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Abstract:

Examining oral correction techniques in the context of form-focused situation in an EFL classroom can help teachers to take the control of corrective feedbacks that they provide to learners’ errors. The aim of the present study was to find out among four corrective feedback conditions which one works better with beginner EFL learners in learning past tense. This study was also concerned with examining the effectiveness of recasts by adding ‘repetition’ to them. To this end, 62 EFL learners divided into four classes. Three groups were experimental group and one control which received the same tasks as experimental groups but did not receive any corrective feedback on their errors. Experimental groups including recast group, prompt group, and recast plus repetition group during treatment period and upon performing tasks, received corrective feedbacks according to the groups they were assigned to. The results showed the effectiveness of using different types of corrective feedbacks in learning past tense sentences. It revealed that the performance of the experimental groups was better than the control group on both posttest and delayed posttest. Prompt and recast plus repetition groups out-performed both control and recast groups on posttest and delayed posttest. Results also showed that recast group performed significantly better than control group. Moreover, results showed that recast plus repetition can be as effective as recasts in drawing learners’ attention to their errors. The findings of this study have implications for L2 teachers and encourage them to use corrective feedbacks in more beneficial ways.
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Chapter One

Introduction

1.1. Background

In recent decades, many studies in SLA have focused on the role of corrective feedback classrooms provided by the interlocutor. Among the very first works that nourished this area we can refer to Long’s (1996) interaction hypothesis which suggests that feedback provided by the interlocutor during conversational interactions, leads to interlanguage development because “…negotiation for meaning, and specially negotiation work that triggers interactional adjustments by the native speaker or more competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways” (Long, 1996, p. 451-452). According to Long, it is the interaction which fosters language learning. The interaction hypothesis has made feedback and different types of feedback a fertile area for research in recent years.

It has been believed that corrective feedback is an inseparable part of SLA process and classroom. Corder (1967) proposed that in fact presenting the input to the learner does not guarantee that it will turn into intake. Because input is what is available and intake is what goes in. Many factors influence the transition of input to intake. “We cannot really teach language, we can only create condition in which it will develop spontaneously in the mind in its own way” (Corder, 1967, p. 169). Corrective feedback is one important condition for learning, because it is based on the need of the learner in the context he is using the language.

Corrective feedback generally refers to responses to learner’s erroneous utterance (Ellis Loewen & Erlam, 2006). In recent years, the question of whether to correct learners has changed to the question of when and how to correct learners’ erroneous utterances, and it has been a hot
debate in the mainstream of SLA studies. The type of corrective feedback which can suit the learners’ needs made researchers propose different classifications for feedback types.

1) Recasts vs. prompts: Lyster (2002) proposed a classification for feedback types. According to Lyster corrective feedbacks that withhold the correct form and persuade learners to produce the correct form in different ways such as clarification request, metalinguistic clues, and elicitation of the correct form are generally referred to as prompts and the other feedback group which provide learners with the correct form of their erroneous utterance are referred to as recasts.

2) Explicit feedback vs. implicit feedback: as the name speaks for itself, it refers to how explicit or implicit a feedback might be. In the case of implicit feedback, there is no overt indication that the uttered sentence is problematic, while in the case of the explicit type there is (Yang, 2008). Researchers came to believe that explicitness/implicitness of a feedback influences the learners’ perception of the feedback as a response to his production. For example some research showed that recasts are too implicit and so they are likely to go unnoticed by learners, specifically beginner learners most of the time take recasts as a sign of confirmation to their production (e.g., Ellis et al., 2006; Lyster, 1998; Carrol, 2001). So some researchers suggested the use of more explicit types of feedback. Some others suggested making recast more explicit, for example by the rise of intonation (Doughty & Varela, 1998). After some time it was said that these ‘more or less types’ lead to difficulties in classifying feedback based on its implicitness/explicitness.

