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The purpose of this study is twofold. It aims to report on a study that describes and analyzes patterns of corrective feedback. It also aims to illustrate how different corrective moves are used as useful language pedagogy. It investigates corrective feedback and learner uptake (i.e., responses to feedback) in two grade 3 English immersion classrooms at a private elementary school in Korea. Transcripts totaling 10.1 hours of classroom interaction taken from 13 English language arts lessons were analyzed. Results include the frequency and distribution of the six different feedback types used by the two teachers, in addition to the frequency and distribution of different types of learner uptake following each feedback type. The findings indicate that (1) recast was the most predominantly occurred feedback type despite its ineffectiveness at eliciting repairs; (2) elicitation yielded the highest rates of uptake and repair among all feedback types in spite of its low frequency of use; (3) negotiation of form (i.e., prompts)—clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition—led to student-generated repair more successfully; and (4) most frequent student-generated repair followed metalinguistic feedback, the second most followed clarification request.

I. INTRODUCTION

Unlike the errors in the computer system, for which obvious and immediate treatments are necessary, errors that language learners make in the process of interlanguage development require that teachers carefully consider how to effectively deal with them in the classroom rather than simply providing correct forms. As Richards (2001) points out, learning doesn’t reflect all of what students have learned from their teachers. Learning is not a mirror of teaching; rather, it involves learner participation that engages their internal learning process. In this sense, a teacher’s provision of corrective moves for learners’ errors doesn’t always work properly unless it invites students to take part in the process of repairing the errors.
While errors in computer systems cause the computer to completely stop, or at least malfunction if it doesn’t receive repair, there are many occasions when teacher-student interaction can still take place without learners’ correction of the erroneous forms. There are even cases when correction hampers the natural flow of communication in the meaning-oriented language classroom; thus, sometimes it would be better not to correct the errors. Therefore, language teachers should always think of effective ways to provide corrective feedback suited to various contexts as well as successfully leading to learners’ repair of the errors. Out of different language learning contexts, immersion classrooms have attracted extensive research related to corrective feedback. This is attributed to the fact that students from immersion schools do not attain native-like language productive skills in spite of studying in such an enriched environment of language input.

Over the last two decades, research has shown that second or foreign language (L2) learners in immersion classrooms can develop not only language proficiency but also content knowledge (Campbell, 1995; Lindholm, 1992; Milk, 1990; Snow, Met, & Genesee, 1989). Immersion classrooms have been found to yield learners who have high L2 proficiency with considerable comprehension competence and fluency; however, they still produce ungrammatical, ill-formed, or incomplete utterances. As a result, researchers have investigated different types of form-focused instruction as a way of promoting L2 accuracy along with the uninterrupted flow of communication. Form focused instruction is categorized into a reactive approach and a proactive approach (Lyster, 1998c), the latter also being called preemptive (Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001; Long & Robinson, 1998). A reactive approach benefits immersion teachers in the way that it attracts learners’ attention to form as teachers go through the content-based subject-matter or theme-based language arts classes maintaining the communicative flow.

Since the late 1990s, Korean researchers have been interested in the immersion program at Y elementary school, the first experimental partial immersion school in Korea. Research has shown that Y immersion classes provide comprehensible input and are characterized by meaningful communication, and contextualize L2 learning in an enriched context of content (Kim, Suh, & Park, 2000). Studies conducted by Fouser (2000) and Kim, Suh, and Park (2000) have reported the benefits of Y immersion program based on observational data; however, they often resulted in drawing either general or speculative findings. Stepping further, this study attempts to report how a reactive focus on form, or corrective feedback, occurs in English immersion classrooms in Y elementary school.
II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake

Teachers in second language classrooms have recognized that there are challenges in providing corrective feedback which effectively result in helping learners’ language acquisition. To this end, a growing body of classroom research has attempted to support L2 teachers by providing pedagogically useful and reliable information as to what kinds of corrective feedback apply to classroom settings (Doughty & Williams, 1998a, 1998b; Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Lyster, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c; Lyster, Lightbown, & Spada, 1999; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Tsang, 2004).

Lyster, Lightbown, and Spada (1999), for example, believe that the research of corrective feedback pertaining to classroom practice shows evidence that “corrective feedback is pragmatically feasible, potentially effective, and in some cases, necessary” (p. 456). They suggest that corrective feedback is feasible because it is applicable in content-based, immersion, and intensive communicative classrooms with the flow of communication continued forward, not broken. The practicality of corrective feedback has been demonstrated by studies conducted by Doughty and Varela (1998), Lyster and Ranta (1997), and Spada and Lightbown (1993), in all of which provision of feedback occurred in ways that it was integrated into meaningful interaction, without interrupting the stream of communication.

In addition to the applicability of corrective feedback, research has also shown the benefits of corrective feedback indicating that teachers can promote L2 noticing and acquisition, thereby enhancing retention of L2 forms by providing corrective feedback (e.g., Mackey & Philip, 1998; McDonough, 2005; Oliver & Mackey, 2003). McDonough (2005), in a study of Thai EFL students, examined the impact of negative feedback and learners’ responses on English question development and found that learners’ modified output in response to teachers’ corrective feedback in the form of clarification requests was a significant predictor for developing L2 question formation. According to McDonough, provision of feedback with L2 learners is beneficial in that they are given chances to modify their output, being pushed to notice the gaps between what they said and what they should have said. This belief is based on the output hypothesis developed by Swain (1985, 1988). Lyster and Mori (2006) further conclude that uptake provides “an effective tool for identifying patterns of teacher-student interaction that include a wide range of learner responses following teacher feedback, thus allowing for an operationalization of pushed output in classroom settings” (p. 273).

Likewise, uptake has recently attracted researchers with its potential to promote second language acquisition (Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001; Loewen, 2004; Lyster, 1998b; Lyster & Mori, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Sheen, 2004; Tsang, 2004). Lyster (1998b)
explains that uptake may facilitate L2 acquisition by “providing opportunities for learners
to proceduralize target language knowledge already internalized in declarative form” (p. 191). “Uptake in focus on form” that occurred in meaning-focused L2 classrooms may also
offer the “opportunity for learners to produce more accurate output” (Loewen, 2004, p. 157). That is to say, as Loewen suggested, uptake, or learners’ responses to feedback, may
be one type of pushed output (Swain, 1985, 1993, 1995). This claim was backed up as Ellis
et al. (2001) pointed out, “on theoretical grounds, uptake may be facilitative of acquisition”
(p. 287). Ellis et al. (2001) defined uptake as follows (p. 286):

a. Uptake is a student move.
b. The uptake move is optional.
c. The uptake move occurs when learners have shown a gap in their knowledge, for
example, by making an error, by asking a question, or by failing to answer a teacher’s
question.
d. The uptake move occurs in response to teacher’s previous move of providing either
explicit or implicit information about linguistic feature.

Uptake can either be successful or unsuccessful (Ellis et al., 2001). In other words, it can
be categorized into repair, meaning that learners reformulate their errors, and need-repair,
in which learners have not corrected their errors, so their errors still need repairing (Lyster
& Ranta, 1997). Whereas Ellis et al. (2001) defined uptake within a broader perspective “to
acknowledge that uptake can occur even when the previous move does not involve
corrective feedback” (p. 287), Lyster and Ranta (1997) have discussed uptake only as it
relates to corrective feedback. They refer to uptake as “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). Therefore, when it comes to the discussion of the relation
between uptake and corrective feedback (i.e., reactive focus on form) as in the present
study, it is appropriate to borrow the definition of uptake from Lyster and Ranta.

2. Studies of Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake

Researchers have aimed to shed light on the patterns of corrective feedback (i.e., reactive
focus on form) and its effectiveness related to uptake in various contexts including French
immersion classrooms at the primary level (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), adult ESL classrooms
(Panova & Lyster, 2002; Suzuki, 2004), and secondary EFL classrooms (Tsang, 2004).
Sheen (2004) went a step further to investigate the similarities and differences in teachers’
corrective feedback and learners’ uptake across four different communicative classroom
settings including French immersion, Canada ESL, New Zealand ESL, and Korean EFL using the taxonomy developed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) to describe the patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake.

To begin with, Lyster and Ranta (1997), in a study of corrective feedback in four classes (18.3 hours) of Grade 4 French immersion lessons in Canada, examined the patterns of error treatment, or relatively unplanned (i.e., reactive) feedback. The data was analyzed twofold: First, the analysis focused on the frequency distribution of the different feedback types used by the teachers; second, on the relationship between feedback types and learner uptake moves. As for the distribution of corrective feedback, a key finding was that though recast was the most frequent type of teacher response to student errors (55%), it was the least likely type of feedback to result in repair (18%). This mismatch between teacher’s provision of feedback and learner uptake suggested that L2 learners in the study didn’t really realize that the recasts were corrective moves. Rather, they seem to have been interpreted as “supportive, scaffolded help” in content or meaning (Panova & Lyster, 2002, p. 591). The ineffectiveness of recasts may also have resulted from the ambiguity of feedback, whether aiming for comprehension or for accuracy (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

With respect to the relationship between feedback type and learner uptake in both studies by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Panova and Lyster (2002), a noteworthy finding was the high rates of uptake and repair of corrective techniques that promote “negotiation of form,” termed by Lyster and Ranta (1997). Lyster and Ranta identified four interactional corrective moves that teachers used to elicit student-generated repairs, and they include clarification request, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation. They refer to these four interactive moves as negotiation of form and speculate that they can enhance language accuracy.

These four corrective moves are useful in immersion classrooms, or communicative ESL/EFL classrooms for two reasons. First, these four interactional corrective moves return the floor to the students, giving them a cue to attend to their erroneous utterances, thus allowing for students’ active participation in the repairing process. Second, negotiation of form can be pedagogically useful in the sense that teachers can push the students to produce correct forms without damaging the communicative flow, in either form of self- or peer-repair; therefore, it may help improve accuracy in the language in question (Lyster, 2002; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002).

To examine the relationship between corrective feedback and learner uptake in another context, Tsang (2004) investigated teacher feedback and learner uptake in 18 secondary English lessons in Hong Kong. Different types of lessons were observed and analyzed: Reading, Writing, Speaking, and General English. In this study, recast and explicit correction turned out to be the most frequent type of feedback, although none of these moves led to student-generated repairs. Repetition was found to be the most effective negotiation feedback in student-generated repair.
The above-mentioned literature has shown that whether learners produce pushed output or not, that is, whether learners’ errors lead to uptake and repair in response to corrective feedback, may depend on the types of teachers’ feedback (Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001; Loewen, 2004; Lyster, 1998b, 2004).

In addition to feedback types, learner uptake following teachers’ corrective moves is also closely related to instructional contexts (Lyster & Mori, 2006; Sheen, 2004). Sheen (2004) notes that different learning contexts may hold influence on the relationship between corrective feedback and learner uptake. The rates for both uptake and repair following recasts were greater in the New Zealand and Korean settings than in the Canadian contexts. The findings in the study suggest that “the extent to which recasts lead to learner uptake and repair” may be greater in “contexts where students are oriented to attending to linguistic form” (p. 263).

Building on more recent research into corrective feedback and learner uptake, Lyster and Mori (2006) report the comparative results from the analysis of teacher-student interaction in relation to interactive feedback and uptake in two different instructional settings at the elementary-school level—one included 18 hours of French immersion and the other included 14.8 hours of Japanese immersion class. The study attempted to investigate the immediate effects of explicit correction, recasts, and negotiation of form, also called prompts in Lyster and Mori’s (2006) study, on learner uptake and repair. The results clearly show that recasts predominantly outnumbered other feedback types such as prompts and explicit correction, irrespective of instructional settings. However, learner uptake seems to have been distributed differently depending on the feedback type and instructional setting. Prompts yielded the largest proportion of repairs in the French immersion classrooms; on the other hand, in Japanese immersion classes, recasts were the most effective feedback type in drawing learners’ uptake, and leading to repair. In an effort to unravel these complicated and contradictory findings, Lyster and Mori (2006) further explain the difference by introducing the counterbalance hypothesis (p. 294).

Instructional activities and interactional feedback that act as a counterbalance to the predominant communicative orientation of a given classroom setting will be more facilitative of interlanguage restructuring than instructional activities and interactional feedback that are congruent with the predominant communicative orientation.

Along the same line, Panova and Lyster (2002) concluded in their study that teachers need to give balanced corrective feedback, varying their use of recast, explicit correction, and negotiation of form (i.e., prompts) considering the different contexts and variables of the classroom.
3. Justification of the Present Research

The literature has demonstrated the importance of teachers’ corrective feedback in eliciting students’ pushed output, thus facilitating L2 acquisition. Describing the patterns of teacher-student interaction in relation to the issue of feedback and learners’ responses, uptake has been used as a functional tool. The studies of corrective feedback and uptake patterns that have been reviewed so far have generally yielded the following findings:

a. Corrective feedback in classroom settings has been effective in promoting L2 acquisition.

b. Different feedback moves yield different learner uptake rates.

c. Different classroom settings have influenced the distribution of learners’ uptake following different teachers’ feedback.

d. Moves of negotiation of form (i.e., prompts) have been shown to be more successful than recast or explicit correction.

However, most of the studies discussed above deal with adult learners, except for Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) study dealing with elementary school-level French immersion learners and Tsang’s (2004) study investigating secondary EFL students in Hong Kong. Additionally, the studies of learner uptake following corrective feedback reviewed so far have reported the results from EFL or ESL classroom settings (McDonough, 2005; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004; Tsang, 2004), and French or Japanese immersion classrooms (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster & Mori, 2006; Sheen, 2004), not from English immersion classrooms in an EFL setting.

The present study attempts to fill these gaps in the literature by investigating the patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake in English immersion classrooms of third graders at Y elementary school in Korea.

Furthermore, English education in Korea has been drastically changing to provide environments where learners are immersed in English. For instance, during class time at school, English teachers are highly encouraged to teach English through English (TETE) by the Ministry of Education, and outside of the classrooms, learners also have various opportunities to interact with native English speakers by joining English camps or English Village programs. In addition, two international middle schools are preparing to open to nurture international students. There, over half of the regular curriculum will be taught in English (“The Korea Times,” 2006), which means that students will learn school subject-matter in English through content-based instruction in the same way as the participants of the present study do in their school.

Considering these shifts of English education in Korea, the present research into
teacher-student interaction in English immersion classroom settings may benefit not only Korean English teachers but also native English-speaking teachers in the sense that they can draw guidelines from the findings of the study for effective interaction with students, specifically for successful provision of corrective feedback with their pupils.

III. METHOD

1. Research Questions

The current study was an attempt to answer the following research questions:

1) What are the different types of corrective feedback and what is their distribution in English immersion classrooms in a private elementary school in Korea?
2) What is the distribution of uptake following the different types of corrective feedback?

2. Participants

The study was conducted over a period of 9 weeks in a private elementary school in Seoul, the first elementary school in Korea to implement an English immersion program. The observations took place in two grade 3 classrooms. At this school, students in every classroom are divided into two groups, each of which consists of 18 students. While one group is taught by a Korean, the other group is taught by a native speaker of English. Two groups—one from Class A (Teacher One) and the other from Class B (Teacher Two)—were observed when they learned from English-speaking teachers and analyzed for the current study. Two English teachers, both of whom were homeroom teachers for each classroom, were participants for the study.

Teacher One (T1) has a three-year teaching experience: ESL and mainstream teaching experience in Canberra, Australia; adult EFL courses at a private institute in Korea. He has been teaching for one year in the current school. Teacher Two (T2) has taught English for the past five years including experience as a supplementary teacher of grades one to six at the elementary level, as well as having been a supplementary teacher at a high school in Jasper, Canada. He has been teaching in the current school for two years.

These two teachers were selected on the basis of their willingness to have their lessons observed and audio-recorded. They had been recommended by the school administrators in response to the researcher’s request to observe and record classrooms with a fair amount of classroom interaction. Although the teachers knew that the research was focused on
3. Database

This observational study yielded 17.9 hours (1076 minutes) of audio recordings from 13 lessons. However, as the research focus was centered exclusively on teacher-student interaction, only the time during which interaction between teacher and students occurred was analyzed. As a result, 7.8 hours of data, during which time, students worked on their individual tasks or group work activities, were excluded from the analysis, leaving a total of 10.1 hours (605 minutes) of teacher-student interaction for the analysis. There were 13 theme-based English language arts lessons, which included reading, writing, oral language, and active listening activities. Subject-matter lessons (i.e. math, science) were not included in the study due to lack of data from content lessons from T2. To record whole class interaction as well as teacher interaction with individuals and small groups, a wireless clip-on microphone was attached to the teachers in each class.

4. Instructional Context

The immersion program of Y elementary school in the study is similar to an early partial immersion. It can be considered an early immersion program in that the entry point is at grade one, and it is considered partial immersion in that students spend half of the day in English language instruction and the other half in Korean instruction of general class subjects. However, the program has some variations from what Swain and Johnson (1997) referred to as core features of immersion.

First, based on the data from the interview with teachers, the students in the study were found to have entered the school with a substantial range of L2 proficiency. Second, as for the curriculum, the students learn all of the subjects (26 units per week) under the local curriculum from the Korean homeroom teacher; in addition, they have additional courses consisting of 15 units (40 minutes each) of English class per week. These English classes involve language arts, math, and science. Language arts cover reading, writing, oral language, and active listening activities. As for the math and science lessons in English speaking classes, they are additionally designed and taught by the English-speaking homeroom teacher, independently of the regular classes of math and science taught by the Korean homeroom teacher. According to the interview with the teachers in the study, the content in their science and math lessons is mainly what the students in English-speaking countries such as Australia, Canada, or USA, have already studied in their first or second years. Therefore, the teachers recall that some of the contents may have already been covered in the math or science classes by Korean teachers.
Third, the teachers are not bilinguals; rather, students have two different homeroom teachers. One is Korean and the other is a native English-speaking teacher. Every class is divided into two groups, so while students in Group A are studying with a Korean teacher, students in Group B are studying with a native speaker of English. In this way, students spend about 40% of the school day with a native English teacher (language arts, math, and science), and the rest (all subjects taught in mainstream) with a Korean teacher. In Music, Art, P.E. and Computer classes, students in both Group A and B get together and learn from the Korean teachers who are responsible for each subject.

5. Coding and Data Analysis

The categories used to code the data in the study followed those used by Lyster (1998a), which were adapted from Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) model of error treatment. The analysis mainly focused on the sequence of error, teacher feedback, and learner uptake. All student utterances were coded as with errors or without errors. When counting errors, unlike the study by Lyster and Ranta (1997), all the student turns with errors were included in the current study. In Lyster and Ranta (1997), “short turns with little or no potential for error” (p. 45) were ruled out, whereas in this study, incomplete or brief utterances were counted because they are important in data analysis considering the fact that there was a large gap in the students’ English abilities. The teachers reported the proficiency of the students in their groups to be very broad, from near native to beginner. Only a few students were native-like in their oral and written production. In this regard, short and simple utterances needed to be included.

1) To Identify Students’ Turns with Errors

The researcher listened to the recordings, transcribed the interaction, then identified the students’ non-target like utterances. An “error” is operationally defined as “the use of a linguistic item in a way which a fluent or native speaker of the language regards as showing faulty or incomplete learning” (Richards & Schmidt, 2002). Errors, or “nonnative-like uses” of English, following Lyster (1998b), were further classified into four different types: Grammatical, phonological, lexical, and unsolicited uses of the first language (L1). The details of each category were slightly modified to better accommodate the data from the current study.

2) To Code Corrective Feedback to the Errors

Once errors with corrective feedback had been identified, different types of corrective
feedback provided to the errors were distinguished as follows: Recast, elicitation, clarification, metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and repetition. These are the categories that Lyster and Ranta (1997) described in their study.

Recast refers to a type of feedback where the teacher unobtrusively reformulates all or part of the student’s erroneous utterance without the error (Layster & Ranta, 1997). In Example 1, when the teacher asked what the title of the story was that the student wrote for the Halloween narrative writing, the student answered “curse pencil.” Then the teacher recast by reformulating the learner’s erroneous utterance in the correct form by raising his tone, “A cursed pencil?”

(1) (T1—Writing—Oct. 26)
T: What’s the title of your story?
S: Curse pencil [Error-grammatical]
T: A cursed pencil? What might happen, if you start writing with a cursed pencil? [Feedback-recast]

Clarification requests pertain to the indicators showing that student utterances are either misunderstood or incorrectly formed so that repetition or reformulation is required (Layster & Ranta, 1997). In the study, a clarification request is counted only when there were accuracy problems (i.e., incorrect forms), not comprehension problems. In Example 2, the teacher requested clarification of pronunciation, so the learner enunciated the words ‘red doll.’

(2) (T1—Writing—Oct. 25)
S: Red doll [Error-pronunciation]
T: Red dog or red doll? [Feedback-clarification request]
S: Red doll. [Learner uptake – needs repair pronunciation]
T: Red dog? D-o-g? or D-o-l-l? [CF-clarification request]
S: Doll [Learner uptake-repair]
T: Is it a famous story?

Example 3 shows the typical phrases that the teacher used when requesting clarification (e.g., pardon me; say one more time; and I don’t understand what you mean, etc.). Here the teacher prompted the student to self-correct the ill-formed utterance, but the student doesn’t catch the teacher’s cue and repeats what she already said earlier (“Only circle? Or make one?”). The second uptake move (i.e., “Only circle the difference?”) indicates that the student changed the form slightly so that the teacher could give additional feedback with details, before which, the teacher said “I don’t know what you mean” to give a signal that it is needed that the students find the correct forms. Finally, a different student showed an uptake move, though it was still in need of repair, including a desirable phrase, “make it differently.”
(3) *(T2—Reading—Nov. 23)*

S: How many differences are there?
T: Six. Good question. Any other question? Yoojin?
Ssam: Only circle? Or make one? [Error-lexical]
T: *Pardon me?* [Feedback-clarification request]
Ssam: Only circle? Or make one? [Uptake-needs repair (same error)]
T: *Say one more time?* [Feedback-clarification request]
Ssam: Only circle the differences? [Uptake-needs repair (different error)]
T: Yeah, just circle the differences. *I don’t know what you mean.* When you get a partner, you can come and ask me. OK? I just want you to circle the differences. If mine has a hippopotamus, and yours doesn’t, then I put a circle around the hippopotamus. [Feedback-repetition / clarification request]
Sdif: Ah, she asked can make it differently. [Uptake-needs repair]

**Metalinguistic feedback** urges the learner to undergo the metalinguistic process that may encourage self-correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). According to Lyster and Ranta, metalinguistic feedback involves “comments, information, or questions related to well-formedness of the student utterance, without explicitly providing the correct answer” (p. 46). Further details described in their study are as follows: (a) Metalinguistic comments point out to learners that there is an error in their utterance (‘No, not X’, or even just ‘No’, ‘Can you find the error?’); (b) metalinguistic information provides either some grammatical metalanguage which describes the nature of the error (e.g., ‘Nail? Good. On a monster, we wouldn’t call them nails.’), or provides a definition of words in the case of lexical errors; (c) metalinguistic questions elicit metalinguistic information related to the error from the students (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

(4) *(T2—Reading—Nov. 19)*

S: Petrol.
T: Petrol? What’s petrol? Boram, you remember?
S: Cars food? [Error-lexical]
T: *Cars food?* Yeah *it’s food for cars, right? But we call that...?* [Feedback – repetition/elicitation]
S: Oil! [Uptake-needs repair / error-lexical]
T: *Oil? Not oil, oil is just big black stuff that you use just to make parts run better.* Yeah, H. J.? Well, we’ll be coming to that later. We’re still trying to figure this out. [Feedback-metalinguistic feedback]
S: *Gasoline.* [Uptake-repair]
T: Gasoline, good.

**Explicit correction** involves the teacher’s explicit presentation of the correct form (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). When providing explicit correction, the teacher indicates that the student had made an error as in Example 5.
In *Elicitation*, the teacher prompts the learners to complete their own utterance and correct the errors themselves. Lyster and Ranta (1997) recognized three techniques to lead students to repair the errors: (a) teachers elicit the correct form by asking various questions, and (b) teachers input a carefully considered pause to have learners finish the sentence with the right word, and (c) teachers request reformulation from students. In Example 6, the teacher gives a strategic pause to invite students to “fill in the blank” (Lyster, 1998b, p.68).

Repetition refers to the teacher’s repetition of the student’s erroneous utterance with a change in intonation to draw attention to the error; for example, with rising intonation (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

3) To Identify and Code Learner Responses to Feedback

Once the different types of corrective feedback were identified on each of the different error types, the next step for coding was to determine whether or not the learner showed any response to the teacher’s corrective move. Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorized uptake moves into two types, “repair” and “needs-repair.” When uptake leads to the correct form, then it was coded as repair. When uptake didn’t repair the error that the feedback highlighted, then it was coded as needs-repair.
IV. RESULTS

The database is composed of 928 student turns and 1,013 teacher turns. Of the student turns, 208 (22%) were ill-formed, or incomplete, or contained unsolicited use of the L1 (including turns coded as needs-repair). Over half (64%) of the student turns with error or use of L1 received corrective feedback.

1. Distribution of Feedback Types

To investigate the teachers’ tendency of choice in feedback types, the total number of each feedback type was counted. Of the 133 teacher turns with feedback, the distribution of the different feedback types is as follows (Table 1): Recast 53%, clarification request 16%, metalinguistic feedback 16%, explicit correction 8%, elicitation 5%, and repetition of error 2%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback type</th>
<th>Total (n=133)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>71 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification request</td>
<td>21 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic feedback</td>
<td>21 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit correction</td>
<td>11 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recast was by far the most frequently used technique in the database. This finding is similar to that from other studies (e.g., Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Tsang, 2004). For example, in the data from Lyster and Ranta (1997), recast was also the most prominent at 53% of the teacher turns containing corrective feedback. Sheen (2004) also found that recast was the most frequent feedback type in all four communicative contexts, including French immersion 55%, Canada ESL 55%, New Zealand ESL 68%, and Korean EFL 83%.

The next most frequently occurring feedback types in the present study were metalinguistic feedback (16%) and clarification requests (16%). Compared to these corrective techniques, a notably low figure of elicitation (5%) and repetition (2%) shows that the teachers preferably used the former two techniques to the latter. The source of low occurrence of elicitation was found in the teachers’ use of techniques that invite students to talk more than elicitation does. In other words, when teachers used elicitation they directly tried to draw the correct form from the students by asking, pausing, and requesting reformulation so as to prompt student to “fill in the blank” with the correct forms, whereas when the teachers gave metalinguistic feedback or requested clarification from learners,
they expected greater student participation in the process of repairing the errors.

As for the low frequency of repetition (2%), as Lyster and Ranta (1997) pointed out, it is “somewhat deceptive” because teachers’ repetitions were often found to take place together with other feedback types as shown in Example 4 above. The teacher repeated the student’s utterance to highlight the error(s) (e.g., cars food; oil), but the repetitions occurred immediately followed by elicitation (“Cars food? Yeah, it is food for cars, right? But we call that…?”), or by metalinguistic feedback (“Oil? No. Not oil, oil is just big black stuff that you use just to make parts run better”).

At this point, one may wonder what kind of feedback is effective in yielding learner uptake, or ultimately allowing for repair. To respond to this question, it is worth discussing the relationship between feedback and uptake as in Table 2.

2. Uptake Following Teachers’ Feedback

To show the feedback-uptake relationship, the distribution of uptake following different types of feedback is presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Repair Uptake</th>
<th>Needs Repair</th>
<th>No Uptake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recast (n=71)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>63 (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification request (n=21)</td>
<td>8 (38%)</td>
<td>12 (57%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic feedback (n=21)</td>
<td>9 (43%)</td>
<td>8 (38%)</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit correction (n=11)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>7 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation (n=6)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition (n=3)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=133)</td>
<td>27 (20%)</td>
<td>29 (22%)</td>
<td>77 (58%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each learner response was coded as uptake or no uptake. Uptake is again divided into two subcategories: Repair (repetition, incorporation, self, or peer) and needs repair (inadequate or incorrect uptake). The predominant feedback type, recast, is the least likely to lead to uptake. The highest rates of learner uptake (100 %) occurred with elicitation, in the ratio of two to one distribution between repair and needs repair. Clarification request was the next most prominent indicator of learner uptake; 95% of the feedback moves resulted in learner uptake. Metalinguistic feedback took the third place leading to uptake 81% of the time. Recast, explicit correction, and repetition are similarly less effective at eliciting learner uptake (11%, 36%, and 33%, respectively).

Lyster and Ranta (1997) raised the question “whether all repairs are equally effective indicators that students have noticed the feedback” (p. 54). They argued that simply
repeating what the teacher says does not necessarily guarantee learners’ understanding of feedback. For that matter, they made a further breakdown of the data involved in differentiating student generated repairs, which are peer- and self-repairs, from repetition and incorporation of teacher’s feedback. Following Lyster and Ranta (1997), the data of the present study was reanalyzed to count the number of student-generated repairs as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 shows a breakdown that involves the number and percentage of each feedback type leading to repair. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), out of the six types of feedback, recast and explicit correction provide learners with the correct forms and cannot lead students themselves to generate the correct forms, thus leaving these categories ruled out from the student-generated repairs. On the other hand, the other four interactional moves—elicitation, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and teacher repetition of errors—are “distinguished from recasts and explicit correction in that they provide learners with signals that facilitate peer-and self-repair rather than with mere rephrasing of their utterances (Lyster, 1998c, p. 71).”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Number of Repairs</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification Request</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic Feedback</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Correction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicates the frequency and percentage of repair by feedback types. As for all repairs, metalinguistic feedback accounts for the highest percentage (33%), closely followed by clarification request (30%), and elicitation is responsible for the next highest percentage of repair (15%). Recast, explicit correction, and repetition are responsible for 11%, 7%, and 5% of all repairs respectively.

Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) four interactional corrective moves, called negotiation of form, including metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, elicitation, and repetition, account for 82% of all repairs. With respect to student-generated repairs, recast and explicit correction are excluded in light of the fact that they encourage learners to respond to the feedback by repeating the correct form provided by the teachers. This exclusion of the two feedback types (recast and explicit correction) changed the percentage of the remaining four corrective feedbacks to the number of all repairs as follows: Metalinguistic feedback 36%, clarification request 41%, elicitation 18%, and repetition 5%.

To summarize, depending on the choices of feedback, there follow different types of
repair. Recast and explicit correction produce student’s repetition of teacher feedback whereas the other four techniques (i.e., negotiation moves) call for student-generated repairs. In addition, out of all student-generated repairs, metalinguistic feedback and clarification request are found to be most effective in pushing students to produce repairs.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the patterns of corrective feedback in immersion classrooms at the primary level. First, the analysis focused on the frequency distribution of the different feedback types used by the teachers; and second, on the relationship between feedback types and learner uptake moves. Some findings in this study are consistent with those found in previous studies on feedback, or focus on form, and others differ. These findings will be discussed under three topics: Recast as corrective feedback, negotiation of form, and pedagogical implication of the findings.

1. Recast as Corrective Feedback

In the data, though recast was the most frequent type of teacher response to student errors, it was the least likely type of feedback to lead to uptake (11%). This ineffectiveness of recast was partly the result of the teachers’ follow-up moves after recast. That is to say, teachers often did not wait for the students to repair, so the students did not have much chance to reformulate their erroneous utterances (See also Chaudron, 1977; Lyster, 1998a; Oliver, 1995). In the present study, the teachers usually rushed into the topic continuation within the teacher’s turn as shown in the Example 8.

(8) (T2—Reading—Oct. 26)
S: With partner? [Error – grammatical]
T: With your partner. Can I please have southern table in the second row, northern table in the third row, and central table in the first row? [Feedback – recast]

Another possible explanation for the low rate of uptake after recasts was the teachers’ tendency to use the same phrases (e.g., ‘great,’ ‘good,’ ‘OK’) for positive reinforcement (Example 9) and for corrective feedback (Example 10), thus leaving recasts competing with signs of approval. This ambiguity, as discussed by Lyster (1998a), led students to become confused so that they often failed to incorporate the feedback as seen in Example 10.

(9) (T1 – Writing – Oct. 26)
S: Because they finish, they want to play.
T: Oh, OK, good. Then what happened?

(10) (T1—Vocabulary Quiz—Oct. 21)
S: Letter? [Error – grammatical]
T: A letter, good. One line one letter. In the test, you do not have to write these words in. [Feedback – recast]
Ssam: Yeah. [Uptake – needs repair/acknowledgement]

In addition to the ambiguity of recast, student proficiency levels appeared to have relevance to the failure of recast in leading to uptake as discussed in the previous studies (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Panova & Lyster, 2002). For example, Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Panova and Lyster (2002) suggested that low level students have difficulties understanding recast as corrective moves. On the other hand, as Mackey and Philp (1998) argued, learners at higher interlanguage development tend to benefit more from recasts than those at lower levels. The teachers in the present study may have presumably viewed the huge gap in proficiency level among the students and perceived that recast may be a good way to provide correct language input without giving less proficient learners the burden of feeling that they have to heavily participate in negotiation of form. However, this ended up leading learners to continue with the content without noticing the linguistic form that recast aimed for.

Finally, Lyster and Mori’s (2006) counterbalance hypothesis can be applied to the low frequency of uptake rate following recasts. They claim that feedbacks that are distinct from the class’s predominant orientation tend to be more facilitative in promoting L2 acquisition than feedbacks that are congruent with the class’s dominant orientation. In the observed immersion classrooms in the present study, where theme-based language arts courses were mainly covered, communicative orientation was prevalent whereas form-focused activities were rarely covered. This communicative orientation has influenced learner uptake rate following feedback, especially on recast. When teachers gave corrective feedback by recasting, in many of the cases, learners were likely to maintain the topic, not attending to the form the teachers tried to draw their attention to. This resulted from the congruity of recast to the tendency of the classrooms toward meaning-focused communication.

2. Negotiation of Form

In communicative language learning contexts and content-based language classrooms, students tend to continue their conversations as long as they don’t have problems related to incomprehensibility. This means that they have little chance to attend to accuracy of language, thus often leaving nontarget-like utterances either unnoticed or uncorrected. The teachers in this study, however, have shown that they were at least trying to fulfill the “dual
role” of covering both language and content at the same time via interactive correction moves, or negotiation of form previously discussed in other studies (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 1998b, 1998c, 2001, 2002).

The teachers’ efforts to attend to both content and language are accounted for by the rate of repair preceded by each of the four interactive feedback moves which are called negotiation of form – elicitation (67%), metalinguistic feedback (43%), clarification request (38%), and repetition (33%). This relatively high percentage of repair achieved through negotiation moves can be a good sign that the teacher-student interaction in the classrooms carries form-focused sequences during the communicative interaction. In the same vein, as suggested by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and further discussed in Lyster (2002), negotiation of form can be pedagogically useful in the way that teachers can push the students to produce correct forms without unduly interfering with the communicative flow of the lesson, in either form of self- or peer-repair. In relation to this matter, Lyster (1998a) also argued that negotiation of form may well serve immersion pedagogy which puts predominant focus on content (i.e., meaning) with correspondent focal interest in language development.

Considering these findings that negotiation of form may help develop accuracy in the language in question, expanding negotiation of form in teaching practice is highly recommended. Despite the relatively high repair rate of negotiation of form in the present study, however, it was found that the percentage of negotiation of form that teachers actually used in the classrooms was quite low, with metalinguistic feedback 16%, clarification request 16%, elicitation 5%, and repetition 2%. In order to redress the imbalance, it is highly recommended that teachers increase the percentage of the four types of interactive feedback under the negotiation of form.

3. Pedagogical Implications

To recapitulate what has been discussed so far in the study, the pedagogical implications of the study can be reduced to three. First, a balanced distribution across different feedback types is necessary for the various contexts in immersion classrooms. Second, immersion teachers need to explore ways to increase the effectiveness of recast as it remains the most frequent type of feedback. Lastly, immersion educators need to develop pedagogical strategies that enhance negotiation of form in classroom interaction.

As for a balanced approach to the different feedback types, immersion teachers should provide different types of feedback suited for a variety of contextual, linguistic, and cognitive aspects (Lyster, 2002; 2004; Panova & Lyster, 2002). Lyster (2004), for example, suggests specific contexts when recasts are useful or when negotiation of form (i.e., prompts) is beneficial. According to Lyster (2004), it is likely that learners can recognize the recasts as a correction move when it is provided with some stress to highlight the error. On the other hand,
learners benefit when they are pushed to produce corrected output by means of negotiation of form when recast is less effective due to its ambiguity as it is mistakenly considered as approval reinforcement. He also suggests that prompts, or negotiation of form, are helpful for developing learners’ automaticity in their use of target language forms.

With respect to necessity of increasing the effectiveness of recast, possible ways can be found in previous studies. For example, as discussed in the study by Doughty and Varela (1998), narrowly focused, frequent recasting promotes the learners’ accuracy. They provided specific ways to provide corrective recasting. First, teachers need to repeat the erroneous utterances the learners have said to draw attention to it. Then, teacher’s recast should follow the repetition to provide the contrastive L2 forms. This technique is slightly more explicit than regular recasts so that it can help learners in noticing their errors.

Pertaining to the increase in negotiation of form, extensive research has revealed the effectiveness of negotiation of form as correction moves (Lyster, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c; Lyster, 2004; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Tsang, 2004). With this in mind, immersion teachers are recommended to develop pedagogical strategies to enhance negotiation of form. Teachers, on occasion, need to deliberately request clarification of any erroneous utterance from the learners or fake incomprehensibility as in the study by Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993). Methodologically-designed corrective feedback, however, is not easy to obtain on the part of the teachers; rather, they need also to learn how to provide effective feedback through proper teacher training.

4. Conclusion

This study has some limitations. First, the database was collected only from language arts classes because the researcher excluded subject-matter lessons due to lack of data of T2’s content lessons. Second, as the database contains data from only two classrooms, the results may be difficult to generalize. Nevertheless, it has sufficient ecological validity in that the study focused on real teacher-student interactions based on regular immersion classroom activities, engaged with regular students, not with learners recruited for a laboratory study.

This study provides patterns of corrective feedback and its relationship to learner uptake in primary English immersion classrooms in Korea. Findings have shown that reactive focus on form, also called corrective feedback, can take place quite often in the context of meaning-based lessons without disturbing the flow of communication.

Among the six corrective moves (i.e., recast, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, elicitation, explicit correction, repetition), the most preferred type of feedback was recast, which accounted for slightly more than half of the teacher turns with feedback; however, meager uptake rates of recast require immersion educators to develop classroom techniques to promote the effectiveness of recast. The study also suggests that feedback under negotiation of form yielded the highest rates of uptake among the various corrective moves. Especially, this holds
true for metalinguistic feedback and clarification request; these two feedback types are interpreted to be the most effective in drawing student-generated repairs.

The results of the study, in conjunction with those of previous studies of corrective feedback and learner uptake, show the importance of balanced corrective feedback. In the light of the fact that there was an imbalance between provision of feedback types and their learner uptake rates, it has been argued that a balanced approach to correction will help to redress this mismatch between feedback and learner uptake.

An important pedagogical implication to Korean English education can also be drawn from the findings of the present study. Korean English education has changed toward creating enriched environments with learners immersed in English in a variety of ways. In classrooms, an increasing number of English teachers are pursuing TETE. Outside of classrooms, English camps and English Villages offer exciting communicative English programs. Specially-designed schools such as foreign language high schools and international middle schools are also competitively launching immersion-like programs, hoping to nurture bilingual students. These trends indicate that students will be learning subjects in English through theme-based or content-based instruction as in the way that immersion students do in the present study.

Taking these shifts into consideration, the present research into teacher-student interaction in English immersion classroom settings in Korea can be helpful not only for English teachers but also for English teacher training specialists in the sense that they can draw guidelines from the findings of the study for effective interaction for L2 acquisition, especially for successful ways to offer corrective feedback to their students.
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**APPENDIX**

Transcription Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ssam.</td>
<td>Same student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdif.</td>
<td>Different student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>()</td>
<td>Extra information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt;</td>
<td>Inaudible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Timed Pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Micropause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Falling Intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>Continuing Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>Lengthening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>//</td>
<td>Phonetic Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>Coding information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Underlined utterances**

**Italicized utterances**

Erroneous turns

Teacher’s feedback

Applicable levels: primary, secondary

Key words: corrective feedback, learner uptake, immersion
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