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Motivation for my research

• Long’s interaction hypothesis
  – Long (1996) argued for the effective role of negative feedback by stating,
  – “Negative feedback obtained during negotiation work or elsewhere may be facilitative of L2 development, at least for vocabulary, morphology, and language-specific syntax, and essential for learning certain specifiable L1-L2 contrasts” (p. 414).

• Recasts: one of such negative feedback
  – defined as “utterances that repeat a learner’s incorrect utterance, making only the changes necessary to produce a correct utterance, without changing the meaning” (Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada, 2001, pp. 732-733).
Recasts

• Recasts have dual roles as they provide positive as well as negative evidence.
  – “models of what is grammatical and acceptable (not necessarily the same) in the L2”
  – “information about what is ungrammatical” (Long, 1996, p. 413)

• Examples of recasts
    • Learner: His mother angry. [an erroneous utterance]
    • Researcher: *His mother is angry*? [a recast]
  – From Sakai (2011)
    • Researcher: What did he do at four in the evening?
    • Learner: He shaked the bottle. [an erroneous utterance]
    • Researcher: *He shook the bottle*? [a recast]
    • Learner: Yes.
Previous Studies on Recasts

• Recasts
  – the most frequent negative feedback type (e.g., Doughty, 1994, Lyster, 1998a, 1998b; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Nassaji, 2007; Oliver, 1995; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Roberts, 1995; Van den Branden, 1997)
    • Existence Issue
  – effective for L2 learning (e.g., Ayoun, 2001; Carroll & Swain, 1993; Doughty & Varela, 1998; Ellis, 2007; Han, 2002; Ishida, 2004; Iwashita, 2003; Loewen & Nabei, 2007; Long, Inagaki, & Ortega, 1998; Mackey, 1995, 1999; Mackey & Philp, 1998; for a meta-analysis, see Mackey & Goo, 2007)
    • Utilization Issue
Characteristics of Recasts

• Recasts do not interrupt the flow of communication (Long, 2007; Long, Inagaki, & Ortega, 1998)
  – For communication-oriented teaching methods
  – Recasts can provide positive evidence.
  – Recasts can provide negative evidence.

• Ambiguity
  – Lyster (1998a)
    • Recasts are ambiguous as negative feedback because recasts and non-corrective repetition, that is to say, repetition of learners’ correct utterances, are difficult to distinguish from each other.
  – Noticing Issue
Previous Studies on Recasts

• L2 learners do notice the corrective nature of recasts (Long, 1996)
  – As indirect evidence, research has shown that L2 learners respond to recasts and non-corrective repetitions differently (e.g., Doughty, 1994; for a review of L1 studies, see Long, 1996).
    • Doughty (1994)
      • L2 learners of French imitated recasts more frequently than the non-corrective repetition (21.5% vs 2.3%).
  – However, it has been pointed out that differing responses to recasts and non-corrective repetitions do not always imply that L2 learners perceive recasts as negative feedback (e.g., Mackey & Philp, 1998).
L2 Learners’ Interpretations of Recasts

• Recently, a more direct introspective technique (i.e., stimulated recall) has been employed in order to elicit noticing data from the learners (Egi, 2007a, 2007b; Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000; Nabei & Swain, 2002; Roberts, 1995).
Egi (2007) investigated the relationship between L2 learners’ interpretation of recasts and factors such as linguistic targets, recast length, and number of changes.

Participants: 49 learners of Japanese
- 31 participants: immediate recall
- 18 participants: stimulated recall

Categories for verbal reports
- (a) responses to content
- (b) negative evidence
- (c) positive evidence
- (d) negative and positive evidence
Egi (2007)

- **Negative evidence**
  - “comments indicating that the learner was aware of error production or correction without a clear indication that the learner noticed the targetlike form provided in the recast” (p. 524)

- **Results**
  - Of the 476 morphosyntactactic feedback episodes
    - Responses to content (21.22%)
    - Negative evidence (34.03%)
    - Positive evidence (18.70%)
    - Negative and positive evidence (26.05%)
  - Of the 77 lexical feedback episodes
    - Responses to content (18.18%)
    - Negative evidence (33.77%)
    - Positive evidence (18.18%)
    - Negative and positive evidence (29.87%).
Noticing Types

- Noticing Types (Doughty & Williams, 1998, p. 228; Swain, 1998, p. 66)
  - (a) noticing a form in the input
  - (b) noticing one’s interlanguage deficiencies (or a hole)
  - (c) noticing the gap between the interlanguage and the target language

  - The output hypothesis
  - “the activity of producing the target language may prompt second language learners to consciously recognize some of their linguistic problems” (1995, p. 126)
  - Noticing a hole
Functions of Recasts

• Noticing a hole
  – L: He shaked the bottle.
    • “What is the past tense of shake? Shaked may be wrong, but …”
  – R: He shook the bottle? [a recast]
    • “Oh, the past tense form is shook.”

