



Input Modification in the Teaching of English Language among Federal University Lecturers in South–West, Nigeria

Fatai Ayiki Azeez

Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

fataiazzez2@gmail.com

Monica N. Odinko

Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

J. A. Abijo

Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

jaabijo@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigated input modification in the teaching of English Language among federal university lecturers in South-West, Nigeria. The study examined English grammar and phonology classes. The study made use of Descriptive survey design. The population of the study comprised undergraduate English Language lecturers and their students in South-West, Nigeria. Purposive sampling technique was used to select fifteen (15) English Language lecturers taking English Grammar and phonology and 350 students in South-West, Federal Universities in Nigeria. Three research questions were answered. Data were collected using Lecturer Classroom Interaction Sheet (LCIS) with reliability co-efficient of 0.76 and Students' Rating of English Language Lecturer Input Modification (SRELLIM) with reliability co-efficient of 0.82. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and T-test. The result of the lecturers' input simplification practices revealed that lecturer explaining new vocabulary is the most frequently used (27%). This is followed by lecturer using basic vocabulary that matches learners' language and lecturer explaining an idea using more than one word which have the same proportion of 26.1%. The study also revealed that elaborating self-utterance to make the meaning clear is the most (54.6%) frequently used input elaboration pattern. This is followed by modifying learners' utterance which amounts to a percentage of 17.0%. The study further revealed a significant difference in score between the two groups of lecturers with $t(87) = .00, p < .05$, two-tailed where experienced lecturers with ($M = 104.33, SD = 24.68$) scoring higher than inexperienced lecturers ($M = 81.15, SD = 15.58$). Also, there was a significant difference in score between the two groups of lecturers with $t(348) = .00, p < .05$, two-tailed where Ph. D holders ($M = 104.33, SD = 24.68$) scoring higher than MA holders ($M = 81.15, SD = 15.58$). The study then recommends that Lecturers should be able to use a variety of input modification patterns and adapt the specific patterns that suit the learners they are teaching.

Keywords: Simplification, Elaboration, Input Modification.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Azeez, F. A., Odinko, M. N., & Abijo, J. A. (2020). Corrective Feedback in the Teaching of English Language among Federal University Lecturers in South-West, Nigeria. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 13(2), 259-270.

INTRODUCTION

Language is the major means of interaction in the classroom. The teacher language in the classroom interaction is instructive and informative. This is because the whole essence of classroom interaction is to promote learning through language. The teacher language (Input) is a vital part of English language classroom interaction. According to Roy (2015), input is the oral or written language that is made available to learners, either through listening, reading or gestures in case of sign language. Input that learners receive in the learning process plays a very important role in the language acquisition. Patten and Benati (2010) are of the view that language input is a major source of data for language learners to construct their competence or intellectual representation of the language based on the examples embedded in the input. Xiao-yan (2006) asserts that teacher input is not just only the object of study, but also the medium through which the teaching objective is achieved. Yana (2013) is also of the view that the quality and quantity of teacher input play an essential role in the language learning. This implies that what the students learn in the English Language classroom is a factor of teacher input. For teacher input to be understood, it requires modification.

Navés, Muñoz and Pavesi (2017) observed that there is a direct relationship between language complexity and learning difficulty. Thus, language teachers need to know and be cognizant of the influence of the language they use on students' academic achievement and classroom interactions (Ernst-Slavit & Mason, 2011). Since language is crucial for learning, most practicing linguists and researchers (Yana, 2013; Adriano, Hashim, Onesm & Abdulkarim, 2016) assert that the ideal practice for educating the learners is to modify the input (language use for classroom teaching and learning) for students' understanding.

