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This study investigates the effects of the types of tasks and feedback on Korean adult EFL learners' fluency, accuracy, and complexity. A qualitative approach was also added to determine the perceptions that learners and teachers have about task-based instruction (TBI) and feedback types with learning journals, interviews, and stimulated recall. Although the experiment had the limitations of a small size of subjects and short length, certain findings are worth noticing. For both levels of group learners (lower intermediate and higher intermediate), fluency was highest in the descriptive tasks receiving implicit feedback. For accuracy, the rate was highest when both groups performed descriptive tasks receiving explicit feedback. For complexity, only higher intermediate level learners showed substantially higher rates in narrative tasks with explicit feedback. Planning time and the freedom to choose the topic (picture to describe) presumably might have affected fluency and accuracy in descriptive tasks. Accuracy was found to have been more affected by explicit feedback that primarily provided corrections on morphosyntactic errors. In addition, the qualitative research on the perceptions that L2 learners and teacher had about their experience with TBI and feedback provides insightful perspectives that are hoped to contribute to designing more effective TBI and interactional corrective feedback. (201)

I. INTRODUCTION

As Korea's influence on the world economy has increased, so has the need for Koreans to communicate effectively on the world stage. For the past few decades the Korean government has put serious efforts into devising ways for especially junior and junior high level students to improve their communication skills in English. After years of much deliberation and research, the government has announced that an English speaking test
will be included in the performance evaluation in secondary schools starting in 2009, which is designed to encourage young Korean EFL learners to "talk." Accordingly, more and more junior-high and high schools in Korea have agreed to adopt the policy of dividing English classes according to the students’ proficiency levels. As this attempt is still quite new to the Korean educational system, not to mention English education in Korea, there is a great need for research in and development of diverse teaching methods to enhance Korean EFL learners’ communicative proficiency at different levels. Given the situation, the teacher’s roles as a facilitator, interlocutor and feedback provider have become all the more important. The perceptions that both teachers and learners have of various teaching techniques also merit serious consideration.

This study intends to provide suggestions on the methods and approaches of teaching English speaking skills to Korean EFL learners of varying English proficiencies, including the types of interactional feedback that English teachers can provide to learners as well as tasks used in class. Quantitative and qualitative analyses were employed to measure the effects of different types of feedback (implicit, explicit) and tasks (narrative, descriptive) on the quality of the learners’ output (fluency, accuracy, and complexity) and to investigate how teachers and learners of different proficiency levels perceive and react to the tasks and feedback types through triangular analysis (class observation, journals, interviews, and stimulated recall). Through the three-pronged method of measuring the spoken output, conducting interviews, and examining journals, I hope to provide clear and substantive guidelines at a time the improvement of teaching quality of conversational English classes in Korea is so critical. Research on the effects of feedback and tasks on ESL / EFL learners’ L2 output have been quite actively conducted for the past few decades, stemming from the idea that interaction facilitates L2 acquisition (Bygate, 1999; Gass, 2003; Gass, Mackey, & Pica, 1998; Gass & Varonis, 1994; Long, 1996; Pica, 1994, 1996; Skehan, 1998). However, what has not always been clear is exactly how different types of communication tasks and feedback affect the L2 learner’s spoken output and what distinguishes them from other activities used in teaching and research. In addition to statistical results, qualitative research on how L2 learners and L2 teachers perceive the effects of task-based instruction (TBI) and feedback types also deserves more attention. The present study is inspired by the belief that insightful observations and understanding of learners’ perceptions of the way they are taught in class, that is specific tasks and types of feedback in the study, are critical in developing L2 tasks and appropriate feedback that will lead to enhanced L2 acquisition. Thus, in order for teachers and researchers to be able to identify, create and employ communication tasks and provide feedback with confidence and success, it seems crucial that they understand the unique contribution these tasks and the types of feedback can make to their work with language learners and be able to distinguish them from the wide range of other activities and settings available for teaching.
and research. Therefore, this study aims to provide an experimental rationale for the use of certain types of communication tasks and different types of feedback during L2 speaking instruction and for research through measuring the effects of different types of task and feedback, as well as investigating the perceptions that both teachers and learners have of the tasks and feedback types they experienced.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Interactional Feedback

Considerable research suggests that an important type of social interaction is negotiation of meaning, which promotes language learning by increasing the comprehensibility of language input (Long, 1983), and by compelling language learners to produce comprehensible output (Swain, 1985). Long (1983) stated that interactional modification, including clarification requests, confirmation checks, and comprehension checks from native speakers given to L2 learners could contribute to L2 acquisition by providing the learners with comprehensible input, negative feedback and opportunities for pushed output. Schmidt (1990) agreed, stating that negotiation of meaning forces the learners to experiment with alternative expressions (pushed output), a process that focuses their attention on target language forms and thus accelerates their L2 acquisition. Varonis and Gass (1985) presented the model of negotiated interaction involving trigger, indicator, response and reaction to the response. Here, trigger, the first stage of the interactional process, refers to the speech of the speaker that was not correctly understood by the hearer. Indicator is the stage where the signs are sent that understanding did not take place. In response, the speaker responds to the signal, then in reaction to the response stage, the hearer responds to the response. Ellis (2003) created four categories (comprehension checks, clarification requests, confirmation checks, and recast) drawing from a number of studies on negotiation of meaning, which can account for the second phase of the Varonis and Gass’s model above, indicator. Pica (1992, 1994) proposed that opportunities to negotiate meaning aid language learners in some of the same ways that negotiation provides learners with feedback on their own use of L2. Such an idea is closely related to ongoing research on the effects of different types of feedback to explore their usefulness for L2 development (Gass, 2003; Gass et al., 1998; Gass & Varonis, 1994; Long, 1996; Pica, 1994, 1996). Ellis, Loewen and Erlam (2006) divided the corrective feedback into two types: implicit feedback and explicit feedback. Implicit feedback gives no indication that an error has been committed in contrast to explicit feedback.

