NOVITAS-ROYAL
RESEARCH ON YOUTH AND LANGUAGE

2020, 14(2), 58-75
Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)
ISSN: 1307–4733

Research Article

The Effects of Intensive and Extensive Recasts on Learning the Third Person Singular -s*

Murat ŞÜKÜR[1] & Fatma Esra DEMİRCAN[2]

[1]PhD Candidate, Gazi University, Ankara, TURKEY
murat.sukur@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-1327-5703
[2]PhD Candidate, Gazi University, Ankara, TURKEY
fdogan@gazi.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0001-7131-8030

Article information

Submission	10/05/2020	Revision received	03/09/2020
Acceptance	18/09/2020	Publication date	20/10/2020

Keywords: Foreign language acquisition, intensive recast, extensive recast, the present simple singular -s

Abstract: This quasi-experimental research aims to investigate the effects of intensive and extensive recasts on learning the English simple present singular –s. In line with this purpose, firstly 56 beginner level learners were non-randomly assigned to three different groups: written intensive recast (n = 20), written extensive recast (n = 17), and control group (n = 19). Then untimed grammaticality judgment test (UGJT), sentence writing test, and story writing test were administered to all participants as pretests. For the treatment process, the participants in the experimental groups received either intensive or extensive recasts, while the participants in the control group did not receive any feedback. Afterwards, all the participants took posttests and delayed posttests immediately after the treatment and two weeks later, respectively. The comparison of the UGJT gain scores indicated that the intensive recast group outperformed the control group in short term and outperformed the extensive recast group in long term. In contrast to this, the comparison of the other tests results revealed no significant difference among the groups. The reasons for these results are discussed in consideration of the previous studies and relevant implications are suggested in this research.

Anahtar Sözcükler: İkinci dil edinimi, yoğunlaştırılmış düzeltme, kapsamlı düzeltme, geniş zaman basit tekil -s

Yoğunlaştırılmış ve Kapsamlı Düzeltmelerin Basit Tekil Şahıs –s Öğrenmeye Etkileri

Özet: Bu yarı deneysel araştırma, yoğunlaştırılmış düzeltme ve kapsamlı düzeltmelerin İngilizcedeki geniş zaman tekil –s'i öğrenme üzerine olan etkilerini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, başlangıç seviyesindeki 56 öğrenci ilk olarak rastgele olmayan bir şekilde yazılı yoğunlaştırılmış düzeltme, yazılı kapsamlı düzeltme ve kontrol gruplarına atandılar. Daha sonra, süresiz gramer değerlendirme testi (SGDT), cümle yazma testi ve hikâye yazma testi ön-test olarak bütün katılımcılara uygulandı. Uygulama sürecinde ise, deney gruplarındaki katılımcılar ya yoğunlaştırılmış ya da kapsamlı düzeltmeler alırlarken, kontrol grubundaki katılımcılar ise hiçbir dönüt almadılar. Sonrasında, bütün katılımcılar uygulamadan hemen sonra son-testleri ve iki hafta sonra da ertelenmiş son-testleri aldılar. SGDT erişi puanlarının karşılaştırması yoğunlaştırılmış düzeltme grubunun kontrol grubunu kısa vadede ve kapsamlı düzeltme grubunu ise uzun vadede geçtiğini göstermiştir. Bunun aksine, diğer test sonuçlarının karşılaştırması gruplar arasında herhangi bir anlamlı fark ortaya çıkarmamıştır. Bu sonuçların nedenleri önceki çalışmalar dikkate alınarak tartışılmakta ve ilgili çıkarımlar önerilmektedir.

To Cite This Article: Şükür, M. & Demircan, F. E. (2020). The effects of intensive and extensive recasts on learning the third person singular -s. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *14*(2), 58-75.

* This study was presented in International Language Teacher Education Conference held in April 2019 in Antalya/TURKEY.

1. Introduction

The effectiveness of corrective feedback (CF) on the acquisition of grammatical structures has been a controversial issue. Regarding this, one side (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2009; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 1999, 2004; Sheen, 2007, 2010a) has claimed that CF has positive effects on the acquisition of L2 grammar. In contrast, another side (Krashen, 1982; Truscott, 1996, 1999, 2007) has opposed the provision of CF by claiming that it is harmful, and it should be abandoned. In order to find a solution to this debate, many research studies focusing on different types of CF were conducted. For example, some research studies investigated the effects of either direct (e.g., Bitchener et al., 2005; Sheen, 2007) or indirect CF (e.g., Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lee, 1997), or compared the effects of both direct and indirect CF (e.g., Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Van Beuningen et al., 2012). In addition, there are also some studies which were conducted to investigate the effects of focused (e.g., Sheen, 2007, Shintani et al., 2014) or unfocused CF (e.g., Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2006).

To date, however, the number of studies comparing the effects of focused and unfocused CF has been few (Ellis et al., 2008; Frear & Chiu, 2015; Kamiya, 2015; Nassaji, 2017; Sheen et al., 2009). Moreover, these studies used different types of feedback such as indirect written corrective feedback (WCF) (Frear & Chiu, 2015), oral recast (Kamiya, 2015; Nassaji, 2017), or direct WCF (Ellis et al., 2008; Sheen et al., 2009). In addition, they focused on one of these three structures: simple past tense (regular and irregular verbs) (Frear & Chiu, 2015; Sheen et al., 2009), definite and indefinite articles (Ellis et al., 2008; Sheen et al., 2009), and unreal conditionals (Kamiya, 2015). Therefore, there is a need for further research comparing the effects of intensive and extensive (or focused and unfocused) recasts. Also, their effects on the accurate use of the present simple –s were not investigated (Ellis, 2008). In this vein, it is expected that this will be a contributing study which aims to compare the effects of written intensive and extensive recasts on the accurate use of the simple present tense third person singular –s by the Turkish beginner level EFL learners.

