

Consciousness-Raising Through Written Corrective Feedback: The Case of Marked Third Person -s

Javad Gholami
Urmia University
gholamij@gmail.com

Ehsan Narimani
Urmia University
narimani.ehsan@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study examined and compared the effects of consciousness-raising written corrective feedback in 2 newly-developed levels in terms of marked third person -s acquisition. Nine elementary level intact classes, including 191 male language learners within the age range of 11-14 at Iran Language Institute, were taken as the participants. Relying on the participants' placement test results, previous term scores, and a pretest to measure their knowledge of marked third person -s, 62 participants in 3 groups were selected to take part in this study. Then, they were assigned into 2 experimental groups treated differently through (a) written pronoun prompt and (b) visually enhanced reformulation for the first 20 min of 6 consecutive sessions over 1 month. No feedback was given to the control group. Two parallel pretest and immediate posttest were used as the instruments. The findings based on ANCOVA, and the *t* tests showed that the written- pronoun-prompt group outperformed the visually enhanced reformulation one.

Keywords: Corrective Feedback; Written Pronoun Prompt; Third Person -s; Reformulation

1. Introduction

Observing two types of interventionist and noninterventionist teachers triggers different approaches toward grammar instruction. There is no doubt about the existence of pedagogical intervention, but the way of conducting is a matter of debate. Considering focus on form (FonF) as a continuum including explicit and implicit grammar instruction extremes, many interextreme techniques (e.g., puzzle-

solving, information gap, picture description, etc.) appear to cover both types of instruction. Following a meaning-based FonF approach toward grammar instruction, many structure-trapping tasks have been designed to elicit the intended grammatical features (Long, 1991). Grammar instruction may raise learners' awareness to notice aspects of English that might otherwise escape their attention while engaged in communication (Schmidt, 1990). In this concern, an important question is whether noticing leads to intake or not. It is like Newton's story of gravity discovery which is triggered by falling of an apple; many apples fall everyday but nobody cares for this phenomenon. Only Newton whose mind was in challenge could discover the gravity. Therefore, learners should be engaged in a challenge of hypothesis construction and "grammaring" which seeks to help learners discover powerful patterns underlying the linguistic system (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

In addition, Pinemann's (1989) learnability-teachability hypothesis, emphasizing developmental sequence and order of acquisition, states that students cannot be pushed to learn a grammatical feature earlier than the time they are cognitively ready to acquire it. The hypothesis paves the ground for syllabus designers to sequence the materials according to the learners' cognitive capability and developmental stages. Furthermore, instruction should take account of the learners' built-in syllabus in which marked grammar with redundant features in contrast to unmarked one is among the latest stages of developmental sequence (Ellis, 2008). As this study has been done at Iran Language Institute, observing its pre-specified syllabus, in which marked third person -s is presented at earlier stages, stimulated carrying out of this study. It seems that the syllabus is in contrast to the learnability-teachability hypothesis and ignores the students' developmental process. In this case, the utilized syllabus can be revised or innovative techniques can be used to ameliorate the problem.

2. Literature Review

This study has been advocated by different theoretical issues to add to novelty and efficiency of operationalized corrective feedback types. Corrective feedback (CF) is referred to as any kind of response to indicate the learners what is

wrong with their output (Lightbown & Spada 1999, cited in Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorized the teachers' CF into six types of explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation or prompt, and repetition. This study adapts and modifies two types of reformulation and prompt as written CF types through CR. CR is an umbrella term defined as "a deliberate attempt to draw the learner's explicit attention to features of the target language, particularly to its grammatical features" (Kumaravadevelu, 2003, p. 187). However, this study in detail manipulates different input enhancement techniques and textual enhancement in operationalizing reformulation. According to Nassaji and Fotos (2004), textual enhancement as input-based approach aims at raising learners' attention to linguistic form by presenting input perceptually frequent through typographic devices, such as bolding, underlining, and italicizing in written input, or acoustic devices such as added stress or repetition in oral input. Nassaji and Fotos (2011) stated that textual enhancement has its origin in input enhancement as the process of making input more noticeable. Different types of input enhancement have been distinguished according to the input being enhanced as positive input enhancement and negative input enhancement. The former specifies the techniques that highlight correct forms to make them salient. However, the latter one, through highlighting incorrect forms, indicates the learners' violation of the target norms such as the use of corrective feedback. Another distinction is between internal and external input enhancement. At one end, the internal one is triggered by the learner's internal cognitive processes or learning strategy to notice the form himself. At the other end, the external one takes place when the noticing caused by external factors of the teacher or external manipulation on the input. Textual enhancement corresponds to external input enhancement as the implicit and unobtrusive instruction. Attributing all to reformulation initiated visually-enhanced reformulation in which the problematic part of the student's sentence is reformulated and enhanced typographically through color coding like the following extract:

- *Extract 1:*
 - *Student: My mother like the birds.*
 - *Teacher: **My mother** likes (with another color) the birds.*

Furthermore, input processing and output hypothesis have fed elicitation or prompt in its operationalized form. Panova and Lyster (2002) define elicitation as a correction technique which urges the learner to self-correct. However, according to teacher's preference in practice, the types of elicitations vary from explicit to implicit such as clarification request, open questions, and strategic pausing. Lyster (2004) states that prompt is keeping the correct form and providing learners with an opportunity to self-repair by producing their own modified responses. Swain (1995, 2000) considered output (i.e., a learner's language produced) as an accompaniment of input which is necessary but not sufficient. Swain stated that output is an indication of learning process that leads the learners into three functions of noticing/consciousness-raising, discovery, and trial of hypothesis as well as metalinguistic function as reflection. The language prompted as a result of the aforementioned functions is referred as pushed output, which the 'written pronoun prompt' of this study was founded on, to make the learners revise their interlanguage. Besides, relying on VanPatten's (2004) lexical preference principle (LPP), a lexical clue related to target structure (in this case, the pronoun in line with third person -s) was used to urge its noticing, trigger input processing, and self-correct. For instance:

- *Extract 2:*
 - *Student: My mother cook lunch every day.*
 - *Teacher: **She***

After providing some theoretical background on the study, the following paragraphs provide a sketch of empirical studies on the research topic. Hanaoka (2007) carried out a research to investigate the role of spontaneous attention to form in writing. It was a four-stage writing task consisting of output, comparison, and two revisions. Japanese college students as the main participants of this study were observed during the early mentioned writing tasks. At the first stage, they were asked to write a story in response to a picture prompt, and then in the second stage, they compared their writing to two native speaker models; in the third and fourth stages, they wrote delayed revisions that enabled the researcher to analyze what they noticed from the models. The results suggested that the students had noticed the

lexical features as their receptive problems, had found solutions through the models, and had included them in the subsequent revisions. The more proficient students noticed significantly more features from the models than the less proficient students to incorporate in their revisions. Additionally, the features that were related to the learners' problems in their original writing were noticed more and retained longer than unrelated ones.

Saxton (2000) carried out a research to adopt the contrast theory of negative input as a framework for analysis in child speech. In this theory, two distinct kinds of corrective input were identified: negative evidence and feedback. The corrective potential of each category was explored by examining the immediate effects of each of them on the grammaticality of child speech. A corpus of naturalistic data comprising 49 hours from a single child underwent a careful analysis with regard to 11 grammatical categories. The influences of negative input were compared with two the noncorrective sources of input including positive input and adult move-on. The results suggested that grammatical forms were more frequent in child speech following negative evidence and negative feedback in comparison with the two types of noncorrective sources of input. These findings well supported the argument that corrective input is very important in explanations for how the child eventually retreats error to obtain a mature system of grammar.

Basturkmen and Varnosfadrani (2009) made an attempt to explore the effects of different manners of correction (explicit vs. implicit correction) on learning of grammatical features. The research predominantly focused on the effectiveness of explicit and implicit correction of developmental early vs. developmental late features. In order to achieve the objectives of the study, 56 intermediate level Iranian EFL learners were asked to read two different written texts and then retell the information in their own way. During the learners' reconstruction of the information in the texts, their randomly-made errors were corrected by the researchers according to one of the two treatment categories: Category one consisted of (A) immediate explicit treatment and (B) delayed explicit treatment; category two consisted of (A) immediate implicit treatment and (B)

delayed explicit treatment. The design of this research was a between-group one that utilized comparison groups to investigate the questions. In accordance with the grammatical errors made reconstruction of the content, individualized tailor-made tests were developed. The learners received three types of treatment (correction): immediate explicit correction, delayed explicit correction, and immediate implicit correction. A pretest and a posttest were administered to examine the effectiveness of each treatment. The meticulous statistical analysis of the results exhibited higher scores for explicitly corrected learners than implicitly corrected ones. The findings gave support to the argument regarding the role of metalinguistic awareness in language learning. Additionally, analysis of the scores indicated that developmental early features are learned better with explicit correction and developmental late features with implicit correction.

