

**RELATIVE EFFECTS OF ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK
COMBINED WITH EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION ON EFL
LEARNERS' PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE**

Hanh Thi Pham

Bachelor of Arts in English Language Teacher Education (Vietnam National University, Hanoi)

Master of Arts in Foreign Language Education (University of Iowa, USA)

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the Faculty of Education

University of Canberra

May 2018



**UNIVERSITY OF
CANBERRA**
AUSTRALIA'S CAPITAL UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

RELATIVE EFFECTS OF ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK COMBINED WITH EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION ON EFL LEARNERS' PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE

Hanh Thi Pham

While the positive impact of oral corrective feedback (OCF) in language acquisition has been confirmed, limited research has been conducted on the effectiveness of OCF on learners' pragmatic development (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013). It has also been suggested that many factors such as instructional context and choice of linguistic targets impact CF effectiveness (Ellis, 2008). More research is needed to identify the interaction of CF and instruction type on learners' pragmatic acquisition.

To address the gap, this study investigated the effects of four OCF types, namely recast, clarification request, explicit correction, and metalinguistic clue, on the acquisition of English requests by low intermediate Vietnamese EFL learners ($n = 122$) in the university foreign language (EFL) classroom who were given explicit instruction. A mixed methods design using an embedded quasi-experimental model was employed to address these aims with more weight assigned to the quantitative than the qualitative aspect. The study involved one control group who received six hours of explicit instruction on English requests and four experimental groups who received six hours of explicit instruction on English requests combined with one of the four types of OCF. Quantitative data were collected using three instruments: role plays (RP), discourse completion tasks (DCT) and judgement tasks (JT). The RP and DCT were used to assess the overall rating of appropriateness of the participants' requests and the number of requesting strategies they used. The JT were employed to elicit the participants' perceptions and awareness about features of English requests. Qualitative data were collected from diaries

of student participants during instruction time, and were used to complement and validate the quantitative data. Scoring was conducted by one native and one non-native speaker, and the analysis used ANOVA and ANCOVA tests.

The statistical results demonstrate the superior effectiveness of explicit instruction alone, there being significant improvement in both the control and treated groups. The results show that the effectiveness of OCF types is highly dependent on the types of outcome measure. Regarding the strategy use, recasts work best of the four types in both the RP and DCT. In terms of overall rating appropriateness of requests, metalinguistic clues and clarification requests appeared to be most effective in both the RP and DCT. While there was no significant difference in the effectiveness of CF with regard to the measure of pragmatic awareness among the groups, the groups that received feedback in the form of metalinguistic clues and explicit correction were most sensitive to their treatments and most likely to make improvements. The thematic analysis from the participants' diaries showed that, generally, feedback was essential and required in the context of explicit instruction and students' high motivation helped promote the acquisition of L2 pragmatic learning. The results of this research also highlighted that explicit instruction has substantial effects in the development of learners' pragmatic competence. The study outlines implications to the field of SLA and pedagogical applications to the teaching of L2 pragmatics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research would not have been possible without support from a number of people. First, I owe my deepest gratitude to Dr Eleni Petraki, my primary supervisor, for agreeing to take me as a PhD student. My persistence to work with her was totally worth it, and I knew early that this was the right choice. Her being a considerate and practical supervisor, providing critical comments and expert guidance during her supervision and throughout the different stages of my PhD project greatly contributed to my research, and also set an example of successful supervision practices that I aim to adopt after my PhD completion. I would like to thank her for all the email exchanges, phone calls, skype sessions, in-person meetings and discussions, and late-night and early-morning last minute thoughts. I am also grateful to Dr Jeremy Jones, my secondary supervisor, whose support, help and advice were crucial. It was an honour for me to have had on my panel Dr Alice Richardson, who provided critical advice on the statistical aspects of the project, and Dr Nguyen Thi Thuy Minh, who offered expert advice with clear and precise comments on my research. I would never have come so far without their enthusiastic and generous support. I would like to thank the audience who attended my presentation at AAAL Orlando 2016. Their critical but inspiring comments have contributed to my thesis and helped me keep the flame alive as a researcher. My thanks also go to Ms. Beth Barber, who provided professional editing and encouragement during the last difficult but critical days of my research.