So the earlier classification came to be of greater interest and use in recent articles and research papers. There have been many research in favor of each of these types of feedback. Although there is an agreement about the usefulness of both recast and prompt in general, there
has been always a question that which one of them is more effective for language learning and how.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Prompts which are explicit kinds of elicitation are believed to have the power of stimulating learners to correct themselves. They include a variety of hints that push the learner to self-repair (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). They do not provide learners with answers but just push them to produce it (Mall-Amiri & Mesbah, 2013). Prompts represent a range of feedback that include “clarification requests, repetition of learner error, metalinguistic cues, and elicitation moves” (Mall-Amiri & Mesbah, 2013, p. 15). Based on these features prompts are preferred by many researchers over recasts.

Lyster (2004) proposed some advantages of prompts over their implicit opponents-recast. His research on the effectiveness of different types of feedback showed that learners receiving prompts expressed greater development than those receiving recasts on both written and oral tasks. He interpreted these outcomes as "the result of prompts’ capability of enabling students to self-repair by using accurate forms. Recasts, despite allowing learners to hear target forms repeatedly in input, rarely make them notice and correct their own mistakes” (Lyster, 2004, pp. 399-426). Fans of prompts over recasts found that recasts were ambiguous in nature and they are sometimes received as simple repetitions or confirmations -especially by beginner learners- and so they would pass unnoticed as a negative evidence to learners’ non-target like productions (e.g., Lyster, 1998; Nicholas, Howard, Lightbown & Spada, 2001; Panova & Lyster, 2002). However, there have been also disadvantages in describing prompts, as well.

Long (2007) argued that elicitation moves such as what happens in prompts, do not provide learners with the correct target form, and this causes only those learners who know the
correct form very well benefit from the feedback. He turned to propose some better features in recasts than prompts.

Long (2007) suggested several advantages for recasts from a psycholinguistic view. He proposed that recasts actually contextualize the data that are needed about the target language, and they also may provide learners with free attentional resources so that they can focus on form because learners have already understood the message. Saxton (1997) proposed that recasts by juxtaposing the correct target form with the learner’s ill-formed utterance can enhance the salience of the target form.

Loewen and Philp (2006) described recasts as “pedagogically expeditious” and “time-saving” (p. 537). They also defined recasts as techniques that, contrary to other corrective feedback types such as prompts, keep the learners concentrated on meaning and at the same time allows the teachers to maintain their control. On the other hand, some other researchers and studies criticized recasts as being too implicit so that learners may take them as confirmations. “The prevailing view in the recast literature is that recasts constitute an implicit form of negative feedback” (Ellis, 2008, p. 230)

Lyster and Ranta (1997) proposed that learners may interpret the teachers’ reformulation just as another way to express the same meaning. This criticism along with other questions led to many arguments about the effectiveness of recasts. “This was reinforced by the fact that teachers were observed to use recasts to reinforce the content (not the form) of students’ utterances as well” (Spada, 2014, p. 48).

Recast despite providing learners with the correct form still was not favored by research and teachers because of lacking the power of drawing learners’ attention to their errors. This issue along with the existing controversies on the effects of different types of corrective feedback
triggered the curiosity of the researcher of the present study to compare the effectiveness of four conditions of corrective feedback on learning past tense in an EFL classroom.

Zhuo (2010) in his study tried to use recasts in more explicit ways. He used stress and rise of intonation to draw learners’ attention to the form. In Zhuo (2010), it was revealed that stressed recast is more beneficial than implicit recast.

Having mentioned the rationale for consideration of the influential type of feedback, this study aimed to investigate the effect of recasts, prompts, and recast plus repetition on errors of beginner learners. Besides, the present study aimed at investigating the likely effectiveness of recasts by repeating them. To achieve this goal one aspect of grammar namely past tense was selected to work on. One reason for choosing past tense was its relevance for beginner level learners. Another reason was related to the fact that it is frequently seen that beginner learners of stage three and four, even after experiencing exposure to English language for three or more semesters and being familiar with the general rules of past simple, fail to use simple past effectively.

