Error correction on oral (and written) production

Date updated: 12/03/20

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Outline of the session

1. Understanding relevant extracts from The Pedagogy Review and considering opportunities for your own context (20 mins)

2. Brief history: how errors & error correction moved from 'the naughty corner' to being 'A Good Thing' (20 mins)

3. Raising awareness about the main types of corrections: The Recast, The Elicitation, and Metalinguistic Information (35 mins)

4. Evidence about effective correction (25 mins)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 1

Recommendations from the MFL Pedagogy Review about 'errors & error correction'

Read the **four** recommendations from the MFL Pedagogy Review, provided on the next four slides.

Then, you will be invited to discuss:

1) the extent to which these are **currently** reflected in **your own practice**
2) the extent to which these are **currently** reflected in practice and policy in your own **department and school**
3) implications for **change,** at
   a) personal,
   b) departmental,
   c) school levels

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 1.1

From the Pedagogy Review: **Errors happen**

Errors: anticipation and correction

10.1 All of us make mistakes when learning a new language. Some of these can be anticipated by the teacher as new material is introduced, based on their knowledge of points of difficulty. Others can be the result of pupils attempting to put into words thoughts that are, as yet, beyond their knowledge of grammar or vocabulary. Teachers need to develop a range of strategies for dealing with these and other types of error, with the aim of providing pupils with clear and effective guidance, without discouraging them from tackling difficulties or, where necessary, taking risks.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 1.2

From the Pedagogy Review: **When** to correct

10.2 Error correction in both spoken and written language is most powerful when it can be done immediately. Lengthy written feedback or complex retrospective written corrections often have less impact. However marking pupils' books, done in such a way as to make good use of teachers' time to give focussed and manageable feedback, is an important part of teaching and assessment. Most helpfully, teachers understand from their review of pupils' work what needs to be taught or practised further in lessons.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 1.3

From the Pedagogy Review: **How** to correct

10.3 While error correction is important for progress, consistently focussing on all errors in all contexts may become a distraction and actually limit practice because pupils become reluctant to try to communicate. Preparedness to try is a pre-requisite for necessary practice leading to use of new language.

10.4 Common strategies for error correction include:
▪ recasting – re-stating what the pupil has said, accurately, but in a reflective and affirmative way;
▪ prompting - in which pupils are encouraged to reflect and correct the error for themselves; and,
▪ explanation – where explicit, often metalinguistic, information is given about a rule relating to the cause of the error and how to avoid it in future.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 1.4

From the Pedagogy Review: **What** to correct

10.5 We know that some features of a language are particularly difficult to master – recognising these is an important part of teachers' pedagogical knowledge and should be continuously developed by language teams. These kinds of errors are to be expected and teachers should know that it can take time to reach accuracy in these areas, especially in oral production. Examples include: reliably accurate gender across all parts of speech (articles, adjectives); rich agreement systems, especially to express concepts that are not easily mapped to English (e.g., past habitual on all verb types); when to use and not to use subjects in Spanish; word order in German or Spanish to alter focus or emphasis.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 1

Recommendations from the MFL Pedagogy Review about 'errors & error correction'

Discuss:

1) the extent to which these are **currently** reflected in **your own practice**

2) the extent to which these are **currently** reflected in practice and policy in your own **department and school**

3) implications for **change,** at

   a) personal,

   b) departmental,

   c) school levels

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Outline of the session

1. Understanding relevant extracts from The Pedagogy Review and considering opportunities for your own context (20 mins) ✔

2. **Brief history: how errors & error correction moved from 'the naughty corner' to being 'A Good Thing' (20 mins)**

3. Raising awareness about the main types of corrections: The Recast, The Elicitation and Metalinguistic Information (35 mins)

4. Evidence about effective correction (25 mins)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 2.1

Brief history: Why we are where we are,
and not in the land of *'grammar translation and rote*
***repetition to get 100% accuracy'* (1)**

1) Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1985):
Interactional modification makes input comprehensible

-> Comprehensible input promotes acquisition

-> interactional modification promotes acquisition

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 2.1

Brief history: Why we are where we are,
and not in land of grammar translation/rote repetition (2)

The interaction & output hypotheses seeped into the
psyches of researchers, teacher educators, advisors,
publishers, testers, teachers …
So, we know learning happens when learners try to **produce**
real meaning, by speaking and writing…
→ moves away from rote, mechanical repetition and away
from a pure focus on perfectly accurate translation
→ But … oh no! Producing *genuine* meaning leads to errors!!
What do we do about that?!

ELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 2.2

Brief history: …What do we do about errors?
We give corrective feedback

Feedback can be:
• On written production
• On spoken production

• Positive: 'that's correct'; evidence of successful communication
• Negative: an error correction; impaired communication

• Implicit: frown; rephrase (recast)
• Explicit: say 'correct'; say 'no'; explain error

• Experienced-to-novice (e.g., teacher -> student; native speaker -> learner)
• Peer to peer (e.g., student to student)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 2.3

Brief history: But, why should we correct?

- Children don't need correcting in their first language …
- Caregivers don't really correct *language*
  (they correct *content!*)
- and, anyway, it doesn't really work…

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 2.3

Brief history: *Does explicit correction work when learning our first language?*

Child: Want other one spoon, Daddy
Father: You mean, you want the other spoon
Child: Yes I want other one spoon, *please* Daddy
Father: Can you say 'the other spoon'
Child: 'Other …one…spoon'
Father: Say 'other'
Child: 'Other'
Father: 'Spoon'
Child: 'Spoon'
Father: 'Other spoon'
Child: 'Other…spoon'. *Now* give me other one spoon!

(From Cazden 1972 in Aitchison 1998: 70)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 2.4

Brief history: A big debate in the history of language teaching: 'Negative evidence' versus 'positive evidence'

Two types of input (=data from which to pick out the language system):
positive evidence and **negative evidence**.

- **Positive evidence** tells the learner of what is **acceptable** in the language.
  It contains "the set of well-formed sentences to which learners are exposed" (Gass, 1997; p. 36).
- **Negative evidence** provides information about **incorrectness.**
  It can be through correcting non-target-like production.

Are *both* types of evidence necessary?

Or is only *positive evidence* sufficient?

…at the heart of debates about 'purely communicative' versus 'more language-focused' approaches to teaching

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 2.4

Brief history:
Argument 1: Learners need only *positive* evidence!
Give them lots of language … over and over

Some might say:
• "don't correct much" or "don't correct *at all"*
→very heavily meaning-focused approaches: immersion, CLIL (more implicit approaches)
• 'correction demotivates'
• 'correction isn't useful for learning'

(Krashen, 1981; Schwartz, 1993, Truscott, 2007)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 2.4

Argument 2: Negative evidence is necessary because…

You can notice that a sound, a word [...] it you see it!

But how do you know if someth[...]

If something exists in your first l[...] another.

For example, **'Do'** in English quest[...]

Students are taught French questions[...]

> use intonation; swap round S-V; use e[...]

Then, a bright 16 year-old floors you[...]

They know how French **does** work, from positive evidence from teachers & books…

but they can't just 'work out' how it does **NOT** work, without being told.

How do you say 'doesn't' – like 'he doesn't go'?

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 2.4

Argument 2: Negative evidence is *useful because…*
In last three decades, evidence for strong role for negative evidence:
external scaffolded attention → internally motivated attention → explicit knowledge →explicit memory → implicit learning → implicit memory, automatization and abstraction.

N C Ellis (2005)

Feedback promotes skill acquisition: knowledge changes from:
declarative -> proceduralised -> automatised

Corrective feedback is one way of making declarative knowledge available in a **useable** form [immediate, memorable, salient]

R Ellis (2007, p. 358)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 2.5

Summary: A brief history of how error correction moved from the 'naughty corner' to being 'A Good Thing'

Getting it wrong and getting corrected …
→ **negative evidence!**

This seems particularly helpful when the L2 appears to be a bit like the L1…
but isn't really!

