



CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND CLASSROOM INTERACTION AT SMA 1 PAYAKUMBUH SUMATERA BARAT

Sahyoni

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Batusangkar,
Sumatera Barat, Indonesia

E-mail: jonvi_aok@yahoo.com

Abstrak: *The main focus of this research is to investigate corrective feedback made by the English teacher during classroom interaction. The study was qualitative research. The data in this study were the utterances that spoken by teacher and student during the classroom activity. The data were collected through a record where the writer himself recorded the utterances during teaching learning process a ninety-minute in duration. In this study, the teacher is an English teacher who teaches at grade XI SMA Payakumbuh. The data were analyzed by qualitative approach, writer explained corrective feedback types that happened in classroom interaction. There are six types of corrective feedback occurred in the classroom interaction at SMA 1 Payakumbuh namely: recast, repetition, clarification request, explicit correction, elicitation, and paralinguistic correction. Recast, clarification request and elicitation are the most corrective feedback applied by teacher in the classroom interaction.*

Kata Kunci: Corrective feedback, English teacher, Classroom interaction

INTRODUCTION

Corrective feedback is a part of classroom interaction. The presence of corrective feedback is evitable, since interaction always happened in classroom. As in classroom interaction, the presence of dialogue or conversation mostly occurs between students and students even students and teacher. Sometimes students get mistake to answer question or give opinion. In another case they may say something incompletely. It is also possible that students are wrong in choosing appropriate diction for certain word. If those problems happen, teachers have to take responsibility to correct their mistakes as well as to avoid their mistakes happen gradually. If not, it is

worried that it becomes a habitual, the learner keep jamming in frozen mistake. Corrective feedback had been researched by several previous researchers (see Lyster and Ranta : 199, Lyster: 1998, Lyster and Mori: 2006, and Fu: 2002). It becomes a burning issue in second language acquisition (SLA).

Corrective feedback always occurs when learning second or foreign language. Lyster and Ranta (1997) conducted a study in a Canadian immersion context. Based on their research, they presented that recasts were by far the most common type of feedback (55%), followed by elicitation (14%), clarification requests (11%) metalinguistic feedback (8%), explicit correction (7%), and repetition (5%).

However, recasts were much less likely to lead to immediate self-correction by the students than are other feedback types. In next year Lyster (1998) further studied the same recorded lessons. In his research obtained that the kinds of negatives feedback provided by the teachers were much more likely to respond to lexical errors with some kind of negotiation, while they typically responded to both grammatical and phonological errors with recasts. Then, Lyster and Mori (2006) investigated a study to compare the distribution of feedback types in two different instructional settings that are Japanese immersion and French immersion. They found that pervasive type of feedback was recast regardless of the variations in the two classroom settings. Recasts accounted for 65% and 54% in Japanese and French classes vice versa. In the Japanese classes, 61% of students' uptakes followed the recasts, while in the French classes, 62% of the uptakes occurred after the prompts.

Fu (2012) conducted a research about teachers' feedback, learner uptake, and feedback perceptions in an adult CFL context. The results showed that the teacher provided feedback to 68.1% of all students' errors. Then, Sung, Tsai, and Sung (2014) did a research on student errors, teachers' oral corrective feedbacks, learner uptake and repair, and learners' preferences on corrective feedback in a Chinese language classroom setting. The results presented that the two most frequently made errors were phonological and lexical, and that recasts were the most frequently used type of corrective feedback. Then, Li (2014) did a research on "Corrective Feedback in Classrooms at Different Proficiency Levels: A Case Study of Chinese as a Foreign Language" It was found that overall the teachers followed a similar pattern providing

feedback to the students, with recasts taking the first place across the three levels, although the elementary level demonstrated more eliciting and explicit feedbacks. As the distribution of uptakes after each type of feedback, recasts worked effectively in the elementary and intermediate class, successfully eliciting a majority of uptakes

Based on the previous explanation, it is found several problems on second language acquisition. It signs that, corrective feedback mostly occurs when learning a new language. One of the most possible reasons is the difference between mother tongue and target language. It is different in terms of phonology, lexical, semantic, even morphology. Previous researches are similar with this research in terms of field of study that is corrective feedback. However, this research focuses on type of corrective feedback made by English teacher of senior high school (SMA N) 1 Payakumbuh. Researcher proposes research question as follows: what types of corrective feedback made by English teacher at SMAN 1 Payakumbuh?. This school had been chosen by researcher because this school quite famous for speaking English. The students are active in speaking English.