1.1. Literature Review

Recasts are known as the most commonly used feedback type in a classroom (Lyster & Mori, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Sheen, 2004). In this research, recasts conceptually refer to the written or oral reformulations of a part or the whole of a second language (L2) learner's ill-formed utterances or sentences (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). This study also classifies recasts into two types according to their focus: intensive and extensive recasts. Of these, intensive recasts refer to the written or oral reformulations made on a part or the whole of the ill-formed sentences by focusing on only one target structure (Ellis, 2001; Nassaji, 2017). On the other hand, extensive recasts refer to the written or oral reformulations on a part or the whole of the learner's ill-formed sentences by focusing on a wide range of grammatical structures (Ellis, 2001; Nassaji, 2017). In light of these definitions, intensive written recasts were provided by the second researcher, who was the regular teacher of the classes, only on the sentences which were ungrammatical in terms of the English simple present tense third person singular-s and the bare form of the verb. On the other hand, extensive written recasts were provided by the teacher on the sentences which were ungrammatical in terms of a wide range of different structures such as present simple tense, prepositions, articles, and so forth.

The studies investigating the effects of intensive (focused) and extensive (unfocused) feedback or recasts are few. Of these investigations, Ellis et al. (2008) targeted the English

articles and compared the effects of focused and unfocused CF. The results of this study indicated that both kinds of feedback were equally effective on the accurate use of the articles. Sheen et al. (2009) also compared the effects of "direct focused CF, direct unfocused CF and writing practice alone" on adult English as a second language learners' accurate use of articles, prepositions, regular, irregular past tense, and copular 'be' (p. 556). They found that direct focused CF was more efficient than direct unfocused CF. Similarly, Frear and Chiu (2015) also conducted another research study and compared the focused and unfocused indirect WCF in terms of their effects on the accurate use of both regular verbs and other grammatical structures. The results of the study displayed that both kinds of WCF led to significant improvements in comparison to the control group. In Kim's (2019) study, whether direct focused and unfocused WCF promote the learning of hypothetical conditional and the definite and indefinite articles was investigated. And it was found that the two kinds of feedback were better than no feedback in general and that focused WCF was more beneficial for learning indefinite articles, while there was no difference between the two feedback types for the development of hypothetical conditionals in particular.

In Turkish context, Beşkardeşler (2018) compared the direct focused and unfocused WCF. The beginner level EFL learners speaking Turkish or Arabic as a first language were the participants. The target structure of this study was the four English prepositions concerning time and place. Therefore, during the treatment process the participants in the focused group received written feedback on the errors related to the prepositions of time and place, while the students in the unfocused group received feedback on grammar, punctuation, and spelling. According to the results from error correction and narrative writing tests, the research found that both types of feedback were more effective in the short and long term than the control group receiving no feedback. However, no significant difference was detected between the focused and unfocused WCF.

As for the studies on recasts, in Kamiya's (2015) study, the effects of extensive and intensive recasts were investigated with regard to the explicit and implicit knowledge of the unreal conditional. This research revealed that the two types of recasts were equally effective on the improvement of the explicit knowledge, while the intensive recasts were more beneficial for the acquisition of implicit knowledge than the extensive recasts. Nassaji (2017) also conducted a study to investigate the effects of extensive and intensive recasts on learning articles. In contrast to Kamiya's (2015) study, he found that the extensive recasts were more beneficial than the intensive ones according to the results from picture description and grammaticality judgment tasks.

In contrast to studies by Kamiya (2015) and Nassaji (2017) but related to the current research, Sarandi (2009) compared the effects of "corrective recast and prompt" on the preparatory school students' acquisition of the present simple third person singular –s in Turkish context (p. VI). While giving recasts, the corrected version of the utterance was provided with intonation in order to draw the participants' attention to the revised part. On other hand, during the provision of prompts the erroneous parts concerning the target structure were repeated by using intonation, and the corrections of the participants were sometimes elicited. Using UGJT and oral production tasks, the researcher administrated pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest with the aim of measuring the effects of the treatment. According to the results from UGJT, the research found no significant difference among the three feedback conditions: recast, prompt, and no grammatical feedback in the short and long term. As for the results of the oral production tasks, only significant difference was

found between the recast group and the control group in the immediate posttest, while there was not any significant difference among the groups in the delayed posttest.

Although the studies mentioned above are somewhat related to this research, there are some aspects in which this study differs from the others. For example, although WCF was provided to the participants in this research, it consisted of the partial or complete reformulation of the erroneous part of the sentence instead of solely writing the correction for the necessary part. Moreover, in the recast studies, feedback was given orally during the interaction as compatible with the common definition of recast. However, in this research, giving written recasts is preferred because it is a mode of feedback frequently used by the instructors teaching to crowded classes. Additionally, there are only two studies (Kamiya, 2015; Nassaji, 2017) comparing the effects of intensive (focused) and extensive (unfocused) recasts. However, oral recasts were used in these studies; therefore, there is a need for research investigating the effects of written intensive and extensive recasts.

