Incidental Focus on Form and Learner Uptake in Iranian EFL Classrooms

Yassamin Pouriran* and Jayakaran Mukundan

Department of Languages and Humanities Education, Faculty of Education, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43300 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the connection between teachers' incidental focus on form, namely, corrective feedback and learners' uptake and immediate repair of errors in communicative English as a Foreign Language classrooms for adults. The data was drawn from the transcripts of oral corrective feedback moves of six audio and video-recorded classrooms at an intermediate level totaling 9 hours. Corrective feedback moves were coded based on Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Panova and Lyster (2002) models. This study investigated the integration of incidental focus on form into six intact communicative EFL classes. A descriptive design which employed qualitative data collection procedure was adopted. The results revealed a significant difference in the ratio of uptake following certain corrective feedback types, which was in sharp contrast to the findings of Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Panova and Lyster (2002). Possible reasons are discussed from different aspects of learners' age, their motivation, and instructional settings.

Keywords: Corrective feedback, incidental focus on form, uptake

INTRODUCTION

As the focus of classroom instruction has shifted over the past few decades from an emphasis on language forms to functional language within communicative context,

the question of error correction has become increasingly significance (Brown, 2004). In studies of classroom-based second and foreign language learning, the concepts of repair and correction are considered as instructional components which facilitate language learning. According to Wells (1996), the most common interaction exchange in the studies on classroom discourse consists of moves, which are normally classified as one of the following:

(1) Initiate, (2) Response and (3) Follow-up (IRF). The follow-up move refers to all the moves following a student's response, whether they are corrective, negative, or affirmative in nature.

Askew and Lodge (2000) state that the relationship between teaching and learning should be considered a dynamic process, rather than a one-way transmission of knowledge. Most of the interaction that takes place during EFL classrooms is guided by teachers; thus they have a significant role in how students learn and what happens in the classroom. Furthermore, if it is true that students can learn from their own errors, then correcting those errors is of crucial importance in learning. Accordingly, it is important to improve teachers' knowledge of their own actions, thereby necessitating that teachers be aware of the corrective feedback techniques they can apply in their classes.

The notions of corrective feedback and uptake have been developed through the theory of Output Hypothesis, as suggested by Swain (1985). Swain posited the Output Hypothesis, which claims that comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985) cannot improve learners' language acquisition in terms of syntax; therefore, the production of output is a crucial factor in furthering language development. Swain proposed that the modified output may be the result of opportunities for output coupled with the provision of useful and consistent feedback from teachers and peers.

The version of interaction proposed by Long (1996) conceptualized the role of negotiation as an entity responsible for facilitating conscious "noticing". In this version, interaction is taken into account both "interpersonally" and "intrapersonally". As for the former, the learner notices input, whereas in the latter, s/he processes information obtained through input.

Of noteworthy consideration are the notions of attention and noticing in relation to learner uptake. Schmidt (1990) proposed the Noticing Hypothesis, according to which the emergence of new forms should be preceded by their being noticed in the input.

Types of Focus on Form: Planned vs. Incidental

Several distinctions have been made regarding focus on form instruction. Ellis (2001) distinguishes between "planned" versus "incidental" focus on form. In planned focused on form (Ellis, 2001), the teacher decides in advance which linguistic features will be targeted within the meaning-focused settings in the lessons. In contrast, incidental focus on form (Ellis, 2001) occurs without any preparation during meaning-focused activities and covers various linguistic items.

Incidental Focus on Form Options: Preemptive vs. Reactive

Ellis (2001) distinguished between two types of incidental focus on form, pre-emptive and reactive, and pointed out that reactive incidental focus on form may be explicit or implicit. Pre-emptive incidental focus on form refers to any effort to draw learners' attention to a linguistic feature and

explain it before an error or breakdown in communication has a chance to occur.

Corrective Feedback Types

To investigate the relationship between error types and kinds of feedback, and learner uptake, Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorized error, feedback, and uptake. They developed an analytic model comprising various moves involving errors (phonological, grammatical, and lexical), corrective feedback (recasts, explicit correction, elicitation, clarification, repetition of error, and metalinguistic feedback, and translation), and uptake (self- or peer repair and needs-repair).

