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Abstract

Both the study of the efficacy and frequency of different types of corrective feedback and the investigation of different teaching styles of educators are of a great prominence in studies of second and foreign language teaching. Teaching style of educators is related to many factors, such as teachers’ thinking style, attitudes, behaviors, personalities, activities, and so on (Heimlich & Norland, 2002). The present study was an attempt to investigate the patterns of error treatment in intermediate teenage EFL classrooms in Iran. In particular, the analysis focused, first, on the frequency and distribution of different feedback types used by the teachers and how they resulted in learner uptake and, second, on the relationship between the educators’ teaching style and types of feedback they provided. Participants of the study were 12 teachers from two branches of Simin Educational Association who taught teenage learners at an intermediated level. Voice recording of their classes totaled 25.4 hours out of which 16.7 hours of teacher-student interaction were considered to be the study’s database which was analyzed based on the study’s coding scheme. The analysis of the database, teachers’ scores on Teaching Style Inventory, and findings of the semi-structured interviews indicated that first, there was an overwhelming tendency for teachers to use recasts in spite of its ineffectiveness at eliciting uptakes from learners. Elicitation was also proved to be the feedback type which led to the greatest amount of learner uptake. Second, it was made clear that teachers with certain teaching styles were more prone to use certain feedback types, indicating that a relationship between teaching styles of the educators and their feedback provision habits does exist.
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چکیده

رابطه میان سبک آموزش مدرسین ایرانی و انواع بازخورددهای ارائه شده توسط آنها در کلاس‌های آموزش زبان انگلیسی

مطالعه کارایی و فراوانی انواع بازخورددها و همچنین تحقیق در مورد انواع سبک‌هاي آموزش مدرسین از اهمیت زیادی در مطالعات آموزش زبان انگلیسی برخوردار است. سبک تدریس مدرسین به عوامل زیادی از جمله سبک تفکر، دیدگاه ها، رفتارها، انواع شخصیت، و فعالیت‌های آنها بستگی دارد. موضوع مورد پژوهش در پایان نامه حاضر، تحقیق در مورد الگوهای تصمیم‌گیری خطاهای زبان آموزان نوجوان در کلاس‌های سطح متوسط (intermediate) آموزش زبان انگلیسی می‌باشد. تمرکز این تحقیق تنها بر روی فراوانی و توزیع انواع بازاردها و چگونگی منجر شدن آنها به پذیرش (uptake) زبان آموزان و دوباره بر روی رابطه بین سبک آموزش مدرسان و انواع بازاردههای ارائه شده توسط آنها می‌باشد. در این تحقیق ۱۲ مدرس که از دو شرکت موسسه‌های مادران زبان می‌باشند و به زبان آموزان نوجوان در سطح متوسط درس می‌دادند، شرکت کرده و مجموعا ۲۵ ساعت از کلاس‌های مدرسان ضبط گردید که این مقدار، ۱۶۴ ساعت که عمدتاً مکالمات بین مدرسان و زبان آموزان بوده، به عنوان بنک اطلاعات این تحقیق در نظر گرفته شد. سپس بنک اطلاعات توسط مدل ک گذاری تحقیق، تحلیل شد. تحلیل بنک اطلاعات، نمره مدرسان در پرسشنامه سبک تدریس (TSI)، و یافته‌های مصاحبه نشان داد که اولاً غیرمغ کارایی ضعیف در فرا خواندن پذیرش (uptake) recast زبان آموزان، مدرسان تماشا زیادی برای استفاده از این نوع بازارده در کلاس‌های آموزش زبان خود داشتند. همچنین ثابت شد که منجر به بیشترین تعداد پذیرش (uptake) در زبان آموزان شد. ثانیاً نتایج تحقیق elicitation حاضر نشان داد که بعضی از مدرسین با سبک‌های تدریس معین، از برخی از بازاردهها بیشتر استفاده کرده‌اند که این ثابت می‌کند که رابطه بین سبک تدریس مدرسان و انواع بازاردههای ارائه شده توسط آنها وجود دارد.
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