1.3. Significance of the Study

In the mainstream of SLA research, there has always been the question of how to correct learners’ errors so that it contributes to their L2 development. Different types of feedback are classified under two main types of feedback namely recast and prompt. Recasts are believed to be implicit and prompts are explicit.

Implicitness of recasts has always taken them under question specifically in response to beginner learners’ errors. It is believed that beginner learners are too much concerned with subject and meaning, so they do not perceive recasts as a response to their erroneous utterance and they are likely to perceive it as a confirmation (Lyster, 2004). “Based on my own
observation studies of immersion classrooms, I have argued that recasting—as defined in the L1 literature and as observed in immersion classrooms is not the most effective way of providing young L2 learners with negative evidence in classrooms where the primary focus is on subject matter, especially in comparison with other feedback options” (Lyster, 2004, p. 404).

On the other hand, prompts which are believed to be explicit enough to work with beginner L2 learners, do not seem to answer all the time. Low proficiency learners when interrupted by the interlocutor’s explicit feedback such as prompt, to their erroneous utterance lose the track and cannot save the flow of communication and are distracted easily. So if we could use recasts in a more explicit way, it might work with beginner learners as well.

Different attempts have been made to make recasts more explicit to learners such as the rise of intonation (Zhuo, 2010). The present study is going to use repetition to make recast more explicit. Repetition in recast situation, in addition to drawing learners’ attention to the fact that there’s a problem with their production, serves as a kind of input providing strategy which is helpful for low proficient learner.

1.4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide beginner learners with the most influential type of feedback. In an attempt, we provided learners with three different types of feedback to examine whether they lead to different outcomes. It also considered the probable more effectiveness of recasts in beginner learners by adding the repetition feature.

1.5. Research Questions

The current study sought to examine the effect of exposure to three different types of feedback on students’ learning of English past tense. In this regard, the following questions were formulated:
1. Do different feedback conditions affect leaning past tense differently?
2. If yes, which type of these three conditions (prompt, recast, recast plus repetition) works better with EFL beginner learners?

### 1.6 Research Hypothesis

In this study, the following null hypothesis was used:

There is no statically significant difference between the three groups of participants receiving different types of feedbacks.

### 1.7. Definition of Key Words

1.7.1 Corrective feedback. Corrective feedback is generally defined as “an indication to the learner that his or her use of the target language is incorrect” (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 172). Lowen (2012) and Sheen (2007) defined corrective feedback as information given to learners regarding a linguistic error they have made.

1.7.2 Recast. “Recasts involve the teacher’s reformulation of all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 47). Long (1996) defined recasts as target language reformulations provided by the interlocutor of a learner’s non target-like production that keeps the central meaning while changing the form of the sentence. A third definition is provided by Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada (2001) for recasts. “The teacher’s correct restatement of a learner’s incorrectly formed utterance” (p. 720).

1.7.3 Prompt. Ding (2011) defined prompts as feedback types which “ withhold correct forms and encourage learners to self-correct including clarification requests, metalinguistic clues, repetition and elicitation of the correct form” (p. 87). Another definition for prompts provided by Lyster and Mori (2006) introduces prompts as a range of feedback types, consisting of four
prompting moves: elicitation, metalinguistic clue, clarification request, and repetition. All these moves offer learners a chance to self-repair by withholding the correct form.

1.8. Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The present study investigated the effect of recasts, prompts, and recasts plus repetition in teaching grammar. English past tense was chosen as an aspect of grammar to work on in the present study. Focusing on past tense is considered to be the delimitation of this study.

