

## Investigating the Problem of Recast Feedback in Grammar Instructions

Rahmatul Jannah<sup>1</sup>, Noviana Hanani<sup>2</sup>, Gina Amalia Shalehah<sup>3</sup>, Md Noor Saper<sup>4\*</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>UIN Antasari Banjarmasin, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup>Sultan Idris Education University

Received: 5 Juni 2022  
Revised: 10 Juni 2022  
Accepted: 13 Juni 2022

### Abstract

Recast feedback is an example of feedback, which is an essential component of any educational experience. Feedback is an essential component of any educational experience. Recast is a kind of corrective feedback in which the instructor either explicitly demonstrates that the student's speech was erroneous, tacitly reformulates the student's mistake, or provides a proper answer. However, there is a potential issue with utilizing recast as a means of providing feedback. It is necessary to investigate the issue in order to locate it in order to determine what the problem is. A Grammar instructor and five students from the Antasari State Islamic University of Banjarmasin are the participants in this research. The university is located in Banjarmasin, Indonesia. Interviews with the participants will be conducted so that information may be gleaned regarding their experiences with recast feedback. According to the findings of the inquiry carried out by the researcher, there are a number of issues with recasts feedback.

**Keywords:** Recasts Feedback, Grammar, English Language Teaching

(\*) Corresponding Author: [md.noor@fpm.upsi.edu.my](mailto:md.noor@fpm.upsi.edu.my)

**How to Cite:** Jannah, R., Hanani, N., Shalehah, G. A., & Saper, M. N. (2022). Investigating the Problem of Recast Feedback in Grammar Instructions. *International Journal of Education, Information Technology, and Others*, 5(3), 52-60. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6679571>

## INTRODUCTION

According to Chaudron (1988), the term "corrective feedback" has a number of different meanings below its surface. According to Chaudron (1988), the term "treatment of error" might simply refer to "any teacher behavior following an error that attempts to inform the learner of the fact of error." The treatment might be imperceptibly invisible in its response, or it might make a concerted effort "to elicit a revised student response." Last but not least, there is "the right, which effectively alters the learner's interlanguage rule in such a way that it no longer produces the incorrect feedback, negative evidence, and negative feedback." are three terms that are used, respectively, in the fields of language education, language learning, and cognitive psychology (Schachter, 1991; Saputra et al., 2021). These two concepts are widely used synonymously within the academic community. It is possible for feedback to be either clear or implicit. Some examples of explicit feedback include grammatical explanations and overt mistake repairs. Examples of implicit correction include things like asking for confirmation, repeating something,



recasting it, asking for an explanation, maintaining quiet, and even displaying bewildered facial expressions.

Recasts have been found to be the most common method of error correction in the classroom, particularly in the context of communication, as they reduce learner anxiety and do not disrupt the flow of communication (Siang et al., 2019; [Rita & Handrianto, 2021](#)). Recasts are the most common error-correction method when analyzing correction feedback in the classroom. On the other hand, since they are so subtle, rewrites are often forgotten about. Requests may relate to several things, including clarifications, metalanguage clues, and study requests. These are all examples of so-called formal negotiating strategies. Indicates that there was an error but does not provide the proper format for the error. These feedback movements are beneficial because they force the learner to reprocess the findings and generate "pushed outcomes." However, although they add to the student's explicit language knowledge rather than their ability, they are not believed to be very powerful.

On the other hand, Long (2006) argues that recasts are the most effective sort of CF for form-focused tasks because they are implicit. According to Long, recasts make it possible to relate a language form to its meaning or purpose, which is crucial for L2 development (Doughty, 2001; Solihatin et al., 2020) in the context of meaningful interaction while maintaining communication. Furthermore, recasts simultaneously provide negative evidence (indicating the linguistic problem) and positive evidence (providing the appropriate linguistic form). As a result, they can assist in the development of L2 by encouraging cognitive comparisons between the student's poorly formed utterance and the teacher's target-like utterance. At the same time, Long seems to have a dubious opinion on the usefulness of prompts. This is because they only convey negative feedback on forms that have only been partly acquired, and as a result, they cannot encourage learning new forms.

