rather than comprehension that learners are nudged from a mere understanding of meaning to an understanding of form, that is, from semantic to syntactic processing. This implies that through language production (output), learners get to notice the gaps and problems in their current second language system (inter-language), thus working on modifying these concerns. This concept is
adopted by proponents of output-based feedback such as elicitations, clarification requests, and meta-linguistic feedback.

The importance of the concept of ‘noticing’ and the role of consciousness in second language acquisition was highlighted in the "Noticing Hypothesis". This hypothesis was introduced by Schmidt (1990, 1993a, 1993b, 1993c, 1994 as cited in Gass, 2003), and looked at different levels of attention. Although Schmidt specified the importance of noticing as a level of attention in terms of learning (Gass, 2003; Mitchell & Myles, 2006), he doubted the concept of implicit unconscious learning proposed by Krashen in 1982, in favor of the view that conscious learning, as an attribute of noticing, is a major requirement for converting the input provided to learners into intake. According to Truscott & Smith (2011), intake is the piece of information that can be used eventually by the learner for acquisition. This implies that intake is the segment of the input that when noticed by the learner becomes intake, a necessary component for subsequent development of the second language (Schmidt, 1990). A study by Schmidt & Forta (1986, as cited in Schmidt, 1990), analyzed the researcher’s own acquisition of Brazilizian-Portoguese; the results showed a strong connection between noticing and the output of learner in terms of his accurate production of the language. Similarly, Gass (1990 as cited in Mackey & Philp, 1998) mentioned that no input in the target language could ever be converted into intake in the learner's language system if it is not noticed by him/her (Robinson, 1995; Rutherford & Smith, 1985; Gilakjani & Ahmadi, 2011). This implies that Schmidt's claims run counter to Krashen's hypothesis that SLA is mainly an unconscious process. However, Swain's "Output Hypothesis" considers noticing crucial for any acquisition to take place. Gass (1988, 1990, 1991 as cited in El Tatawy, 2006), asserts the importance of allowing learners' to notice the mismatch between the input provided to them and their inter-language system. Consequently, she rejects the idea that presenting comprehensible input to learners, even in an extensive form, would convert it into intake, and subsequently output (as claimed by Krashen (1985). Furthermore, Gass regards providing corrective feedback for learners as a means of directing their attention to discrepancies between their inter-language and the target language. Recasts as an input-based feedback technique and elicitations as an output-based feedback technique are the main thrust in the debate between the two hypotheses. A review of the studies investigating the two feedback techniques from 1997 to 2010 will be provided in this chapter of the paper. However, before discussing the different views on the two feedback techniques, it seems of special importance to address
different notions on the issue of ‘feedback’ in itself. Actually, the concept of ‘feedback’ has a long history of rejection and acceptance by different scholars and different teaching methodologies in the realm of language learning and second language acquisition. The following section presents a quick review of this history.

2.2 A quick review of the history of feedback with regard to different teaching methodologies and language scholars

The importance of error correction and feedback on errors has always been a controversial issue in the field of Second Language Acquisition. The debate dates back to the behaviorist views of the 1950s and the 1960s which agreed with the Audio-lingual Method that error correction was inevitable and should occur at all costs. Since it was based on the behaviorist view of habit formation, correct use of a trait causes positive reinforcement, while incorrect use brings about a negative one. Two decades later, the 1970s Natural Approach, in contrast, discouraged error correction in an attempt to keep the learners’ affective filter low. According to the Natural Approach, error correction results in only more anxiety and embarrassment to learners, thus raising their affective filter, a practice that hinders rather than promotes learning (Russel, 2009).

In the 1980s, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) became very popular as a teaching approach. The main goal of this approach was the development of learners' fluency. In order to achieve this target, the approach's main focus was on meaning and use instead of a focus on form. Hence, error correction in the view of CLT was of only minimal importance, meaning that corrective feedback was largely overlooked during classroom activities (Han, 2002).

In the 1990s, however, this view changed as a number of researchers (Swain, 1995 cited in Mitchell & Myles, 2006; Swain & Lapkin, 1989, Lyter & Ranta, 1997, Mackey & Philp, 1998) asserted that giving learners the freedom to produce language without correction in an environment heavily dependent on meaning-based activities would entail providing a relatively low quality input for learners. This is because input that is an outcome of excessive interaction among students with no assistance from the teacher tended to be negatively viewed. This implies that learners, instead of receiving authentic language- are actually receiving a plethora of output from the other students’ IL (Han, 2002), which might undermine opportunities for language learners to develop their language system in the direction of the target language. This risk created
a need for the introduction of pedagogical input that included form-focused instruction and error correction (Han, 2002).

The 1990s witnessed a different era with many researchers now promoting the positive effect that explicit grammar instruction, feedback, and focus on form might have on SLA (Second Language Acquisition (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Fotos, 1994; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 1998; Mackey & Philp, 1998). For instance, Aljaareh & Lantolf (1994) asserted that learning a second language is not, actually, an outcome of the learner's efforts alone; rather, it is the outcome of some kind of collaborative effort where other people, such as the teacher or native speakers of the language, can be involved. By providing appropriate feedback, those people could help learners modify their IL. Fotos’ (1994) study was a departure from traditionalist views based on the CLT approach, the main goal of which was to provide learners with rich input without any attempt at formal grammar instruction on the teacher’s part. In fact, teacher intervention came to be considered an obstacle to the developmental path of learners' fluency. In this study, Fotos explored ways to integrate instruction on grammar in a communicative framework through meaning-focused activities. The study showed that employing grammar-consciousness-raising tasks was a successful method in promoting knowledge of problematic structures through communicative activities (Fotos, 1994). Similarly, in a 1990 study by Lightbow & Spada (cited in Fotos, 1994), a large number of communicative classes featuring formal instruction and error correction were investigated. The researchers concluded that learners in these classes showed accuracy in the subsequent use of different grammatical forms, a situation that was not really available to learners in classes which lacked focus on both form and error correction.

Consequently, the importance of error correction and feedback on errors was reinforced by many researchers in order to investigate its effect in the field of language learning and second language acquisition (e.g.; see Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 1998; Mackey and Philp, 1998; Han, 2002; Castro, 2010; Coskun, 2010; Takimoto, 2006). For instance, Omaggio (2001) emphasized the importance of feedback on errors, arguing that this feedback is in an attempt to orient instruction towards proficiency. In this regard, Omaggio (2001) presented five hypotheses which she viewed as underlying principles for proficiency-oriented teaching. Feedback formed the core of the third
hypothesis in which Omaggio urged that some attention should be given to errors, especially those tending to interfere with comprehensibility. Hypothesis Three states that:

"The development of accuracy should be encouraged in proficiency-oriented instruction. As learners produce language, various forms of instruction and evaluative feedback can be useful in facilitating the progression of their skills toward more precise and coherent language use" (Omaggio, 2001, p.263).

Also, a study by Miller (2003), carried out a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of corrective feedback which, the author argued, had a positive effect on learners' errors, in terms of helping them to pinpoint their problematic linguistic structures, and take notice of their errors. This provided them with the opportunity to modify those errors in an attempt to progress in the acquisition of the target language.

In a study by Banitalebi (2011), an investigation was conducted of the different types of corrective feedback utilized by L2 teachers in reading comprehension L2 classes (acknowledgment, acceptance, repetition, rephrasing, recasts, meta-linguistic, elicitation, and clarification requests). Although the study showed that these techniques were not equally used by L2 teachers, Banitalebi asserts that reading teachers could help learners develop their reading skills by providing sufficient feedback. This implies that L2 learners could develop their skills as an outcome of feedback as it makes learners realize the discrepancies between their utterances and the target language forms, and consequently, try to replace the flawed IL forms with target-language forms.

In another study by Ferris & Roberts (2001) on the effect of feedback on L2 writers’ (ESL, in this case), ability to self-edit their texts, the effects of two types of explicit feedback were investigated. The researchers devised a coding system to identify errors in the performance of ESL writers while refraining from marking or labeling these errors in any way. At the same time, the researchers compared the two experimental groups were compared against a control group that received no feedback at all. The results of the study showed that both of the experimental groups outperformed the no-feedback control group on the self-editing task, while no significant differences appeared between the coded and non-coded group. This indicates that
providing feedback, generally works in the favor of the L2 learner, no matter how explicit the feedback may be.

However, not all researchers are equally convinced of the benefits of feedback, attitudes towards which range from hesitancy to disfavor. Belonging to the latter group is Truscott (1996, 1999), who takes a major stand against feedback. Actually, Truscott opposes feedback and error correction both orally and in writing. In a paper on the issue of grammar correction in writing, Truscott (1996), asserts that he can neither deny the importance of grammatical accuracy nor disclaim feedback as a teaching technique in and of itself. The problem, according to Truscott, is the general ineffectiveness of error correction, which, when employed, can work to learners’ detriment. Truscott justifies his views on the basis of a literature review of a number of studies supporting the ineffectiveness and even negative effects of feedback on grammatical errors. For instance, in a ten-week study on German students conducted in 1984 by Semke (cited in Truscott, 1996), subjects were divided into four groups, each receiving a different type of feedback (comments on content, comments on errors, comments on both errors and content, and a self-correction group). According to Truscott (1996), Semke found no significant differences between the four groups in terms of the development of their grammatical accuracy in writing. Furthermore, providing more feedback meant more harm to the learners. For instance, the group which received two types of feedback on content and errors were inferior to the other groups in terms of performance while the self-correction group performed the worst of all. Truscott also presented another study that was conducted in 1984 by Robb et al. Similarly, this study investigated the effects of four different types of corrective feedback on L2 writers and found no significant differences among them in terms of their writing ability. As for oral correction, Truscott (1999) argued that most language teachers are not grammar experts. As a result, these teachers might fail to gain insight into the nature and cause of the errors. Accordingly, when teachers themselves are confused about the errors and their source, they have little chance of helping their students. Assuming teachers manage to help learners, the correction will most likely end up confusing these learners. Truscott also pointed out inconsistencies in correction such as correcting one aspect of the error and leaving others, or providing the learner with different types of feedback on the same error, all of which might have harmful effects on learners. Another important issue presented by Truscott (1999) in his argument centers on the affective side of feedback and error correction. He warns that, if delivered in an aggressive or
 unfair manner, feedback and error correction might arouse negative feelings of embarrassment, anger, inferiority, or even a resentful attitude towards the class and / or the language itself.

Among the second group of researchers who showed hesitancy over the results of studies on the effects of feedback on second language development, Ferris (2004), mentions that despite decades of research on and debate on this issue, the majority of the results were not sufficiently complete or consistent enough to allow either researchers or teachers to take them for granted or consider them as a basis for any definite conclusions about the topic. Taking a similar stance, Guenette (2007), in a study titled "Is feedback pedagogically correct?" asserts that results of feedback studies conducted over the past twenty years yielded no clue to teachers on whether or not to correct errors in L2 classes. Guenette attributed the inconsistency in the results to the research design and methodology as well as external factors beyond the control of researchers.

The above argument indicates that some researchers support employing corrective feedback (CF) in L2 classes while others totally oppose it, and yet others remain skeptical about the results of the studies investigating the topic. This implies that more studies on the impact of corrective feedback on second language development are called for, thereby forming the starting point in this research; to conduct an in-depth investigative study on the effect of feedback on second language development, or to be more precise, on second language acquisition.

2.3 Review of studies on Recasts and Elicitations

Given the importance of corrective feedback in SLA and L2 learners' IL development, Lyster & Ranta (1997), conducted a study on the relationship between types and distribution of corrective feedback in communicative classroom and learner uptake. The study took place in four French immersion classrooms at the primary level. The four class teachers to be observed were chosen on the basis of their willingness to participate in the study, and to have their classes observed and tape-recorded. The transcriptions of 27 lessons formed the data base for the study. Analysis of data showed that, among the six different types (explicit correction, repetition, recasts, clarification requests, meta-linguistic, elicitations) of feedback moves provided by the four teachers in this study in response to their learners' errors, recasts were by far the most widely used technique (accounting for 55% of the feedback moves), while elicitations came under the second category in terms of their frequency of usage (14%). However, in terms of the
distribution of uptake following different feedback types, recasts led to uptake only 31% of the time in comparison to elicitation moves leading to uptake 100% of the time. The researchers concluded that feedback moves providing negotiation of form (elicitations and meta-linguistic) have proven to be the most compelling ways of encouraging learners' repairs. Lyster & Ranta attributed this to the argument in favor of feedback moves that are output-based. That is, feedback that provides opportunities, through negotiation of form, for self-generated repair of errors may be important for L2 learning. This is because it can allow learners to confront their errors in a way that is conducive to drawing on their own resources in order to review their already existing hypotheses about the target language (see also Tsang, 2004; Jabbari & Fazilatfar, 2012). In cases where recasts were used, however, only a very small percentage (18%) led to successful repairs, which merely consisted of repetitions of the teachers' recasts, or what the researchers referred to as ‘echoes’ of the teachers' reformulations. The researchers argued that recasts might lead to a great deal of ambiguity in communicative classrooms, because they do not allow for student self-generated repair, leaving the students in a situation where they have to sort out for themselves the teachers' intentions, whether these relate to form or meaning. Given the ambiguity of recasts form the classroom learners’ perspective, Lyster and Ranta (1997) argued that learners' might fail to notice the gap or the mismatch between their non-target like utterances and the teachers' modifications.

Lyster (1998) further investigated the ambiguity issue of recasts. Lyster classified the 377 recasts, extracted from the same data base used in the previous study, according to their pragmatic functions. The analysis of the functional properties of recasts in the four classes revealed four types of recasts: isolated declarative, isolative interrogative, incorporated declarative, and incorporated interrogative. The first two types involve complete or partial reformulation of the utterance with falling intonation and no additional meaning (declarative) or rising intonation and no additional meaning (interrogative). In the second pair, the teacher provides additional information by integrating the correct reformulation of the learner's utterance into a longer statement or question (incorporated declarative and incorporated interrogative, respectively). Results showed that isolated declarative recasts, that is, the first type, (also the same type of recasts investigated in the current study) led to very limited instances of uptake with 66 instances of successful repair and 27 instances of needs-repair out of 251. This implies that almost two thirds of isolated recasts provided no opportunities for uptake (Lyster, 1998).
for the other three types, there were even fewer chances for learners' uptake (one repair instance and 21 instances of needs repair for types two, three and four). Lyster concluded that the corrective function of recasts in communicative classes is ambiguous and not sufficiently clear to learners. Analysis of data also showed teachers' tendency to repeat learners' well-formed utterances in a phenomenon known as ‘Non-Corrective Repetitions’. These repetitions, exactly like recasts, perform the function of confirmation checks (Lyster, 1998). Due to the nature of isolated recasts that provide learners with what is possible in TL by simply providing them with a correct model (input) of their erroneous utterances, learners tend to confuse them with corrective repetitions.

This argument was further emphasized in a study by Carpenter et. al (2006) on learners' interpretations of recasts which attributed this ambiguity to the idea that learners' do not actually notice the corrective element in recasts, tending to perceive them as semantic repetitions of what they said. According to Long (in press as cited in Carpenter et.al, 2006), prosodic and extra-linguistic cues such as facial expressions might help learners disambiguate recasts from other types of feedback. On the basis of these claims, the researchers found it crucial to investigate the immediate discourse context where recasts are employed and look into the presence of other possible cues that might affect the way learners perceive the corrective nature of recasts.

Accordingly, the researchers addressed two research questions: "A) Do learners recognize the corrective nature of recasts when the recasts are removed from their immediate discourse context? B) Do learners identify any nonlinguistic cues when deciding whether utterances are recasts or repetitions?" (p. 217). Participants were 34 advanced-level students from the English program at two universities and two community colleges in the United States. To allow learners to gain exposure to authentic recasts and repetitions, a video tape stimulus was prepared depicting 26 adult learners from English as a second language program in a medium-sized urban university. The learners were shown engaging in communicative task-based activities, including recasts and repetitions, with one of two NSs who were also researchers in the current study (two ESL/ EFL teachers who were ESL MA degree holders). The participants were divided into two groups; Response-only group whose video clip was edited by erasing learners’ utterances that preceded NS responses using recasts and repetitions, and an Utterance-response-group who gets to see the whole procedure without any editing, that is, learners' triggering utterances and NS response to them using recasts and repetitions. The results of the study showed that when recasts
were removed or edited from their immediate context in the Response-only group, the learners were less accurate and less able than the other group to identify the corrective nature of recasts (20% for the response-only group versus 33% for the utterance-response group). This indicates the importance of the immediate context of interaction in helping learners recognize the corrective nature of recasts despite the absence of any non-verbal cues. Although the results showed that cognitive comparisons between learners' erroneous utterances and target-like reformulations provided by teacher do not occur following the majority of recasts, the researchers concluded that opportunities provided by the interactional feedback context (given to L2 learners to compare their non target-like utterances with the more target-like utterances provided by recasts) might be one source of effectiveness attributed to this type of feedback. The concept of providing aiding cues in recasts feedback context in order to make them more salient to learners was presented in a study by Doughty & Varela in 1998. Doughty and Varela investigated the effect of employing recasts as a feedback technique on young ESL learners' acquisition of English past tense forms. In this study, the researchers provided recasts to learners in two phases: first, a repetition of the learner's erroneous utterance as a means of drawing the learner's attention to the error, and, second, provision of a target-like form of the error using recast. Doughty & Varela (1998) divided the subjects into a treatment group, which received recasts according to the previously mentioned procedure, and a control group which did not receive any systematic feedback. The researchers named the treatment group, Focus on Form (F on F) Group. This is because researchers believe that placing more emphasis on the recasting procedure by repetition of learners’ errors will help learners focus on the form of the utterance provided by the teacher in response to the learner's error than on the meaning alone. The study employed a pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test design. The results of the study showed that the gains made by the treatment group, in terms of learners’ developmental progress, accuracy, and usage frequency of past tense reference is quite significant when compared to the lack of significant progress in the control group. Doughty & Varela suggested that, despite the relative implicitness of recasts in comparison to other feedback techniques, using repetition of errors as a helping strategy made them more explicit to learners. The researchers concluded that recasts could be very effective in L2 classrooms provided that they are accompanied by a sort of additional aid to accentuate them, helping learners realize the equal focus on form and meaning of their utterance.
The previous conclusions in the study conducted by Doughty & Varela (1998) and Carpenter et.al (2006) give an indication that the ‘input-based’ nature of recasts might not facilitate learners' noticing of the gap between their erroneous utterances and the target-like form of L2. Conversely, other studies suggest that output might raise learners’ awareness of the linguistic gaps in their knowledge and possibly engage learners in deep levels of cognitive processing that moves learners from semantic to syntactic analysis. Some of these studies are noted below.

