

INSIGHTS INTO LEARNING DYNAMICS: UNRAVELING IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

Garshasp Gholami

Faculty of Foreign Languages, University Language Centre, Isfahan University, Hezarjereeb, Isfahan, Iran

Abstract: This study delves into the nuanced realm of language learning dynamics by investigating the impacts of implicit and explicit corrective feedback. Through a systematic examination, we unravel the intricate processes underlying language acquisition, shedding light on the effectiveness of these feedback mechanisms. By employing a comparative approach, we elucidate the differential outcomes of implicit and explicit feedback, providing valuable insights into optimizing language learning strategies.

Keywords: Language learning, corrective feedback, implicit feedback, explicit feedback, learning dynamics, language acquisition, comparative analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Language acquisition is a complex and multifaceted process, influenced by a myriad of factors including feedback mechanisms employed during learning. Corrective feedback, in particular, plays a pivotal role in shaping learners' linguistic competence. Traditionally, corrective feedback has been classified into two main types: implicit and explicit. Implicit feedback involves subtle cues or indirect indications of error, whereas explicit feedback directly addresses and corrects errors.

Understanding the effectiveness of these feedback strategies is crucial for educators and learners alike, as it can inform the development of more efficient language learning methodologies. While previous research has explored the effects of corrective feedback, there remains a need for a comprehensive comparative analysis that delves into the nuances of implicit and explicit feedback mechanisms.

In this study, we embark on an exploration of learning dynamics by unraveling the impacts of implicit and explicit corrective feedback. Through a systematic examination, we seek to elucidate the underlying processes that govern language acquisition. By employing a comparative approach, we aim to discern the differential outcomes of implicit and explicit feedback, providing valuable insights into optimizing language learning strategies.

Published Date: - 05-12-2011

E-ISSN: 2229-3213

P-ISSN: 2229-3205

By shedding light on the intricate interplay between feedback mechanisms and learning outcomes, this research contributes to the broader understanding of language acquisition processes. Ultimately, our findings hold the potential to inform pedagogical practices and enhance the efficacy of language instruction.

METHOD

The study commenced with participant recruitment from diverse language learning programs, ensuring a varied representation of proficiency levels. Following informed consent, participants were randomly allocated to either the implicit or explicit feedback group. Each participant engaged in a series of language learning tasks designed to elicit errors, spanning writing, speaking, and comprehension exercises.

Throughout the tasks, the implicit feedback group received subtle cues or indirect indications of error, encouraging self-correction and reflection. In contrast, the explicit feedback group received direct, clear corrections addressing errors promptly. These feedback mechanisms aimed to simulate real-world learning scenarios while maintaining experimental control.

Data collection encompassed both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Quantitative analysis involved assessing accuracy rates, error frequencies, and self-reported perceptions of feedback effectiveness through statistical methods like t-tests and ANOVA. Qualitative data were collected through participant reflections, providing insights into their learning experiences and perceptions of feedback utility.

Upon data collection, rigorous analysis ensued. Quantitative findings were scrutinized to discern differences in performance between the implicit and explicit feedback groups. Qualitative data underwent thematic analysis to uncover recurring patterns and themes regarding feedback perception and learning outcomes.

Participant Selection:

We recruited a diverse group of language learners with varying proficiency levels to ensure representative samples. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two experimental conditions: implicit feedback group or explicit feedback group.

Experimental Design:

Each participant engaged in a series of language learning tasks designed to elicit errors. These tasks included writing prompts, speaking exercises, and comprehension activities. Throughout the tasks, participants received corrective feedback tailored to their assigned condition.

Implicit Feedback Group: Participants in this group received subtle cues or indirect indications of error during the tasks. Feedback was provided in a manner that encouraged self-correction and reflection.

Published Date: - 05-12-2011

E-ISSN: 2229-3213

P-ISSN: 2229-3205

Explicit Feedback Group: Participants in this group received direct, explicit correction of errors during the tasks. Feedback was clear and specific, aiming to address errors directly.

Data Collection:

We collected both qualitative and quantitative data to assess the effectiveness of implicit and explicit corrective feedback. Quantitative data included accuracy rates on language tasks, frequency of errors, and self-reported perceptions of feedback effectiveness. Qualitative data involved participant reflections on their learning experiences and perceptions of feedback utility.

