영어어문교육, 14권 3호 2008년 가을

Teacher Feedback and Learner Uptake in the ESL Classroom

Chonglim Yoon
(Sungshin Women's University)

Yoon, Chonglim. (2008). Teacher feedback and learner uptake in the ESL classroom. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 14*(3), 259-282.

This study investigates the types of teacher feedback related to learner uptake across error types and the characteristics of teacher feedback that lead to learner uptake in the ESL classroom. Three ESL teachers and sixteen students participated in this study. Lyster and Ranta's (1997) Error Treatment Sequence Model and their definitions about types of feedback were used to analyze and code the data. Results include the frequency and distribution of feedback types and learner uptake across error types. The findings indicate that 1) phonological errors followed recasts, but lexical and grammatical errors followed negotiation moves; 2) among negotiation moves, elicitation feedback led to learner uptake the most; and 3) learners were more likely to correct their errors when teachers made their feedback saliently. In the study, when teachers responded right after their errors or used several feedback types in multiple sequences of interactions, learners noticed the feedback and produced uptake. These findings also show that instructional context may have influence on teacher feedback types and learner uptake.

[negative feedback/learner uptake/error type/ESL context]

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, considerable attention has been directed toward the role of teacher feedback in a learner's utterance (e.g., Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mackey, Oliver & Leeman., 2003; Oliver & Mackey, 2003). When there is a communication breakdown, teachers may give learners opportunities to correct their output by providing various types of feedback. Teachers can give explicit correction about learners' errors, or, they may recast or negotiate forms implicitly by

providing learners with clues to trigger peer or self-repair. Based on the received feedback, second language (L2) learners may modify their output in an acceptable way in the target language rule system. Such pushed output by teacher feedback may have an influence on second language acquisition (SLA) (Swain, 1995).

Learners receive both positive and negative evidence from a teacher when they make errors. However, there are debates about the form that feedback needs to take for SLA to occur. The early studies of feedback (e.g., Beck & Eubank, 1991; Grimshaw & Pinker, 1989) claimed that teachers' error correction was unreliable, inconsistent, frequently ambiguous, and difficult to interpret, and therefore the value of correction was not clearly demonstrated. Based on a Universal Grammar (UG) perspective, these nativists denied the role of negative feedback and admitted only the role of positive evidence in language learning. Krashen (1985) also insisted that positive evidence alone be sufficient for learners to acquire a second language. In an interactionist perspective, positive evidence is not sufficient for L2 acquisition. The updated version of the Interaction Hypothesis (IH) (Long, 1996) considers the role of both positive and negative evidence for SLA. According to the updated version of the IH, interaction promotes noticing L2 forms when there is a mismatch between input and the learner's output by providing feedback, especially negative feedback (NF).

Studies about negative feedback have been conducted in several languages in different interactional contexts, indicating the widespread use of NF with L2 learners (Iwashita, 2003; J. Lee, 2007; Lyster, 1998a; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002). However, most previous studies were conducted with adults. Although there have been some studies about NF with children, they were conducted in immersion programs (Lyster, 1998a, b; Lyster & Ranta, 1997), quasi-experimental, or laboratory situations (Mackey & Oliver, 2002), in English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts (J. Lee, 2007; Tsang, 2004) or in the dyads of learners (Oliver, 1995).

Chaudron (1988) reports that the extent to which errors are corrected depends on the contexts whether it is ESL or EFL settings. Teacher feedback and learner uptake can be influenced by the age of the learners, contexts, and instructional settings (Loewen, 2004). According to Wong-Fillmore (1985), in contrast to the usual assumption that children learn language mainly from peers outside of the classroom, the classroom is the only place that many ESL students can be exposed regularly to English. In the classroom, at least, students can hear their teachers speak English, and they also have some opportunity to practice English themselves. Thus, teacher feedback which may facilitate ESL learners' language learning is a very important research area. This study, therefore, investigated the types of teacher feedback

related to learner uptake across error types and the characteristics of teacher feedback that lead to learner uptake or repair in the ESL classroom context. This study was guided by the following questions:

1. How do teachers respond to learners' linguistic errors in ESL classrooms in the elementary school?
2. What are the characteristics of teacher feedback that lead to learner uptake?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Depending on the disciplinary orientation of the researcher, negative feedback is referred to in many ways. For example, linguists (e.g., White, 1989) named it as negative evidence, psycholinguists (e.g., Kasper, 1985) as negative feedback, and L2 teachers (e.g., Fanselow, 1977) as corrective feedback. Negative feedback can be preemptive or reactive. While preemptive negative feedback is provided before learners produce language structures, probably to prevent errors, reactive negative feedback is provided as a response after learners' utterances during negotiation. Reactive feedback can be provided explicitly or implicitly to language learners.

Recasts, one type of implicit negative feedback, have recently received increasing attention in L2 acquisition. Recasts are "utterances which rephrase a child's utterance by changing one or more sentence components (subjects, verb or object) while still referring to its central meanings" (Long, 1996, p. 434). Unlike recasts, negotiation moves (e.g., clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition) do not provide the corrective form to learners. Instead, they play a role as a trigger and provide learners with clues or signal so that learners might notice their non-target-like utterances and try to repair them by themselves. In a more recent study, Lyster (2004) referred to negotiation moves as "prompts" and mentioned that prompts can respond to Swain's (1985) pushed output.

