

Navigating Teacher's Display and Referential Questions to Enhance Learners' Speaking Accuracy: A Case of Explicit and Implicit Corrective Feedback

Shiva Seyed Erfani¹ & Masoumeh Karimi¹

¹ English Language Department, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran

Correspondence: Shiva Seyed Erfani, English Language Department, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran. Postal code: 189. E-mail: sh.erfani@iau.ac.ir, sherfani2020@gmail.com

Received: March 29, 2023

Accepted: April 20, 2023

Online Published: April 22, 2023

doi: 10.5539/elt.v16n5p31

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v16n5p31>

Abstract

Corrective feedback with its potential role in oral interaction, and teacher's questions with the capacity to engage the learners in conversational activities led to the investigation of their roles in speaking accuracy of EFL learners. Teacher's display and referential questions were employed along with explicit (explicit correction, metalinguistic clue, elicitation) and implicit (conversational recast, repetition, clarification request) corrective feedback to create opportunities for the learners to participate in interaction, to modify their errors, and to produce accurate output. Therefore, 112 learners who attended 10 intact classes of 15 session terms in one control and four experimental groups were homogenized through administering a PET. In all groups, accuracy was focused while learners were engaged in conversational activities. In the first and second experimental groups teacher's display questions were implemented followed by the provision of explicit and implicit feedback types. However, the third and fourth experimental groups were asked to answer teacher's referential questions who received explicit and implicit corrective feedback respectively. To measure the learners' speaking accuracy, both pre and posttests of speaking were recorded and transcribed to estimate the percentage of error free clause. An analysis of covariance indicated that in learners' speaking accuracy; both teacher's display and referential questions with either explicit or implicit feedback types were significantly effective; there were no significant differences between the effectiveness of teacher's display and referential questions with explicit corrective feedback; and teacher's referential questions were significantly more effective than display questions with implicit feedback types. The substantial enhancement of EFL learners' speaking accuracy bears testimony that in interactional view, communicative behavior resulting from the questioning and corrective feedback paves the way for a higher level of accurate output.

Keywords: display question, referential question, implicit feedback, explicit feedback, speaking accuracy

1. Introduction

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The globalization of English has been caused great demand for good English-speaking methods across countries and this requirement is extending and spreading worldwide. Based on Long's (1996) interaction approach to second language acquisition learners can benefit from variety of opportunities, situations, and procedures which interaction can expose them to. He further maintains that learners need to take part, pay attention, and consciously perceive mismatches between input and their output in order for input to become intake. Negotiation of meaning during interaction which promotes noticing on one hand, and corrective feedback received on their utterances during negotiation work on the other seem to facilitate second language development. For Long (1981), to remove conversational problems, speakers can modify or repair the input or structure by using interactional strategies.

Communicative language teaching holds that learners learn to use a language communicatively through interaction in the target language and language classroom should provide the learners with the opportunities to acquire language through interaction (Goh, 2007). Saunders and O'Brien (2006) believe that the correct use of language forms is an important factor for learners' oral proficiency. Yuan and Ellis (2003) assert that "speaking accuracy indicates the extent to which the language produced conforms to target language norms" (p. 2). Skehan (1996) also believes that grammatical accuracy is the matter of compatibility of the target language produced by the producer of the language based on the rules of that language.

Corrective feedback is a reactive instructional strategy in which teachers can correct students' errors. Ellis, Loewen and Erlam (2006) defines them as 'responses to learner utterances containing an error' (p. 28). Brown (1998) states that feedback gives opportunity to learners to experience the effect of what they utter as a guide in their output. When an error is made, the teacher can adopt two different approaches called explicit feedback and implicit feedback. The first one constitutes request for correction, the second one indicates that there is some kind of mistake in learner's output. While explicit correction, metalinguistic clue, and elicitation are considered as explicit feedback, conversational recasts, repetition, and clarification request act as implicit ones (Lyster, Satio & Sato, 2013). It is very important for language teachers to employ suitable feedback type. Teachers should take the right decisions about what, when, and how to correct the students' errors.

As far as teachers' talk relates to questioning, asking question is the best way to create opportunities for learners to benefit from authentic interaction in class. Tan (2007) pinpoints that teachers can turn students' attention to form or content of the target language through questioning which leads to shape both the process and outcome of learner language development. As communication is the ultimate goal in language classrooms, Long and Sato (1983) suggest two questioning types. In display questions the answer is already known to the teacher and this type of questions is asked to elicit or display particular structures. On the contrary, referential questions refer to the questions that teachers do not know the answers and they are designed to elicit longer and more authentic response than display questions do.

There are different reasons why a teacher might ask a question in the classroom, such as providing either a model for language, assessing learning, encouraging self-expression, etc. There are other cognitive reasons for asking questions such as thought-provoking recall, developing understanding and encouraging problem solving. (Brown & Wragg, 1993). Although teacher's questions and corrective feedback seem to be effective in learning English language. However, which types of corrective feedback accompanied with which types of teachers' questions are more influential on the learners' speaking accuracy still seem unsubstantiated.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

Learning is a matter of participation and questioning is seen as an instructional practice which can create or impede the opportunities for participation (Donato, 2000). In this study two frequent types of display and referential questions by the teachers were implemented. The former encourages the learners to display their knowledge of comprehension, clarification or confirmation and the latter encourages the learners to create genuine conversation.