Some researchers have argued that certain types of feedback are more effective than
others in generating modified output from learners (Lyster, 1998; Lyster & Ranta 1997; Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989), showing that learners are more likely to modify their output by making it more grammatical following requests for clarification rather than confirmation checks, underlining the importance of feedback type. Lyster’s (1998) study on the relationships among error types, feedback types, and immediate learner repair in four French immersion classrooms at the elementary level, found that lexical errors were most effectively repaired through negotiation of form. Grammatical and phonological errors favored recasts, but with different effects in terms of learner repair. Lyster also found that the negotiation of form proved more effective at leading to immediate repair than did recasts or explicit correction, particularly for lexical and grammatical errors, but not for phonological errors. Phonological repairs resulted primarily from recasts. Recasts have been studied for their effects for the past few decades. Recasts refer to feedback that reformulates a learner’s non-targetlike utterance into a target-like one (Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada, 2001) and will be used as a variable in this study as a form of implicit feedback. Panova and Lyster (2002) found in their observational research of patterns of error treatment that there was a clear preference for implicit type of reformulative feedback as recasts and translation. However, their research also showed, with respect to the relationship between feedback types and learner uptake, that recasts were the least successful type and that elicitation resulted in the highest rate of uptake. Similar results were yielded from Lyster and Ranta (1997), who found through their classroom research on the effects of different types of feedback on French learners that recasts (implicit feedback) led to the least learner uptake, though the teachers apparently preferred to use recasts as feedback. In Pica, Holliday, Lewis, and Morgenthaler’s (1989) study, learners were found to be more likely to modify their output by making it more grammatical following requests for clarification rather than confirmation checks.

Such findings from previous studies suggest that it is crucial for researchers and teachers to gain more clear perspectives on types of feedback and their actual effects on L2 learners’ output. Research by Ellis (2002) confirms that despite the overall consensus that interaction plays a facilitative role in L2 acquisition, there are questions still to be answered as to how and under what conditions feedback works most effectively and what factors or characteristics of feedback may influence its effectiveness (Mackey, 2007; Mackey & Gass, 2006; Russell & Spada, 2006). These findings have triggered current research on task-based studies designed to examine the effects of feedback on learners’ output (uptake) following feedback and subsequent acquisition.
2. Feedback Types

Generally, there are four strategies used to promote negotiation: (a) comprehension checks, which include any expression designed to establish whether the speaker’s own preceding utterance has been understood by the addressee; (b) clarification requests, any expression that elicits clarification of the preceding utterance; (c) confirmation checks, any expression immediately following the preceding speaker’s utterance intended to confirm that the utterance was understood or heard correctly; and (d) recasts (Ellis, 2003). Ellis also categorizes some interactional devices as either implicit or explicit feedback types: for implicit, request for clarification, and recast; and for explicit, explicit correction, metalingual comment/question, query, and advice. Among these, some prominent examples warrant consideration.

1) Implicit Feedback: Recasts and Clarification Requests

Recasts, the most popularly used type of implicit feedback according to the definition made by Long (1996), is “an utterance that rephrases an utterance by changing one or more of its sentence components (subjects, verb, or object) while still referring to its central meanings,” for example,

A: I go to cinema this weekend.
B: You went to the cinema. What did you see?
A: “Gladiators.” It was great.

As seen above, recasts are responses to non-targetlike utterances that provide a target-like way of expressing the original meaning according to Mackey and Gass (2006). It is also noted in Mackey’s (2006) study that recasts often signal to learners that their utterance was non-targetlike. Mackey and Philp (1998) have found, in their study to examining the effect of recasts on the development of question forms by employing through information gap tasks that advanced learners who received recasts produced more advanced question forms in the post-tests than learners in the control group did. Clarification requests, according to Ellis’s (2002) definition, are any expressions that elicit clarification of the preceding utterance, for example,

A: I was really chuffed.
B: Uh?
A: Really pleased.
Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993), in their study using clarification requests as the main interactional feedback, found that students, when pushed to do so, reformulated their past tense errors after requests for clarification. They also demonstrated greater accuracy in using the past tense in a subsequent task one week later. Interestingly, the students who observed the interaction did better than those who actually took part, which underscores the importance of modified input rather than modified output for learning (Ellis, 2002). This finding suggests that learners can only benefit from the opportunity when they already have necessary linguistic knowledge to do so. In other words, feedback in the form of clarification requests more readily contributes to the automatization of existing knowledge than to the internalization of new knowledge.

2) Explicit Feedback

Ellis (2002) proposed that explicit focus can be provided either preemptively or responsively. Preemptive focus can be made by the teacher as he/she draws the student’s attention to the targeted feature by asking a question or by making a metalingual comment. This can be achieved in the following manner:

S: I went to park on last Saturday.
T: Hmm, isn’t something missing between to and park?
S: Huh?
T: You should put an article the in front of park.

Explicit feedback can be in the form of providing explicit correction, as follows:

S: I like an apple... most.
T: Apples. It needs to be plural since you’re talking about apples in general.
S: I like apples.
T: Right. Also you’re supposed to say the most, not just most. It’s superlative.

Dabaghi’s (2008) study, which compared the effects of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on learners’ performance in tailor-made tests, notes that the main concern of language learning should be the degree of explicitness and implicitness of learning. Ellis et al. (2006) reported in their study another interesting point: Statistical comparisons of the learners’ performance on the post-tests showed a clear advantage for explicit feedback over implicit feedback for both the delayed imitation and grammaticality judgment post-tests. The results indicated that metalinguistic explanation benefited implicit as well as explicit knowledge and pointed to the importance of including measures of both types of
3. Task Types

The effects and contribution of TBI on communicative language teaching have also been proven in Aejin Kang’s (2007) research on the effects of task-based instruction in comparison with content-based instruction (CBI). The findings illustrate that while “CBI seemed stronger in motivating the learners to participate in the class, which led to a higher satisfaction with the course and self-perceived improvement of linguistic skills,” it was TBI that was observed “more effective in improving language skills.” Among a great deal of research on TBI, Willis (1996) suggested that the procedure of task-based learning be divided into three phases: pre-task, task cycle and language focus. In the pre-task phase, the teacher introduces topic, presents activities that can help the students recall or study useful vocabulary words or expressions, and examines if the instructions are well understood by the students. In the task cycle phase, the students implement the task fully in pairs or groups. The teacher supervises the students as they undertake the task, plan and report, corrects their mistakes, and provides them with necessary linguistic assistance or feedback on the content or forms of their presentation. In the language focus phase, there can be two sub-phases: analysis and practice. In analyzing, the students experience consciousness-raising to figure out certain language forms from reading or listening passages. Willis also presented five principles for the implementation of a task-based approach: (a) exposure to worthwhile and authentic language, (b) active use of language, (c) tasks that motivate learners to engage in language use, (d) a focus on language at some points in a task cycle, and (e) a focus on language that is more and less prominent at different times. With these principles in mind, Willis established a model that is designed to meet various needs.