Input modification refers to language that is adjusted to the understanding level of the learners. The teacher that intends to teach course content is expected to modify the entry language within the domain of what the students are conversant with. The major reason why teacher modifies input in classroom interaction is that new concepts and vocabularies are introduced in the classroom using language. Such concepts and vocabularies require modification for students to understand. It means that when a teacher uses a vocabulary that is above the learners' level of understanding, the expectation is that he should break it down for the students to understand. Walsh in Reza and Bahareh (2017) stressed that teachers' ability to control their use of language is at least as important as their ability to select appropriate methodologies. More importantly, input modification is coming in because students who are exposed the input to do not understand the input. Besides, student-teacher who are going to teach using the input find it difficult to teach during training. Yana (2013) is of the view that input modification in teacher talk leads to understanding of input, helps students to avoid misunderstanding, encourages students' involvement and exposes students to the communicable language for classroom interaction.

Also, Lynch (1996) identifies three reasons why teachers modify their input when teaching learners. Firstly, there is a link between understanding of teacher language (input) and language learning. Secondly, learners' language development is strongly linked to teacher language use. More so, learners often face difficulties in understanding teacher language (input). Brown (2006) highlights three reasons why teachers modify their language (input) when teaching learners. These include; teacher should not use vocabulary that is too high or difficult; teacher should not use language that is too simple. Also, teacher should be able to adjust vocabulary and being eclectic in their teaching by carrying their students along. Therefore, since the whole

essence of classroom interaction is to promote learning through communication, teacher modification of language input become necessary for students understanding of input.

Patterns of Input modification

Hasan (2008) and Le (2011) identify patterns of input modification as: simplification, that is making input easy to understand and elaboration, which is expanding input in detail. Simplification involves substituting unknown words with basic or high frequency words. Simplification is a kind of intralingua translation whereby a piece of word or expression is reduced to a version written or spoken in the supposed language of the learner (Moradian, Naserpoor & Tamri, 2013). Other researchers (Urano, 2000, Brewer, 2008; Yana, 2013) are of the view that simplification involves controlling the input presented to the learners by removing unknown words in order to enhance understanding; replacing a low frequency word with a synonyms or phrases that are commonly use; as well as using less complex words and short sentences.

Patterns of Input simplification

Hasan (2008) identifies different patterns of input simplification in attempt to enhance acquisition of English Language. These include, making use of simplified vocabulary, explaining low-frequency words, co-switching and paraphrasing. One of the major ways of simplifying input in classroom interaction is making use of simplified vocabularies (Adriano, Hashim, Onesm and Abdulkarim, 2016). Brewer (2008) stresses that simplified vocabulary comprises words that are basic and match the language proficiency level of the learners. The teacher avoids the use of unfamiliar words in classroom interaction in an attempt to retain simplified vocabulary. Also, simplified vocabulary is achieved by making use of high frequency words. Brewer (2008) is of the view that high frequency words are words that are considered to be within the learners' language ability. For instance in English phonology, such words as, stress, rhyme and intonation are considered to be simple vocabularies for the undergraduate English Language students. Therefore, the teacher uses such simple vocabularies instead of a complex vocabulary like supra- segmental which also refer to stress, rhyme and intonation to make input clear to the learner.

However, teacher uses complex words or low-frequency words in classroom interaction in an attempt to expose new concepts or new ideas to the students. According to Brewer (2008), low frequency words are words that are considered to be beyond the learners' language ability. Teacher simplifies input by explaining or defining low frequency words. For instance in English phonology, such words as "segmental", "supra- segmental" and so on and so forth are considered as low frequency words for undergraduate English Language students. Therefore, in English Language classroom interaction, teacher explains the low-frequency words to make input clear to the learners. For instance, segmental which is any unit that can be identified either physically or auditory in the stream of speech.

Co-switching is another pattern of simplifying teacher language according to Adriano et. al., (2016). Cook (2001) argues that the use of the first language of students in the second language classroom teaching is an excellent resource in promoting second language learning. Code-switching is a significant phenomenon in language teaching and learning as it is considered as an important speech style used to pull off interactional effects and attain communicative goals.

Code-switching is used to emphasize some points and facilitate understanding (Gulzar, 2010). The teacher who focuses on explicit, deductive grammar instruction of the second language (L2) through the first language (L1) seems to assume that through contrastive analysis with the first language, accuracy and understanding of the second language can be attained.