Researchers argued that when there is negotiation of form involving negotiation moves, students may engage more actively in the feedback than involving recasts. In other words, students follow with uptake, especially with "student generated repairs" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 54) when they receive feedback in the form of negotiation moves. Uptake is "a student's utterance which immediately follows the teacher's feedback" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 49). It has been regarded as an important measurement to see the effectiveness of NF on language

acquisition. There are two types of learner uptake: uptake that results in successful repair of the targeted error and uptake that results in needs-repair that still needs repair. When learners produce uptake, we assume that their attention is drawn to a linguistic form that they failed to produce, and they 'notice the gap' (Schmidt & Frota, 1986) between their own interlanguage and their target language. However, a number of researchers argued that the frequency of uptake cannot be a valid measure of the effectiveness of feedback or of language learning. Learning can happen without producing uptake (Mackey & Philp, 1998). Learners may not always produce uptake even though they notice the teacher feedback for their ill-formed utterances. Or, learners may not always notice feedback, or interpret it as a teacher intended. Mackey and Philp (1998) indicated that even for learners who repeated the recast, it is difficult to identify whether they actually perceived the recast as feedback or simply another way to say the same thing. That is, learner perception about feedback is questionable. If learners cannot notice the feedback, then they cannot produce uptake to repair errors. Accordingly it is important to investigate what kind of feedback draws more learners' attention and leads to uptake, and what the characteristics of those feedbacks are.

A number of studies have examined the relationship between the types of NF and learner uptake (e.g., J. Lee, 2007; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; H. J. Kim, 2004; Y. Kim, 2007; Oliver, 1995, 2000; Tsang, 2004), the effects of NF on short-term and/or long-term L2 learning (e.g., Iwashita, 2003; Long, Inagaki, & Ortega, 1998) and learner perceptions of NF (e.g., Mackey & Philp, 1998; Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000). These studies have found that among the types of NF, recasts are commonly found across the various instructional contexts, in different interaction forms, and different age levels. However, the effects of recasts on SLA are controversial.

In two experiments with adult L2 Japanese and Spanish students, Long et al. (1998) found that recasts are more effective than models in achieving at least short-term improvements on L2 structure. Iwashita (2003) examined the short-term effects of feedback on the acquisition of two Japanese structures with L2 adult learners of Japanese. It was found that although positive evidence was used more frequently than negative feedback, it had beneficial effects only on learners who had above-average scores on the pretest. However, it was implicit negative feedback, especially recasts that had a larger impact than other conversational moves on short-term L2 grammatical development.

On the other hand, a majority of research has found that recasts are not beneficial in L2 learning, compared to negotiation moves. Even if recasts prevailed as teacher feedback in the language classroom, if learners cannot perceive it as feedback, they cannot repair or modify the

problematic utterance, and they cannot acquire the target form. Lyster and Ranta (1997) studied the relationship between corrective feedback and learner uptake in four elementary French immersion programs. The results indicated an overwhelming tendency for teachers to use recasts (60% or more), in spite of their ineffectiveness at eliciting student-generated repair. Lyster (1998b) suggested that teacher feedback such as clarification requests, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation encouraged learners to self-correct, and therefore, was more beneficial than recasts to L2 learning. More recently, Lyster (2004) investigated the effects of form-focused instruction (FFI) and corrective feedback on French immersion students' grammatical gender acquisition. The findings agreed with previous studies, revealing that FFI instruction with prompts is more beneficial for acquiring grammatical-gender than recasts or no feedback in retrieving target-like forms. Loewen (2004) also investigated the characteristics of focus-on-form that predicted uptake, and revealed that complexity (multiple negotiation turns), timing (immediate feedback), and response (elicit response moves) were more likely to lead to learner uptake. In addition, when negotiation is focused on linguistic form rather than on meaning, there was more successful uptake. It may be that compared to meaning-focused interaction, form-focused feedback is very specific and salient enough to draw learners' attention to a targeted linguistic form and therefore, result in successful uptake.

Tsang (2004) investigated teacher feedback and learner uptake at secondary levels in Hong Kong. The findings indicated that recast and explicit correction were the most frequent types of feedback, but did not result in the student-generated repairs at all. J. Lee (2007) explored teacher's corrective feedback types at a private elementary school in Korean EFL contexts. She also found that teachers used recasts predominantly despite its ineffectiveness at leading to learner repairs. In her study, negotiation moves such as metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, elicitation, and repetition led to student-generated repairs more successfully.

Lyster (1998b) investigated different types of feedback according to error types in elementary French immersion programs. He found that teachers preferred negotiation moves for lexical errors, whereas they preferred recasts for grammatical and phonological errors, but with differential effects in terms of learner repair. Only phonological repairs followed from recasts, but lexical and grammatical repairs followed from negotiation moves. Tsang (2007) also found that most grammatical repairs resulted from negotiation, and phonological repairs resulted equally from recast and explicit correction. However, Y. Kim (2007)'s study showed slightly different results from the above studies. The study was conducted at secondary levels in Korean EFL classrooms. In her study, phonological and lexical errors invited recasts, whereas grammatical errors invited negotiation moves even though the differences were not

significant. Interestingly, the results of the interviews and questionnaires showed that students generally preferred negotiation moves, but for grammatical errors, they preferred recasts. Teacher's instructions and students' expectations about corrective feedback were mismatched.