SMA 1 Payakumbuh offers English as main subject that taught three times in a week per class. As foreign language, surely mistakes quiet frequent happen during teaching-learning process. Correction is truly needed in order to encourage students to be better, without giving correction means welcoming the students to make mistake permanently. If the mistake occurs frequently and no correction, it becomes serious problem for the students. They are in mud of misleading. Corrective feedback is one way of solving that mistake.

Furthermore, corrective feedback is a term for teacher in order to improve, reconstruct and correct the mistakes that have occurred during lecturing in the classroom. Teachers tolerate the mistake, but not the habit of the students. It means, mistake is something natural but if the students do not want to correct it, later it becomes overgeneralization and robust error. Every mistake needs a correction. By this, knowledge and comprehension will run well on students mind, and language exposure becomes smoother and natural.

In line with previous explanation, Ellis (2009:1) affirms the role of feedback has a place in most theories of second language (L2) learning and language pedagogy. In term of both behaviorist and cognitive theories of L2 learning, feedback is seen as contributing to language learning. In both structural and communicative approaches to language teaching, feedback is viewed as a means of fostering learner motivation and ensuring linguistic accuracy. Gumbard (2012) further states several main problems of error. The first and the most frequent factor of error making problem is caused by Interference from L1. The second factor influencing error occurrence is complexity of the target language. The third factor is overgeneralization or developmental error this is when students learn a grammar rule but then they still apply it incorrectly because they try to apply a recently learnt grammar rule to all forms. This research examines type of corrective feedback that used by teacher in classroom interaction. Researcher uses corrective feedback theory that has stated by Rod Ellis. Theoretically, Ellis (2009:8-9) proposes six corrective feedback strategies as following:

a. Recast

The corrector incorporates the content words of the immediately preceding incorrect utterance and changes and corrects the utterance in some way (e.g., phonological, syntactic, morphological or lexical). Mostly in similar sound, Rodger (2008) elaborates recasts are reformulation utterance of the students with non-target-like elements transformed into appropriate formulation. The correction may be accompanied by accentuated word stress or intonation. In this occasion, teacher reformulation what word that said by the students with the correct by changing the intonation. This is done in order to warn the students that what they have said is incorrect. Teachers usually do not correct the error words directly; instead they say another correct form of the words. So, the students try to correct themselves in which part their mistake was.

L: I went there two times.

T: You've been. You've been there twice as a group?

L: I have an ali[bi]

T: you have what?

L: an ali[bi]

T: an alib? An ali[bay]

L: ali[bay]

b. Repetition

According to Panova and Lyster (2002:584) this type of corrective feedback is to provide repetition which is less communicatively intrusive in comparison to explicit error correction or metalinguistic feedback and hence falls at the implicit extreme on the continuum of corrective feedback. Then, they add, this feedback is simply the teachers or interlocutors' repetition "of the ill-formed part of the student's utterance, usually with a change in

intonation. The corrector repeats the learner utterance highlighting the error by means of emphatic stress.

L: I will showed you.

T: I will SHOWED you.

L: I'll show you.

L: I have three new toy

T: Three new toy?

L: What do you spend your extra time with your wife?

T: Ah, how do you spend?

L: How do you spend.

L: Can, can I made a card on the ...for my little brother on the computer?"

T: Pardon?

c. Clarification request

Clarification request is a type of feedback that takes questions indicating that the utterance has been wrong form or misunderstood and that a reformulation or a repetition is required are identified as clarification requests. Lyster & Ranta (1997:47) explain that this kind of feedback encapsulates "problems in either comprehension, accuracy, or both". Then, they also add that clarification requests, different with explicit error correction, recasts, and translations, can be more consistently relied upon to generate modified output from learners since it might not supply the learners with any information concerning the type or location of the error.

The corrector indicates that he/she has not understood what the learner said. Usually someone will ask for clarification by saying "*Sorry?, Pardon me?, excuse me? What do you mean by? What, I do not understand?*". Sometimes, someone (listener) difficult to understand what the speaker has said, so the listener asks a request to say that utterance again. In term of accuracy, sometimes a speaker says the utterance quickly and difficult to catch by the listener, to avoid misunderstanding the listener ask for clarification.

L: What do you spend with your wife?