Using the framework set forth by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Panova and Lyster (2002), teachers' feedback moves were coded into seven categories in the current study. The following explains each feedback type, along with examples from the actual data collected in the present study.

Recasts

Recasts occur when a teacher provides a student with the correct answer without trying to give more information about the error, or without trying to help a student produce the correct form. An example of recast found in the present data is as follows:

Example:
S: I was in a live [li:v] concert last month. (Phonological error)
T: A live [laIv] concert. (Recast)
S: oh, yes. A live concert. (Uptake)

Explicit correction

When a teacher gives the correct answer and furthermore provides the student with a clear indication that his/her utterance was incorrect, the teacher is using explicit correction. Below is an example of an explicit correction move from the present data:

Example:
S: I am agree with my friend. (Grammatical error)
T: You agree with your friend, no need to say "am". (Explicit feedback)
S: I agree with her. (Uptake)

Clarification request

There are situations in which the teacher does not understand a student's utterance, and therefore a clarification request is in order.

Example:
S: If we can find the major, we can complain about the problem. (Lexical error)
T: What? (Clarification feedback)
S: Oh… I mean manager not major. (Uptake)

Metalinguistic feedback

Lyster and Ranta (1997) define Metalinguistic feedback as a type of feedback that contains comments, information, or questions which prompt students to correct the error.

Example:

S: Service agent compensates to the damage. (Grammatical error)

T: You cannot use "to", you should use another preposition. (Metalinguistic feedback)

S: Yes, service agent compensates for the damage. (Uptake)

Translation

According to Panova and Lyster (2002), translations occur when a teacher hears a student uses his/her L1 (first language), and, in the event that the use of L1 is not permitted, the teacher translates the student's utterance from L1 to the target language.

Example:

S: As a good friend, we must be "roorast" [in L1] (Lexical error)

T: Honest. (Translation)

S: Oh… We must be honest.

Elicitation

An elicitation is similar to metalinguistic feedback in that it also encourages the student to self-correct.

Example:

S: My brother had hurted his leg. (Grammatical error)

T: He had ….. (Elicitation feedback)

S: Sorry!… had hurt his leg. (Uptake)

Repetition

Another form of corrective feedback that is explicit and does not provide the student with the correct answer is repetition.

Example:

S: And I was wrotting another sentence about schooling system. (Grammatical error)

T: I was wrotting… (Repetition)

S: No, no!…. I was writing another sentence about schooling system. (Uptake)

Learner Uptake

There are two types of uptake: "(a) uptake that results in "repair" of the error on which the feedback focused and (b) uptake that results in an utterance that still needs repair (coded as "needs repair")" (Lyster and Ranta, 1997, p. 49)

Objectives and Research Questions

While learning the foreign language, the learner usually encounters varied linguistic problems that evidently handicap and hamper his/her learning and ultimately exert a detrimental impact upon his/her general proficiency. This phenomenon is also found in the learning of English as a foreign language (EFL) among Iranian English language learners. One of the researchers who has worked as an English teacher and supervisor in one of the reputable English language institutes in Iran, where the instruction targets the L2 within the realm of communicative language teaching, has observed that learners at a high level of

language proficiency make grammatical, phonological, and lexical errors while participating in classroom discussions and activities; this resulted in learners producing more ungrammatical utterances in their oral output.

