The Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice
Vol. 16, No.32, Spring and Summer 2023(177-201)
DOI: 10.30495/jal.2023.1993437.1513

Research Article

The Efficacy of the Inclusion of Recast and Prompts Corrective Feedback in Task- based Language Teaching on Iranian EFL Learners' Grammar Knowledge

Nourodin Yousofi[1], Vahid Mohammadi*[2]
[1,2] *Department of English, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran*
*Corresponding Author: nyousofi@razi.ac.ir
(Received: 2023/08/18; Accepted: 2023/12/05)

Online publication: 2023/12/09

Abstract

This study sought to investigate the effects of recast and prompt as two types of corrective feedback on the learning and retention of English past tense by Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners. This study followed quasi-experimental design including pre-test, treatment, an immediate post-test, and a delayed post-test procedure. Initially, the pretest data from learners' performance on the Oral Performance Test (OPT) and the Untimed Grammatical Judgment Test (UGJT) was collected. After administering the pretest, the researchers gave the treatment to two experimental groups. Recast corrective feedback was supplied to the first experimental group, prompt corrective feedback was provided to the second experimental group, and no specific corrective feedback was given to the control group. After the completion of the treatment, the immediate post-test and three weeks later the delayed post-test were given. The findings showed that when it came to their explicit and implicit knowledge of past tense, students who received prompt or recast corrective feedback outperformed those who received no particular corrective feedback. The results also showed that in this area, students in the group receiving prompt corrective feedback still did significantly much better than those in the recast group. The findings of this study may be beneficial for all stakeholders in the field of education but particularly for language teachers and students. They would benefit language teachers, teacher trainers, and material developers interested in employing task-based approach with feedback in their pedagogical activities.

***Keywords**:* corrective feedback, prompt, recast, Oral Performance Test, Untimed Grammatical Judgment Test

Introduction

The study of language learning via interaction is growing in popularity in the field of second language pedagogy (Alcon Soler, 2002). According to Loewen and Sato (2018), the ability to interact is essential for second language acquisition (SLA). Long (1980, 1983, 1985), as a pioneering researcher in the area of interaction hypothesis, suggests that interaction hypothesis is grounded on the belief that second language learners are able to acquire the target language when they have chance to negotiate the solutions for communication problems they face. Long (1996) advanced the Interaction Hypothesis in reaction to Krashen's comprehensible input hypothesis emphasizing that input framed through interaction eventuates to the acquisition. Likewise, According to Swain (1995), output gives students the chance to go from only a semantic analysis of language to a more syntactic one by using contextualized language to verify their hypotheses about how the target language is used.

Corrective feedback is a response to inappropriate student speech providing the learner with negative evidence (Lyster et al., 2012). In fact, when learners make linguistic errors in their oral or written production in a second language, they are given corrective feedback (CF) (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). As it presents important information about the learners' errors, development, and other critical language concerns, corrective feedback appears to be one of the essential components of foreign language acquisition (Klimova et al., 2022). Various methods and formats can be used to give and convey feedback (AbuSeileek, 2013; Ching & Hsu, 2016; Zou & Lambert, 2017).

According to Swain (2005), learners' answers to corrective feedback may take the shape of modified output, which refers to revisions made to the learner's original non-target-like output. As the modified output pushes learners to reprocess their initial production, resulting to syntactic processing and more in-depth noticing, the modified output is thought to be a substantial learning process (Swain, 2005).

Swain's Output Hypothesis (1995) claims that second language input itself does not suffice language acquisition and language output activates cognitive processes required for second language learning. Negotiation of meaning facilitates this process because by developing a conscious awareness of one's own production, output serves the metalinguistic function of assisting learners to internalize language structures (Swain, 1995).

A logical advancement from the viewpoint of the classroom and research on foreign language acquisition is the use of communicative activities as a crucial tool for systematic instruction of new language and for expanding learners' existing comprehension of it (Bygate, 2015). By requiring students

to do the tasks involving the language, task-based language instruction, an extension of communicative language training aims to promote successful learning (Bao & Du, 2015). The idea behind task-based language instruction is that by engaging students in interactive language usage in the classroom, instructors can help them better comprehend how various linguistic features function and integrate new language into their active communicative use.

The history of empirical investigation on corrective feedback has produced contradictory findings. Numerous studies revealed the facilitative role of corrective feedback for developing learners' interlanguage (e.g., Ammar, 2008; Kang, 2010; Nassaji, 2007; Nassaji, 2009; Rahimi & Zhang, 2013). Other investigations (such as Ellis, 2007; Long, Inagaki, & Ortega, 1998) have shown a neutral role for the error correction and corrective feedback in increasing learners' foreign language acquisition. There is a need for further research to determine how effective corrective feedback is in enhancing learners' linguistic understanding is warranted in light of these contradictory findings. In order to improve Iranian EFL learners' knowledge of the past tense, the goal of the present study is to determine the relative effectiveness of including recast and prompt corrective feedback in task-based language teaching.

