



Analogy-based CF or Metalinguistic Feedback: Which One Is Better in EFL Classrooms?

Hosein Masjedi

Payam noor University of Esfahan (isfpnu), Iran, masjedi.hosein@yahoo.com

Seyyed Parsa Tabatabaei

Payam noor University of Esfahan (isfpnu), Iran, parsatabatabaei08@gmail.com

The present study investigated the comparison between effectiveness of recast plus explicit correction that can be called analogy-based corrective feedback (CF) and metalinguistic feedback on mastering the target structures of Iranian EFL learners at elementary level. In order to get the results, the participants were divided into three groups namely as two experimental groups who had a special kind of treatment, and one control group as no feedback group. The participants within the experimental group had either recasts or explicit correction as analogy-based CF as error-correction strategy on errors; the other received the other types of feedbacks that is metalinguistic feedback during 8 sessions of teacher-learner interaction with 45 young EFL learners. The data gathering instruments were a homogeneity test, a pretest in grammar and a posttest in grammar. The results in the effectiveness of the programs revealed that analogy-based CF group outperformed in terms of grammar learning to those of metalinguistic feedback and the control group. Results of the present study may have implications for teachers as well as learners that instead of traditional methods of CF, use analogy-based corrective feedback in grammar classrooms.

Keywords: analogy-based, corrective feedback, grammar learning, metalinguistic feedback, EFL learners, EFL classrooms

INTRODUCTION

As it is axiomatic, "the classroom is the crucible – the place where teachers and learners come together and language learning, we hope, happens" (Allwright & Bailey, 1991, p. 18). English classrooms are complicated places where everybody can observe lots of interactions among learners and teacher. Within classrooms as social environments (Tudor, 2001) with typically one instructor and a number of students, negotiation of meaning and form to gain acquisition is of primary importance. As a matter of fact,

Citation: Masjedi, H., & Tabatabaei, S. P. (2019). Analogy-based CF or Metalinguistic Feedback: Which One Is Better in EFL Classrooms?. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(3), 513-528. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12331a>

classrooms settings contain both errors on students' turns and correction of errors in the form of feedback by teachers, especially in communicative-oriented contexts.

Simultaneous with the history of error treatment, from the survey of various approaches and methods in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research, the history of interaction in meaning-focused instructions gained significant importance in learning second language (L2).

During the middle of the previous century, with the rise of behaviorism, errors were considered as bad habits that students should be corrected promptly when committing such errors in order to prevent their re-occurrence. Nevertheless, with the emergence of generative grammarians in 1957, Chomsky (1959) criticized structural linguistics and demonstrated that the linguistics is unable to account for and explain the human beings' fundamental feature of creativity. Then, there was no need of fearing students' errors anymore; rather, it was felt that they should be formulated, tested, hypothesized, and revised based on the received feedback. Given that, students would play a much more active role in the classroom than they did earlier (Schmitt, 2002).

With the shift of attention moving towards a more communicative approach to language teaching and learning, views on error-treatment changed once more again. Those who were the proponents of communicative approach gave more prominence to the fluency rather than the accuracy; for this reason, the students' errors have been neglected more and more, and they have been tolerated unless they block and prevent comprehension. Furthermore, in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research, the history of interaction in meaning-focused instructions gained significant importance in second language (L2) learning, especially with the emergence of Long's (1996) well-known *interaction hypothesis*. The hypothesis claims when L2 learners interact with each other or with native speakers, they try to use a series of interactional techniques and adjustments to make the communication comprehensible and to negotiate the meaning (Gass & Selinker, 2008; Schmitt, 2002) through comprehension checks, confirmation checks and repetition. In two versions of interaction hypothesis (early and later versions), Long simply postulates a role for comprehensible input but in the later version, he was more faithful to the earlier work of Hatch in that he acknowledged that interaction can facilitate acquisition by assisting learners' L2 production. The later version of the hypothesis has also been closely associated with another construct- *focus on form* (Ellis, 2008) as a basis for attention to the linguistic forms within meaning-oriented activities (Long, 1991). Focus on form is different from traditional form-focused instruction that was common in non-communicative activities where learners pay more attention to specific linguistic forms (Long, 1991); they are not polar opposites in the way that form and meaning have been considered to be (Doughty & Williams, 1998).