Can you think of language features that are cross-linguistically *similar* but are, in fact, *different*?!

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Outline of the session

1. Understanding relevant extracts from The Pedagogy Review and considering opportunities for your own context (20 mins) ✓

2. Brief history: how errors & error correction moved from 'the naughty corner' to being 'A Good Thing' (20 mins) ✓

3. **Raising awareness about the main types of corrections: The Recast, The Elicitation and Metalinguistic Information (35 mins)**

4. Evidence about effective correction (25 mins)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3

Part 3: Increasing awareness about how we correct spoken production

**From
'almost invisible'
to
'in your face'**

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3

Increasing awareness about how we correct spoken production

We focus on correction during oral production because it is:
• thought to influence learning (think back to the interaction & output hypotheses)
• in the moment (immediate)
• thought to affect mood or motivation
• happens so fast – millisecond decision making in the classroom

We focus on two main types of feedback:
1. Recasts (reformulations)
2. Elicitations (prompts)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.1

1] Recasts (reformulations):
positive evidence, can be implicit or explicit

"utterances that repeat a learners' incorrect utterance, making only the changes necessary to produce a correct utterance, without changing the meaning"

(from Nicholas et al. 2001, p. 733 cited in Mackey 2005, p. 7)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.1

Examples of recast

Example 1
Learner: what do they do your picture?
Native speaker: what are they doing in my picture?

Example 2
Learner: yeah and they're eat lunch
Native speaker: yes they're eating lunch
(Mackey & Philp, 1998, p. 342)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.1.1 — Recasts – when correcting **phonics**

Type 1: implicit recast

[Students have to say if they have or don't have items written on board]

S: Tengo una lave [for key, pronounced as single 'l', not double 'll']

T: Tienes una llave [no emphasis, accepts content is correct, moves on]

Type 2: explicit recast

[Students exploiting a short text for phonics practice]

S: No estudia por la manana [Student pronounces 'ñ' like 'n']

T: La **man̲ y̲ ana** [teacher adds emphasis, raises voice]

Type 3: explicit recast + metalinguistic explanation

[Students reading sentences aloud]

S: Elle est donz [for 'dans'] le parc

T: c'est **dans**. [teacher adds emphasis, raises voice]. Remember that French words often have a silent final consonant. So, don't pronounce the 's' in 'dans'.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.1.1 — Recasts – when correcting **vocabulary**

Type 1: implicit recast

T: ¿Cómo se dice 'strong' en español?

S: For….¿forte?

T: Vale, fuerte.

Type 2: explicit recast

S: Il est allemagne

T: il est **allemand** [teacher adds emphasis in voice]

Type 3: explicit recast + metalinguistic explanation

S: J'aime aller à la place pour nager

T: la **plage** [teacher adds emphasis]. La **place** means a square, like in a town or city

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.1.1 — Recasts – when correcting **grammar**

Type 1: implicit recast

S: La fille est francais.

T: Oui, la fille est française.

Type 2: explicit recast

S: El colegio hay tres profesores de español.

T: El colegio **tiene** tres profesores de español [teacher adds emphasis].

Type 3: explicit recast + metalinguistic explanation

S: York es en Inglaterra.

T: York **está** en Inglaterra. Remember, we use 'está' to say 'is' for locations. Estar means 'be' when talking about where things are

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.1.2

What happens after a recast?
Example of recast + FULL UPTAKE

Learner: and in your picture they children playing?

Native speaker: **are the children playing**? Yes

Learner: yes and are they happy or sad?

Native speaker: they're happy (.) they're playing with the ball

Learner: and ah **are the children playing** in the garden near house?

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.1.2

What happens after a recast?
Example of recast + PARTIAL UPTAKE

Learner: oh (...) she go to the zoo and she is she fun?