T: What?

d. Explicit correction

According to Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam (2006) explicit correction is similar with explicit feedback where it concerns on the explicit end of corrective feedback spectrum. This kind of error correction therefore, is characterized by an overt and clear indication of the existence of an error and the provision of the target-like reformulation and can take two forms, i.e. explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback. There two keys point on this types of correction: explicit and metalinguistic feedback. First the corrector identifies the error. Corrector mentions which part that is incorrect to the students and tries to correct it.

For example when students say "my pen is more cheap than yours". Corrector on this case is teacher will say "not more cheap but cheaper, my pen is cheaper than yours". Meanwhile, metalinguistic more concern how the corrector explains why that utterance was wrong, correctors correct the utterance indirectly. More detail, connector provides comments, information, or questions related to the mistake of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form. After students listen the explanation from teachers, student may correct themselves, to which part that was ill-formed. The corrector indicates an error has been committed, identifies the

error and provides the correction. In simply, corrector indicates the error or shows that utterances was error, then identifies which one was error, or in which part the mistake was, so the students know their mistake. Then, after finding the error, corrector corrects the mistake. Corrector may change totally the word or modify the words becomes correct.

L: On May.

T: Not on May, In May. We say, "It will start in May."

L:the coyote, the bison and the cr...crane." (phonological)

T: And the crane. We say crane.

L: The dog run fastly

T: "Fastly does not exist, "fast" does not take -ly. You should say "quickly".

e. Elicitation

According to Panova & Lyster in Rezaei (2011:4) elicitation is a correction technique that prompts the learner to self-correct. There are three elements in elicitation feedback: reformulating the mistake, asking open question, and applying pause strategic. The corrector repeats part of the learner utterance but not the erroneous part and uses rising intonation to signal the learner should complete it. By means, elicitation occurs if teachers doing elicitation directly on students' utterance by prompting the correct formulation. To do so, in most cases the teachers do correction by accentuating intonation or word stress.

L: I'll come if it will not rain.

T: I'll come if it?

f. Paralinguistic signal

The corrector uses a gesture or facial expression to indicate that the learner has made an error. A clarification request appears if a teacher gets misunderstanding or failed on comprehending the utterance spoken by students. The teacher mostly do clarification in order to catch the appropriate form of the utterance.

L: Yesterday I go cinema.

T: (gestures with right forefinger over left shoulder to indicate past)

L: There are two book on the table

T: Huh...(show two fingers, indicates plural)

Literature review

Numerous researches about corrective feedback have been examined by researchers. Most of them conducted study in examining corrective feedback that occurred in the oral classroom as conducted by Lyster & Ranta (1997). Several years later, Kato (2007), Lyster & Ranta, (1997) Suzuki, 2004) examined the frequency the usage of feedback type and studied relationship of feedback toward language acquisition (Braid, 2002; Leeman, 2003; Lyster, 2004; Sheen, 2006) . Lyster and Ranta in year of 1997, highlight six different forms of oral feedback, that mostly happen in the language classroom when they did observational study in French immersion classes. They are: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. One important to be noted was problems with implicit correction is to what extent the students actually pay more attention on the provision of teachers in giving feedback.

Then, in (2000) Mackey, Gass, and McDonough conducted a research on feedback, they revealed that doing correction on grammatical were much less likely to be focused than phonological corrections. They considered that the mistakes have fossilized, especially grammatical mistakes, doing correction less noticeable. In the filed of language acquisition, numerous researchers have argued that noticing or paying attention to form is necessary (Schmidt,1994, 2001; Long 1996), an awareness of the feedback being provided might be a critical aspect in the process of correction and an important first step if feedback is to highly lead to language acquisition. Lastly, Kagimoto and Rodger (2008) among six types of oral feedback, metalinguistic feedback was revealed the highest mean (4.56) on preference (like/ dislike) for the respondents in this research, it becomes the most popular forms of feedback. In the second place was explicit feedback which mean was 4.51. It seemed to be one of the preferred feedback types. Repetition took the third place, it was the lowest of previous feedback types (2.46). As it was smaller than the central point 3.5 on the 7-point scale, it signed that repetition was seen negatively, and mostly disliked by the respondents.

METHODS

Participant

The participants were an English teacher and 32 Senior High School students exactly SMAN 1 Payakumbuh. They are the excellent class. During the class they speak actively. The ratio between male and female students is 35% male and 65 % female. The researcher took this class due to this class is the active one. Besides, there happened

much frequent conversation and feedback by the teacher to students.

