The Other Exemplar-based Corrective Feedback: Analogical Corrective Feedback in the EFL Classroom

Kavita E. Thomas
University of Gävle
Sweden
kavita.e.thomas@gmail.com

It has been argued that explicit feedback in the form of metalinguistic rules results in better success on both explicit and implicit measures (R. Ellis *et al*, 2006) and that repeated explicit corrective feedback draws externally scaffolded attention which gradually converts to explicit learning and then implicit learning and finally abstraction (following N. Ellis, 2005). Sheen (2007) found that metalinguistic corrective feedback increases awareness as understanding and not just noticing and found that while high aptitude learners benefitted from both types of feedback, the advantage was clearer for metalinguistic feedback over provision of the correct exemplar. Individual differences in feedback efficacy for exemplar-based feedback can possibly be explained by findings in syntactic priming for L2, where more proficient speakers showed greater effects of priming than weaker ones (Bernolet *et al*, 2013). In a study of primed productions, Kim and McDonough (2008) indicate that beginners may be more reliant on lexical items than advanced learners, who may be more able to generalize.

In terms of benefits of learner involvement, Panova and Lyster (2002) argue that uptake involving learner generated repair may contribute more to learner development. This may be explained by repair (rather than repetition) involving deeper understanding and abstraction as claimed by McLaughlin *et al* (1983), who argue that more proficient learners tend to process language at deeper levels than less proficient ones, whose shallower processing utilizes surface features of language more. Analogical reasoning may promote deeper processing via increased involvement, and Kurtz *et al* (2001) show that inducing mutual alignment via explicit comparison of two exemplars fosters transfer to new situations. Gentner *et al* (2003) show that analogical encoding can help novices transfer knowledge to new situations and can act to bootstrap knowledge, citing durable results over time. According to Gentner's structure-mapping theory, analogy involves alignment of relational structure which leads to knowledge change via abstraction.

In this presentation, a case is made for analogical corrective feedback in which the learner's attention is drawn to an analogical example to their erroneous utterance with the goal of fostering mutual analogical alignment. Learner-generated repair is then prompted. This alternative to recasts for exemplar-based corrective feedback is compared with recasts and metalinguistic feedback, all with prompting, in a quasi-experimental classroom study with a pretest, posttest, delayed posttest between-groups design. Tentative results indicating the advantages of analogical corrective feedback over recasts for subject-verb agreement are presented.

N.B.: My preference is for an oral presentation if possible. I would like my abstract to be evaluated for the usage-based approaches to SLA session but it could also conceivably fit into the main session.

References

Bernolet, S., Hartsuiker, R.J. and Pickering, M.J., 2013. From language-specific to shared syntactic representations: the influence of second language proficiency on syntactic sharing in bilinguals. Cognition, 127: 287-306.

Ellis, N.C., 2005. At the interface: How explicit knowledge affects implicit language learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27: 305-352.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S. and Erlam, R., 2006. Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28: 339-368.

Gentner, D., Loewenstein, J. and Thompson, L., 2003. Learning and transfer: a general role for analogical encoding. Journal of Educational Psychology, 95(2): 395–408.

Kim, Y. and McDonough, K., 2008. Learners' production of passives during syntactic priming activities. Applied Linguistics, 29(1): 149-154.

Kurtz, K.J., Chun-Hui, M. and Gentner, D., 2001. Learning by analogical bootstrapping. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 10(4): 417-446.

McLaughlin, B., Rossman, T. and McLeod, B., 1983. Second language learning: an information-processing perspective. Language Learning: a Journal of Applied Linguistics, 33(2): 135-158.

Panova, L. and Lyster, R., 2002. Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 36: 573-595.

Sheen, Y., 2007. The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. TESOL Quarterly, 41(2): 256-283.