Native speaker: is she=?

Learner: fun

Native speaker: is she having fun?

Learner: having fun

Native speaker: yeah yeah

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.1.2

What happens after a recast?
Example of recast: NO UPTAKE

Example 1

Learner: I think some this girl have birthday and and its big celebrate

Native speaker: big celebration

Learner: oh

Example 2

Learner: this window is full or broke?

Native speaker: is it broken?

Learner: yeah

(Mackey & Philp, 1998, p. 342)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.1.2

What happens after a recast?
Example of recast + INCORRECT UPTAKE

Learner: what thinking?
Native speaker: what **does she** think?
Learner: what **does she** thinking her friends?

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.1.3

Problems?
Why might recasts not be effective for correcting errors?

1. Could be perceived as alternative way of saying same thing → no uptake
2. Uptake is not correct
3. Might not make the learner actively participate – rote repetition of teacher's correction, with no real learning, no 'desirable difficulty'

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.1.3

Do learners actually learn from recasts?

After 67% of recasts, learners just carried on talking
Only 27% of recasts were repeated by learner
Just 6% of original full utterances were modified by learner

Mackey & Philp (1998)

Learning *can* still happen, even when no uptake
But … it seems a bit risky…

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Effectiveness of recasts is 'risky':

Depends on learners':
- proficiency
- motivation & personality
- awareness & analytic ability
    - does student notice the difference between what they said and what the teacher said?
    - was that the *intended* difference?!
- working memory
    - student has to: hold on to what they want to say + hear what was said + repeat what they heard + carry on what they were saying!

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

2] Elicitations (prompts)

Elicitations prompt the learner to think about the language they used and to correct the error themselves.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

A type of elicitation (a clarification request) + uptake

The learner realises their pronunci...

Clarification request: negative evidence, showing how the language does NOT work! Prompting the learner to self-correct

Learner: There are /flurs/?
Native speaker: Floors?
Learner: /fluw'rs/ uh flowers

Mackey et al. (2000, p. 486)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

12

Part 3.2.1 — Elicitation – when correcting **phonics**

Type 1: implicit elicitation
[pupils have to say whether they have the things written on board]
S: Tengo un pero
T: [coughs and raises eyebrows with expectant look]
S: [if the student takes the hint…] perro

Type 2: explicit elicitation
T: [points at number 12]. Le numéro, ¿c'est quoi?
S: deuze ['eu' pronounced as in 'deux']
T: Was that 'deux'? [seeking clarification, as there is a potential miscommunication]
S: douze!

Type 3: explicit elicitation + metalinguistic explanation
S: Tournez [pronouncing the 'z'] à gauche
T: Try the word for 'turn' again, Remember, silent final consonant
S: Tournez [no 'z' pronounced]

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.2.1 — Elicitation – when correcting **vocabulary**

Type 1: implicit
T: ¿qué es? [points to a table]
S: una silla [teacher then raises eyebrows, touches a chair to show what 'silla' is].
S: Ah, no. Una mesa.
Type 2: explicit
S: C'est le cousin de Marc.
T: Mais c'est une fille!
S: La cousine.
Type 3: explicit + metalinguistic explanation
T: Dónde está Londres? [points to map of England]
S: Está en el sur.
T: ¿En el sur......? [gestures towards 'east' and 'west'].
S: el suroeste
T: Not quite. Remember 'east' and 'west' sound very similar in Spanish!
S: Ah, en el sureste

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.2.1 — Elicitation – when correcting **grammar**

Type 1: implicit
S: Mis padres tenemos un coche.
T: [raises eyebrows, inquisitive look]
S: Mis padres tienen un coche.

Type 2: explicit
S: Je ne pas joue au foot.
T: You said all the words. Now think about the order and try again.
S: Je ne joue pas au foot.

Type 3: explicit + metalinguistic explanation
T: Tu vas où?
S: À la magasin.
T: Magasin is a masculine noun. How do you say 'to the' for a masculine noun?
S: Au… au magasin.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

13

Part 3.3 — **Match the CF type to the extract**

Implicit recast
Gives the correct answer as if to confirm the content of what was said.