This study encountered some limitations, as well. One of the limitations was the researcher’s inability in choosing the participants and randomly assigning them into the specified classes. This was due to the institutional constraints and the unavailability of participants. Another limitation which was again owing to the institutional constraints was that the researcher was not allowed to specify a class time for proficiency test. However the institute’s manager assured the researcher of the homogeneity of the participants, still the researcher felt the need for a proficiency test. One other limitation of the study was the low number of participants (n= 15 & 16). It was due to the unavailability of more crowded classes and participants of the same level.
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Literature Review

2.1. Overview

This chapter reviews the most related literature regarding the use of corrective feedback and different types of corrective feedback in language teaching and learning process. The current chapter is divided into three parts. The first part discusses the use of interaction in language learning classrooms, the beneficial effects that it provides L2 learners with, and the theoretical rationale behind the use of interactional feedback in this study. The second part of this chapter deals with the review literature of different types of corrective feedback studies. The third part presents some overall views on focus-on-form instruction and its use in language learning situations.

2.2. Interaction Research

The effectiveness of corrective feedback can be attributed to its negative evidence. Gass (1997) reported that in SLA situations learners are faced to two types of input: positive evidence and negative evidence. Positive evidence is provided to inform the learner about what is acceptable in the target language and refers to “the set of well-formed sentences to which learners are exposed to” (Gass, 1997, p. 36). Negative evidence on the other hand, provides learners with information about the non-target like sentences and is often realized through the presence of corrective feedback in response to learners’ erroneous L2 production.

The distinction between these two types of evidence, raised the question whether provision of positive evidence suffices L2 acquisition or it is necessary to provide learners with corrective feedback when they commit errors.
One group of researchers such as Krashen (1981), Schwartz (1993), and Truscott (2003) argued that if learners are provided with enough amount of proper input, acquisition will take place; they referred to what happens in L1 acquisition to support their claim. Therefore, there would be no need to draw learners’ attention to linguistic forms or focus on form instruction. Based on this claim exposure to enough input leads to L2 acquisition.

Later on, other research proved that for L2 learning to take place provision of input is not enough. Some immersion programs which were based on high exposure to authentic input, showed that even after many years of exposure to target language, still interlanguage of the learners in many grammatical points is flawed. The results of these immersion programs such as French immersion program in Canada (Swain, 1985) indicated that the failure of these programs is partly due to the absence of negative feedback to learners’ errors.

Since then the usefulness of corrective feedback was justified from different perspectives. Meanwhile, the interaction hypothesis proposed by Long (1985, 1996), and followed by Gass (1997) and Pica (1994) gave credit to the importance of teachers’ corrective feedback. Interactionists acknowledged the significance of exposure to input, but in the meantime emphasized the notability of negative evidence afforded by teachers or competent interlocutors through interactional feedback.

Early studies on interaction hypothesis were mainly focused on interactions which included negotiation of meaning. “It was hypothesized that second language learners, like first language learners, develop their knowledge about the structure of language by “doing conversations”, as Evelyn Hatch put it (e.g. Hatch, 1978)” (Spada & Lightbown, 2009).

Another study related to interaction hypothesis was conducted by Yule and MacDonald (1990) to explore the proficiency level in relation to the nature of interaction. Participants of this
study worked in pairs including a higher proficiency member and a lower proficiency one. Participants upon the completion of task needed to interact with each other. Results of this study revealed that during interactions in which lower proficiency learners had the active role, more negotiation for meaning took place comparing to the interactions in which higher proficiency learners played the active role.

Research such as that of Yule and MacDonald (1990) was classroom-oriented research rather than classroom-based research. It is believed that classroom-based research is most likely to show better understanding about the type of interaction that occurs in classrooms in which the interaction mostly takes place between learners and the teacher as the only proficient speaker and where there are varieties of dyadic interaction of different types between learners.

The shift from classroom-oriented research to classroom-based research, shifted the focus away from the product of classroom to its processes (Lightbown & Spada, 2009). Classroom-based studies involved the observation of linguistic behaviors between teacher and students in the classroom. During 1980s and 1990s, many studies sought to provide details of what actually goes on inside the classrooms. Research in the domain of interaction analysis intended to investigate not only how students go for negotiation of meaning, but also many other features were the subjects of these studies.