The primary aim of this study was to investigate the provision of corrective feedback in the Iranian EFL classrooms. The contexts in which feedback was provided were also analyzed. Its secondary aim was to ascertain whether Lyster and Ranta's (1997) model of corrective discourse was applicable in a different instructional context. Lyster and Ranta's study was conducted with young learners in French immersion classrooms in meaning focused settings; in contrast, the present study involved adult learners of English as a foreign language in a mixture of meaning-focused and form-focused situations. The research questions that served to guide this study are as follows:

1. What kinds of corrective feedback do occur in EFL classrooms?

2. What types of corrective feedback do lead to more learner uptake?

3. To what extent does corrective feedback result in the repair of different kinds of learner errors?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Corrective Feedback and learner Uptake

The correlation between teacher feedback and learner uptake in different educational contexts has been investigated by many researchers. Lochtman (2002) concentrated on how oral corrective feedback functions within analytic foreign language classroom interaction. The study showed that the highest rates of no learner uptake occurred after recasts and explicit corrections. Metalinguistic feedback and elicitations were the most effective corrective feedback types for eliciting learner uptake.

Tsang (2004) who studied non-native English lessons in Hong Kong concentrated on teacher feedback and learner uptake. The aim of the study was to show the correlation between corrective feedback and learner uptake - which feedback types resulted in learner repair. Tsang (2004) found that the most preferred corrective feedback types used by the teachers were recast, explicit correction and repetition.

A recent study on teacher-student interaction investigating the effects of corrective feedback moves on learner uptake was conducted by Lyster and Mori (2006). The researchers found that uptake moves were most frequently present in situations in which the teachers prompted an answer from the students. To investigate the connection between error types and kinds of feedback (as the independent variables), and learner uptake (as the dependent variable), Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorized error, feedback, and uptake. The findings showed that while recasts were the most widely used form of corrective feedback, they were the least likely to lead to successful uptake. It was also found that the most successful type of feedback leading to students' repair was elicitation. Panova and Lyster (2002) conducted a similar study

on corrective feedback and learner uptake. Panova and Lyster focused on learner error, teacher feedback, and learner uptake, and subsequently categorized corrective feedback moves under seven different terms: recasts, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, repetition, translation, clarification request, and explicit correction. Panova and Lyster (2002) concluded that the low proficiency level of the students may have been the reason that the teacher used recasts so frequently.

METHOD

The main goal of the present study was to show the different ways in which a teacher could correct a student's oral errors. Most teacher training programs fail to prepare teachers to handle the variety of errors which occur in student's output; it is therefore the aim of the current study to provide information about the connection between corrective feedback and learner uptake. This study involved a descriptive design which utilized qualitative data to address the research questions.

Context of the Study

The research was conducted at a private school in Iran. Six intact classes with six different teachers participated in this study. The instructional approach of the school was within the communicative orientation of language teaching, with a strong emphasis on vocabulary development, speaking and listening activities, and, to a lesser degree, grammar, writing and reading. Thus, activities that focus on linguistic form were

minimal, and the evaluation of the learners did not focus on the accuracy of learner language. This means that the teachers had to rely on personal choices as to whether and when to focus on formal features of the language, including provision of corrective feedback.

Participants

In order to find out reasonable answers to research questions regarding the use of different types of corrective feedback and the students' oral errors, 88 students and 6 teachers participated in this study.

Teachers

Six teachers (female & male) participated in this study, all of whom had the experience of teaching EFL in different language schools for 6 or 12 years. All of the teachers were Iranians whose mother tongue was Azeri and were fluent in Persian. The teachers' demographic information is provided in Table 1.

Following the ethical guidelines at the work site, the researchers approached the six teachers and asked them if they would be willing to participate in the study. The teachers were informed that the purpose of the research was to examine classroom interaction during meaning-focused lessons where there would be some focus on form; however, they would not be made aware of the precise focus of the study in order to minimize any effects relating to the observer's paradox. No effort was made to guide the teachers in their choice of lesson plans or to select any type of corrective

feedback. Teachers with different levels of experience were the participants in this research, all of whom were non- native speakers of English and used English as the medium of instruction.

Learners

The next group of participants consisted of intermediate level Iranian students at a private Language School in Iran. The EFL learners were female and at different ages (17-40). The number of students in each class ranged from 12 to 18, the total number being 88. They were fluent in Azeri (mother tongue) and Persian (official language). Students were seated in circles of chairs in such a way that teachers could walk in middle of the classes. According to the students' application forms collected upon their registration, they were interested in learning English for a variety of reasons including academic purposes, professional development, TOEFL or IELTS tests, to brush up on their English, and immigration to other foreign countries.