Where Willis’ model provides useful guidance for TBI, its drawback, according to Skehan, is first, the lack of constant interplay between form and meaning, and second, the lack of a clear connection to broader theorizing about SLA, the role of noticing, acquisitional sequences, information processing and so forth. The absence of an explicit connection to research is another defect in that Willis’ model seems to rely more on experiences than test results and research. In an attempt to address these problems, Skehan (1998) proposed five principles for TBI, which are grounded in theory and research, to offer some guidelines for the systematic development of underlying interlanguage and effective communicative performance: (a) choose a range of target structures, (b) choose tasks that meet the utility criterion, (c) select and sequence tasks to achieve balanced goal development, (d) maximize the chances of focus on form through attentional manipulation, and (e) use cycles of accountability. In contrast to Willis, Skehan emphasized why pre-
task activities are necessary: to introduce to new language, to mobilize language, to recycle language, to ease processing load and to push learners to interpret tasks in more demanding ways (see Table 1). The activities designed based on this foundation would make the task more productive (Skehan, 1998).

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Willis</th>
<th>Skehan (1998)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-task</td>
<td>Introduction to topic and task</td>
<td>Three major types of pre-task activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Teaching: Introduction of new language, Restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Consciousness raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Planning (helps boost fluency, accuracy, complexity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During-task</td>
<td>Task planning</td>
<td>Manipulation of attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>- Time pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-task</td>
<td>Language focus</td>
<td>Altering attentional balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Reflection and consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>- Identify, consolidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Classify (either structurally or semantically)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Hypothesize, check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Engage in cross-language exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Search for patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Recall or reconstruct texts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A great number of studies have pointed out that task variables should be considered from different perspectives. That discourse mode is one of the influential factors in determining the learners’ output has been proven in many studies. Foster and Skehan (1999) found differences in the score of complexity for the watch-and-tell and the watch-then-tell conditions of the narrative tasks. Here, watch-and-tell led to ‘descriptive commentary’ and watch-then-tell induced ‘narrative commentary.’ In the narrative commentary, the use of subordinating constructions was more evident than in the descriptive commentary. On the same note, Newton and Kennedy (1996) found that a greater use of prepositions was witnessed in a task that required description. In comparing learners’ output on four tasks, two of which involved ‘narrative,’ and the other two ‘argumentation,’ Bygate (1999) found that the narrative tasks elicited greater production overall, with no difference found in complexity. The results also showed that the narrative task evoked linguistically denser talk compared to argumentation, which resulted in more short turns involving echoic repetition. Bygate concluded that the narrative tasks may be...
the ones that stretch the speakers more in terms of complexity of syntactic and lexical processing.

It has been generally argued that discourse mode or discourse type is an influential task design variable to elicit more complex language use. Narrative tasks, for example, are more likely to lead to more complex language use than, for example, descriptive tasks. As for other task variables, Foster and Skehan (1996, 1997) investigated the effects of different tasks and planning conditions in two studies (see Table 2). Performance on the tasks was measured in terms of fluency, complexity, and error-free clauses (accuracy) in both studies. Similar tasks and variables were used. The results showed some consistency: Narrative task is the least accurate in each case, whereas the other two tasks showed higher scores in the second study. Complexity generated less consistent scores in two studies. In addition, fluency showed different patterns in the scores. In the first study, the scores of participants’ fluency were significantly higher than the other two task types. In the second study, however, “personal” tasks resulted in much higher scores in fluency. These studies indicate the followings: Trade-off effects operate very strongly; therefore, selective rather than across-the-board improvement seems to be more realistic, and encouragingly task characteristics predispose learners to channel their attention in predictable ways. The results of these studies suggest that tasks may be selected and practiced so that particular pedagogic outcomes are accomplished in TBI.

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Effects on Accuracy, Fluency, and Complexity: Collated Results from Foster and Skehan (1996) and Skehan and Foster (1997)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster &amp; Skehan (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skehan &amp; Foster (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complexity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster &amp; Skehan (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skehan &amp; Foster (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster &amp; Skehan (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skehan &amp; Foster (1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Learners' Perception about Interactional Feedback

As interrelationship among input, interaction and language acquisition have been investigated in a host of studies, much effort has been put forth to understand how linguistic knowledge (competence) comes to be acquired (Mackey, Perdue, & McDonough, 2000). In that regard, the crucial role of attention in the language acquisition process has been acknowledged (Long, 1996; Gass, 1997). Among the studies of learners’ perceptions on feedback, Mackey et al. (2000) reported that learners were relatively accurate in their perceptions about lexical, semantic, and phonological feedback, while morphosyntactic
feedback was generally not perceived as much. The study also found that not only the
content of the feedback but also the nature of it may have affected learners’ perceptions.
Yoshida (2008) argued that the choice of feedback types that ESL teachers make may be
influenced by their perception of particular learners and the error types of the learners; also
the low rate of uptake or lack of understanding of the teachers’ intention of the corrective
feedback may be related to the learners’ preference for particular feedback types. In the
study by Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005), both teachers and learners perceived corrective
feedback as more effective when the teachers take more time, provide longer explanations
and use different types of feedback. In considering the possible effect of perceptions that
learners have on different corrective feedback types, Philp (1999) presented evidence that
learners do notice feedback provided in the context of conversational interaction. The
study also found that over 70% of recasts were accurately recalled. More advanced
learners showed greater accuracy than lower level learners. Some correlations were found
to exist between accuracy of recall and variables such as the level of the learner, the length
of the recast and the number of changes in the recast. As the findings of the previous
studies have shown, there have been mixed results as to what and how the effects of task
conditions and feedback types had on the linguistic, communicative proficiency of L2
learners.