Instrument

The instrument to collect the data is recording. Recording in this case is audio recordings were the main source of data. Researcher collected the data by recording the utterances that spoken by teacher and students during a ninety-minute long. Some of the utterances inaudible because much noisy happen at that time. Researcher role was an observer where he only came to the class and record. It means that no participation that is done by researcher. The researcher only recorded activities that happened during classroom teaching learning process.

Procedure

Researcher obtained the data by attending to the class, then recording utterances that spoken both by students and teacher. After getting raw data, researcher then transcribed it from audio (spoken) into visual one (written). Transcription process is aimed to make easy for researcher interpreting the data. Then, researcher categorized the data based on the types of corrective feedback namely: recast, repetition, clarification request, explicit correction, elicitation and paralinguistic. Last step was researcher analyzed the data carefully by using qualitative approach. Data from the classrooms were analyzed by examining classroom interactions.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

After doing deep analysis on the data, the researcher then presented the data into table. There are several corrective feedback

strategies found on this study. They are presented as in the table below:

No	Corrective Feedback Strategy	Utterances
1	Recast	1. S: Open house, Miss.. T : House warming 2. S: I 'm the first to congratulate you on your graduation day. T: I will be the first to congratulate you on your graduation day. 3. T: Ok, what is the first one? S: What kind of tenses we use for this material? T: What kind of tenses we use for this material?, OK what tenses will be used for this material S: Will be used
2	Repetition	1. S: Win the dorprize... T: Win the dorprize? S: Win the doorprize
3	Clarification Request	1. What else? 2. S: So here we go... T: Pardon me? 3. S: we can use..eh.. past tense or present depend on science-nya (<i>its science</i>) T: <i>Misalnya</i> (for example?)
4	Explicit Correction	1. S: Naik Haji T: Ooo I see, go to Mecca.. 2. T: group one first, how many questions do you have? S: Two question T: You mean two questions with s after question
5	Elicitation	1. S: C-o-n-g-r-a-t-u-l-a-t..... T: g? S: t...

		2. T: Opening..Opening...? S: Opening store 3. S: Lebaran..... T: Lebaran is.....
6	Paralinguistic signal	1. S: Independent day T: Huh.....??? S: Independence day

Accordingly, corrective feedback strategy that mostly occurred on this study is clarification. Teachers prompts the sentence what else several times, writer only puts two examples, and more details are on the appendixes.

The corrective feedback strategy recast just occurs twice as in example below:

1. Students : Open house, Miss 2. Teacher : Warming house..	3. Student : I 'm the first to congratulate you on your graduation day. Teacher : I will be the first to congratulate you on your graduation day.
4. Teacher : Ok, what is the first one? Student : What kind of tenses we use for this material? Teacher : What kind of tenses we use for this material?, OK what tenses will be used for this material Student : Will be used	

The corrector, prompts the content of word immediately by preceding incorrect utterance and change it into the correct one. For case number 1, the students mentioned “open house”, teacher however did correction by changing the words becomes “House warming”. The term warming house is appropriate diction than open house for terms “*syukuran rumah baru*” in Bahasa Indonesia.

Then, nearly similar with previous case, teacher precedes immediately the

incorrect utterance into the correct one. This utterance “*I ‘m the first to congratulate you on your graduation day*” seems unusual. Teacher presents the appropriate utterance is “*I will be the first to congratulate you on your graduation day*”. This term sounds correct and commonly used in daily conversation. The corrector holds important role in correcting the mistake, that is, teacher as corrector directly corrects the students’ mistake.

In case 3 the corrector knows the students make mistake in their utterance. The corrector incorporates the content words of the immediately preceding incorrect utterance and changes and corrects them. Student says “what kind of tenses we use for this material?”. This utterance is incorrect, teacher says the words again but it was corrected. In this case, the corrector underlines the lexical mistake. The correct one is “OK what tenses will be used for this material”. Student knew his/her mistakes, he/she then says the correct one “will be used”.