Mackey and Goo (2007) did a meta-analysis on 28 studies about interaction analysis. The results revealed that interaction groups out-performed the comparison and control groups who did not engage in negotiation of meaning or interaction opportunities. However, since most studies lacked delayed posttests Mackey and Goo reported that they cannot be sure about the long lasting effects of interaction.
In 1990, Long proposed a revised version of his interaction hypothesis. “…the revised interaction hypothesis gives more importance to individual cognitive processing (in particular, to noticing specific features of language in the input and the role of corrective feedback) than did the original version of the interaction hypothesis with its emphasis on negotiation for meaning” (Spada & Lightbown, 2009, p. 162-163).

Long (1996) stated that “negative feedback obtained during negotiation work or elsewhere may be facilitative of L2 development, at least for vocabulary, morphology, and language-specific syntax, and essential for learning certain specifiable L1-L2 contrasts” (Long, 1996, p. 417).

According to the revised version of interaction hypothesis, corrective feedback is of high importance in classroom studies. From 1990s on and after Long’s (1990) revised version of interaction hypothesis, many classroom-based and laboratory researches were conducted to examine the effectiveness of corrective feedback on L2 learning.

2.3. Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback is generally defined as “responses to a learner’s non-target like L2 production” (Li, 2010, p. 309). The effectiveness of corrective feedback was investigated from different perspectives. In what follows, some corrective feedback research will be mentioned.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) conducted a study to examine the relationship between corrective feedback types and learner uptake. The data were derived from an observational study from six immersion classes of French. One hundred hours of a variety of lessons in four grade 4 and two grade 6 classes were audio-recorded. The school program of the participants consisted of 60% French and 40% English. Then all recordings were transcribed by a native or native-like French speaker. Transcripts were verified by a second native or native-like speaker of French.
transcriber. Then the transcripts of level 4 classes were selected for investigation. Since the primary focus of the research was to identify how teachers and students engage in error treatment in communicative interactions, selected lessons for analysis in this study excluded formal grammar.

The units of analysis in this study were error treatment sequences which were coded as follows. Each sequence began with an erroneous utterance by learner. Then the erroneous utterance was followed by a corrective feedback from teacher or not, if not there was topic continuation. If there was corrective feedback by teacher, then it was followed by learner’s uptake or not. And finally if there was uptake on the part of the learner, then students’ primarily erroneous sentence was repaired or not. Also errors were classified as either phonological, lexical, or grammatical (only grammatical gender errors).

Then they classified different types under six categories as being explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, meta-linguistic feedback, and repetition. Definitions of each of these types are presented below:

*Explicit correction.* “Refers to the explicit provision of the correct form. As the teacher provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the student said was incorrect” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 46).

*Recasts.* Lyster and Ranta (1997) defined recast as “teacher’s reformulation of all parts of a student’s utterance minus the error” (p. 47).

*Clarification request.* “It is the feedback that indicates to students that their utterance has been misunderstood by the teacher or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way and a repetition or reformulation is required” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 47).
Metalinguistic feedback. Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorized metalinguistic feedback as “comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form” (p. 47).

Elicitation. This method asks for a direct elicitation of reformulation from students by asking questions such as “How do we say that in English?” or by pausing to let students complete the teacher’s utterance, or by asking students to reformulate their utterance (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Repetition. Refers to the teacher’s repetition, in isolation, of the student’s erroneous utterance (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 49).

In this study, they also defined uptake as “a student’s utterance that immediately follows teacher’s feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher’s interaction to draw attention to some aspects of the student’s initial utterance” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 49). Results of this study provided a rational for later works in feedback domain.