Data Collection Procedure

The data were collected from the six EFL classes at intermediate levels with six teachers. The data comprised 9 hours (540 minutes) of audio and video-recorded classroom talk from the classrooms. Each class was equipped with a wall-mounted mini-video recorder placed in the top corners of the classrooms which zoomed in on the frontal sections of the class. This procedure provided data relating to any interaction involving the teachers and the whole class. The school had a quality assurance department and the supervisory staff used these mini-cameras to monitor and optimize the quality of the ongoing instruction.

Coding System and Data Analysis Procedure

The categories used to code the data in the present study were adopted from the error treatment sequence from those developed by Lyster and Ranta's (1997) model and Panova and Lyster (2002). The main unit of

TABLE 1
Teachers' Demographic Information

Class	Gender	Age	Teaching experience	EFL qualifications*	Time at school
C1	female	40	12 years	MA in TEFL/CELTA	10 years
C2	female	32	8 years	MA in TEFL	7 years
C3	female	28	6 years	MA in TEFL	6 years
C4	male	38	12 years	MA in TEFL	10 years
C5	male	26	5 years	BA	3 years
C6	male	30	9 years	BA	8 years

MA: Master of Arts
BA: Bachelor of Arts
CELTA: Cambridge Certificate in English Language Teaching to Adults

analysis was the error treatment sequence, which went as follows: learner error, teacher feedback, and learner uptake consisting of either repair of the error by a student who made the error or needs-repair when no repair was made by a student and the teacher or other students repaired the error. This sequence commenced with at least one error in a learner's utterance. The non-target utterance was followed either by the teacher's corrective feedback or without it; if without, topic continuation was done. If the teacher provided corrective feedback, it was either followed by uptake on the part of the learner or without it. If uptake occurred, the learner's non-target utterance could be modified in two ways: repair or needs-repair. Each occurrence of either one of the techniques was referred to as *an episode*. This order reflected what actually happened when a teacher responded to an utterance containing an error and when the learner attempted to respond to the teacher's feedback moves. All learners' utterances with errors were counted. In the present study, three types of error were analyzed: grammatical errors, lexical errors, and phonological errors.

To explore the answers to the research questions, the researchers designed a checklist including different types of feedback, learners' errors, and learners' uptake. In order to gain the reliability of transcribed data and to check the inter-rater reliability in coding the data into reactive and the occurrence of uptake, one data analyst who was a PhD candidate in TESL was briefed about the aim and objectives of the study. She was given the recorded DVDs from the classes, transcriptions of all of the classes which were written by the researchers and 6 checklists for 6 classes in order to record her own observation by marking on the checklists independently. The analysis of the current study focused on teacher-learner interaction only and the episodes involving focus on form were transcribed. The data analyst recoded 20% of the randomly selected data from the error sequences coded by the researchers. There was 90% agreement ($p<.05$) between the researchers and the third rater in the transcribed classroom interactions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis yielded 106 error sequences; each error was initiated by a learner turn containing one error which was coded as lexical, grammatical, and phonological.

26 % were lexical, 42% were grammatical, and 32% were phonological. As for error types, it should be stated that all six teachers provided corrective feedback to grammatical errors with the highest rate of other error types.

Table 2 provides the distribution of corrective feedback types by six teachers in the current study, Lyster and Ranta's (1997), and Panova and Lyter's (2002).

According to the results, the teachers' most preferred type of feedback was recasts (56%), with the second most used method feedback being elicitation (11%) and the third being translation (10%). The order in the current study was the same as Lyster and Ranta's (1997) in the first and the

second type of corrective feedback. The fourth through the seventh were repetition, metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and clarification in the present study, whereas this order is different from the other studies. In Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Panova and Lyster (2002), the third most was clarification request (11%) in both and the least used type was repetition (5% and 1%), respectively. In this study, clarification request stands in the last part of the order (3%).

