The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback

Alaa Albalawi

Al-Ghad International College, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Alaa Albalawi has a Master's degree in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL) from Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington. Currently, Alaa is an English lecturer at Al-Ghad International College for Applied Medical Sciences where Alaa helps Saudi students to improve their English language skills.

I am very interested in learning many things about the effectiveness of corrective feedback and it made me decide to choose the topic. Personally, I acquired my English grammar through the second language program. However, at times I could not understand my teacher's comments while at other times the feedback provided enabled me to understand some various grammatical concepts.

My experience as MTESOL student made me have an interest in the effectiveness of feedback to a L2 class. As an ESL student beginner, I was only exposed to a few methods of corrective feedback. However, my progress in the field has exposed me to other forms of corrective feedback. Due to the current exposure, I have known more about the effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2.

Literature Review

According to Gitsaki (2011), feedback is the response given by a teacher following an error made by the student. The study by Gitsaki (2011), examines the effectiveness of feedback on L2 learners. Gitsaki conducted an observation study on L2 beginners and intermediate students. The class was marked as A and B with each comprising 14 L2 learners organized by two English native teachers (Gitsaki, 2011). In order to determine the perception of the teachers on the effectiveness of the corrective feedback, the authors conducted a teacher interview on completion of each class.

On the other hand, Yamamoto (2005), carries out a detailed review on different experiential studies with the aim of evaluating the factors necessary for effective feedback. Yamamoto (2005), provides essential insight on the challenges affecting the application of various feedback methods. Similarly, Ellis (2012), examines the differences surrounding corrective feedback and its effectiveness to L2 students.

Types of Feedback

Corrective feedback is common in the education field, particularly in second language programs. According to Gitsaki (2011), pedagogical practice assumes that corrective feedback is necessary for learners' progress in the uptake of second languages. Additionally, Yamamoto (2005), says that the age of the learners determines the type of corrective feedback used by the teacher.

According to the Gitsaki (2011), explicit corrective feedback methods are the best for beginners while the implicit corrective feedback is good for advanced learners. Some of the explicit corrective feedback methods include: recasting, metalinguistic clues, and clarification requests, (Zhang, 2016). On the other hand, implicit corrective methods are comprised of written communication to the student's work. Implicit and explicit corrective feedback have varying effectiveness on the L2 learners.

Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback

The effectiveness of corrective feedback on students uptake of information depends on various factors that impact on different types of learners.

Explicit methods of corrective feedback are useful for L2 beginners. One of the most efficient exact methods is the recasting method. Recasting method entails multiple engagements of the teacher and the student, (Kawaguchi & Ma, 2012). The teacher makes a direct correction to the student's spoken language while the student repeats after the teacher. The method is effective in students with a low understanding of the second language, (Profozic, 2013). The most effective explicit method in an intermediate or advanced student is through metalinguistic clues, (Yamamoto, 2005). Metalinguistic clues enable students to identify challenges in their output; thus, the teacher poses questions or provides information that connected to the student's utterance.

Implicit methods are mostly appropriate to advanced students. Written communication effectively corrects grammatical errors and leads to the achievement of written language skill. Gitsaki (2011), estimates the effectiveness of corrective feedback based on the errors they intend to correct. Overall, recast methods are

most effective in correcting pronunciation errors while metalinguistic clues effectively eliminate phonetic errors. On the other hand, implicit corrective feedback leads to grammar corrective, (Kawaguchi & Ma, 2012). However, the debate on the most effective corrective way is a controversial one owing to different factors influencing the application of corrective feedback.

Factors Influencing Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback

The effectiveness of corrective feedback depends on various factors that touch on both the learner and the teachers. According to Ellis (2012), teachers are faced with numerous challenges when choosing corrective feedback methods. The study thus classifies L2 teachers in two broad categories: voluminous correctors and the sparse correctors, (Ellis, 2012). The voluminous correctors offer numerous corrections to the student, thus providing an actual impression of the improvements that the students need to make. Voluminous corrections risk demotivating students, (Wang and Yang, 2012). Demotivation occurs when students think that the errors they have made mean that they are a failure, (Zhang, 2016). Students may also believe that their failure is due to the fact that the teacher supports some people and thus develop a negative image towards the teacher and ESL in general.