Since the ultimate goal of this study was to involve students in accurate oral production therefore, to get learners involved in interaction, teacher's questions provided learners with opportunities to produce some language output. The purpose was to employ the questions to create opportunities for the learners to receive corrective feedback, to reformulate their own utterances, to produce accurate output, and eventually to promote the learners' speaking accuracy.

The interaction hypothesis holds that SLA can be facilitated by conversational interaction and it can be done due to feedback that learners receive on their utterances. It appears that display questions are asked to see if the learners have learned the lesson. However, by asking referential questions, the teachers try to elicit new information from the students. Consequently, both types of questions seem to play important roles in improving learners' speaking accuracy. However, which teacher's questions along with which corrective feedback were more effective needed to be studied.

Corrective feedback is necessary according to White (1991) because it can match the learners' utterance with its corresponding version in the target language and draw the learners' attention to forms and structures that have not been used correctly. In this study corrective feedback applied in the context of learners carrying out communicative speaking activities to promote accuracy in their oral production. Corrective feedback contributes to learning as well as indicating the errors for the learners. Since oral participation is often a problematic area in SLA and most of the language teachers are interested to find a way to increase more productive learners in class, teachers questioning may be a promising way to increase students' participation in oral activities.

1.3 Theoretical Perspectives

The interactional approach (Long, 1983) emphasizes on the importance of input, negotiation, output, feedback, and attention to stimulate students to participate in meaningful interaction. Skehan and Foster (2001) state that collaborative interaction provides the negotiation of meaning as a crucial feature of interaction. Also, cognitive theories (Long, 1996; Lyster, 2004) consider corrective feedback as facilitating L2 acquisition. Ellis (1985) refers to feedback as the response given by the teacher to effort by the learner to communicate. It is absolutely obvious that students must be aware of their errors otherwise there is a risk of fossilization or incorrect internalization, what the student is incapable to change afterward (Linnarud, 2002).

The primary means of engaging student's attention is questioning which seems to be one of the most common

communication behaviors in teaching. One of the classifications considers questions is the one by Long and Sato (1983) who introduce first, display questions and second, referential questions. Display questions refer to known information question, lower cognitive questions, and closed questions. The majority of the questions that are asked by teachers in classroom exchanges are display questions (Long & Sato, 1983; Thornbury, 1996).

On the other hand, referential questions known as information seeking question, higher cognitive questions, or open questions seek new information and activate genuine communication (Long & Sato, 1983; Lynch, 1991). It is believed that although referential questions elicit longer and more authentic responses, display questions dominate classroom interaction (Long & Sato, 1983).

Corrective feedback is categorized either as explicit or implicit type. Lyster and Ranta (1997) maintain that explicit error corrections are applied when the students are corrected directly if what they said was incorrect (p.46). It may include the phrases such as ‘You should say’, ‘Oh, you mean that’, etc. The teacher reformulates a student utterance followed by an explicit indication of an error. (Lyster, Sato & Sato, 2013). Metalinguistic is an explicit feedback which does not provide the learner with the actual target-like form of their mistakes but to give them clues, questions, or comments on how to make self-correct their mistakes (Sauro, 2007). It is also defined as “a brief metalinguistic statement aimed at eliciting a self-correction from the student” (Lyster, Sato & Sato 2013; p.4). The good thing about metalinguistic feedback is that “unlike recast, learners are less likely to misconstrue the feedback intention” (Lyster, 2007; p. 405). Learners also get elicitation feedback as an explicit feedback by asking them to reformulate an ill-formed utterance and by presenting them some pauses or wait time to let them complete an utterance. Lyster, Sato and Sato (2013) states that Elicitation feedback “directly elicits a self-correction from the student, often in the form of a wh-question (p.4).

Conversational recast is considered as implicit corrective feedback. It refers to the reformulation of a student utterance in an attempt to resolve a communication breakdown which often takes the form of confirmation checks (Lyster, Sato & Sato, 2013; p.4). Repetition as another implicit feedback assists learners to realize the corrective intent of the repeated form usually consisting intonational or visual cues to locate the error. It also refers to as “teacher’s repetition, in isolation, of the student’s error” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; p. 48). They also refer to clarification requests as other types of implicit corrective feedback which require the students to repeat or reformulate their utterance since it was either ill-formed or misunderstood by the teachers. In clarification request a phrase such as ‘Pardon?’ and ‘I don’t understand’ is used to indirectly show an error in a student utterance (Lyster, Sato & Sato, 2013).