I am thankful to Australia for the Australian Awards Scholarships, which made this thesis possible and have changed the trajectory of my life. Their team has done a great job in making my learning experience in Canberra very meaningful and joyful. My appreciation also goes to the University of Canberra for such a wonderful team of library staff who tried to

provide their best service, and the Research Development staff who implemented wonderful practices such as Shut-up and Write sessions and Writing Weekends with free food.

I also would like to thank the students and teachers from Vietnam who cooperated with me during the hard time of the pilot and data collection, as well as the native participants from Australia, America and New Zealand. Some very special thanks go to my colleagues and friends, and to those who I have met and I have not had a chance to meet face to face; I thank you for your questions, comments and coffees despite the scarcity of time.

I owe a great deal to my sisters, brother-in-law, my parents-in-law for their support, and especially my parents for their sublime self-sacrificing and unconditional love for me.

Without their being there in Vietnam helping me to take care of the children, I would not have been able to keep staying here in Australia and continuing my study. Rarely do I express my gratitude and emotion by saying it, but rather, showing it. Now, I would like to say that I am thankful for having you as parents and that I love you.

Finally, to my husband, Can, and my two children, Han and Chau. It has been a long haul for you, Can, and there is so much to thank you for: for being such a smart insightful listener who has helped unravel so many problems, for your not-so-gentle critiques that always forced me to up to my game, for those full-of-love-and-assurance chit-chats over the phone, for taking care of the children and yourself without complaint when I had to stay in this far away land, completing my study. Thank you for your acceptance of my adventure and encouraging me to tame “the tiger” - my PhD when I was about to give up. And thank you my lovely son and daughter for your love, your patience and your hard work. I’m all yours - you are the ones I travel with now. And how wonderful the journey will be.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iii
Certificate of Authorship.....	v
Acknowledgements	vii
Table of Contents	ix
List of Tables.....	xv
List of Figures	xix
List of Abbreviations.....	xxi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background of the study.....	1
1.2.1 Oral corrective feedback	1
1.2.2 Pragmatics.....	4
1.3 Statement of the research problem	6
1.4 Research aims and research questions.....	7
1.5 Research methodology	10
1.6 Significance of the study	12
1.7 Organization of the thesis.....	14
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	17
2.1 Introduction	17
2.2 Oral corrective feedback (OCF)	18
2.2.1 Definition of corrective feedback	18

2.2.2	Theoretical background of OCF in SLA.....	19
2.2.3	Classifications of oral corrective feedback.....	23
2.2.4	OCF effectiveness.....	34
2.3	Pragmatics.....	56
2.3.1	Interlanguage pragmatics.....	57
2.3.2	Speech acts.....	58
2.3.3	The speech act of requesting.....	69
2.4	Pragmatics teaching.....	79
2.4.1	Teachability of pragmatic competence.....	80
2.4.2	Approaches to L2 pragmatics teaching.....	83
2.4.3	Effects of explicit and implicit instruction in pragmatics.....	86
2.5	Chapter summary.....	91
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY.....		93
3.1	Introduction.....	93
3.2	The methodological approach: Mixed methods.....	93
3.2.1	Philosophy, definition and purposes of MMR.....	93
3.2.2	Methodological characteristics of MMR.....	96
3.2.3	The Embedded Experimental Model and its use in this study.....	96
3.3	Quasi-experimental design.....	98
3.3.1	True experimental and quasi-experimental designs.....	98
3.3.2	Threats to validity.....	101
3.4	Ethics.....	106