The major focuses of this study are task-based language instruction and corrective feedback. The researchers believe that providing corrective feedback to targeted activities makes learning a foreign language much easier and more effective. It has been demonstrated that task-based grammar training makes learning language more enjoyable, encouraging, and supportive (Fotos & Ellis, 1991; Garcia Mayo, 2002; Loumpourdi, 2005). The history of empirical research also shows that giving students corrective feedback helps them use language correctly (Ammar, 2008; Ammar & Spada, 2006; Kang, 2010; Nassaji, 2007; Nassaji, 2009; Rahimi & Zhang, 2013). Additionally, allowing students to practice for a task performance provides a means of implementing a focus-on-form method of instruction. It lessens the demands on students' working memory by allowing them to be aware of form while they are primarily focused on message delivery.

Corrective feedback has been described in the L2 literature using a variety of words. The words corrective feedback, negative evidence, and "negative feedback" are some of the most often used ones (Karim & Nassaj, 2019). In the field of language teaching, the term ‘corrective feedback’ has gained much attention and been frequently utilized in the field of language teaching and the other two terms have been primarily utilized in language acquisition and cognitive psychology (Schachter, 1991). Corrective feedback, according

to Nassaji and Kartchava (2017), is a reaction to the learner's inaccurate output with the intention of enhancing the correctness of the targeted form. Corrective feedback can take many different forms, from implicit (such as indirect feedback without the proper form) to explicit (such as direct feedback with the appropriate form) (Karim & Nassaj, 2019). Long (1996) divided the data given to students into positive and negative evidence. Positive evidence gives students instances of what is correct and grammatical in the target language (TL). On the other hand, negative evidence reveals what is grammatically incorrect. Our focus in this paper is on negative evidence.

Negative feedback, according to Iwashita (2003), is beneficial because it awakens students to discrepancies between their input and output. In a manner similar to this, according to McDonough (2005), receiving negative feedback during interaction may aid the development of L2 learners by educating them about the comprehensibility of their utterances and increasing their awareness of language Explicit corrections, recasts, elicitations, repetition, requests for clarification, and metalinguistic feedback were the six primary forms of feedback identified by Lyster and Ranta (1997) in their key study on French immersion classrooms. These feedback types were eventually divided into three major categories by Lyster and Mori (2006): recasts, explicit corrections, and prompts. Several studies have examined the usage patterns and efficacy of various feedback types, according to Lyster and his colleagues' feedback taxonomy, and found that prompts led to more immediate student uptake while recasts were the most popular among teachers (Brown, 2016; Wang & Li, 2020). Studies employing a pre-test and post-test methodology found that all forms of feedback were beneficial (Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Nassaji, 2017). Individual learner variations, the style of delivery, and the context in which feedback is delivered are all mediating elements that affect how effective feedback is given (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2020).

It is thought that recasts help second-language learners discover the inconsistencies between their non-native-like utterances and the target-like reformulation (Ammar & Spada, 2006). According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), recasts occur when a teacher reformulates all or a portion of a student's speech but leaves out the error. According to Long (1996), recast is a discourse technique that rewords an expression by altering a few sentence components while leaving the core idea unchanged. Recast is also described by Brown (2007) as a type of feedback that rephrases or discreetly extends a poorly formulated or incomplete statement. Under Long's (2006) definition of a corrective recast, one or more non-target-like forms are used in place of the corresponding target language structures in a learner's immediately preceding phrase.

Recasts are regarded as the optimal kind of interactional feedback since they are learner-centered, dependent on what the learner is conveying, implicit, and unobtrusive without interrupting the flow of conversation (Trofimovich et al., 2007).

The benefits of prompts have been linked to the chances they give students to rectify their own incorrect statements (Ellis et al., 2001; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Based on comprehensible input and Swain's (1985) Output Hypothesis, it is recommended that this act of alteration will aid L2 development. Learners analyze linguistic hypotheses when they are producing language, focusing on the language's syntactic characteristics (Swain, 1995). Prompts that provide opportunities for students to practice under control in a communicative environment (Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009) help students develop accurate knowledge by reconstructing what they already know and improve the practice effect by encouraging them to self-correct (Ranta & Lyster, 2007).

A growing number of empirical investigations studied the influence of various forms of corrective feedback on the development of interlanguage knowledge. Rahimi and Zhang (2013) conducted research to determine how incidental, unfocused cues and recasts affected the growth of English language learners' grammatical accuracy. The participants in the study consisted of three complete advanced English courses. When two experimental groups made grammatical mistakes, they either received prompts or recasts. The control group, on the other hand, offered content comments rather than correcting the students' errors. The TOEFL grammar portion and oral interview were used to evaluate the learners' overall accuracy. The results demonstrated that the experimental groups excelled the control group in both instances. It was also found that in the immediate, delayed, and post-tests, the prompt group did better than the recast group.