Explicit correction recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition are the six categories of feedback that Lyster and Ranta (1997) identified as:

- The instructor's correction made explicitly clear to the student indicates that the student's statement was incorrect and that the teacher supplies the right form.
- Recast: Recast is a kind of corrective feedback in which instructors implicitly reformulate the student's mistake or deliver the correction without explicitly indicating that the student's statement was inaccurate. This is done instead of directly stating that the student's utterance was incorrect.
- Clarification: When teachers use phrases like "excuse me" or "I do not understand," they indicate that the message has not been understood or that the student's utterance contains some error and that either repetition or a reformulation is required.
- For example, "excuse me" means "I do not understand," and "I do not understand" means "I do not understand."
- Clues On the Metalanguage During this kind of feedback, the instructor asks questions, makes remarks, or gives information regarding the learner's speech.

- The instructor will correct the student by repeating their mistake and changing their tone to get the student's attention.

Aside from that, there are two primary strategies for providing corrective feedback on the acquisition of English prepositions of movement and place. These strategies are recasts (implicit) and metalinguistic (explicit). This study aims to determine which strategies are more effective for third-grade intermediate learners' preposition recognition and production in their grammar performance (Siang et al., 2020; Tiara et al., 2021). This study also looked at declarative and interrogative recasts to see which of the two types of recasts the students wanted the researcher to employ to help them enhance their grammatical performance, name recognition, and productivity. There is a range of opinions among academics on the efficacy of the two distinct types of recast (Handrianto et al., 2021).

In this paper, the researchers focus on Recast Feedback and their study. Researchers interested in second language acquisition (Bohannon and Stanowicz, 1988) were the first to employ recasts feedback. These researchers noticed that adults or caregivers fixed their children's ill-formed utterances by recasting morphosyntactic or semantic faults (Rahman et al., 2022). It would seem that Nelson, Carskaddon, and Bonvillian (1973) were the first to use the term "test feedback" to refer to adult replies to children's utterances in L1 research (Nicholas et al., 2001; p.724; Sudrajat et al., 2020). Although recasts feedback has been given a variety of definitions in the relevant research literature, it seems that there is a set of clear and agreed-upon qualities that are inherent in recasts feedback, which is described as follows: A recast is a feedback maneuver that follows an inaccurate utterance and consists of the following components: a reformulation of the ill-formed declaration; enlargement of the ill-formed statement; and the recast's ability to keep its core meaning (Handrianto & Rahman, 2019; Rahman et al., 2021).

The research that has been done on the topic highlights several advantages and disadvantages. Several theoretical considerations have highlighted the importance and value of recasts in second language acquisition research (Long, 2006; Saxton, 2005). In the first place, recasting feedback seems like a trivial communication activity when the parties involved have a "common attentional focus" (Long, 2006; p. 114). Second, because of the reactive character of recasts, they engage the attention and motivation of learners by bringing a particular topic into focus. This helps learners concentrate on the material at hand. Third, it is believed that learners will have prior knowledge of the material included in recasts. As a result, other materials are made available to the learners, making it easier for them to connect form to function (Doughty, 2001). Fourth, since recasts feedback is active, it does not impede the flow of communication and is thus seen as harmful.

The initial restriction of recast feedback for certain researchers' difficulties is tied to whether or not it is noticed and how perplexing it is. Some academics feel that recast feedback benefits learners, whereas others (e.g., Lyster, 1998a; Panova & Lyster, 2002) think that recast feedback is not beneficial to the development of IL and is not observed by learners. Because of the ambiguous nature of recasts, another critique leveled against them is the possibility that language students would see them as being functionally comparable to mere repetition (e.g., Herlina et al., 2021; Long, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Morris & Tarone, 2003; Nicholas et al., 2001). The third disadvantage of recasts feedback is that it does not elicit repair, as

stated by Loewen and Philp (2006). This is the case because recast feedback does not elicit repair. The correct form is shown to the students, but they are not required to work on improving their IL. In addition, as the fourth restriction of recasts feedback, we may include a reference to the fact that the efficacy of this constraint varies depending on the desired form being investigated. To put it another way, Loewen and Philp (2006) believe that, based on previous research, recasting its feedback may be useful in varying degrees, depending on the goal state that is being investigated (e.g., Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Long, 1996).