In form-focused instruction, various terms came to scene, especially with continues studies of Lyster and Ranta (1997) on error-correction. The terms represented the error-correction strategies such as explicit correction, recasts, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, repetition, and elicitation. With the integration of these strategies, again some extra terms such as input-providing, output-prompting, prompt,

exemplar-based, rule-based and analogy-based CFs were introduced by scholars (Leeman, 2007; Ellis, 2008). One of the key-terms that attracted the attention of the researchers of this study was analogy-based CF. As Thomas (2018, p. 1) states "analogy-based CF provides a structurally similar synonymous example to an erroneous learner utterance where that form is corrected and also includes a prompt for learner revision". It is an amalgamation of recast in addition to explicit correction, whereas in metalinguistic clues, teacher informs the learner in an implicit manner through comments or questions to correct the ill-formed utterance (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Although various types of feedback has been studied from the heydays of error treatment to the present by different researchers (Lyster, 2004; Yang & Lyster, 2010; Takahashi, 2014; Thomas, 2018), actually, there are still some aspects of different feedback types such as analogy-based CF and metalinguistic feedback in young EFL learners' classes which have been neglected to a large extent. This very study explored the effectiveness of these two types of CF on grammatical gains of young EFL learners.

Focus on form is a vast and expanding area of enquiry (Gerzic, 2005). Pouresmaiel and Gholami (2014) point out that:

Focus on form is a method of teaching which gives the primary attention to meaning in a communicative environment but occasionally shifts attention from meaning to form. This shift of attention is done when learners are not able to continue transferring their message because of some linguistic problems; Hence, it is in the form of corrective feedback (p. 3).

The term focus on form is classified into two basic types: planned instructional activities and incidental instructional activities. They are different in the kind of explicit or implicit design aimed at inducing learners to pay attention to linguistic forms in the course of instruction (Long, 1991). Based on these two basic types, Long (1991) made the distinction between focus on form and focus on forms. Focus on forms, is concerned an integrated kind of instruction whose main purpose is teaching discrete grammar points based on synthetic syllabus. In this syllabus the methodological sequence or the well-known 'PPP' method is of the main focus (Long, 1991).

In the aforementioned sequence linguistic features are preselected previously and provided with conscious awareness by teacher or by students, and then presented, followed by controlled practice, and free production at the final step. However, focus on form is more evident in communicative methodology (Gerzic, 2005). In this method, learners are prepared to employ activities used in natural settings like out of classroom (Celce-Murcia, 1991). Language is viewed more than a chain of grammatical drills and word memorization (Richards & Rodgers, 2003). The goal is to train skilled learners' functioning independently of their teachers (Van Patten & Benatiby, 2010). Errors are considered as a natural and inseparable part of language learning, but they should be detected and corrected as early as possible (Sibata, 1983). Students are encouraged to practice language with one another and to detect each other's error with their teacher's guidance (Gerzic, 2005) in which the role of teacher is not to control students. Instead, he/she can provide learners with comprehensible input containing information related to real-language models to the learners and focus on the linguistic features being studied.

In fact, there is a little amount of control but the aim is that the learners gain confidence to use language in natural settings (Canale & Swain, 1980). Incidental instructional activities or focus on form, as defined by Long (1991) arise incidentally whose focus is on meaning or communication. The concept of focus on form is assumed to take place interactionally during communicative-oriented activities (Van Patten, 1990). The main assumption is that despite focus on meaning, the learners are looking for occasions in which to choose focus on form incidentally (Gerzic, 2005).

Focus on form can occur in two types: learner-initiated preemptive focus on form, and teacher-initiated focus on form. In the former, learner felt a gap in his/her linguistic knowledge and ask question about the problem from the teacher to bridge the gap. In teacher-initiated preemptive focus on form the teacher predict the problem before an error occurs, and explain the problem to the learners in order to aware them from the error implicitly.