Izumi (2002) conducted a study to investigate the facilitative effects of output versus input enhancement on the acquisition of English relativization by adult English as second language (ESL) learners. The main research question addressed in this study investigates which of the two situations (input enhancement versus output) might be more successful in drawing learners' attention to problematic form features in their inter-language. The study adopted a pretest-posttest experimental design. Participants were divided into four experimental groups: one that produced output and received unenhanced input, another group that produced output and was exposed to regular enhanced input, a third that received enhanced input without being required to produce output, with the last group receiving only unenhanced input. In addition, a control group participated only in the pre and posttests (Izumi, 2002). The two dependent variables in this study are noticing measures and acquisition measures. The noticing measures are used to determine the extent of noticing triggered by input and output; acquisition measures are used to discover the extent of learning brought about by each of the two independent variables under investigation. Two types of noticing measures were used in this study: note-taking by subjects during the input exposure phases of the treatment, and the immediate uptake of form that could be monitored in learners' production during the output phases of the treatment. A reading text, which was divided into sub-sections, was used for all groups. Also, each group was informed of the required variations and adjustments. During the first input exposure phase, the output groups were asked to take notes of each and every word they might make use of in their output task (text reconstruction task), while the input groups did the same thing. However, for the input group, the note-taking component was explained to them as a tool to achieve better understanding of the text. During the post exposure task 1, subjects in the output groups were asked to reconstruct the text subsections as accurately as possible in terms of content and grammar, while the input groups were required to answer an extension question that demanded their opinion regarding the topic discussed in the text. In the input groups, several participants received enhanced text with a
combination of bolding, shadowing, highlighting, and font sizes, in addition to underlining whole noun phrases that have relative clause, while the unenhanced group received the same unenhanced text. The same procedure was repeated until the entire text was covered. In order to assess subjects' knowledge of the target structure, four different written testing measures were introduced before and after the treatment: sentence combination, a picture-cued sentence completion to assess the subjects' productive knowledge, an interpretation test, and a grammatical judgment test to assess the subjects' receptive knowledge. The results showed that the input-output group outperformed the input only group who were only exposed to input for the purpose of comprehension. The results also showed that there are no measurable effects for input enhancement on learning. The researcher attributed this to "attention-inducing effect of output" (Izumi, 2002, p.566) which places the learner in a position where he/she has an opportunity to make a comparison between the IL and TL forms, which might not be the case for input enhancement. According to Saxton's Contrast Theory (1997a, 1997b as cited in Izumi, 2002), as is the case in L1, L2 acquisition can be promoted if the learner's error is immediately followed by a target-like form that contrasts his/ her erroneous utterance. Although Izumi conceded that input enhancement might succeed in drawing learners' attention to form, this attention induced by input enhancement takes place at a relatively shallow level. This is because it does not engage learners in sufficiently deep levels of cognitive processing conducive to acquisition. Izumi supports his argument by referring to a paper on memory research by Craik and Lockhart (1972 as cited in Izumi, 2002) where depth of processing was attributed to the degree of cognitive analysis and elaboration in response to the input stimulus. According to Craik and Lockhart, the deeper the levels of processing, the greater the chances for the persistence of memory traces in the human memory. However, if the processing occurs at the level of rehearsing and repeating only (as is the case in the input situation); it will not by itself lead to retention unless the learner engages in deeper levels of cognitive processing. This indicates that noticing accompanied by deeper levels of processing might lead to long term retention of target-like L2 forms.

Mennim (2007) investigated the role played by noticing and conscious attention to form on the long-term improvement of oral output of university EFL learners enrolled in an oral presentation course in Japan. Students who worked in groups conducted research on a topic chosen by them for a whole academic year. These students were required to give three oral presentations on the
selected topic over the same period of time; one presented in month three (10 minutes), one in month four (20 minutes), and the last one in month nine (30 minutes). During the research period, students were responsible for the input received in L2 by making contact with English in published material or through the internet. In order to draw learners' attention to L2 language forms, the researcher prepared a number of noticing exercises that might aid learners in focusing on linguistic forms in both the input and their L2 output, a strategy the researcher claimed might feed into the language learning process. These exercises comprised language development awareness sheets that the students had to fill out with information on any new language that they had noticed over the previous week, post-presentation questionnaires, where learners reported on the language they produced in their presentations in terms of newly learned language, errors they made and instances of self-correction, and transcription exercises where learners were required to transcribe around five minutes of their own speech. For the transcriptions of the first two presentations, students made corrections of their errors in groups. The researcher then selected two of the learners whose topic was the effect of garbage disposal on the environment, and traced their noticing, throughout the year, of the non-count noun ‘garbage’. The study provided evidence that, despite showing problems in correct grammatical use of ‘garbage’ at the start of the academic year, students gained increased accuracy by the end of the course in using this target language. This suggests a long term gain in learning the language. According to Menninm (2007), the noticing exercises in which learners were engaged throughout the academic year provided learners with opportunities to notice the gap between their inter-language and the target language, and to form hypotheses about L2. However, the researcher doubted that the same results could be applied to different populations. Nevertheless, a study by Khatib & Alizadeh (2012) on the noticing effect of output supported Mennim's findings. The study participants were Iranian EFL learners in a high school in Tehran who, in response to a pretest of 20 multiple choice questions administered to them showed inaccuracy in English past tense forms, the target structure for this study. The participants were divided into two experimental groups who were given the treatment for a period of five sessions, and a control group. All the participants were first exposed to narrative reading passages which served as a source of input, as they contained various forms of past tense. All participants were asked to underline words and phrases they found important. This procedure was considered a noticing measure. The participants were then divided into groups, each of which was assigned different follow up tasks after reading each
text; for instance, EG1 (experimental group 1) was given a picture-cued task where they had to use the pictures and accompanying cues to rewrite the story they had just read. The second group, EG2 (experimental group 2), were given a reconstruction task in form of a dictogloss. Before proceeding with the reconstruction task, the researcher read the text out loud twice to the subjects at a normal speed. During the first round, the subjects only listened to the text; in the second round, however, they were required to take notes prior to being asked to rewrite (reconstruct) the text as closely as possible to the original one in terms of grammar and content. The CG (control group), on the other hand, were not required to produce any output as they answered comprehension questions that excluded the target feature. Then the post-test was administered to the subjects. The results of the study showed that the two experimental groups outperformed the control group on the posttest, which further strengthens the argument that producing output can have a positive influence of learners' noticing of the target feature. Despite the fact that EG2 were better promoted than EG1 in terms of noticing the target feature, the researchers attributed this to the nature of the reconstruction task, which gave them a better chance of attending to the target structure. Khatib & Alizadeh (2012) concluded that learning a grammatical feature requires more than merely gaining exposure to input containing the target structure. Rather, it requires giving learners the opportunity to produce the target form. According to the researchers, output helps learners to notice the gaps in their output, eventually leading to improved inter-language. Khatib & Alizadeh also concluded that their study supports Swain's hypothesis on the crucial influence of the noticing function of output on L2 learning.

In a similar vein, McDonough (2001) investigated Swain's claim on the effect of output production on L2 learners' acquisition and inter-language development. Accordingly, McDonough carried out a study exploring the relationship between the production of modified output and 84 Thai EFL learners' development of questions and past tense verb forms. The researcher argued that producing modified output in response to feedback provided by the teacher on learners' erroneous utterances might focus learners' attention on their production of the target language. This would then stimulate the development of connections in the memory. Hence, McDonough's central prediction is that there is a positive relationship between learners' production of modified output and L2 learning. The researcher tested this prediction by comparing between groups of participants: groups considered as either 'modifiers or 'non-modifiers' depending on the amount of output they are allowed to produce during the treatment
sessions. The study employed a pretest-posttest design in order to assess learners' performance. The subjects participated in a series of communicative tasks with five native speakers (NS) of the language (all of whom were lecturers at the English Department at Chiang Mai University where that study took place). The subjects were exposed to five different treatment conditions where different output and feedback opportunities were provided by NS interactors; in condition one, the NS interactors responded to learners NTL (non target-like) questions and past tense form, by a repetition of the error with stress and rising intonation, followed by a clarification request, and a pause proving the learner with an opportunity to respond to the request. As such, this group was termed as the ‘enhanced and elicited group’. In condition two, the subjects forming the ‘elicited group’ received only clarification requests and an opportunity to produce modified output. Group three (the enhanced no-opportunity group) received a repetition of their errors with stress and rising intonation, but given no opportunity to modify their NTL production as the NS interactors were instructed to change the topic and carry on with the conversation right after the repetition. Group four forms the ‘no opportunity group’, that receives nothing more on their NTL forms than a comment from the NS stating that their utterance was not understood before moving on to another topic. The control group received no feedback on their questions and past tense forms. The subjects carried out 12 communicative task-based activities especially designed to elicit the target structures during the treatment sessions. The study went on for eight weeks, during which period the subjects participated in the treatment sessions and completed a battery of oral production and grammaticality judgment tests (MacDonough, 2001). Pretests were administered in the first week, and the posttests in week two, five, and eight. The study gave empirical evidence to the claim that there is a positive relationship between modified output and L2 learning. The results of the study showed that learners who produce modified output, including target-like forms are more likely to develop in their IL than learners not producing modified output. The study provided evidence that the learners in the enhanced and the elicited group who were pushed by NS to repair their erroneous utterances developed their inter-language in terms of moving to a higher stage of question formation, insertion, and usage of past tense forms, a relationship that was not confirmed for any of the other groups (McDonough, 2001). Another study carried out by McDonough (2005) looked at the same issues of feedback, output, and learners' inter-language development. In this study, however, McDonough took things one step further by investigating whether negative feedback (feedback that informs the
learner about what is not possible in the target language (Iwashita, 2003) and modified output can be significant predictors of ESL learners’ question development. The findings of the study indicated that the production of modified output of learners' erroneous utterances was the sole predictor of learners' question development. The researcher concluded that this study, on the one hand, provides empirical evidence to Swain's hypothesis, and on the other, supports the argument for the relationship between modified output and L2 learners' inter-language development.

The effect of pushed output and noticing on L2 learners' inter-language development was further investigated in a study by Leeser (2008), who examined the effect of pushed output during a series of reconstruction tasks on learners’ noticing of target forms when receiving subsequent input, their comprehension of input, and their development of L2 Spanish past tense morphology” (Leeser, 2008, p. 196). Participants were chosen from a content-based course on Spanish-American geography that is open to learners in four sections. Learners from two sections were randomly chosen by the researcher and the 47 learners enrolled in them were divided into two groups: a + output group (25 subjects), and a – output group (22 subjects). During the treatment session, all the participants first listened to a short passage on the course content, then listened to the passage for a second time, and were asked to take very short notes on the passage. Next, the learners in the +output group were required to reconstruct the listening passage using their notes. In the following step, the groups listened to the passage for a third time and took notes, but again, only the +output group was required to reconstruct the passage using their second set of notes. The idea behind this activity is to push learners through the reconstruction tasks to compare their output (reconstructed version of text) with the subsequent input (listening to the text again). The researcher asserted that this procedure would give learners the opportunity to notice the mismatch between their output and the target language (past tense forms) provided to them in the listening activity. Following Izumi's (2002) study that employed reconstruction tasks, the -output group participated in all the previously mentioned stages except for the reconstruction task. Instead, they were required to answer extension questions after the second and the third listening of the passage. Finally, all the groups were asked to perform a recall protocol in English (L1), in which they were required to write everything they remembered about the passage. Immediately after the treatment, the groups completed a post-treatment writing sample. In both the pre-treatment and the post-treatment, learners were required to write a 10 sentence paragraph, using past tense forms, on their semester break for the pre-treatment,
and on their mid semester break for the post-treatment activity. The results of the study came in line with Swain's argument on the role played by pushed output in getting learners to notice – even during expressing meaning- their linguistic problems. Through this empirical study, Leeser (2008) set out to find evidence that learners' output in the reconstruction task would give them the opportunity to compare this output (their inter-language) to the subsequent input (target-like past tense forms) in the listening passages, a device that would help them notice the mismatch between their IL and the TL, and try to repair it in their subsequent production of Spanish past tense verb forms. The overall results of the study showed that, in comparison to the –output group (that answered comprehension questions only), the +output group (that participated in the reconstruction task) reported the following: comprehension of the listening passages, a decrease in the production of the non-target like forms, more noticing of most of the passage nouns, but not the past tense forms. The post-treatment writing samples, on the other hand, showed an increase in learners' attempts to use the past tense verb forms, an obvious increase compared to learners' usage of the Spanish past tense forms in the pre-treatment activity. The researcher attributed this to processing limitations, according to which learners might find difficulty in attending to both content and form at the same time. Leeser (2008) also attributed this to the short-term nature of the study and the slow nature of inter-language development (Doughty, 2004 as cited in Leeser, 2008). Despite that, the researcher considered the consistent increase in learners' attempts to use the past tense forms as a sign of progress in the past tense morphology, at least on an immediate post-test measure. The researcher suggested that more research is needed to see if the effects of pushed output extend beyond immediate posttest.

The studies discussed in the previous section attempted to shed light on noticing as a prerequisite to language development (Schmidt, 1990). Pushed modified output was the catalyst employed by these studies to bring the target like structure –under investigation- into focus, and get learners to notice the mismatch between their output and the target-like language forms, which eventually contributes to their inter-language development. However, other studies have shown that output is not a factor of noticing, and that noticing could take place despite lack of output. According to the previously mentioned studies by Lyster & Ranta (1997) and Lyster (1998), lack of uptake was considered as an indication of not noticing recasts as corrective moves. A study by Mackey &Philp (1998), however, suggested that recasts can be beneficial for the short-term development of the learners' inter-language despite the fact that they are not incorporated in the learners'
immediate response. More specifically, Mackey & Philp were interested in exploring the relationship between recasts as one form of interactional feedback in communicative classroom, and L2 development. Accordingly, the study has two main hypotheses: the first one is that L2 learners who receive intensive recasts in conversational interaction will more likely show a greater increase in the production of developed and advanced L2 structures than learners who do not; the second hypothesis predicts that learners’ L2 structures will also develop if they modify their erroneous utterances in response to recasts provided by the teacher. Participants were 35 ESL adult learners from two private English schools in Sydney. In addition, two NS researchers and three project research assistants participated in the study. The participants' levels were determined based on the proficiency-level assessment done by the schools. Consequently, they were classified as beginners and low intermediate level learners. The participants were divided into two interactor groups, two recasts groups and one control group. The study consisted of three sessions; the first one was a weekly session that lasted from 15 to 25 minutes, the second session took place a week later, and the third session three weeks later. The treatment sessions and the tests were composed of information gap tasks. In the test sessions, the assigned activity was a ‘spot the differences’ task, where learners had to figure out the differences between two similar pictures by asking questions (question formation is the target feature in this study). In the treatment sessions, the subjects performed three tasks: a drawing task, a story completion, and a story sequencing task. The NSs in the recast group were instructed to use recasts intensively in response to learners' non-target like utterances in the question forms produced by them during the treatment session. The interactor groups participated in the previously mentioned tasks; however, they did not receive recasts on their errors. In terms of producing developmentally advanced structures in question formation, the results of the study revealed that the only group to show sustained improvement was the recasts group. The results also revealed that of all the responses to recasts, only 5% were modified while 53% of the learners continued with the task without modifying their responses. This implies that the results of the study confirm the findings of Lyster & Ranta (1997) on the low uptake by learners after recasts, and how they rarely result in self-generated modifications by learners. Despite the fact that Lyster & Ranta considered the low rate of learners' uptake after recasts an indication of recasts not being noticed by learners as corrective moves, (and consequently will not be utilized by them in reforming their future erroneous utterances), results of the delayed post-test in this study showed that the recasts group
increased its production of developmentally more advanced questions, which – unlike Lyster & Ranta’s study - shows that ‘uptake’ might not be the sole and most critical factor in determining that recasts are noticed by learners. This study reveals that despite lack of immediate response (uptake) by learners, learners are eventually able to make some use of the provided recasts. These results could be considered an indication that pushing learners to produce modified output in order to draw their attention to the teacher’s corrective feedback might not be of significance in the domain of interactional feedback due to the learner's innate apparatus will help him/her extract the target like model and incorporate it into the learner's linguistic system. The results of this study are further confirmed in the study discussed below.

Ohta (2000) investigated Lyster’s (1998) argument that recasts cannot contribute to the development of learners' inter-language. She based her argument - as previously mentioned - on the claim that recasts go unnoticed by learners in communicative classes because teachers in those classes have strong tendency to recast learners' error-free utterances. Ohta challenges Lyster's claim by presenting evidence that learners could well utilize recasts despite the lack of overt oral response. Episodes containing private speech formed the core of this study, which utilized a qualitative discourse- analytic approach, where the private speech of seven EFL Japanese learners was analyzed. However, four of these subjects were more prone to use private speech than others, also responding to recasts in their private speech episodes. Accordingly, their episodes formed the focus of analysis in this study. The researcher was interested in investigating how salient recasts were, how they affected all learners (addressees and non addressees), and how learners make use of the target-like utterances offered by teachers in reaction to their ill-formed utterances. Ohta (2000) argued that lack of learners' uptake was considered an indication of the ineffectiveness and insufficient salience of recasts as corrective feedback moves (e.g. Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 1998). Nevertheless, according to analysis of learners' private speech, there was evidence of recast utilization by learners who were not addressed by the teacher, as obvious in the responses they provided in their private speech. Ohta considered this as evidence of recast saliency, claiming that employing recasts as a feedback technique in L2 classrooms offers a fertile ground that triggers learners' mental activity to notice contrasts between ill-formed and target-like utterances. Finally, the researcher concluded that the salient contrasts provided by recasts could contribute to L2 learners' language development. This is because learners manage to notice them and utilize them in their mental activity, even though
they do not give an immediate overt oral response in reaction to recasts. This gives further evidence that utility of recasts should not be measured on the basis of learners' uptake.