On the other hand, sparse corrections imply omission of some errors. Sparse correction enables the student to concentrate on few mistakes. However, the omission of some errors may lead the students to believe that they are perfect in the omitted areas, (Kawaguchi & Ma, 2012). The false image of perfection prevents future uptake of the language.

Ellis (2012), argues that utilization of the recasting method in older learners is inappropriate, this is because it's difficult to eliminate the first language rise from old learners. The findings by Ellis (2012), concur to those of Gitsaki and Althobaiti (2011), who found that recasting methods among intermediate learners led to unnecessary interruptions when applied to correct phonetics errors.

Additionally, students' motivation greatly impact on the effectiveness of corrective feedback. Demotivated students tend

to view corrections as personal attacks and thus quickly lose interest in the language, (Wang & Yang, 2012). Another factor is the level of proficiency. The effectiveness of the corrective way greatly depends on the level of knowledge in the language. Students with high level in the language find explicit methods boring and time wasting, (Wang and Yang, 2012). Implicit methods such as written communication are most effective on this type of students, while explicit methods are most appropriate to the beginners.

Application to the Classroom

A classroom setup involves teachers and students. For effective learning to take place, the teacher should explore alternative methods of providing feedback that will increase the learners' uptake of the second language and facilitate to faster learning of the spoken English, (Ellis, 2012).

Ways and Examples

Teachers should provide written comments on the students' worksheet. The teachers' comments should be on the first pages of the worksheet. This is in order to enhance visibility and thus make the students see the corrections they need to make. Students, on the other part need to ask clarification of the concepts that they do not understand. Additionally, the teachers will ensure that recast method is more effective.

The sole responsibility of the student in the class is involved. In my experience, involvement entails requesting for clarification, availing oneself after the instruction questions and carrying out an extra exercise in order to gain more knowledge on the grammar concepts.

Conclusion

Corrective feedback is a widespread practice in the ESL program; the corrective feedback enables students to identify the differences between their inputs and outputs. Corrective feedback serves as a way of informing and guiding the students on how to avoid grammatical errors. It thus contributes to the uptake of the second language. However, the effectiveness of corrective feedback in the acquisition of L2 grammar depends on various factors such as; age, motivation of the student and the amount of correction offered by the teachers. The research emphasizes the need for teacher evaluation to determine the

most appropriate method. At the same time it encourages an increase in student participation during the class to promote progress in the acquisition of L2 grammar.

References

Ellis, R. (2012). "Language teaching research and language pedagogy." *Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development, 4(13)*, 45–80. doi:10.1002/9781118271643

Gitsaki, C. & Althobaiti, N. (2011). "ESL teachers' use of corrective feedback and its effectiveness on learners uptake." *The Journal of Asia. 7(1)*, 197–219. doi:10.3726/978-3-0351-0201-7. Retrieved from http://marifa.hct.ac.ae/2011/994.

Kawaguchi, S., & Ma, Y. (2012). "Corrective feedback, negotiation of meaning and grammar development: Learner-learner and learner-native speaker interaction in ESL." *OJML, 02(02)*, 57–70. Retrieved May 9, 2018, http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2012.22008

Profozic, N. M. (2013). *The effectiveness of corrective feedback and the role of individual differences in language learning*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang GmbH, International Verlag der Wissenschaften. Retrieved from https://www.peterlang.com/view/product/16300

Wang, Y. H., & Young, S. S. (2012, Nov 2). "Exploring young and adult learners' perceptions of corrective feedback in ASR-based CALL system." *British Journal of Educational Technology, 43(3)*, E77–E80. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2011.01275.x. Retrieved May 9, 2018, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2011.01275.x

Yamamoto, S. (2005). "Can corrective feedback bring about substantial changes in the learner interlanguage system?" *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 3(2)*. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2a07/1fd189d06d1ecb3c5b64edc645ccce22a04f.pdf

Zhang, X. (2017). "Reading–Writing integrated tasks, comprehensive corrective feedback, and EFL writing development." *Language Teaching Research, 21(2)*, 217–240. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1362168815623291