In dyadic interaction, Nassaji (2007) contrasted the facilitative roles of elicitation and reformulation. The main focus of his research was on the many ways that each sort of feedback is provided and their connection to learner repair. This study included two native English teachers and a sample of 42 intermediate English learners. Five separate elicitation subtypes and six different reformulation subtypes were discovered based on the prominence of the feedback and the degree to which they compelled the learner was responsive to the input. The examination of the data revealed that contrary to less explicit prompts or none at all, reformulation and elicitation in conjunction with clear intonational or vocal instructions increased the rates of accurate repair. In different research, Nassaji (2009) examined the effects

of recasts and elicitations, two types of interactional feedback, on the acquisition of language forms. Forty-two adult ESL students engaged in task-based engagement while receiving a variety of recasts and elicitations from two native English speakers who educate students in the language. The outcomes demonstrated that recast is more effective than elicitations at encouraging learners to correct their mistakes.

Ellis (2007) examined the varied effects of recasts and metalinguistic feedback on the acquisition of the English past tense -ed and comparative -er among adult ESL learners using a pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest paradigm. In this study, the two experimental groups each received feedback that was either metalinguistic or recast, while the control group received no information. The findings indicated that metalinguistic feedback had an impact on learning the two structures and that there was a statistically significant difference between the metalinguistic group and the control group. However, neither between the recast effects nor between the recast group and the control group was a significant difference.

To compare the various impacts of recasts and prompts together with instruction that focused on form on learning French grammatical gender in the subject-matter, Lyster (2004) conducted an experimental study. The participants were grouped into four categories: a control group that did not receive any FFI; a group that received FFI plus prompt; a group that received FFI plus recast; and a group that received FFI but no feedback. The prompts and FFI group performed better than both the comparison group and the recasts and FFI group, according to the findings. The comparison group did not do as well on the immediate or delayed written posttests or the delayed oral posttests as the recast with FFI group did. To compare recasts to feedback from second language learners that offers either negative or positive evidence, Leeman (2003) conducted experimental research. The participants were divided into four groups and given recasts, interrogative repetition of errors as negative feedback, phonologically improved models of correct forms as feedback, and unenhanced models of target-like forms as positive feedback. According to the study's findings, individuals who received updated and enhanced positive evidence performed better than the control group. However, there was no discernible difference between the interrogative repetition group and the feedback group. Han (2002) examined the impact of recasts on the consistency of tense in ESL learners' oral and written output in research that was comparable to this one. The research involved two groups of adult L2 English learners, one of which received recasts and the other of which received traditional teaching but no recasts. The findings supported the

significance of recast in fostering learners' understanding of tense consistency in both their oral and writing production in a second language.

In more recent research, Sarandi (2017) examined the impact of mixed oral corrective feedback on the accuracy of foreign language learners' oral output in two intact English classrooms at a Turkish university. In response to their incorrect usage of the English third person '-s' ending, the experimental group received multiple oral corrective comments, whilst the control group did not. Prompts and recasts were used as the format for the corrective comments. Through an oral narrative assignment and an elicited imitation test, learners' oral production accuracy was assessed. The learners in the experimental group performed better on the oral narrative task than those in the control group, but not on the elicited imitation test, according to a statistical comparison of the immediate and delayed posttests. The results indicated that learners' oral correctness of partially acquired structures can be enhanced by the combined application of prompts and recasts.

Zhai and Gao (2018) conducted several speaking task tests with 24 university students in China to examine the impact of teachers' corrective feedback on the complexity of English language speaking tasks. The data analysis revealed that different task difficulty levels of corrective feedback have varying effects on EFL oral output. The effects of five distinct types of corrective feedback—metalinguistic feedback, confirmation check, recast, clarification request, and repetition—were compared in order of greatest to lowest influence on the challenging speaking task. In the fundamental speaking task, the effects of five distinct forms of corrective feedback—clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, recast, repetition, and confirmation check—were investigated. Therefore, effective ways and formats for giving corrective feedback are anticipated to increase its effectiveness in EFL courses.

In a mixed learning experiment, Sarre et al. (2019) looked at the ideal conditions for effective corrective feedback. Ninety-three research participants were divided into seven groups at random to study this issue: six treatment groups received six different types of online corrective feedback, while one control group received no corrective feedback. The first and last pieces of writing submitted by research participants were compared in terms of accuracy in order to gauge the relative efficacy of the various corrective feedback methods. The findings demonstrated that providing any form of corrective feedback is preferable to providing none, and that distributing indirect corrective feedback with metalinguistic comments on the nature of errors along with additional computer-mediated microtasks over the course

of a predetermined time period (24 weeks) appeared to be the most successful type of corrective feedback.

This study sought to ascertain if introducing recasts and prompts to task-based language instruction may improve Iranian EFL learners' knowledge of the past tense. The hypothesis that underlies this research is that interaction, in which communication failures lead to meaning negotiation and interactional feedback that fosters mutual comprehension, is what initiates L2 growth (Long, 1996). To address the purposes of the study, two research questions were formulated:

1. Is there any significant difference in the effectiveness of recasts and prompts in developing Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' knowledge of past tense?
2. Are the instructional effects of recasts and prompts effective in retaining the gain of past tense knowledge?