Corrective focus on form which is explored in the present study has different labels and names: Error correction, negative evidence and corrective feedback (Long, 1996). It occurs when learners pay attention to their produced errors in meaning-focused contexts. Also it occurs when teacher gives explicit negative feedback to correct errors with particular form. CF is regarded as a vital part of form focused instruction when the teacher tries to reaction against the learners' committed errors. When the teacher responses to the students orally, it is regarded as "Oral CF" (Gooch, Saito & Lyster, 2017). There is bulk of research investigating the CF types to bold the effectiveness of one type over the others within the processes of SLA (they mostly have focused on recasts versus prompts). In the current study recasts and explicit feedback were equated with analogy-based CF. in addition, the other strategy used was metalinguistic feedback.

Analogy-based CF provides a structurally similar synonymous example to an erroneous learner utterance where that form is corrected and also includes a prompt for learner revision (Thomas, 2018). In this type of CF, the instructor prepares a repair prompt and this repair pushes the student to find and fix their error. The main advantage of analogy-based CF is the fact that it presents an example with the correct form and synonymous lexical items. This strategy of CF "requires learners to compare the syntactic structure in the erroneous and analogous sentences to discover the source of the error, thereby promoting deeper processing of the positive evidence" (Thomas, 2018, p.2).

On the other side of coin, there was another strategy that falls under the category of rule-based CF (i.e.) metalinguistic feedback, which is explicitly corrective in nature. It provides explicit negative evidence of an ill-formed utterance and a rule governing usage (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In terms of the first category, some studies have studied recasts and explicit correction under the category of analogy-based CF from different angles, but their effectiveness is still fraught with uncertainty (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Erlam & Loewen, 2010; Mackey & Oliver, 2002; Morris, 2002; Loewen & Nabei, 2007; Rassaei, 2015; Varnosfadrani & Basturkmen, 2009).

In a study of 22 child ESL learners participated in three session information gap tasks, Mackey and Oliver (2002) could find that interactional corrective feedback may be profitable for the children in comparison with those observed with Mackey and Philp's (1998) finding on adults in the same context. Also they concluded that the effect of corrective feedback was more immediate on children than the adults. They considered that children are more sensitive to recasts due to the fact that recasts as implicit types of feedback expose alike function to the feedback provided by caregivers in acquiring children's first language. Also, in another study which is in line with that of Oliver (2000), and Mackey and Oliver (2002), Lyster and Satio (2010) in a meta-analysis of 15 classroom-based studies examined the pedagogical effectiveness of corrective feedback in relation to duration of studies, instructional settings, and age of learners in classroom setting. They found a negative linear relationship between the effects of corrective feedback and learners' age. They claimed that corrective feedback has effectual influence on young learners than the adult ones. On the other hand, the fresher the learners are, the more they profit from the feedback.

Morris (2002) in a comprehensive study, tried to explore the impact of different feedback types including recasts, repetition, explicit corrective feedback, recasts, clarification requests, confirmation checks, and repetition on learners' performance in the form of repair, as well as the relation of these CF types with special errors have been checked. The results of audio-recording of conversations more than half of the produced errors received corrective feedback.

Ellis, Leowen, and Erlam, (2006) tried to examine the effect of explicit and implicit types of feedback on learners' ability in developing English regular past tense. The results of delayed posttests indicated that metalinguistic feedback was superior to recasts or implicit corrective feedbacks because the explicit feedback that contains metalinguistic comments can help and support learners to develop implicit as well as explicit L2 knowledge.

Varnosfadrani and Basturkmen (2009) similar to Ellis, Leowen, and Erlam (2006) compared the effects of explicit corrective feedback and implicit correction in the form of recast on the grammatical difficulty of structures. The structures were coded as either early developmental or later developmental that the former is regarded as easy, and the latter is considered as difficult. They found that recasts were more effective than explicit feedback on difficult structures. They concluded that explicit corrective feedback support to learning easy structures and recasts were effective for learning difficult structures.

More recently, Elhami and Roshan (2016) designed a study to show whether two different types of recast that are full and partial ones given to third person "s" or simple past "ed" affected learners' performance of theses target forms. The 32 elementary-level participants of the study were categorized into two different groups and exposed to noticing getting tasks such as picture-description task. The classes were recorded in order to collect data from the teacher-learners moves after feedback in full and partial recasts. The results of Chi Square and Paired-Samples t-test approved the null

hypothesis and led the researchers to conclude that full and partial recast did not have statistically significant difference in simple past “ed” and the third person “s”.