The study of grammar is one of the cornerstones of linguistic theory. Grammar studies a language's structure and how linguistic components like words and phrases are integrated to generate sentences in that language (Canale & Swain, 1980). A language's grammar is the compilation of its many rules and laws. There has been much discussion about the significance of grammatical understanding in the acquisition of English for the last several decades (Kumar, Kumar, & Sagar, 2015). Despite this, grammar is a necessary component of language acquisition. Listening, reading, speaking, and writing are the four core linguistic abilities that must be mastered to be fluent in a language (Rahman & Ja'afar, 2018). Consequently, it is utterly impossible to speak good English without first mastering appropriate grammar.

Grammar is the study of words and how they interact; it is an invisible force that directs us as we put words together to make sentences. Grammar is the study of words and how they interact with one another. Everyone who speaks a certain language, whether intentionally or unintentionally, eventually becomes cognizant of the grammar of that language. Kumar (2013) presented an example to explain the significance of language. Specifically, he cited a writer who has supplied a stunning analogy to illustrate how grammatical knowledge may be used in real-world situations.

Aside from that, providing corrective feedback while learning English prepositions of movement and location may be accomplished in two ways (Situmoranga et al., 2019). Recasts (implicit) and metalinguistics are these two types of methods (explicit). This research aims to identify which of these approaches is superior in improving the preposition recognition and production abilities of intermediate learners in third grade. This research also looked at declarative and interrogative recasts to identify which kind of recast the students wanted the investigator to use to enhance their grammatical performance, recognition, and production. The results of this study may be summarized as follows: This was done because various academics have varied ideas on which kind of recast is more beneficial. The researchers wanted to find out which form of recast the students liked. Thus, they carried out this study.

Teachers provide students with corrective feedback, in which they point out flaws in the students' work and explain why the errors arose. Corrective feedback is one type of feedback (Lightbown & Spada, 2006; Handrianto et al., 2020; Ibrahim et al., 2021). Some academics prefer the term "negative feedback" when referring to these strategies in SLA; however, the terms "corrective feedback," "error treatment," "error correction," and "negative evidence" have all been used interchangeably in recent years. "Negative feedback" is the term that is preferred by some academics. Similarly, our research tries to propose appropriate solutions

to these problems, beginning with the question: (1) What is the problem with the feedback provided by a grammar lecture?; and (2) What is the student's answer to the reformulated feedback problem?

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study used qualitative method by using interview for data collection. Five undergraduate students from Antasari State Islamic University in Banjarmasin participated in the research. The students studied the English language's grammar and attended a lecture on grammar. The researchers spoke to the five students and one of the lecturers via interviews. In general, the students presented information similar to their prior experience in English study, with some having completed as many as four semesters (three years) of English classes. An interview is a kind of discussion that is conducted to gather information. In this approach, the researchers and the respondents meet face to face to verbally gather information to obtain data that may explain study issues. This question and answer session occur throughout communication, going back and forth between the interviewer and the interviewee to investigate the themes covered

## RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The process of the corrector absorbing the substance of a worse statement that occurred immediately before an erroneous utterance and then modifying and correcting the declaration in some manner is referred to as "recast feedback," and the phrase pertains to the specific scenario described above.

For example:

Student: *Yesterday I drove. I drove at the traffic light.*

Teacher: *You drove through the traffic light. (Recast)*

Student: *I went through the traffic light.*

The information presented in this paragraph was gleaned throughout an interview conducted at the Antasari State Islamic University of Banjarmasin with a member of the English education department who teaches classes on various aspects of grammar. In order to provide a solution to issue number one, the difficulty that a grammar lecture has when it comes to recasting feedback is as follows: When it comes to providing feedback, instructors often face a dilemma similar to the one they had when replying to the researchers. Because recast feedback so often gives students opportunities to make modifications on their own, students may not realize that they have received direct feedback on their work. According to the hypothesis that the researchers had previously researched, the concept that recast input has relations to whether or not it is noticed. The degree to which it is confusing is stated to have been established. When students are shown this recast feedback, they are often confused by it, and as a consequence, they rightly disregard it since they are unaware that recast feedback is taking place.