Table 3 displays the connection between error types and types of corrective feedback. In other words, it shows which type of error led to which type of corrective feedback. As can be seen, all three types of errors led to recasts and, except for recasts and elicitation, other types of corrective feedback accounted for a small percentage of all error types. According to Table 3, lexical errors invite translation and recasts as much as (57%) more than other feedback types. Recasts and elicitation were given as corrective feedback (73%) to grammatical errors and (94%) to phonological errors. On the other hand, clarification requests, translation, explicit correction, and metalinguistic feedback were not used as corrective feedback to grammatical and phonological errors.

TABLE 2
Distribution of Corrective Feedback for the Current Study, Lyster and Ranta's Study, and Panova and Lyster's Study

Feedback types	Current study	Lyster and Ranta	Panova and Lyster
Recasts	59 (56%)	375 (55%)	226 (55%)
Elicitation	12 (11%)	94 (14%)	15 (4%)
Clarification request	3 (3%)	73 (11%)	44 (11%)
Explicit correction	5 (5%)	50 (7%)	9 (2%)
Repetition	9(8%)	36 (5%)	6 (1%)
Metalinguistic feedback	8 (7%)	58 (8%)	21 (5%)
Translation	10 (10%)	-	91(22%)
Total	106 (100%)	1686 (100%)	412 (100%)

TABLE 3
Connection between Error Types and Corrective Feedback Types in the Study

Corrective feedback type	Error type			Total
	Lexical	Grammatical	Phonological	
Recasts 59 (56%)	6 (21%)	24 (55%)	29 (85%)	59 (56%)
Elicitation 12 (11%)	1 (4%)	8 (18%)	3 (9%)	12 (11%)
Clarification request 3 (3%)	3 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (3%)
Explicit correction 5 (5%)	1 (4%)	4 (9%)	0 (0%)	5 (5%)
Repetition 9 (8%)	4 (14%)	3 (7%)	2 (6%)	9 (8%)
Metalinguistic feedback 8 (7%)	3 (11%)	5 (11%)	0 (0%)	8 (8%)
Translation 10 (10%)	10 (36%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (9%)
Total	28 (100%)	44 (100%)	34 (100%)	106 (100%)

The result of the present study is in contrast with that of Lyster and Ranta (1997), where the recasts were used 55% of the time and repetition 5%. In this study, recasts and elicitation altogether accounted for 67% of all feedback moves given to the three types of errors, while other types of corrective feedback accounted for 33%.

In Table 4, there was 15% of *no uptake* in all the responses to corrective feedback. The highest rates of no uptake went to recasts (24%), metalinguistic (13%), and repetition (11%), respectively. This was very different from the study of Lyster and Ranta (1997), where the participants did not react to (69%) of recasts, (50%) of explicit correction, (22%) repetition, (14%) metalinguistic feedback, and (12%) clarification requests. Another remarkable difference in the current study and the one done by Lyster and Ranta (1997) was the ratio of repair and needs-repair. In this study, there were more uptake moves with repair (69%) than those in the need of repair (16%), whereas in Lyster and Ranta (1997) 28% was for needs-repair, which is a bit more than repair (27%). In the current study, the amount of repair belonged to translation (90%), elicitation (83%) and needs-repair

to repetition (67%) and clarification (33%) while this amount was (18%) for recasts, (46%) for elicitation and needs-repair to repetition was (47%), and (60%) for clarification in Lyster and Ranya's study.

The present study aimed to examine incidental focus on form on adult learners' oral errors and their uptake in EFL classrooms in Iran. The aforementioned results permitted the following answers to the research questions.

The study found that all six teachers used all the seven corrective feedback types; recast was the most frequent type of feedback (56%), a finding which paralleled the findings obtained from other observational studies with child and adult language learners (Lyster and Ranta, 1997, Panova and Lyster, 2002; Roberts, 1995).