In a similar vein, some researchers aimed at comparing and contrasting the effects of both recasts and elicitations in the same setting. For this reason, a number of studies investigated the impact of the two feedback techniques on learners' inter-language development. A few of these studies will be covered in the following section of this review.

Ammar (2003) carried out a quasi-experimental study to investigate the effect of recasts and elicitations on SLA, and to determine their potential benefits. The study took place in an intensive ESL (English as a second language) program. Participants were selected on the basis of a preliminary observation round in which the researcher observed six intensive ESL classes. Out of the six classes, the researcher selected a recaster, an eliciter, and a teacher who preferred to ignore learners' errors. The three teacher-subjects were assigned three treatment conditions that are similar to their natural behavior. The participant learners came from the classes of the three teachers (26-30 subject in each class), and consequently Ammar formed three experimental groups; REG group (recasts group), EG (elicitations group), and a COG (control group). Possessive determiners (PD) *his* and *her* are the target structure in this study. The subjects were tested on their knowledge of the target feature in a pre-test administered to them before the treatment, after which eight subjects were excluded for poor performance. Also, before the treatment, 12 sessions (out of 35-40 spread over a period of 4 weeks) were provided to the learners to isolate the effect of the two target feedback techniques from instruction. During the treatment period, participants engaged in communicative activities that focused on the target feature, and teacher participants were instructed to respond to learners' errors during these activities using recasts and elicitations according to the group to which the learners were assigned. After the treatment, participants' knowledge of PDs was tested twice; an immediate post-test (right after the treatment), and a delayed post-test (four weeks later). The researcher included different types of tests (a passage correction test, a computerized test, and an oral test), in order to cover as many aspects as possible of the PDs. The researcher was interested in finding out which of the two techniques benefits learners more and adds to their IL development; the one that pushes learners to self-correct by correcting their non-target-like utterances, or the one that provides them with a target-like model of their errors. The results of the study indicated that
elicitations as a technique focusing on learners' output appeared to be more effective as a corrective feedback strategy. The EG group outperformed the REG group; not only on the immediate post-test, but also in terms of their significant IL development in the delayed post-test, implying that EG learners continued to improve over time. Besides, the study revealed that the COG was the least area of benefit, which gives further evidence of the effect of feedback on the learning process. Another study by Ammar (2008) on the differential effects of recasts and elicitations on L2 learners’ morpho-syntactic development reached similar conclusions; The overall comparative effects of recasts and elicitations showed that learners who were pushed to self-correct (produce output in response to elicitations) managed to obtain higher accuracy scores in both the immediate and delayed post-tests than those receiving an input of target-like models of L2 as in the recasts group. The researcher argued that learners' inability to benefit from recasts could be attributed to the differential noticeability of the two corrective feedback techniques. Learners who received recasts found difficulty in noticing the morpho-syntactic reformulations provided by their teachers. Ammar (2008) also argued that even if recasts are noticed by learners, the delayed post-test showed that they “couldn't store them in their long-term memory for subsequent retrieval and accurate use” (p.199). As for the effect of learners' proficiency level on possible gains from each feedback strategy, elicitations and recasts seemed to be equally effective for high proficiency learners, while elicitations seemed to be more suitable for low proficiency learners. Similar results were shown by another study in which Ammar & Spada (2006) investigated the effect of elicitations (termed by the researchers as ‘prompts’) and recasts on L2 leaning across different proficiency levels. The researchers hypothesized that prompts will make a better contribution to the development of learners' IL than recasts for both high and low proficiency learners. The researchers employed a pretest-posttest design. Participants were divided into three groups: two experimental groups where each group received one of two forms of reactive feedback, either recasts or elicitations, and a control group. Each group was further divided into two sub-groups according to either low or high proficiency. These classifications were made on the basis of the participants' scores in the pretest, where those who scored 50% or less on the pre-test, were assigned to the low proficiency group. The results of the study revealed that the prompts group outperformed the recasts group on both the immediate and delayed posttests. In addition, the gap between the two groups continued to grow till the time of the delayed posttest, confirming Ammar’s (2003) conclusions on the prolonged effect of
elicitations on L2 learners' inter-language development. As for learners' proficiency level, high proficiency learners benefited equally from both feedback techniques. However, for the low proficiency learners, prompts seemed to be more effective. The researchers attributed the likely gains of low level learners to benefit from prompts over recasts to the nature of the two feedback moves. That is, elicitations provide learners with cues and give them the opportunity to produce output that aids learners not only in noticing their errors but also in understanding the nature of these errors in a way that make this type of CF more effective. On the other hand, recasts provide learners with input in the form of target-like models of L2, which might not be noticed on their part as a corrective move. Ammar & Spada argued that the implicitness of recasts and the load placed on the learners' attention capacity might limit learners’ chances of benefiting from their teachers' reformulations. However, no consensus is reached among researchers on the suitability of recasts for a specific proficiency level. For instance, the study by Mackey & Philp (1998) on recasts revealed that recasts seemed to be more successful and beneficial in terms of fostering more target-like L2 production for learners at higher levels. However, a different conclusion was reached by Jobbari & Fazilatfar (2012) who argued that learners at early learning stages lack sufficient language knowledge to enable them to self-correct via elicitations.

More evidence of the prolonged effect of elicitations on learners' inter-language development is provided by a study conducted by Nassaji (2009) on the subsequent effect of recasts and elicitations on learning linguistic forms that emerge incidentally in dyadic interaction. Participants were 42 adult ESL learners and two native speaker English language teachers from an intensive ESL program in a Canadian university. Each learner participated in a task-based interaction activity with one of the teachers. The interactions took place outside the classroom in a room equipped with a small microphone and a digital audio-recorder. Each learner participated individually in a sequencing activity where he/she received four pictures depicting a story and was required to put them in order, then describe them orally to the teacher. The teacher interacted with the learner during the reconstructing procedure and responded to the learner's erroneous utterances using whatever feedback technique (whether recasts or elicitations) deemed suitable for different errors occurring during the interaction. The audio-recordings were transcribed for analysis. The researcher's aim was to capture the subsequent effect of feedback on recognizing and reforming the linguistic forms targeted by feedback during the interaction sessions. Nassaji was also interested in measuring learners' performance on the targeted forms before and after the
interaction; accordingly, three other procedures were added to the interaction session: a pre-interaction scenario description, an immediate post-interaction error correction and identification component (conducted during the same session), and a delayed error correction and identification component (conducted two weeks after the interaction session). Unlike the interaction session, the other three sessions were written down. In the immediate post-interaction activity, learners were given their pre-interaction written descriptions and asked to edit them on the basis of feedback received during the interactions. In the delayed post-interaction, they were again given the original text without the corrections they performed in the immediate post-interaction session. The reason behind this was to monitor learners’ sustained ability to correct the targeted forms after two weeks. The overall results of the study showed that a high percentage of non target-like forms corrected by learners in the immediate posttest were originally corrected by recasts in the treatment session. This implies that the percentage of corrections traced back to recasts were higher than those traced back to elicitations. However, in the delayed post-test, not only did this difference diminish but learners could better correct errors receiving elicitations. Nassaji (2009) argued that if learners are given the opportunity to self-correct their errors, they have a better chance of remembering these corrections than if corrections are provided in the form of target-like reformulations, as is the case with recasts. It is also worth mentioning that the researcher employed six subtypes for recasts and five for elicitations that were classified as implicit and more explicit depending on whether the two feedback strategies were associated with stress, rising intonation, or explicit verbal prompts: (Is that what you mean?) to highlight the error. The study results revealed that the more explicit forms of the two feedback types led to a higher percentage of error correction in both the immediate and delayed post-tests. However, the explicitness factor seemed to work better for recasts than elicitations. This finding might be an indication that elicitations are sufficiently salient to learners to dispense with further explicitness.

The concept of feedback explicitness was handled in a study by Nassaji in 2007, in which he investigated the effect of the degree of explicitness of recasts (termed as ‘reformulations’ by the researcher) and elicitations on learners’ uptake. This was not the only concern, however; the researcher was particularly interested in the type of repair in uptake following the two feedback techniques, ranging from successful repair, partial repair, or no repair at all. The researcher investigated six different reformulation subtypes, and five different elicitation sub-types. The
sub-types differed from one another in terms of their degree of explicitness, and the degree to which they pushed the learner to react to the feedback provided by the teacher. Nassaji aimed at monitoring the form that is associated with successful repair within each feedback type. While immediate uptake might not be an indication that language acquisition has taken place, Nassaji argued, it could eventually contribute to learners' IL development. This is because it may be regarded as indicative of learners' noticing of the corrective feedback move and making some use of it. According to Lyter (1998) and Panova & Lyster (2002), elicitations might be more salient and less ambiguous to learners while Nassaji (2007) proposed a different argument in this study; he hypothesized that, based on the claim that salience is a crucial factor in noticing and incorporating feedback (Ellis, et.al, 2006; Long & Robinson, 1998 as cited in Nassaji, 2007), reformulations and elicitations, the degree of learner repair will be investigated in terms of the effect of the degree of explicitness of each feedback technique as determined by linguistic and non-linguistic prompts associated with it. Data collection took place through dyadic interactions between 42 adult ESL learners and two teachers. The interaction sessions occurred outside the classroom in a room equipped with a microphone and a digital audio recorder connected to a computer terminal. During the one to one interactions (one participant – one teacher), learners carried out communicative activities. The recorded data was transcribed and interactional exchanges (IEs) were identified in terms of a three-move model of conversational discourse. The model involved an initiation move by the learner-participant, a feedback move by the teacher, and a possible response by the learner in response to the feedback provided by the teacher. Six types of recasts were investigated: isolated recasts - prompts (the one investigated in the current study) in which the teacher extracted the error out of the learners' utterance and reformulated it without employing any prompts such as rising intonation or stress as is the case in the second subtype of recasts known as isolated recasts +prompts. In embedded recasts, the reformulation provided by the teacher involves all of the learner's utterance with or without stress and rising intonation (+ prompt / - prompt). In recasts + enhanced prompts, additional verbal prompts such as "Do you mean…….?" are employed in addition to stress and rising intonation. In recasts with expansion, new information is added to the learner's utterance. Five subtypes of elicitations were investigated in this study: unmarked elicitations, which were more like clarification requests (Sorry? Excuse me?), and marked elicitations in which the teacher pushed the learner to modify the error by referring to it in the form of an interrogative repetition. In marked elicitation
+prompt or + enhanced prompt, the teacher repeated the error with rising intonation and stress or used additional verbal prompt such as: "Is this correct?" (one of the elicitation forms used in the current study). Elliptical elicitation, in which the teacher repeats the learner's erroneous utterances and pauses to give the learner the opportunity to supply the correct form, is also one of the elicitation forms employed in the current study. The results of the study showed that generally recasts occurred twice as often as elicitations. Results also showed that recasts that reformulated errors with no additional prompts, whether isolated or embedded, led to no immediate repair. However, two thirds of recasts with additional prompts led to successful repair. Similarly, elicitations in the form of clarification requests (unmarked elicitations) led to no immediate repair, while elliptical and marked elicitations +prompts led to 36% and 40% successful repair respectively. Nassaji (2007) asserted that both recasts and elicitations resulted in successful repair as long as they are associated with some kind of feedback enhancement in the form of prompts. The researcher argued that providing emphasis to interactional feedback helps in drawing learners' attention to the corrective purpose of the feedback, helping them focus on the target form. The findings also revealed that recasts led to a slightly higher rate of repair than elicitations. The researcher attributed this more to the higher percentage of recasts employed in the study in conjunction with enhanced feedback prompts than to elicitations.

Nassaji's (2007) results were further confirmed in a study by Youssef (2009) conducted at the School of Business Administration in The Arab Academy for Science and Technology, where new students have to register for the English I course. 19 Egyptian students participated in the study. Accordingly, nineteen student-teacher interactions were video recorded and formed the data base of the study. Youssef explored the amount of immediate repair generated by lower intermediate EFL learners after their teacher provided them with recasts and elicitations in response to their erroneous utterances. The researcher was also interested in the measuring the degree of repair following the different sub-types of recasts and elicitations and sub-type most often associated with successful repair. The results showed that both types led to very close rates of repair; however, the degree of repair varied in accordance to the different sub-types of both feedback techniques. Similarly, as in Nassaji's study, recasts and elicitations moves accompanied by some kind of verbal or intonational prompt led to higher rates of successful repair in learners' responses following the two feedback moves. Youssef (2009) asserts that the results of the study give solid evidence to the argument on the importance of getting learners to notice the corrective
nature of feedback. For instance, both isolated recasts and unmarked elicitations failed to draw learners' attention to the target form in question (giving directions) and were interpreted by them as requests for further explanation. On the other hand, feedback moves associated with additional prompts helped learners recognize their erroneous utterances, thus pushing them a step closer to modifying them.
Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Research Design

For the purposes of this paper, the researcher is interested in the effects of both recasts, as input-based feedback, and elicitations, as output-based feedback, on AFL learners' IL in terms of their short-term development of the target-like production of subject verb agreement in Egyptian colloquial Arabic (Ammiyah). This study is quasi-experimental (Perry, 2005) because it involves the manipulation of variables with the researcher aiming to investigate how and to what extent the variable of influence in this study, the independent variable (recasts and elicitations) causes change or variation in the dependent variable (uptake/modified output, immediate pick-up of the teacher's feedback and short-term development of learners' inter-language). The study cannot be classified as purely experimental since the sample in the study was not selected randomly.

As mentioned earlier, ECA classes were the setting for carrying out the study because the researcher is interested in face-to-face verbal interaction between the class teacher and learners. Since ECA classes depend mainly on verbal interaction, and learners' performance is judged on the basis of their oral production in Egyptian Amiyya, they provide a suitable environment for the study to take place.

In order to measure the effect of recasts and elicitations on the learning process, it is necessary to investigate their effect on ECA learners' acquisition of target-like subject-agreement forms contributing to the subsequent development of their inter-language. The study was carried out at the AUC’s ALI Department and the Netherlands Flemish institute in Cairo in the fall-spring semesters, 2012-2013 during regular class times. Four classes were involved in the study: two classes forming the recasts' group, and two classes forming the elicitations' group.

A pretest- immediate/ delayed post test was the chosen design for the current study. Since the experimental groups are divided among four classes, the study procedures (pretest, immediate and delayed post-test) were carried out separately in each and every class. In order to neutralize
the effect of instruction by different teachers in various classes, the initial plan was to conduct a
review of the different verb forms in ECA for all the groups involved in the study prior to
administering the pre-test. However, the researcher decided not to take this step for a number of
reasons: first, teaching and time constraints prevented the researcher from requesting an
additional day for revision purposes when three days (one for the pretest, a second for
introducing the treatment and administering the immediate posttest, and a third for the delayed
posttest) had already been taken from the learners’ schedule. Second, teaching is an
accumulative process that cannot be reduced in one revision session, and so a one-day review
would not have added much to learners existing knowledge of ECA past tense verb forms.
Third, the researcher was concerned that a review session might accidently introduce one of the
two feedback techniques under investigation, an eventuality that might jeopardize the results.
Accordingly, the researcher, in an attempt to minimize the differences between classes,
introduced a pretest to detect structures that represent problematic areas in ECA past tense verb
forms for each group. Then, on the basis of each group’s pretest results, the researcher designed
tailor-made activities in the treatment and the posttests reflecting these problematic areas. By
following this procedure, the researcher is responding to the differences between the classes’
proficiency in handling ECA subject-verb agreement, which could be (partially) attributed to
instructors’ efficiency in introducing ECA past tense verbs to learners. It is worth mentioning,
however, that the changes in test forms between groups were minor. This because learners tend
to encounter problems in subject-verb agreement in specific verb forms that are not influenced
by the kind of instructor they have. Examples of these problems include verbs that end with
"حرف مَصِدَّد" such as "حَبَب، جَاد، حَطَّ" hollow verbs, such as "نَام، قَام، طَار" / "ناːm,
ʔaːm, ṭaːːr" , and weak verbs, such as "اشْتَرَى، كَوَى، صَنُّى" / "ʃṭara, kawa,ʔaḍḍa". While learners in
all groups committed errors when conjugating these three verb forms with different subject
pronouns, there were differences between groups in the percentage of errors. The researcher then
designed tests for each group according to the areas in which each had a high percentage of
errors.

3.2 Participants

The participants were students studying ECA at the ALI (Arabic Language Institute)
Department, AUC, and at the Netherlands-Flemish Institute in Cairo. In order to expand the
sample, two institutions were involved in the study. The number of participants was 29 AFL learners (14 males and 17 females) distributed unevenly among the four groups. However, 5 participants were excluded from the statistical analysis because they missed one or two sessions of the study. Accordingly, the final number of participants was 24 (13 males and 11 females). All learners taking part in this study were just introduced to usage of ECA verb forms (as indicated by their teachers) which constitute part of syllabus introduced to intermediate level learners. At this early stage of learning ECA students were expected to problems in their production of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement. This fact was verified by learners’ performance during pretest conducted by researcher.

The groups/classes involved in the study were chosen on the basis of the mutual willingness of different class teachers and students to forgo three days of classes for study participation purposes. The researcher contacted class teachers who happened to be teaching Ammiya at the time of the study after, later meeting with them to explain the study's objective and the chosen procedure in implementing the study. In addition, the researcher informed class teachers of the required number of days needed, and gave them a copy of the planned activities to be presented during the four phases of the study. This was an important step to brief teachers on the different verb forms to be used in the study. Teachers agreeing to participate in the study then presented the IRB consent forms to their students, upon which those willing to take part signed the form. Classes were assigned to the group of each feedback technique randomly, that is, the first class slotted to participate was assigned to the recasts group, the following one to the elicitations group, the next to the recasts group again, and so on until the four classes were divided between the two feedback techniques (10 subjects in the ‘recasts’ group and 14 subjects in the ‘elicitations’ group). The order in which the different classes participated in the study was determined by the schedule of each class, and whether or not the class teacher had covered the ECA past tense verb forms. For instance, of the four classes, the first class ready to participate was assigned to the ‘recasts group’ with a total of ten participants which was later reduced to five (three males and two females) as some of the participants had missed one or two phases of the study. The second class, five participants (four males and one female), was assigned to the ‘elicitations group’. The third class, which was assigned to the ‘recasts group’, also had five subjects (three males and two females). Nine subjects (six females and three males) participated in the study in the fourth class.
3.3 Target Structure

Subject-Verb agreement forms in ECA past tense verbs (S V O), was the chosen linguistic structure for this study. This structure was specifically chosen for a number of reasons. First, the results of the preliminary observation session carried out by the researcher, before conducting the study, showed that recasts and elicitations are widely used by AFL teachers in giving corrective feedback on subject-verb agreement errors (50% and 30% of feedback moves for recasts and elicitations, respectively). Accordingly, the author of the paper found that choosing a feature from AFL learners’ errors that is widely corrected by recasts and elicitations might well serve the purposes of this research. Second, previous research showed that the subject-verb agreement as a feature has special importance in and of itself. According to the "Competition Model" of language learning (Gass & Selinker, 2001), subject verb-agreement can form an important cue that L2 learners can use in deciphering sentence meaning. This claim was further investigated by Taman (1993), when he carried out a study to monitor the major cues used by native speakers in the comprehension of Arabic sentence: case marking, gender agreement, and animacy. The findings of the study showed the superiority of gender agreement as a highly reliable cue that native speakers of Arabic used in interpreting Arabic sentences. Accordingly, subject-verb agreement could be considered (in terms of number and gender) a feature of special significance in the Arabic language.