There were some studies conducted in an adult ESL classroom context (e.g., Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001; Loewen, 2004; Panova & Lyster, 2002). Ellis et al. (2001) and Loewen (2004) investigated learner uptake in incidental focus-on-form in New Zealand. Both studies revealed a much higher rate of uptake than those found in other studies, such as Lyster's (1998b) and Oliver's (1995) studies. These results imply that the different learning context may have an impact on learners' uptake after negative feedback. Sheen (2004) argued that the rates of learner uptake following recasts were greater in Korea EFL and New Zealand ESL classrooms than in ESL and Canadian Immersion programs. That is, the extent to which recasts lead to learner uptake and repairs may be greater in contexts where the focus of the recasts is more salient and where learners are oriented to focus on linguistic form rather than meaning. The difference may be due to the fact that students in the EFL and ESL settings are more motivated and oriented to view language as an object (Ellis et al., 2001). In contrast, students in immersion classes may view language as a tool for learning the subject area (Loewen, 2004).

Also, the age of the learners may make a difference in learners' production of uptake. As opposed to adults, children were more likely to use feedback (Oliver, 2000). Oliver (2000) compared the provision and use of negative feedback in different age groups (adult NS-NNS vs. child NS-NNS) in different contexts (teacher-fronted lessons vs. pairwork tasks). There were no significant differences in the use of NF by the two age groups in either context. However, she mentioned that children might have "a greater cumulative opportunity" (p. 143) of both receiving and using implicit negative feedback.

Studies involving children were conducted in the Canadian immersion and EFL contexts, but not in many ESL contexts. Research is needed to explore the occurrence of uptake and repair with child ESL learners in a classroom context. So, the present study is aimed to investigate the relationship between error types, the types of feedback and learner uptake in ESL elementary classes. However, this study has some limitations. It only investigated the interaction between teacher and learners. Interactions between learners were not considered. Accordingly, the study did not show the complete picture of classroom interaction. Also this study only examined the immediate use of feedback. Therefore, it is impossible to determine later incorporation of feedback or learner perception of feedback.

III. METHODS

1. Instructional Setting and Participants

The study was conducted over a period of nine weeks in an elementary school in southwest Texas. The school conducts a pull-out ESL program. Students are pulled out once a day for 45 minutes and participate in the ESL classes instead of regular classes. The classes across the grade levels include phonics, spelling lessons, vocabulary lessons, and reading comprehension. The class is more oriented toward language itself than content.

Three ESL teachers and their sixteen students participated in the study. Table 1 shows the detailed participants information. The teachers were all female. Ms. Beth teaches 1st graders, Ms. Kay, 2nd graders, and Ms. Susan, both 4th and 5th–6th graders. Ms. Beth has been an ESL teacher for 10 years and a bilingual teacher for 19 years. Ms. Kay has been an ESL teacher for two years and a regular classroom teacher for 17 years. Ms. Susan has been an ESL teacher for six years with a total of 33 years of teaching experience.

TABLE 1

General Information of Participants

Teacher	Grade	Numbers	Gender	Nationality
Ms. Beth	1	6	5 girls, 1 boy	5 Filipinos, 1 Korean
Ms. Kay	2	3	3 boys	2 Korean, 1 Vietnamese
Ms. Susan	4	3	2 boys, 1 girl	2 Korean, 1 Thai
	5-6	4	3 boys, 1 girl	1 Filipinos, 1 Russian, 2 Korean

The student participants included seven girls and nine boys; seven Koreans, six Filipinos, one Russian, one Thai, and one Vietnamese. In this study, all of students were in the beginning level. They just started to learn English, or had been schooled for less than a year in the U.S.A.

2. Data Analysis

The data was taken from the author's (C. Y. Lee, 2006) previous research. The data includes 10.5 hours (628 minutes) of typical communicative interaction between teacher and students. This data consists of about 2.5 hours of data from each grade, including spelling words,

vocabulary, and reading comprehension lessons. The recordings were transcribed by a native English speaker using Digital Voice Editor 2.

To code the data, this study used Lyster and Ranta's (1997) Error Treatment Sequence Model, which has been used in various context, age levels, and language. This model and categories help identify student error and teachers' feedback types. Since Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study was conducted in the immersion program, and this study was conducted in the ESL context, Lyster and Ranta's codes and its terminology were modified to fit the setting of this study. First, among the types of learner errors, since no students spoke their first language in the teacher-learner interactions (except in learner-learner interactions), L1 was not included. Second, incomplete or brief utterances were included as data which were due to students' language proficiency abilities. Students in this study were beginners, and they used incomplete and brief utterances a lot. Teachers regarded incomplete sentences as grammatical errors and provided feedback to help students make complete sentences.

Following the Lyster and Ranta's model, a unit of interaction consisted of learner error, teacher feedback, and learner response. First, the learners' errors were coded as phonological, lexical, or grammatical errors based on Lyster's (1998b) description. Second, after recognizing the learners' errors, the teachers' feedback was coded for the types and nature of feedback the teachers provided. The types of teacher feedback included explicit correction, recasts, or negotiation moves (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

1) Explicit correction refers to the correct form provided after a non-target utterance. The teacher provides directly and clearly what the student has said is incorrect.