According to the findings of this study, the type of corrective feedback that led to repair the most was translation (90%), with elicitation (83%), and explicit correction (80%) being the second and third most used feedback types. The corrective feedback types which led to needs-repair were repetition (67%), followed by clarification (33%) and metalinguistic feedback (25%). Among the corrective feedback types,

TABLE 4
Distribution of Uptake in Relation to Corrective Feedback Type in the Current Study

Learner uptake type	Corrective feedback type							
	Recasts	Elicitation	Clarification	Explicit correction	Repetition	Metalinguistic	Translation	Total
Repair	41 (69%)	10 (83%)	2 (67%)	4 (80%)	2 (22%)	5 (62%)	9 (90%)	73 (69%)
Needs-repair	4 (7%)	2 (17%)	1 (33%)	1 (20%)	6 (67%)	2 (25%)	1 (10%)	17 (16%)
No uptake	14 (24%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	16 (15%)
Total	59 (100%)	12 (100%)	3 (100%)	5 (100%)	9 (100%)	8 (100%)	10 (100%)	106 (100%)

recasts (24%), metalinguistic feedback (13%), and repetition (11%) led to no uptake, whereas the other types led to learners' uptake.

As shown in Table 3, most phonological errors followed from recasts (85%) as did grammatical errors (55%), while lexical errors followed from translation (36%).

Lyster and Ranta (1997) conducted their study in a French immersion setting, in which the students were from varying backgrounds. Some of them excelled in their French language skills, since the language they spoke at home was French as well. The researchers found that of all the feedback moves provided by the teachers (55%) led to learner uptake of some kind, but only 27% of all the feedback turns resulted in learner repair. Additionally, in Panova and Lyster's study (2002), the students were rated to be at a beginner level in terms of language skills due to their limited oral and written production abilities with respect to vocabulary and sentence structure. Similarly, the results of to Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study showed that 47% of all teacher feedback moves led to some sort of student uptake, but only a third of the learner uptake included repair moves. These two studies yielded similar results, although their participants were from dissimilar language backgrounds and language skill levels. There are major differences between Lyster and Ranta's study and the present study in the type of instruction that has been investigated; the classrooms in the present study were a mixture of meaning-focused and form-focused instruction, whereas Lyster and Ranta's were meaning-focused.

The present study, therefore, had a higher percentage of learner uptake and learner repair than did some of the previous studies, and most of the previous studies showed that learner uptake was usually present in at least half of the feedback situations.

The significant difference between the present study and the previous corrective feedback studies is that the earlier studies were mostly conducted in adult ESL or immersion classrooms, whereas the present study concentrated on adults in an EFL settings in which the purpose of attending classes was to improve their use of English. In Lyster and Ranta's immersion classrooms, the focus was on acquiring general knowledge along with learning the French language, so the classes focused on content rather than the accurate use of French. As a result, the students in the immersion program did not react to some of the corrective feedback types as much as the EFL learners did in this study.

The difference in the ages of the participants might create dissimilarities in the results; the fact that the teachers needed to adjust their teaching methods according to the students' different language skills might have influenced the way teachers corrected students' oral errors. Lyster (1998) concluded in his study that young learners are not as sensitive to linguistic forms in learning their second language. This fact explains why the rate of uptake was higher in the present study than it was in the immersion classrooms.

The target language in the classrooms is another main difference between the current study and previous ones. In the previous studies, the target languages as well as the L1 of the participants varied considerably. Many of the studies were conducted in French immersion classrooms, or the participants had dissimilar backgrounds – some of the adult classrooms included students from different countries and from various language backgrounds, such as in Panova and Lyster's (2002) study, where the participants came from Haitian, French, Portuguese, and Spanish backgrounds. In the present study, however, all the participants had similar language experiences and were native Azeri and Persian speakers. Also, the teacher in their study was a French/English bilingual, whereas the teachers in this study were non-native speakers of English who have learnt English as a foreign language. It might be concluded that non-native English language teachers adopted different strategies in providing corrective feedback in the current study in comparison with other studies.