1.4 Research Questions

The study was looking for the answers to the following questions:

- (1) Do teacher’s display questions with explicit feedback types have any significant effect on the speaking accuracy of Iranian EFL learners?
- (2) Do teacher's display questions with implicit feedback types have any significant effect on speaking accuracy of Iranian EFL learners?
- (3) Do teacher's referential questions with explicit feedback types have any significant effect on the speaking accuracy of Iranian EFL learners?
- (4) Do teacher's referential questions with implicit feedback types have any significant effect on the speaking accuracy of Iranian EFL learners?
- (5) Is there any significant difference between the effect of teacher's display questions and referential questions with implicit feedback types on the speaking accuracy of Iranian EFL learners?
- (6) Is there any significant difference between the effect of teacher's display questions and referential questions with explicit feedback types on the speaking accuracy of Iranian EFL learners?

2. Method

The methodology of the study was as follows:

2.1 Participants and Sampling

The participants of the study consisted of 112 adult Iranian females and males, aged 17 to 35, at intermediate level, studying in a 15-session intensive English program in a language school in Tehran, Iran. They attended 10 intact classes; therefore, they were selected based on convenient sampling method. However, the classes were randomly assigned either to a control group or experimental groups. Table 1 shows the classes learners attended before being homogenized.

Table 1. Intact Classes before the students being Homogenized

Group		
Exp. I Display Questions & Explicit Feedback	Class A: 14	Class B: 15
Exp. II Display Questions and Implicit Feedback	Class C: 12	Class D: 17
Exp. III Referential Questions & Explicit Feedback	Class E: 15	Class F: 13
Exp. IV Referential Questions & Implicit Feedback	Class G: 16	Class H: 12
Control Group	Class I: 12	Class J: 15

After the administration of The Preliminary English Test (PET) to 141 students to assure their homogeneity. At the end, 112 the homogeneous students' scores on PET, pre, and posttests were used in the study.

Table 2. Participants in Groups after being Homogenized

Group		
Exp. I Display Questions & Explicit Feedback	Class A: 11	Class B: 13
Exp. II Display Questions and Implicit Feedback	Class C: 9	Class D: 15
Exp: III Referential Questions & Explicit Feedback	Class E: 14	Class F: 12
Exp. IV Referential Questions & Implicit Feedback	Class G: 14	Class H: 9
Control Group	Class I: 9	Class J: 7

2.2 Instruments

The instruments used in this study included:

2.2.1 Preliminary English Test

A Preliminary English Test (PET), (Quintana, 2013), was used as a tool for testing the participants' homogeneity. Rating scale for speaking and writing of PET from Cambridge ESOL (2003) were used to score speaking and writing sections.

2.2.2 Speaking Sections of PET for Pretest and Posttest

The speaking part of the conducted PET was used to measure the participants' speaking accuracy as pre-test. The speaking part of another PET was administered to measure the effect of the treatments as posttest.

2.2.3 Teaching Materials

The teaching materials were taken from the textbook of New English file 3 (Oxenden & Latham-Koenig 1997). Each unit consisted of 3 sections A, B, and C. Each section consisted of Grammar, Listening, Reading, Writing, Pronunciation, and Conversation. Beside the main book, other supplementary books such as Oxford Word Skill Intermediate (Gairns & Redman, 2012), and Developing Tactics for Listening (Richard & Trew, 2015) were also used in the teaching process. The topics discussed in all groups were as Education, Facts and Realities, Ideal World, Friendship, Money, Slow Down and Move Fast, Hobbies, Gossiping with Girls, Same Planet Different Worlds, Job Swap, Personalities and Right Job. The grammar points covered in the sessions were Conditional Type I and II, Adverbs of Frequency, Present Perfect, Present Continuous, Quantifiers, Make/Have/Let/Help/Get, Article/ No article, Used to/ to be Used to, Adjectives.

2.3 Design

The design of this study was quasi experimental. Since randomization was not possible, convenient sampling using intact classes were applied. In this study displays and referential questions along with explicit and implicit corrective feedback types were independent variables, while speaking accuracy of the learners was considered as dependent variable.

2.4 Procedure

The study went through the following procedure:

2.4.1 Operationalization

In this study language proficiency of the students was operationalized and measured through PET, and speaking grammatical accuracy was operationalized through speaking pre and posttests. Grammatical accuracy was operationally defined as the percentage of error-free clauses to all clauses (Foster & Skehan, 1996).

2.4.2 Main Study

At the outset, in the first two sessions, a PET was administered to all students attended the intact classes to determine homogeneous participants. All the papers were scored as accurately as possible for overall score. The speaking part of the same PET was also used as pretest of the study. The recorded speaking tests were transcribed to be rated by two raters to check the inter-rater reliability besides the estimation of inter-rater reliability of the writing section. The transcriptions of speaking section also went through the process of counting the total as well as error free clauses to measure the accuracy in pretest to be later compared with those of posttest.

Then, the classes were randomly assigned into four experimental groups and one control group. Each group experienced a term of 15 sessions during which 12 sessions were devoted to treatments. Each session lasted 100 minutes in which a 45minute period was dedicated to speaking skill with the permission of the institute. All the treatment sessions were recorded and transcribed.

