

References

- Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 465-483.
- Allen, P., Swain, M., Harley, B., & Cummins, J. (1990). Aspects of classroom treatment: Toward a more comprehensive view of second language education. In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins, & M. Swain (Eds.), *The development of second language proficiency* (pp.57-81). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Allwright, R. L. (1975). Problems in the study of the language teacher's treatment of learner error. In M. K. Burt & H. C. Dulay (Eds.), *On TESOL '75* (pp.96-109). Washington D.C.: TESOL.
- Allwright, R. L. (1984). Why don't learners learn what teachers teach: The interaction hypothesis. In D. M. Singleton & D. G. Little (Eds.), *Language learning in formal and informal contexts*. Dublin, Ireland: IRAAL.
- Allwright, R. L., & Bailey, K. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bohannon, J. N., III., & Stanowicz, L. (1988). The issue of negative evidence: Adult responses to children's language errors. *Developmental Psychology*, 24, 684-689.
- Borg, S. (1998). Teacher's pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 9-38.
- Breen, M. P. (2001). Overt participation and covert acquisition in the language classroom. In M. P. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Brown, R., & Hanlon, C. (1970). Derivational complexity and order of acquisition in child speech. In J. R. Hayes (Ed.), *Cognition and the development of language* (pp.11-53). New York: Wiley.
- Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 357-386.
- Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning*, 27, 29-46.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, A. (1994). Verbal reports on learning strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 678-682.
- Coughlan, P., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Same task, different activities: Analysis of SLA task from an activity theory perspective. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp.173-193). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- Cowan, R., & Hatasa, Y. A. (1994). Investigating the validity and reliability of native speaker and second-language learner judgments about sentences. In E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Research methodology in second language acquisition* (pp.303-322). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp.33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- Doughty, C. (1994). Fine-tuning of feedback by competent speakers to language learners. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown university round table on language and linguistics 1993* (pp.96-108). Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp.114-138). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1998a). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1998b). Teaching and research: Options in grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 39-60.
- Ericsson, K., & Simon, H. (1984). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1987). *Introspection in second language research*. Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.

- Farrar, M. J. (1990). Discourse and the acquisition of grammatical morphemes. *Journal of Child Language*, *17*, 607-624.
- Farrar, M. J. (1992). Negative evidence and grammatical morpheme acquisition. *Developmental Psychology*, *28*, 90-98.
- Fortune, A., & Thorp, D. (2001). Knotted and entangled: New light on the identification, classification and value of language related episodes in collaborative output tasks. *Language Awareness*, *10*, 143-160.
- Frawley, W. (1997). *Vygotsky and cognitive science: Language and the unification of the social and computational mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gass, S. M. (1994). The reliability of second-language grammaticality judgments. In E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Research methodology in second language acquisition* (pp.303-322). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goss, N., Zhang, Y., & Lantolf, J. (1994). Two heads may be better than one: Mental activity in second-language grammaticality judgments. In E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Research methodology in second language acquisition* (pp.263-286). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grimshaw, J., & Pinker, S. (1989). Positive and negative evidence in language acquisition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *12*, 341-342.
- Harley, B. (1994). Appealing to consciousness in the L2 classroom. In J. H. Hulstijn & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Consciousness in second language learning* (pp.57-67). Amsterdam: Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée.
- Harley, B., & Swain, M. (1984). The interlanguage of immersion students and its implications for second language teaching. In A. Davies, C. Criper, & A. Howatt (Eds.), *Interlanguage* (pp.291-311). Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings* (pp.401-435). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Ikeda, M. (2005). *Toward better instruction of EFL reading strategies: An instructional model based on a synthesis of five empirical studies*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Kansai University, Osaka, Japan.
- Jewel, M., & Hatori, H. (Eds.). (1992). *Colloquial expressions in dialogue form:*