Excerpt 1

T: What is 'reported'?
S: To tell?
T: To tell. Reported is past tense. So, 'told about.'

2) Recasts involve immediate implicit reformulation of all or part of the non-target utterance.

Excerpt 2

S: She's cousin died. If, she's cousin was very old? Like grandma?
T: Her cousin?

3) Negotiation moves do not provide the correct form. Instead, it encourages learners to generate their initiated repairs. It includes elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests, and repetition.

(1) In elicitation, teachers directly elicit the correct form from the students by asking an open question or by asking students to reformulate their utterance, or by pausing to allow students to complete the utterance.

Excerpt 3

T: What do we call that relationship? In..ter...

S: Interdependent.

(2) Metalinguistic feedback refers to "either comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 46). The teacher usually provides information about the nature of the error or a word definition for lexical errors.

Excerpt 4

T: How would you feel?

S: Happy?

T: Okay. Give me a sentence. I can't just write 'happy' up here because that's not a sentence.

(3) Clarification requests indicate that the utterance is ill-formed in some way and eliciting repetition or reformulation from the student. Clarification requests are often used to clarify the meaning as well. In this study, clarification requests were analyzed when there were problems only with students' utterance form.

Excerpt 5

S: That's five verbs.

T: That's what? That's what?

(4) Repetition refers to teachers' repetition of the student's ill-formed utterance, usually with a change in intonation.

Excerpt 6

T: Now, tell me another word that means 'beneath.'
S: Beside?
T: Beside? I am beside you. Am I beneath you?
S: No.

4) In some cases, teachers provided several types of feedback in one teacher turn. Whenever that happened, this study coded these examples following Oliver's (2000) and Morris' (2002) suggestions that a hierarchical value be assigned to such types of feedback.

Excerpt 7 Clarification request and Recasts (Clarification request < Recasts)

S: I like the re... I like the re...lay. (Lexical error)
T: Relay races? (Recasts)

Excerpt 8 Repetition and Recasts (Repetition < Recasts)

S: Something that touch . . . any . . . didn't touch any place?
T: Didn't touch any place? Or, place is where no one else lived before?

Lastly, the learners' responses to teacher feedback were coded based on whether or not they followed the feedback: uptake or no uptake. Uptake included repairs and needs-repairs (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Successful repairs were coded as 'repair' and unsuccessful repairs as 'needs-repair'. Unsuccessful repairs included even when learners responded with acknowledgment (e.g., yeah, um-hum), made other errors or the same errors, or repaired partially (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Learner Error Types and Teacher Feedback

The analysis yielded a total of 894 error sequences, each initiated by a student turn containing at least one error coded as phonological, lexical, or grammatical. The majority of student errors throughout all grade levels were grammatical, then lexical and phonological errors followed.

Of the 894 errors, 643 (72%) were followed by teacher feedback (table 2). This result is a relatively high rate of teacher feedback following student errors compared to those of Lyster (1998b, 61%) in Canadian immersion classrooms and J. Lee (2007, 64%) in elementary immersion classrooms in the Korea EFL context. However, it is lower than that of Y. Kim's (2007, 87%) study conducted in Korea EFL classrooms. In immersion programs, the emphasis is not only on studying the language, but also on studying the content of the curriculum in L2. Attention to linguistic form was decreased, and attention to meaning was increased. The emphasis in EFL or ESL pull-out classrooms is just the opposite. For example, the teachers in this study regularly taught phonics, vocabulary, and sometimes grammar if necessary as a part of instruction. Therefore, it seems that there are more negotiations of form in EFL or ESL pull-out classrooms than in immersion programs. Furthermore, the results showed that the teachers in ESL pull-out programs focused more on linguistic forms than in immersion programs, but probably less than in EFL contexts.

TABLE 2

Rate of Feedback per Error Type

Phonological	158/168	(94%)
Lexical	186/211	(88%)
Grammatical	299/515	(58%)
Total	643/894	(72%)

Table 2 shows that the students received the most feedback for their phonological errors, then lexical, and lastly grammatical errors. Even though students made grammatical errors the most among error types, they received the least feedback for these errors from their teachers. Possible explanations for this finding are: first, the teachers prefer to provide feedback for phonological and lexical errors. Or, teachers may be more intolerant of phonological and lexical errors. This kind of teacher preference is explicitly shown in utterances with multiple errors. When there were multiple errors in the student's utterance, the teachers mostly provided feedback for phonological and lexical errors, not for grammatical errors. In excerpt 9, Jo made both grammatical and lexical errors. Ms. Kay only provided the word, *bar* that Jo did not know, but she did not correct the grammatical error, *at Thursday* and continued her utterance.

Excerpt 9

Jo: The at Thursday is it's a short...

Ms. Kay: It's a short bar. So that means what? (recast)

Second, teachers might not provide their feedback for grammatical errors because learners were not ready to notice the feedback. The participants were all beginners. They did not have enough linguistic knowledge of the target language yet to differentiate which form is correct or not. They were not developmentally ready to get benefits from teacher's feedback (Mackey & Philp, 1998).