1.2. Theoretical Framework

The Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996), the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), and the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985) informed this research (Yılmaz, 2014). Therefore, in the following sections, each of these three hypotheses is explained in some detail.

1.2.1. The Interaction Hypothesis

The Interaction Hypothesis of Long (1996) proposes that interactional processes such as negotiation of meaning and the feedback provision facilitate the learners to acquire the L2 by connecting "input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways" (pp. 451-452). According to this hypothesis, input has two types as positive and negative evidence. Positive evidence refers to the provision of the input which is grammatically correct (Frear & Chiu, 2015). That is to say, the learners receive comprehensible input during the interaction. Regarding this, Krashen's (1985) comprehensible input model claims that the learners' exposure to the comprehensible input is enough for acquisition. However, Long (1996) pointed out that acquisition did not always occur just by receiving input. Therefore, he argued that negative evidence, which involves "information that a particular utterance is deviant vis-à-vis TL [target language] norms," was also necessary for the acquisition of a second language (Gass et al., 2013, p. 360). Some studies also revealed compatible results with this argument. For example, White (1991) investigated the effects of positive and negative evidence on the learning of adverb placement by French learners of English and found that the group receiving both types of evidence showed significant development when compared to the other groups which had not.

As Frear and Chiu (2015) stated, although Long's Interaction Hypothesis originally referred to oral communication as the mode of interaction, it can also be applied to the written way of communication. In this vein, the present study involves written recasts for the provision of negative and positive evidence (Lyster & Saito, 2010; Mackey, 2006) to the learners with regard to their accuracy in using the singular –s.

1.2.2. The Noticing Hypothesis

This hypothesis proposed by Schmidt (1990) is based on the idea that noticing or consciously being aware of the form of input is necessary for second language acquisition (SLA). The Noticing Hypothesis opposes Krashen's (1981) view that the role of the conscious learning

is limited in SLA and proposes that the input should become intake by the learner's noticing or consciously registering it for learning a second language (Schmidt, 2001, 2010). The findings of most studies supported this claim of the Noticing Hypothesis. For example, Mackey (2006) investigated the effects of feedback on the promotion of noticing L2 forms and the relationship between the learners noticing the language forms and their learning. The study revealed that feedback enhanced noticing and that the development of learning was related to noticing.

Furthermore, in their case study concerning Schmidt's learning of Portuguese, Schmidt and Frota (1986) found that corrections did not usually have an effect on Schmidt's learning because he was not aware that he was being corrected. By drawing on this finding, they suggested another concept they called "noticing the gap" (Schmidt, 2010). This concept was based on "the idea that in order to overcome errors, learners must make conscious comparisons between their output and target language input" (Schmidt, 2010, p. 724). Moreover, CF plays a significant role in that by facilitating the learner to notice the gap (Sheen, 2010b). In this vein, the present study aims to investigate the effects of written recasts on the EFL learners correcting their errors by noticing the difference between their utterances and the input involved in the recasts.

1.2.3. The Output Hypothesis

The Output Hypothesis claims that "the act of producing language (speaking or writing) constitutes, under certain circumstances, part of the process of second language learning" (Swain, 2005, p. 471). According to this hypothesis, output has three functions in second language learning: the noticing/triggering function, the hypothesis-testing function, and the metalinguistic function (Swain, 1995). The noticing/triggering function provides the learners with the opportunity to recognize their linguistic problems by trying to produce the target language (Swain, 2005). This can happen in two ways: (1) the learner can notice the difference between his utterance and the target language form as Schmidt and Frota's (1986) noticing the gap principle suggested, or (2) the learner may not produce the intended utterance in the target language. In an experimental study, Izumi and Bigelow (2000) investigated how output affects noticing and acquisition of English relative clauses. With this aim, they compared two groups, one of which produced output while the other was engaged in comprehension-based activities. The results of the study indicated no difference between the groups in terms of both noticing and acquisition of the target structure.

As for the hypothesis-testing function, it states that through language, the learner tests their hypotheses related to how they can say an intended utterance (Swain, 1985). In order to do that, firstly the learners should say or write something. Then, they can receive feedback and modify their output by drawing on it. However, it is also possible that the learners modify their utterances without receiving any feedback.

Finally, the metalinguistic function suggests that the learners reflect on others' and their own utterances by using the language, and this mediates learning of the second language (Swain, 2005). Based on Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory, this view sees language as a mediating tool that is initially used by others in order to regulate cognitive behavior and then internalized by the learner to regulate his or her cognitive functioning (Swain & Lapkin, 1998). As a supporting finding to this view, Swain and Lapkin (1998) found that the students engaging in collaborative dialogue used their first and second languages both for communicating with each other and for learning the L2.

In consideration of these aspects pertaining to the Output Hypothesis, this research adopted the production tasks such as sentence writing and story writing tasks in order to enable the participants to use the target structure while producing something in the target language.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Question and Research Design

With the aim of investigating the effects of intensive and extensive written recasts on the accurate use of the singular -s, this study seeks answers to the single research question given:

- How do intensive (focused) and extensive (unfocused) recasts affect learning the third person singular –s?