(1) Exp. I (Display Questions with Explicit Feedback)

In this group, the teacher's display questions with explicit corrective feedback types including explicit correction, metalinguistic clue, and elicitation, were applied during speaking activities. Each session started with introducing the topic and teaching the related grammar point. Following the instruction, the teacher made efforts to form a conversation among students. This was planned as an occasion for practicing the grammar point on one side and provision of the explicit feedback on the learners' errors on the other following the display questions by the teacher. Explicit feedback enabled the learners to somehow manage the self-correction process along with teacher correction. Teacher's reactions to errors varied as she relied on questions and comments to ask for reformulation of the sentence, give relevant information to alert the students about the errors in their answers and help them arrive at the correct forms.

The grammatical point was embedded in the teacher's display questions to enhance the chance of problem solving, supposed to elicit the structure through display questions. The students were reminded that teacher responses to their answers could carry some hints to show they might have said something wrong and they need to correct it. For the explicit feedback, some clues of each type were provided such as 'You should say that' or 'Oh, you mean that' for explicit correction, 'Can you find your error' or 'Do we say that in English?' (metalinguistic), 'How do we use it in English' (elicitation).

As the answers to the display (convergent) questions were already known, the teacher used them to inculcate the structure and enhance understanding. The questions were of known answers that focuses on eliciting a very specific structure without which it would be difficult to give the correct answer. They were used to play the role of a supplementary tool to contribute self-correction. Each student was led through a maze of signals carried in questions, comments, pauses, to gain the capability of dealing with the structural accuracy. Here are some examples of teacher's display questions followed by explicit feedback of explicit correction, metalinguistic clue and elicitation in experimental group one.

T: Do your parents let you stay out late at night? (Display Question)

S1: My parents never letting me stay out late at night.

T: You should say let me; my parents never let me stay out late at night (Explicit correction)

S2: No, my parents doesn't let me to stay out late at night.

T: I doubt if your sentence structure is correct in English (Metalinguistic clue, comment)

S: My parents doesn't let me stay out late at night.

T: What do we use for parents? doesn't or.... (elicitation)

S: My parents don't let me stay out late at night.

(2) Exp. II (Display Questions with Implicit Feedback)

In this group, the teacher's display questions were applied during speaking, pair and group conversation activities, but this time it was accompanied by implicit corrective feedback types including conversational recast, repetition, and clarification request. Each session commenced with briefing the students on the topic. The grammatical point was encapsulated in display questions to be answered by the students.

During the instruction, the teacher directed the class for participating in a conversation requiring the students to apply the given structure so their errors could be detected and the teacher had the opportunity to provide the class with the implicit feedback. The ultimate goal was again to boost self-correction. For the implicit feedback, the

students were required to listen carefully to the sentences that the teacher was going to make as a reaction to their responses. They were informed that the responses might be treated with a sentence almost similar to what they have made, yet with some changes to make a correct form (recast), that there would be a sheer repetition of the ill-formed answer, (Repetition) or that there would be some oral reactions on the teacher's side like 'excuse me?' or 'I don't understand' (Clarification request).

Sometimes the teacher made a list of display questions to embrace the grammatical point. The teacher's plan was to enhance the chance of problem solving and to give the students a limited spectrum of answers in which they had to come up with the structure required. Here are the examples:

T: Now look at the picture. How many people are there on the beach? (Display question)

S: There are little people on the beach.

T: Yes, there are a few people on the beach (Recast)

S: Yes, a few people

T: Are you used to working in a mine? (Display question)

S: No, I'm not. I am never use to work in a mine.

T: I am never used to!! (Repetition)

S: Er Oh! I am not used to work.

T: Then, is it work?

S: working. I am not used to working in a mine.

T: Are you reading a novel now? (Display question)

S: No, I don't reading a novel now.

T: Pardon, I cannot get your point. (Clarification request)

S: No, I am not read a novel now.

T: Now, now

S: I am not reading a novel now.

(3) Exp. III (Referential Questions with Explicit Feedback)

Experimental group three enjoyed teacher's referential questions besides explicit corrective feedback types including explicit correction, metalinguistic clues, and elicitation during oral activities as an assistance for the teacher to manage meaningful conversations through relying on the accurate use of syntactic structures. This stage was designed to turn students' attention to their errors through implementing pauses in response to the errors, and asking critical questions to elicit the correct answer through self-correction. Here, the elements of pause, comments, and skeptical questions were at the service of making students conscious enough to detect the errors in their work and reformulate their own sentences as required by the criteria of accuracy.

The questions were of an open nature meant to enhance the flow of natural questions with genuine answers. What teacher sought in such questions was an opportunity for the students to use the target structure in real-sound conversations. Here are some examples of teacher's referential questions followed by explicit feedback types used in this group:

T: What rules do you hate at home? (Referential question)

S: Actually, I don't like taking my bed every morning.