Another pattern of input simplification is paraphrasing. Gláucia (2006) maintains that paraphrase occurs when the same point is expressed with different words. This means that a paraphrased expression is an expression that is said or written in a different way but with the same meaning. Tania (2014) is of the view that paraphrase is a communicative strategy which involves a speaker looking for an alternative to the word or the expression in the target language. Tania (2014) identifies variants of paraphrase strategy as word substitution strategy and circumlocution. Word substitution involves looking for some kind of vocabulary, using synonyms or more general words. Circumlocution involves explaining an idea using more than one word to express the meaning. Teacher makes input clear and understood to the learners by paraphrasing words and expressions. For instance, when the teacher says; “she learnt the skills concurrently” I mean “she learnt the skills at the same time”. The teacher has paraphrased concurrently using the phrase, at the same time. Adriano et al (2016) investigate the role of input simplification and modification in the Tanzanian English-Language classroom and the study found that simplification of learners’ utterances takes the form of paraphrasing. The study also revealed that teacher educational level as well as personal teaching style was found to have influenced the use of paraphrases.

While input simplification is good for learners’ acquisition of English Language, Yana (2013) argues that over-simplified input in the language classroom can prove to be a great obstacle in the process of acquisition of communication skills that are essential for the real world. Negari and Rouhi (2012) argued that simplification hinders the opportunity for a learner to learn new linguistic items. Over-simplification of input might tamper with the authenticity of the language, and authenticity forms a crucial element in real life communicative proficiency (Yana, 2013).

Input Elaboration and its patterns

Kim (2003) is of the view that input modification in the direction of elaboration is preferred in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) on the ground that elaborated input retains the material that Second Language learners (L2) need for their language development. According to Adriano *et al* (2016), elaboration is a pattern of modification of input that adds clarifying elements to the input. In elaboration, the unfamiliar word is not removed, but it is given a word which is well-known or of high frequency of use in appositions (Adriano et al., 2016). Elaboration involves adding redundant information to the input through the use of repetition (Urano, 2000). Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991), noted that elaborated input have the advantage of supplying learners with access to the new vocabularies they have not yet acquired.

Hassan (2008) and Adriano et al. (2016), identify the patterns of input elaboration in an attempt to enhance learners’ acquisition of English Language. These are: comprehension check, clarification request, self-elaboration and modification of learners’ utterances into appropriate form. Smejkalová (2014) presents the number of strategies that support language teaching and learning:

- Teach students strategies for requesting clarification and assistance when faced with comprehension difficulties;
- Conduct comprehension checks to ensure understanding;
- Make meaning clear through body language, gestures, and visual support;
- Negotiate meaning with students and encourage negotiation among students;
- Elicit talk that increases in fluency, accuracy, and complexity over time;
- Encourage self-expression and spontaneous use of language;
- Offer feedback to assist and improve students' ability to interact orally in the target language.

Clarification request is a classroom interaction pattern for expansion of input in detail for students learning. This entails asking for more clearly stated information. According to Hasan (2008), clarification request is any expression that is used to elicit clarification of the preceding utterances. In classroom interaction, language development occurs when the teacher or the learner requests for clarification in a case of misunderstood communication (Brewer, 2008). Examples of clarification request are; "What do you mean by convention?", "How do we say that?", "What do you mean by that?", "I don't understand" and "please repeat" and so on, following an utterance to indicate that the input is not clear. Therefore, input is understood when both the teacher and the learners modify and restructure interaction patterns by requests for clarification of the language input of each other (Hassan, 2008).

Moreover, apart from clarification requests, another way of making input comprehensible is through the use of comprehension checks. Hassan (2008) stresses that comprehension checks is any expression by a teacher that is designed to establish whether his or her proceeding utterance(s) had been understood. Zhang (2012) is of the view that in comprehension checks, questions are used to check the students' understanding of meaning of word or expression and to elicit an answer from the student. Hassan (2008) added that comprehension checks are good interactional devices to avoid breakdown of communication and to repair the discourse when communication breaks down. Smejkalová (2014) proposed ways by which teacher's ensure comprehension check by asks questions in order to check comprehension, asks learner to explain or rephrase and teacher repeats his/her words or those of the learner. Examples of comprehension checks are; have you read the introduction? What is it all about?