Method

Participants

Three intact classes of Iranian pre-intermediate EFL students took part in this study. They were assigned to two groups of recasts and prompts corrective feedback in tasked-based language instruction and one task-based instruction without any corrective feedback. Their age ranged between 15 to 25 years. They were given Oxford placement in an attempt to assure the homogeniety of the students. The participants' scores on OPT were rated out of 60, and those whose scores fell between the lower intermediate range (28–36) were chose to take part in this study.

Instrument

Oxford Placement Test: This is a proficiency test which assesses learners' global language ability (Brown, 2005). It comprises 60 items with different question formats including grammar, vocabulary, and reading. This test was given in order to measure EFL learners' language proficiency level and ensure that the participants were at intermediate level (their scores ranged between 37 and 47) of English proficiency. Edwards (2007) indicated that the test is a reliable and efficient instrument of placing students at various levels of language proficiency. OPT can be used with any number of students of English to make sure an accurate, efficient, and reliable grading and placing of students into classes at all levels. In addition, it has been calibrated against the proficiency levels based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and the Cambridge ESOL Examinations (Allen, 2004). Birjandi and Sayyari (2010) employed the OPT to specify the

proficiency level of participants and established the concurrent validity of the OPT with TOEFL scores. The finding showed a high correlation between the OPT and TOEFL scores.

Oral Performance Test (OPT)

This test was administered individually through which learners were required to narrate a personal story of past events. For example, they were asked to narrate the events and activities they did on their last birthday or what they did on their last trip. Three version of the oral test were designed for pre-test, post-test, and delayed post-test. Oral tests were applied to measure the learners' productive knowledge of the past tense prior the treatment and after it. In order to assess implicit knowledge, students were required to communicate in a time-sensitive way during a meaning-focused activity rather than applying metalinguistic knowledge during the oral assessments (Ellis et al., 2006). The learners' performance was scored out of 20. Each grammatical mistake detracted half a mark from their total score. The students were already familiar with simple past tense as they had been taught about this grammatical structure in their past courses. Here the purpose was to consolidate the use of this structure both implicitly and explicitly.

Untimed Grammatically Judgment Test (UGJT)

Three Untimed GJTs were developed and validated by the researchers for pre-test, post-test, and delayed post-test. This test was created to extract students' explicit knowledge by requesting them to make decisions in a relaxing environment while focusing on form. Also, they promoted some amount of analysis by asking students to identify the error (Ellis et al., 2006). The items were developed using English books like Four Corners by Jack c Richards and David Bohlke (2011) and Touch Stone by Michael McCarthy, Jeanne McCarten, and Helen Sandiford (2014). To ensure the validity of the test, the developed test was given to two university professors and were requested to review the instrument, give feedback concerning its precision and suggest revisions if necessary. In addition, it was given to ten EFL learners with the same proficiency level to answer it and mention points of ambiguity. This test comprised 20 items. Both the regular and irregular past tenses had an equal number of items. The test also included an additional number of distractor items with the target items. This test was administered in an untimed format which according to Ellis (2004) provide learners adequate time to systematically process the sentence, note any incorrect form,

and reflect what is incorrect. Each item carried one score totaling 20 marks as the maximum score.

Procedure

This study followed a pre-test, treatment, an immediate post-test, and a delayed post-test procedure. EFL learners were initially given the Oxford Placement Test in an effort to homogenize them the learners who were classified at lower-intermediate (28-36) level of proficiency were selected. Secondly, the pretest data were collected including learners' performance on Oral Performance Test and Untimed Grammatically Judgment Test. After administering the pre-test, the researchers presented the treatment to two experimental groups. Recast corrective feedback was given to the first experimental group, and prompt corrective feedback was provided to the second experimental group. Following the completion of treatment, the immediate post-test was carried out, and the delayed post-test was administered three weeks later. One example of a recast and prompt is as follows:

Recast: Student: He *clean his room yesterday.

Teacher: Aha, He cleaned his room yesterday.

Prompt: Student: They *rent a big house last year.

Teacher: They WHAT… a big house last year.

Student: Oh, they rented a big house last year.

The treatment was introduced in the last 15 minutes of nine sessions over the three weeks. It was picture story tasks to elicit past tense. Students were divided into pairs and given a series of pictures to work with. They were instructed to find the story together and then write it down in a chronological manner.

In the pre-task phase, learners were prepared for the task. The preparation included general briefing about the purpose of the task a presentation of the structure that the learner dealt with, and an indication of what the learners were requested to attain by the end of the task. In the 'on-task' phase, learners were involved with the task. The instructor circulated to supply support and clarification, making sure that the learners were dealing with the target structure. The teacher supplied learners with corrective feedback. The first group was exposed to recast corrective feedback and the learners in the second group received prompt corrective feedback. In the post-task phase,

attempts were made to ensure that the learners' on-task work resulted in a clear outcome. The same procedure was followed for the control group; however, the teacher did not provide any corrective feedback.