T: I wonder if the sentence you have made is correct. (Metalinguistic, comment)

S: doing my bed?

T: No, but you are close. You don't do your bed, you --

S: making?

T: Yes

S: I hate making my bed.

T: What will you do if you need to heat your food? (Referential questions)

S: If I need to heat the food, I would use an oven or microwave.

T: Do we say would? (Elicitation feedback)

S: Yes.

T: Yes? (Pause)

S: I should use will?

T: I think so. If you need to heat your food, you-----

S: If I need to heat my food, I will use an oven.

(4) Exp. IV (Referential Questions with Implicit Feedback)

In experimental group four, the teacher applied referential questions and relied on implicit corrective feedback types including recast, repetition, and clarification request during students' interactions. The divergent questions required open answers containing pieces of new information, yet the students were required to put the taught structure in their answers as it was applied in the questions. The class interaction was allocated to a conversation to detect the errors and provide the students with the implicit corrective feedback (recast, clarification request, repetition).

The students had been already warned that if they saw their answers are repeated by the teacher or exposed by some questions on her side, they had to pay attention to the details of their sentences as there might be an erroneous area to be noticed. Students had parts in group conversations as they enjoyed the teacher assistance as the source of implicit feedback to lead students toward the self-correction. The teacher focused on the problem solving and deepening the understanding by making referential questions that required free answers.

T: Have you managed money for buying clothes on your own? (Referential question)

S: My mother has save my money in a bank.

T: So smart! Your mother has saved your money in a bank. (Recast)

S: Yes, she has saved

T: What will you do if you need to cool the water? (Referential questions)

S: If I need to cool the water, I would put in the fridge.

T: I don't understand the sentence (Clarification request)

S: If I need to cool the water, I would put in the fridge.

T: Would? Do we use would?

S: Will? Yes. I will put in the fridge, if I need to cool the water.

T: What would you do if you could meet a celebrity? (Referential question)

S: I sang a song with them.

T: You sang a song with them? (Repetition feedback)

S: Yes, I sang a song.

T: You sang a song?

S: I sing a song.

(5) Control Group

The learners in the control group studied the same topics and did the same activities in the class as did four experimental groups. Although the speaking activities involved communicative behavior, neither teacher's questions nor considerable feedback were present during the class interactions. In all groups, the pictures, topics, grammar points, reading and listening parts of the books were all at the service of the conversation.

The last session (session 15) of the course was devoted to the speaking posttest administration in all groups as well as the final exam of the term. Every participant's speaking posttest was recorded and transcribed. Two papers were attached to each transcription for two raters to count the clauses first, then the error free clauses got its percentage to obtain score from 100.

3. Results

Based on PET scores, 112 participants out of 141 test takers who scored plus and minus one standard deviation of mean score were selected as the participants of the main study.

3.1 Testing Normality Assumption

The data of homogenous students were analyzed through analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) and independent-samples t-test. The assumption of normality as displayed in Table 3, was met. The ratios of skewness and kurtosis over their standard errors were lower than +/-1.96.

Table 3. Testing Normality Assumption

Group		N	Skewness		Ratio	Kurtosis		Ratio
			Statistic	Std. Error		Statistic	Std. Error	
Display	PET	24	-.251	.472	-0.53	-.733	.918	-0.80
Explicit	Pretest	24	.139	.472	0.29	-1.279	.918	-1.39
Display	PET	24	.113	.472	0.24	-1.255	.918	-1.37
Implicit	Pretest	24	.481	.472	1.02	-.470	.918	-0.51
Referential	PET	26	-.641	.456	-1.41	.289	.887	0.33
Implicit	Pretest	26	.164	.456	0.36	-.534	.887	-0.60
Referential	PET	23	.259	.481	0.54	1.654	.935	1.77
Explicit	Pretest	23	.420	.481	0.87	.540	.935	0.58
	PET	15	.687	.580	1.18	-.488	1.121	-0.44
Control	Pretest	15	.007	.580	0.01	-1.006	1.121	-0.90

The results of estimating the inter-rater reliability through Pearson indicated that;

- a) there was a significant agreement between the two raters who rated the participants' performance on the speaking section of PET ($r(110) = .920, p = .000$ representing a large effect size)
- b) there was a significant agreement between the two raters who rated the participants' performance on the writing section of PET ($r(110) = .922, p = .000$ representing a large effect size).
- c) the KR-21 reliability index for the whole PET was .65.

3.2 Homogeneity of the Groups Based on PET

A one-way ANOVA was run to compare the five groups' mean values to prove that they were homogeneous in terms of their general language proficiency prior to the main study. The assumption of homogeneity of variances for PET was also met ($F(4, 107) = 1.27, p = .283$).