Self-elaboration involves the teacher expanding the vocabulary use in classroom interaction. For instance, in English Grammar class, instances of teacher self-elaboration of vocabulary include: Teacher: "lexical relations can be explained in syntagmatic terms", "that is, word relation exist at the level of linear structure as we have in fixed collocation like phrasal verb (look into, cut off, break in). Another instance of teacher self-elaboration of language use is: Teacher: "connotative meaning", "which mean, the implied meaning of words".

Moreover, apart from, self-elaboration, another classroom interaction pattern for expansion of language input in detail for students learning is modification of learner's utterance. Adriano *et al* (2016) are of the view that modification of learners' utterances takes the form of changing or adding some information to the students' utterances. Seong (2009) found that modification of learner's incomplete words or sentences help them notice the language and it was also considered a useful strategy for promoting students' English proficiency. For instance, in English phonology class, instances of teacher modification of learners' utterances are:

- Teacher: What did we examine on Monday?
- Student: Supersegmental!
- Teacher: Suprasegmental!
- Teacher: What of last week?
- Student: Sequence!
- Teacher: Tense sequence!

The Teacher's year of teaching experience seems to contribute greatly to achievement of students in English Language. According to Adeyemi (2008), teaching is a complex and demanding profession that requires skills in management and fast decision making, patience, empathy, communication, careful planning, stress tolerance, deep subject knowledge and psychological insight. One cannot acquire a high level of expertise within only a few years of teaching. Brown (2006) stresses that experienced teacher appears to prepare and plan classroom activities based on proven techniques and strategies that have worked with students over the years. The experienced teacher also appears to be well-versed in the latest thinking in language pedagogy. Also, according to Clotfelter, Ladd and Vigdor (2007), there is the possibility of little new learning taking place after teachers have been in the profession for a couple of years.

In contrast, the inexperienced teacher appears to experiment with different strategies wondering whether they will work or not (Brown, 2006). It is not uncommon for new teachers to take some time developing an understanding on how best to support student learning and this may determine their students' level of performance (Douglas, 2017). Some studies have established that inexperienced teachers (those with less than five years of experience) are typically less effective than senior teachers, those with higher years of experience (Onabanjo, 2004; Adeyemi, 2008; Akinsolu, 2010). Clotfelter, Ladd and Vigdor (2007) reported that teachers with more experience were more successful at raising student achievement than teachers with less experience. The most consistent and frequent result reported in the literature review indicated when teacher experience is positively related to achievement gains (Clotfelter, Ladd and Vigdor, 2007).

Norman (1975) study on teacher language in the classroom revealed that teaching experience is a strong factor that determines the teacher language in the classroom as the experienced teachers used a higher level of vocabulary than the inexperienced. This implies that teacher teaching experience may be a factor determines the teacher choice of vocabulary which may determine students' academic achievement. A study by Bilesanmi-Awoderu (2004) reveals that a direct causal relationship exists between teacher experience and students' academic achievement. This means that how students succeed or fail in learning what is expected of them depends greatly on the experience of the teacher. In other words, students learn more and achieve better with more experienced lecturers than the less experienced ones. Contrarily, other researchers (Tella, 2008; Andrew & Schwab, 1995) argue that very well prepared or certified beginning teachers are highly as effective in teaching as experienced teachers.

Teacher qualification is a factor that may affect the achievement of students in English Language which is one of the variables in this study. Teacher qualification is considered in this study as a factor that may influence classroom interaction pattern which may eventually impact learning. Unanma, Abugu, Dike and Umeobika (2013) observe that teachers with higher qualifications are in a better position to lead students to achieve effectively, as they are equipped with the pedagogical content knowledge to teach their subject areas. According to Unanma et al. (2013), teachers who continually update their knowledge by further degrees are able to

manipulate the learning environment and process to make learning easier for their students. Arubayi (2009) asserts that lecturers' qualification in higher institutions, to a great length is a determinant of the quality of the products of the institutions.