Data Analysis:

Quantitative data were analyzed using statistical methods, including t-tests and ANOVA, to compare performance between the implicit and explicit feedback groups. Qualitative data were analyzed thematically to identify recurring patterns and themes related to feedback perception and learning outcomes.

Limitations:

It's important to acknowledge potential limitations of the study, such as the controlled laboratory setting, which may not fully capture real-world language learning environments. Additionally, the sample size and composition may impact the generalizability of findings.

RESULTS

Quantitative analysis revealed that participants in the explicit feedback group demonstrated significantly higher accuracy rates and lower error frequencies compared to those in the implicit feedback group across various language tasks ($p < 0.05$). Self-reported perceptions also indicated a preference for explicit feedback among participants, citing its clarity and effectiveness in error correction.

Qualitative analysis unveiled nuanced insights into participants' experiences with implicit and explicit feedback. While some participants in the implicit feedback group appreciated the opportunity for self-correction and autonomy, many expressed frustration with ambiguity and desired clearer guidance. In contrast, participants in the explicit feedback group appreciated the directness of corrections but noted potential drawbacks, such as dependency on the instructor for error identification.

DISCUSSION

The findings suggest that while implicit feedback may promote learner autonomy and reflection, it may be less effective in facilitating accurate error correction compared to explicit feedback. The clarity and directness of explicit feedback appear to enhance learning outcomes by providing learners with immediate guidance on error correction.

Published Date: - 05-12-2011

E-ISSN: 2229-3213

P-ISSN: 2229-3205

However, it's essential to consider the balance between autonomy and guidance in language learning. While explicit feedback may offer clear correction, it may also foster dependency on instructors for error identification, potentially hindering learners' ability to self-monitor and self-correct.

The study highlights the importance of tailoring feedback strategies to individual learner preferences and needs. While some learners may benefit from the autonomy afforded by implicit feedback, others may require the clarity and guidance provided by explicit feedback. Educators should consider incorporating a combination of both feedback types to cater to diverse learning styles and maximize learning outcomes.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study provides valuable insights into the impacts of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on language learning dynamics. While explicit feedback emerges as more effective in promoting accuracy and clarity in error correction, implicit feedback offers opportunities for learner autonomy and reflection.

Educators and language instructors should consider incorporating a balanced approach to feedback, taking into account the strengths and limitations of both implicit and explicit feedback strategies. By tailoring feedback mechanisms to individual learner preferences and needs, educators can optimize language learning experiences and enhance overall proficiency. Further research is warranted to explore the long-term effects of different feedback strategies on language acquisition and proficiency development.

REFERENCES

1. Bley-Vroman, R., 1986. Hypothesis testing in second language acquisition. *Language Learn.*, 36: 353-376.
2. Bley-Vroman, R., 1989. What is the Logical Problem of Foreign Language Learning? In: *Linguistic Perspectives of Second Language Acquisition*, Gass, S. and J. Schachter (Eds.). Cambridge University Press, New York, pp: 41-68.
3. Brown, J.D., 1988. *Understanding Research in Second Language Learning: A Teacher's Guide to Statistics and Research Design*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
4. Carroll, S. and M. Swain, 1993. Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies Second Language Acquisition*, 15: 357-386.
5. Carroll, S., 2001. *Input and Evidence: The Raw Material of Second Language Acquisition*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
6. Chaudron, C., 1988. *Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
7. DeKeyser, R.M., 1993. The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. *Modern Language J.*, 77: 501-514.

Published Date: - 05-12-2011

E-ISSN: 2229-3213

P-ISSN: 2229-3205

- 8.** Doughty, C., 1991. Second language instruction does make a difference: Evidence from an empirical study of SL relativization. *Studies Second Language Acquisition*, 13: 431-469.
- 9.** Doughty, C., 2001. Cognitive Underpinnings of Focus on Form. In: *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*, Robertson, P. (Ed.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp: 206-257.
- 10.** Dulay, H. and M. Burt, 1973. Should we teach children syntax? *Language Learn.*, 23: 245-258.
- 11.** Dulay, H. and M. Burt, 1974. You Can't Learn Without Goofing. In: *Error Analysis*, Richards, J.C. (Ed.). Longman, London, pp: 95-124.
- 12.** Ellis, R., 1989. Are classroom and naturalistic acquisition the same thing? A study of the classroom acquisition of German word order rules. *Studies Second Language Acquisition*, 11: 305-328.