III. METHOD

1. Research Questions

In order to examine the effects of different types of feedback and tasks on the spoken
output of Korean adult EFL learners, the following questions were formulated.

1) Would task types impact the oral proficiency of the students?
   (1) How do the task types affect the oral proficiency of low intermediate level
   students when measured in terms of fluency, accuracy, and complexity?
   (2) How do task types affect oral proficiency of high intermediate level students
   when measured in terms of fluency, accuracy, and complexity?

2) Would feedback types impact the oral proficiency of the students?
   (1) How do feedback types affect the oral proficiency of low intermediate level
   students when measured in terms of fluency, accuracy, and complexity?
   (2) How do feedback types affect the oral proficiency of high intermediate level
   students when measured in terms of fluency, accuracy, and complexity?

3) How do the teacher and students perceive task and feedback types?
2. Participants

Twelve adult students (five men, seven women) taking English conversation course at one of the major language institutes in Korea were asked to participate. Their ages ranged from 23 to 35 with previous English learning experience at the school of six to ten years. All 12 participants were studying at the same language institute where the duration of their learning experience ranged from three months to one year. Nine of them were college students, two men were missionaries, and one female was a school teacher. The students were first recruited as volunteers and were recommended by two of their conversational English teachers at the institute. The institute offers a one-year conversation-based language learning program of six levels, level one being the lowest and level six being the highest. Six subjects from level one (one student), two (four students), and three (one student) were categorized as the lower intermediate group (LIG); and six subjects from level five (two students) and six (four students) were in higher intermediate group (HIG) for research purposes. Proficiency levels were first based on the students' oral test results on the placement test, then their in-class performance, the two teachers' holistic, impressionistic judgment, and the vice director's personal experiences with the students.

Both HIG and LIG were again divided into two sub-groups according to the types of feedback (implicit, explicit) that they would receive. Each level group performed two different types of tasks based on the discourse mode: narrative and descriptive. The experiment was supervised by a female teacher, a native speaker of English from Georgia, in the United States, who has three years' experience teaching English conversation to Korean adult EFL learners. The teacher was fully informed about the purpose of the study and the discourse mode of the tasks and was trained to provide two different types of feedback through two meetings and four email exchanges with the researcher. Though she had said before the study began that she had been more familiar with implicit feedback as conversational instructor teaching in Korea, for this study, the teacher was instructed to provide interactional feedback of two kinds whenever it seemed appropriate and in whatever form seemed appropriate during the interaction. The feedback was provided when there were morphosyntactic, phonologic, lexical, or semantic errors, in the form of implicit (recasts, clarification requests) feedback only to the implicit feedback group (IFG) and explicit (explicit error correction, metalingual correction) feedback exclusively to the explicit feedback group (EFG).

3. Procedure

The experiment was conducted for the duration of two months from December, 2009 to January, 2010. First participating students were recruited as volunteers, and their
proficiency levels were determined based on the following factors: (a) their performance in the language institute (placement test, in-class performance test results), (b) the impressionistic judgments of two conversation teachers (both native speakers of English) who had taught them in the institute, and (c) the vice director's holistic judgment drawn from his experience teaching them. An orientation session in which the purpose of the study was explained was followed by three weeks of study. During this time, each student participated in six sessions, usually two classes each week, in which they performed different tasks and received different types of feedback. All performance and interactions with the teacher were videotaped. Students were informed about the purpose of this study and what to do (taking tests, writing a journal, and having an interview) briefly in the orientation session, and participated in six experiment sessions in which each student had a one-on-one interview with the teacher for five to seven minutes, usually twice a week, over a three week period. At the end of each experiment session, the individual learner was asked to write a learning journal modeled after the learning journal used in Mackey's (2006) research on feedback, noticing and instructed language learning. After the treatment period, each student and the teacher all had an individual interview with the researcher and an open discussion all together to talk about their experience in learning and receiving different types of feedback and performing different tasks. First, the number of AS-units of the students' spoken output was counted to serve as a barometer to measure accuracy, fluency, and complexity. Through examining learning journals written by the students, the learners' perception on the teaching techniques was also investigated. At the end of the course, the teacher had an interview with the researcher to discuss her opinions and perceptions of the tasks and feedback types she employed during the course. To acquire more data for qualitative research, follow-up interviews were conducted with all the participants, including the teacher, via email one month after, which was again in the form of stimulated recall. The participants watched video files of their previous interactions and were asked to reflect on their thoughts at the time the interaction was taking place.

1) Task Types

The learners of both levels (HIG, LIG) experienced the same types of discourse mode in tasks for three weeks to investigate the possible differences in the results of their oral proficiency shown in narrative and descriptive modes respectively. However, due to limited task familiarity, the amount of output by LIG turned out to be too small to be examined. The task needed to be adjusted to lessen the cognitive, processing load the learners to elicit more output. Therefore, the last two descriptive tasks allowed all the learners to have a short planning time of five minutes during which they could choose a
picture and prepare to talk about it. A selection of pictures was prepared by the researcher.

Both HIG and LIG were divided into two sub-groups according to the type of feedback they would receive. The implicit feedback group received mostly recasts and clarification requests, while the explicit feedback group received mainly metalinguistic instruction and explicit error correction. Since the teacher had a clear understanding of implicit and explicit feedback, was trained in specific feedback techniques, and was already familiar with using both types of feedback in her class, she was free to employ other techniques as long as they were from the same type of feedback category. However, the teacher used mostly recast and clarification request as implicit feedback, and making metalingual comments or explicit corrections as explicit feedback.