As shown in Table 4; the display explicit ($M = 76.73, SD = 8.66$), display implicit ($M = 73.29, SD = 6.56$), referential implicit ($M = 75.62, SD = 6.03$), referential explicit ($M = 74.78, SD = 6.87$) and control ($M = 69.97, SD = 7.23$) groups had almost the same mean values on the PET.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of PET for all Groups

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
					Display Explicit	24		
Display Implicit	24	73.29	6.561	1.339	70.52	76.06	64	85
Referential Implicit	26	75.62	6.037	1.184	73.18	78.05	61	86
Referential Explicit	23	74.78	6.874	1.433	71.81	77.75	60	93
Control	15	69.97	7.235	1.868	65.96	73.97	62	85
Total	112	74.43	7.287	.689	73.06	75.79	60	93

The results of one-way ANOVA ($F(4, 107) = 245, p = .050, \omega^2 = .050$ representing a weak effect size) indicated

that there were not any significant differences between the groups' means on the PET test. Therefore, they were homogenous in terms of their general language proficiency prior to the main study.

Table 5. One-Way ANOVA of PET for Groups

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	496.180	4	124.045	2.459	0.050
Within Groups	5398.748	107	50.456		
Total	5894.929	111			

The results of estimating the inter-rater reliability using Pearson at 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed) indicated that;

a) there was a significant agreement between the two raters who rated the students' speaking accuracy on pretest ($r = .947$, $p = .000$ representing a large effect size);

b) there was a significant agreement between the two raters who rated the students' speaking accuracy on posttest ($r = .959$, $p = .000$ representing a large effect size).

3.3 Testing the Null-hypotheses

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was run to compare the five groups' mean values on the posttest while controlling for the possible effect of the learners' prior speaking accuracy as measured through the pretest (covariate). At first, the assumptions of homogeneity of regression slopes and linear relationship between the dependent variable and the covariate were investigated. The assumption of linearity was met. The results of the linearity test depicted in Table 6 ($F(1, 89) = 258.20$, $p = .000$) indicated that there was a linear relationship between the pretest and posttest of speaking accuracy of the learners.

Table 6. Linearity Table for Pretest and Posttest of the Students' Speaking Accuracy

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
	(Combined)	13183.941	22	599.270	12.554	.000	
Posttest * Pretest	Between Groups	Linearity	12325.024	1	12325.024	258.203	.000
		Deviation from	858.918	21	40.901	0.857	.644

The assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes was also met. It was revealed that there was a non-significant interaction between groups and the pretests of the learners' speaking accuracy. ($F(4, 102) = 1.75$, $p = .144$, Partial $\eta^2 = .064$ representing a moderate effect size).

Table 7. Tests of Between-Groups Effects for Testing Homogeneity of Regression Slopes

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Group	309.234	4	77.309	2.793	.030	.099
Pretest	6970.097	1	6970.097	251.792	.000	.712
Group * Pretest	194.091	4	48.523	1.753	.144	.064
Error	2823.559	102	27.682			
Total	687964.000	112				

As displayed in Table 8, the referential questions with explicit feedback group ($M = 82.48$) had the highest mean on the posttest of speaking grammatical accuracy. This was followed by; display questions with explicit feedback ($M = 80.02$), referential questions with implicit feedback ($M = 44.88$), display questions with implicit feedback ($M = 74.06$) and control ($M = 68.79$) groups.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics for Posttest of The Students’ Speaking Accuracy of Groups with Pretest

Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Display Explicit	80.027 ^a	1.137	77.772	82.281
Display Implicit	74.061 ^a	1.111	71.858	76.264
Referential Explicit	82.488 ^a	1.051	80.403	84.572
Referential Implicit	77.884 ^a	1.113	75.677	80.091
Control	68.793 ^a	1.520	65.781	71.806

a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Pretest = 67.69

The results of ANCOVA ($F(4, 106) = 18.35, p = .000, \text{Partial } \eta^2 = .40$ representing a large effect size) indicated there were significant differences between the five groups’ mean values on the posttest of speaking accuracy after controlling for possible effects of the pretest.

Table 9. Tests of Between- Groups Effects for Posttest of the Students’ Speaking Accuracy of Groups with Pretest

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Squared	Eta Squared
Pretest	7286.672	1	7286.672	255.957	.000	.707	
Group	2089.577	4	522.394	18.350	.000	.409	
Error	3017.649	106	28.468				
Total	687964.000	112					

Although the F-value of 18.35 proved significant differences between the five groups’ mean values on the posttest, the post-hoc comparison tests were run to test the null- hypotheses of this study. Based on the results in Table 10 it can be claimed that;

3.3.1 Hypothesis One

The experimental group one, teacher’s display questions with explicit feedback types ($M = 80.02$) significantly outperformed the control group ($M = 68.79$) on the posttest of speaking accuracy ($MD = 11.23, p = .000$).