In line with this research question, the current study has a quasi-experimental research design which involves the non-random assignment of the participants to the groups (Creswell, 2012; Fraenkel et al., 2012). Because of some reasons such as course schedule of the participants or the difficulty of getting administrative permission, non-random assignment is usually inevitable for the researchers in the field of education. Although the quasi-experimental research is acknowledged as "more vulnerable to threats to validity than a full experimental design" (Dörnyei, 2007, p.118), it is frequently used in educational research in order to test hypotheses regarding various factors.

2.2. Participants

The participants of this research were selected by using convenience sampling method, which refers to the selection of the volunteer and available participants. Consequently, the participants consisted of 56 EFL learners (13 male and 43 female) who were studying at one of these departments: Mathematics Teaching, Social Sciences Teaching, Turkish Language Teaching, and Preschool Education. Ages of these participants ranged from 18 to 38 years old. In order to determine the proficiency level of the participants, Part 1 of the Oxford Quick Placement Test was used, and the results of this test indicated that the students were the beginner learners of English. Moreover, the second researcher, who is a non-native English-speaking instructor, participated in this research. She was the regular teacher of the classes and gave all the recasts to the students.

2.3. Target Structure

In the present study, the target structure was the English present simple tense third person singular-s. This structure was chosen for three reasons. First, the second researcher determined that her students had difficulty using this structure accurately. Second, it is known that this structure can be difficult for learners to acquire (DeKeyser, 1998; Ellis, 1990). Finally, this structure was chosen because to the best of the researchers' knowledge, there is not any research investigating the effects of intensive and extensive written recasts on the acquisition of it.

2.4. Procedure

This research is a quasi-experimental research study, and it is based on a pretest, treatment, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest research design (see Table 1). According to this design, the participants were conveniently sampled and non-randomly assigned into one of these three feedback conditions: written intensive recast (n = 20), written extensive recast (n

= 17), and control group (*n* = 19). Then the students' English proficiency level was determined through the Oxford Quick Placement test (Part I).

In this research, the data was collected through three different tests: an untimed grammaticality judgment test (UGJT), a sentence writing test, and a story writing test. Of these tests, the UGJT had two versions, and each of them involved 36 items. In these versions of the UGJT, 20 items with 9 grammatical and 11 ungrammatical sentences were related to the target structure. On the other hand, the remaining 16 items in each test were used as distractors.

The sentence writing test consisted of 16 items. For each item, scrambled words were given to the students. In this test, the participants were required to make sentences by correctly ordering the given words and using the singular –s or the bare form of the verb for the obligatory occasions. Moreover, it is to note that the English articles, prepositions, and the plural forms of the words were not given to the students in this test. Therefore, they also used these structures if necessary. This test had three versions, and each version consisted of the identical items. That is to say, the subjects and verbs given for each item in the three tests were the same, but the remaining words of the sentences were different.

Finally, in the story writing test, the students wrote a story for the pretest, immediate posttest, and the delayed posttest. For writing these stories, six related pictures and word prompts were given to the participants for each test, and the students were asked to write at least six affirmative sentences in simple present tense by looking at the pictures and using the words. The stories written by the participants were about these characters: Cinderella, Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs, and the Little Red Riding Hood.

While administering the tests, the researchers gave the instructions in Turkish in order to facilitate the participants to understand what they should do for completing each test. Further, when there was a word which the students did not know the meaning of, the Turkish equivalent of that word was given to the students.

Table 1.

The research schedule

Week	Activity
1	Oxford Quick Placement Test
3	Task piloting
4	Pretest • UGJT • Sentence Writing Test • Story Writing Test
5	Feedback on written Task I Written Task II
6	Feedback on written Task II Immediate Posttest • UGJT • Sentence Writing Test • Story Writing Test
8	Delayed Posttest • UGJT • Sentence Writing Test • Story Writing Test

2.5. Treatment

The sentence writing test and the story writing test administered for the pretest were also used for giving written intensive or extensive recasts to the participants. After the students completed these tests, the second researcher analyzed the sentences written by the students and wrote intensive or extensive recasts on the papers. Next week, when the participants received these papers, the researcher told the students to look over their errors and the recasts for at least ten minutes. However, they did not receive any extra explanation about their errors nor revise their sentences (Ellis et al., 2008). On the same day, the students also completed the Written Task II. Like the Written Task I, this task also consisted of two parts. However, the first section of this task required the students to write 12 sentences using the unscrambled word prompts. As for the second section of that, it involved six related pictures and word prompts about the daily routine of a cartoon character named Bob. After all the students completed this task, the teacher examined the papers again and wrote intensive or extensive recasts on them. Next week, the students in the experimental groups received their papers and looked over their errors and the recasts for at least ten minutes. In contrast to the participants in the other groups, the students in the control group just completed the tasks without receiving any kind of feedback in response to their errors.

2.6. Scoring and Data Analysis

Scoring

In this data analysis process, firstly the researchers scored the data from the UGJT. For this test, the scorers gave 1 point for each correct answer for grammatical sentences, and they gave 1 point for ungrammatical sentences if the correct form of the simple present singular -s was supplied for the obligatory occasions or if the correction was made using the bare form of the verb. Moreover, it is to note that the scorers did not assign any points if a grammatical item was judged as ungrammatical and correction was supplied for a non-obligatory part (Kamiya, 2015). In this test, 20 points were the top score, and the distractors were ignored.