Lastly, teacher preference for error types may be influenced by the instructional context. Unlike in EFL classrooms, teachers in ESL or immersion classrooms are more likely to focus on meaning or contents, not on linguistic structure. That is, ESL contexts probably permit a freer communicative use of the target language, compared to other contexts such as EFL which instructional focus is more on form. That is why more feedback can be provided for lexical errors than grammatical errors.

TABLE 3

Distribution of Feedback Types Across Error Types

	Phonological	Lexical	Grammatical	Total
Recasts	110	70	271	451
	(70%)	(37.6%)	(91%)	(70%)
Negotiation Moves	35	85	21	141
	(22%)	(45.7%)	(7%)	(22%)
Explicit correction	13	31	7	51
	(8%)	(16.7%)	(2%)	(8%)

Table 3 shows that among feedback types, recasts were the most common feedback type (70%), while the rate of negotiation moves (22%) and explicit corrections (8%) were relatively low. A comparison of the distribution of feedback types across error types revealed that recasts followed mostly grammatical and phonological errors. These preferences of feedback types for error types are the same with those of Lyster's (1998b) study, but different from Y. Kim's (2007). In Y. Kim's (2007) study, teachers did not recast, but negotiated forms for learners' grammatical errors. In the interviews with teachers, Y. Kim (2007) found that teachers used negotiation moves by adding more explanations to correct learners' grammatical errors because grammar is too hard for learners. On the contrary, Lyster (1998b) explained that teachers used recasts for grammatical errors because grammatical knowledge is too complicated to discuss with learners. This study did not include teachers' interviews. So, it is hard to know why the teachers provided recasts for grammatical errors. Further research has to be investigated in this area.

The pedagogical focus may also make a difference. Y. Kim's (2007) data included *Let's Write* instructions which deal with grammar explanations. The teachers have to explain grammar to teach. However, the present study did not include any formal grammar instructions except for incidental instructions that happened during conversation (Appendix B).

Compare to phonological and grammatical errors, teacher feedback for lexical errors was a little different. The teachers provided negotiation moves more than recasts for lexical errors. Teachers tried negotiating for lexical errors. It may be due to the fact that lexical errors are directly related to comprehension. Teachers can not simply say or correct the word when they do not know what students really want to say. They have to ask what students want to say by asking, checking, confirming, or repeating. In contrast, as seen in excerpt 9, a little syntactic defect does not cause misunderstanding of the utterance. Accordingly, the teachers seemed to often ignore the grammatical errors to avoid interrupting the conversation flow. Or, they simply provided recasts by rephrasing or reformulating the problematic utterance and let the students continue the conversation. However, they negotiate lexical errors to avoid possible confusion.

2. Teacher Feedback and Learner Uptake

Of the 643 feedback moves, 289 (45%) led to learner uptakes including successful repairs and needs repairs (table 4). This result is higher than in Lyster's (1998b, 33%) and Oliver's (1995, 35%) studies. However, it is lower than in adult ESL classrooms (Ellis et al., 2001, 74%; Loewen, 2004, 73%) and similar to J. Lee's (2007, 42%) study. These contrasting results suggest that the learning context and age may play a role in learners' production of uptake. First, learners tend to produce uptake in ESL or EFL classrooms rather than in immersion programs. Second, learners use negative feedback more in teacher-fronted lesson than in pairwork interactions (Oliver, 1995). Third, adult learners tend to produce more uptake than child learners. The lessons in ESL or EFL classrooms and teacher-student interactions are more didactic than those in immersion classrooms and learner-learner interaction. When a teacher's instruction focuses more on language, not on content (i.e., meaning), teachers might make their feedback saliently and therefore, increase the rate of learner uptake. In addition, learners, in particular, adults, are more willing to follow teacher's utterances (Sheen, 2004).

Table 4 shows that negotiation moves led learners to produce both uptakes and successful repairs the most. Uptake after recasts is mostly due to the tendency of recasts for phonological errors. Students in the study made a lot of phonological errors. Especially, most of phonological errors were made by one student (108 among 158 errors). He had difficulty in

reading, and the teacher provided recasts for his phonological errors as a feedback type. When teachers provided the correct pronunciation by recasts, students noticed the feedback easily and repeated teachers' correct words. Recasts were a convenient and easy feedback type to provide when students made phonological errors while reading aloud, without interrupting the students' activity.

TABLE 4

Distribution of Uptakes Across Feedback Types and Error Types

	Uptake					
	Repair			Needs-repair		
Feedback type	*PE	**LE	***GE	*PE	**LE	***GE
Explicit correction (n=23)	9	4	3		6	1
Recast (n=125)	88	4	6	2	14	11
Negotiation Moves (n=141)	13	28	4	22	57	17
Elicitation (n=73)	(2)	(23)	(4)	(3)	(29)	(12)
Metalinguistic feedback (n=63)	(11)	(5)		(17)	(25)	(5)
Clarification request (n=5)				(2)	(3)	

Note. *PE: Phonological Error, **LE: Lexical Error, ***GE: Grammatical Error

For lexical errors, learners followed negotiation moves. Especially elicitation was preferred among negotiation moves. The eliciting sentences that teachers used the most for lexical errors were *What's another word for it?* or *There is another word for it* (excerpt 10). These eliciting sentences not only helped the students repair their error by themselves but also helped them expand their vocabulary knowledge.