- Japanese-English*. Tokyo: Asahi Shuppan-sha.
- Kowel, M., & Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 3, 73-91.
- Krashen, S. D. (1976). Formal and informal linguistic environments in language acquisition and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10, 157-168.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp.1-26). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leeman, J. (2000). Towards a new classification of input: An empirical study of the effect of recasts, negative evidence, and enhanced salience on L2 development. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 61(07), 2684A. (UMI No. 9978109)
- Leont'ev, A. N. (1981). The problem of activity in psychology. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology*. Armark: Sharpe.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1993). *How languages are learned* (1st ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lin, Y., & Hedgcock, J. (1996). Negative feedback incorporation among high-proficiency and low-proficiency Chinese-speaking learners of Spanish. *Language Learning*, 46, 567-611.
- Long, M. (1977). Teacher feedback on learner error: Mapping cognitions. In H. D. Brown, C. A. Yorio, & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '77* (pp.278-294). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.
- Long, M. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126-141.
- Long, M. (1988). Instructed interlanguage development. In L. M. Beebe (Ed.), *Issues in second language acquisition: Multiple perspectives* (pp.115-141). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. deBot, R. B. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspectives* (pp.39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing company.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp.413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp.15-41). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyster, R. (1998a). 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. (1998b). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 51-81.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Mackey, A., Gass, S. M., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive implicit negative feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22, 471-497.
- Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses and red herrings? *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 338-356.
- McCormick, D. E., & Donato, R. (2000). Teacher questions as scaffolded assistance in an ESL classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp.183-201). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Morris, F. A. (2002). Negotiation moves and recasts in relation to error types and learner repair in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, 395-404.
- Nakamura, K. (1998). Vigotsukii no Hattatsuron: Bunka-Rekishiteki Riron no Keisei to Tenkai [Vygotsky's Developmental Theory: Construction and Development of the Cultural-Historical Theory]. Tokyo: Tokyo University Press.
- Nakamura, K. (2004). Vigotsukii Shinrigaku: Kanzen Dokuhon [Vygotsky's Psychology: Complete Readings]. Tokyo: Shindokusho-sha.
- Nassaji, H., & Cumming, A. (2000). What's in a ZPD? A case study of a young ESL student and teacher interacting through dialogue journals. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 95-121.
- Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles.

- Language Awareness*, 9, 34-51.
- Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning*, 51, 719-758.
- Ohta, A. S. (2000). Rethinking recasts: A learner-centered examination of corrective feedback in the Japanese classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp.47-71). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17, 459-581.
- Ortega, L., & Long, M. (1997). The effects of models and recasts on the acquisition of object topicalization and adverb placement in L2 Spanish. *Spanish Applied Linguistics*, 1, 65-86.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 573-595.
- Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes. *Language Learning*, 44, 493-527.
- Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 63-90.
- Roberts, M. A. (1995). Awareness and the efficacy of error correction. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning (Technical Report #9)* (pp.163-182). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
- Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research*, 7, 89-102.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 129-158.
- Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. In J. H. Hulstijn & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Consciousness in second language learning* (pp.11-26). Amsterdam: Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée.
- Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning (Technical Report #9)* (pp.1-63). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum

- Center.
- Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. N. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn* (pp.237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209-231.
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8, 263-300.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Slimani, A. (1987). The teaching/learning relationship: Learning opportunities and learning outcomes. An Algerian case study. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Lancaster, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49(07), 1689A.
- Slimani, A. (1992). Evaluation of classroom interaction. In J. C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp.197-221). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Smagorinsky, P. (1998). Thinking and speech and protocol analysis. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 5, 157-177.
- Snow, C. E., & Ferguson, C. A. (Eds.). (1977). *Talking to children*. London, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Spada, N. (1997). Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language Teaching*, 30, 73-87.
- Spada, N., & Fröhlich, M. (1995). *The communicative orientation of language teaching observation scheme: Coding conventions and applications*. Sydney, Australia: National Centre for English Language
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H.G. Widdowson* (pp.125-144). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp.64-81). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 371-391.
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1998). Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320-337.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Talking it through: Two French immersion learners' response to reformulation. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37, 285-304.
- Takahashi, E., Austin, T., & Morimoto, Y. (2000). Social interaction and language development in a FLES classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp.139-159). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- van Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp.245-259). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vandargriff, L. (2003). From prediction through reflection: Guiding students through the process of L2 listening. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59, 425-440.
- VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Verplaetse, L. S. (2000). Mr. Wonder-ful: Portrait of a dialogic teacher. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp.221-241). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Vigil, N. A., & Oller, J. W. (1976). Rule fossilization: A tentative model. *Language Learning*, 26, 281-295.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (Eds.), *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky* (Vol.1, pp.37-285). New York: Plenum Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1980). The significance of dialogue in Vygotsky's account of social, egocentric, and inner speech. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 5, 150-162.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V., Tulviste, P., & Hagstrom, F. (1993). A sociocultural approach to agency. In E. Forman, N. Minick, & A. Stone (Eds.), *Contexts for learning: Sociocultural dynamics in children's development*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Williams, J. (1999). Learner-generated attention to form. *Language Learning*, *49*, 583-625.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *25*, 45-62.

Appendices

Appendix A

Glossary

- AL (Attention to Language) A coding category for students' recall, referring to their attention to language.
- AC (Attention to Content) A coding category for students' recall, referring to their attention to content.
- CPRE (Compound Recast Episode) A subcategory of Recast Episode which contains two or more recasts provided in different turns.
- CR (Clarification Request) A type of feedback through which difficulty in comprehension of the non-target-like utterance is indicated and a repetition or a reformulation is required.
- CXRE (Complex Recast Episode) A subcategory of Recast Episode which is composed of at least one recast feedback and other feedback types.
- EL (Elicitation) A type of feedback through which the interlocutor attempts to elicit the more target-like form from the previous speaker.
- EM (Explicit Model) A type of feedback through which a target form is explicitly provided.
- ETE (Error Treatment Episode) One or more sequences of feedback turns to deal with one aspect of non-target-like language use found in a learner's utterance. It can include 5 different feedback types: CR, EL, EM, MF, and R.
- GJ Grammaticality Judgment
- LRE (Language Related Episode) A unit of analysis proposed by Swain and Lapkin (1995, 1998). An LRE is any part of a dialogue where students talk about language they are producing, question

their language use, or correct or self-correct their language production.