• Recasts provide positive evidence only because the learner already knows that the utterance is not correct.
  – Egi (2007)
    • Negative evidence: “I had no idea how to say this verb, so I just said hayai [“fast”], which turned out to be wrong, and then you told me how to say ‘hurry,’ isoide” (p. 524).
    • At the time of production, this learner noticed his or her error.

• When do L2 learners notice errors?
  – At the time of production
  – At the time of receiving a recast
Interpretations of Recasts

  – Various errors

  – Irregular past forms
Sakai (2011)

• How do L2 learners interpret recasts for the learning of morphology?

• Participants: 20 university students
  – the recast group \( (n = 10) \)
  – the no-feedback group \( (n = 10) \)

• Data: Introspective verbal reports
  – A stimulated recall
Sakai (2011)

- The target structure:
  - irregular past tense forms
    - *drink, feed, beat, cast, strike, draw, swing, bite, shake, and fight*
  - overgeneralized forms (*shaked*) vs the appropriate forms (*shook*)
  - In order to investigate whether recasts provide negative evidence for the learner, it is necessary to create a condition in which the learner will produce interlanguage forms different from the targetlike forms.
    - For example, an L2 learner produces *drinked* as the past form of the verb *drink* and is provided with a recast including the targetlike form *drank*. This case may enable researchers to examine whether the learner will not only notice the correct form *drank*, but also recognize that the overgeneralized form *drinked* is not acceptable.
Sakai (2011)

• Pretest:
  – a story-making task
  – What did Yuki do?
  – A chart (a time line from 8:00 to 22:00) & 10 small picture cards that depicted the actions of the target verbs
  – They were told to shuffle the picture cards and to place each card into a time slot on the chart with the card faces down. Then, they were allowed to turn the cards over. They were told to narrate in English what Yuki (a female character) did yesterday.
  – The planning time of 1 minute was given, during which they were not allowed to make written notes.
Sakai (2011)

• Treatment task:
  – an information gap task (Ken’s Story)
  – A timeline and ten small picture cards
  – First, they were told to shuffle the picture cards and place them on the chart. Then, they were instructed to turn the cards over.
  – The researcher held the same set of ten picture cards and the time chart and asked the participants, “What did Ken do at ten in the morning?” so that the cards could be placed in the same order as on the participants’ chart.
Sakai (2011)

• The Recast Group
  Yusuke:  *He ... he swunged the bat.* [erroneous]
  Researcher:  *Ah, he swung a bat?*  [a recast]
  Yusuke:  Yes.

• The No-Feedback Group
  Kaori:  *He shaked a bottle.*  [erroneous]
  Researcher:  *Um. OK. I got it.*
Table 2

**Procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Recast group</th>
<th>No-Feedback group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>- Consent form</td>
<td>- Consent form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1 (pretest)</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>- Yuki’s Story</td>
<td>- Yuki’s Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 (treatment task)</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>- Ken’s Story</td>
<td>- Ken’s Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>received recasts or</td>
<td>received no feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-corrective repetition</td>
<td>but received some positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>encouragement like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Yes” and “OK.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3(^a)</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>- Yuki’s Story</td>
<td>- Yuki’s Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal reports</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>- Stimulated recall</td>
<td>- Stimulated recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>- Exit questionnaire</td>
<td>- Exit Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The results of Task 3 are not reported in the current study (see Note 1).
Table 3

**Coding Categories for Verbal Protocols**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Noticing Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Noticing a hole</td>
<td>- make comments about what they cannot express or what they only partially know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Noticing a gap at the moment of production</td>
<td>- notice errors in their utterance, or that their utterance is wrong, at the moment of speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>Noticing a gap through a recast</td>
<td>- notice errors, or that their utterance is wrong, by receiving a recast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnoticing</td>
<td>Noticing at the interview / No report</td>
<td>- notice errors, or that their utterance is wrong, at the moment of the verbal report, or fail to make a report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 4**