Explicit elicitation
Requests for clarification or repetition (sometimes due to genuine miscommunication caused by the error).

Explicit recast, with metalinguistic explanation
Isolates the error and says it correctly, with emphasis on the correction. Talks *about* the language that caused the error / explains the correction.

A
S: Madrid es en España
T: ***está*** en España. Remember we use 'está' to talk about locations.

B
S: Tiene quince [pronounced with English 'qu'] años
T: Quince años. Muy bien.

C
T: C'est qui? [points at child on family tree]
S: C'est la cousine.
T: Mais c'est un garcon!
S: Le cousin.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.3 — **Match the CF type to the extract**

Implicit elicitation
The use of non-verbal techniques to elicit self-correction.

Explicit elicitation, with metalinguistic correction.
Requests for clarification or repetition. Also talks *about* language to prompt self-correction.

Explicit recast
Isolates the error and says it correctly, with emphasis on the correction.

A
S: Nous aimer parler
T: D'accord. Nous aim**ons** parler [teacher adds emphasis]

B
T: ¿ Qué es [points to picture of key]?
S: una lave. [pronounced with single 'l']
T: [coughs]
S: una llave.

C
T: Tu vas où?
S: À la magasin
T: Magasin is a masculine noun. How do you say 'to the' for a masculine noun?
S: Au….au magasin

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.3 — **Definitions**

Implicit recast. Gives the correct language, as if to confirm the content of what was said.

Explicit recast. Isolates the error and says it correctly, with clear emphasis on the correction.

Explicit recast, with metalinguistic information. Isolates the error and says it correctly, with clear emphasis on the correction. Talks *about* the language that caused the error and/or explains the correction.

Implicit elicitation. Uses non-verbal techniques (e.g., raised eyebrow, puzzled look) to elicit self-correction.

Explicit elicitation. Requests clarification or repetition, sometimes due to genuine miscommunication caused by error.

Explicit elicitation, with metalinguistic information. Requests clarification or repetition, and talks *about* language to prompt self-correction.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.3 — **Name that CF type [1]…**

A
T: [points to word 'ciencias' on board]
S: ciencias [with hard 'c']
T: ¿cómo?
S: ciencias [with correct ceceo pronunciation]

B
[Students are reading aloud].
S: La pollution [pronounced with English 'tion'] est un problème
T: c'est *pollution*. [teacher adds emphasis]. Remember that the '-i-o-n' endings are pronounced 'ion'.

C
T: ¿Qué es 'flowers' en español?
S: flores [without 'es' sounded out, floors]
T: flores

D
S [reading 'utiliser' on board] yutilizer [pronounces 'u' like English 'you']
T: Now try it again, focusing on the first letter. Bring your lips really close together as you say the vowel.
S: utiliser

E
S: La fille est français [no 's' sounded]
T: La fille est française.

F
T: ¿qué es? [points to a church]
S: Es una inglesia
T: [looks confused / puzzled]
S: Ah, no. Iglesia.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 3.3 — **Name that CF type [2]**

G
S: El colegio hay tres profesores.
T: **en** el colegio hay tres profesores [adds emphasis on 'en'].

H
S: Les parents écoutent la radio [pronounces '-ent']
T: Je ne comprends pas
S: err, écoutent [silent –ent]

I
S: En mi casa, hay tres … bedrooms
T: Do … Like the English word for a room with lots of beds in a hostel
S: Dormitorios!

J
S: Je ne mange pas la viande.
T: The noun, viande, follows a negative. What do you need after negative verbs?
S: de. Je ne mange pas de viande.