The student's response to the amended feedback problem is the topic of the second question in this section. What are some of the things that they believe ought to be done? The interviews with the five students who had taken grammar for a

combined total of two semesters indicated a few significant variations in their understandings of the subject matter.

- The first student responded that it was helpful to him, even though he had difficulty understanding it; nevertheless, as his pupil gained used to it, it became straightforward for him to understand.
- The second student said that he did not make any progress due to the professor's remarks and that the lecturer only provided replies without any explanation.
- The third student claimed that he found it less beneficial to learn grammar when he was given fresh remarks by the professor, especially when rewriting longer phrases. This was particularly true for him while he was studying grammar. Because the teacher did not call the student's mistakes out in any specific way, the student in question was oblivious to the learning opportunities he was passing up.
- The first issue is the lecturer's reaction to the flaws encountered in the recast's feedback, the student's lack of awareness in responding to the feedback provided by the lecturer, and the student's failure to pay attention to the lecturer's feedback. According to the hypothesis of Lyster (1998), the student does not notice recast feedback, which does not contribute to the learner's progress. There was a wide range of replies regarding the findings of the interviews conducted with the five students who had participated in earlier Grammar classes. The first student to respond provided a favorable response to the recast comments. The second student who answered said that, in his opinion, the recast feedback did not give any improvement and did not adequately explain the lecturer's feedback response. This is connected to the hypothesis advanced by the third student, Loewen and Philp (2006). Recast feedback did not lead to progress, and learners were given the right form without being compelled to enhance their interleaving level. This is another one of recast feedback's weaknesses; its position as a remedial tool.

In addition, the viewpoint of the third student was that the effectiveness of recast feedback was diminished. This student believed that he did not completely realize the mistakes that were rectified by the lecturer owing to the absence of additional information surrounding the mistake, and he only submitted an accurate response. This viewpoint is related to the idea that was presented by Loewen and Philp (2006), who believe that rearrangements may be of variable usefulness depending on the targeted form that is being evaluated. This perspective connects to the theory that Loewen and Philp proposed. In addition to this, and as a final point, the responses of the fourth and fifth pupils were identical. Because the recasting of the lesson was only done in its most basic form, there was simply repetition. According to Long (2006), recasts feedback is supplied with ambiguous nature; language learners can see them as serving a role akin to simple repetition.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the finding and discussion, it can be concluded that students still have problems for learning English grammars. The inquiries carried out by the researchers, there are a number of issues with recasts feedback. The answers that the youngsters in the fourth and fifth classes have submitted are comparable. They

believe this updated feedback is understandable; nonetheless, they believe that it should be provided in a manner that avoids repetition. The findings of interviews conducted at the Antasari State Islamic University of Banjarmasin with a grammar professor and five students who have studied grammar show results that match the theory of an earlier study.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bohannon, J. N., & Stanowicz, L. (1988). The issue of negative evidence: Adult responses to children's language errors. *Developmental Psychology* 24, 684-689.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(3).
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Daneshvar, E., & Rahimi, A. (2014). Written corrective feedback and teaching grammar. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 217-221.
- Doughty, C. (2001). *Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form*. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206–57).
- Doughty, C. (2001). *The cognitive underpinnings of focus on form*. Robinson, P. (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Handrianto, C., & Rahman, M. A. (2019). Project based learning: a review of literature on its outcomes and implementation issues. *LET: Linguistics, Literature and English Teaching Journal*, 8(2), 110-129. <https://dx.doi.org/10.18592/let.v8i2.2394>
- Handrianto, C., Jusoh, A. J., Goh, P. S. C., Rashid, N. A., & Rahman, M. A. (2020). The role of teachers in drug abuse prevention in schools. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(11), 708-716. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v10-i11/8131>
- Handrianto, C., Rasool, S., Rahman, M. A., Mustain, M., & Ilhami, A. (2021). Teachers Self-Efficacy and Classroom Management in Community Learning Centre (CLC) Sarawak. *Spektrum: Jurnal Pendidikan Luar Sekolah (PLS)*, 9(2), 154-163. <https://doi.org/10.24036/spektrumpls.v9i2.111963>
- Herlina, S., Rahman, M. A., Nufus, Z., Handrianto, C., & Masoh, K. (2021). The development of students' learning autonomy using tilawati method at a madrasatul quran in south kalimantan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 18(2), 431-450. <https://doi.org/10.14421/jpai.2021.182-12>
- Ibrahim, R., Hock, K., Handrianto, C., Rahman, M., & Dagdag, J. (2021). Perceptions of parents and teachers on students with learning disabilities (sld) in malaysia. *International Journal of Education, Information Technology, and Others*, 4(2), 287-298. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5057585>
- Khojastehnejad, A., & Zareipur, P. (2017). A survey of the effect of recast and prompt by teachers on iranian efl student's grammar with high and low anxiety level. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(1), 29-47.
- Kumar, P. (2013). The importance of grammar in English language teaching - a reassessment. *Language in India*, 13(5), 482-486.

- Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult english L2 classroom: Characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *Modern Language Journal* 90, 536-556.
- Long, M. (2006). *Problems in SLA*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19, 37-66
- Mohammadi, M. (2009). Recast and metalinguistic feedback in teaching and learning L2 writing: A comparative study. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 6(3).
- Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language learning*, 51(4), 719-758.
- Rahman, M. A., & Ja'afar, H. (2018). A review of the mingle model as a new technique in teaching speaking: Indonesian context. *LET: Linguistics, Literature and English Teaching Journal*, 7(2), 181-194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18592/let.v7i2.1949>
- Rahman, M. A., Jamalullail, J., & Handrianto, C. (2021). An overview of the implementation of musical drama in the introduction to literature course. *IJEIT*, 4(2), 9-19. <https://doi.org/10.26499/ijea.v4i2.156>
- Rahman, M. A., Novitasari, D., Handrianto, C., & Rasool, S. (2022). Assessment challenges in online learning during the covid-19 pandemic. *Kolokium*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.24036/kolokium.v10i1.517>
- Rezaei, S., & Derakhshan, A. (2011). Investigating Recast and Metalinguistic Feedback in Task-based Grammar Instruction. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 2(3).
- Rita, Y., & Handrianto, C. (2021). Innovation of digital learning in package c program in facing the new normal education. *Kolokium*, 9(1), 20-28. <https://doi.org/10.24036/kolokium-pls.v9i1.447>
- Saputra, E., Handrianto, C., Pernantah, P. S., Ismaniar, I., & Shidiq, G. A. (2021). An evaluation of the course experience questionnaire in a malaysian context for quality improvement in teaching and learning. *Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers and Teacher Education*, 11(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.37134/jrppte.vol11.1.1.2021>
- Saxton, M., (2005). 'Recast' in a new light: Insights for practice from typical language studies. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 21, 23-38.
- Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback from a historical perspective. *Second Language Research*, 7, 89-102.
- Siang, J. L., Dahlan, J., & Umar, M. A. (2020). The effect of learning method and verbal intelligence on english writing skill of viii grade students. *International Journal of Education, Information Technology, and Others*, 3(1), 199-205.
- Siang, J. L., Nurdin, I., & Robinson, S. (2019). Development of hypercontent module using jonnuro model learning desain for candidates master guide. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(2), 70-78.
- Situmoranga, R., Siang, J. L., Ibrahimc, N., & Lagunsiangd, J. (2019). Development of collaborative learning materials based on QR code to facilitate learning. *Development*, 8(6), 85-98.



- Solihatin, E., Syarifain, R. I., Siang, J. L., & Sukardjo, M. (2020). Development of teaching materials" quantitative research methodology for students based on QR code. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(5), 395-408.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (2006). *How languages are learned*. Oxford University Press.
- Sudrajat, Y., Siang, J. L., Marzuki, I., Wiyanti, E., Sari, N. W. A. P., Mufliharsi, R., ... & Hanafi, H. (2020). Model development of response to intervention for children with disabilities in central jakarta inclusive schools. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(3), 651-656.
- Tiara, A., Rahman, M., & Handrianto, C. (2021). The Students` Perception About Use of Duolingo Application for Improving English Vocabulary. *International Journal of Education, Information Technology, and Others*, 4(4), 690-701.