Lee and Huang (2008) utilized visual input enhancement (VIE) as a typographical technique, which includes boldfacing, italicizing, underlining and capitalizing, to study its effect on grammar learning. Results have shown that the L2 readers provided with enhancement-embedded texts barely outperformed those who were exposed to unenhanced text with the same target forms flooded in them. In short, noticing does not always imply understanding or intake.

Nowadays, there is a great interest in the complementary role of metalinguistic knowledge accompanying direct CF and reformulation. Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, and Takashima (2008) examined a new distinction between unfocused and focused CF. In normal practice, teachers tend to correct students' all errors in an unfocused manner. This type of CF is viewed as extensive because teachers feel free to treat multiple errors. But focused CF selects specific errors to be corrected and ignores other errors. This kind of CF varies from highly focused to less focused one. Focused CF demands essentialness of form trapping task which causes those focused structures. This study examined the effect of written CF including focused and unfocused (FCF, UCF) as independent variable on accurate use of definite and indefinite article as dependent variable. It developed pretest, immediate posttest, delayed posttest design. The study used a quasi-experimental design involving intact

classes serving as two experimental groups: FCF ($N = 18$), UCF ($N = 18$), and a control group ($N = 13$). The participants were requested to write a narrative on picture stories and also take an error correction test prior and following the treatment. The obtained results from repeated measures of ANOVA indicated that both experimental groups produced more accurate features in the long term than the control group, and the difference was statistically significant, whereas the difference between the two experimental groups was not significant.

Different types and dichotomies of CF like direct-indirect, focused-unfocused, explicit-implicit, oral-written, metalinguistic explanation, reformulation, recast, and prompt have been suggested in the literature. Each type or dichotomy has been proposed out of a thought in the classroom for example: the case of increasing self- and peer-correction to encourage interaction. The present study adapts a form of consciousness raising CF to make balance between pedantic grammar instruction in explicit form and grammar negligence in implicit form. In spite of many studies on consciousness-raising related to input, there are few researches attributing this point into CF and produce some interextreme cases between focused vs. unfocused CF, metalinguistic vs. meaning feedback. Many newly-developed terms might contribute to the literature in this field. And out of various observations from different classes, marked third person -s is extracted as the most difficult grammatical feature which students encounter even in the case of strict presentation like ILI.

3. Research Questions

1. Does written pronoun prompt have any significant effect on the acquisition of marked third person -s?
2. Does visually enhanced reformulation have any significant effect on the acquisition of marked third person -s?
3. Is there any significant difference between written pronoun prompt vs. visually-enhanced reformulation in terms of their effects on the acquisition of marked third person -s?

4. Method

4.1 Participants

Nine elementary level intact classes including 191 male language learners within the age range of 11-14 at the ILI in the summer of 2012 participated in the study through convenience sampling. Concerning the participants' age, their family consent was gotten by the official of the ILI.

The choice elementary classes was justified as the participants of this research because third person singular was covered in the syllabus of this level and consistent third person singular errors were observed among these students or their counterparts in previous courses by the researcher as an experienced teacher in the research site.

The participants were homogenized through the ILI placement test scores and the average score of the final tests of the three previous terms. Due to homogeneity, 14 as the outliers out of the 191 participants were not taken into account and reduced to 177. As a result of the pretest, 62 main participants who scored below 30 out of 50, corresponding to 60 out of 100 as the ILI final exam passing cut-point, were specified as the participants not having acceptable proficiency in third person singular. Meeting the balanced design, each group comprised of nearly equal *N* sizes for all the groups ($G1 = 22$, $G2 = 20$, $G3 = 20$).