*Distribution of Each Category for the Past Tense Forms in Task 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recast Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>No-Feedback Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(48.5%)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(48.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(37.9%)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(41.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misformation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(13.6%)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* For the recast group, the number in the category *Other* was 20 out of 132 (3 for Correct, 14 for Incorrect, and 3 for Misformation).
Figure 1. Distributions of noticing types by groups.
Sakai (2011)

### Table 5

**Distribution of Noticing Types by Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Report</th>
<th>Recast Group</th>
<th>No-Feedback Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Mis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recast</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unnoticing</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mis = Misformation.

misformation (overgeneralized form)

Recast group: 6 out of 15 $\rightarrow$ negative evidence
No-Feedback group: 0 out of 16

Figure 1. Distributions of noticing types by groups.
Sakai (2011)

• Recasts
  – The results suggest that recasts are effective in drawing L2 learners’ attention to otherwise nonsalient forms and in informing L2 learners that overgeneralized forms such as **shaked** and **fighted** are ungrammatical in the target language.

• Output
  – The results suggest that L2 learners may notice what they cannot express in the target language.
Previous Studies

• Existence
  – Frequent feedback type

• Noticing
  – Indirect: yes
    • Uptake
  – Direct: yes
    • Noticing of recasts
    • Interpretations of recasts (Egi, 2007; Sakai, 2011)

• Utilization
  – As positive evidence: yes
    • L2 learners may learn correct forms or structures through recasts.
  – As negative evidence: unknown
    • Do L2 learners learn through recasts that some forms/structures are ungrammatical?
      – Decrease of interlanguage forms
      – Improvement of grammaticality judgment tests or elicited imitation tests with ungrammatical items
Sakai, H. (unpublished). Do recasts provide second language learners with negative evidence?

• Research questions:
  – Are recasts effective for narrowing overgeneralized rules in an L2, and
  – if so, how do recasts work?
    • 5 specific research questions and hypotheses
Theories to be Tested

• the direct contrast hypothesis (Saxton, 1997, 2000)
  – the juxtaposition of the learner utterance and the recast → negative evidence

• the additional input hypothesis (Gass, 1997; Gass & Mackey, 2007; Long, 1996, 2007)
  – the juxtaposition of the learner utterance and the recast → evidence
  – further input after the provision of negative evidence

• the enhanced salience hypothesis (Leeman, 2003)
  – the juxtaposition of the learner utterance and the recast → enhanced salience
Participants

• 75 Japanese university students learning English.
• randomly assigned to four treatment groups:
  – the Recast Group (REC Group) \((n = 20)\)
  – the Non-Contingent Positive Evidence Group (POS Group)--- as a comparison group \((n = 20)\)
  – the Recast Plus Additional Input Group (REC+ Group) \((n = 16)\)
  – the Input with Enhanced Salience Group (SAL Group) \((n = 19)\)
Research design

• A pretest, posttest, and delayed-posttest design
  – the independent variable: the treatment conditions (four groups, including a comparison group)
  – the dependent variable: the test scores regarding ungrammaticality
    • three testing tasks (oral production, elicited imitation, and grammaticality judgment).
• Session 1
  – were provided with the explanation about the study and asked to sign the consent form
  – answered the background questionnaire
  – took the CELT test (structure section)
  – the pretest.
• Session 2 (1 week later)
  – were provided the treatment
  – took the immediate posttest.
• Session 3 (1 month later)
  – took the delayed-posttest
  – took the meta-language test
  – completed the exit questionnaire
• After Session 3
  – filled in the follow-up questionnaire
Target structures

• Adjective ordering rules: size-color-noun
  – Japanese:
    • *akai–ookina–hon (red-large-book)
    • *ookina–akai–hon (large-red-book), while only the former sequence, *a red large book, is permitted in English (p. 121)
  – English:
    • *a red large book
    • a large red book

• The main criteria for selecting the target structures
  – (a) Japanese learners of English face a learnability problem regarding the structures
  – (b) they make persistent errors when producing or comprehending the structures
  – (c) the structures are within the L2 learners’ processing capabilities
Instrumentation

• To measure the participants’ learning the ungrammaticality of the overgeneralized rules

• Three testing tasks:
  – untimed grammaticality judgment tests
    • 10 tokes for the structure (5 grammatical items & 5 ungrammatical items)
  – oral production tests
    • ADJ: a spot-the-difference task / 8 tokens
  – elicited imitation tests
    • 10 tokens for the structure (5 grammatical items & 5 ungrammatical items)

• The order:
  – oral production → elicited imitation → untimed grammaticality judgment tests
Treatment

• The REC and REC+ Group
• During the treatment tasks, the participants received recasts and non-corrective repetitions in the form of confirmation checks: In other words, I repeated every grammatical utterance or reformulate every erroneous utterance

Learner: This is a *big white bag*. [grammatical]
Researcher: This is a *big white bag*? [non-corrective repetition]
[The researcher will identify the picture.]
Learner: There is a *black short T-shirt*. [erroneous]
Researcher: There is a *short black T-shirt*? [recast]
[The researcher will identify the picture.]
Treatment

• The POS and SAL Groups
  • the non-provision of feedback in the form of non-corrective repetition or recasts.