Secondly, the sentence writing tests were scored, and 1 point was given if the single person –s was correctly used in the obligatory occasion. In this vein, the highest score was 16 for this test. Furthermore, the correct use of other structures such as prepositions, articles, or plural forms of the words was ignored.

As for the story writing tests, the obligatory occasion analysis (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Ellis et al., 2008) was used while scoring the answers given for these tests. According to this analysis, the scorers firstly determined the number of the accurate usages of the target structure. Then the number of the obligatory occasions was found. Lastly, the obligatory occasion rate was calculated by dividing the number of correct usages into the number of obligatory occasions as shown in the following formula:

$$\frac{n\ correct\ usages\ of\ the\ singular - s}{n\ obligatory\ occasions\ of\ the\ singular - s}$$

Figure 1. The formula for the obligatory occasion analysis

Finally, it should be noted that the second researcher scored a randomly selected 20% of the data with the aim of having more reliable scoring results. Then the inter-rater agreement rates were calculated. As a result, agreement percentages of 90.5, 95, and 93.75 were found

between the raters for the data from the UGJT, the sentence writing test, and the story writing test, respectively.

Data Analysis

As for the statistical analysis of the data, the pretest UGJT scores of the groups were compared through the Kruskal-Wallis test since according to the results of the Shapiro-Wilk tests, the data from the extensive recast group (W = .849, p = .010) and control group (W = .824, p = .003) do not ensure normal distribution (Dörnyei, 2007). Then, since there was a significant difference among the pretest scores of the groups, gain scores were used in order to compare the groups in terms of their immediate and delayed posttest UGJT scores (Kamiya, 2015). In this vein, the Kruskal-Wallis test was employed to compare the groups' gain scores that were computed by subtracting the pretest scores from the immediate posttest UGJT scores. Moreover, the independent samples *t*-test and two Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted as post-hoc tests. Because the gain scores did not distribute normally, Mann-Whitney U tests were used for post-hoc comparisons. Furthermore, a Bonferroni correction was used in order to prevent the increase of type I error (Field, 2009). As another comparison, the gain scores of the groups from the pretest to the delayed posttest were compared through the Kruskal-Wallis test. Again, independent samples *t*-test and two Mann-Whitney U tests were employed for post-hoc comparisons. Moreover, the Bonferroni correction was used again.

Secondly, the One-Way ANOVA was used to compare the groups' pretest scores from the sentence writing test. Because the groups were not equal in terms of their pretest scores, and the control group's immediate posttest scores did not distribute normally (W = .810, p = .002), it was decided that the gain scores were used to make comparisons among the groups (Kamiya, 2015). In this context, the gain scores of the groups indicating the difference between their pretest and immediate posttest scores were compared through the Kruskal-Wallis test. Additionally, the gain scores of the groups from the pretest to the delayed posttest were compared through the One-Way ANOVA.

Finally, the pretest scores of the story writing test were compared through the Kruskal-Wallis test because the three groups' scores did not distribute normally (W = .862, p = .008; W = .890, p = .046; W = .856, p = .008). Then, as it was found that the groups' pretest scores were equal, they were directly compared in terms of their immediate and delayed posttest scores without calculating the gain scores. In this vein, the groups' immediate and delayed posttest scores were compared through the Kruskal-Wallis tests because the intensive and extensive groups' immediate posttest scores (W = .902, p = .044; W = .867, p = .020) and the extensive and control groups' delayed posttest scores (W = .866, p = .019; W = .887, p = .029) did not ensure normal distribution criterion.

3. Findings

In order to answer the research question, the three groups were compared in terms of their pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest scores. However, before presenting the results related to the research question, it should be noted that the students in the experimental groups received almost equal number of recasts for the singular –s as the results of independent samples *t*-test ($t(35) = 0.309$, $p > .05$) showed.

Firstly, the pretest UGJT scores of the groups were compared through the Kruskal-Wallis test. The results given in Table 2 indicated that the groups were significantly different from

each other ($\chi^2_{(2)} = 9.863$, $p < .05$). Then, the groups' gain scores were compared, and the results of the test revealed that there was a significant difference among the groups (Table 3) ($\chi^2_{(2)} = 6.781$, $p < .05$). Afterwards, the post-hoc tests indicated that the intensive recast group had significantly more gains than the control group ($Z_u = 103.000$, $p < .016$). On the other hand, there was not any significant difference between the gain scores of the intensive and extensive recast groups ($t(35) = 1.183$, $p > .016$) and between the ones of the extensive group and the control group ($Z_u = 131.500$, $p > .016$). According to the comparison made among the groups' gain scores between the pretest and delayed posttest, there was a significant difference among the groups (Table 4) ($\chi^2_{(2)} = 7.784$, $p < .05$). The post-hoc test results indicated that the intensive recast group had significantly more gains than the extensive recast group ($t(35) = 2.573$, $p < .016$), while there was not any significant difference between the intensive recast group and the control group ($Z_u = 157.500$, $p > .016$). In addition, no significant difference was found between the gain scores of the extensive recast group and the control group ($Z_u = 91.000$, $p > .016$).

Table 2.

Kruskal-Wallis test results for the groups' pretest means of UGJT

Group	**N**	**Mean rank**	**df**	**χ2**	***p***
Intensive	20	21.83	2	9.863	.007
Extensive	17	26.09			
Control	19	37.68			

Table 3.