Finally, Fu and Nassaji (2016) examined different variables such as teacher feedback, learner uptake and learner and teacher's attitudes towards feedback in an EFL context with Chinese adult learners. Lyster and Ranta's (1997) coding system with its well-known six types of feedback were used in order to transcribe and code ten hours of classroom interactions after videotaping. The reason was to identify feedback frequency and learner observational uptake. The researchers found extra feedback types except Lyster and Ranta's (1997) six feedback types. The extra feedbacks included delayed recasts, translation, asking a direct question, directing question to other students, re-asks, and using L1-English. The results of Fu and Nassaji's study was in contrast with some previously reported studies in ESL and EFL due to the differences in the distribution of some of the feedback types and learner's observational uptake. Some of the newly investigated feedback types led to noticeable uptake. Furthermore, there was a mismatch in the students' and teacher's perceptions in terms of perceiving the frequency of each feedback type.

From this brief overview of the literature and to the best knowledge of the researcher, there is no study to compare the effectiveness of analogy-based CF and metalinguistic feedback in young EFL learners' classrooms. Therefore, our knowledge of the effectiveness of these types of CF types is premature. Therefore, to provide us with more information about the effectiveness of analogy-based CF with metalinguistic feedback and to contribute to EFL teachers' understanding of the potential differential effects of those strategies on grammatical gains of young learners, the present study was an attempt to investigate the effectiveness of these two strategies in an EFL context. To this end, the following research question was formulated:

Is there any significant difference in the relative effects of analogy-based CF and metalinguistic feedback on young EFL learners' grammar learning?

Based on the research question, the following null hypothesis was formulated:

H0: There is no significant difference in the relative effects of analogy-based CF and metalinguistic feedback on young EFL learners' grammar learning.

METHOD

Design of the study

As it is axiomatic, in the big area of research, three types of quantitative research are commonly used: (1) questionnaire survey, (2) correlational research, and (3) experimental and quasi experimental research. In the present study, quasi-experimental research design was deemed to be the most appropriate research method to gain a deeper understanding of the effect of analogy-based CF and metalinguistic feedback on Iranian EFL learners' acquisition of special target forms. The design of the study was a quasi-experimental one, "a typical experimental study usually uses comparisons or control groups to investigate research questions" (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

Context and participants

For the purpose of this study, approximately 72 learners with an elementary level of proficiency studying at one private Language Institute in Isfahan, Iran were randomly selected as the participants of the study. The participants were male young learners ranging in age from 10 to 13 with Persian as their L1. The learners were homogenized at general language proficiency based on in-house placement test and the learners' previous achievements at the institute under study, to ensure the homogeneity, a proficiency test (YLE) was administrated to the young EFL learners. Furthermore, one of the researchers as experienced teacher was responsible for instructions of the classes because, the teacher was enough briefed about what and how to teach based on the classes he was teaching in.

Procedure

The present study was an attempt to investigate any possible effects of analogy-based CF and metalinguistic feedback on learners' grammatical gains in young classes. The grammatical points to be tapped in this study were the grammatical points such as yes/no questions, conditionals and prepositions that were covered at the textbook under study for the young EFL learners. Based on the content of the textbook and the grammar points covered during treatment, a pre-test was designed. The pre-test was in the form of multiple-choice with 40 items from the three grammatical rules that were covered in the treatment. The total score of pre-test was 20. Considering the important role of validity, the test had been expert-judged by three experts in the assessment board of the institute. The panel of experts reported acceptable validity. The reliability of the test was reported to be .84. In order to investigate any possible impacts of the two FFI options, the learners were divided into three groups randomly. Accordingly, there were two experimental groups and one control group. These three groups of learners were instructed by the researcher himself with more than 10 years of teaching.

As stated before, the participants of the current study were EFL learners from a private language institute in Iran, Isfahan who were homogenized by YLE within 60 minutes, the 72 young EFL learners of the study as participants had to complete the test. After scoring the results of proficiency test, 45 young EFL learners have been chosen as final participants of the study (15 students in each group) and they were divided into three groups of experimental and control groups. The experimental groups received either analogy-based CF or metalinguistic clue in correcting young learners' grammatical errors occurring during teacher-learner interactions. The participants in the control group, however, received feedback but not on the target grammars under study. In fact, the teacher ignored the learners' grammatical errors in yes/no questions, prepositions and conditionals. After homogenizing the learners, they were pre-tested by a grammar pre-test as explained above in an isolated session before treatment. The time limit for the pre-test was 60 minutes. The test piloted before the study by a limited number of the participants from the same population (young EFL learners with the same age range at elementary level) to remove some items from the tests or to add the other items based on the results of the pilot study.

The process for treatment in the groups under study was as follows:

In the analogy-base CF group, the instruction on the target structures was embedded into communicative tasks. The young learners engaged in communicating with each other, and the teacher carefully observed them and provided them with corrective feedback through analogy-based CF on errors in using the target structures. Corrective feedback through this type of feedback means that learners' errors on the grammatical points taught at the classroom were corrected by both recast and explicit correction. However, instead of correcting the form of the learner's erroneous utterance as an explicit correction or recast would do, analogy-based CF presents an example with the correct form and synonymous lexical items (Thomas, 2018). One example can clarify this sentence.

T: when does she go to the party?

S: when...she go afternoon.

T: almost, you could say: she writes a letter, now can you correct your sentence with your original words?"

S: she goes to the party in the afternoon.

T: yes it is true.

As a matter of fact, in this type of CF, the learner exposes to both positive and negative evidence and the strategy presents an example with the correct form via the model (almost, you could say: she writes a letter). Furthermore, the next statement (now can you correct your sentence with your original words?"'), as a requirement to make a repair, pushes the learner to produce correct form and as a result, uptake happens.

All of the tasks and instructions were the same for the metalinguistic feedback group except that the young learners' errors on the grammatical points were corrected by this type of CF that is linguistic in nature (Lyster, 2004). The following example from this group under study can visualize the classroom.

S: How old are your friend?

T: your friend is just one individual, then for subject-verb agreement you should use singular verb not the plural one...How old is not how old are your friend.

S: how old is

Finally, the teacher gave no feedback or control group corrected the young learners' errors in the target forms without any feedback types but in the form of focus on meaning that attracted the attention of the learner to the meaning not form. The following extract is example of interactive moves occurred in control group.

S: do your father go to work every day?

T: Ali you have one father, yes?

S: aha one father ...does your father ...?

It is worth mentioning that the treatment lasted for 8 sessions. After the treatments, the posttest in grammar was administrated to the learners based on the content of the textbook under study and the instructions that were given by the teachers.

Data analysis

To answer the research question that was about the existence of any significant difference in the relative effects of analogy-based CF and metalinguistic feedback on young EFL learners' grammar learning, a repeated measure ANOVA was run. The reason for running ANOVA was the including of three groups in the treatment.

FINDINGS

The null hypothesis claimed that there is no significant difference in the relative effects of analogy-based CF and metalinguistic feedback on young EFL learners' grammar learning. The numbers of the students (N), means (M) and standard deviations (SD) of scores in the use of target forms under study for each group in pretest are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of Groups in Pretest

Pretest	N	Minimum	Maximum	mean	SD	variance
Analogy-based CF	15	7.00	11.00	9.00	1.6	2.4
Metalinguistic	15	6.00	12.00	9.00	1.8	1.9
Control	15	8.00	11.00	9.25		2.3

As it is clear from the above Table, the means of groups are about to somehow the same at pre-test. Then it can be concluded that the learners are the same in special grammar forms before treatment. But, this is not enough for concluding about the homogeneity or heterogeneity of the groups. This study was a parametric test since the tests were in the form of interval scale or scores like pre-test of grammar which is in the form of interval data. Then, for parametric tests, some assumptions should be meet. One of the assumptions is that the data should be normally distributed. Table 2 shows test of normality of pre-test among groups.