K
S: Los chicos no estudia el arte
T: estud**ian** [teacher adds emphasis, raises voice]

L
[Student translates 'the tree']
S: la arbre
T: **l'ar**bre, bien [teacher adds emphasis]

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Outline of the session

1. Understanding relevant extracts from The Pedagogy Review and considering opportunities for your own context (20 mins) ✓
2. Brief history: how errors & error correction moved from 'the naughty corner' to being 'A Good Thing' (20 mins) ✓
3. Raising awareness about the main types of oral corrections: The Recast, The Elicitation and Metalinguistic Information (35 mins) ✓
4. **Evidence from research about effective correction (25 mins)**

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.1

Evidence from research (1):
Eliciting tends to be more effective than recasting

Prompts & elicitations more likely to be effective
(Li, 2019; Ammar & Spada, 2006, Lyster, 2004)
Corrective feedback for learner errors: How effective is it? (OASIS summary)
Li (2010)

- A meta-analysis of 33 studies
- Correction had medium-sized effect (benefit); maintained after 30+ days
- Direct correction (recasts) more effective in short term
- Indirect correction (prompting, eliciting) slightly larger effects in longer term
- Benefits of direct correction decreased over time
- Benefits of indirect correction increased slightly over time
- Benefits were larger in foreign language than second language settings.
- Correction in drills produced larger effects than in communicative activities.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.1

Evidence from research (2):
Effectiveness depends on language feature and proficiency

The impact of recasts and rule-based correction on L2 Chinese learners: Comparing proficiency levels and simple vs complex structures (OASIS summary)
Li (2014)

For learning simple structure (classifiers)
Rule-based correction better than recasts for *low proficiency learners*
Both feedback types beneficial for high-proficiency learners.
For learning complex structure (perfective -le)
Recasts not very effective for low proficiency learners immediately after or 7 days after instruction.
Recasts benefited high proficiency learners & benefits increased over time.
Rule-based correction beneficial to learners at both proficiency levels
rule-based correction *more effective than recasts for low proficiency* (but did not last over time).

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.1

Evidence from research (3):
Effectiveness depends on nature of activity

A simpler task can increase the benefits of error correction for learning a grammatical feature, regardless of aptitude
Kourtali & Révèsz (2019)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.1

Evidence from research (4):
Metacognitive training in error correction

Metacognitive means 'being aware of thinking, doing, learning'

Normalising making errors and error correction has been found to help

  Prepare pupils for the kinds of error correction they might receive

  …from teachers (Sato & Loewen, 2018)

  …from peers (Sato & Lyster, 2012)

    NCELP pairwork activities 'trap' the language feature

      =If partner A gets it wrong, partner B can't get their bit right.

    But errors will happen between peers! (once the language gets 'freer')

    Encourage them to correct each other

In sum:

Reassure pupils that errors + correction in a FL class are normal and helpful

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.1

Evidence from research (5):
Teacher beliefs

Synthesis of research on teachers' and learners' **beliefs** about oral corrective feedback (a meta-analysis by Li, 2017)

26 studies

(1) learners keen to receive correction; teachers more hesitant to provide it

(2) learners predicted effectiveness of explicit feedback

(3) CPD programs incorporating hands-on practice activities had favourable impact on teachers' beliefs

(4) some incongruence between teachers' *beliefs* and their *actual* practices

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.1

Evidence from research (6):
Teacher beliefs & practice

Teachers tend to think that prompts are used more often than they are actually used in practice

Recasts are by far the most frequent in classrooms (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Sheen, 2004; Faqei, 2019)

Recasts might be more common because they feel supportive to ongoing communication

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.2

Effectiveness likely de[...]r

> **Which CF type feels best for which type of error? [1]**

Implicit recast
Gives the correct language as if to confirm the content of what was said.

Phonics (SSC knowledge)
S: Tengo una lave.
T: Llave. Muy bien.

Grammar
S: La fille est francais.
T: La fille est française.

Vocabulary
T: ¿Cómo se dice 'strong' en español?
S: Forte.
T: Fuerte.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.2

Which CF type feels best for which error? [2]

Explicit recast

Isolates the error and says it correctly, with emphasis on the correction.