Design

A quasi-experimental comparative research design was used for this investigation. The type of corrective feedback, that is prompt or recast, was the independent variable. The students' knowledge of the past tense was counted as the dependent variable. One-way between-groups ANOVA was used to investigate if there was a significant difference in the effectiveness of prompt corrective feedback versus recast corrective feedback in enhancing learners' knowledge of the past tense. Using repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA), it was possible to determine the effectiveness of prompt and recast corrective feedback in retaining knowledge gained in the second study question.

Results

In order to demonstrate that the three groups were homogeneous in terms of their knowledge of the past tense, a one-way between-groups ANOVA was conducted to compare the results of the recasts, prompts, and control groups on the oral performance pre-test. The results of the descriptive statistics for the three groups are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1
The Results of Descriptive Statistics for Three Groups' Performances on the Oral Performance Pre-test

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Recast	30	12.80	1.03	.18	12.41	13.18	11.00	15.00
Prompt	30	13.00	1.144	.20	12.57	13.42	11.00	15.00
Control	30	13.03	1.09	.20	12.62	13.44	11.00	15.00
Total	90	12.94	1.08	.11	12.71	13.17	11.00	15.00

As shown in Table 1, the mean score of the oral performance pre-test for the recast group was 12.80 with the standard deviation of 1.03. For the prompt

group, the mean score was 13 with the standard deviation of 1.14 and the mean score for the control group was 13.03 with the standard deviation of 1.09. Table 2 represents the results of the ANOVA.

Table 2
The Results of ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.95	2	.47	.40	.671
Within Groups	103.76	87	1.19		
Total	104.72	89			

The learners' scores on the oral performance pre-test for the three groups did not differ statistically significantly, as shown in Table 2, $F(2, 87)=.4$, $p=.67$, $p>.05$. To ascertain if the use of recasts and prompts in task-based language instruction improved students' implicit knowledge of the past tense, one more between-groups one-way ANOVA was used to compare the outcomes of the recasts, prompts, and control groups. Table 3 presents the results.

Table 3
The Results of Descriptive Statistics for Three Groups' Performances on the Oral Performance Post-test

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Recast	30	15.26	.63	.11	15.02	15.50	14.00	16.00
Prompt	30	17.63	1.09	.20	17.22	18.04	15.00	20.00
Control	30	13.80	1.15	.21	13.36	14.23	11.00	16.00
Total	90	15.56	1.86	.19	15.17	15.95	11.00	20.00

As indicated in Table 3, the mean score of *Oral Performance Post-test* for the recast group was 15.26 with the standard deviation of .63. For the prompt group, the mean score was 17.63 with the standard deviation of 1.09. Finally, the mean score for the control group was 13.80 with the standard deviation of 1.15. Table 4 represents the results of the second ANOVA.

Table 4
The Result of ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	224.46	2	112.23	114.02	.000
Within Groups	85.63	87	.984		
Total	310.10	89			

As Table 4 indicates, there was a statistically significant difference between three groups' performance on Oral Performance post-test: $F(2, 87)=114.02$, $p=.00$, $p<.05$. In Table 5, multiple comparisons of the three groups are provided.

Table 5
Multiple Comparisons

(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Recast	prompt	-2.36*	.25	.000	-2.97	-1.75
	control	1.46*	.25	.000	.85	2.07
Prompt	Recast	2.36*	.25	.000	1.75	2.97
	Control	3.83*	.25	.000	3.22	4.44
Control	Recast	-1.46*	.25	.000	-2.07	-.85
	prompt	-3.83*	.25	.000	-4.44	-3.22

Multiple comparisons' results in Table 5 show that three groups were statistically different from one another.

A one-way between-groups ANOVA was also performed to compare the recasts, prompts, and control groups' performances on the Untimed Grammatical Judgment pre-test in order to prove that the three groups were homogenous in terms of their explicit knowledge of English past tense. The results are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6
The Results of Descriptive Statistics for Three Groups

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Recast	30	13.13	1.47	.27	12.58	13.68	10.00	16.00
Prompt	30	13.20	1.44	.26	12.65	13.74	11.00	16.00
Control	30	13.23	1.43	.26	12.69	13.76	10.00	16.00
Total	90	13.18	1.43	.15	12.88	13.48	10.00	16.00

As shown in Table 6, the mean score of the Untimed Grammatical Judgment pre-test for the recast group was 13.13 with the standard deviation of 1.47. For the prompt group, the mean score was 13.20 with the standard deviation of 1.44. Finally, the mean score for the control group was 13.23 with the standard deviation of 1.43. Table 7 illustrates the results of the ANOVA.

Table 7
The results of ANO VA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.15	2	.07	.03	.96
Within Groups	183.63	87	2.11		
Total	183.78	89			

As shown in Table 7, there was no statistically significant difference between the three groups' learner scores on the untimed grammatical judgment pre-test, $F(2, 87)= .037$, $p= .96$, $p> .05$.

In order to assess the effectiveness of the inclusion of recasts and prompts on promoting learners' explicit knowledge of past tense, another one-way between- groups ANOVA was applied to compare recasts, prompts, and control groups' performance on untimed Grammatical Judgment post-test. The results of the descriptive statistics are presented in Table 8.