Table 2
Tests of Normality for the Pretest

Pretest	Group name	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
	Analogy-based CF	.118	15	.200*	.959	15	.289
	Metalinguistic	.132	15	.193	.960	15	.308
	control	.151	15	.077	.936	15	.071

As the normality Table above reveals, the Sig value for analogy-based CF group is .289 and for metalinguistic group is .308 and finally for control group is .071. Since, the Sig values are more than 0.05, it indicates that there is no significant difference among three groups' scores before treatment. Therefore, it can be concluded that the data were

normally distributed. So, there is a need for running ANOVA to investigate the significance of the difference among the three groups in the pre-test. However, before running ANOVA, a test of homogeneity of variances, as an assumption needed to be used. The result is illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3
Test of Homogeneity of Variances at Pretest

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.269	2	51	.765

As Table 3 shows, since the p-value (.765) is higher than the alpha level (.05), the assumption of the homogeneity of variances is also met. Thus, ANOVA can be conducted on pretest scores. Table 4 shows the results of ANOVA on the pretest of grammar.

Table 4
Results of ANOVA for Pre-test

Pretest					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.622	2	1.811	.376	.688
Within Groups	418.867	57	4.815		
Total	422.489	59			

As Table 4 indicates, there was no significant difference among three groups' mean scores, $F(2, 57) = .376, p = .688 \geq 0.05$, therefore, it can be concluded that the groups were homogeneous regarding their writing performance at the beginning of the study. After conducting treatments to the learners under study during eight sessions of instruction, a post-test was administered to the learners. Table 5 reveals the descriptive statistics of posttest in grammar.

Table 5
Descriptive Statistics of Post-test

Posttest	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Analogy-based CF	15	11.00	19.00	15.00	1.9
Metalinguistic	15	11.00	14.00	12.5	2.3
Control	15	10.00	12.00	11.00	2.4

Table 5 reveals that the mean scores of the analogy-based CF group is 15.00 with the SD of 1.9 and the mean score of metalinguistic group is 12.5 with the SD of 2.3. Also, the mean of the control group is 11 with the SD of 2.4. As it is clear from Table 5, the means of the groups were slightly different. However, the differences among groups needed to be tested statistically; thus, the assumption of parametric test needed to be tested. As mentioned before, one of the assumptions is that the data should be normally distributed. Like the above-mentioned process for the pre-test, normality test was run to post-test scores. The results of normality for the post-test scores are represented in Table 6.

Table 6
Tests of Normality for Post-test Scores

	Group name	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Posttest	Analogy-based CF	.158	15	.056	.925	15	.067
	metalinguistic	.127	15	.200*	.942	15	.104
	control	.177	15	.071	.921	15	.061

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

As Table 6 shows the p-value for all groups based on Shapiro-Wilk values are more than alpha level (.05) so, it can be concluded that the data were normally distributed. In this regard, the parametric test of ANOVA can be conducted. But before running ANOVA, a test of homogeneity of variances needs to be used. The result is illustrated in Table 7.

Table 7
Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Posttest Scores

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.735	2	51	.187

As Table 7 indicates, the p-value (.187) is higher than the alpha level (.05), therefore, it can be concluded that the data is normally distributed in posttest, this also legitimizes the use of ANOVA on posttest scores (see Table 8).

Table 8
Results of ANOVA for Post-test Scores

Posttest					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	130.489	2	65.244	24.258	.000
Within Groups	234.000	57	2.690		
Total	364.489	59			

As Table 8 reflects, there was a significant difference between the mean scores of the three groups, $F(2, 57), 24.26, P = .000$. In order to know which group outperformed in grammar, a post hoc test was run. The results are demonstrated in Table 9.

Table 9
Multiple Comparisons of Tests

(I) Group name	(J) Group name	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Analogy-based	Metalinguistic	1.200*	.423	.016	.19	2.21
	control	2.933*	.423	.000	1.92	3.94
Metalinguistic	Analogy-based	-1.200*	.423	.016	-2.21	-.19
	control	1.733*	.423	.000	.72	2.74
control	Metalinguistic	-2.933*	.423	.000	-3.94	-1.92
	Analogy-based	-1.733*	.423	.000	-2.74	-.72

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The results in Table 9 show that there were significant differences among the mean scores of the control group and the other two groups. Moreover the mean difference between the metalinguistic and analogy-based was significant ($P= 0.016 \leq .05$). It revealed that analogy-based group outperformed the other groups. Then, the null hypothesis that claimed there is no significant difference in the relative effects of analogy-based CF and metalinguistic feedback on young EFL learners' grammar learning was rejected and the results showed that analogy-based CF group outperformed in terms of grammar learning to those of metalinguistic feedback and no feedback group.