3.4 Procedure and Instruments

* Instructional period: each class had two or three weeks of instruction by their class teacher on the various forms of ECA past tense verbs. The time of instruction varied from two to three weeks depending on the pace of each class. During the instruction weeks, the researcher was in constant contact with each class teacher to ensure that all the required verb forms were covered, before the researcher was allowed into the class to carry out the study.

* A pretest/immediate/delayed posttest procedure:

This procedure was implemented on all the participating groups in the study, videotaped, and transcribed to form the data base of the study.
- **A pretest**: immediately after the instruction period. The pretest was administered to participants in each group prior to introducing the treatment in order to detect learners' knowledge of the targeted structure and identify common mistakes or problematic areas in subject-verb agreement forms in each group. These problematic areas were targeted by tailored activities in other phases of the study, and addressed by researched feedback techniques, making it possible to measure the effects of these techniques on AFL learners' production of the detected structure. The test was administered between two to three days before the treatment as per class schedules. Without exception, all the activities in the pre-test and other phases of the study focused on verb conjugation with various subject pronouns. Lyster & Ranta in their 1997 observational study concluded that learners might sometimes grasp teachers' intentions, whether feedback provided by them is on form or meaning. Accordingly, by choosing activities that focused on verb conjugation, the researcher made it clear to learners that the activity was targeting form. The pre-test activity was in the form of a power point presentation entitled: "الناس دي عملت إيه إمامرح؟". The subjects had to explain the actions taking place in the picture, while adding the time adverb "إمامرح" to every action. They were also required to conjugate the past tense verb depicted in each action using the given subject-pronoun. The power point presentation consisted of fifty slides each featuring verbs to be conjugated in question and answer format; "إنت (عمل) إيه إمامرح؟ أنا (راج) الجامعة". This involved pair-work with one partner asking a question and the other answering. The questions were designed to cover different verb forms and all related subject pronouns in order to help the researcher monitor cases where learners would most likely commit mistakes. As mentioned earlier, this gave the researcher the chance to design a tailor-made treatment activity and post-tests focusing on areas where learners had issues with regard to ECA subject-verb agreement forms. In order to give learners the opportunity to conjugate as many verb forms as possible, the same verb form appeared more than once on the slides. For instance, "الفعل الأجوف"/ (hollow verb) appeared in a variety of verbs on the slides such as /aːm, naːm, ʂaːm, raːħ/ swam, slept, fasted, went. Similarly, there was a redundancy in all other verb forms. Since the pre-test was used as an instrument for measuring performance, it was unified for all the experimental groups. However, it is worth mentioning in this respect that the results of a 2012 8-participant pilot study showed that learners tended to face issues with specific verb forms with irregular conjugations. This also proved true during the phases of the current study for all participating groups. Accordingly, the researcher took this into
consideration when designing the treatment and posttest activities. Since the researcher, as mentioned earlier, is interested in verbal interaction between teacher and learner, learners responded orally to this activity and all other activities in the following phases of the study.

Examples from the pre-test power point presentation:

(See the full activity in Appendix I)
- **The treatment**: Although activities in ECA classes should mostly depend on conversation and interaction among students, for the purposes of this research, the activity for the treatment was controlled since controlled activities are perceived to optimize the researcher’s chances for accurate monitoring of students’ performance. Accordingly, the researcher opted to design controlled activities for both the immediate and delayed posttests as well.

The purpose of the treatment was to introduce one of the two feedback techniques under investigation to the group at hand. This was achieved by using the pre-test results, which pinpointed the weak areas in each group’s production of ECA subject-verb agreement form, to design an activity with verb forms emphasizing these trouble areas. Of course, this strategy served to increase learners’ errors during the treatment activity, in turn, allowing the researcher to respond to those errors, using either recasts or elicitations. As stated earlier, the researcher would not be comparing the results of the pretest with those of the posttests, using them only for the
purpose of designing the treatment and posttests activities. Accordingly, the researcher
compared learners' performance in the treatment activity (which was accurately tailored to
learners' mistakes and actual instances of error correction in response to recasts or elicitations) to
their performance in the immediate and delayed posttests. Another reason was that the pre-test
featured all forms of verbs, including regular and irregular, easy and difficult. As a result, the
pre-test could neither be used for judgment purposes as no emphasis was placed on learners’
errors nor for measuring the effect of the two feedback techniques. Learners’ responses to
corrective feedback, whether in the form of ‘uptake’, in case of recasts, or modified output, in
case of elicitations, were supposed to give a preliminary indication of learners' noticing of the
teacher's feedback on their erroneous utterances and reading of this as a corrective move.
The treatment was initially supposed to be in the form of a game where students would have two
boxes on the table: one with strips of paper with different ECA past tense verbal sentences (20 or
more depending on the number of students in each class) and missing subject pronoun while the
other box contained a variety of subject-pronoun strips of paper that learners were required to
match with the sentences in the other box. However, the pilot study carried out by the researcher
prior to conducting the actual study revealed that this activity would be overly simple to yield
learners’ errors. This is mainly because it was a receptive activity that did not involve production.
Accordingly, the activity was changed to another in the form of a number of verbal sentences
(40-50 sentences depending on the size of each class), where the verb in each sentence was
conjugated with a specific subject pronoun, e.g. أًا أكلج فزاخ إهبارح / аана' akaltifra:x jimbarih / (I
ate chicken yesterday). Learners were required to change the verb conjugation into a given
subject-pronoun, e.g. أنا أكلت فراح إمبارح (هي) / 'ана' akaltifra:x jimbairh (hiyya) / I ate chicken
yesterday (she)

The teacher/researcher responded to learners’ errors using only one of the two feedback
techniques under investigation, depending on the experimental group to which the class in
question was assigned (recasts or elicitations). Because the researcher is interested in student-
teacher interaction, students were informed that they were not allowed to correct each other’s
mistakes. Learners also responded orally to this activity. The treatment was introduced to all
groups on a Thursday to allow for a two-day time gap between the treatment and the delayed
post-test. This is further explained in the following section of the paper.
Examples from the treatment activity:

(See the full activity for each group in Appendix II)

1. هو دقّ المسمار بالشاكوش (إنتوا)
   /huwwa daʔʔilmusmar biʃakʃuʃ (intu)/
   He hammered the nail with the hammer

2. إمبارح إحنا تُهنا في الطريق لشرم الشيخ (هم)
   /imba:riħ ʔiḥna tuhna fittariʔ liʃarmiʃe:x (humma)/
   Yesterday we got lost on our way to Sharm EL Sheikh

3. هم اشتكوا للمدير الأسبوع اللي فات (إنتي)
   /Hummaʃtaku lilmudiːr liʃisbuʃ ʔilli faːt (inti)/
   They complained to the boss last week

4. هي قالت الحقيقة (احنا)
   /Hiyya ʔaːlit ʔilhaʔiːʔa (iḥna)/
   She told the truth

5. إنتي فضيتى الأكل اللي في الحللة (هي)
   /ʃinti fadeːtil ʔilli filħalla (hiyya)/
   You poured the food out of the pot
An immediate post-test administered to learners on the same day as the treatment in order to monitor learners' immediate pickup of information provided to them in the form of error correction by the teacher. By monitoring the immediate pickup, the researcher intended to investigate whether the teacher's feedback was incorporated in the learners' linguistic system right after correction of their errors. Also, the purpose of the immediate posttest was to compare
the rate of learners' uptake /modified output during treatment session to the frequency of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms produced by learners in the immediate post-test, which gives an indication that learners had noticed the feedback move as an error correction. The activity was in the form of a game, where learners were given a number of paper strips (40-45 strips) placed exactly in the center of the table. One by one, each student selected a strip of paper where there was a verb that was not conjugated; learners were given a specific subject pronoun that they were required to conjugate the verb with. The researcher used a different format for this activity for two reasons: first, the exercise used in the treatment was quite mechanical, so it was important to introduce an activity to keep learners animated and alert. Second, using the same format that was used in the treatment would be more like testing learners in different verb forms in the same mould, a thing that might give them clues to follow the same pattern, especially when the test was oral, and the learners had all the sentences printed in front of them on a sheet of paper, as was the case with the treatment activity. However, a different format for the immediate post-test not only deprived learners of a pattern to follow, but also kept them in a state of suspense with regard to sequencing of verbal sentences.

The immediate post-test was administered to learners in order to monitor the immediate pickup of information provided in the corrective feedback (whether recasts or elicitations) on the part of learners. Consequently, it would furnish the researcher (in addition to learners' responses during the treatment) with a more reliable indication that learners had noticed the CF; similarly, this method would indicate that learning and acquisition were in process. The learners were asked to respond orally to this activity.

**Examples from the immediate posttest activity:**

(See the full activity for each group in Appendix III)

1- حَبّ (أنا)  
5- شال (إنتي)  
/ʃa:l ( 'inti)/  
/ habb( 'ana)/  
Love (I)  
Carry (you)
- A delayed post-test administered to all learners two days after the immediate post-test (on Sunday). The purpose of carrying out this procedure was to investigate the short-term development of learners' target-like production of ECA subject-verb agreement forms. Since, there is no acquisition without retention, administering a delayed post test was necessary to monitor the effects of each feedback strategy on learners' ability to retain the acquired information during the interactional feedback procedure using each feedback technique. In addition, it might consequently add to their IL development by shedding light on which of the two feedback techniques could have a sustained effect over time. This was measured by monitoring the accuracy of learners' production of target-like subject-verb agreement forms in the delayed post-test. Despite being fully aware that there are other possible indicators of language acquisition, in the current study the researcher considers learners' accuracy in producing the correct verb subject-agreement forms a sign of acquisition, and subsequent language development.
Selecting to investigate short-term development of the learners' inter-language, rather than long-term development, could be justified by the fact that it would have been extremely difficult to introduce the treatment (giving students feedback on their erroneous utterances in ECA subject verb agreement forms using either feedback strategy), and then suspend any instruction or activities on subject-verb agreement in the various classes/groups for a month or thereabouts specifically for the purpose of measuring the long-term effect of the treatment. Moreover, ECA classes are mainly conversation classes, where learners are liable to receive input on targeted features from sources other than the researcher's provided feedback. For this purpose, the delayed post-test could not have been postponed for more than two days, in order to reduce the impact of the external factors such as the effect of classroom instruction as well as interactions with native speakers of the target language (Egyptians). Accordingly, both the treatment and the immediate post-test were administered right before the weekend (on Thursday) and the delayed post-test right after it (on Sunday). However, it has to be acknowledged that it proved extremely difficult to block all external factors during the two-day time gap between introducing the treatment and administering the delayed post-test. ECA classes are based on Amiyya, that is, the vernacular variety easily accessible by learners through contact with Egyptian natives in addition to exposure to Egyptian media in the form of songs, movies, series, talk shows and the like. These factors may be considered one of the limitations of the current study, which will be discussed in more detail in the final chapter. By means of limiting the time span, however, between administering the treatment and the delayed post-test to two days only, the effect of external variables was somewhat minimized.

The activity of the delayed post-test was also controlled to some extent in that it was similar to the pre-test in terms of using a "PowerPoint" presentation with pictures depicting a variety of actions. The difference lay, however, in the lack of interaction among learners in the delayed post-test activity. The number of slides ranged from 35 to 50 depending on the number of participants in each group, and the number of errors specified in the pretest. Verbs representing the actions in each slide were conjugated by learners using different subject pronouns. The verb in each slide was presented to learners in the form of the 3rd person masculine form "هو"/"huwwa"/"he", and learners were required to conjugate the verb with the other seven pronouns "أنا ، إجنا ، هي ، هم ، إنثى ، إنثوى ، إنتى ، إنكوا"/"'ana, 'hna, hiyya, humma, 'inta, 'inti, 'intu"/"I, we, she, they, you (masculine, feminine, and plural)". As was the case in the immediate posttest, a new verb
popped up on each slide with a variety of subject pronouns with which to be conjugated. Again, this reduced the chances of giving learners a pattern to follow in their answers. Learners responded orally to the delayed posttest activity.

The whole procedure (pre-test, treatment, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test) was video and audio recorded, and the data was transcribed for quantitative analysis.

Examples from the delayed post-test power point presentation:

(See the full activity for each group in Appendix IV)
It is worth mentioning in this respect that the researcher introduced changes in the verb forms and the given subject pronouns, forming the treatment activities and the two posttests (delayed and immediate), according to the errors monitored in each group during the pre-test. As previously mentioned, however, there were very slight variations among various groups. These variations required minor changes in the verb forms used in the activities of each group, which did not go beyond adding a few more verb forms on each activity for a specific experimental group. All the experimental groups tended to have issues in the following forms:
Conjugations in these verbs are irregular. For this reason, learners tend to have problems in conjugating them. Actually, one of the pedagogical implications of this study is to encourage teachers to place more emphasis on these ECA verb forms, which represent areas of common mistakes for AFL learners.

*Carrying out investigations on the type of feedback implemented by the teacher of each and every class:*

After the researcher finished conducting the study using the steps described above for all the groups, and once the results of the study were out, the researcher was interested in investigating the type of feedback used by the teacher of each class/group. The argument proposed by the researcher in this respect is that the more familiar a class is with a certain feedback type, the better it performs when this specific feedback type is implemented in correcting class errors. Accordingly, the researcher decided to go back to the teachers and investigate this issue. The researcher asked the teachers about their preferred feedback techniques, taking detailed notes on their responses. The objective behind this procedure was to try to gain a better understanding of the data and to add a deeper dimension to the interpretation of the results.
Chapter (4)

Data Analysis

In this section of the paper the researcher presents an analysis of the transcribed data with an attempt to answer the study's research questions:

1- What is the rate of ECA learners' uptake in response to recasts when employed by ECA teacher/researcher as a feedback strategy? (Belongs only to the recasts group)

2- What is the rate of ECA learners' modified output in response to elicitations when employed by ECA teacher/researcher as a feedback strategy? (Belongs only to the elicitations group)

3- What is the effect of recasts as compared to elicitations on learners' immediate pick up of target like ECA subject-agreement forms? (Belongs to both groups)

4- What is the effect of recasts on the short term development of AFL learners' target- like ECA subject-verb agreement forms as compared to elicitations? (Belongs to both groups)

In order to collect data for the two feedback techniques, four experimental groups were used. Two groups were in the Recast feedback technique and another two were in the Elicitation feedback technique.

Recast Groups:

Two groups were used in the Recast feedback technique. Group 1 included 5 students, and Group 2 included also 5 students making a total of 10 students. The reason for applying the recast feedback technique on two groups was for two reasons:

- Due to the small number of students in each group
- In order to be more confident regarding the results of the feedback technique by applying it twice to two different groups.

Elicitation Groups:

Two groups were used in the Elicitation feedback technique. Group 1 included 9 students and Group 2 included 5 students making a total of 14 students. The reason for applying the elicitation feedback technique on two groups was for the same aforementioned reasons.
So, this implies that for each group within each feedback technique, we're investigating the following:

A- Rate of students’ immediate response (uptake/modified output) to the feedback provided by the teacher/researcher

B- Students’ immediate pickup of the information provided by the teacher/researcher in the interactional feedback procedure. This is indicated by the decrease in the rate of learners' errors in the immediate posttest, and whether this decrease is significant or not.

C- Students’ short-term retention of information provided by the teacher/researcher during the interactional feedback procedure. This is indicated by the decrease in the rate of learners' errors in the delayed posttest, and whether this decrease is significant or not.

Accordingly, three tests were used in each group for each feedback technique:

1- Treatment test: This test was used as a treatment. Its main purpose was to correct students’ mistakes and monitor the rate of their immediate response (uptake/modified output).

2- Immediate post-test: This test was used immediately after the treatment. It was used in order to know the effect of the treatment on the immediate pick up of correction provided by the teacher during the interactional feedback procedure (treatment). It is worth mentioning also that this test was used on the same day.

3- Delayed post-test: This test was used after two days from using the treatment. It was used in order to measure the short-term retention of the correction provided by the teacher (in recasts) or produced by the learners (in elicitations) during the interactional feedback procedure (treatment).

The hypothesis for each group was:

- The high rate of uptake/modified output indicates a decrease in the rate of errors in both the immediate and the delayed posttests.

- The rate of errors is supposed to decrease - for each feedback technique- from the treatment to the immediate posttest, and similarly, from the treatment to the delayed posttest.

Accordingly, it is expected that the most successful researched feedback technique (whether recasts or elicitations) will lead to a high rate of response on part of learners (whether uptake or modified output) when employing it in correcting their errors. This high rate is supposed
to be translated into a decrease in the rate of learners' errors both in the immediate posttest and the delayed posttest. Good performance on part of learners in the immediate posttest (translated into a decrease in their rate of errors after the treatment) signifies that learners made an immediate benefit from the error correction strategy introduced by the teacher/researcher during the interactional feedback procedure. Similarly, it expected that the most effective feedback technique will help learners retain the target-like forms provided during the feedback procedure for a two days time span, and thus adding to the short-term development of their inter-language.

Accordingly, in each group representing each feedback technique, the researcher compared between:
- The treatment test and the immediate posttest with respect to the rate of errors.
- The treatment test and the delayed posttest with respect to the rate of errors.