Kruskal-Wallis test results for the groups' gain scores from pretest to posttest UGJT

Group	**N**	**Mean rank**	**df**	**χ2**	***p***
Intensive	20	35.63	2	6.781	.034
Extensive	17	27.00			
Control	19	22.34			

Table 4.

Kruskal-Wallis test results for the groups' gain scores from pretest to delayed posttest UGJT

Group	**N**	**Mean rank**	**df**	**χ2**	***p***
Intensive	20	34.13	2	7.784	.020
Extensive	17	19.65			
Control	19	30.50			

As for the comparison of the scores from the sentence writing test, it was found that the groups were not equal in terms of their pretest scores (Table 5) ($F(2, 53) = 6.493$, $p < .05$). Then, the comparison among the gain scores of the groups from the pretest to immediate posttest scores put forward that there was not any significant difference among the groups' gain scores (Table 6) ($\chi^2_{(2)} = .300$, $p > .05$). Similarly, the test showed no significant difference among the gain scores calculated as the difference between the groups' pretest and delayed posttest scores from the sentence writing test (Table 7) ($F(2, 53) = 2.544$, $p > .05$).

Table 5.

ANOVA results for the groups' pretest sentence writing test scores

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	*p*
Between groups	187.066	2	93.533	6.493	.003
Within groups	763.487	53	14.405		
Total	950.554	55			

Table 6.

Kruskal-Wallis test results for the groups' gain scores from pretest to posttest sentence writing test

Group	N	Mean rank	df	χ2	*p*
Intensive	20	30.03	2	.300	.861
Extensive	17	27.21			
Control	19	28.05			

Table 7.

ANOVA results for the groups' gain scores from pretest to delayed posttest sentence writing test

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	*p*
Between groups	60.939	2	30.469	2.544	.088
Within groups	634.900	53	11.979		
Total	695.839	55			

Finally, the groups were compared in terms of their scores from the story writing test. First of all, it was found that the groups were equal before the treatment process (Table 8) ($\chi^2_{(2)}$ = .086, $p > .05$). In addition, the results of the comparison made among the groups' immediate posttest scores indicated that there was not any significant difference among the groups (Table 9) ($\chi^2_{(2)}$ = 2.943, $p > .05$). Likewise, the test results indicated that there was not any significant difference among the groups in terms of their delayed posttest scores (Table 10) ($\chi^2_{(2)}$ = .178, $p > .05$).

Table 8.

Kruskal-Wallis test results for pretest story writing test

Group	N	Mean rank	df	χ2	*p*
Intensive	20	28.15	2	.086	.958
Extensive	17	27.94			
Control	19	29.37			

Table 9.

Kruskal-Wallis test results for posttest story writing test

Group	N	Mean rank	df	χ2	*p*
Intensive	20	27.83	2	2.943	.230
Extensive	17	24.03			
Control	19	33.21			

Table 10.

Kruskal-Wallis test results for delayed posttest story writing test

Group	N	Mean rank	df	χ2	*p*
Intensive	20	29.48	2	.178	.915
Extensive	17	27.24			
Control	19	28.61			

4. Discussion

In this study, the research question concerned the intensive and extensive written recasts' effects on the acquisition of the third person singular –s. The results of the study displayed that the intensive recast group performed significantly better than the control group according to the comparison of the gain scores calculated by subtracting the pretest UGJT scores from the immediate posttest UGJT scores. Furthermore, the intensive recast group had significantly higher gain scores from the pretest to the delayed posttest UGJT than the extensive recast group. However, either in the short or long term, the study failed to find any significant difference among the groups in terms of their scores from the two production tests: the sentence writing test and the story writing test. Consequently, these results suggest that the intensive recast is more effective than the extensive recast in developing explicit knowledge of the singular –s. In contrast, the results also display no significant difference in terms of the effects of two types of recasts on the development of the implicit knowledge regarding the target structure.

When these results are compared with those of the previous studies, it can be said that there are some similarities. For example, similar to this research, Ellis et al. (2008) found that the focused, unfocused, and control groups were not significantly different on narrative writing in short term. Drawing on the results from narrative writing tests, Sheen et al. (2009) also revealed that there was no significant difference between the unfocused feedback group and the writing practice group receiving no feedback. In consideration of these compatible results, it is possible to assert that writing practice without any feedback has as many short-term effects as unfocused (extensive) written feedback on the development of grammatical structures.

In contrast to these similarities, some results are also incompatible with the ones found by the WCF studies (Ellis et al., 2008; Sheen et al., 2009; Frear & Chiu, 2015; Beşkardeşler, 2018; and Kim, 2019). Of these studies, for example, Ellis et al. (2008) did not find any significant difference between the focused and unfocused CF while revealing that both feedback types were significantly better than no correction in the delayed narrative writing posttest. Sheen et al. (2009) also found the focused CF group performed significantly better than the control group in the delayed narrative writing posttest, while the unfocused CF did not achieve that. Regarding the effects of indirect WCF Frear and Chiu (2015) displayed that the focused and unfocused indirect WCF were significantly better than no feedback for the accurate use of regular past tense and total accuracy. Furthermore, using narrative writing tests and error correction tests Beşkardeşler (2018) reported that both focused and unfocused feedback were better than no feedback and that there was not any significant difference between these two kinds of feedback. Similarly, Kim's (2019) study indicated that both focused and unfocused WCF were more beneficial than no feedback for the accurate use of the indefinite article and hypothetical conditional on reconstruction tasks. Considering the results from the sentence writing and story writing tests, in contrast to the previous studies, the current

research displayed no difference between the written recast groups and the control group in short- and long-term.