Researchers like Asikhia (2010) and Olaleye (2011) find that teachers' qualification has influence on student achievement. So also, Unanma *et al* (2013), find a perfect positive relationship between teacher qualification and students' academic achievement. Brewer (2000) and Stigler and Hiebert (2007) argue that increased teacher qualification promotes teaching effectiveness which subsequently translates to students' achievement. Adriano et al (2016) found that teacher educational level was found to have influenced the use of paraphrases. Owoeye (2000) also observes that teacher educational level turns out to be the most powerful determinant of academic achievement of students.

Contrarily, Zuzovsky (2003) investigates the impact of teachers' qualifications on students' achievement. The study reveals that most of the teacher variables commonly regarded as desired qualifications such as advanced academic degrees, securing a major in the subject being taught do not show positive relationships with students achievement. Also, Richardson (2008) carries out an examination of teachers' qualifications and students' achievement in Mathematics. The study indicated that a significant relationship does exist between teachers' qualifications and students' achievement. Chidolue (1996) finds a significant but inverse relationship between teacher qualification and students achievement. However, Adeola (2011) and Simbo (2003) find no significant difference in student achievement based on teacher qualification.

Statement of the Problem

In classroom interaction, input modification is crucial for students learning. However, despite the classroom instructions received by the undergraduate English students, the quality of undergraduate English students produced in the Nigerian universities seems to be deteriorating at an alarming rate. It appears that the poor academic achievement of the undergraduate English students may be as a result the deficiency coming from the classroom interaction in terms of the quality and quantity of input modification provided by the course facilitators.

The available literature on the language of instruction and interaction patterns in classroom in Nigeria focused on the teachers' language of instruction in classroom which is dichotomized as either English Language or the language of the immediate community. However, it appears that there is a dearth of study conducted in Nigeria that examined lecturers' input modification patterns. Therefore, this study assessed input modification patterns in the teaching of English Language among University lecturers in South-west, Nigeria.

Research Questions

- What are the types of input modification patterns commonly used by English Language University lecturers in South-West, Nigeria?
- Is there any significant difference in the lecturers' input modification patterns based on teaching experience?
- Is there any significant difference in the lecturers' input modification patterns based on teacher qualification?

METHODOLOGY

The study made use of Descriptive survey design. Data was collected through classroom observation technique. The population of the study comprised undergraduate English Language lecturers and their students in South-West, Nigeria. Purposive sampling technique was used to select fifteen (15) English Language lecturers taking English Grammar and phonology and 350 students from federal universities. Three research questions were answered. Data were collected using Lecturer Classroom Interaction Sheet (LCIS) with reliability co-efficient of 0.76 and Students' Rating of English Language Lecturer Input Modification (SRELLIM) with reliability co-efficient of 0.82. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and T-test.

RESULTS

Research Question One: What is the prevailing input modification pattern used by University English Language lecturers in South-West Nigeria?

Table 1: Frequency of input simplification patterns and the percentage in the total sum

| | Input simplification patterns | Frequency | Percentage |
|----|--|------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | Uses basic vocabulary that matches learners language level | 2,072 | 26.1% |
| 2. | Explains complex vocabulary | 2,146 | 27.1% |
| 3. | Explain concepts using other language(s) (co-switch) | 1,036 | 13.0% |
| 4. | Substitution of words by using synonym | 592 | 7.4% |
| 5. | Explain an idea using more than one word | 2,072 | 26.1% |

The result of the lecturers' input simplification practices revealed that using basic vocabulary that matches learners language level and explaining an idea using more than one word shared the same proportion (26.1%) in the order of input simplification pattern. This finding is line with Arzu and Meryem (2015) assertion that learning occurs when learners are exposed to language input that correlates with their level of proficiency. Xiao-.Yan (2006) also stressed that a better understanding of the use of teachers' language can certainly help students improve their learning. The study is also in line with Arzu and Meryem (2015) submission that one way of learning a second language is through simplified input.