The results indicated that 62% erroneous utterances of learners received feedback. Of all feedbacks provided to learners only 27% led to learner uptake. Among different types of feedback moves, recasts were used most frequently than other types (55%) and repetition was used least among them (5%). Elicitation moves were the second frequent type of feedback (14%), then clarification requests (11%), after that meta-linguistic feedback (8%), and explicit correction were used 7% of the time.

Further analysis was done to investigate the amount of uptake per each type of corrective feedback. Surprisingly it was revealed that recasts rarely tended to lead to repair or uptake, only 31% of time. While clarification requests, meta-linguistic feedbacks, and repetition were similar
in eliciting uptake from subjects (88%, 86%, and 78% respectively), elicitation was the most successful type of feedback in that it almost always led to learners’ uptake.

In another study, Panova and Lyster (2002) conducted an observational study on patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in adult classrooms. A class of 25 students was selected to be observed. Most of the students (20) were from Haitian backgrounds and others from a variety of L1 backgrounds. The teacher was a French/English bilingual female. She was informed that the examination would be on interactions of classroom but did not know that the main focus was on corrective feedback. Eighteen hours of classroom interactions were recorded. Then 10 hours were transcribed by the first author to constitute the database of this study. It should be mentioned that the lessons were not only focused on grammar, but also a considerable part of lessons and classroom activities were theme-based.

The transcribed data were categorized according to Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) model. To ensure rater reliability, the second author randomly selected a sample of 16% of feedback sequences and transcribed the data, and the test of inter-rater reliability showed a 0.86 level of agreement. The results showed that half of the students’ errors received corrective feedback. Different types of feedback were used in response to learners’ errors, among which recasts and translation were the most frequent types. “Recast and translation together accounted for 77% of the feedback moves in the data-base, thus leaving little opportunity for use of other corrective techniques” (Panova & Lyster, 2002, p. 586). The frequency of use of other types of feedback was as follow: clarification requests with the frequency use of 11%, explicit correction 2%, and repetition 1%.
In relation to learner uptake, it was revealed that 47% of feedback moves were followed by uptakes. Although only 16% of the uptake moves led to learner repair, and of all learner errors, it can be said that only 8% led to learner repair after teacher feedback.

The relation between types of corrective feedback and learner uptake or repair yielded interesting results. “The highest rate of learner uptake (100%) occurred with clarification requests, elicitation and repetition” (panova & Lyster, 2002, p. 586). Meta-linguistic feedback 71% of times led to learner uptake and was the second indicator of learner uptake. However, recast and explicit correction led to low rate of uptake, at 40% and 33% of total number of feedback types. The lowest rate of uptake was related to translation with 21%. With respect to learner repair, the results indicated that repetition and elicitation led to the highest rates of repair, while recast, translation, and explicit correction led to the lowest rate of repair.

Oliver and Mackey (2003) conducted a research to investigate whether distinct interactional contexts can be identified by researchers and teachers in teacher-learner exchanges during classroom discourse. Besides, they aimed at exploring if opportunity for and the provision and the use of feedback differ according to the identified interactional context. Five Australian teachers and their students were the participants of this study. On a randomly selected day, each class was video recorded. The first 150 clear and complete three-part exchanges were transcribed for each class.

Each three-part exchange consisted of a learner’s initial utterance, the teacher’s response to the learner’s utterance, and the learner’s reply to the response of the teacher. Transcripts were made by one of the researchers and then they were checked against the videos by a trained observer. Researchers identified four unique patterns of interactional contexts and they were classified as being one of the following primary foci: a) context exchanges, b) management
exchanges, c) communication exchanges, d) explicit language focus exchanges. The classification was based on the teachers’ responses to learners’ utterances. The three-part exchanges were classified by one of the researchers and checked against videos by trained raters. Finally, the researchers’ intuitions were triangulated by investigating the teachers’ perceptions about the data.

The results showed that different interactional contexts were possible to be identified. “Two researchers identified the contexts. Two independent, trained raters obtained a very high level of agreement for coding within these contexts. The stimulated recall comments made about their classroom discourse by five teachers were highly consistent with the four distinct contexts identified by the researchers in this study” (Oliver & Mackey, 2003, p. 525).