Learner: This is a big white bag. [grammatical]
Researcher: OK. [The researcher will identify the picture.]
Learner: There is a girl with a black short T-shirt. [erroneous]
Researcher: I see. [The researcher will identify the picture.]

• The SAL Group:
  – The target structures were provided with the enhanced salience by stress and intonation.
Procedure

• REC Group
  – Object placement task (input, 5 tokens) → Picture description task (output with recasts & non-corrective repetition, at most 5 opportunities)

• POS Group
  – Object placement task (input, 5 tokens) → Picture identification task (input, 5 tokens) → Picture description task (output, 5 tokens)

• REC+ Group
  – → Picture description task (output with recasts & non-corrective repetition, at most 5 opportunities) --> Object placement task (input, 5 tokens)

• SAL Group
  – Object placement task (input with enhanced salience, 5 tokens) → Picture identification task (input with enhanced salience, 5 tokens) → Picture description task (output, 5 tokens)
Results: Is exposure to non-contingent positive evidence alone effective? (RQ 1)

• For adjective ordering
  – The POS Group did not perform better or worse on the adjective ordering posttests or the delayed posttests of the three measures.
Results: Adjective ordering rules (GJT)

1. Did the POS Group change between the tests?

A Friedman test:
\[ \chi^2(2) = 2.393, \ p = .302 \]

*Figure 4*. Mean scores of incorrect acceptance of ungrammatical items (color-size) on the grammaticality judgment tests.
**Results: Individual analysis for adjective ordering rules (GJT)**

Table 21. *Individual Analysis of Performance on the Grammaticality Judgment Tests (Adjective Ordering)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Pretest UNGRAM</th>
<th>Pretest GRAM</th>
<th>Posttest UNGRAM</th>
<th>Posttest GRAM</th>
<th>Delayed posttest UNGRAM</th>
<th>Delayed posttest GRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion: RQ 1

- RQ 1: Is exposure to non-contingent positive evidence alone effective?
- H 1: It is hypothesized that the POS Group will not gain from the pretest to the posttests. (supported)

- The present study indicated that exposure to positive evidence did not help L2 learners learn the ungrammaticality of the color-size.
- In the present study, the POS Group was provided with five instances of the target structures in the communicative tasks. Thus, the findings suggest that positive evidence, or at least five tokens of the target structures, do not work as indirect negative evidence.
Results: RQ 2 to RQ 5

• RQ 2 to RQ 5
  – concern the three theoretical hypotheses concerning the mechanisms of recasts as negative evidence: the direct contrast hypothesis, the additional input hypothesis, and the enhanced saliency hypothesis.
Results: Adjective ordering rules (oral production)

2. Did the groups differ in the changes between the tests?

(1) Period 1 (pre to post): $\chi^2(3) = 4.241, p = .237$

(2) Period 2 (pre to delayed): $\chi^2(3) = 4.069, p = .254$

(3) Period 3 (post to delayed): $\chi^2(3) = 2.832, p = .418$

Figure 1. Mean frequencies of incorrect adjective order on the oral production tests.
Results: Adjective ordering rules (elicited imitation)

Did the groups differ in the changes between the tests?

(1) Period 1 (pre to post): $\chi^2(3) = 2.350, \ p = .503$

(2) Period 2 (pre to delayed): $\chi^2(3) = 0.323, \ p = .956$

(3) Period 3 (post to delayed): $\chi^2(2) = 2.870, \ p = .412$

*Figure 3.* Mean scores of incorrect acceptance of ungrammatical items (color-size) on the elicited imitation tests.
Results: Adjective ordering rules (GJT)

Did the groups differ in the changes between the tests?
(1) Period 1 (pre to post): $\chi^2(3) = 4.161$, $p = .245$
   REC $>$ POS ($r = .319$)
(2) Period 2 (pre to delayed): $\chi^2(3) = 8.996$, $p = .029$
   REC $>$ POS ($r = .326$)
   REC+ $>$ POS ($r = .315$)
   REC $>$ SAL ($r = .368$)
   REC+ $>$ SAL ($r = .356$)
(3) Period 3 (post to delayed): $\chi^2(3) = 2.709$, $p = .439$

**Figure 4.** Mean scores of incorrect acceptance of ungrammatical items (color-size) on the grammaticality judgment tests.
Results

• No statistically significant differences among the four groups
  – On oral production tests
  – On elicited imitation tests.