**Figure (1)**

As a result, for analyzing the data in the current study, the researcher used the following statistical tests:

One Sample t-test: This test was used in order to measure the rate of errors in the three tests for all groups involved in the study. In addition, it was used in order to know whether there was a significant decrease in the rate of errors in each test or not.

- Dependent Means t-test: This test was used to measure whether there was a statistical significance in the difference between the number of errors in the treatment-test and the two
posttests (immediate & delayed). The term “Statistically significant” means that if the result of
the aforementioned applied tests” exceeds a certain statistically known value, then the difference
is large enough to confirm the effectiveness of the treatment in achieving its goal” (Hassan,
2010, p.72)

The objective behind using the one sample t-test was to be able to measure the result and the
degree of change inflicted by each feedback technique in each group independently. In addition,
the dependent t-test was used for each group in order to measure whether a statistical difference
occurred between first test (treatment-test) and the other two posttests (immediate and delayed)
or not.

It is worth mentioning also that these two statistical tests were applied on the two groups of each
feedback technique. This was for giving the researcher the chance to confirm the results with
respect to each feedback technique. For example, if the results of the two recast groups lead to
the same conclusion, despite the variations between the two groups, this reinforces the results to
a certain extent. However, it is worth highlighting the fact that these results are still not definite
putting into consideration the small size of samples used in each group.
4.1 Recast Feedback Technique

Group (1)

A- Rate of students’ immediate response (uptake) to the feedback provided by the teacher/researcher

The table below displays the number of turns for every student during the treatment activity/test, the number of instances of errors during each student's turns, the number of instances of teacher's feedback, and the number of instances of successful uptake or lack of uptake for each student.

Table (3) Rate of student's errors, teacher feedback, and students' uptake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total student turns</th>
<th>Total student turns with error</th>
<th>Total teacher turns with recasts</th>
<th>Total student turns with &quot;successful uptake&quot;</th>
<th>Total student turns with &quot;no uptake&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that out of 17 instances of error, the students responded to the teacher's recasts with 15 instances of successful uptake, and only two instances of "no uptake". This indicates that learners repeated the teacher's reformulations of their erroneous utterances with a high rate of 88.2% "uptake" versus 11.8% of "no uptake". Even these two "no uptake" instances were done by the same student (number 3).

According to hypothesis one, this high rate of learners' uptake could result in high rate of decrease in the learners' errors in the immediate posttest and the delayed posttest. The argument is that the high rate of learners' uptake signifies that the learners have noticed the teacher's recasts as error correction, have internalized those recasts into their linguistic system, and would consequently retain the target like forms provided during recasts for subsequent use. The results of the immediate posttest and the delayed posttest will confirm this argument. If there is a high rate of immediate pick up of the target-like subject-verb agreement forms in the immediate posttest and high rate of learners' retention in the delayed posttest, this will confirm the prediction presented in hypothesis one.

This 2-D column chart below illustrates the rate of instances of "successful uptake" in comparison to the rate of instances of "no uptake" of learners in "Recasts Group"
This illustration indicates the high rate of ECA learners' uptake in response to recasts when employed by ECA teacher/researcher as a feedback strategy. This further indicates that learners' have either noticed the teacher's move as error correction and responded to it by reformulating their erroneous utterances, or they have merely parroted the teacher's reformulations in what could be described as a "mechanical act". (Panova & Lyster, 2001, p.592)

**B- Rate of learners' errors in the treatment test, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Treatment test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above represents the students' scores in the treatment test. Each score demonstrates the number of instances in which the student was able to produce target-like forms in a specific number of turns. For instance, student one was able to provide 6 instances of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms out of 7 turns, and so on and so forth for the rest of the students.

By using the one sample t-test, it was found that $t = -0.4924$ with $df = 4$. As a result, that is less than the needed $t$ which is equal to 2.132 at 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, the result shows that students' rate of errors is high and it didn't decrease in the treatment test. In fact, this is to be expected since this test was structured to target gaps in students' knowledge, thus creating a natural context for providing learners with targeted forms of feedback (in this case recasts) in response to their errors which allows for testing the effect of targeted feedback strategy on students' performance during post test and delayed post test.

Table (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Immediate Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is the case with the treatment test, the scores in this test also represent the number of instances of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms produced by every student out of a certain number of turns (6).

By using the one sample t-test, it was found that $t = 0.1078$ with $df = 4$. As a result, that is less than the needed $t$ which is equal to 2.132 at 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, this implies that despite the decrease in the rate of errors in the immediate posttest, that decrease is not significant. This result undermines the prediction in hypothesis one that learners' high uptake rate will be translated into a decrease in the rate of errors in the immediate posttest. Despite the fact that there is a slight decrease in the errors in the immediate posttest, yet, this decrease couldn't be considered significant, when compared to the rate of errors in the treatment test.
As is the case with the treatment test and the immediate posttest, the scores in this test also represent the number of instances of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms produced by every student out of a certain number of turns (35).

By using the one sample t-test, it was found that $t= 1.4859$ with df= 4. As a result, that is less than the needed $t$ which is equal to 2.132 at 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, this value means that learners' errors decreased with a higher rate in the delayed posttest than the immediate; yet, it is negative, because the decrease is still not significant. Again this result undermines the prediction in hypothesis one that learners' high uptake rate will be translated into a decrease in the rate of errors in the delayed posttest.

**Comparison between the values of the t-tests of the three aforementioned tests**

**Table (7)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment Test</th>
<th>Immediate Post test</th>
<th>Delayed Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>-0.4924</td>
<td>0.1078</td>
<td>1.4859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table above, it is found that the value of t-test in the treatment test is equal to (-0.4924), value of t-test in the immediate post-test is equal to (0.1078), and the value of the t-test in the delayed posttest is equal to (1.4859). That means that the number of errors in the treatment test was very high, but the rate of errors decreased in immediate post-test and then decreased slightly in the delayed post-test.
These values are represented in the following illustration:

Figure (2)

![t-test values in the three tests](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Test vs. Immediate Posttest</th>
<th>Treatment Test vs. Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean1 = -0.1923</td>
<td>Mean2 = 0.49675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (8)

We can see from the above figure that there is a positive linear relation between the three tests. The mean between t-test (Treatment Test) -0.4924 and t-test (Immediate posttest) 0.1078 is equal to -0.1923. Accordingly, the value of the t-test (immediate posttest) is less than the average. In addition, the mean between t-test (Treatment Test) -0.4924 and t-test (delayed posttest) 1.4859 is equal to 0.49675. Accordingly, the value of the t-test (delayed posttest) is higher than the average. It is concluded from these values that there is a negative difference between treatment and immediate tests but a slight high difference between treatment and delayed tests. In order to know whether the difference is significant or not, dependent t-test is used as follows:
C- Measuring the statistical significance in the difference between the number of errors in the treatment-test and the two posttests (immediate & delayed)

Dependent t-test

1- Comparison between treatment test and immediate post-test with respect to rate of errors

Dependent Means t-test is used in order to measure whether there is a statistical significant difference between number of errors in the treatment-test and immediate post-test or not.

Table (9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Treatment test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Immediate Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of $t$ is 1.112252. The value of $p$ is 0.164184. The result is not significant at $p \leq 0.05$

This indicates, there was no immediate pickup of the teacher's CF on part of learners, in this group, when the teacher employed recasts as a feedback technique. This occurred despite the high rate of learners’ successful uptake in response to the teacher's correction (15 instances of successful uptake in response to 17 instances of teacher's corrective feedback using recasts). The non significant rate of decrease in the learners' production of non-target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms, indicated in the low rate of immediate pickup, confutes the prediction in
hypothesis two that there will be a decrease in the rate of errors from the treatment to the immediate posttest.

1- Comparison between treatment test and delayed post-test with respect to rate of errors

Dependent Means t-test is used in order to measure whether there is a statistical significance difference between number of errors in the treatment-test and delayed post-test or not.

Table (10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Treatment test</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Delayed post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of $t$ is 1.1875. The value of $p$ is 0.150364. The result is not significant at $p \leq 0.05$

This indicates that there was no retention of the of the teacher's CF on part of learners, in this group, and consequently no short-term development in the learners' IL, when the teacher employed recasts as a feedback technique. This occurred despite the high rate of learners' successful uptake in response to the teacher's correction (15 instances of successful uptake in response to 17 instances of teacher's corrective feedback using recasts). Again this result confutes the prediction in hypothesis two that there will be a decrease in the rate of errors from the treatment to the delayed posttest.
D- Results of the inquiry on the feedback technique implemented by the teacher of this group/class

The teacher of this group asserted that elicitation is the used feedback technique when it comes to correcting learners' errors. However, the way the teacher of this class implements elicitation is slightly different from the common definition of this feedback technique in terms of spontaneity. As previously mentioned, elicitations are provided by the teacher in response to learners' errors on the spot, that is, right after the learner makes an error. The teacher of this class writes down all the errors on a piece of paper, later writing them down on the board and eliciting the correct forms from the class as a whole, in case of common mistakes, and on a one-on-one basis, in case of individual mistakes. The researcher implemented recasts as a feedback technique in this group, which in addition to being different in the implemented approach is also a spontaneous feedback technique.
4.2 Recast Feedback Technique

Group (2)

A- Rate of students’ immediate response (uptake) to the feedback provided by the teacher/researcher

The table below displays the number of turns for every student during the treatment activity/test, the number of instances of errors during each student's turns, the number of instances of teacher's feedback, and the number of instances of successful uptake or lack of uptake for each student.

Table (11) Rate of student's errors, teacher feedback, and students' uptake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total student turns</th>
<th>Total student turns with error</th>
<th>Total teacher turns with recasts</th>
<th>Total student turns with &quot;successful uptake&quot;</th>
<th>Total student turns with &quot;no uptake&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table above, the learners' responded to all the instances of the teacher's CF using recasts with 15 instances of successful uptake, and without any instances of "no uptake".

According to the hypothesis one, this high rate of learners' uptake could result in high rate of decrease in the learners' errors in the immediate posttest and the delayed posttest. The argument is that the high rate of learners' uptake signifies that the learners have noticed the teacher's recasts as error correction, have internalized those recasts into their linguistic system, and would consequently retain the target like forms provided during recasts for subsequent use. The results of the immediate posttest and the delayed posttest will confirm this argument. If there is a high rate of immediate pick up of the target-like subject-verb agreement forms in the immediate posttest and high rate of learners' retention in the delayed posttest, this will confirm the prediction presented in hypothesis one.
This is clearly illustrated in the 2-D column chart below **Graph (2):**

![Graph (2)](image)

This illustration indicates the high rate of ECA learners' uptake in response to recasts when employed by ECA teacher/researcher as a feedback strategy. This further indicates that learners have either noticed the teacher's move as error correction and responded to it by reformulating their erroneous utterances, or they have merely parroted the teacher's reformulations in what could be described as a "mechanical act". (Panova & Lyster, 2001, p.592)

**B- Rate of learners' errors in the treatment test, immediate, and delayed post-tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Treatment Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (12)
The table above represents the students' scores in the treatment test. Each score demonstrates the number of instances in which the student was able to produce target-like forms in a specific number of turns. For instance, student one was able to provide 5 instances of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms out of 8 turns, and so on and so forth for the rest of the students.

By using the one sample t-test, it was found that t= 0.7905 with df= 4. As a result, that is less than the needed t at 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, the result shows that students’ rate of errors is high in the treatment test. Again this is to be expected since this test was structured to target gaps in students' knowledge, thus creating a natural context for providing learners with targeted forms of feedback (in this case recasts) in response to their errors which allows for testing the effect of targeted feedback strategy on students' performance during post test and delayed post test.

Table (13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Immediate Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is the case with the treatment test, the scores in this test also represent the number of instances of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms produced by every student out of a certain number of turns (8).

By using the one sample t-test, it was found that t= 1.7651 with df= 4. As a result, that is less than the needed value at 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, the result shows that students’ rate of errors is high in the immediate post-test. Accordingly, this implies that despite the decrease in the rate of errors in the immediate posttest, that decrease is not significant. This result undermines the prediction in Hypothesis One that learners' high uptake rate will translate into a decrease in the rate of errors in the immediate posttest. Despite the fact that there is a slight
decrease in the errors in the immediate posttest, yet, this decrease couldn't be considered significant, when compared to the rate of errors in the treatment test.

Table (14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Delayed post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16/26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is the case with the treatment test and the immediate posttest, the scores in this test also represent the number of instances of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms produced by every student out of a certain number of turns (26).

By using the one sample t-test, it was found that $t= 3.4647$ with df= 4. 4. As a result, that is more than the needed value at 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, the students’ rate of errors decreased in the delayed post-test; however, the decrease is not significant. Again this result undermines the prediction in Hypothesis One that learners' high uptake rate will translate into a decrease in the rate of errors in the delayed posttest.

Comparison between the values of the t-tests of the three aforementioned tests

Table (15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Test</th>
<th>Immediate Post test</th>
<th>Delayed Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$t$-test=0.7905</td>
<td>$t$-test=1.7651</td>
<td>$t$-test=3.4647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table above, it is found that the value of t-test in the treatment test is equal to (0.7905), value of t-test in the immediate post-test is equal to (1.7651), and the value of the t-test in the delayed-posttest is equal to (3.4647). That means that the number of errors in the
treatment test was high and didn't significantly decrease in the immediate posttest, but it decreased slightly in the delayed posttest.

These values are represented in the following illustration:

![t-test values in the three tests](image)

**Figure (3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Test vs. Immediate Posttest</th>
<th>Treatment Test vs. Delayed Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean1 = 1.2778</td>
<td>Mean2 = 2.1276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table (16)**

We can see from the above figure that there is a positive linear relation between the three tests. The mean between t-test (Treatment Test) 0.7905 and t-test (Immediate posttest) 1.7651 is equal to **1.2778**. Accordingly, the value of the t-test (immediate posttest) is a bit more than the average. In addition, the mean between t-test (Treatment Test) 0.7905 and t-test (Delayed posttest) 3.4647 is equal to **2.1276**. Accordingly, the value of the t-test (delayed posttest) is higher than the average. It is concluded from these values that there is a negative difference between treatment and immediate tests but a slight high difference between treatment and delayed tests. In order to know whether the difference is significant or not, dependent t-test is used as follows:
C- Measuring the statistical significance in the difference between the number of errors in the treatment-test and the two posttests (immediate & delayed)

Dependent t-test

1- Comparison between treatment test and immediate post-test with respect to rate of errors

Dependent Means t-test is used in order to measure whether there is a statistical significant difference between number of errors in the treatment-test and immediate post-test or not.

Table (17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Treatment test</th>
<th>Immediate Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of \( t \) is 1.632993. The value of \( p \) is 0.088904. The result is not significant at \( p \leq 0.05 \)

This indicates there was no immediate pickup of the teacher's CF on part of learners, in this group, when the teacher employed recasts as a feedback technique. This occurred despite the high rate of learners' successful uptake in response to the teacher's correction (15 instances of successful uptake in response to 15 instances of teacher's corrective feedback using recasts without any "no uptake" instances). The non significant rate of decrease in the learners' production of non-target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms, indicated in the low rate of
immediate pickup, refutes the prediction in Hypothesis Two that there will be a decrease in the rate of errors from the treatment to the immediate posttest.

1- Comparison between treatment test and delayed post-test with respect to rate of errors

Dependent Means t-test is used in order to measure whether there is a statistical significance difference between number of errors in the treatment-test and immediate post-test or not.

Table (18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Treatment test</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Delayed post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of $t$ is 1.787985. The value of $p$ is 0.074149. The result is not significant at $p \leq 0.05$

So despite the fact that there was a slight decrease in learners' errors in "Recasts 2" group as indicated by the value of the one sample t-test, yet, according to the results of the Dependent Mean t-test, this decrease was not significant. This indicates that there was no retention of the teacher's CF on part of learners in this group, and consequently there is no short-term development in the learners' IL, when the teacher employed recasts as a feedback technique. This occurred despite the high rate of learners' successful uptake in response to the teacher's correction (15 instances of successful uptake in response to 15 instances of teacher's corrective feedback using recasts with no occurrence of "no uptake" instances). Again this result refutes
the prediction in Hypothesis that there will be a decrease in the rate of errors from the treatment to the delayed posttest.

**D- Results of the inquiry on the feedback technique implemented by the teacher of this group/class**

Recast was the feedback technique that was routinely implemented by the teacher of this class. However, the teacher mentioned that in rare instances, she referred to elicitations on topics that learners were well versed in. Since the learners in this class were at the trial and error stage of ECA subject-verb agreement forms, recasts introduced by the researcher could be considered a feedback technique that learners are accustomed to receiving in similar situations. However, recasts when used by the researcher in response to learners’ errors failed to result in any significant development in terms of learners’ production of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms.
4.3 Elicitation Feedback Technique

Group (1)

A- Rate of students’ immediate response (modified output) to the feedback provided by the teacher/researcher

The table below displays the number of turns for every student during the treatment activity/test, the number of instances of errors during each student's turns, the number of instances of teacher's feedback, and the number of instances of modified output or lack of modified output for each student.

Table (19) Rate of student's errors, teacher feedback, and students' modified output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total student turns</th>
<th>Total student turns with errors</th>
<th>Total teacher turns with Elicitations</th>
<th>Total student turns with &quot;Modified Output&quot;</th>
<th>Total student turns with &quot;No Modified Output&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table above, the learners' responded to all the instances of the teacher's CF (12 instances) using elicitations with 9 instances of modified output (75%), and with 3 instances of "no modified output" (25%). However, it is worth mentioning in this respect that 3 subjects in "Elicitations, Group 1" didn't commit any errors, yet, the researcher didn't exclude them from the group, for two reasons: first, the feedback technique implemented by the researcher across all the groups involves addressing all the group members rather than specific individuals in it. Second, one can never know for certain what thought processes and
reactions actually occur in learners' minds while the teacher is correcting errors made by their peers. What supports this argument is the study carried out by Ohta (2000). Despite the fact that the study investigated a different feedback technique from the one that is addressed to this group i.e. recasts, yet, its findings could still apply to the situation in this group. Ohta (2000) investigated the private speech pattern (the learner's speech addressed to himself / herself) of seven learners of Japanese as a second language. The study showed that learners to whom the CF wasn't actually addressed, but to their classmates and/or to the whole class, were able to utilize them and to notice them as feedback moves. According to Ohta (2000), these findings provide compelling evidence that CF can be utilized in the learners' mental activity and help them notice the contrast between their ill-formed utterances and the teacher's reformulations, despite the absence of "overt oral response" (Ohta, 2000, p.54).