2) Treatment

For three weeks, each participant met with the NS teacher twice a week for an individual talk of about five to seven minutes. The tasks were presented to them without any prior notice except the last two sessions, when five minutes were given to the students to prepare their talk by choosing a picture and planning their output. The decision to add planning time was made after the open discussion in which the students expressed their frustration with the difficulty of the task and their unfamiliarity with task-based instruction. Considering that the participants had been much more accustomed to the book-oriented, drill-dominated teaching methods in that particular language institute rather than TBI, the decision to provide planning time for the students to prepare was inevitable especially to allow them to generate more output. To ensure the task load did not hinder output, other task topics were also carefully chosen based on the students’ general interests and experiences. Each student performed three narrative tasks and three descriptive tasks. As for the feedback, the teacher corrected each student’s utterances mainly on grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and meaning whenever she thought it was appropriate for feedback during interactions. After the teacher–student talk finished, the learner was asked to fill out a journal form to reflect on the interactions they had with the teacher and report the corrections they remembered as well as their personal feelings and opinions.

3) Interview

Each student from both groups and the teacher had an interview with the researcher after the second week of treatment, discussing their learning experience so far in the study. The interviews were videotaped and transcribed for later qualitative research. First, each participant talked about his or her own feelings and experiences to the camera, and then in an open follow-up discussion, they talked more candidly about how they felt about the
teaching techniques. The interviews and the open discussion were, in part, in the form of stimulated recall as they watched the video of their own performance. They could provide insights on devising more detailed methods for each type of feedback as well as considerations for both researchers and practitioners to take for further study and teaching.

4) Learning Journal

The journal had eight questions for the learners to answer, either in the form of “fill in the blanks” or “writing a short essay.” The questions concerned the corrections they noticed in terms of their vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, etc. The learners were, also asked to write their candid opinions and feelings about that day’s class and the way the corrections were made. It took approximately five to ten minutes for the students to fill out the form at the end of each session.

5) Survey – Stimulated Recall

Roughly one month after the treatment period, all the learners who participated in the study were given the video files of their performance and the questions about their thoughts and feelings at the moment of interaction during the class. Each learner downloaded the video files of their performance from the web onto their own computer and watched them before they answered the questions.

4. Analysis

The study results were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. For quantitative analysis, the students’ output performance shown in the interactions during the task-based language learning classes for three weeks were all fully videotaped, transcribed and measured for accuracy, fluency, and complexity. Since the purpose of the study was to examine how the types of tasks and feedback affect the quality and quantity of the students’ spoken performance, the participants’ fluency, accuracy and complexity of spoken outcome were studied on the basis of AS units. To classify production variables in task-based research, the study used standards provided by Skehan (1996). The following categorical measures were used to measure classification. To assess students’ fluency, two measures were used: the speech rate, which is the number of words used per minute (Ellis, 1990); and the number of reformulations, which is phrases or clauses that are repeated with some modification (Foster & Skehan, 1999). In terms of accuracy, the percentage of error-free clauses (Foster & Skehan, 1996) was measured. For complexity, the rate of subordinations (Foster & Skehan, 1996), which is the total number of separate clauses
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divided by the total number of AS-units, and type-token ratio, which is the total number of different words used (types) divided by the total number of words in the text (tokens) (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Robinson, 1995) were used.

In qualitative analysis three approaches were used: interview, journal, and stimulated recall in the form of a survey. Each learner wrote a learning journal at the end of each session during the three weeks of the study. The basic concept and purpose of having the students write a learning journal was inspired by the study by Mackey (2006), who also used learning journal to examine learners' perceptions. Questions were asked in Korean and students were free to answer either in English or Korean. The questions included what grammatical (morphosyntactic), vocabulary (lexical) knowledge or pronunciation (phonologic) problems they had corrected by the teacher during the class and how they perceived the experience. Each question was given with a simple example response. The teacher was also interviewed by the researcher about how she viewed providing different feedback types to students of different levels, and how this experience would influence her future teaching style. There also was an open discussion after the second week of the study on an individual and group basis about their perceptions of different tasks and feedback types they had received thus far in the study, including grammar (morphosyntax), vocabulary (lexis), and pronunciation (phonology).

IV. RESULT

Result analysis began with counting the number of AS-units of the learners' utterances. Each group level showed a similar number of AS-units, which proves that the within level proficiency can be regarded as stable. The total number of AS-units from HIG and LIG was 2,785. The average number of AS-units from the explicit feedback group of HIG was 61; from implicit feedback group, 58. From LIG, the explicit feedback group's average number of AS-unit was 46; the implicit feedback group, 45.

1. Effects on Fluency

In the study, fluency was measured based on the number of words per minute and reformulations. According to the result (see Table 3 & Table 4), the fluency rate of LIG was generally lower than that of HIG learners; however, the implicit feedback group learners of both HIG and LIG showed increased fluency when they performed descriptive tasks compared to narrative tasks. Here, it is assumed that implicit feedback and descriptive tasks aid improvement in fluency for both proficiency level groups. The gap in fluency rates between the narrative and descriptive tasks groups shown by LIG was a little
larger than HIG, which shows that the explicit feedback group's fluency rate even went down slightly. It is also possible to assume that planning time and task difference must have stronger effect on the lower intermediate group than the higher intermediate group. In viewing each group level separately, it can be said that for HIG, the most impact can be expected when the feedback is provided in explicit ways in a descriptive task setting. The same holds true for LIG, though the margin is not as evident as it is in HIG. This finding partially coincides with Foster and Skehan's (1996, 1997) finding that fluency is affected by task types, except that in Foster and Skehan's study, it was in the narrative task rather than the decision-making task where greater fluency was noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
<th>Number of Words per Minute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4</th>
<th>Percentage of Reformulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Effects on Accuracy

Accuracy was measured by counting the percentage of error-free clauses as is shown in the following Table 5. In general, accuracy seems to have been affected by feedback type. In both group levels, the explicit feedback groups achieved more accuracy than implicit feedback groups. However, in terms of task type, the statistical results are somewhat mixed: the descriptive task seemed to have elicited more accuracy from both group levels' utterances, except the implicit feedback group of HIG, for whom the percentage decreased a little. Overall, this does not coincide with the finding from Foster and Skehan's (1996, 1997) study in which the narrative task had more effect on the increase of accuracy in both advanced and beginner level groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
<th>Percentage of Error-Free Clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Effects on Complexity

Complexity was measured by two standards: the number of subordination and type-token ratio, which is the rate of using different words divided by the total number of words. As seen in Table 6, the complexity rate based on the number of subordination does not show any significant changes between task groups or feedback groups. Therefore, it can be said that neither feedback types nor task types affect complexity, regardless of differences in proficiency. The type-token ratio seems to be higher for both LIG and HIG in narrative tasks rather than descriptive tasks (see Table 7). Feedback type does not seem to have resulted in significant differences in terms of complexity. The difference of the complexity rate between narrative and descriptive is larger for LIG than HIG. It is likely that the pictures used in last two tasks (descriptive) which required students to describe the picture were too simple to require complex sentences to describe. Moreover, HIG learners might already have had more control over their linguistic knowledge. However, LIG learners might have benefitted more from the narrative task which asked them to talk about their personal experiences rather than general topics. It should be noted that the students from both group levels turned out to show more diversity in the vocabulary they used during narrative tasks rather than descriptive tasks. The explanation for this may be that in narrative tasks learners were asked to talk about either their own experiences or other common situations that did not require a specific answer; however, in picture description tasks, what could be described in the picture was so obvious and limited that the speaker (learner) could have felt less freedom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6</th>
<th>Percentage of Subordinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7</th>
<th>Type-token Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding how corrective feedbacks were provided, in general, most feedback was given to correct morphosyntactic errors, followed by lexical, semantic and phonological errors in that order (see Table 8). In addition, the implicit feedback group of both HIG and LIG seem to have received more feedback on morphosyntactic errors than the explicit
feedback group. This result matches fairly well with the students’ responses provided in the survey, recall, interview and journal. Learners from both proficiency group levels said their grammar seemed to be most problematic and received the most number of corrections. As for uptake, the statistical result shows that in HIG, feedback did not seem to have much effect; however, in LIG, explicit feedback clearly seems to have had a positive effect on the learners’ uptake of corrective feedback (see Table 9). Therefore, it can be said that explicitness in providing feedback does play a crucial role for lower proficiency group learners to produce more uptake, which is expected to promote effective L2 acquisition.

**TABLE 8**

Linguistic Content of Feedback Episodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphosyntactic</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonological</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 9**

The Uptake Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptake +</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptake -</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Students’ Perceptions on TBLT

The learners were asked to provide written feedback of their general opinions and feelings of task-based language lessons with corrective feedback provided at the end of each session. All 12 students participated in this qualitative research by answering questions about which linguistic elements of their speech were corrected, how they felt about that day’s class, and the interactions with the teacher. Regarding the instructional approaches using tasks and feedback, most learners provided a positive response. The following are some of the opinions presented by the learners on TBLT:

It was something that I hadn’t experienced often before. It was pretty refreshing and I like the idea that I could use real-life English in a situation, instead of having to do drill exercises and memorizing expressions. (Ally, HIG)
I liked it because it was a good opportunity for me to think of and use the expressions that I never really thought much of before. (Justin, LIG)

The most common positive views of TBLT was that the learners who had mostly been used to traditional teaching methods, that is focused on memorization and drills, were exposed to near-real life situations in which they had a chance to spontaneously use diverse vocabulary. As Ellis (2003) stated, the topic effects work as an important variable in this study. The effect varied according to the individual learner’s familiarity with a particular subject area. Even proficiency level difference did not matter. Many learners from both proficiency group levels and feedback groups said they believed their performance could have been better if they had been familiar with the topic about which they were asked to talk during the task. The most challenging element was, according to their answers during the interviews and survey, that they had to first hypothesize the situation and decide what to talk about, before they thought of which vocabulary and grammar knowledge to use to express their thoughts and opinions. They believed that it was especially challenging for them to do so because they had never experienced such situations. Three participants (one from LIG, two from HIG) also agreed that they did not feel interested in certain topics at all, which resulted in less talk than if it had been otherwise. Here are some of the concerns mentioned by the learners:

When I had to use my imagination and talk about it in English, I really didn’t know what to do; it was too much of a headache. (Philip, LIG)

When I was asked to describe what I saw in the picture, certain vocabulary words came up to my head but only in Korean. The thing is I’d never had a chance to talk about those things that I felt so frustrated. (Monica, HIG)

As seen in the above examples, the frustration seems to have mostly stemmed from the learners’ lack of task-based learning experience in a Korean EFL setting and unfamiliarity with the given topics. Many students talked about their frustration and even complained that they had to use their imagination to figure out the setting of the task, which was too much for them to handle since they were already heavily burdened with linguistic limitations. Such frustration was more prominent among LIG learners. However, it is still worth noticing that the learners, especially from LIG, gained confidence. The students shared some advantages, difficulties and suggestions based on their experience of performing tasks as Table 10 shows.
TABLE 10
Students' Overall Perception of a Task-Based Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students' comments</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) TBLT made them become more attentive to their own output.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) It gave them opportunities to think of and utilize the vocabulary of diverse</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) It made them more confident in speaking English with native speakers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difficulties</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) When the topics were not interesting or unfamiliar to the student, they felt less</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) When there was someone nearby, the student's anxiety negatively affected</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Since the lesson can be time-consuming, it was not always easy for the student</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to feel that their proficiency was actually improving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Planning time before the task implementation would help students relax and</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) In choosing topics for TBLT, it would be more beneficial if the topic are chosen</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based on the students' cultural background and interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11
Students' Overall Perception of Corrective Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students' comments</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) It makes me realize what kinds of linguistic errors I've been commonly making so</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that I can put efforts into correcting them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) It helps me to pay closer attention and become more conscious about what I say.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) It makes me realize that I need to practice English speaking harder.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difficulties</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I was discouraged whenever I was cut off during speaking.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) It was hard for me to repeat after the teacher for fear of making the same mistake.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Many times I didn't know that I was receiving corrections at all.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I wish I had a chance to review the corrected forms afterwards.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I wish the teacher could wait until I finished a sentence before correcting errors.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I wish the feedback could be more salient so that I could easily notice and more</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judging from the journal, interviews, discussions, and a stimulated recall that the learners and the teacher participated in, the learners generally seemed to have a positive attitude towards receiving feedback and its effect on their oral proficiency (see Table 11). Many students said that corrective feedback was useful to make them think again of the errors that they had been making commonly without realizing, and to make sure that they were on the right track in learning to improve their conversational English proficiency. The following is a sample statement provided by a learner citing the reasons for such a positive attitude:
I'd always used to wonder how my English speaking sounded. Corrective feedback was very useful for me to figure out what mistakes I tend to make so often. (Ellen, HIG)

Another positive effect of corrective feedback seems to be that it made the learner become more proactive in their future English learning, as shown in the following:

Today I kept making the same grammar mistakes even after it was corrected in the beginning of the session. I guess I will have to practice harder. (Ann, LIG)

The students, especially the higher intermediate level learners strongly expressed that they were content with the feedback and its positive effect on their proficiency, and were even willing to take more risks. In contrast, LIG learners expressed some negative opinions about receiving corrective feedback, which should not be ignored:

Whenever the teacher cut me off while I was speaking and tried to correct my English I sometimes felt a little offended, probably because I didn’t know what she was doing at the moment. (Esther, LIG)

Only if I had known that I was getting feedback to correct my English, I wouldn’t have felt so bad. I thought she was simply being mean. (John, LIG)

A few suggestions were also commonly made by the learners of both proficiency and feedback groups about the need for a review of the corrections, preferably in a written form, and about the way the feedback should be provided. The following are a few of these suggestions:

I could only remember that I received some feedback on the errors I made but not exactly what items were corrected. I wish we had a handout or something of those corrections. (John 2, LIG)

I wish we’d had some kind of review handout where the list of corrections is included, so that I could carry it around and practice them. (Monica, HIG)

In response to the suggestion for a “review handout,” Ms. Kim, the teacher, mentioned that though she understands the students’ desire for such a handout, she doubts if the students would take full advantage of it. The teacher seemed to think of a “handout” as a sort of psychological security blanket for the students. Here are some comments on the
way corrective feedback should be provided:

When the teacher corrected my pronunciation, I just kept quiet, instead of repeating after her correction, because I knew that I would make the same pronunciation errors again anyway and I was afraid. I wish that the teacher could speak a little more slowly so that I could listen and repeat after her. (John 2, LIG)

I wish the teacher waits for me until I finish a sentence before she corrects the errors. When she stops me and starts correcting (my errors) I felt so helpless. (Esther, LIG)

In response to these suggestions, especially the one about the teacher’s waiting for the learner to finish a sentence before providing corrective feedback, Ms. Kim expressed some disagreement before eventually agreeing to compromise:

If I wait for them to finish saying one whole sentence, it was already too late for me to provide correction and expect them to repeat after my correction. So many times, the student just gave up repeating the correct form and moved on. But I know that it actually depends on the language proficiency and learning style of individual learner so I guess I’ll have to make a quick judgment and keep trying to provide corrective feedback at appropriate moments. (Ms. Kim, teacher)

Another suggestion concerning the way corrective feedback should be provided was about the salience of the feedback. Often the corrective feedback passed unnoticed by the learner, especially when it was delivered implicitly and to lower intermediate group learners. Here are some statements made by the students during the stimulated recall:

If I had known that I was getting corrected I would have paid more attention. (Joe, HIG)

Many times I was not sure if the teacher was correcting the errors that I made or simply repeating what I just said. So, I just moved on without repeating after her. (Philip, LIG)

Here, it is worth noticing that it is possible that when learners are provided with the target form and are then pushed to respond to feedback, they might or might not notice the contrast between their erroneous output and the target form, depending on whether the feedback was salient enough for the learner to notice. The above statements imply that, other than the salience of feedback, the learner’s linguistic proficiency also might be a
contributing factor in determining the effectiveness of the feedback in relation to the degree of salience. On the whole, in regard to the feedback’s effects on learners’ proficiency, most learners failed to report any substantial changes in their English oral proficiency themselves in terms of fluency, accuracy or complexity. However, as was illustrated above, the learners came to have more positive views on receiving corrective feedback and said the feedback was helpful for them to be able to pay more attention to forms of their speech, especially grammar and vocabulary. Complexity was the area that was almost never mentioned by the learners.

5. Teacher’s Perception on TBI and Feedback

The teacher, Ms. Kim, had an interview with the researcher and exchanged emails to share her views and feelings about TBI and the feedback that she provided. During the interview, she revealed that she preferred to use implicit feedback, especially recasts when students interacted during the study, as she had taught other Korean adult EFL learners in the past. She explained:

I really didn’t want to interrupt the student’s speaking. Generally I don’t like to do it in my class. Besides honestly it is more comfortable and convenient for me as a teacher too because I don’t have to stop and explain in detail to correct their errors. To be honest there are some grammar points that I find it too difficult to explain.

Here, it can be assumed that many EFL teachers’ preference for recast over explicit correction is not due solely to the effects on the student’s language proficiency, but also for the teacher’s convenience. Ms. Kim also said that when she provided feedback to non-targetlike utterances, many students would just repeat that particular vocabulary or phrase only, not the whole context. She seemed to believe that uptake is a crucial factor in ensuring successful L2 acquisition in conversational classes. However, some learners commented that when doing a partial uptake after a corrective feedback they felt reluctant to repeat the whole context because they were afraid of making the same mistakes or new mistakes. A few learners even said they just decided to keep quiet even when they knew that corrective feedback had just been provided, because they were so frustrated by the feedback itself. It turned out that Ms. Kim also used to make a written list of corrections and hand them out to the students later. From the journals, interview, and stimulated recall, many students suggested that corrected forms should be made into a list and reviewed later since the students only vaguely remembered what corrections they received. However, Ms. Kim said she became doubtful of its effects after she realized that the students did not seem to take the notes seriously after all. Ms. Kim also seems to believe that both types of
feedback should be actively used during the interaction to meet the needs of the learner. She also said that each student may have a different learning style that should be fully respected by the teacher. Through this experience in which her main role was to provide different types of feedback, she said she became more convinced of the effects of feedback and more aware of the need to develop various ways to provide it.

V. Conclusion and Implications

Based on the measurement of learners’ utterances made during the TBI lessons, in terms of fluency, complexity, and accuracy as well as the responses from both learners and the teacher on TBI and feedback, it is possible to infer the following. First, both learners and teacher need to understand the nature, purpose, and the mechanics of TBI itself. Learners need more opportunities to familiarize themselves with TBI, and the teacher needs to have his or her learners participate more actively in designing TBI. That one of the most conspicuous features of TBI is that it is learner-centered supports this reference. Second, teachers need to have an accurate understanding of the students’ English learning backgrounds before designing tasks and deciding on the feedback types, so that the L2 learners can take full advantage of TBI and feedback. Third, learners need to learn to pay attention and notice the corrections and produce uptake. Regarding uptake, it would be more beneficial for learners to allow time to repeat after the teacher’s corrections, especially in the case of low proficiency level learners. This finding is in line with Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005), who asserted that both teachers and learners perceived corrective feedback as more effective when the teachers take more time, provide longer explanations and use different types of feedback. Lastly, as planning time has been found to have positive effects on improving low proficiency level learners’ speaking proficiency, various ways of strategic planning need to be considered in task design.

To sum up, the results of this study confirm the role of salience and explicitness as important characteristics of effective feedback in dyadic student-teacher interaction and the effects that different task types and task conditions have on the oral proficiency of L2 learners of different proficiency levels. The usefulness of interactional feedback, whether implicit or explicit, largely depends on its explicitness and the extent to which it is able to draw the learner’s attention to form (Ellis et al., 2006). The present study also suggests that the perceptions that learners and teacher have of feedback and tasks play an equally important role in ensuring success in L2 development. It should be noted, however, that the usefulness of implicit or explicit feedback and also TBI is not universal and depends on how they are implemented and various task conditions. Although the present study agrees with Skehan (1998) that task characteristics predispose learners to channel their
attention in predictable ways, and the results of the studies on task and feedback suggest that tasks and feedback types may be selected and practiced so that particular pedagogic outcomes are accomplished in TBI, other variables also should not be taken into consideration for teachers in designing tasks and choosing feedback type, design and feedback choices.

The present study has limitations in that the number of subjects was too small (twelve people) and the duration of treatment was too short (two months) to adequately examine the exact effects of different types of tasks and feedback on Korean EFL learners’ oral proficiency. In addition, for the two last sessions, the decision to allow task planning time and freedom to choose a subject to explain (pictures to describe) could possibly have had contaminating effects on the overall result. Therefore, further research on the effects of task and feedback types involving a larger group of learners and conducted for a longer period of treatment time will yield more reliable, statistical results.
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**APPENDIX A**

**Questions during tasks**

| Treatment#1 | HIG | What did you do on Chusok?  
Tell me what people usually do on Chusok in Korea. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/21</td>
<td>LIG</td>
<td>What did you do last weekend?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Treatment#2 | HIG | Suppose you saw a car accident. One man is staggering out of the car.  
And there’s a huge tree right in front of the car.  
-What do you think happened?  
-What do you think they should have done? |
| 10/26       | LIG | What did you do to improve your English so far?                 |
| Treatment#3 | HIG | Let’s pretend I’m your business associate who is in my 50s, asking you to show me around Korea.  
-How would you introduce tourists’ spots?  
Also tell me about your similar experiences. |
| 11/4        | LIG | Tell me about the drinking culture of Korea.  
-What kinds of alcohol are popular?  
-Where do people from younger generation hang out to drink? |
| Treatment#4 | HIG | Let’s suppose you’re representing a candidate for marketing position.  
Here is some information about each candidate.  
-How would you describe each candidate to support him/her? |
| 11/9        | LIG | Tell me about your least favorite English teacher.  
-How was he/she?  
-Why did you not like that teacher so much? What did he/she do?  
-What do you think he/she should have or shouldn’t have done?  
If you’re given 500000 won to spend on your English study, how would you spend the money and why? |
| Treatment#5 | HIG | Picture description  
-What do you think have happened? What do you think will happen? |
| 11/23       | LIG | Picture description  
-What do you think have happened? What do you think will happen? |
| Treatment#6 | HIG | Picture description  
-What do you think have happened? What do you think will happen? |
| 11/25       | LIG | Picture description  
-What do you think have happened? What do you think will happen? |
APPENDIX B

The learning journal

Name _______ Level _______ Date _______

Did you have to make any correction in your speech during your conversation with the teacher?

Yes / No

If so, please check the items that were corrected in the below chart and write the content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrected by</th>
<th>Corrected by</th>
<th>I knew about it</th>
<th>I didn’t know</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>myself</td>
<td></td>
<td>about it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>before.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vocabulary
Grammar
Pronunciation
Others

Please write how you felt about the corrections.

1. Vocabulary (Example: I didn’t remember the word “gyul-hon(“marriage”) at the moment. So I just said “wedding.” Then the teacher corrected it to “marriage.” I always have a problem with vocabulary. So frustrating! I could’ve done a better job!)

2. Grammar (Example: It’s not I didn’t know (those grammatical knowledge) but I keep making mistakes in using past tense of be-verbs. This time I guess I was paying attention not to make the same mistake, I just corrected myself. Though I often stutter, I still think it’s more important to speak correctly.

3. Pronunciation (Example: Again I was confused between “i” and “r.” I thought I was pronouncing correctly but I guess not. The teacher corrected me. I wonder how I can correct my pronunciation!)

4. Others (Example: It took me a long while to think of what to say first.)

5. Please write casually how you felt about today’s class.

________________________________________

You did a great job in class today! Have a good rest of the day today! We’ll see you next time. Thank you.
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