Table 10. Pairwise Comparisons between Groups

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Dis-Explicit	Dis-Implicit	5.966*	1.544	.000	2.905	9.027
	Ref-Implicit	2.143	1.599	.183	-1.027	5.312
	Control	11.233*	2.005	.000	7.258	15.209
Dis-Implicit	Control	5.267*	1.956	.008	1.389	9.145
	Dis-Explicit	2.461	1.570	.120	-.652	5.574
Ref-Explicit	Dis-Implicit	8.427*	1.544	.000	5.365	11.489
	Ref-Implicit	4.604*	1.529	.003	1.573	7.635
	Control	13.695*	1.812	.000	10.102	17.287
Ref-Implicit	Dis-Implicit	3.823*	1.578	.017	.695	6.951
	Control	9.090*	1.871	.000	5.380	12.800

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

3.3.2 Hypothesis Two

The experimental group two, teacher’s display questions with implicit feedback types ($M = 74.06$) significantly outperformed the control group ($M = 68.79$) on the posttest of speaking accuracy ($MD = 5.26, p = .008$).

3.3.3 Hypothesis Three

The experimental group three, teacher’s referential questions with explicit feedback types ($M = 82.48$) significantly outperformed the control group ($M = 68.79$) on the posttest of speaking accuracy ($MD = 13.69, p = .000$).

3.3.4 Hypothesis Four

The experimental group four, teacher's referential questions with implicit feedback types ($M = 77.88$) significantly outperformed the control group ($M = 68.79$) on the posttest of speaking accuracy ($MD = 9.09$, $p = .000$).

3.3.5 Hypothesis Five

The experimental group three, teacher's referential questions with implicit feedback types ($M = 77.88$) significantly outperformed the experimental group two, the display questions with implicit feedback group ($M = 74.06$) on the posttest of speaking accuracy ($MD = 3.82$, $p = .017$).

3.3.6 Hypothesis Six

There was not any significant difference between the effect of teacher's referential questions with explicit feedback (the experimental group four) ($M = 82.88$) and the display questions with explicit feedback (the experimental group one) ($M = 80.02$) on the posttest of speaking accuracy ($MD = 2.46$, $p = .12$).

4. Discussion

The study found that both teacher's display and referential questions with either explicit or implicit feedback were significantly effective in learners' speaking accuracy. Although teacher's referential questions were significantly more effective than display questions with implicit feedback, there were no significant differences between the effectiveness of teacher's display and referential questions along with explicit feedback in learners' accurate speaking. Empirically speaking, the study indicated that one of the appropriate ways to make the learners to produce accurate oral production in terms of grammaticality is to applying teachers questioning; furthermore, corrective feedback enables teachers correct students' errors effectively.

The findings of the study were in favor of both display and referential questions to improve the learners' speaking accuracy. This was in the same line with Suryati, (2015) who found that using the interaction strategies including the display and referential questioning facilitated the oral production in all respects. Yet, this was opposed by Kao and Weng (2012) who showed that using instructional questions of any type made the students passive and rather silent.

This study indicated that both types of questions could enhance the level of class interaction. This was supported by Toni and Parse's (2013) finding that questioning could applied as a tool to increase the level of interaction for learning/teaching. However, it was in contrast with the finding of Hidayanti (2016) that display questioning did not have a significant impact on improving interaction in EFL classrooms.

As found by the study, referential questions were more effective than display one when they were both accompanied with implicit feedback. This did not agree with Yu's (2010) result that display question was significantly more effective in improving the learning level. However, it was supported by Heritage and Heritage (2013) who demonstrated that open referential questions could potentially reflect the learning level and guide the teaching plans.

The study indicated that feedback provision either explicitly or implicitly had significant effect on the learners' speaking accuracy. The findings were in agreement with a study by Ellis et al. (2006) who conducted the effects of different types of interactional feedback on learners' acquisition of regular past tense and found that the metalinguistic feedback was more effective. The findings were also compatible with the Van Diggelen, den Brok, and Beijaard (2013) who illustrated that using feedback as an instructional tool could enhance learning process. However, the findings are against Zohrabi & Ehsani, (2014) who showed that the explicit feedback took over the implicit feedback in betterment of accuracy in speaking.

5. Conclusions and Implications

Within the communicative approach and interactional model of teaching language, this study investigated the role of teacher questioning along with explicit and implicit feedback types in promoting speaking accuracy of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. The conclusion of this study is supported by the interactional approach (Long, 1996) in that learners need to attend, notice and consciously perceive mismatches between input and their output in order for input to become intake.

Using corrective feedback was a tool for present study to mend the areas in need of work to increase oral grammatical accuracy. Conceptually, this conclusion is supported by Linnarud, (2002) who suggests that students need to be conscious of their errors to help their self-correction. It was also supported by Lyster (2004) who asserted that corrective feedback is facilitating the L2 acquisition in general and of grammatical features in particular.

The study was an evidence for the ability of the corrective feedback to improve the problematic areas in speaking irrespective of the type of feedback (whether explicit or implicit). The ability to speak accurately was enhanced through active participation when it was instructed based on teacher's questions. This could be confirmed by Banbrook and Skehan (1990), and Thompson (1997) who introduce the questioning as a reliable

tool for active participation, increasing the students' talk time, and learning through interaction.