According to Hypothesis One, this high rate of learners' uptake could result in a correspondingly high rate of decrease in the learners' errors in the immediate posttest and the delayed posttest. The argument is that the high rate of learners' modified output signifies that the learners have noticed their errors when pushed by the teacher to correct them by producing modified output, have internalized the target-like forms into their linguistic system, and would consequently retain them for subsequent use. The results of the immediate posttest and the delayed posttest will confirm this argument. If there is a high rate of immediate pick up of the target-like subject-verb agreement forms in the immediate posttest and high rate of learners' retention in the delayed posttest, this will confirm the prediction presented in Hypothesis One.

The rate of learners' errors during the treatment activity/test is illustrated by the 2-D column chart below:
Graph (3)

According to the above illustration, there is a high rate of modified out instances (75%) in response to the teacher's CF using elicitations, and a low rate of "no modified output" instances (25%). This indicates that a majority of learners have noticed the gap between their inter-language and the target language and responded by modifying their erroneous utterances.
B- Rate of learners' errors in the treatment test, immediate, and delayed post-tests

The table above represents the students' scores in the treatment test. Each score demonstrates the number of instances in which the student was able to produce target-like forms in a specific number of turns. For instance, student one was able to provide 3 instances of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms out of 5 turns, and so on and so forth for the rest of the students.

By using the one sample t-test, it was found that $t= 1.7888$ with $df= 8$. As a result, that is less than the needed value at 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, the result shows that students' rate of errors is high in the treatment test. Again this is to be expected since this test was structured to target gaps in students' knowledge, thus creating a natural context for providing learners with targeted forms of feedback (in this case elicitations) in response to their errors which allows for testing the effect of targeted feedback strategy on students' performance during post test and delayed post test.
Table (21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Immediate Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is the case with the treatment test, the scores in this test also represent the number of instances of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms produced by every student out of a certain number of turns (4)

By using the one sample t-test, it was found that \( t = 3.3549 \) with \( df = 8 \). As a result, that is more than the needed value at 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, the result shows that students' rate of errors decreased in the immediate post-test. However, this decrease is not significant. This result undermines the prediction in Hypothesis One that learners' high modified output rate will translate into a decrease in the rate of errors in the immediate posttest. Despite the fact that there is a slight decrease in the errors in the immediate posttest, yet, this decrease couldn't be considered significant, when compared to the rate of errors in the treatment test.

Table (22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Delayed post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>27/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>26/27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As is the case with the treatment test and the immediate posttest, the scores in this test also represent the number of instances of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms produced by every student out of a certain number of turns (26).

By using the one sample t-test, it was found that \( t = 16.0588 \) with \( df = 8 \). As a result, that is more than the needed value at 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, the result shows that students’ rate of errors decreased sharply in the delayed post-test. This result confirms the prediction in Hypothesis One that the high rate of learners' modified output during the interactional feedback procedure signifies a decrease in learners' errors in the delayed posttest.

**Comparison between the values of the t-tests of the three aforementioned tests**

**Table (23)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment Test</th>
<th>Immediate Post test</th>
<th>Delayed Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( t )-test</td>
<td>1.7888</td>
<td>3.3549</td>
<td>16.0588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table above, it is found that the value of \( t \)-test in the treatment test is equal to \( 1.7888 \), value of \( t \)-test in the immediate post-test is equal to \( 3.3549 \), and the value of the \( t \)-test in the delayed posttest is equal to \( 16.0588 \). That means that the number of errors in the treatment test was high, but the rate of errors decreased in immediate post-test and even decreased a lot more in the delayed post-test. This indicates that there is a relationship between the high rate of learners’ modified output, and their retention of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms. However, this relationship can only be proved significant through using the Dependent Means \( t \)-test.

**These values are represented in the following illustration:**
Figure (4)

![t-test values in the 3 tests](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment Test vs. Immediate Posttest</th>
<th>Treatment Test vs. Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean1</strong></td>
<td>2.57185</td>
<td><strong>Mean2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean2</strong></td>
<td>8.9238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (24)

We can see from the above figure that there is a positive linear relation between the three tests. The mean between t-test (Treatment Test) 1.7888 and t-test (Immediate posttest) 3.3549 is equal to 2.57185. Accordingly, the value of the t-test (immediate posttest) is higher than the average. In addition, the mean between t-test (Treatment Test) 1.7888 and t-test (delayed posttest) 16.0588 is equal to 8.9238. Accordingly, the value of the t-test (delayed posttest) is higher than the average. It is concluded from these values that there is a slight difference between treatment and immediate tests but a high difference between treatment and delayed tests. In order to know whether these differences are significant or not, dependent t-test is used as follows:
C- Measuring the statistical significance in the difference between the number of errors in the treatment-test and the two posttests (immediate & delayed)

Dependent t-test

1- Comparison between treatment test and immediate post-test with respect to rate of errors

Depended Means t-test is used in order to measure whether there is a statistical significance difference between number of errors in the treatment-test and immediate post-test or not.

Table (25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Treatment test</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Immediate Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of $t$ is 0.716986. The value of $p$ is 0.246891. The result is not significant at $p \leq 0.05$

This value indicates that despite the high rate of learners' correction of their erroneous utterances in the form of "modified output", the decrease in errors in the immediate posttest was not statistically significant. This refutes the prediction in Hypothesis Two that there will be a decrease in the rate of errors after introducing the treatment in the immediate posttest. Accordingly, using "elicitations" as a feedback technique wasn't beneficial to learners in terms of their immediate recall of the error correction which occurred during the interactional feedback technique/ treatment.
**2- Comparison between treatment test and delayed post-test with respect to rate of errors**

**Table (26)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Treatment test</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Delayed post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The value of \( t \) is 2.929444. The value of \( p \) is 0.009507. The result is significant at \( p \leq 0.05 \)**

The above value indicates that using "elicitation" as a feedback technique was successful in helping learners in "Group 1" retain the information produced by them during the treatment. The result in the delayed posttest is different from that of the immediate in terms of the significance in the decrease of the rate of errors. This result supports Hypothesis Two, which predicted that there will be a decrease in the rate of errors from the time of the treatment test, when the treatment was introduced, to the time of the delayed posttest, after the two-day time gap. Consequently, there is a potential relationship between learners' rate of modified output and the short-term development of learners' ECA past-tense subject-verb agreement forms.

**D- Results of the inquiry on the feedback technique implemented by the teacher of this group/class**

The teacher of this class asserted that elicitations always form a better choice when correcting learners' errors, and so they are commonly used by him as a feedback strategy. He mentioned that giving the learners' a fishing line is always more effective than giving them a fish. Yet, he also mentioned that sometimes he resorts to recasts when there is a common problem among learners in failing to correct their own errors.
4.4 Elicitation Feedback Technique

Group (2)

A- Rate of students’ immediate response (modified output) to the feedback provided by the teacher/researcher

The table below displays the number of turns for every student during the treatment activity/test, the number of instances of errors during each student's turns, the number of instances of teacher's feedback, and the number of instances of modified output or lack of modified output for each student.

**Table (27) Rate of student's errors, teacher feedback, and students' modified output**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total student turns</th>
<th>Total student turns with errors</th>
<th>Total teacher turns with Elicitations</th>
<th>Total student turns with &quot;Modified Output&quot;</th>
<th>Total student turns with &quot;No Modified Output&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table above, the learners' responded to all the instances of the teacher's CF (19 instances), using elicitations, with 17 instances of modified output, and only 2 instances of "no modified output". This implies that out of 19 instances of error, learners—in response to the teacher's attempts to elicit the target-like form from them—responded by modifying 17 of their erroneous utterances (89.5%), and by not modifying only 2 errors (10.5%). According to Hypothesis One, this high rate of learners' uptake could result in high rate of decrease in the learners' errors in the immediate posttest and the delayed posttest. The argument is that the high rate of learners' modified output signifies that the learners have noticed their errors when pushed
by the teacher to correct them by producing modified output, have internalized the target-like forms into their linguistic system, and would consequently retain them for subsequent use. The results of the immediate posttest and the delayed posttest will confirm this argument. If there is a high rate of immediate pick up of the target-like subject-verb agreement forms in the immediate posttest and high rate of learners' retention in the delayed posttest, this will confirm the prediction presented in Hypothesis One.

The rate of learners' errors during the treatment activity/test is illustrated by the 2-D column chart below:

**Graph (4)**

According to the above illustration, there is a very high rate of modified output instances (89.5%) in response to the teacher's CF using elicitations, and a very low rate of "no modified output" instances (10.5%). This indicates that a majority of learners have noticed the gap between their inter-language and the target language and responded by modifying their erroneous utterances.
**B- Rate of learners' errors in the treatment test, immediate, and delayed post-tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Treatment Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (28)

The table above represents the students' scores in the treatment test. Each score demonstrates the number of instances in which the student was able to produce target-like forms in a specific number of turns. For instance, student one was able to provide 3 instances of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms out of 5 turns, and so on and so forth for the rest of the students.

By using the one sample t-test, it was found that \( t = 0.1728 \) with df= 4. As a result, this is less than the needed value at 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, the result shows that students’ rate of errors is high in the treatment test, which is to be expected since this test was structured to target gaps in students' knowledge, thus creating a natural context for providing learners with targeted forms of feedback (in this case elicitations) in response to their errors which allows for testing the effect of targeted feedback strategy on students' performance during post test and delayed post test.
Table (29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Immediate Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is the case with the treatment test, the scores in this test also represent the number of instances of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms produced by every student out of a certain number of turns (9).

By using the one sample t-test, it was found that $t = 2.582$ with df= 4. As a result, that is more than the needed value at 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, the result shows students’ rate of errors decreased in the immediate post-test. However, this decrease is not significant. This result undermines the prediction in Hypothesis One that learners' high modified output rate will translate into a decrease in the rate of errors in the immediate posttest. Despite the fact that there is a slight decrease in the errors in the immediate posttest, yet, this decrease couldn't be considered significant, when compared to the rate of errors in the treatment test.

Table (30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27/32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is the case with the treatment test and the immediate posttest, the scores in this test also represent the number of instances of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms produced by every student out of a certain number of turns (32).
By using the one sample t-test, it was found that \( t = 16.3669 \) with \( df = 4 \). As a result, that is more than the needed value at 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, the result shows that students’ rate of errors decreased sharply in the delayed post-test. This result confirms the prediction in Hypothesis One that the high rate of learners’ modified output during the interactional feedback procedure signifies a decrease in learners’ errors in the delayed posttest.

**Comparison between the values of the t-tests of the three aforementioned tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment Test</th>
<th>Immediate Post test</th>
<th>Delayed Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( t )-test</td>
<td>( 0.1728 )</td>
<td>( 2.582 )</td>
<td>( 16.3669 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table (31)**

According to the table above, it is found that the value of \( t \)-test in the treatment test is equal to \( 0.1728 \), value of \( t \)-test in the immediate post-test is equal to \( 2.582 \), and the value of the \( t \)-test in the delayed-posttest is equal to \( 16.3669 \). That means that the number of errors in the treatment test was high, decreased slightly in the immediate posttest, and decreased sharply in the delayed posttest.

These values are represented in the following illustration:

**Figure (5)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Test vs. Immediate Posttest</th>
<th>Treatment Test vs. Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean1= 1.3774</td>
<td>Mean2= 8.26985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (32)

We can see from the above figure that there is a positive linear relation between the three tests. The mean between t-test (Treatment Test) 0.1728 and t-test (Immediate posttest) 2.582 is equal to 1.3774. Accordingly, the value of the t-test (immediate posttest) is higher than the average. In addition, the mean between t-test (Treatment Test) 0.1728 and t-test (delayed posttest) 16.3669 is equal to 8.26985. Accordingly, the value of the t-test (delayed posttest) is higher than the average. It is concluded from these values that there is a slight difference between treatment and immediate tests but a high difference between treatment and delayed tests. In order to know whether the difference is significant or not, dependent t-test is used as follows:

*C- Measuring the statistical significance in the difference between the number of errors in the treatment-test and the two posttests (immediate & delayed)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Comparison between treatment test and immediate post-test with respect to rate of errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Means t-test is used in order to measure whether there is a statistical significant difference between number of errors in the treatment-test and immediate post-test or not.
Table (33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Treatment test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Immediate Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of $t$ is 1.616448. The value of $p$ is 0.090652. The result is not significant at $p \leq 0.05$

This value indicates that despite high rate of learners' correction of their erroneous utterances in the form of "modified output", the decrease in errors in the immediate posttest was not statistically significant. This refutes the prediction in Hypothesis Two that there will be a decrease in the rate of errors after introducing the treatment in the immediate posttest. Accordingly, using "elicitations" as a feedback technique wasn't beneficial to learners in terms of their immediate recall of the error correction that occurred during the interactional feedback technique/treatment.

2- Comparison between treatment test and delayed post-test with respect to rate of errors

Depended Means t-test is used in order to measure whether there is a statistical significant difference between number of errors in the treatment-test and delayed post-test or not.
The value of $t$ is 2.370794. The value of $p$ is 0.038377. The result is significant at $p \leq 0.05$

The above values indicate that using "elicitation" as a feedback technique was equally successful in helping learners in both the Elicitation Group 2 and the Elicitation Group 1, retain the information produced by them (when learners modified their errors) during the treatment activity. Also in this group, the result of the delayed posttest was different from that of the immediate in terms of the significance in the decrease of the rate of errors. This result supports hypothesis two, which predicted that there will be a decrease in the rate of errors from the time of the treatment test, when the treatment was introduced, to the time of the delayed posttest, after the two days time gap. Consequently, there is a potential relationship between learners' rate of modified output and the short-term development of learners' ECA past-tense subject-verb agreement forms.

**D- Results of the inquiry on the feedback technique implemented by the teacher of this group/class**

The teacher of this class commonly uses elicitations in correcting her learners' errors. However, she doesn't give feedback spontaneously. She writes down all the common mistakes and then uses elicitations in pushing learners to self-correct. She mentioned that giving on the spot correction breaks the flow of communication which works against learners' fluency in producing the target language.
Chapter (5)

Discussion of Findings

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the results of the study carried out in four different AFL classes to investigate the following: the effect of recasts on two of these classes and compare it to the effect of elicitations on the other two classes in terms of the impact of each technique on learners' immediate response (uptake/modified output) to the feedback provided by the teacher (whether recast or elicitation). Also investigated was the immediate incorporation of the correction provided by the teacher into learners' linguistic system, and learners' retention of this information after a two-day time gap from the treatment, and consequently, the short-term development of their ECA subject-verb (past tense) agreement forms. The results are discussed in terms of the values attained by the statistical analysis of data in the previous chapter, and interpreted in terms of the previously mentioned theories in the introduction of this paper, in addition to other studies conducted by other researchers in the area of feedback provision, specifically, recasts and elicitations.

5.1 Discussion of findings for recasts and elicitations

Recasts

A- Rate of ECA learners' uptake in the two "recasts experimental groups" in response to recasts when employed by ECA teacher/researcher as a feedback strategy (Question1)

The results of the two experimental groups showed that there was a very high rate of learners' uptake (88% of successful uptake for Group 1 and 100% for Group 2) in reaction to the teacher's recasts. These results agree with the results of Nassaji (2007), Loewen & Philp (2006), and Youssef (2009) where recasts led to high repair rates. At the same time, however, the results run counter to those found by Lyster & Ranta (1997), Lyster (1998), and Tsang (2004), where recasts led to the least uptake rate on the part of learners in comparison to other feedback techniques. The results also conflict with those found by Macnulty (2007), where despite the high rate of learners' uptake in response to recasts (100%), they led to successful repair for only 20% of the cases.
**B-The immediate incorporation of the teacher's recasts into the learners' linguistic system (Question 2)**

The results of the Dependent t-test showed that there was no significant decrease between learners' errors in the treatment test and the immediate posttest for both groups. As mentioned earlier in the study methodology, the researcher planned to consider learners' uptake rate during the treatment a preliminary indication of learners noticing the teacher's move as error correction. The researcher also planned to view learners' improved performance in the immediate posttest as further evidence that learners have noticed the teacher's feedback, and incorporated the teacher's feedback into their linguistic system, indicating that acquisition is in process. However, the results of the immediate posttest suggested that learners in the two recasts group failed to notice the teacher/researcher's reformulations of their errors. This was further confirmed by the results of the delayed posttest.

**C-Students’ short-term retention of information provided by the teacher/researcher during the interactional feedback procedure (Question 4)**

Statistical analysis of the delayed posttest data showed that there was a high rate of errors in the learners' utterances. This result confirmed that learners had not utilized the recasts provided to them by the teacher in the two recasts groups. This further confirmed that learners had not noticed the teacher's recasts, and despite the high rate of uptake, the rate of errors had not decreased significantly in both the immediate and the delayed posttests.

Accordingly, the current study suggests that learners' uptake should not be considered the sole indicator that learners have or have not noticed recasts. This result agrees with the views of other researchers. For instance, Mackey & Philp (1998), and Ohta (2000) argued that learners' uptake, in response to recasts, should not be taken as sole evidence that learners have noticed the error correction function of recasts. However, unlike the learners in the current study, learners in the two studies mentioned earlier progressed in their language development after being corrected on their errors by recasts. Similarly, Lowen & Philp (2006) argued that there is a possibility of a positive relationship between successful uptake and learners' subsequent recall of error correction with various types of feedback. However,
they also argued that "recast" is an exception to this finding because, with recasts, successful uptake should not be regarded as a significant factor. This finding is further supported by Rezaei & Derakhshan (2011) who concluded that when teachers use recasts as a feedback technique, there is always a mismatch between the teacher's intent and learners' interpretation of the teacher's move. Accordingly, learners are liable to regard most of these recasts as mere repetition (confirmation checks) of their utterances. (See also Lyster, 1998; Carpenter et. al, 2006).