Results of this study also indicated that the use of feedback differs according to each of the interactional contexts. “…learners used feedback by modifying their initial output most often when it was provided in the context of explicit language-focused exchanges (85%), whereas they never used the feedback that was provided in management contexts. They used the feedback 27% and 38% of the time when it was provided in context and communicative exchanges, respectively” (Oliver & Mackey, 2003, p. 527).

Another study about corrective feedback which investigated the difference of the provision of interactional feedback when the interlocutor is a native speaker versus situations where a non-native speaker is the interlocutor was conducted by Mackey, Oliver, and Leeman (2003). They also aimed at investigating the effect of age differences in the provision of feedback by interlocutors as well as the use of feedback for the production of modified output by learners.
They selected 96 participants, half of them were adults and half of them children. In each of adults and children groups there were 36 NNSs of English and 12 NSs. Then participants were randomly assigned to 48 dyads including 12 NS-NNs dyads and 12 NNS-NNs dyads for adults and children. There were equal numbers of male and female dyads. Two tasks were carried out by each dyad: a one-way and a two-way task in a counterbalanced design. The first 100 utterances in each task were transcribed. Then all transcriptions were checked by a trained rater to make sure of the consistency of utterance segmentation and utterance context. Decoding the gathered data, first of all only exchanges that began with non-target like utterances were included.

The next step was the classification of interlocutor responses to non-target like productions according to whether they provided negative feedback. All feedback types which might imply the unacceptability of the original sentence were classified as negative feedback. The cases in which the interlocutor without providing any indication of the non-target like utterance, continued the conversation were classified as no feedback. In the next step, the interlocutor’s negative feedback was classified according to whether it provided learners with the opportunity to produce modified output. The cases in which the interlocutor provided the negative feedback but continued her turn without giving the learner the chance to produce modified output were classified as ‘no opportunity for modified output’ and the other group of feedback letting the learner to reformulate themselves were coded as ‘opportunity for modified output’, and finally, in the last step learners’ responses to the provided negative feedback with opportunity to modify their production were classified based on whether such modified output actually occurred or not.
The results showed that although negative feedback was provided for all four types of dyads, NS interlocutors in both age groups, provided more feedback comparing to NNSs. More specifically, this difference was significant for adults. In child dyads the difference was not statistically significant.

Results also indicated that regardless of dyad types, the vast majority of provided feedback offered opportunities for learners to reformulate themselves. However, in adult dyads NNSs provided learners with more opportunity than NSs. With regard to the question whether learners used the opportunities available or not, results indicated that “there were no significant differences in terms of production of modified output between NNS-NNS and NS-NNS dyads” (Mackey, Oliver, & Leeman, 2003, p. 55).

The results regarding the differences among children vs. adults indicated a variety of outcomes. “…we found that whereas there were no significant age differences in the nature of feedback, there were significant differences in the nature of feedback and the production of modified output, although only in NNS-NNS dyads” (Mackey, Oliver, & Leeman, 2003, p. 55).

In what follows, some studies on the effectiveness of different types of corrective feedback are presented. Mackey and Oliver (2003) carried out a study to examine whether interactional feedback including recasts and negotiations facilitates second language development in children or not. Twenty-two child ESL learners took part in this study. They were from different L1 backgrounds with their ages ranging from 8 to 12 years old. Participants were randomly assigned to either the treatment or the control group. A pretest was administered a day before the treatment sessions. Tasks used in this study consisted of different types of tasks and examples of information-gap activities such as picture-sequencing, picture-placement, and spot the differences. Tasks required students to produce the target form which was question
forms. Each learner worked in dyads with one of the researchers and a native speaker of Australian English to perform the tasks.

Through the interactions between child learners and their interlocutor, participants of the interaction group asked questions whenever necessary to carry out tasks and native interlocutors also asked their questions. When there was communication breakdowns, negotiations and recasts were provided to learners. The control group carried out the same tasks. However, they received carefully tailored input from the researcher. The pre-modified output was provided to minimize the problems which could lead to interactional feedback. Therefore, when learners of control group had communication breakdowns due to inefficiency of the pre-modified output, the researcher tried to move on with the conversations.

The day following the last session of treatment, participants received a posttest, a second posttest one week later, and a final posttest three weeks later. The results indicated that the experimental group out-performed the control group. Results showed that “eight out of 11 child learners in the interaction and feedback group showed sustained development, whereas only three out of 11 learners in the control group showed this sustained development” (Mackey & Oliver, 2003, p. 470).

Mackey’s (2006) research with 28 university learners of English in the USA demonstrated the effectiveness of interactional feedback from the teacher. In her research, the students were assigned into an experimental group with the provision of feedback and a control group without any feedback at all. The results indicated that in the post-test, the experimental group outperformed the control group on the tasks involving English plurals and past tense.

Another study related to feedback was conducted by Choi and Li (2012). They aimed at answering two main questions. They mainly wanted to know which types of errors lead to which
types of feedback in child ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) classes. Besides, they aimed at measuring the amount of uptake for each type of feedback. Thirty-eight ESOL students were their participants. Participants were prepared before the treatment to be familiar with the tasks which were also form-focused ones. Tasks were mostly conversational interactions between learners and teacher. Eight hours of lessons were observed and interactions were recorded using a camera and an audio recorder. Then the recorded data were transcribed and coded. Also upon the completion of the transcription job, the teacher was invited and asked about her choices of feedback in certain episodes.

Each set of coded data started with an erroneous production by the learner. The set was classified as if it was followed by teacher’s corrective feedback or not. If the feedback was provided then they were classified as whether they led to learner uptake or topic continuation. And finally if there was uptake, then whether the initial error was repaired or still needed to be repaired. Errors were also classified as being phonological, lexical, or grammatical. Provided feedback was classified under six categories: recast, explicit correction, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and repetition.

The results of the study demonstrated that “grammatical errors constituted the majority of errors and received the most feedback” (p. 339). The analysis of feedback type per error showed that lexical errors almost always were followed by feedback and grammatical errors only half of the time received feedback. Analysis of the occurrence of different types of feedback showed that recast was provided more than other types while only a small amount of feedback was prompts. Further analysis related to the rate of uptake indicated that the highest rate of uptake went to elicitations and clarification and the lowest rate went to recast. Overall, their results
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**چکیده:**
بررسی روش‌های بررسی تأثیر تمرکز-بررسی بازخورد اصلاحی در شرایط مختلف بین زبان‌های خارجی و بهبود معادلات دهی در سه روش تداوی مذاکره‌ای، تداوی معادل‌های دهی و تداوی معادل‌های دهی سه همراه تکرار (دومین آزمون) به‌منظور بررسی تأثیر شرایط تمرکز-بررسی بازخورد اصلاحی در آزمون اول، ترکیبی و دوم بررسی قرار گرفت. نتایج نشان داد که روش‌های تداوی مذاکره‌ای و معادل‌های دهی سه همراه تکرار در هر دو آزمون، از گروه‌های کنترل و معادلات دهی، بطور چشمگیری بیشتر از گروه کنترل عمل کرد. علاوه بر آن، نتایج انبساط کرده که تکنیک معادلات دهی سه همراه تکرار به اندازه‌ای از تفاوت‌های معادلات دهی سه همراه تکرار در سه روش تداوی مذاکره‌ای ارائه می‌دهد. نتایج نشان می‌دهد که در سه روش تداوی مذاکره‌ای، روش تداوی مذاکره‌ای درباره‌ی شرایط تمرکز-بررسی بازخورد اصلاحی در اولین آزمون بهتر عمل می‌کند. 
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