Excerpt 10

Ms. Beth:	What's the problem?
Ally:	because there's a hole in his bike.
Ms. Beth:	In the bike or what part of the bike? (elicitation)
Ally:	Umm...the wheel?
Ms. Beth:	Ok. There is another word for it. (elicitation)
Irene:	Umm...tire
Ms. Beth:	Tire, ok. Tire, yeah. He keeps getting a flat...
Ss:	Tire.

In terms of grammatical errors, the teachers preferred recasts, but learners produced uptakes after negotiation moves the most. This finding is the same with that of Y. Kim's (2007) study. Lyster (1998b) and Y. Kim (2007) stated a different explanation about teacher feedback types for grammatical errors. Lyster (1998b) thinks that grammar is too hard to discuss with learners so that teachers used recasts. In Y. Kim's (2007) view, because of that fact, teachers tried negotiating to add more explanations. Mackey and Philp (1998) insisted that to get the greater gains from recasts, learners have to be developmentally ready. For example, when learners possess both a target-like form (e.g., He doesn't) and an incorrect from (e.g., He don't) in their interlanguage, they can notice their error and choose the correct form from recasts. Without interviewing the teachers or learners, it is hard to know why the teachers used recasts for grammatical errors, and whether or not learners already have grammatical knowledge to notice the target form. Just one thing for sure is that the participants in this study were all beginners, and they followed after negotiation moves, not recasts.

Except for phonological errors, table 4 shows that most of negotiation moves such as elicitation or metalinguistic feedback led to learner uptakes. This result supported the hypothesis of Mackey et al. (2000), in which negotiation requires learners' participation so that learners have to respond in a certain way. In the study, negotiation moves did not lead to successful repairs on the first try. Usually it took multiple sequences of negotiations as seen in excerpt 10. Sometimes it involved several learners to repair the error. Among negotiation moves, the students preferred to follow elicitation and metalinguistic feedback across error types. Especially, for phonological errors, metalinguistic feedback was preferred for learner uptake. For lexical and grammatical errors, elicitation was preferred by students. Even though there were very few examples of repetitions, they were instantly followed by other feedback types such as elicitation and metalinguistic feedback or explicit correction moves. So, there was no data for repetition moves in this study.

In summary, table 4 shows that except for lexical errors, recasts were the most common feedback type in the classroom. However, except for phonological errors, recasts were rarely followed by learner uptake. As one of reasons, Lyster (1998b) stated that recasts seem to function similarly to non-corrective repetitions after well-formed learner utterances. The teacher recasts students' utterances by changing only the problematic form. Therefore, without paying careful attention to teacher recasts, students may easily regard the recast as simple repetition of their utterances by the teacher. In particular, if there is no emphasis while the teacher is recasting the ill-formed part, it is hard for the students to notice the feedback. Second,

teachers usually accompany positive responses such as, 'Okay' and 'Right' in their recasts. Once students listen to the teacher's positive comment, this may reduce their tension. Then, they may not continue to concentrate on the following message or information. Lastly, in many cases, the teachers continued speaking after recasting. Although teachers provide immediate feedback after learner errors, they do not demand learners to repeat or modify their utterances following the feedback. Further, recasts are embedded in meaning-based interaction. Once the teachers understood the students' content, they continued their conversation while recasting students' inappropriate form (excerpt 9). So, the students did not have any chance to respond after recasts (Oliver, 1995) and instead, responded to the teacher's next question. That may be why the recasts lead to the least uptake.

3. Characteristics of Teacher Feedback Leading to Learner Uptake

According to Swain (1985, 1995), pushed output or modified output may facilitate language acquisition. L2 researchers argue that the types of teacher feedback may have influence on learners' output (Lyster, 2004; Lyster & Ranta, 1997, Mackey & Oliver, 2002; Morris, 2002). However, previous studies have shown that learners may not always correct or modify their errors after teacher feedback (e.g., Lyster, 1998; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mackey et al., 2000). Learners may not notice the feedback as the teacher intended. Learners simply do not feel the need to respond to the feedback (Lochtman, 2005). Or, the feedback is not salient enough to push learners to repair their errors (e.g., Mackey et al., 2000; Morris, 2002). The teacher's role is very important as "facilitators and shapers of learner output" (Long, 1996, p. 413). Accordingly, the present study examined the characteristics of teacher feedback that led to learner uptakes.

First, in the case of recasts, the students rarely incorporated teacher feedback to modify their output except for phonological errors. However, there were some examples that the students modified their output after recasts. Since the participants in this study were beginners, they made lots of incomplete sentences (excerpt 11). For these ill-formed utterances, teachers provided recasts continuously. Also they often encouraged learners to make complete sentences. Repetitive and continuous feedback on a specific form may make teacher feedback saliently. Excerpt 12 also shows that when the teacher targeted immediately and specifically the student's problematic linguistic form, the student was more likely to notice the corrective feedback and repair the error. This seems to support Nicolas, Lightbown, and Spada's (2001)

hypothesis that "recasts appear to be more effective in contexts where it is clear to the learner that the recast is a reaction to the accuracy of the form" (p. 720).

Excerpt 11

Ms. Kay:	Those are all things do what?
Ss:	fly
Ms. Kay:	Those are all things that fly. (recast)

Excerpt 12

Ms. Beth:	Tell me something we saw at the circus and use it in a sentence.
Ally:	I see ...
Ms. Beth:	I saw (recast)
Ally:	I saw a ..uh ...