If the questions are well- designed, the teachers could build an ambiance of interaction that is governed by the provision of corrective feedback in all types. Learners' speaking accuracy does not occur by chance and it requires their involvement. Eventually, with sufficient output, learners have opportunity to be corrected. Teacher questioning provides the ground for the learners to participate in interaction. In particular, learners who are more active have more opportunities to be corrected due to be more accurate. Some of the students who are silent and inactive by the techniques of questioning will pose to participate in communicative activities. Moreover, different types of corrective feedback make students much more attentive to speak accurately. Learners who seize opportunities to answer teacher's questions automatically participate in interaction activities and by getting feedback they commit to correct their errors.

References

- Banbrook, L., & Skehan, P. (1989). Classrooms and display questions. In C. Brumfit & R. Mitchell (Eds.), *ELT Documents 133* (pp. 141-152). London: the British Council.
- Brown, J.D. (Ed.). (1998). *New ways of classroom assessment*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Brown, G., & Wragg, E. C. (1993). *Questioning*. London: Routledge.
- Cambridge ESOL. (2003). *Preliminary English test 3 teacher's book: Examination papers from the university of Cambridge ESOL examinations (PET Practice Tests) paperback –Teacher's edition*. Cambridge books for Cambridge exams.
- Donato, R. (2000). Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 27–50). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S. & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 3(28), 339-368. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060141>
- Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(3), 299-323. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100015047>
- Gairns, R., & Redman, S.(2012). *Oxford word skills*. Oxford University Press.
- Goh, C. C. M. (2007). *Teaching speaking in the language classroom*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- 1.3 Heritage, M., & Heritage, J. (2013). Teacher questioning: The epicenter of instruction and assessment. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 26(3), 176-190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08957347.2013.793190>
- Hidayanti, W. R. (2016). Teacher's and students' questioning and teacher's feedback in EFL classroom. *DISERTASI dan TESIS Program Pascasarjana UM*.
- Kao, S. M., & Weng, W. C. (2012). Do You understand? An analysis of native and Non-native EFL teachers' questioning patterns at a Taiwanese cram school. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 14(4), 39-68.
- Linnarud, M. (2002). Is less more? Some research findings on response to second language writing. *Moderna Språk*, 96(2), 128-135. <https://doi.org/10.58221/mosp.v96i2.9571>
- Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. In Winitz, H. (Ed.), *Native language and foreign language acquisition. Annals of New York academy of science*, (379), 259-278. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1981.tb42014.x>
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126-141. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.126>
- Long, M. H. (1996). *The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition: Handbook of second language acquisition*. San Diego: Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012589042-7/50015-3>
- Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. Seliger and M. H. Long (eds.) *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition*. (pp. 268-286). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Lynch, T. (1991). Questioning roles in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 45(3), 201-210. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/45.3.201>
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 2(6), 399-432. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263104263021>

- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.18>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R. Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback on second language classrooms *Lang Teach*, 46(1), 1-40. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365>
- Oxenden, C., & Latham-Koenig, C. (1997). *New English file 3*. Oxford.
- Quintana, J. (2013). *The tests for the Preliminary English Test (PET)*. Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Trew, G. (2015). *Tactics for listening*. Oxford University Press.
- Saunders, W. M., & O'Brien. (2006). Oral language. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. M. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 14-45). Cambridge University Press.
- Sauro, S. (2007). *A comparative study of recasts and metalinguistic feedback through computer mediated communication on the development of L2 knowledge and production accuracy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 38-62. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/17.1.38>
- Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (2001). Cognition and tasks. In P. Robinson (Ed.). *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp.183-205). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524780>
- Suryati, N. (2015) Classroom interaction strategies employed by English teachers at lower secondary schools. *TEFLIN Journal, Malang* 26(2), 247-264. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i2/247-264>
- Tan, Z. (2007). Questioning in Chinese university EFL classroom. *RELC Journal*, 38(1), 87-102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206076161>
- Thompson, G. (1997). Training teachers to ask questions. *ELT Journal*, 51(2), 99-105. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/51.2.99>
- Thornbury, S. (1996). Teachers research teacher talk. *ELT Journal*, 50(4), 279-289. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.4.279>
- Toni, A., & Parse, F. (2013). The status of teacher's questions and students' responses: The case of an EFL class. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 4(3), 564-569. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.3.564-569>
- Van Diggelen, M., den Brok, P., & Beijaard, D. (2013). Teachers' use of a self-assessment procedure: The role of criteria, standards, feedback and reflection. *Teachers and Teaching*, 19(2), 115-134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.741834>
- White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research*, 7(2), 133-161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026765839100700205>
- Yu, W. (2010). An analysis of college English classroom questioning. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(2), 136-144. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.2.136-144>
- Yuan, F., & Ellis, R. (2003). The effects of pre-task planning and on-line planning on fluency, complexity and accuracy in L2 oral production. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/24.1.1>
- Zohrabi, Kh., & Ehsani, F. (2014). The role of implicit & explicit corrective feedback in Persian-speaking EFL learners' awareness of and accuracy in English grammar. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 98, 2018-2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.637>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).