Table 8
The Results of Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Recast	30	17.03	.92	.16	16.68	17.37	15.00	19.00
Prompt	30	17.36	1.09	.20	16.95	17.77	15.00	19.00
Control	30	14.76	1.00	.18	14.39	15.14	13.00	17.00
Total	90	16.38	1.53	.16	16.06	16.71	13.00	19.00

As demonstrated in Table 8, the mean score of the Untimed Grammatical Judgment pos-test for the recast group was 17.03 with the standard deviation of .92. For the prompt group, the mean score was 17.36 with the standard deviation of 1.09, and the mean score for the control group was 14.76 with the standard deviation of 14.76. Table 9 represents the results of the ANOVA.

Table 9
The Results of ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	120.08	2	60.04	58.49	.000
Within Groups	89.30	87	1.02		
Total	209.38	89			

As illustrated in Table 9, there were statistically significant differences in the results of the Untimed Grammatical Judgment Post-Test between the three groups, $F(2, 87)= 58.49$, $p=.00$, $p<.05$. Table 10 reveals the multiple comparisons among three groups.

Table 10
Multiple Comparisons

(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Recast	Prompt	-.33	.26	.41	-.95	.29
	Control	2.26*	.26	.00	1.64	2.89
Prompt	Recast	.33	.26	.41	-.29	.95
	Control	2.60*	.26	.00	1.97	3.22
Control	Recast	-2.26667*	.26	.00	-2.89	-1.64
	Prompt	-2.60*	.26	.00	-3.22	-1.97

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

The results of the multiple comparisons in Table 10 show that three groups were statistically distinct from one another. The effectiveness of the recasts and prompts in helping the students recall the knowledge they had gained was examined in the second study question, and Repeated Measures ANOVA was conducted to check the result. Table 11 shows the descriptive statistics of the recast group.

Table 11
Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Pre-test recast	12.80	1.03	30
Post-test recast	15.26	.63	30
Delayed recast	14.70	.74	30

As indicated in Table 11, the mean score of the pre-test, post-test and delayed test for the recast group with regard to the implicit knowledge was 12.80, 15.26, and 14.70 with the standard deviations of 1.03, .63, and .74, respectively. Table 12 show the related multivariate tests.

Table 12
Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Recast feedback	Pillai's Trace	.78	52.41[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.78
	Wilks' Lambda	.21	52.41[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.78
	Hotelling's Trace	3.74	52.41[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.78
	Roy's Largest Root	3.74	52.41[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.78

The results in Table 12 reveals that there was a significant effect for recast corrective feedback in retaining the gain of implicit knowledge in the recast group, Wilks' Lambda= .21, F(2, 28)= 52.41, p=.00, p<.001, partial eta squared=.78. Table 13 represents the descriptive statistics of the prompt group.

Table 13
Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Pre-test prompt	13.00	1.14	30
Post-test prompt	17.63	1.09	30
Delayed prompt	16.83	1.08	30

As shown in Table 3, the mean score of the pre-test, post-test and delayed test for the prompt group with regard to the effect of corrective feedback on learners' implicit knowledge was 13.00, 17.63, and 16.83, with the standard deviations of 1.14, 1.09, and 1.08, respectively. Table 14 show the related multivariate tests.

Table 14
Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Prompt corrective	Pillai's Trace	.95	307.10[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.95
	Wilks' Lambda	.04	307.10[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.95
	Hotelling's Trace	21.93	307.10[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.95
	Roy's Largest Root	21.93	307.10[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.95

As indicated in Table 14, prompt corrective feedback had a substantial impact on maintaining the gain of implicit knowledge, Wilks' Lambda= .04, F(2, 28)= 307.1, p=.00, p<.001, partial eta squared=.95. Table 15 illustrates the descriptive statistics for the recast group.

Table 15
The Results of Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Pre-test recast	13.13	1.47	30
Post-test recast	17.03	.92	30
Delayed test recast	16.53	.86	30

As shown in Table 3, the mean score of pre-test, post-test and delayed test for the recast group with regard to the effect of corrective feedback on learners' explicit knowledge was 13.13, 17.03, and 16.53, with the standard deviations of 1.47, 0.92 and .86 respectively. Table 16 represents the results of the related multivariate tests in the recast group.

Table 16
Multivariate Tests

	Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Recast	Pillai's Trace	.86	86.15[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.86
	Wilks' Lambda	.14	86.15[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.86
	Hotelling's Trace	6.15	86.15[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.86
	Roy's Largest Root	6.15	86.15[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.86

Table 16 reveals that there was significant effect for recast corrective feedback in retaining the gain of explicit knowledge, Wilks' Lambda= .14, F(2, 28)= 86.15, p=.00, p<.001, partial eta squared=.86. In Table 17, the descriptive statistics for the prompt group are presented.

Table 17
The Results of Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Pre-test prompt	13.20	1.44	30
Post-test prompt	17.36	1.09	30
Delayed test prompt	17.93	.73	30

As shown in Table 17, the mean score of pre-test, post-test and delayed test for the prompt group regarding the effect of corrective feedback on learners' explicit knowledge was 13.13, 17.03, and 16.53, with the standard deviations of 1.14, 1.09, and 1.08, respectively. Table 18 reveals the results of the multivariate tests in the prompt group.