The results revealed by the current research are also not in line with the results presented by the recast studies. For example, Sarandi (2009) targeted the third person –s and put forward that the group receiving corrective recast significantly outperformed the no feedback group on the oral production immediate posttest. As for the Kamiya (2015) study, it reported that both intensive and extensive recasts were significantly effective on the development of the explicit knowledge which was measured through UGJT. On the other hand, Nassaji (2017) found extensive recast was more beneficial than intensive recast and no feedback for the accurate use of articles on the oral picture description and grammaticality judgment tasks. In contrast to these results, the present research indicated that intensive recasts had significantly more beneficial effects on the development of the explicit knowledge related to the simple present –s than the extensive recasts and no feedback. However, regarding the comparison between these results, it should be noted that the recast studies mentioned above are different from this research in terms of the mode of feedback provided during the treatment process. Therefore, this comparison should be considered with caution.

Furthermore, some possible reasons can be discussed for these incompatible results. For example, in contrast to Nassaji's (2017) explanation that the provision of extensive recasts may have enhanced "the salience and noticeability of the recast as feedback" (p. 363), the extensive recasts given in this study may have hindered the participants to cognitively process the given feedback effectively (Ellis, 2008, Ellis et al., 2008; Sheen, 2007; Sheen et al., 2009). Therefore, although the number of recasts about the target structure is almost equal for the two experimental groups, it can be said that the learners receiving intensive recasts "can more easily focus on one identifiable structure" (Kamiya, 2015, p. 70).

The length of the treatment might have also been effective on the results. As the treatment process lasted for two weeks, the learners in the experimental groups might not have benefited from the recasts as much as it was anticipated. Especially the participants in the extensive group may have needed more time and feedback to outperform the control group. Furthermore, as Shintani et al. (2014) pointed out, revision subsequent to WCF can play an important role on the effectiveness of feedback. In contrast to this, in this research the participants in the experimental groups did not revise their written products, but looked over the given recasts in a few minutes, and this inhibited the participants from producing outputs. However, according to Swain's (1985) output hypothesis the learners' producing "pushed output" is important for noticing the target language form. Moreover, as compatible with Truscott's (1999, 2004) claim, writing practice without any CF may have been beneficial for the learners in the control group to learn the target structure. Hence this can be a reason for the insignificant difference among the groups.

In addition, the types of the outcome measures that are used in this research are also important for the results (Nassaji, 2017). Although the recasts were provided to the participants through the tasks similar to the ones in the production tests, the students receiving the intensive or extensive recasts could not outperform the control group on these tests. One reason for this result may be the fact that the participants may have had more difficulty in accurately using the target structure than judging whether a sentence is grammatical or not and correcting the problematic part of the item in the UGJT. The situation that there is a significant difference between the intensive recast group and the control group in terms of the UGJT gain scores while there is no difference among the

groups on the production tests can also be stated as a result supporting this claim. However, this is a finding contrasting with the Révész (2012) study which found that recasts were more effective on a written production test than on a written grammaticality judgment test.

Another possible explanation for the ineffectiveness of the recasts can be that the participants not receiving any feedback in control group might have noticed that the singular –s was focused on the tasks. Consequently, they may have gotten extra information about the target structure from some sources like grammar books or the internet. And their extra study outside of the class might have caused this research to find some insignificant results between the effects of recasts and no feedback. Therefore, as made in Kamiya (2015), choosing a target structure which the learners are developmentally ready to acquire but have minimal knowledge of that might have resulted in different findings of the effects of the recasts.

Finally, the significant difference among the groups' pretest scores may also be another factor that can explain the ineffectiveness of the recasts (Ammar & Spada, 2006, Mackey & Philp, 1998). To be more precise, the control group students' having significantly higher pretest scores on the UGJT and the sentence writing test may show that the participants in this group are more ready to acquire the target structure than the ones in other groups (Kamiya, 2015). Consequently, this difference among the groups might have affected the comparability of the groups (Ellis et al., 2008), and therefore the results revealed by the current research should be interpreted with caution. However, it should be noted that equalizing the groups' pretest scores before the outset of the treatment process was impossible because the researchers did not have the chance to randomize the participants.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this research was to compare the effects of intensive and extensive recasts on the acquisition of the simple present singular –s. On the whole, the findings of the research revealed that the intensive recast had positive effects on development of the explicit knowledge with regard to the target structure in the short term while the extensive recast did not have a significant effect neither in short nor in long term. Moreover, regarding the development of the implicit knowledge about the target structure, the study found no significant difference among the three feedback conditions: written intensive recast, written extensive recast, and no feedback. Therefore, it can be concluded from the findings of this research that the effects of written recasts on learning the simple present –s are too limited.