3.5	Site and population	107
3.6	Pilot study	109
3.6.1	Purpose	109
3.6.2	Aims and research questions	110
3.6.3	Participants	110
3.6.4	Assessment materials	111
3.6.5	Piloting assessment instruments	112
3.6.6	Marking and inter-rater reliability	114
3.6.7	Results and discussion	118
3.6.8	Instrument revisions after the pilot study	121
3.7	Research design of the main study	122
3.7.1	Participants	123
3.7.2	Instructional materials design	125
3.7.3	Teaching intervention	137
3.7.4	Data collection instruments	144
3.8	Data collection procedures	160
3.8.1	The quantitative phase	164
3.8.2	The qualitative phase	165
3.9	Data management	166
3.9.1	RP and DCT appropriateness	167
3.9.2	RP and DCT strategy use	168
3.9.3	JT Judgement	170

3.9.4 Diaries	170
3.10 Data analysis.....	170
3.11 Chapter summary.....	174
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS.....	177
4.1 Introduction	177
4.2 Appropriateness of requests	178
4.2.1 RP Appropriateness of students' English requests	178
4.2.2 DCT Appropriateness of students' English requests	188
4.3 Strategy use	198
4.3.1 RP strategy use.....	198
4.3.2 DCT strategy use.....	208
4.4 Pragmatic awareness	217
4.4.1 Improvements within groups	219
4.4.2 Comparative effects of OCF between the five groups.....	224
4.5 Qualitative results: students' diaries.....	228
4.5.1 Reflection on the topic of English requests	228
4.5.2 Reflection on the learning materials	234
4.5.3 Reflection on the teachers and teaching.....	235
4.5.4 Reflection on peers and learning.....	241
4.5.5 Reflection on the benefits from the course	243
4.5.6 Reflection on the objective factors that affect their learning.....	243
4.5.7 Suggestions related to the course	245

4.6	Chapter summary.....	247
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS.....		255
5.1	Introduction	255
5.2	Appropriateness of learners' requests	256
5.2.1	Appropriateness in oral/online production (the RP)	256
5.2.2	Appropriateness in written/offline production (the DCT)	259
5.3	Strategy use in learners' requests	263
5.3.1	Strategy use in oral/online production (the RP).....	263
5.3.2	Strategy use in written/offline production (the DCT).....	265
5.4	Comparison of appropriateness versus strategy use in oral and written production ..	267
5.5	Pragmatic awareness	270
5.6	Chapter summary.....	275
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION		277
6.1	Introduction	277
6.2	Restatement of aims and methodological approach of the study	277
6.3	Summary of key findings	280
6.4	Contributions and implication in theory and pedagogy	288
6.4.1	Contributions and implications to SLA theory	288
6.4.2	Pedagogical implications	292
6.5	Research limitations and recommendations	294
REFERENCES.....		297

APPENDICES	311
Appendix 1 Information sheet.....	313
Appendix 2 Consent forms.....	319
Appendix 3 Common European Framework for References	321
Appendix 4 Samples of RP, DCT and JT prompts	323
Appendix 5 Scoring rubrics.....	325
Appendix 6 Strategies/modification devices taught in the course	327
Appendix 7 Sample of lesson plan.....	329
Appendix 8 Guidelines for data collection.....	335
Appendix 9 Inter-rate reliability for RP and DCT appropriateness	339
Appendix 10 Assumptions	341