4.2 Instruments

Because any valid and reliable ready-made test in line with the objectives of this research was not in the market, a new test was developed by the researcher. At first draft, 72 items were adapted from the ILI *Test Time 2* (Hosseinzadeh & Ghojogh, 2009) to meet the face-validity through the learners' familiarity with the format and scoring of the test. Having piloted the first draft on similar learners, modifying some poor items and discarding six of them, a 66-item test including 38 multiple-choice, 14 fill-in-the-blank, and 14 open-ended items remained. However, it is noteworthy that subject expectancy, (i.e., related to people issues and guessing the results of investigation to help the researcher achieve optimal results) (Brown, 1988), was controlled through providing some distracter items, unrelated to the

construct of the test. The number of distracter items was as following: eight multiple-choice, four fill in-the-blank, and four open-ended items out of whole 66. The piloted test, excluding distracter items, enjoyed a good degree of reliability index through Cronbach's alpha (alpha= 0.82). Besides, the researcher consulted with three of his colleagues to check the content validity of the test.

Ensuring the reliability and validity of the first draft, it was randomly divided into two parallel 33-item tests serving as the pretest and posttest. Out of the 33 items, 19 were multiple-choice type with four distracter items (i.e., a new term not considering the distracter option meaning in multiple-choice test used for separate item in a test irrelevant to the main focus of the test), and seven fill-in-the-blank type with two distracter items, and seven open-ended type with two distracter items. Two piloted separate tests, randomly assigned as the pretest and posttest showed reliability indices of 0.75 and 0.78 respectively.

4.3 Procedure

The current study was conducted to investigate the effect of written consciousness-raising CF on marked third person -s acquisition. To this end, nine elementary level intact classes including 191 male learners were selected. Through the homogenizing process and the pretest results, 62 learners remained as the main participants. After random assignment of groups, they received treatments in two experimental groups, namely written pronoun prompt and visually-enhanced reformulation, and one control group with no feedback. In order not to intervene with the methodology and syllabus of the ILL, the study was executed at first 29 min of six consecutive sessions in checking and review section of the class time by the teacher, and it masqueraded as the usual dictation period. Therefore, the treatment was done according to the sessions including third person and the sessions allocated to *Story Time*, *Review*, and *Film* in the syllabus. Furthermore, with the aim of investigating pure corrective feedback effect free from presentation effect, the pretest was taken after third person-singular presentation session 12 and those who got below the cut-point of 30 out of 50 were taken into account of this study. In addition, the researcher participated in the class as the observer to specify the

uptakes shown by the learners. However, regarding the researcher's participation, halo effect, (i.e., the learners' inclination to please their teacher; Brown, 1988), was controlled through participating at the first session after the pretest, session 13, without treatment. And respectively, in order to control the subject expectancy, the teachers were not informed fully about the variables of the study, especially dependent variable, marked third person singular. Therefore, teachers were asked to correct all the errors; in this case the learners and teachers could not figure out the objectives of the study to help the researcher achieve the aims of the study. The main treatment began at session 14 and continued for six consecutive sessions until session 19 at which the immediate posttest was taken. During this period, in two experimental groups of this study, the teachers elicited third person singular through a task facilitated by the teachers' topic prompts. Through this task, the students brought individual family member picture and wrote about it every session. This writing was done under pressure of time to limit the thinking time of production. Individual pictures were asked in order to urge students use only third person singular sentences. The groups received corrective feedback in written form at the end of the session.

The only difference between the experimental groups in the study was that the teachers provided different corrective feedbacks to the learners' errors. In G1, the teacher used written pronoun prompt to urge the learners self-correct. Through this corrective feedback technique, the subject and verb components of the sentence were underlined and instead of proper noun or noun phrase as the subject of the sentence, third person singular pronoun as lexical clue was provided with the learners to make them self-correct. In G2, the teacher corrected the errors through visually enhanced reformulation. Using this technique, the meaning of the sentence was kept constant, and the sentence was reformulated. However, subject and third person -s were written with red pen. And finally, G3 as the control group of this study was provided feedback only on meaning. And, the aforementioned corrective feedback techniques were not employed in this group, and the learners spent most of the time practicing grammar drills.

At last, considering the design of the study, variables, and collecting the data appropriately, this study utilized one-way between-groups analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to analyze the data.