The result further revealed that lecturers some times (27%) explain new vocabulary. This finding underscores the finding of Navés, Muñoz and Pavesi (2017) who found a direct relationship between linguistic complexity and learning difficulty. Therefore, in order to avoid learning difficulty, lecturers simplifies the difficult words. This buttress the fact that when teacher explains new vocabularies, students' learning of English Language is promoted. The finding also shows that lecturers occasionally (13.0 %) co-switch. This finding is in line with Adriano et al. (2016) who found that the teachers' utterances were accompanied by occasional code-switching which were used to clarify instructions for classroom activities, emphasis important point, check students' understanding and giving additional instructions. In essence, code-switching is used in English Language classrooms when simplifying vocabulary so as to make language easier for learners.

Moreover, the finding is in line with Cook (2001) who stresses that the use of the first language of students in the second language classroom teaching is an excellent resource in promoting second language learning. This finding is also in line with Sterns in Smejkalová

(2014) assertion that there are certain periods during which First Language (L1) is allowed to be used in order to remove uncertainties, ask for verification or clarification and give explanations that would not be accessible for learner in Second Language (L2).

The finding revealed that the lecturers rarely (7.4) substitute words by using synonyms. This finding negates Adriano et al. (2016) who found that the use of synonyms by the teachers were found to be highly useful for students to build their own word power. Lecturers explaining an idea using more than one word took 26.1% in the total input simplification.

Table 2: Frequency of input elaboration and the percentage in the total sum

| Input elaboration patterns | Frequency | Percentage |
|--|------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Elaborates self-utterance to make the meaning clear | 2,368 | 54.6% |
| 2. Modifies learners' utterance | 740 | 17.0% |
| 3. Comprehension Check | 564 | 12.9% |
| 4. Request for clarification | 666 | 15.3% |

The study revealed that elaborating self-utterance to make the meaning clear is the most frequently used pattern of input elaboration by the lecturers which amount to (54.6%). This finding in line with Arzu and Meryem (2015) assertion that elaborations in teacher talk helped second language learners understand the input and enable them to acquire the language. Also, Adriano et al. (2016) found that teachers' elaboration of self- utterance was done by giving more elaborations and explanations to the concepts discussed so as to enable students to learn more about these concepts.

The study shows that lecturers sometime (17.0%) modify learners' utterances in appropriate form. This finding is consonance with Seong (2009) who found that modification of learner's incomplete words or sentences help them notice the language and it was also considered a useful strategy for promoting students' English proficiency. Also, Adriano et al. (2016) also found that teachers' modification of learners' utterances took the form of putting the learners' utterances into the appropriate form by paraphrasing their utterances and adding information to what the learners had said.

It was found out that lecturer occasionally (12.9%) check students' understanding. This finding is supported by Krashen and Mason (2018) who argued that comprehension check become necessary for two good reasons. First, comprehension check serves as a motivating factor that make the students to pay attention to input that is difficult and boring. Second, sometime, students think they understand input but they do not due to comprehension error. Also, Harmer (2000) points out that getting students to speak and use the language they are learning is a way of checking their understanding and a vital part of a teacher's job.

The study shows that lecturers rarely (15.3%) make request for clarification from the students. This finding is in line with Hashemian and Mostaghazi (2015) assertion that clarification requests foster opportunity for second language students to clarify their own erroneous utterance by rephrasing or expanding.

Generally, the finding further revealed differences in the use of input modification patterns. The descriptive statistics show that lecturers used more of input simplification than input elaboration. The reason might be because the lecturers adopt more of lecturer-centered pattern of interaction than student-centered interaction pattern. I can be concluded that input simplification is entirely lecturer-providing input modification pattern and input elaboration pattern is more of student-providing input modification pattern.

Research Question Two: Is the observed input modification pattern based on Lecturers' years of teaching experience?