DISCUSSION

As stated before, the aim of the present study was exploring the existence of any significant difference in analogy-based CF and metalinguistic feedback as well as no feedback group as control group in Iranian young EFL learners' classes. The results represented that among three groups under study, the analogy-based CF group outperformed in terms of grammar learning to those of metalinguistic feedback and no feedback group. One justification for the performance of analogy-based CF over the other two groups can be the presentation of both positive and negative evidences in one move that attracted the attention of the learner who produced the error and this integration caused the deep processing and learning happens.

In addition, the explicit or implicit nature of the feedbacks also seems to have a vital role in the findings of this study. With respect to the benefits of explicit CF, Ortega (2009, p. 75) stated that "when two or more implementations of negative feedback are compared, the more explicit one leads to larger gains". Ortega's claim mirrors the findings of the meta-analysis by Norris and Ortega (2000) concerning the superiority of explicit instructional treatments over more implicit ones (Spada & Tomita, 2010). There are some factors, according to Dabagh and Basturkmen (2005), which makes explicit corrective feedback bold over implicit one. The factors are as follows: (a) much more attention can be expected with explicit form of corrective feedback, (b) by implicit correction, the learners cannot understand their exact erroneous sentences and as a matter of fact, it is impossible for them to correct their committed errors, (c) by implicit corrective feedback learners cannot identify the issue that they have received feedback and they cannot get the prompt that they have to correct their erroneous sentences, and (d) correcting the learners' committed errors explicitly made some juxtapositions with inter-language they possess.

Regarding control group or no feedback group, the results of data analysis represented that the performance of no feedback group was lower than the other two experimental groups. The reason for this loss can be the age of the participants as young EFL learners. The young learners with the age range of 10-13 years old seemed to be unable to cover the implicit nature of focus on meaning in teaching and receiving meaning-based feedback to the formal errors. This is a hunch and its validity could be estimated using interviews from the learners. However, the impracticality of interview or even protocols such as stimulated recall and think-aloud protocols with the young learners of this study obliged the researcher not to use these tools for data gathering. This claim can be in

contrast with some studies (e.g. Shook, 1999) that showed that when learners engage in the top-down processing as a prerequisite for comprehension and focus on meaning, less noticing of specific forms occurs.

Also, Ellis (2016) claimed that "less proficient learners may struggle to engage in dual processing – comprehending the meaning of the text and consciously attending to linguistic form – and are likely to prioritize meaning over form" (p. 13). Finally, there is clear evidence that learners do notice the corrections they receive even in implicit types of corrective feedback (Egi, 2007), but to date there is little evidence to show a consistent direct effect of such noticing on acquisition (Mackey, 2006).

The findings of this very study showed that analogy-based CF group outperformed the metalinguistic group; at the same time, the performance of metalinguistic group was better than the group which received no feedback. These very findings are in line with some previously conducted studies (e.g. Ammar & Spada, 2006; Ellis, 2007; Lyster, 2004; Thoma, 2018). Given the design of this very study and its focus on some target forms such as yes/no questions, these findings can be added to other research which have been done to make clear the impact of analogy-based CF on various language forms and skills such as writing. Exploring the role of analogy-based CF on writing surely can remove the disadvantage and difficult nature of this method in oral classrooms and can decrease the "potential difficulty of spontaneously producing" Thomas, 2018, p.18).

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis, the results showed that analogy-based CF group was superior in grammar learning to metalinguistic clue group and control group. furthermore, although the metalinguistic group outperformed in grammar learning to that in no feedback group, actually its performance was not as significance as analogy-based CF group perhaps due to the fact that the teacher in this group mostly used feedbacks in the form of structural and direct and linguistic correction of errors that this syntactic nature of the feedback is unsuitable for the low age of the learners.

The present study was subject to some limitations which are going to be pointed out shortly in the following:

First of all, the groups were taught by one teacher with the low number of the students. Robust and more reliable results could be gained by using a large number of the participants with different teachers. Second, test items should be more than the number administered in this very study. Third, the findings of only one level of proficiency (i.e., elementary level that was considered in this research) cannot be generalized to other proficiency levels. Hence, the study calls for further research to examine the effect of different levels on the distribution of analogy-based CF which might result in disparate findings from the ones reported in the present research.