5. Results

One-way between-groups analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to compare the effectiveness of two different interventions designed to increase the learners' marked third person -s acquisition. The independent variable was the type of intervention (written pronoun prompt, visually-enhanced reformulation) and control group (no CF), and the dependent variable consisted of the learners' scores on the posttest administered after the intervention was completed. The learners' scores on the pretest were used as the covariate in this analysis. Before running ANCOVA, homogeneity of regression slopes test was used to check interaction between the covariate and the experimental manipulation. The result of this test is shown in Table 1:

Table 1. *Result of Homogeneity of Regression Slopes*

Sum of Squares	Means Squares	df	F	p value
43.29	21.65	22	.54	0.59

As shown in Table 1, the *F* statistic was not significant ($p < .59$). It may be concluded that there is no interaction between the covariate and the experimental manipulation. In Table 2, groups' descriptive statistics and in Table 3, homogeneity of variance test are shown and the result of covariance analysis have been reported in Table 4:

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics of Groups in Posttest*

Group	<i>NN</i>	Mean	<i>SSD</i>
Written Pronoun Prompt	22	29.36	9.65
Visually Enhanced Reformulation	20	24.20	7.68
Control Group (No CF)	20	19.20	6.24
Total	62	24.42	8.96

Table 3. *Leven's Test of Homogeneity of Variance*

<i>F</i>	<i>df1</i>	<i>df2</i>	<i>p</i> value
3.15	2	59	0.05

According to the above Table 3, the Leven's test was significant ($p < .05$). So, it may be concluded that the variance of the posttest scores was not homogenous across the groups. Violations of homogeneity of variance usually can be corrected by the transformation of the dependent variables scores. Interpretation, however, is then limited to the transformed scores. Another option is to use untransformed variables with a more stringent alpha level (for nominal $\alpha = .05$, use 0.025 with moderate violation and 0.01 with severe violation; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007). In this study, the second option and acceptable alpha level was used and set to 0.025 to reject the null hypothesis:

Table 4. *Result of Covariance Analysis to Compare Groups in Posttest*

Source	SS	MS	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i> value	<i>df</i>	Effect Size
Pretest	1504.06	1504.06	37.73	0.001	1	0.39
Group	1456.65	728.32	18.29	0.001	2	0.39

As shown in Table 4, *F* statistic of group membership is significant at 0.001 alpha levels, after controlling the pretest scores ($F = 18.29, p < .001$). This finding shows that there are significant differences among the groups in the posttest scores. Effect size statistic shows that group membership predicts 39 % of variance in the posttest scores. Pair-wise comparison of groups estimated marginal mean scores which have been reported in Table 5:

Table 5. *Result of Pair-Wise Comparison of Groups Estimated Mean Scores*

Groups	Groups	Mean difference	Std. Error	<i>p</i> value
Written Prompt	Pronoun Visually Reformulation Enhanced	7.57	1.99	0.001
Written Prompt	Pronoun Control Group (No CF)	11.72	1.97	0.001
Visually Reformulation	Enhanced Control Group (No CF)	4.15	2	0.13

According to Table 5, the estimated means difference of written pronoun prompt and control groups (11.72) is significant at (0.001) alpha level. According to this result, it may be concluded that the written pronoun prompt has significant

positive effect on the acquisition of marked third person -s. The estimated means difference of visually enhanced reformulation and control groups (4.15) is not significant ($p > .05$). So visually enhanced reformulation does not have any significant effect on the acquisition of marked third person -s. Also, the result of Table 6 shows that the estimated means difference of written pronoun prompt and visually enhanced reformulation groups (7.57) is significant at (0.001) alpha level. According to this finding, it may be concluded that the effect of the written pronoun prompt method on the acquisition of marked third person -s is higher than the visually enhanced reformulation method.

6. Discussion

The present study has been advocated by various theoretical issues. The choice of marked person -s was the outcome of comprising linguistics as marked grammar, second language acquisition, developmental order, learnability/teachability hypothesis and pedagogical grammar. Furthermore, in order to focus language in use through a contextualized task and take account of both accuracy and fluency based on Richards (2001), the students were asked to bring their individual family member picture to meet fluency aspect of the task while enhancement manipulations and VanPatten's (2004) lexical preference principle as input processing aspect besides not interrupting learners' production regards accuracy. Attributing lexical preference principle in this study through providing learners' with pronoun prompt meets Swain's (2000) pushed output and Long's (1996) modified input. Furthermore, Nassaji and Fotos' (2011) negative input enhancement as corrective feedback technique and external input enhancement were adapted in this study. All the aforementioned manipulations were operationalized over marked third person -s to direct the learners' attention into the target feature and lead them into the process of Ellis' (2012) noticing, comparing, and integrating which corresponds to VanPatten's (2004) input processing, accommodation, and restructuring.