Table 3: T-test statistic, mean and standard deviation of experienced and inexperienced lecturer on the use of input modification patterns

| Variables | N | Mean | SD | df | t | p-value |
|---------------|-----|--------|-------|-----|-------|---------|
| Experienced | 181 | 104.33 | 24.68 | 348 | 10.41 | .000 |
| Inexperienced | 169 | 81.15 | 15.58 | | | |

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the lecturers input modification pattern based on Experience. There was a significant difference in score between the two groups where the experienced lecturers, $t(87) = .00$, $p < .05$, two-tailed with ($M = 104.33$, $SD = 24.68$) scoring higher than the inexperienced lecturers ($M = 81.15$, $SD = 15.58$). The magnitude of mean difference is 21. The study revealed a significant difference in the input modification patterns of the experienced and inexperienced lecturers. The mean of the experienced lecturers is higher than the inexperienced probably because the experienced lecturers' wealth of experience made them to know how to prompt students to talk and be part of the teaching learning process. This finding is in line with Norman (1975) who found that teacher teaching experience is a strong factor that determines the teacher language in the classroom, as majority of teachers used simple vocabulary; the experienced teachers used a higher level of vocabulary than the inexperienced.

This study is also in line with Arzu and Meryem (2015) who found out that experienced Elementary teachers use of monologue accounts for 73% while inexperienced teachers use of monologue accounts for 60%. The experienced teachers' monologues, irrespective of the grade taught, were shorter and more frequent than that of inexperienced teachers.

Research Question Three: Is the observed input modification pattern based on Lecturers' qualification?

Table: T-test statistic, mean and standard deviation of the lecturer on the use of input modification patterns based on qualification

| Variables | N | Mean | SD | df | t | p-value |
|---------------|-----|--------|-------|-----|-------|---------|
| Experienced | 181 | 104.33 | 24.68 | 348 | 10.41 | .000 |
| Inexperienced | 169 | 81.15 | 15.58 | | | |

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the lecturers input modification pattern based on qualification. There was a significant difference in score between the two groups of Ph.D holders, $t(348) = .00$, $p < .05$, two-tailed with ($M = 104.33$, $SD = 24.68$) scoring higher than MA holders ($M = 81.15$, $SD = 15.58$). The magnitude of mean difference is 23.18. This finding is in line with Adriano et al. (2016) who found that teachers' educational qualification as well as their personal teaching style was found to have influence on the use of input modification patterns. Also, Adriano et al. (2016) found that teacher educational qualification was found to have influenced the use of paraphrases. Stigler and Hiebert (2007) also found that increased teacher qualification promotes teaching effectiveness which subsequently translates to students' achievement.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the whole essence of classroom interaction is to promote learning through communication, teacher adjustment of classroom language (input modification) for students understanding becomes necessary. The finding of the study revealed that lecturer explaining new vocabulary is the most frequently used (27%) input simplification pattern. This is followed by lecturer using basic vocabulary that matches learners' language and lecturer explaining an idea using more than one word which have the same proportion of 26.1%. The study also revealed that elaborating self-utterance to make the meaning clear is the most (54.6%) frequently used input elaboration pattern. The study then recommends that Lecturers should be able to implement a variety of input modification patterns and adapt the specific patterns they use to the particular learners they are teaching. Also, Input modification training should be prioritized in the training of teachers.