Hence, a possible interpretation of the results of the recasts groups in the current study is that learners had either noticed the teacher's feedback moves and considered it ‘confirmation checks’ to their utterances, thus not responding to the teacher's real intention to correct their errors as proposed by the previously mentioned studies, or, conversely, had not noticed the teacher’s feedback move at all, thus simply mimicking the teacher's reformulations. This interpretation strengthens the argument proposed by Sawin & Lapkin, 1995 (cited in Panova & Lyster, 2002) that, even in limited instances where uptake and /or modification of the target language occur after a recast, this might merely be "mechanical repetition" (Panova & Lyster, 2001, p. 592) of the target like model provided by the teacher without the learners’ attention being consciously drawn to the mismatch between their erroneous utterance and the teacher’s correct model. This concept was further emphasized by Sheen (2004) who claimed that uptake after recasts is nothing more than repetition of the interlocutor's (whether a teacher or a native speaker) reformulation of the erroneous utterance.

Similarly, these findings support Schmidt's (1990) "Noticing Hypothesis" and views on the importance of noticing input as a prerequisite to learning. He argued that, in the absence of getting to notice this input, there would be minimal chances for the provided input to be converted into intake and become incorporated into the learners' linguistic system.

These results also cast doubt on the argument proposed by Krashen (1982, 1985) which emphasized the importance of input in SLA. According to Krashen, "input" (termed as "comprehensible input") is both crucial and sufficient for acquisition to take place. If clear enough to learners, input helps language progresses along the natural order with no intervention needed on the part of the teacher. Krashen also asserted that acquisition is an implicit subconscious process; thus, noticing the gap between the second language target-like
form and learners' actual L2 production (inter-language) does not really facilitate the process of acquisition. In the current study, as clear from analysis of the data, it could be argued that one of the factors hindering learners from progressing in their production of ECA subject-verb agreement forms is the type and nature of feedback provided to them. This is because it kept them from noticing the mismatch between their utterances and the target-like forms provided by the teacher. Supporting this argument is the fact that both groups reached similar results, despite their variations. Learners were provided with a ready-made correction that did not require any modification of the erroneous utterances on their part (output) since it was pure input. If Krashen's assumptions were accurate, the results of the two posttests would have been totally different, and the rate of learners' errors would have decreased with a significant value. In the meantime, the findings of the recasts group bolster Swian's (1985) argument on the importance of the noticing/consciousness-raising function of the learners' output in helping learners become aware of gaps and problems in their current language system, test their hypotheses on erroneous language structures produced by them, and eventually, modify those errors into more target-like forms (Mitchell & Myles, 2006).

The study also affirms Miller's (2003) views on the efficiency of 'input' by arguing that providing input in the form of a target-like model of the language to L2 learners in response to their errors can never be adequate for learning to take place. According to Miller, unless learners are given the opportunity to repair their language and self-correct their errors, they will not be able to notice the gap between their inter-language and the target-like language. Similarly, White (1987) emphasized that there are situations where input, as defined by Krashen, will fail in helping learners give up some non-target forms produced by them, and consequently, fail to cause a change in learners' grammar.

These results could be also attributed to the argument of deep cognitive processing. Izumi (2002) asserted that providing learners with error correction in the form of input takes place at a relatively shallow level as it does not engage learners in deep levels of cognitive processing that might be necessary for acquisition. Izumi supports his argument by referring to a paper on memory research by Craik and Lockhart (1972 as cited in Izumi, 2002) which attributed the depth of processing to the degree of cognitive analysis and elaboration in response to input stimulus. According to the authors, the deeper the levels of processing, the more the chances for
the persistence of memory traces in the human memory. However, if the processing occurs at the level of rehearsing and repeating only (as is the case for the two recasts groups); it will not by itself lead to retention unless the learner engages in deeper levels of cognitive processing. This indicates that noticing accompanied by deeper levels of processing might lead to long term retention of target-like L2 forms.

Some studies have attributed learners' failure to utilize recasts to individual differences in the Working Memory Capacity (WMC). For instance, Goo (2012) argued that learners with high WMC are more efficient in processing the input they receive since noticing recasts required the control of ‘attentional sources’ (p.465). This is because it places a requirement on learners to engage in cognitive comparisons. The ability of learners to notice the gap in their inter-language depends on storing their initial erroneous utterance in a readily accessible state. This allows learners to retrieve it spontaneously, comparing it with the incoming target-like utterance provided by the teacher in the recast. If learners fail to do so, due to low WMC, there is little chance that they could utilize recasts provided to them in response to their erroneous utterances. Although this argument could offer a logical interpretation to the results of the recasts group in the current study, it would not hold true because learners' WMC had not been tested. Accordingly, the research recommends that this issue should be investigated in future research.

The results of the recasts group could also be interpreted in terms of the proficiency level of participants in the study. As mentioned earlier, the subjects taking part in this study were just introduced to usage of ECA verb forms (as indicated by their teachers) which constitute part of syllabus introduced to intermediate level learners. This implies that learners are at an early stage of language learning. A few studies stated that recasts might not be suitable for low proficiency learners because they are too implicit to be noticed by them. For instance, Ammar & Spada (2006) argued that the implicitness of recasts and the load placed on learners' attention capacity might minimize chances of learners benefiting from their teachers' reformulations. The researchers also asserted that for low proficiency learners, prompts seemed to be more effective (see also Philp, 2003; Ammar, 2008; Sepehrinia et. al, 2011). Furthermore, Ammar & Spada explained that low level learners might have a better chance of benefiting from prompts rather than recasts due to the nature of the two feedback moves. That is, elicitations provide learners with cues and give them the opportunity to produce
output that helps them not only to notice their errors but also to understand the nature of these errors in a way that increases the effectiveness of this type of CF. Accordingly, the results of the recasts group might also be attributed to learners' inability (at this stage of their language development) to utilize recasts provided by the teacher in reformulating their non-target like ECA subject-verb agreement forms.

Both the results of the study and the above argument clearly show that the implemented approach by recasts (in terms of providing learners with pure input in the form of the teacher's reformulations) could be held responsible for learners' failure to utilize them. Nevertheless, several other studies attribute this failure to the linguistic target of recasts, considered it a factor that might influence learners' interpretations (such as Egi, 2007). For instance, Mackey et al. (2000 as cited in Yalmez & Yuksel, 2011) found that learners could perceive recasts targeting phonology and lexis more easily than those targeting morpho-syntax. Similarly, Saito & Lyster (2012) asserted that recasts may not be salient to learners when they target morpho-syntactic errors, but could be sufficiently salient to learners when they target pronunciation errors. Ellis & Sheen (2006) also supported these views, arguing that recasts could be far more effective if they were directed at lexis and pronunciation rather than grammar (see also Carpenter et.al, 2006; Ellis et.al, 2001). However, this is not the case for elicitations, as they were reported to be successful in treating phonological, lexical, and grammatical errors (Macnulty, 2007). Since our target structure in the current study was morpho-syntactic, learners' failure to utilize recasts might well be attributed to the linguistic feature at hand.

A possible interpretation of the results might also lie in the type of feedback commonly used by the class teacher and with which the learners are familiar. As mentioned earlier, learners in recasts Group 1 were accustomed to elicitations rather than recasts as a feedback technique. Spoon feeding them by correcting their errors in the form of input might have failed to catch their attention to the feedback move provided by the researcher. In addition, the teacher does not provide elicitations spontaneously, as mentioned earlier, and so the spontaneity of recasts might have distracted the learners. Actually, the results of recasts Group 2 support this argument. Unlike Group 1, learners in Group 2 were accustomed to recasts, which was the feedback technique commonly used by their teacher. Although results of the posttests were insignificant for both groups, a comparison between the results of the t-test of the immediate posttests in both groups reveals that the value of the t-test of the immediate posttest for Group 2 (1.7651) was
higher than that of Group 1 (0.1078). The higher value indicates a correspondingly high rate of decrease in learners' errors after the treatment, which again indicates that learners in this group might have benefited more from the feedback provided. A similar situation occurred in the delayed posttest for the two groups. For instance, the value of the t-test of Group 2 was 3.4647 as compared with 1.4859 for Group 1. These numbers indicate that employing recasts in Group 2 led to more successful results in terms of decreasing the rate of learners' errors after the treatment. This again indicates that there was improved retention of the correction provided during the interactional feedback procedure, which might have slightly added to learners' inter-language development. Accordingly, it could be suggested that familiarizing learners with specific feedback techniques might affect the way they respond to and benefit from these techniques in the future.

Elicitations

**A- Rate of ECA learners' modified output in the two "elicitations experimental groups" in response to elicitation when employed by ECA teacher/researcher as a feedback strategy (Question 1)**

The results of the two experimental groups revealed a high rate of modified output of learners' erroneous utterances (75% for Group 1, and 89.5% for Group 2) in response to the teacher's feedback using elicitation. Accordingly, these findings support studies in which elicitation resulted in high repair moves on the part of learners (e.g. Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Jabbari, 2012; Ammar & Spada, 2006; Ferreira & Atkinson, 2009). They also strengthen the argument in favor of the importance of output-based feedback in eliciting modified output which allows learners to notice the mismatch between their inter-language and the target-like language.

**B- Immediate incorporation of target-like forms produced during error correction into the learners' linguistic system (Question 3)**

Many studies gave credit to modified output in terms of its ability to draw learners' attention to their problematic areas in L2, thereby helping them to realize what they are actually producing as opposed to what they need to produce. For instance, Khatib & Alizadeh (2012) concluded that
learning a grammatical feature requires more than surface exposure to input containing the target structure. Rather, it requires giving learners the opportunity to produce the target form. According to the researchers, output helps learners to notice the gaps in their output, and eventually help in improving their inter-language. Khatib & Alizadeh also concluded that their study supports Swain's hypothesis on the crucial influence of the noticing function of output on L2 learning (see also Menim, 2007; MacDonough, 2001). However, in comparison to these views, the results of the immediate posttests for the two elicitations groups were totally unexpected: the decrease in the rate of errors for both groups in the immediate posttest after the treatment could not really be considered significant. In most of the studies employing elicitations as a feedback technique, elicitations had a significant effect on learners in both the immediate and the delayed posttests (e.g. Ammar, 2003; Ammar & Spada, 2006; MacDonough, 2001). Only in very rare cases (e.g. Nassaji, 2009) were results of the immediate posttest as significant as those of the delayed posttest.

However, a logical interpretation for these results could be provided in Robinson's (1995) views on 'Working Memory' (WM). According to Robinson, Working Memory is “a subset of short-term memory” (p. 631), or focal attention which coincides with awareness. However, activation in the short-term memory must reach a certain threshold before it integrates with awareness. In other words, in order for newly detected information to be encoded in the working memory, it must enter focal attention and short-term memory to enable rehearsal processes to operate prior to encoding. Rehearsal occurring after detection might call for data-driven processing. Robinson (1995) described data-driven processing as stimuli encoded in bits and pieces, and later assembled in the WM. According to Robinson, more permanent encoding is the result of the level of activation of information in the short term memory, which itself is an outcome of rehearsal and elaboration. If this view is applied to the results of the immediate posttest for the two elicitations groups, it could be argued that learners in the immediate posttest, which was administered right after the treatment, were still in the rehearsal stage since the stimuli provided to them in the form of error correction is still in the ‘bits and pieces’ stage. Upon taking the immediate posttest, learners in the two elicitations groups might have been in a situation where they were still assembling the detected information in their working memory. Furthermore, a feedback technique such as elicitation requiring deep levels of cognitive processing might require more time to get assembled in the learners' brains (De Bot, 1996; Mackey et. al, 2010).
Another possibility is that learners could still have been in the testing hypothesis stage (a function of output stated by Swain in the Output Hypothesis) at the time of the immediate posttest. The results of the delayed posttest, that were statistically significant, could provide support to this argument.

**C-Students’ short-term retention of information provided by the teacher/researcher during the interactional feedback procedure (Question 4)**

Statistical analysis of the delayed posttest data confirmed that learners utilized the elicitations provided to them by the teacher in the two elicitation groups. Learners' errors decreased sharply in the delayed posttest for the two groups, signifying a short term development of learners' ECA subject-verb agreement forms. These results provide more evidence to the Output Hypothesis proposed by Merrill Swain in 1985. Swain (1993 as cited in Gass & Mackey, 2006) argued for the importance of pushing learners to produce an output, which allows them to notice and reflect on their problematic areas in L2 as well as consider ways of modifying output to enhance comprehensibility, appropriateness, and accuracy (p. 4).

Results for the elicitation groups were in line with those of other studies that investigated the effect of modified output on L2 learners' IL development. For instance, MacDonough (2001) investigated Swain's claim on the effect of producing output on L2 learners' acquisition and inter-language development. The study gave empirical evidence to the claim that there is a positive relationship between modified output and L2 learning; the results of the study showed that learners who produced modified output, including target-like forms, were more likely to develop in their inter-language than learners who did not (see also MacDonough, 2005). Leeser (2008) also reached similar results in a study that investigated the effect of pushed output during a series of reconstruction tasks on learners’ noticing of target forms when receiving subsequent input, their comprehension of this input, and finally their development of L2 Spanish past tense morphology (e.g. Izumi & Bigelow, 2002).

The findings of the current study, in terms of the positive impact of modified output on IL development, aligned with those of two studies by Ammar (2003, 2008), in which she compared the effect of recasts versus elicitations on learners' L2 development. The results showed that learners' inter-language development was reflected in the delayed post-test. Thus, both Ammar’s findings and those of the current study confirm the positive effect of modified output via elicitations in helping learners to progress over time (see also Ammar & Spada, 2006). It should
be mentioned, however, that Ammar (2008) argued that even if recasts are noticed by learners, the delayed post-test showed that they “could not store them in their long-term memory for subsequent retrieval and accurate use” (p.199).

A possible interpretation of the results might also lie in the type of feedback that is commonly used by the class teacher and, accordingly, the learners familiar with it.

As mentioned earlier, the teacher of both groups used elicitations as their feedback strategy in correcting learners' mistakes. Accordingly, this factor might be seen as being advantageous to subjects in the elicitations groups by providing them with a feedback technique with which they are familiar, thus contributing in learners’ gains from this feedback technique.

The only difference between the two groups is the spontaneity factor. The teacher of elicitations Group 1 provided learners with elicitations spontaneously, that is, immediately after their errors. The teacher of Group 2, on the other hand, delayed the feedback process until she had a complete record of the common mistakes among learners, after which she started eliciting the correct forms from them. Actually, it could be also argued in this respect that spontaneity might be a factor affecting learners' ability to handle feedback. A review of the results of the t-tests of the posttests supports this argument. For instance, Group 1, which is accustomed to spontaneous elicitations, achieved higher value in the immediate posttest (3.3549) than Group 2 (2.582).

Meanwhile, Group 2, which is used to delayed feedback, made better use of elicitations in the longer term, that is, in the delayed posttest (16.0588 and 16.3669 for Group 1 & 2, respectively). Again, this suggests that accustoming learners to specific feedback techniques might affect the way they handle and benefit from those techniques in the future.

5.2 Conclusion
This study aimed at investigating the effect of recasts and elicitations on AFL learners' immediate response to the teacher's correction, immediate incorporation of this correction in the learners' linguistic system, and the short-term development of learners' inter-language. Accordingly, the study proposed two hypotheses:

- The high rate of uptake/modified output indicates a decrease in the rate of errors in both the immediate and the delayed posttests.
• The rate of errors is supposed to decrease significantly for each feedback technique, from treatment to immediate posttest, and, similarly, from treatment to delayed posttest.

The results were as follows:

**Recasts**
* The high rate of uptake in the two recasts groups failed to guarantee a decrease in the rate of errors in the immediate posttest and the delayed posttest.
* The rate of errors did not decrease significantly over the time span from the treatment to the immediate posttest or from the treatment to the delayed posttest.

**Elicitations**
* The high rate of modified output in the two elicitation groups indicated a decrease in the rate of errors in the delayed posttest. However, it failed to guarantee a decrease in the immediate posttest.
* The rate of errors did not decrease significantly from the treatment to the immediate posttest, but decreased from the treatment to the delayed posttest.

According to the above results, the study concludes that:
Elicitations (as an output-based feedback technique) are far more effective, in terms of the effect on AFL learners' short-term inter-language development, than recasts (as an input-based feedback technique).

High rate of learner' uptake in response to recasts should not be considered an indication that learners noticed recasts as error correction. This conclusion is supported by the fact that learners in the recasts' group achieved high uptake rates that where even higher than the modified output rates in the elicitation groups. However, the results of both the immediate and the delayed posttest showed no progress for the recasts group in terms of a reduction in the rate of their errors.

These results, however, need to be perceived with caution due to the small number of subjects in the study.

In addition, other studies which investigated the effect of recasts on L2 learners' inter-language development arrived at different results in favor of recasts in terms of their effect on L2 development. For instance, a study by Mackey & Philp (1998) investigated the effect of recasts
on the development of English question forms for ESL learners. The results of the study showed that learners progressed from Level 4 to Level 5 (measured on the Pienemann & Johnston (1997) Developmental Scale for English question formation in measuring learners' progress) after being corrected on their errors using recasts. This progress occurred despite the low rate of learners' uptake (5%) in this study. However, another study also investigating the effect of recasts on the development of English questions by MacDonough & Mackey (2006) revealed a positive relationship between learners' uptake and learners' language development. Nevertheless, they stressed a certain type of uptake where learners did not merely repeat the teachers' reformulation to their erroneous question forms, but responded to the teacher's reformulation with a new question. This type of response to the teacher's recasts was termed as 'primed production'. According to the researchers, this technique is far more effective than simply mimicking the teacher's reformulations because it helps learners' to notice the error correction. Accordingly, they concluded that recasts could be well utilized by learners if they were made more explicit. Similar views were offered by Han (2002) who argued that, in order to gain full understanding of the role played by recasts in language development, it is necessary to investigate "under which conditions and on which aspects of L2 development would recasts have a positive effect?" (Han, 2002, p.569). The results of another study by Leeman (2003) supports this argument by investigating the effect of enhanced input versus unenhanced input on learners' development of Spanish gender agreement of inanimate nouns. The group exposed to the enhanced input outperformed the unenhanced input group on the post-treatment measures. Moreover, Loewen and Philp (2006) reported that recasts bearing stress, declarative intonation, and only one change predicted successful uptake. The results of the previously mentioned studies raise the argument that recasts, if made more salient, could be beneficial to learners in terms of helping them notice the linguistic gap in their inter-language, consequently enabling learners to modify these gaps to enhance their L2 development. The recasts employed in the current study were isolated recasts which had not provided the learners with any other means to notice the correction rather than providing them with a reformulation of their errors. The addition of more stress or intonation to the recasts might have yielded different results. On the other hand, other studies which investigated the effect of recasts versus prompts on L2 learners' inter-language development also reached different results. ‘Prompts’ represent the broad
category under which all output-based feedback techniques (such as clarification requests, metalinguistic, and elicitations) are classified. For instance, Lyster and Izquierdo (2009) investigated the effect of prompts versus recasts on the acquisition of grammatical gender markers. An unexpected finding in this study was that both groups made similar progress over time, regardless of the type of feedback received. It is worth noting in this respect that this study was conducted in a laboratory setting. The researchers explained that a laboratory setting was chosen for their study to guarantee intensive feedback for all the subjects and to control the opportunities for learners' feedback in accordance with the treatment conditions. The researchers affirmed that controlling all these variables created a condition where both recasts and prompts proved equally effective. This indicates that more controlled conditions could yield different results for the current study in terms of the effect of recasts and elicitations on learners' acquisition of target-like ECA subject-verb agreement forms.