Second, most of negotiation moves led to uptake. However, it took multiple sequences of interactions to get successful repairs. Even though teachers could always lead learners to respond to their elicitation or metalinguistic feedback, they did not always lead learners to produce successful repairs on the first try. The teachers used various strategies to help the learners repair their errors. The teachers repeated or modified their questions, added more explanation related to the problematic word, provided a clue or a definition, or used a combination of feedback types such as metalinguistic feedback and elicitation as seen in excerpt 13. These kinds of negotiation feedback emphasized the feedback and enhanced it saliently. Therefore, the learners were more likely to notice the feedback.

Excerpt 13

Ms. Beth:	How would you feel?
John:	Happy?
Ms. Beth:	Okay. Give me a sentence. I can't just write 'happy' up here because that's not a sentence. (metalinguistic feedback)
John:	Mmm...
Ms. Beth:	(pointing the picture) Who is this? Who is this right here? Who is this? Do we know his name? Uh...let me see...where is Matt? There is no Matt, is he? Oh, okay. Let's pick this boy right here. Who is that? Do we know his name? (elicitation)

Ss:	...
Ms. Beth:	What are we gonna call him? (elicitation)
Ally:	Friends.
Ms. Beth:	(writing it on the chart) The...friends... (elicitation)
Ally:	happy
Ms. Beth:	Okay. The friends are happy. (recasts)

Last, excerpt 13 also shows that teachers involved several learners in multiple sequence of negotiation to resolve the error. When the learners could not repair their errors even with teacher feedback, the teacher tried negotiation with other learners. By cooperating, the students lessened the burden to solve the problem on their own. Swain (2000) defined collaborative dialogue as dialogue in which learners are building and solving problems by putting together several linguistic solutions. Learners collaborate to solve problems by verbalizing their knowledge. Through verbalization, students become aware of their problems, predict their linguistic needs, monitor their own language use, and evaluate their overall success. The present study revealed the role of the teacher in seeking to build collaborative dialogue between learners. As seen in excerpt 13, by asking multiple questions, the teacher guided the students to verbalize their knowledge. Based on teacher response about their utterance, the students checked the appropriateness of their knowledge and kept trying to verbalize their knowledge related to the error until the problem was resolved. Through continuous negotiations, the students tested and rebuilt the hypothesis about their previous linguistic knowledge.

4. Pedagogical Implications

The present study reveals that teacher feedback is often not perceived as the teacher intends and does not lead learners to correct their errors. For example, regarding grammatical errors, in spite of its high frequency, teacher feedback was rarely followed by learner uptake. Drawn from these findings, some of pedagogical implications are recommended to teachers especially while providing feedback for learners' grammatical errors.

First, teachers have to try making their feedback saliently. Although recasts are the most common teacher feedback used in the classroom, they rarely lead to learner uptake. However, in the study, when the teachers enhance their feedback with emphasis, for example, when they stress or emphasize the positive form using intonation and when they provide feedback on the specific form immediately, the students are more likely to notice the target form and correct

their errors. Schmidt (1995) also points out that noticing is a "necessary and sufficient condition for the conversion of input to intake for learning" (p. 17). Accordingly, teachers need to develop pedagogical strategies that enhance their feedback.

Second, teachers might consider providing a form-focused communicative task. The study shows that students made a lot of grammatical errors, but received a few feedbacks, and rarely repaired their grammar errors. Previous studies have shown that input with intensive recasts has a positive influence on students' performance (Mackey, 1995; Mackey & Philp, 1998). Swain (2000) stated, "tasks which encourage students to reflect on language form while still being oriented to meaning making might be particularly useful for learning strategic processes as well as grammatical aspects of language" (p. 112). Accordingly, teachers need to develop communicative tasks which are designed to target specific grammar features.

Third, teachers might want to provide collaborative tasks that engage learners in collaborative dialogue. In the study, teacher-learner collaborative dialogue helped learners build particularly syntactical knowledge. Learner-learner collaborative dialogue guided by teachers may help learners co-construct their target language knowledge by putting together their previous linguistic knowledge. Through verbalizing in the process of discussion, learners may notice their linguistic problems and through problem solving processes, they may eventually learn the target language form.

Lastly, teachers might engage students in longer negotiation sequences rather than give learners only one opportunity to produce uptake. In this study, the teachers provided their feedback using various feedback types or a combination of feedback types until students repaired their errors. It enhances teacher feedback saliently and helps students correct their errors by themselves. Through trial and error processes in multiple negotiation sequences, learners may test their hypothesis about the target language and are more likely to build new appropriate knowledge. This process also gives learners more wait-time to modify their errors. Extended wait-time not only increases the number of learner responses, it often results in more complex answers and leads to an increase in teacher-learner interaction (Walsh, 2002).