By drawing on these mentioned findings of the research, some implications can be suggested. For example, the English teachers can provide their students with more intensive recasts rather than the extensive ones because intensive recasts may help the learners notice the target structure more easily and focus on how and where that structure should be used. This can be beneficial especially for the learners who do not have much background knowledge about the target structure. In addition, through various production tasks, the teachers can provide their students with the opportunity to use the target structure and especially the learners who are more ready to learn the structure can benefit from these tasks. Therefore, the teachers should give the learners the chance to test their hypotheses and revise them instead of just presenting the grammatical information regarding the form in question.

However, the study has also some limitations. Firstly, in contrast to previous research (e.g., Beşkardeşler, 2018; Nassaji, 2017), the non-random assignment of the participants into the groups resulted in the difference among the groups' pretest scores, and this made the

comparability of the groups difficult. This situation also constitutes a limitation for the generalizability of the findings revealed by this research to other groups. Moreover, the period between the immediate posttest and the delayed posttest could have been longer than two weeks, so it would be possible to reach more valid results about the long-term effects of the recasts. As another limitation, only the simple present singular –s was selected as the target structure, and the effects of intensive and extensive recasts on the acquisition of this structure were compared. However, whether and how the acquisition of other untargeted structures is affected by the intensive and extensive recasts might have been investigated.

In the light of these limitations, future research can compare the effects of extensive and intensive recasts in the groups which are at different levels in terms of their readiness to acquire the target structure. Moreover, these effects can also be investigated with a research study in which the length of the treatment process takes longer than two weeks. In order to reach more valid results regarding the long-term effects of the recasts, other studies can also have a longer period between the immediate and delayed posttests. Moreover, further research should be conducted to compare the effects of these two types of recasts on learning other grammatical structures.

Ethical Issues

The author(s) confirm(s) that the study does not need ethics committee approval according to the research integrity rules in their country.

References

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all?: Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *28*(4), 543-574.

Beşkardeşler, S. (2018). *The effects of written corrective feedback types on the prepositions of time and place and students' perceptions on written corrective feedback in EFL context in Turkey.* MA Thesis, Sakarya University Institute of Educational Sciences, Sakarya.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, *12*(3), 409-431.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The relative effectiveness of different types of direct written corrective feedback. *System*, *37*(2), 322-329.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *19*(4), 207-217.

Bitchener, J., Young, S. & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *14*(3), 191-205.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*(3), 267-296.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th Ed.). Boston: Pearson.

DeKeyser, R. M. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42–63). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, *51*, 1–46.

Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, *63*(2), 97-107.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analyzing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, *36*(3), 353-371.

Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(1), 1-11.

Ferris, D. (2004). The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime…?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*(1), 49-62.

Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Ferris, D. & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(3), 161-184.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London: SAGE.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012*). How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Frear, D., & Chiu, Y. H. (2015). The effect of focused and unfocused indirect written corrective feedback on EFL learners' accuracy in new pieces of writing. *System*, *53*, 24-34.

Gass, S. M., Behney, J., & Plonsky, L. (2013). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (4th Ed.). New York: Routledge.

Izumi, S., & Bigelow, M. (2000). Does output promote noticing and second language acquisition?. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(2), 239-278.

Kamiya, N. (2015). The effectiveness of intensive and extensive recasts on L2 acquisition for implicit and explicit knowledge. *Linguistics and Education*, *29*, 59-72.

Kim, J. H. (2019). Relative effects of direct focused and unfocused WCF on the accuracy development of two language forms, *English Teaching, 74*(4), 29-50.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford University.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D. (1985).*The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* London: Longman.

Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for teaching. *System*, *25*(4), 465-477.

Long, M. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In Ritchie, W. C & Bhatia, T. K. (Eds.), *Handbook of Language Acquisition: Vol. 2. Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic.

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*(1), 37-66.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *32*(2), 265-302.

Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *27*(3), 405-430.

Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, *82*(3), 338-356.

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

Révész, A. (2012). Working memory and the observed effectiveness of recasts on different L2 outcome measures. *Language Learning*, *62*(1), 93-132.

Sarandi, H. (2009). *Corrective recast and prompt in learning L2 grammar in EFL setting*, Doctoral Dissertation, Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences, Ankara.

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

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Schmidt, R. (2010). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning. In W. M. Chan, S. Chi, K. N. Cin, J. Istanto, M. Nagami, J. W. Sew, T. Suthiwan, & I. Walker, *Proceedings of CLaSIC 2010*, Singapore, December 2-4 (pp. 721-737). Singapore: National University of Singapore, Centre for Language Studies.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. N. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research, 8*(3), 263-300.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*(2), 255-283.

Sheen, Y. (2010a). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 203-234.

Sheen, Y. (2010b). Introduction: The role of oral and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 169-179.

Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, *37*(4), 556-569.

Shintani, N., Ellis, R., & Suzuki, W. (2014). Effects of written feedback and revision on learners' accuracy in using two English grammatical structures. *Language Learning*, *64*(1), 103-131.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S. & Madden, C. (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition,* (pp. 235-252). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in hour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University.

Swain, M. (2005). The Output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning.* (pp. 471-485). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, *82*(3), 320-337.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, *46*(2), 327-369.

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(2), 111-122.

Truscott, J. (2004). Evidence and conjecture on the effects of correction: A response to Chandler. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*(4), 337-343.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *16*(4), 255-272.

Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning*, *62*(1), 1-41.

White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research*, *7*, 133– 161.

Yılmaz, N. (2014). *Effects of written recast on the acquisition of the simple past tense by learners of English as a foreign language.* MA Thesis, Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.