It could be speculated that the motivation for learning a new language might be higher for adult EFL learners. The difference could be attributed to the nature of learning programs; the immersion program was an obligatory curriculum for students, whereas in an EFL context students attended the course for a variety of reasons, such as obtaining TOEFL/IELTS certificate, migrating to other countries, or brushing up on their English skills. EFL learners were motivated to be corrected because they believed that error correction was a way to enhance their English proficiency, a fact which was borne out by the high rate of uptake in EFL classrooms.

Overall, it is impossible to generalize the findings of this study to other, different research settings. However, it should be kept in mind that recasts were the most used corrective feedback types in this study. With respect to the connection between recasts and learners' uptake, the higher percentage of uptake following translation was observed in the current study, which was in sharp contrast to the findings of previous studies.

CONCLUSION

The aim of the present study was to describe the ways in which teachers corrected learners' oral errors in EFL settings. Additionally, the learners' reactions to the feedback moves were discovered by concentrating on learner uptake. The findings of the present study showed that there was a variety of feedback moves present during English lessons, and that learners were able to correct themselves effectively if teachers used feedback types that elicited answers from the learners.

This study identified similarities and differences in comparison to the studies by Lyster & Ranta (1997) and Panova & Lyster (2002). As was previously discussed, the instructional setting, L1 background, and learners' age and motivation might elicit various results from classroom observation. It should be noted that this study could be viewed from different striking aspects. In this EFL context, translation was effective in

eliciting uptake and learners reacted (90%) to any corrective feedback moves.

Swain and Lapkin (1995) state that feedback makes learners notice errors in their output, thereby impelling them to modify it. They suggest that what takes place between the first and second output is the part in which the process of L2 learning occurs. According to Swain and Lapkin (1995), cognitive processes can be activated between the first and second output through applying the appropriate feedback type.

In the study conducted by de Bot (1996), producing the correct forms by learners is emphasized. De Bot claims that language learners are likely to benefit more from being pushed to retrieve linguistic forms than from hearing them in the input. In relation to de Bot's claim, Clark (1995) and Grosofsky, Payne, and Campbell (1994) argue that participants remember items that they have generated in response to some kind of cues better than the items that have just been presented to them.

Ellis (1997) distinguishes between two types of acquisition: (a) acquisition as the internalization of new forms and (b) acquisition as an increase in control over forms that have already been internalized. It could be concluded that positive evidence like recasts facilitates the process of internalization of new forms; in contrast, negotiation of form techniques increases the control of forms which have already been internalized. Therefore, a balance of applying various types of feedback in relation to different instructional settings

should be selected by teachers and they should prevent overusing any one type of feedback.

This study did not consider the proficiency level of the learners at elementary and advanced levels; neither did it consider the teachers' beliefs towards the use of different corrective feedback types. As a result, further studies can investigate the aforementioned issues in EFL situations within form-focused and meaning-focused settings.

REFERENCES

Askew, S., & Lodge, C. (2000). Gifts, ping-pong and loops-linking feedback and learning. In Askew, S. (Ed.). *Feedback for Learning* (pp.1-17). London: Routledge.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Clark, S. (1995). The generation effect and the modeling of associations in memory. *Memory & Cognition, 23,* 442–455.

de Bot, K. (1996). The psycholinguistics of the output hypothesis. *Language Learning, 46*, 529–555.

Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Grosofsky, A., Payne, D., & Campbell, K. (1994). Does the generation effect depend upon selective displaces rehearsal? *American Journal of Psychology, 107,* 53–68.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York: Longman.

Lochtman, K. (2002). Oral corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom: how it affects interaction in analytic foreign language teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37*, 271-283.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition, ed. W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia*, 413-468. New York: Academic Press.

Lyster, R. (1998). 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., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*, 269–300.

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

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly,* 36, 573–595.

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, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

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

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.). *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16*, 371–391.

Tsang, W. (2004). Feedback and uptake in teacher-student interaction: An analysis of 18 English lessons in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Regional Language Centre Journal, 35*, 187–209.

Wells, G. (1996). Using the tool-kit of discourse in the activity of learning and teaching. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 3(2)*, 74-101.