Table 18
Multivariate Tests

	Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Prompt	Pillai's Trace	.90	128.213[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.90
	Wilks' Lambda	.09	128.213[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.90
	Hotelling's Trace	9.15	128.213[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.90
	Roy's Largest Root	9.15	128.213[b]	2.00	28.00	.000	.90

Table 18 demonstrates that the retention of the explicit knowledge was significantly affected by prompt corrective feedback, Wilks' Lambda= .09, F (2, 28) = 128.21, p=.00, p<.001, partial eta squared=.9.

Discussion

The impetus for this study was provided by a motivation to inquire into the advantages of recasts and prompts in promoting learners' conscious and implicit understanding of the past tense. The findings showed that both prompts and recasts considerably outperformed no corrective feedback in terms of improving learners' explicit and implicit grasp of the past tense. In fact, implicit knowledge was gauged through oral performance test and explicit knowledge was measured via Untimed Grammaticality Judgment Test. These results confirm past study, which demonstrated that prompts had a stronger learning impact than recasts (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Lyster 2004; Yang & Lyster, 2010).

The superiority of prompts over recast may be attributed to the salient nature of prompts to students which are therefore easily noticed. Prompts are more noticeable and hence more effective; since, they encourage the students to change their own output by openly indicating the presence of an error. When students are asked to self-correct their incorrect statements, they may pay attention to the knowledge gap and focus on following feedback (Doughty, 2001; Swain, 1995). These results suggest that students are more likely to remember comments and corrections from self-correcting their language mistakes than from having recasts offer the corrections.

There are differences between prompts and recasts in terms of how they supply input and prompt output. The prompt group was given the cues to reformulate their incorrect forms, whereas the learners in the recast group were

exposed to the corrected forms of the erroneous forms. The prompt group therefore carefully examined their prior language learning. This might be the reason why the prompt group outperformed both the control and the recast groups, whereas the recast group outperformed the control group. Elicitation, according to Loewen (2004), has the advantage of involving students in deeper cognitive processing because they are required to determine the correct or alternate form on their own. An active engagement may facilitate later learning because it might create sustainable links in the memory.

Prompts are described by Lyster (2004) as a chance for learners to practice those results in the reorganization of the incorrect forms in interlanguage. Since learners must practice self-repair, prompts encourage learning (Swain, 1995). De Bot (1996) consistently shows that students actively participated in the learning process as a result of elicitation, which called for high degree of attention.

The findings of our study revealed that students who received prompt or recast corrective feedback outshone those receiving no specific corrective feedback. The results also showed that the students in the prompt group still did significantly much better than those in the recast group. Therefore, the findings highlight the crucial importance of providing learners with corrective feedback in general and prompt corrective feedback in particular in their attempts to produce grammatically corrects sentences with past tense.

This study would benefit language teachers, teacher trainers, and material developers interested in employing task-based approach with feedback in their pedagogical activities. Also, the combination of task-based language teaching coupled with grammar instruction may promote the growth of communicative competence and empower students to utilize language for communication.

This study was limited only to learners' past tense knowledge. In order to make the study more generalizable, more grammatical structures need to be taken into consideration. Another limitation is the fact that this study exclusively investigated lower-intermediate EFL learners. Further studies can include participants of diverse language proficiency levels to check the effectiveness of this approach on learners across diverse proficiency levels. Since the study's results and the majority of related empirical investigations demonstrated that prompts are more facilitative to promoting linguistic knowledge, it is suggested that teachers incorporate prompts in their teaching activities.

Declaration of interest: none

References

AbuSeileek, A. F. (2013). Using track changes and word processor to provide corrective feedback to learners in writing. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 29*(4), 319–333.

Ahmadian, M. J. (2016). Task-based language teaching and learning, *The Language Learning Journal, 44*(4), 377-380.

Bao, R. & Du, X. (2015). Implementation of task-based language teaching in Chinese as a foreign language: Benefits and challenges. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 28(3),* 1-20.

Braidi, S. M. (2002). Reexamining the role of recasts in native speaker/nonnativespeaker interactions. *Language Learning, 52*, 1–42.

Breen, M. P. (1987) Learner contributions to task design. In C. N. Candlin. and D. Murphy (eds.), Language learning tasks (pp. 23–46). Lancaster practical papers in English language education,7. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall International.

Brown, D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. NY: Pearson.

Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: a meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research, 20*(4), 436–458.

Bygate, M. (2015). Sources, developments and directions of task-based language teaching. *The Language Learning Journal*, doi: 10.1080 /09571736.2015.1039566.

Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*, 357-386.

Chaudron, C. 1977. A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning, 27*(1), 29-46.

Ching, Y.-H., & Hsu, Y.-C. (2016). Learners' interpersonal beliefs and generated feedback in an online role-playing peer-feedback activity: An exploratory study. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 17*(2), 105–122.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2005). *Planning and Task Performance in a Second Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

Ellis, R. (2007). The differential effects of oral corrective feedback on two grammatical structures. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in secondlanguage acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 339–360). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63*(2), 97-107.

Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*, 605–628.

Garcia Mayo, M.P. (2002). The effectiveness of two form-focused tasks in advanced EFL pedagogy. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 12*(2), 156-175.

Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Han, Z. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on tense consistency in L2 output. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*, 543-572.

Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction: Differential effects on L2 development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,25,* 1-36.

Schachter, J. (1991) Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research, 7*, 89–102.

Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2019). The effects of written corrective feedback : a critical synthesis of past and present research. *Instructed Second Language Acquisition, 3*(1), 28-52.

Kang, H. S. (2010). Negative evidence and its explicitness and positioning in the learning of Korean as a heritage language. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 4, 582-599.

Klimova, B., Pikhart, M., Benites, A. D., Lehr, C., & Sanchez-Stockhammer, C. (2022). Neural machine translation in foreign language teaching and learning: A systematic review. *Education and Information Technologies, 28*(1), 663-682. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11194-2

Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and second language development: Beyond negative evidence. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*, 37–63.

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: a meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 309–365.

Lightbown, P.M. & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*(4), 429-48.

Loewen, S. (2004). Uptake in incidental focus on form in meaning-focused ESL lessons. *Language Learning, 54*, 153-188.

Loewen, S. (2014). *Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. NY: Routledge.

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., & Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and instructed second language acquisition. *Language Teaching, 51*(03), 285-329.

Loumpourdi, L. (2005). Developing from PPP to TBL: A focused grammar task. In C. Edwards & J. Willis (Eds.), *Teachers exploring tasks in English languageteaching* (pp. 33-39). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. DeBot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413-68). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Long, M. H. (2006). Recasts in SLA: The story so far. In M. H. Long (Ed.), *Problems in SLA* (pp. 75-116). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Long, M. H., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *Modern Language Journal, 82*, 357–371.

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*, 399–432.

Lyster, R., Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(2), 269–300

Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*, 37-66.

Lyster, R., Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: a meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 265–302.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2012). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46*(1), 1-40. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365

McDonough, K. (2005). Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners' responses on ESL questions development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27* (1), 79-103.

Nassaji, H. (2007). Elicitation and reformulation and their relationship with learner repair in dyadic interaction, *Language Learning, 57*(4), 511–548

Nassaji, H. (2009). Effects of recasts and elicitations in dyadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. *Language Learning, 59*(2), 411–452.

Nassaji, H., 2017. The effectiveness of extensive versus intensive recasts for learning L2 grammar. *Modern Language Journal, 101*(2), 353–368.

Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2017) The role of corrective feedback: theoretical and pedagogical perspectives. In H. Nassaji and E. Kartchava

(eds) *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning: Research, Theory, Applications, Implications* (pp. ix–xv). Routledge.

Oliver, R. & Mackey, A. (2003). Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*(4), 519-33.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 36,* 573-595.

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rahimi, M. & Zhang, L. J. (2013). The role of incidental unfocused prompts and recasts in improving English as a foreign language learners' accuracy. *The Language Learning Journal,* 44(2), 257-268. Doi: 10.108009571736 .2013 .858368

Sarandi, H. (2017). Mixed corrective feedback and the acquisition of third person '-s', *The Language Learning Journal*, 48(4), 402-413.

Sarré, C., Grosbois, M. & Brudermann, C. (2019). Fostering accuracy in L2 writing: impact of different types of corrective feedback in an experimental blended learning EFL course. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 34*(3), 1-23. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2019.1635164

Schachter, J. (1991) Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research*, *7*, 89–102.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11,* 129-158.

Suzuki, W., Nassaji, H., & Sato, K. (2019). The effects of feedback explicitness and type of target structure on accuracy in revision and new pieces of writing. *System, 81,* 135-145. https://doi.org/10.1016 /j.system .2018.12.017

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidhofer, (Eds.), *Principles and practice in the study of language. Studies in honor of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook on research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471-483). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Trofimovich, P., Ammar, A. &, Gatbonton. E. (2007). How effective are recasts? The role of attention, memory, and analytic ability. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquisition: A Series of Empirical Studies* (pp. 171-195). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

VanPatten, B. (1990). Attending to content and form in the input: An experiment in consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12,* 287-301.

Wang, W., Li, S. (2020). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in American ESL and Chinese EFL classrooms: a comparative study. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 34(1), 1-16.

Zhai, K., & Gao, X. (2018). Effects of corrective feedback on EFL speaking task complexity in China's university classroom. *Cogent Education, 5*(1), 1-13.

Zou, D., & Lambert, J. (2017). Feedback methods for student voice in the digital age. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *48*(5), 1081–1091.

Biodata

Nouroddin Yousofi is an associate professor of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) at Razi University of Kermanshah, Iran. His main fields of interest are language education and research in foreign or second language learning and teaching.

Vahid Mohammadi is a TEFL Ph.D Candidate at Razi University of Kermanshah, Iran. His main research interests are second language acquisition, and teacher education.