

## Corrective Feedback - Extract

### Extract from:

**Panover, I & Lyster R (2002). Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573 – 595.**

Learners claimed to notice forms that they were pushed to self repair more than forms that were implicitly provided by teachers.

Roberts (1995) conducted a small-scale study with three adult learners of Japanese. He investigated their ability to identify instances of teacher feedback in a post hoc viewing of a video recording of a 50-minute lesson in which they and an unidentified number of other classmates had participated. One learner was able to identify 46% of the feedback moves in the 50-minute segment, another identified 37%, and another only 24%. Recasting was the predominant type of response to learner errors, constituting 60% of all feedback. Roberts coded many of the recast moves as partial recasts because they shortened the learner's utterance to isolate the error, and the learners were more likely to identify these as feedback moves although they were still unable to identify any more than 43% of these partial recasts.

Research on negative evidence in L1 acquisition motivated Doughty's (1994) study of corrective feedback with adult learners of French as a foreign language. In 6 hours of recorded classroom interaction, the teacher provided corrective feedback after roughly half the students' ill formed utterances, and recasts accounted for about 70% of these corrective feedback moves. Learners in this study responded with well formed repetitions after only 21% of these recasts, a finding that appears to be at odds with Doughty's conclusion that the learners in this study tended to notice the teacher's feedback.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) analyzed 18.3 hours of teacher-student interaction in four Grade 4/5 French immersion classrooms during subject-matter and French language arts lessons. Drawing on categories from previous models as well as adding new categories derived from the analysis of teacher-student interaction in these classrooms, the researchers developed an analytic model to code error treatment sequences in terms of corrective feedback types and learner uptake.

Specifically, they identified six types of corrective feedback in the database:

- explicit correction,
- recasts,
- clarification requests,
- metalinguistic feedback,
- elicitation,
- repetition of error.

## Corrective Feedback - Extract

Two types of uptake (immediate learner responses) were identified, namely, uptake with repair and uptake with needs-repair. Furthermore, each type of uptake included additional possibilities regarding various levels of student responses. The notion of uptake enabled the researchers to identify different degrees of student participation in the error treatment sequence and thereby to describe various patterns of error treatment in teacher-student interaction. Uptake was not considered to be an instance of learning, although the authors speculated that certain types of uptake (i.e., those including learner-generated repair) are likely to benefit the development of target language accuracy. The following patterns emerged from the analysis.

First, teachers provided feedback on 62% of the erroneous utterances. Second, recasting of learner utterances was the most widely used type of feedback. Next, with respect to the relationship between type of feedback and learner uptake, recasts were the least successful type, and elicitation resulted in the highest rate of uptake. In addition, most learner generated repair occurred after elicitation and metalinguistic feedback.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) argued that feedback types such as metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, clarification requests, and repetition of error create opportunities for negotiation of form by promoting more active learner involvement in the error treatment process than do feedback types that reformulate learner errors (i.e., recasts and explicit correction). In a subsequent study, Lyster (1998a) found that corrective sequences involving negotiation of form (i.e., feedback types that provide clues for self repair rather than correct reformulations) were more likely than recasts and explicit corrections to lead to immediate repair of lexical and grammatical errors, whereas recasts were found to be effective in leading to repair of phonological errors.

Using the same database, Lyster (1998b) analyzed the function and the distribution of different types of recasts and compared them with the distribution of teachers' non corrective repetitions of well-formed utterances. The analyses revealed the potential for ambiguity of recasts from the learners' perspective, because the function and distribution of recasts following ill-formed utterances paralleled the function and distribution of non corrective repetitions following well-formed learner utterances. Lyster suggested that the corrective purpose of recasts may not be the primary one, especially when they are accompanied by approval directed at the content of the ill-formed utterance, and argued that "recasts have more in common with non-corrective repetition and topic-continuation moves than with other forms of corrective feedback" (p. 71). Consequently, recasts, similar to non corrective repetitions, can be perceived by learners as positive evidence (information about what is acceptable in the target language) rather than negative evidence (see also Long, 1996).

## Corrective Feedback - Extract

### References

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.

Lyster, R. (1998a). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning, 48*, 183–218.

Lyster, R. (1998b). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20*, 51–81.

Lyster, R. (2002). The importance of differentiating negotiation of form and meaning in classroom interaction. In P. Burmeister, T. Piske, & A. Rohde (Eds.), *An integrated view of language development: Papers in honor of Henning Wode* (pp. 381–397).

Trier, Germany: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37–66.

Roberts, M. (1995). Awareness and the efficacy of error correction. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (Tech. Report No. 9, pp. 162–182). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.