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table 2.1 Classifications of OCF (Ranta and Lyster, 2007)</i>	26
<i>Table 2.2 A Taxonomy of OCF strategies (Sheen and Ellis, 2011, p. 594)</i>	27
<i>Table 2.3 Sentence-function Mapping</i>	63
<i>Table 2.4 CCSARP Taxonomy of Request Head Act Strategies</i>	71
<i>Table 2.5 Trosborg's Taxonomy of Request Head Act Strategies</i>	72
<i>Table 2.6 Blum-Kulka and Olshtain's Taxonomy of Request Modification Devices</i>	74
<i>Table 2.7 Alcón Soler, et al.'s (2005) Taxonomy of Request Modification Devices</i>	76
<i>Table 2.8 Implicit versus Explicit Form-focused Instruction (House and Pierrard, 2005)</i>	84
<i>Table 2.9 Examples of studies that revealed the effects of one method over another</i>	88
<i>Table 3.1 Test-taking Groups in the Pilot</i>	113
<i>Table 3.2 Cohen's Kappa for RP pilot (N= 34)</i>	115
<i>Table 3.3 Cohen's Kappa for RP pilot (N= 34)</i>	116
<i>Table 3.4 Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test for the RP Pilot (N = 34)</i>	119
<i>Table 3.5 Wilcoxon Signed Rank for DCT Pilot (N = 34)</i>	120
<i>Table 3.6 Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test - JT Pilot (N = 34)</i>	120
<i>Table 3.7 Treatment of the Groups</i>	123
<i>Table 3.8 Environment Constraints and Effects</i>	127
<i>Table 3.9 Teaching Content of the Experiment</i>	134
<i>Table 3.10 Studies that Revealed Effects of Treatment Length</i>	138
<i>Table 3.11 Focus and Procedures in Data Collection Formats</i>	146
<i>Table 3.12 P, D, R in the RP, DCT, and JT</i>	155
<i>Table 3.13 Matrix for the RP</i>	158
<i>Table 3.14 Matrix for the DCT</i>	159
<i>Table 3.15 Matrix for the JT</i>	159
<i>Table 3.16 Difference in Pre-test Scores of the Five Groups</i>	171
<i>Table 3.17 Phases of Thematic Analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.87)</i>	173

<i>Table 4.1 Mean Scores Gained by the Five Groups in RP Pre-test and Immediate Post-test</i>	<i>178</i>
<i>Table 4.2 Mean Scores Gained by the Five Groups in RP Pre-test and Delayed Post-test.....</i>	<i>179</i>
<i>Table 4.3 ANOVA - Recast RP Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>180</i>
<i>Table 4.4 Pairwise Comparisons - Recast RP Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>181</i>
<i>Table 4.5 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Clar Req RP appropriateness</i>	<i>181</i>
<i>Table 4.6 Pairwise Comparisons - Clar Req RP Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>182</i>
<i>Table 4.7 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Exp Corr RP Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>182</i>
<i>Table 4.8 Pairwise Comparisons - Exp Corr RP Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>183</i>
<i>Table 4.9 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Meta RP Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>183</i>
<i>Table 4.10 Pairwise Comparisons - Meta RP Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>184</i>
<i>Table 4.11 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Control RP Appropriateness</i>	<i>184</i>
<i>Table 4.12 Pairwise Comparisons - Control RP Appropriateness</i>	<i>185</i>
<i>Table 4.13 One-way Between Groups ANOVA - RP Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>186</i>
<i>Table 4.14 Post hoc Analyses - RP Immediate Appropriateness</i>	<i>186</i>
<i>Table 4.15 One-way Between Groups ANOVA - RP Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>187</i>
<i>Table 4.16 Post hoc Analyses - RP Immediate Appropriateness</i>	<i>188</i>
<i>Table 4.17 Mean Scores Gained by the Five Groups in DCT Appropriateness Pre-test and Immediate Post-test</i>	<i>189</i>
<i>Table 4.18 Mean Scores Gained by the Five Groups in DCT Appropriateness Pre-test and Delayed Post-test ...</i>	<i>189</i>
<i>Table 4.19 ANOVA - Recast DCT Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>191</i>
<i>Table 4.20 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Clar Req DCT appropriateness</i>	<i>191</i>
<i>Table 4.21 Pairwise Comparisons - Clar Req DCT Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>192</i>
<i>Table 4.22 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Exp Corr DCT Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>192</i>
<i>Table 4.23 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Meta DCT Appropriateness</i>	<i>193</i>
<i>Table 4.24 Pairwise Comparisons - Meta DCT Appropriateness</i>	<i>193</i>
<i>Table 4.25 ANOVA - Control DCT Appropriateness</i>	<i>194</i>
<i>Table 4.26 ANCOVA - DCT Immediate Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>195</i>
<i>Table 4.27 Pairwise Comparisons - DCT Immediate Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>196</i>
<i>Table 4.28 ANCOVA - DCT Delayed Appropriateness</i>	<i>197</i>
<i>Table 4.29 Pairwise comparisons - DCT Delayed Appropriateness</i>	<i>197</i>