Phonics (SSC knowledge)
S: No estudia por la manana [pronounces 'ñ' as 'n'].
T: La **mañana** [teacher adds emphasis]

Vocabulary
T: Dis le mot 'German' en français.
S: Allemagne.
T: **allemand** [teacher adds emphasis].

Grammar
S: El colegio hay tres profesores de español.
T: **en** el colegio hay tres profesores [teacher adds emphasis on 'en'].

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.2

Which CF type feels best for which error? [3]

Explicit recast, with metalinguistic information
Isolates the error and says it correctly, with emphasis on the correction. Talks *about* the language that caused the error / explains the correction.

Phonics (SSC knowledge)
S: Elle est donz le parc.
T: Oui, c'est **dans** [pronounced correctly with emphasis]. Remember that French words often have a silent final consonant. You don't need to pronounce the 's' in 'dans'.

Vocabulary
T: Dis le mot 'beach' en français.
S: la mer
T: la **plage** [teacher adds emphasis, raises voice]. La mer means the sea.

Grammar
S: York es en Inglaterra.
T: York **está** en Inglaterra. Remember we use 'está' to talk about locations.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Slide [4]

Part 4.2

Which CF type feels best for which error? [4]

Implicit elicitation
The use of non-verbal techniques (e.g., raised eyebrow, puzzled look, cough) to elicit self-correction.

Phonics (SSC knowledge)
T: [points to 'dog'].
S: pero
T: [surprised look]
S: perro

Vocabulary
T: ¿qué es? [points to a table]
S: una silla
T: [touches chair & gives questioning look]
S: Ah. Una mesa.

Grammar
S: Mis padres tenemos un coche.
T: [raises eyebrows, inquisitive look]
S: Mis padres tienen un coche.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Slide [5]

Part 4.2

Which CF type feels best for which error? [5]

Explicit elicitation
Requests for clarification or repetition, sometimes due to genuine miscommunication as a result of the error.

Phonics (SSC knowledge)
T: [points at number 12]. Le numéro, ¿c'est quoi?
S: deuze ['eu' pronounced like that in 'deux']
T: Was that 'deux'?
S: Ah, non, c'est douze!

Vocabulary
T: C'est qui? [points at picture of girl]
S: C'est le copain.
T: ¿C'est un garçon?
S: No, la copine!

Grammar
S: Je ne pas joue au foot.
T: You said all the words. Now think about the order and try again.
S: Je ne joue pas au foot.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Slide [6]

Part 4.2

Which CF type feels best for which error? [6]

Explicit elicitation, with metalinguistic correction.
Requests for clarification or repetition. Talks *about* the language to prompt self-correction.

Phonics (SSC knowledge)
T: C'est quoi? [points at 'utiliser' word on board]
S: yutilizer [pronounces 'u' like English 'you']
T: Now try it again, focusing on the first letter. Bring your lips really close together as you say the vowel.
S: utiliser

Vocabulary
T: Dónde está Londres? [points to map of England]
S: Está en el sur.
T: Sí, perfecto. ¿En el sur......? [gestures towards 'east' and 'west'].
S: el suroeste
T: Not quite. Remember 'east' and 'west' sound very similar in Spanish!
S: Ah, en el sureste.

Grammar
T: Tu vas où?
S: À la magasin.
T: Magasin is a masculine noun. How do you say 'to the' for a masculine noun?
S: Au….au magasin.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.3

Research into error correction on written work

Recasts / reformulations
- Direct correct
- Direct correct + explanation

Prompts / elicitations / indirect:
- Indirect correction
  - Circling
  - Codes for error types
  - Just explanation

- Computer-based feedback – can be both of the above

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.3

Research about *written* corrective feedback (1)

The effectiveness of comprehensive corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy (OASIS summary)

Van Beuningen, C.G., De Jong, N.H., & Kuiken, F. (2012)

Direct corrective feedback was most beneficial for improving *grammatical* accuracy (e.g. articles, inflections).