REFERENCES

- Adeyemi, T. O. (2008). Teachers' teaching experience and students' learning outcomes in secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Educational Research and Review*, 3(6), 204-212.
- Adriano, U., Hashim, I. M., Onesmo, S. N., & Abdulkarim, S. M. (2016). The Role of Input Simplification and Interactional Modification Strategies in the Tanzanian English Language Classroom. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 7(1), 1-24.
- Arzu, U., & Meryem, M. (2015). Syntactical Modifications in Teacher Talk of Native and Non-Native Speakers in EFL Classrooms. *Theory and Practice of Second Language Acquisition*, 1(1), 125-141.
- Asikhia, O. (2010). Students and Teachers' Perception of the Causes of Poor Academic Performance in Ogun State Secondary Schools: Implications for Counseling for National Development. *European Journal for Social Sciences*, 13(2), 229-242.
- Brewer, B. A. (2008). Effects of Lexical Simplification and Elaboration on ESL Readers' Local-Level Perceived Comprehension. MA project. Department of Linguistics and English Language Brigham Young University.
- Brown, A. V. (2006). Students' and Teachers' perceptions of effective teaching in the foreign language classroom: a comparison of ideals and ratings. Ph.D. Thesis University of Arizonapp.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2007). Teacher credentials and student achievement: Longitudinal analysis with student fixed effects. *Economics of Education Review*, 26(6), 673-682.
- Ernst-Slavit, G., & Mason, M. R. (2011). Words that hold us up: Teacher talk and academic language in five upper elementary classrooms. *Linguistics and Education*, 22(4), 430-440.
- Gulzar, M. A. (2010). Code-switching: Awareness about Its Utility in Bilingual Classrooms. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 32(2), 23-44.
- Harmer, J. (2013). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 4th ed. Harlow: Pearson.
- Hashemian, M., & Mostaghazi, H. (2015). Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences in Iranian L2 Learners with Different Proficiency Levels. *English Language Teaching*, 2(3), 1-19.
- Hasan, A. S. (2008). Making Input Comprehensible for Foreign Language Acquisition. *Damascus University Journal*, 24(2), 31-53.

- Kim, Y. (2003). Effects of input elaboration and enhancement on second language vocabulary acquisition through reading by Korean learners of English. PhD. Thesis. School of Education College of Social Sciences University of Glasgow.
- Le, H. T. X. (2011). Pre-modified input in second language learning. *Hawaii Pacific University Journal*, 9(1&2), 27-31.
- Lynch, T. (1996). *Communication in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moradian, M. R., Naserpoor, A. & Tamri, M. S. (2013). Effects of Lexical Simplification and Elaboration of ESP Texts on Iranian EFL University Students Reading Comprehension. *International Journal psychology and Behavioural Research*, 2(6), 332-338.
- Navés, T., Muñoz, C., & Pavesi, M. (2017). Second Language Acquisition.
- Negari, G. M., & Rouhi, M. (2012). Effects of lexical modification on incidental vocabulary acquisition of Iranian EFL students. *English Language Teaching*, 5(6), 95-104.
- Norman, F. D. (1975). Teacher Language in the classroom. M.A. Project thesis. University of Canterbury.
- Reza, K., & Bahareh M. (2017). The development and validation of an English language teacher talk functional scale. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 5(2), 37-52.
- Richardson, A. R. (2008). An Examination of Teacher Qualifications and Student Achievement in Mathematics. Ph. D. Thesis. Graduate Faculty of Auburn University.
- Roy, J. E. (2015). An Exploratory Study of Teacher's Oral Corrective Feedback in the Government Secondary Schools of Bangladesh. MSc. Project. Institute of Languages BRAC University.
- Seong, M. H. (2009). Strategies making language features noticeable in English Language Teaching. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 113-126.
- Smejkalová, J. (2014). The role of the target language in foreign language teaching. Diploma Thesis. Charles University Faculty of Education Department of English Language and Literature.
- Tania. M. Q. (2014). Classroom interaction and the speaking skill. B.A. Project in English and French program, University of Narino.
- Unanma, A. O., Abugu, H. O., Dike, R. C., & Umeobika, U. C. (2013). Relationship between Teachers Educational Qualifications and Student's Achievement in Chemistry: A Case Study of Owerri West LGA. *IOSR Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 3(11), 5-10.
- Urano, K. (2000). Lexical simplification and elaboration: Sentence comprehension and incidental vocabulary acquisition. M.A. Project. Graduate Division of the University of Hawaii, Manoa.
- Xiao-yan, M. (2006). Teacher Talk and EFL in University Classrooms. M. A. Project. School of Foreign Languages and Literature. Yangtze Normal University China.
- Yana, I. D. (2013). Teacher Talk: Linguistic Characteristics and Adjustments. MA Thesis Faculty of the American University. Sharjah College of Arts and Sciences United Arab Emirates.
- Zhang, P. (2012). Interactive Patterns and Teacher Talk Features in an EFL Reading Class in a Chinese University. A case Study with Communicative Teaching. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(5), 980-988.