<i>Table 4.30 Mean Scores Gained by the Five Groups in RP Strategy Pre-test and Immediate Post-test</i>	198
<i>Table 4.31 Mean Scores Gained by the Five Groups in RP Strategy Pre-test and Delayed Post-test</i>	198
<i>Table 4.32 ANOVA - Recast RP Strategy Use</i>	200
<i>Table 4.33 Pairwise Comparisons - Recast RP Strategy Use</i>	200
<i>Table 4.34 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Clar Req RP Strategy Use</i>	201
<i>Table 4.35 Pairwise Comparisons - Clar Req RP Strategy Use</i>	201
<i>Table 4.36 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Exp Corr RP Strategy Use</i>	202
<i>Table 4.37 Pairwise Comparisons - Exp Corr RP Strategy Use</i>	202
<i>Table 4.38 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Meta RP Strategy Use</i>	203
<i>Table 4.39 Pairwise Comparisons - Meta RP Strategy Use</i>	203
<i>Table 4.40 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Control RP Strategy Use</i>	204
<i>Table 4.41 Pairwise Comparisons - Control RP Strategy Use</i>	204
<i>Table 4.42 ANCOVA - RP Immediate Strategy Use</i>	205
<i>Table 4.43 Pairwise Comparisons - RP Immediate Strategy Use</i>	206
<i>Table 4.44 ANCOVA - RP Delayed Strategy Use</i>	207
<i>Table 4.45 Pairwise Comparisons - RP Delayed Strategy Use</i>	207
<i>Table 4.46 Mean Scores Gained by the Five Groups in DCT Pre-test and Immediate Post-test</i>	208
<i>Table 4.47 Mean Scores Gained by the Five Groups in DCT Strategy Pre-test and Delayed Post-test</i>	208
<i>Table 4.48 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Recast DCT Strategy Use</i>	210
<i>Table 4.49 Pairwise Comparisons - Recast DCT Strategy Use</i>	210
<i>Table 4.50 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Clar Req DCT Strategy Use</i>	211
<i>Table 4.51 Pairwise Comparisons - Clar Req DCT Strategy Use</i>	211
<i>Table 4.52 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Exp Corr DCT Strategy Use</i>	212
<i>Table 4.53 Pairwise Comparisons - Exp Corr DCT Strategy Use</i>	212
<i>Table 4.54 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Meta DCT Strategy Use</i>	213
<i>Table 4.55 Pairwise Comparisons - Meta DCT Strategy Use</i>	213
<i>Table 4.56 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Control DCT Strategy Use</i>	213
<i>Table 4.57 Pairwise Comparisons - Control DCT Strategy Use</i>	214
<i>Table 4.58 ANCOVA - DCT Immediate Strategy Use</i>	215