Indirect (prompts) corrective feedback was most beneficial for improving *non-grammatical* accuracy (e.g. word choice)

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.3

Research about *written* corrective feedback (2)

López, Steendam, Speelman, & Buyse, (2018)

139 low intermediate learners

-> 5 groups:
- direct corrections of grammar
- metalinguistic codes for grammar
- direct corrections of grammar *and* non-grammatical errors
- metalinguistic codes for grammar *and* non-grammatical errors
- a control group (just did the tests)

All effective *immediately* (while revising the texts)

But a **long-term advantage** *only* for **direct corrections** (4 weeks later) for both grammatical and non-grammatical errors

'Cognitive load' significantly *lower* for the direct feedback group

Attitudes to direct feedback more positive

because it was more 'comprehensible'

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.4

In sum… a lot of evidence ...
What to recommend?

- **30 summaries of research on error correction on OASIS**
- **5 meta-analyses** (Keck et al, 2006; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Li, 2010; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Russell & Spada, 2006)
- **Multiple narrative syntheses**

Here, we provide some broad principles for:
- written error correction
- oral error correction

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.4

Broad principles for *written* error correction…

- Correction tends to help, but it is limited

- Where meaning is affected by errors, then it is most effective to correct errors

- Simple, direct approaches to correction are most effective – focusing on a very small number of features

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Part 4.4

Broad principles for *oral* error correction…

More explicit prompts tend to be more effective than more implicit
Prompts include: seeking clarification, explicit request for correct version, providing metalinguistic information
Compared to recasts, *prompts* tend to:
- Result in more 'uptake'
- Result in more learning
  - for **vocabulary** and **grammar**,
  - in FL classes with less proficient learners

For **pronunciation**, recasts probably more effective
- But if 'meaning' is affected by poor phonics or pronunciation, make the most of 'misunderstanding' to elicit a self-correction

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Summary of the session

1. Understanding relevant extracts from The Pedagogy Review and considering opportunities for your context ✔
2. Brief history: how errors & error correction moved from 'the naughty corner' to being 'A Good Thing' ✔
3. Raising awareness about the main types of corrections: The Recast, The Elicitation, and Metalinguistic Information ✔
4. Evidence about effective correction ✔

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Selection of references

Bonilla López, M., Van, Steendam, E., Speelman, D. and Buyse, K. (2018), The differential effects of comprehensive feedback forms in the second language writing class. *Language Learning*, 68: 813-850. doi:10.1111/lang.12295

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

Li, S. (2010). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. Language Learning, 60: 309-365. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x

Li, S. (2009). The Differential Effects of Implicit and Explicit Feedback on Second Language (L2) Learners at Different Proficiency Levels. APPLIED LANGUAGE LEARNING, 19, 1/2; pp. 53-78

Li, S. (2014). The interface between feedback type, L2 proficiency, and the nature of the linguistic target. *Language Teaching Research*, *18*(3), 373-396. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813510384

Long, M. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory in S. Gass and C. Madden (eds.): *Input in Second Language Acquisition Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House (pp. 377-93)*

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy

Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (1993). *How Languages are Learned* Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Relevant chapter: "Second Language Learning in the classroom")

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

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

Sato, M. and Loewen, S. (2018). Metacognitive instruction enhances the effectiveness of corrective feedback: Variable effects of feedback types and linguistic targets. *Language Learning*, 68, 507-545. doi:10.1111/lang.12283

Sato, M., & Lyster, R. (2012). Peer interaction and corrective feedback for accuracy and fluency development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 34(4), 591-626. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263112000356

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

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *System*, 16, 255–272.

Van Beuningen, C.G., De Jong, N.H. & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning*, 62(1), 1-41. doi: http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00674.x

Watanabe, Y. (2008). Peer-Peer Interaction between L2 Learners of Different Proficiency Levels: Their Interactions and Reflections. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 64 (4), 605-636.

NCELP | National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy