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Form-Focused Instruction

• “pedagogical events that occur within meaning-based approaches to L2 instruction, in which a focus on language is provided in either spontaneous or predetermined ways” (Spada, 1997, p. 73)

  – **Spontaneous**: react to learners’ errors as they occur in communication (i.e., corrective feedback)

  – **Pre-planned** activities focus on remedying any form-related issues the students may face in the learning process (i.e., grammar teaching)

• Language focus is important in SLA for it allows learners to:
  – to gain **awareness** of the target forms, which
  – helps them **notice the gap** between what they know and the target (Schmidt, 1990; 2001) => positive changes in the accuracy of L2 productions
Corrective Feedback

• CF – “any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner’s utterance” (Chaudron, 1977, p. 31)

• “responses to learner utterances containing an error” (Ellis, 2006)

• Can be provided in:
  – Oral discourse
  – Writing
  – Technology-mediated communication
What are errors?

• Errors are deviations from the target language
  – Pronunciation
  – Grammar
  – Vocabulary
  – Pragmatics
Where do errors originate?

• Source of errors
  – Slip / Lack of attention
  – Interlanguage development
    • E.g. talk/talked, play/played, eat/*eated, put/*puted
  – L1 influence
    • E.g. I am 12 years old./*I have 12 years old.
How frequent is oral feedback?

• **Non-classroom settings:**
  – Rare, and usually not preferred (Schegloff et al., 1977)
  – Possible, depending on:
    • Relationship between L2 learner and his/her interlocutors
    • Personality of the interlocutor
    • How inclined the interlocutor is to provide language-related information to L2 learner

• **Classroom:**
  – Many errors are typically responded to
    • **Lowest:** 48% during 10 hrs of ESL among Haitian Creole and French L1 speakers (Panova & Lyster, 2002)
    • **Highest:** 90% (= feedback every 0.65 minutes!) during 10 hrs of German as a foreign language lessons in Belgium with 3 high-school classrooms of Dutch L1 speakers (Lochtman, 2002)
    • **Novice teachers:** 19% in 10 hrs of instruction to 54 ESL learners in Montreal (Kartchava et al., forthcoming)
How is CF provided?

• Lyster & Ranta (1997) => most influential classification of CF techniques for the L2 classroom

• 6 types:
  – Explicit correction
  – Recasts
  – Prompts (previously “Negotiation of Form”)
    • Clarification Requests
    • Metalinguistic feedback
    • Elicitation
    • Repetition
Corrective Feedback Techniques
(Lyster & Ranta, 1997)

• **Explicit correction** - explicitly provides the learner with the correct form with an indication that his/her rendition was incorrect
  – S: *The dog run fastly.

Lightbown & Spada (2013)
Corrective Feedback Techniques
(Lyster & Ranta, 1997)

• **Recasts** - refer to “the teacher’s reformulation of all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error” (p. 46)
  – S: *Why you don’t like Marc?
  – T: Why don’t you like Marc?

Lightbown & Spada (2013)

• 4 types:
  • Regular, isolated, integrated, and interrogative
Error: *more ease. I feel, to learn...*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 types of Recasts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isolated recast</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Easier”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular recast</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So, you said it’s easier now.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated recast</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It’s easier now. How difficult was it before?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interrogative recast</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“How (much) easier is it now?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tarone & Swierzbion, 2009, p. 59
Corrective Feedback Techniques
(Lyster & Ranta, 1997)

• Clarification requests indicate to Ss that either their utterance has been misunderstood or is incorrect in some way => and that a repetition or a reformulation in needed.

• Phrases like “Pardon me”, “Excuse me”, “What do you mean by...?” may be used to indicate the presence of an error

  – T: How often do you wash the dishes?
  – S: Fourteen.
  – T: **Excuse me.** (Clarification Request)
  – S: Fourteen.
  – T: **Fourteen what?** (Clarification Request)
  – S: *Fourteen for a week.
  – T: **Fourteen times a week?** (Interrogative Recast)
  – S: Yes. Lunch and dinner.

Lightbown & Spada (2013)
Corrective Feedback Techniques
(Lyster & Ranta, 1997)

- **Metalinguistic feedback** - “contains either comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student’s utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form” (p. 47).
- This technique indicates the presence of an error and generally provides information about its locus and nature through metalinguistic clues

  - S: *We look at the people yesterday.
  - T: What’s the ending we put on verbs when we talk about the past?
  - S: /e-d/

Lightbown & Spada (2013)
Elicitation - refers to the use of many strategies teachers adopt to elicit the correct form from the students. L & R name pausing (e.g., “It’s a …”), asking questions (e.g., “How do we say X in English?”), and asking Ss to reformulate their own utterances (example below) as examples of these strategies.

– S: *My father cleans the plate.
– T: (Excuse me), he cleans the __________?
– S: Plates?

Lightbown & Spada (2013)
Corrective Feedback Techniques
(Lyster & Ranta, 1997)

• **Repetition** - refers to T’s repetition of the learner’s incorrect utterance generally with a change in intonation (rising, in most cases)
  – S: *I have three new toy.
  – T: Three new toy?
  – S: *We is...
  – T: **We is?**

Lightbown & Spada (2013)
Corrective Feedback Techniques
(Lyster & Ranta, 1997)

• 6 types:
  – Explicit correction
  – Recasts
  – Prompts
    • Clarification requests
    • Metalinguistic feedback
    • Elicitation
    • Repetition

Supplied by TEACHER

Supplied by STUDENT
Distribution of CF types

1. Provide the correct form (input-providing)
   - Explicit correction
   - Recasts

2. Elicit the correct form (output-pushing)
   - Clarification request
   - Metalinguistic feedback
   - Elicitation
   - Repetition
How effective are these CF techniques?

• No consensus among the researchers, but effectiveness may depend on:
  1. The amount of **uptake** a technique generates,
  2. Its degree of **explicitness (i.e., noticeability)**, and
  3. The **context** in which it is used
Uptake

• “a student’s utterance that immediately follows the teacher’s feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher’s intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student’s initial utterance” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 49)

• Uptake can be in the form of:
  – Repair
    • student produces a sentence that shows the feedback has been heard and results in a correct sentence
  – Needs repair
    • There is an indication that the student has noticed the teacher’s feedback, but the error is not corrected
  – No uptake
    • The conversation continues with no indication that the student has noticed the feedback
# Uptake

*(Lyster & Ranta, 1997)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>occurrence</th>
<th>repair</th>
<th>Needs-repair</th>
<th>No uptake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>recast</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elicitation</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cla. req.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CF type affects production of uptake

RECASTS

- Used the most by teachers in the content-based L2 classrooms (emphasis is on meaning), BUT lead to the smallest % of uptake from Ss... Why?
- Recasts => IMPLICIT
  - Require complex processing (VanPatten, 2004)
    - Double challenge: keep focus on meaning AND form = taxing on information processing system
  - Ambiguous - Ss may think that T is responding to the content, not form, of their utterance (Lyster, 1998a)
  - Ss do not necessarily notice recasts (esp., low-proficiency ones, Philp, 2003)
- Noticeability of recasts is limited by:
  - Error type (Mackey et al., 2000)
  - Length (Philp, 2003)
  - Explicitness (Ammar & Sato, 2010a)
  - Individual variables
    - Proficiency level (Philp, 2003)
    - Working memory capacity (Mackey et al., 2002)
    - Attention switching ability (Ammar & Sato, 2010a)
    - Anxiety (Sheen, 2011)
    - Beliefs about CF (Kartchava & Ammar, 2013)
CF type affects uptake

**PROMPTS**
- Are not used a lot, but generate more uptake than recasts... *Why?*
- *Prompts* => *EXPLICIT*
  - Clearly mark the error
  - Allow learner multiple trials to produce the target form
  - Help learners revise their hypotheses about L2
  - Easier to notice than recasts (Ammar, 2008; Kartchava & Ammar, 2014)

**RECASTS + PROMPTS**
- More noticeable than recasts alone (Kartchava & Ammar, 2014)

Research consistently shows that explicit types of CF yield larger gains than implicit ones (*in writing, too*)
Effectiveness of CF and Context

• Classroom
  – Prompts more effective than Recasts
    • (e.g., Lyster, 2004; Ammar & Spada, 2006; Loewen & Nabei, 2007; Yang & Lyster, 2010)

• Language laboratory
  – Recasts more effective than models/ no CF
    • (e.g., Long, Inagaki, & Ortega, 1998; Doughty & Varela, 1998; Mackey & Philp, 1998)
  – Recasts and Prompts are equally effective
    • (McDonough, 2007; Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009)
Putting it all together

• Provision of oral CF in the L2 classroom is **important** to increase learner accuracy

• **Six types of feedback** have been identified in L2 classrooms
  – Recasts are used by teachers the most, but lead to least uptake
  – Prompts are used less but are more effective in getting a learner to react to and learn from the feedback
  – Prompts & [Recasts + Prompts] are more noticeable

• BUT, things are not clear-cut =>
  – The **choice of CF** a teacher would use depends on
    • **Explicitness** of the technique
    • Instructional **context**
    • Desired learner **response**
Practically speaking...

• **WHEN should CF take place?**
  – No consensus, but immediate and delayed CF may contribute to learning in different ways (Ellis & Shintani, 2014)
    • Immediate CF – may help Ss to understand the “why”
    • Delayed CF – may promote reflection, leading to deeper understanding of “how”
  – Some teachers believe that correction interrupts communicative flow – **NOT SO!**
    • Students expect correction in class (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Schulz, 1996, 2001; Kartchava, forthcoming)
    • Certain corrective techniques (e.g., metalinguistic feedback) have been shown not to intrude unduly in the communicative flow of the activity but to focus overtly and briefly on form (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006)
Practically speaking...

• **WHICH errors should be treated?**
  – Most prevalent/s systematic ones
  – Target language (lesson’s objectives)

• **Who should do the correcting?**
  – Teachers AND learners
  – Self-correction allows learners to:
    • Automatize the retrieval of target language that they already possess
    • Confront own errors to revise hypotheses about L2

• **How?**
  – With a variety of techniques, to reach all learners
  – Consistently
Promoting oral fluency and accuracy

• Good speaking activities allow for
  – Rehearsal
    • Ss rehearse real-life situations in the safe environment of a classroom using authentic language in meaningful contexts
  – Feedback
    • T and Ss see progress
    • Appropriate feedback ensures satisfaction and encourages confidence into further study
Activity ideas to promote fluency and accuracy

• **Debates** (Gatbonton, 1994)
  
  – **Scenario:** Jane has won $200,000 in a competition. *How should she spend the money?*
  
  – Students are assigned to groups => Jane’s parents (mother/ father)/ sister/ aunt/ boyfriend & Jane => How would you spend money if you were Jane?
  
  – In groups, Ss brainstorm possible ways to spend the money from the perspective of the assigned character
  
  – The possibilities are debated as a class (CF provided)
Activity ideas to promote fluency and accuracy

• **Alibis** (Wright, Betteridge & Buckby, 1984)

  – **Scenario**: A crime was committed last Saturday and everyone is a suspect. Each team of 4 needs to come up with an alibi. Pairs are interrogated separately by the whole class to find inconsistencies (CF provision)

  – In groups of 5, four people receive a card that depicts his/her activities at the time in question; the fifth person’s card is blank and s/he has to invent what s/he was doing. All share their statements and cross question another. Then, all guess who the culprit is (when the actual culprit confesses), sharing their stories with the rest of the class (CF provision)
Activity ideas to promote fluency and accuracy

• **Consensus-building** (Gatbonton, 1994)
  
  – In groups of 4, Ss pretend that they **live in the same household and have chores to share**
  
  – Together they decide **how to divide** the household chores and who has to do what and when => record these in the chart (next slide)
  
  – Later, each member of the group interviews **other people from another group** about the way their group divided up the household tasks
  
  – The findings are shared with the class (CF provided)
# Household Chores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare supper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the dishes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum the floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the laundry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed the pet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take out the garbage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk the dog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash the car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the repairs in the house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!
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