5.3 Pedagogical Implications

A-Ellicitations:

- Push learners to self-correct their erroneous utterances which, in turn, helps them notice the linguistic gap between their IL and the TL. This implies that elicitations, when used as a correction technique by learners, could be widely utilized by learners in modifying their errors.
- Engage learners in deep levels of cognitive processing which increases the chances for the retention of target-like L2 forms provided during the feedback procedure.
- Yield a positive visible effect within a limited time span, but might not be evident spontaneously.
- Could be well utilized with low proficiency levels. Giving learners clues that help them figure out their mistakes was shown to be helpful to all learners regardless of proficiency level. (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Ammar, 2008)
- Are effective in correcting morpho-syntactic errors. In addition, it has been reported that elicitations could be equally efficient in addressing phonological and lexical errors (Macnulty, 2007).
B- Recasts:

- Provide learners with a ‘readymade’ reformulation of their errors which reduces the chances of having recasts noticed by learners.
- Are less likely to add to learners' IL development due to low rates of learners' retention of target-like forms after being corrected on their errors using recasts.
- Should be implemented with caution in terms of learners' proficiency levels. The current study has suggested, as supported by reports of other studies (Ammar, 2008; Sepehrinia et. al, 2011; Philp, 2003), that recasts might not be suitable for low proficiency learners.
- Are not effective in correcting morpho-syntactic errors as suggested by the results of this study, and as reported by other studies investigating the effect of recasts on morpho-syntactic errors (Saito &Lyster, 2012; Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Carpenter et.al, 2006; Ellis et.al, 2001). However, they could be useful in correcting lexical and phonological errors as suggested by the previously mentioned studies.

C- ECA past tense verb forms:

Throughout the whole study procedures, it was obvious to the researcher that a majority of AFL learners (32 subjects) who participated in the study (including the 8 subjects in the pilot study), have major issues in terms of conjugating specific verb forms. These verbs are irregular verbs that require changes when conjugated with different subject pronouns: (الفعل الذي يوجد في آخره حرف مشدد، الفعل الأجوف، الفعل الناقص)

(The verb ending with double consonants, the hollow verb, and the weak verb). Accordingly, the study recommends that more focus should be given to these forms by ECA teachers when instructing AFL on ECA past tense forms.

5.4 Suggestions for further research

Recommendations for future research include:

- Expand the study by involving more participants; replicating the study using a larger sample will give more credibility to the results.
• Compare the effect of each feedback technique across different proficiency levels (low, intermediate, high, and advanced). This would provide AFL instructors with useful information for selecting the most suitable feedback technique for each proficiency level. This consequently results in a better instructional impact on learners.

• Investigate the effect of each feedback technique on a variety of Arabic features other than the one investigated in this study. It would be of great benefit to both teachers and learners to measure the effect of different feedback techniques on different Arabic language features. As mentioned earlier, recasts, for instance, were proved to be more suitable for correcting lexical and phonological errors.

• Investigate the effects of the two feedback techniques on the same group of subjects. This was not the case in the current study, where each group was exposed to one feedback type only. Exposing the same group of learners to the two feedback types limits the effect of a variety of external variables (such as individual differences, learning styles, anxiety level, and so forth) that could be present when investigating the effect of recasts and elicitations on different groups of learners.

• Expand the time span of the study by measuring the long-term retention of learners’ repair in response to the two feedback techniques.

• Carry out the study under more controlled conditions such as in a laboratory. There were reports that studies investigating the same issues could lead to different results if carried out in different settings (a laboratory versus a classroom).

• Investigate the effect of learners’ WMC on the efficiency of recasts and elicitations.

5.5 Study Delimitations

• The study focused only on one feature represented in ECA past tense subject-verb agreement forms. Other features might have led to different results.
• The study focused on learners of a low intermediate proficiency level. Implementing the study across different proficiency levels could have yielded different results.
• The study did not survey the issue of learners’ noticing the researcher's feedback move as error correction. Going back to learners and asking them, right after administering the treatment activity, could have given more depth to the analysis of the results.
• The study didn't look into the learners' previous knowledge of Fusha, which could have possibly affected their performance in the posttests.

5.6 Study Limitations

• The limited number of participants in the study which limits the possibility of generalizing the results.
• Different linguistic backgrounds of the study participants, some of whose L1 was English while others’ was Dutch, which might have affected their linguistic performance.
• Difficulty in controlling a number of external variables that might have affected the study results. For instance:
  * The effect of instruction. Each class/group of participants had a different instructor, which might have affected the learners' proficiency in handling their errors.
  * The effect on learners coming into contact with native speakers of the language (Egyptians) from the day of the treatment till the day of the delayed posttest. This could have represented an external source of information on the learners' errors other than the correction provided to them by the teacher/researcher on the treatment day.
  * The effect on learners exposure to Egyptian media in the form of songs, movies, televised serials and so on which also could have represented an external source of information on the learners' errors other than the correction provided to them by the teacher/researcher on the treatment day.
  * Individual differences between participants in terms of proficiency in ECA verb conjugations, learning styles, and anxiety thresholds.
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Appendix I

Pretest for all groups

Slides# 1&2

Slides# 3&4
أنا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (فطر)
هم (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (إفطار)

إنت (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (انكلم في الموبايل)
هي (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (اشترى الخضار)

إحنا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (نزك الحبل)
أنا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (قصّة اليوم على البحر)

هو (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (عمل نانو)

أنا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (عم+B)

إحنا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (راح الملاهي)

إنتوا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (عام)

أنا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (تعب من شغل البيت)

أنا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (دق المسمار على الحيطة)
Slides# 17&18

هم (عمل إيه إيمارح؟) (غسل و غزى الهدم)

أنت (عمل إيه إيمارح؟) (حكى قصة)

Slides# 19&20

هي (عمل إيه إيمارح؟) (خليط)

إنتوا (عمل إيه إيمارح؟) (انجوز)

Slides# 21&22

أنا (عمل إيه إيمارح؟) (حط مكياج)

أنا (عمل إيه إيمارح؟) (جري)
.slides #23 & 24

إِنْتُ (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (رسَم صورة)

أَنَا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (ساق بسرعة)

الله (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (قابل أصحابهم)

.slides #25 & 26

إِنْتُ (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (صدَّ الكورة)

إِحْنا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (لعب باسكت)

أَنَا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (عِيْطَةَ)
Slides# 35&36

إنتوا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (صام رمضان)

Slides# 37&38

إنت (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (زمن الزبالة)

Slides# 39&40

إحنا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (طففي الحريفة)

هل (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (أكل السندوتشات)
Slides# 41&42

أنا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (استنئي الأتوبيس)

إنتي (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (لم الغسيل)

Slides# 43&44

هي (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (أغلى)

إنتوا (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (صلى)

Slides# 45&46

هي (عمل إيه إمبارح؟) (ناول أمها الشاي)

إحنا عمل إيه إمبارح؟ (سَلَّم عليها)
Slides# 47&48

إحنا عمل إيه إمبرارح؟ (شاور)

أنت عمل إيه إمبرارح؟ (اخت دشر)

Slides# 49&50

هم (عمل إيه إمبرارح)? (صحى بنتهم من النوم)

أنا عمل إيه إمبرارح؟ (نصف الشارع)
Appendix II

Treatment/Recasts (1)

تدريب على الفعل الماضي

1- هو دقّ المسمار بالشاكوش (إنتوا)

2- إمبارح إحنا تُهنا في الطريق لشرم الشيخ (هم)

3- همُ اشتكوا للمدير الأسبوع اللي فات (إنتي)

4- هي قالت الحقيقة (إحنا)

5- إنتي فضيتي الأكل اللي في الحلة (هي)

6- همُ اتمشَى على النيل النهاردة الصبح (إنت)

7- هي غشِّت في الامتحان (أنا)

8- همُ قروا الدرس (إنتوا)

9- إحنا قَسنا كل الهدوء اللي في المحل (هو)
10 - هي ودعت ابنها للدكتور (أنا).

11 - هي جرّت الكرسي على الأرض (إنتي).

12 - هم شافوا الأخبار في التلفزيون (إنتوا).

13 - هو على العمارة كده ليه؟ (إنتوا).

14 - إنتي حُفّتى من الكلب بتاع الجيران (هم).

15 - هم جابوا قطة جديدة (إنت).

16 - أنا عضيت أخوي (هي).

17 - أنا خُيطت على الباب جامد و محدش فتح (إنتي).

18 - هي شتّتت ريحّة وحشة (إنت).

19 - هم شاطوا الكورة في الجو؟ (إنتوا).

20 - هم عّنا الفلوس غلط (إحنا).

21 - هي داخت في الملاهي يوم الخميس (إنتي).
22- إخننا عطسنا بصوت عالي (هي)

23- إنتوا غبتوا عن الفصل 5 مرات (آنا)

24- هو نطق من على السور (إنتي)

25- إخننا عدنا كتابة الدرس (هم)

26- هي اغطت بالبطانية عشان الجو برد (إخننا)

27- إنتوا حطيتوا الأكل كله على الترابيزه؟ (هي)

28- هم غنوا في حفلة الجامعة (إنت)

29- آنا كويت هديمي بالمكرى الحديدة (هي)

30- إخنا بعتنا الأوراق للشركة (إنتوا)

31- آنا لاحظت إنها زعلانة (إنتي)

32- آنا غيروت الهدوم في المحل (إنتوا)
33 - هم صفوا للمغني جامد أوغ (هم)

34 - انت قابلت محمد في النادي (أنا)

35 - هو أخذ برد شديد (إنت)

36 - أنا زهقت من كثر المزاكاة (إنتي)

37 - هم رمو الكورة من الشباك (إجنا)

38 - هو مات من الخوف (إنتي)

39 - أنا شكيت إن هو اللي سرق العربة (هم)

40 - هي سابت الموتالي في البيت (أنا)

Treatment/ Recasts (2)

The same exercise, except for sentences 22, 29, 33, 34, 35, 37, which were replaced as follows:

22 - اجنا فهمزنا الدرس كوبس (إنتوا)

29 - أنا نزلت على السلم بسرعة (إنتوا)
- أنا كنت مدومن بالنكوى الجديدة (هي)

- هم فتحوا سوبر ماركت جديدة في الشارع (إنتوا)

- هم رمموا الكورة من الشباك (إحنا) 37- هو أخد برد شديد (إنتوا)

Treatment/Elicitations (1)

The same exercise, except for sentences10, 22, 23, 33, 36, 40, which were replaced as follows:

- أنا شديت الكتاب من الشنطة جامد فالتقطع (هم)

- إنتوا غبتوا عن الفصل 5 مرات (أنا)

- هي غدت ابنها قبل ما يروح النادي (إحنا)

- إنتي عبيتي الأكل في العلبة (هي)

- أنا زقيت السرير جنب الحيط (هي)

- أنا نزلت على السلم بسرعة (هي)
The same exercise, except for sentences 17, 26, 30, 34, 35, which were replaced, and 15 sentences were added because the number of the group members was 9 participants, and they were supposed to be eleven. Accordingly, more sentences were needed. The changes are as follows:

17 - أنا صُفِّيت المكرونة من المية (هم)

26 - هي شنَّت الكتاب من الشنطة جامد فاتقطع (إحنا)

30 - أنا زقَّيت السرير جنب الحيط (هي)

34 - هي ردَّت على التليفون بسرعة (انا)

35 - هو صدِّع من الدوشة بِتاعة الأولاد (إحنا)

41 - هي اضطرِّت تروح للدكتور الأسبوع الي فات (إنتوا)

42 - إنتي صلحتي الساعة فين ؟ (هي)

43 - هي فكت 100 جنيه من البقال (انانا)

44 - هو طاف حولين الكعبة (إنت)
45- إنتوا استعدوا لامتحان (هم)

46- أنا نزلت على السلم بسرعة (هي)

47- هم استحموا في حمام السباحة في النادي (إنتوا)

48- أنا لاحظت إنها زعلانة (هي)

49- هي قامت من نص الفيلم عشان وحس (إنتي)

50- أنا سويت الأكل على نار هادئة (هي)

51- هي اتغطت بالبطانية عشان الجو برد (احنا)

52- إنتوا فيهمتوا الدرس كويس (هي)

53- هم نقوا 50 جنيه على الأرض (إنت)

54- إحنا مديننا الأجزة أسبوع (هم)

55- هو فات على بيتنا إمبارح و هو مرور (إنتوا)
Appendix III

Immediate posttest/Recasts (1)

1- حَبّ (أنا)
2- سَعَى (إنتٌ)
3- صوّر (إنتوا)
4- سَحَب (إنت)
5- شال (إنتي)
6- خَسّ (إحنا)
7- سِهِر (هً)
8- صحّى (إنتوا)
9- ضاف (أنا)
10- ناول (أنا)
11- عَدّى (هي)
14- زَعَق (إنت)
15- ناول (أنا)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>شمار</th>
<th>نص الآية</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>فات (إنتوا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>قُبّض (إنت)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>لَفّ (إحنا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>حَلَف (إنتي)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>مَّدّ (إنت)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>شاب (إنت)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>نَقّ (إنتوا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>حَمَّى (أنا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>لَمَح (هي)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>مَّال (إحنا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>نَفّ (هي)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>كَافح (إنتي)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>إتعمى (إحنا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>شَنَم (إنتوا)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>خاف (إنت)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ساب (هم)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Immediate posttest/Recasts (2)

The same exercise was used with recasts group (2), except that more five verbs were added, which are:

31 - دَسّ (هم)  
32 - سَقّى (إنتوا)  
33 - غاب (أنا)  
34 - نَقَل (إنت)  
35 - مَطّ (إنتي)  
36 - إِتْشِفَى (هي)  
37 - فِلَكّ (أنا)  
38 - إِتْمَشّى (هم)  
39 - عَكّ (إحنا)  
40 - عَكّ (إنتوا)  
41 - كتب (إنتوا)  
42 - طِلِع (إنتوا)
Immediate posttest/Elicitations (1)

The same exercise, except that verbs number 3, 4, 14, 18, 23, 28, 34, was replaced by other verbs as follows:

- 4 - 44- فَتَحَ (إنتوا)
- 45 - عِطِش (إنتوا)

- 3 - ضَحَّى (همّ)
- 4 - حَسّ (إنت)

- 14 - هِدّى (هي)
- 18 - خَفّ (إحنا)

- 23 - طُفِّي (إنتي)
- 28 - مصّ (إنتوا)
Immediate posttest/Elicitations (2)

The same exercise, except that four verbs were replaced, and four verbs were added, as follows:

7- كَسَرُ (أنا)
13- لمّ (إحنا)
26- ابتدأ (هي)
41- هبّ (إنتوا)
42- زاع (إنت)
15- إسَمَرَ (إنتي)
34- ملا (أنا)
43- إنهى (هم)

44- شفّ (انا)
Appendix IV

Delayed posttest/Recasts (1)

Slides# 1&2

Slides# 3&4
Slides# 11&12

شذ الولد من إيده

زور باريس

Slides# 13&14

فّ الوظوار

وطّى صوت التلفزيون

Slides# 15&16

راقب الحرامية

نفّى أحلى فستان في الفروينة
Slides# 17&18

ضايع في الزحمة

دعا رينا

Slides#19&20

إتشي على البحر

راح المدرسة

Slides# 21&22

حسٍ إن الجو برد

اشترى حاجات كثير
Slides 23&24

جاب هدية كبيرة

على صوت المزيكا

Slides# 25&26

شرور

جز الشنطة

Slides# 27 &28

شاهد فيلم في السينما

استلقي على البحر
Delayed posttest/Recasts (2)

The same "PowerPoint" used for recasts (1) was used for recasts group (2), except that five more slides were added. They were inserted in different parts of the above power point, which changed the order of the slides. Also, the number of subject-pronouns that appeared on every slide changed from six to five. The added slides came in numbers 2, 5, 9, 14, & 33, as follows:

Slides# 2&5
Slides # 9& 14

Delayed posttest/Elicitations (1)

The same "PowerPoint" used for recasts (1) was used for elicitation group (1) except that five more slides were added. They were inserted in different parts of the above PowerPoint, which changed the order of the slides. Also, the number of subject-pronouns that appeared on every slide changed from six to four. The added slides came in numbers 2 & 7, as follows:
Delayed posttest/Elicitations (2)

The same "PowerPoint" used for recasts (1) was used for elicitations group (2) except that twenty more slides were added. They were inserted in different parts of the above power point, which changed the order of the slides. Also, the number of subject-pronouns that appeared on every slide changed from six to five. The added slides came in numbers 5, 10, 19, 25, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, &50

Slides# 5&10
Slides# 19&25

عداد من واحد لثلاثة

أنا

إنت

إنتوا

هم

إحنا

استعد للامتحان

www.shutterstock.com - 81678804

www.shutterstock.com - 94524865

Slides# 31&35

استمر في اللعب طوال اليوم

هم

إنتوا

إنت

إحنا

رمي نفسه على الأرض

www.shutterstock.com - 77403049

www.shutterstock.com - 106124853

Slides# 36&37

قال الحقيقة

إحنا

إنت

إنتوا

هم

إنت

أنا

www.shutterstock.com - 395065297

www.shutterstock.com - 86575887
Slides# 38&39

عدي الباقيين

Slides# 40&41

Slides# 42&43

إتصل باللعب

اضطر وروح لدكتور السنان

لم الناس في مظاهرة

قام هي النوم بذري