It is recommended that in future researchers try to examine the stability of findings over a long period (e.g., multiple years of academic performance) and in different subjects in ESP classes. Furthermore, not only is grammar development, but other sub-skills and

skills of academic achievement, like listening, writing, and reading also would be more generalizable to investigate how teachers apply focus on form techniques to correct errors.

Furthermore, a practice effect might have been shown in the tests, because they included only a limited number of target items. In future studies, increasing the number of test items in pretest and posttest and using delayed ones would certainly yield more robust results. The current study highlighted our understanding by considering effectiveness of corrective feedback's different types, its divergence positions, and different views about form-focused instruction. One of the obvious implications of the present study concerns the role of negative evidence as a part of reactive focus on form as well as the role of uptake in reaction to teachers' corrective feedback against non-target-like in order to help learners to gain greater linguistic accuracy. Teacher trainers can also instruct the teachers how to use focus on form options in teaching process and encourage them to draw more attention to analogy-based CF along with other focus on form interventions.

REFERENCES

- Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 543–574.
- Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114–138). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, 51, 1–46.
- Ellis, R. (2008, 2nd ed.). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ellis, R. (2016). Focus on form: A critical review. *Language Teaching Research*, 1–24.
- Gholami, J. & Aliyari, S. (2016). The impact of planned preemptive focus on form on Iranian EFL learners' essay writing ability, *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning, Learning*, DOI: 10.1080/22040552.2015.1135500.
- Gooch, R., Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2017). Effects of recasts and prompts on second Language pronunciation development: Teaching English /r/ to Korean adult EFL learners. *System*, 1-18.
- Hall, G. (2011). *Exploring English language teaching, language in action*. New York: Routledge.
- Hatch, E. (1978). Acquisition of syntax in a second language. In J. Richards (Ed.), *Understanding second and foreign language learning* (pp. 34-70). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

- Kamiya, N. (2015). The effectiveness of intensive and extensive recasts on L2 acquisition for implicit and explicit knowledge. *Linguistics and Education* 29, 59–72.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Loewen, S., & Nabei, T. (2007). Measuring the effects of oral corrective feedback on L2 knowledge. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 361–376). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult English L2 classroom: Characteristics explicitness, and effectiveness. *Modern Language Journal*, 90, 536–556
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126-141.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In C. Ritchie, T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition, vol. 2. Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York : Academic press.
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 26(3), 399–432.
- Lyster, R., & Izquierdo, J. (2009). Prompts versus recasts in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning*, 59, 453-498.
- Lyster, R. & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 269-300.
- 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. & K. Saito (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 32(2), 265–302.
- Lyster, R., K. Saito. & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46 (1), 1-40.
- Maftoon, P. & Kolahi, S. (2009). The impact of recasts on the syntactic accuracy of Iranian EFL university students' oral discourse. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2 (2), 160-178.
- Morris, F. A. (2002). Negotiation and recasts in relation to error types and learner repair. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(1), 395-404.

- Rassaei, E. (2015). Journal writing as a means of enhancing EFL learners' awareness and effectiveness of recasts. *Linguistics and Education*, 32, 118–130.
- Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2012). Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of /ɹ/ by Japanese learners of English. *Language Learning*, 62, 595-633.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback, language aptitude, and learner attitudes on the acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (ed.), 301–322.
- Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*. New York: Springer.
- Schmitt, N. (2002). *An introduction to applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Takahashi, N. (2014). Stressed intonation on recasts: Differential effects in comparison with prompts. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 4(2), 15-28.
- Thomas, K. E. (2018). Comparing explicit exemplar-based and rule-based corrective feedback: Introducing analogy-based corrective feedback. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102(2), 1-21.
- Trofimovich, P., A. Ammar & E. Gatbonton (2007). How effective are recasts? The role of attention, memory, and analytic ability. In A. Mackey (ed.), 171–195.
- Tudor, I. (2001). *The Dynamics of the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Varnosfadrani, A.D., & Basturkmen, H. (2009). The effectiveness of implicit and explicit error correction on learners' performance. *System*, 37(4), 82-98.
- Yang, Y & Lyster, L. (2010). Effects of form-focused practice and feedback on Chinese EFL learners' acquisition of regular and irregular past tense forms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 235– 263.