Saxton (2000) maintained the same positive effect of input-based negative evidence and feedback as this study which investigated the reformulation as an

input-based corrective feedback type. Conflicting with the treatment process of this study in which consciousness-raising corrective feedback was included, Basturkmen and Varnosfadrani (2009) investigated the extreme cases of explicit and implicit corrective feedback. However, grammatically developmental late features were taken into account in line with marked third person -s of this study. Moreover, positive effect of implicit correction over developmental late features confirmed the result of this study on marked third person -s. In contrast to this study which adapted the planned FonF through input-based and output-based corrective feedback to make the learners notice, compare and integrate the target feature, Hanaoka (2007) examined the spontaneous attention to form through output, comparison, and two revisions. Similarly, it used written revision and posed the ease of problematic features. Contrary to Lee and Huang (2008) showing no significant difference between visually enhanced text and unenhanced input flooded text, the current study found a positive effect in the case of visually enhanced reformulation in question two. In addition, the findings of this study were supported by Ellis et al. (2008) who maintained that the FCF yielded a positive effect.

Because this study was triggered by observing problematic features at the ILI classrooms to ameliorate learners' difficulty with linguistic rule preoccupation and FonF, it can be implemented as a source of revision in teachers' methodology to bring forth to some extent FonF, enhancement issues, peer-correction/self-correction techniques. Furthermore, because the current study emphasized the effect of different corrective feedback types on the accurate use of marked third person -s, which is included in the syllabus of *Run 4* teenagers' level, it might be a good stimulation to bring about evolutionary changes in syllabus according to learners' developmental order and learnability-teachability of a target feature. Besides, because this study inclines toward coherent teaching and self-correction through enhancement and lexical clues, materials used in the classroom should be in line with the aforementioned goals through manipulating enhancement techniques. Finally, as a focused study using different pedagogical interventions, the research can help EFL teachers to be on the alert for the nature of the errors and corrective

feedback provision based on different factors to improve learners' linguistic competence.

Studies investigating potential effects of corrective feedback according to different grammatical structures can give credence to this study. And, it allows inference of investigating innovative corrective feedback types considering developmental readiness, language aptitude, learner styles and strategies, individual differences, personality factors, motivation, and attitude toward correction. Moreover, corrective feedback in CALL and MALL settings can be another area of research.

7. Conclusion

The present study investigated the effect of consciousness-raising written corrective feedback in general and written-pronoun-prompt outperformance of visually enhanced reformulation on marked third person -s acquisition in detail. To this end, following the pretest-treatment-immediate posttest design, the learners' errors were treated for the first 20 min of six sessions through the aforementioned pedagogical interventions. Novelty of corrective feedback types designed according to developmentally late acquired feature at this study can be a good hint to do the appropriate modifications in syllabus design, methodology, and material development. Taking multifaceted forms of research concerning individual, social, psychological and other aspects adds to the fertility of this area to meet the dynamic nature of the classroom in practice.

References

- Basturkmen, H., & Varnosfadrani, A. D. (2009). The effectiveness of implicit and explicit error correction on learners' performance. *System*, 37, 82-98.
- Brown, J. D. (1988). *Understanding research in second language learning: A teacher's guide to statistics and research design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 36(3), 353-371.
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research & language pedagogy*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hanaoka, O. (2007). Output, noticing, and learning: An investigation into the role of spontaneous attention to form in a four-stage writing task. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(4), 459-479.
- Hendrickson, J. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern Language Journal*, 62, 387-398.
- Hosseinzadeh, S., & Ghojogh, A. N. (2009). *Test time 2* (6th ed.). Tehran: Iran Language Institute.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. London: Yale University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principals in language teaching*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, S., & Huang, H. (2008). Visual input enhancement and grammar learning: A meta analytic review. *SSLA*, 30, 307-331.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. DeBot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 399-432.
- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2004). Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 126-145.
- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*. New York: Routledge.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 573-593.
- Pinemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? *Applied Linguistics*, 10, 52-79.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saxton, M. (2000). Negative evidence and negative feedback: immediate effects on the grammaticality of child speech. *First Language*, 20, 221-252.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook, & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in the study of language: Studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

VanPatten, B. (2004). Input processing in SLA. In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary* (pp. 5-32). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.