• Grammaticality judgment tests
  – Medium effect sizes
    • Period 1 (from the pretest to the posttest): REC > POS
    • Period 2 (from the pretest to the delayed posttest): REC, REC+ > POS, SAL
Discussion: RQ 2

- RQ 2: Is exposure to input with recasts (juxtaposed with learner utterances) more effective than exposure to non-contingent positive evidence (not juxtaposed with learner utterances)?
- H 2: The REC Group will perform better than the POS Group. (partially supported)
  - Adjective ordering (Grammaticalinity Judgment Tests)
    - Partial support for the direct contrast hypothesis
Discussion: RQ 3

• RQ 3: Is exposure to input with both recasts and additional subsequent input more effective than exposure to input with recasts?)

• H 3: The REC+ Group will perform better than the REC Group. (not clearly supported)

• The provision of recasts in the REC and REC+ Groups was effective at least for the adjective ordering grammaticality judgment tests.

• Additional input might not be necessary for L2 learners to retreat from the overgeneralized rules due to L1.
Discussion: The Direct Contrast Hypothesis & The Additional Input Hypothesis (RQ 2 and RQ 3)

• The direct contrast hypothesis:
  – Partially supported for adjective ordering (GJT)
• The additional input hypothesis:
  – not clearly supported
• These findings implied that juxtaposition might be a sufficient condition for learning the ungrammaticality of the overgeneralized rules and that additional input provided after the provision of recasts might not be necessary, even though additional input might facilitate learning.

• Frequencies of the target structures
• The timing of the provision of further positive evidence
Discussion: RQ 4

• RQ 4: Is exposure to input with enhanced salience of positive evidence (without negative evidence) more effective than exposure to input with unenhanced positive evidence (non-contingent positive evidence)?
• H4: The SAL Group will perform better than the POS Group. (not supported)

• These findings suggest that enhanced salience was not effective for L2 learners to learn the ungrammaticality of the overgeneralized rules about adjective ordering like positive evidence.
Discussion: RQ 5

• RQ 5: Does exposure to input with recasts differ from exposure to input with enhanced salience of positive evidence?
• H 5: No differences will be found between the REC and SAL Groups. (not supported)

• The findings of this study suggest that differences might have existed between the REC and SAL Groups at least for adjective ordering.
  – Grammaticality judgment test (Period 3: pretest to the delayed posttest)
  – REC > SAL (medium effect size)

• The findings related to the fourth and fifth research questions/hypotheses suggest that Leeman’s (2003) claim that negative evidence might be unnecessary for L2 learning must be considered to be limited to the learning of non-salient forms.
Discussion: The mechanisms underlying recasts

Table 36. *Examination of the Three Hypotheses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Contrast Hypothesis</td>
<td>Contingency and juxtaposition</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Input Hypothesis</td>
<td>Additional input</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Saliency Hypothesis</td>
<td>Enhanced saliency</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sakai (unpublished): Conclusion

- Two general research questions:
  - “Are recasts effective for narrowing overgeneralized rules in an L2?” and
  - “If so, how do recasts work?”

- The answer obtained through the study:
  - Recasts are effective for narrowing some overgeneralized L2 rules.
  - The nature of contingency and juxtaposition might be necessary conditions for recasts to provide L2 learners with negative evidence and facilitate L2 learners’ retreat from overgeneralized rules due to L1.
  - In other words, this study lent partial support (i.e., for adjective ordering) for the direct contrast hypothesis (Saxton, 1997, 2000) as a mechanism underlying recasts.
MERRIER Approach

How to provide comprehensible and communicative input for your students

1. Model/Mime: Use extra-linguistic information (e.g., visual aids, gestures).
2. Example: Give examples.
3. Redundancy: Paraphrase difficult sentences.
4. Repetition: Repeat important information.
5. Interaction: Interact with your students to enhance their involvement.
6. Expansion: Repeat and expand what your student said (i.e., feedback).
7. Reward: Praise and encourage your students.
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