<i>Table 4.59 Pairwise Comparisons - DCT Immediate Strategy Use</i>	<i>215</i>
<i>Table 4.60 ANCOVA - DCT Delayed Strategy Use</i>	<i>216</i>
<i>Table 4.61 Pairwise Comparisons - DCT Delayed Strategy Use.....</i>	<i>217</i>
<i>Table 4.62 Mean Scores Gained by the Five Groups in JT Pre-test and Immediate Post-test</i>	<i>218</i>
<i>Table 4.63 Mean Scores Gained by the Five Groups in JT Pre-test and Delayed Post-test.....</i>	<i>218</i>
<i>Table 4.64 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Recast JT.....</i>	<i>220</i>
<i>Table 4.65 Pairwise Comparisons - Recast JT.....</i>	<i>220</i>
<i>Table 4.66 ANOVA - Clar Req JT</i>	<i>221</i>
<i>Table 4.67 Pairwise Comparisons - Clar Req JT.....</i>	<i>221</i>
<i>Table 4.68 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Exp Corr JT.....</i>	<i>222</i>
<i>Table 4.69 Pairwise Comparisons - Exp Corr JT.....</i>	<i>222</i>
<i>Table 4.70 ANOVA - Meta JT.....</i>	<i>223</i>
<i>Table 4.71 Pairwise Comparisons - Meta JT.....</i>	<i>223</i>
<i>Table 4.72 ANOVA Sphericity Supported - Control JT.....</i>	<i>224</i>
<i>Table 4.73 Pairwise Comparisons - Control JT.....</i>	<i>224</i>
<i>Table 4.74 One-way Between Groups ANOVA – JT Immediate.....</i>	<i>225</i>
<i>Table 4.75 Post hoc Analyses – JT Immediate.....</i>	<i>226</i>
<i>Table 4.76 One-way Between Groups ANOVA – JT Delayed</i>	<i>227</i>
<i>Table 4.77 Post hoc Analyses - RP Immediate Appropriateness</i>	<i>227</i>
<i>Table 4.78 Summary of Improvements of Individual Groups (Y: yes; N: no).....</i>	<i>250</i>
<i>Table 4.79 Summary of Improvements between Groups.....</i>	<i>251</i>

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Figure 2.1 Classification of OCF (Lyster et al., 2013)</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Figure 2.2 Brown and Levinson's (1987) model of FTA-avoiding strategies (p.69)</i>	<i>66</i>
<i>Figure 2.3 Practice Activities in PPP (Ellis, 2002).....</i>	<i>85</i>
<i>Figure 3.1 One Phase Embedded Experimental Model (Creswell &Clark, 2007, p.68).....</i>	<i>97</i>
<i>Figure 3.2 The research design of the main study.....</i>	<i>101</i>
<i>Figure 3.3 Needs Analysis Process.....</i>	<i>129</i>
<i>Figure 3.4 Data Collection Methods Related to Modality of Language Use and Degree of Control</i>	<i>146</i>
<i>Figure 3.5 Phases in Instrument Design</i>	<i>154</i>
<i>Figure 3.6 Diary Guide.....</i>	<i>160</i>
<i>Figure 3.7 Data Collection Procedures</i>	<i>163</i>
<i>Figure 4.1 Improvements in RP Appropriateness</i>	<i>179</i>
<i>Figure 4.2 Improvements in DCT Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>190</i>
<i>Figure 4.3 Improvements in RP Strategy Use</i>	<i>199</i>
<i>Figure 4.4 Improvements in DCT Strategy Use.....</i>	<i>209</i>
<i>Figure 4.5 Improvements in JT</i>	<i>219</i>

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ANCOVA	Analysis of Covariance
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
CCSARP	Cross-cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns
CEFR	Common European Framework Reference
CF	Corrective Feedback
Clar Re	Clarification Request
DCT	Discourse Completion Tasks
EFL	English as a Foreign Learning
EI	Explicit Instruction
ESL	English as a Second Language
Exp Corr	Explicit Correction
FFI	Form-Focus Instruction
FTA	Face Threatening Act
ISLA	Instructed Second Language Acquisition
JT	Judgement Task
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
Meta	Metalinguistic Clue
MMR	Mixed Method Research
NS	Native Speaker
NNS	Non-native Speaker
OCF	Oral Corrective Feedback
qual	Qualitative
QUANT	Quantitative
RP	Role Play
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Science
WCF	Written Corrective Feedback