Then, let move to the next data from the conversation. In this case, teacher used repetition strategy. The data as in following table:

- | |
|---|
| 2. S: Win the dorprize...
T: Win the DORPRIZE?
S: Win the doorprize |
|---|

Teacher re-mentioned to what have been said by the students. Students mentioned the word “dorprize”, teacher then get confused and the word sound incorrect in spelling. The corrector repeats the learner is utterance highlighting the error by means of emphatic stress. The teacher mentioned the word “dorprize” in high tone or stress by means as indication the students must correct that words. Students then realized that they have made a mistake, therefore they repeat

the word in correct spelling “DOORPRIZE” as well as pronunciation. This strategy does not force teacher to request the students to correct their utterance directly; however teacher highlights the error by his/sound stress on the error one.

The next case is clarification strategy. The data are presented in following table:

- | |
|--|
| 3. S : Wedding anniversary ?
T : What?
S: So here we go...
T: Pardon me?
S: we can use..eh.. past tense or present depend on science-nya (<i>its science</i>)
T: <i>Misalnya</i> (for example?) |
|--|

Researcher found several clarification strategies; however, researcher only stated two examples. Reasonably, other examples are same word “pardon me, for example and what” utterances. Based on the data above, teacher got unclear utterance from the students, therefore the teacher asks students to say the word clearly. The corrector indicates that he/she has not understood what the learner said. Perhaps, for the case above teacher knows what the students’ utterance, but he/she hasn’t accurately sure yet. Theoretically, for this case, the teacher encapsulates the problem either comprehension or accuracy. In other words, teacher has not gotten the meaning yet of students utterances. Situation on the class also influences teacher to get understanding. Like in a noisy class, teacher can’t understand clearly because too many students in a classroom and noise. Regarding to data above, students mentioned “so here we go”, and teacher has not got the clear understanding. He/she uses clarification strategy by saying “pardon me and what” to make it clear. In the last utterance, teacher used clarification

strategy in order to dig more explanation from students. By using phrases like "for example?" the teacher indicates that the message has not been understood or that the student's utterance contained some kind of mistake and that a repetition or a reformulation is required. It is done in order get understanding and to make sure that the student can grasp the comprehension.

In points of explicit correction, the writer found an error as in following table:

4. S: Naik Haji T: Ooo I see, go to Mecca..
--

As the name suggests, explicit feedback falls at the explicit end correction of corrective feedback. This kinds of error correction therefore is characterized by an overt and clear indication of the existence of error and provision of the target-like reformulation. Explicit correction means corrector mentions the incorrect words directly and prompts the correct one to the students. In explicit correction, corrector provides both positive and negative evidence. In term of negative evidence, teacher says clearly what the students have produced is erroneous. Teacher then propose the positive evidence by correcting it appropriately.

Referring to the data above, students don't know appropriate term in English for word "naik haji". Even though, teacher does not explain what appropriate term for *naik haji* is, teacher then explains it by saying "go to Mecca". Students will know this term is equal go to Mecca in English. Indeed, the most appropriate terms is pilgrimage, writer views the term of go to Mecca has represented that one simply.

Moreover, in point of elicitation feedback, writer found data as follow:

5. S: C-o-n-g-r-a-t-u-l-a-t..... T: g? S: t...tion T: Opening..Opening...? S: Opening store S: Lebaran..... T: Lebaran is..... S: lebaran is ...oh... the day for ah.... apa ya?

Elicitation strategy is a corrective technique that prompts the learner to self-correct. It allows the students correct themselves toward their ill-informed or incomplete utterances. Lyster and Ranta (1997) identify three ways of eliciting the correct form from the students: (a) teacher pauses and lets students complete the utterances, (b) teacher asks an open question directly, (c) teacher requests a reformulation of the ill-informed utterances. As in example spelling the word CONGRATULATION, the teacher let student complete the next part of the spelling.

The next example, teacher pauses his utterances in order to let student complete utterance. When teacher says the word "opening... then it is mentioned again, hoped the learner give respond. Students know that signal, so they say the complete one by saying "opening store". The corrector repeats part of the learner's utterance but not the erroneous part and uses rising intonation to signal the learner should complete it.

The last example, teacher pauses the utterances and let student complete it. It indicates that teacher gives space and time students to complete the utterances. When teacher says "lebaran" the tone is normal, but when coming to "is" (lebaran is) the tone is rising up. Learners then give explanation or response toward this utterances. They repairs the utterances by saying "*lebaran is ...oh...*

the day for ah.... apa ya?. Even though the utterances have not completed yet, at least the students have repaired that utterances.

Moreover, paralinguistic feedback example can be presented as follow:

6. S: Independent day T: Huh.....??? S: Independence day
--

The corrector uses a gesture or facial expression to indicate that the learner has made an error. Teacher's respond when hear students say "independent day" is upset or get confuse. Teacher uses her facial gesture following by saying "huh" which means this utterance is wrong. The error is placed in "independent" word where part of speech *independent* is adjective, the meaning is *merdeka* in Bahasa Indonesia. The correct one it must be placed with *independence* where the part of speech is noun. So the meaning is *kemerdekaan* (freedom from being governed or ruled by another country). It is important to note that, sometimes teacher uses his/her body language to signal the students repair their error. For example, teacher is moving the hand up and down in pronunciation practice. It also can be done by proposing the gestures with right forefinger over left shoulder to indicate past. Indicating future tense, the teacher is raising his/her hand up and pointing forward.

CONCLUSION

Corrective feedback is essential part in classroom participation. In line with the statements above, the most corrective strategy used by teacher is clarification strategy. Teacher requests the students to repeat the utterances. Perhaps, for junior high school level, elicitation occurs mostly due to the teacher mention the word then completed by the students. For senior high school level,

teacher tried to use paralinguistic strategy, recast, and others type of corrective feedback. Their knowledge and experience are much develops than junior high school level, so they deserve to be treated differently.

This research concludes six types of corrective feedback made by the teacher. First is recast where the teacher locates the mistake and provide the correct one. Second is repetition, in this case contributes little, repetition needs the corrector to say the error words again and again until the students aware and correct it. Then, clarification request happened mostly in the classroom interaction. Learning second or foreign language may lead to the mistake since mother tongue and target language is quite different. Sometimes teacher cannot understand clearly what students said, the best way of avoiding misunderstanding is to ask them to clarify. Then explicit correction, corrector finds the mistake and tries to correct it without asking directly to students the error part. Corrector modifies the words to another one.

Next is elicitation, where the corrector asks students to correct their word by asking question, not yes/no question, but responsive answer. Another ways is by pausing, it is done in order to allow the student to complete the teacher's utterance for example "*It's a.....*" or by asking students to reformulate the utterance for example "*mention that again.....*". The last is paralinguistic signal. Giving correction is not only by using language but also body gesture or body language. Corrector may use part of his/her body to give correction. For example, when students say "I go to Paris last week" and the corrector rises up his/her pointing finger and points to the back. It indicates that

the tense is past tense. As the finding of this study revealed, corrective feedback needs in teaching learning process. In response to the dilemma of error correction, it can be stated that leaving students' error untouched may lead to the fossilization of ill-formed structures. Essentially, corrective feedback can be used as an effective way in eliminating possible non-target-like utterances in instructional process. Learning SLA or FLA cannot be separated from making mistake that is natural. It becomes unusual if the mistake keep doing by the learner. Corrective feedback can minimize the mistake and lead learner to better language learner

REFERENCES

- Ellis, Rod. 2009. Corrective feedback and teacher development. L2 Journal, volume 1 2009. Shanghai International Studies and University of Auckland.
- Fu, T. (2012). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in a Chinese as a foreign language class: Do perceptions and the reality match? *Unpublished master thesis*. University of Victoria.
- Kagimoto, E., & Rodgers, M. P. H. (2008). *Students' perceptions of corrective feedback*. In K. Bradford Watts, T. Muller, & M. Swanson (Eds.), JALT2007 Conference Proceedings. Tokyo: JALT
- Kato, M. (2007). Corrective Feedback in oral communication classes at a Japanese senior high school. *The Language Teacher*, 31(3), 3-8
- Li, Liu. 2014. Corrective Feedback in Classrooms at Different Proficiency Levels: A Case Study of Chinese as a Foreign Language. Department of Modern Languages and Classics, Ball State University.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In Ritchie, W. C. and Bhatia, T. K. (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Lyster, R. (2004) Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20 (1), 51-92.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). *Corrective feedback and learner uptake*. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19 (1), 37-66
- Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48, 183-218.
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Corrective feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 269-300
- Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). Do learners recognize implicit negative feedback as feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22 (4), 471-497.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 573-595.

Schmidt, R. (1994). *Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions of applied linguistics*. AILA Review, 11, 11-26.

Sung, K. , Tsai, H. & Sung, K. (2013). Exploring Student Errors, Teachers'

Corrective Feedback (CF), Learner Uptake and Repair, and Learners' Preferences of CF. The Journal of Language Learning and Teaching, 4(1), 37-54.