IV. CONCLUSION

This study investigated the relationship between error types, negative feedback, and learner uptake in response to that feedback in elementary ESL classrooms. The results underscore that teacher feedback is different across contexts and so is its effectiveness on learner repairs. The

present study revealed that teachers in ESL pull-out classrooms provide more feedback than in immersion, but less than in EFL classrooms. The rate of learner uptake was higher than in immersion programs, but similar to EFL classrooms. One of the reasons for this could be that the ESL pull-out program in this study has mixed characteristics of immersion programs and EFL contexts (Appendix B). ESL pull-out programs are conducted in an ESL context, but its instructions focus more on language than in ESL immersion classrooms, but less than in EFL classrooms. Teachers are more likely to provide recasts to learners' errors because they do not want to interrupt the flow of conversation. At the same time, they do not want to give up teaching linguistic aspects.

In the study, to elicit student-generated repairs, teachers used multiple turns of negotiation and immediate response targeting linguistic forms. As the predictive factor of uptake, Loewen (2004) mentioned multiple turn negotiation, immediate responses that elicit a learner response, form-targeted feedback (code-related focus-on-form episodes in Loewen's term), and a heavy emphasis consisting of either direct responses or multiple indirect responses. These factors draw the learner's attention to form incidentally and make the form more salient and noticeable. In addition to Loewen's findings, the present study found that teachers used a combination of feedback types (e.g., metalinguistic feedback and elicitation, or elicitation and recasts) to repair learner's errors in multiple negotiation sequences. Also, teachers used peer assistance as a scaffolding strategy in negotiation sequences. While teachers negotiate with other peers, learners can not only lessen the stress to repair the error on their own, but also have more opportunities to repair the errors through longer wait-time.

This study investigated the interaction between teacher and learners in the ESL context. So, the findings can not be generalized across all contexts. However, the results show how teachers can provide effective feedback for student learning. Further research is still needed to investigate the relationship between negative feedback and learner uptake related to L2 acquisition in other contexts to confirm these findings.

REFERENCES

Beck, M., & Eubank, L. (1991). Acquisition theory and experimental design: A critique of Tomasello and Herron. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 73-76.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Preemptive focus on form in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 35* (3), 407-432.

Fanselow, J. (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. *Foreign Language Annals, 10*, 583-593.

Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grimshaw, J., & Pinker, S. (1989). Positive and negative evidence in language acquisition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12*, 341-342.

Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction: Differential effects on L2 development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*, 1-36.

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*, 200-215.

Kim, H. J. (2004). The role of negative feedback in second language acquisition with a focus on recasts. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 9*(2), 151-171.

Kim, Y. (2007). Teacher's corrective feedback: Focus on initiations to self-repair. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 13*(1), 111-131.

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

Lee, C. Y. (2006). *Teacher feedback and student learning in ESL classrooms.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Texas Tech University, USA.

Lee, J. (2007). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in English immersion classrooms at the primary level in Korea. *English Teaching, 62*(4), 311-334.

Lochtman, K. (2005). Negative feedback and learner uptake in analytic foreign language teaching. In A. Housen & M. Pierrard (Eds.), *Investigations in instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 333-352). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Loewen, S. (2004). Uptake in incidental focus on form in meaning-focused ESL lessons. *Language Learning, 54*, 153-188.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA.: Academic Press.

Long, M., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative evidence in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *Modern Language Journal, 82*, 357-371.

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

Lyster, R. (1998b). 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. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*, 399-432.

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

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive implicit negative feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*, 471-497.

Mackey, A., & Oliver, R. (2002). Interactional feedback and children's L2 development. *System, 30*, 459-477.

Mackey, A., Oliver, R., & Leeman, J. (2003). Interactional input and the incorporation of feedback: An exploration of NS-NNS and NNS-NNS adult and child dyads. *Language Learning, 53*, 35-66.

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

Leeman, J. (2003). Interactional input and the incorporation of feedback: An exploration of NS-NNS and NNS-NNS adult and child dyads. *Language Learning, 53*, 35-66.

Morris, F. A. (2002). Negotiation and recasts in relation to error types and learner repair. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*, 395-404.

Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning, 51*, 719-758.

Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS/NNS conversation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17*, 459-483.

Oliver, R. (2000). Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pair work. *Language Learning, 51*, 719-758.

Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2003). Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal, 87*, 519-533.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 573-595.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 1-63). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn* (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.

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). 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* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tsang, W. K. (2004). Feedback and uptake in teacher-student interaction: An analysis of 18 English lessons in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *RELC, 35*(2), 187-209.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 6*(1), 3-23.

White, L. (1989). *Universal grammar and second language acquisition.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 17-50). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

APPENDIX A

Transcription Conventions

Symbol	Meaning
S(s)	Student
T	Teacher
...	Continuing Discourse

APPENDIX B

Description of Weekly Lessons in Each Grade

	1st	2nd	4th	5th – 6th
Duration (mins)	45	45	45	45
Monday	Phonics	Word study	Reading	Word study Reading
Tuesday	Phonics Reading	Reading	Reading	Word study Reading
Wednesday	Phonics Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading
Thursday	Reading Activity	Reading	Reading	Reading
Friday	(Test) Phonics (CD)	Reading	Reading (Word Test)	Reading (Word Test)

Examples in: English
Applicable Language: English
Applicable Levels: Elementary

Chonglim Yoon
Dept. of English Language and Literature
Sungshin Women's University
249-1 Dongseon-Dong 3-Ga, Seongbuk-Gu
Seoul 136-742, Korea
Tel: (02) 2212-3616
Email: goandrew1@hotmail.com

Received in July, 2008
Reviewed in August, 2008
Revised version received in September, 2008