- MF (Metalinguistic Feedback) A type of feedback through which comments, explanations, or questions about the divergence of the learner's utterance are provided without explicitly providing a more target-like form.
- NFB (Noticing Feedback) A coding category for students' recall referring to their noticing of teacher feedback.
- NoA (No Attention) A coding category for students' recall indicating that they were not paying attention.
- R (Recast) Either isolated or expanded rephrasing of learners' non-target-like utterances provided by the teacher or peer learner(s) immediately after the non-target-like utterances are made.
- RE (Recast Episode) A sequence of feedback turns, involving at least one recast, to deal with one aspect of non-target-like language use found in a learner's utterance. A subcategory of Error Treatment Episode.
- SRE (Single Recast Episode) A subcategory of Recast Episode which is composed of only one recast.

Appendix B

Uptake Claim Form

(Original form was in Japanese)

Direction: Please recall your lesson today, and try to remember EVERYTHING that you NOTICED and THOUGHT you learned in the lesson. Please write down the things you remember from the lesson.

1. Words and phrases:
2. Spelling:
3. Pronunciation:
4. Grammar:
5. Ways of using the language:
6. Other(s)

Appendix C**Sample Items from Grammaticality Judgment Tests**

	Absolutely Correct	Probably Correct	Probably incorrect	Absolutely Incorrect	Not sure
1. The woman graduated from my school.					
2. The woman was from my graduated school graduated.					
3. Citizens don't know about environmental problems.					
4. Citizens doesn't know about environmental problems.					
5. We have freedom of thought.					
6. We have freedom of thinking.					
7. It is not right to force other people believe in your religion.					
8. Don't involve other people in your religion.					

Appendix D

Questions Asked in the Stimulated Recall Interviews with the Students

1. Basic Questions

Before watching the video

“Do you remember anything about the class?”

While watching the video

“What were you thinking then?”

“What was going on there?”

“You are laughing there. Why?”

After watching the video

“Do you have any comments after watching this?”

“Do you have anything to add?”

2. Specific Questions

(Asked when students were found to give few comments about the teacher and the teacher’s recasts.)

“Here the teacher seemed to have repeated what X said. Do you think the teacher repeats often? Why do you think the teacher repeated?”

(At the conclusion of the 3rd interview session)

“What do you think of this discussion class? How do you think it may be useful in your learning English in this college?”

(At the conclusion of the final interview session)

“Can you describe on what you focus the most in the process of learning English in this college? What is your belief and “policy” in studying English?”

Appendix E**Questions Asked in the Interviews with the Teacher**

1. Basic Questions (asked after each video scenes)

“What were you thinking then?”

“Why did you do/say/ask so then?”

2. Additional Questions

Elicitation of the teacher’s view of each student regarding:

Her willingness for getting linguistic feedback

Her competence and participation in the class

Appendix F

ETE/RE Coding Guideline

Error Treatment Episode:

Definition: An error treatment episode (ETE) is defined as a sequence of feedback turns to deal with one aspect of language problem (i.e., morpho-syntactic, lexical, phonological, or semantic). ETE also includes treatment of L1-L2 translations, although use of L1 is not an error. This is because recasting are found to occur frequently in response to a student's use of L1 in Lyster and Ranta (1997).

Data needed to be Coded:

1. The initial Teacher/Peer-feedback (Type(s) of feedback)
2. The initial S-error triggering the feedback (Type(s) of Error) ? Beginning of the ETE
3. The end of episode (uptake/no uptake/ no chance for uptake)
4. All the T-feedback within the episode

The language problem dealt within an ETE is

- Grammatical (Gram)
(i.e., morpho-syntactic mistakes such as incorrect tense marking, singular/plural marking, use of articles)
- Lexical (Lex)
(i.e., incorrect choice of word; mistakes with open-class.)
- Phonological (Phon)
(i.e., problems in pronouncing words and/or audibility of the utterance.)
- L1 Use
(i.e., using L1 in place of unknown L2 word(s))
- Incomplete Sentence (Inc)
(i.e., the student is unable to complete the utterance due to linguistic limitations)
- Multiple of above

While grammatical, lexical and phonological problems are readily recognized as linguistic errors, problems with L1 use and incomplete sentences are not necessarily

linguistic errors. ETEs include those non-linguistic errors, however, because recasting is found to occur frequently in response to these types of problems (e.g., Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

ETE starts with an erroneous utterance reacted by another interlocutor, and ends when the treatment ends. It is possible that the episode contains only one treatment as in Example 1.

Example 1

S : Temporary housing and money. *Owari*.

T : *Owari?* What's *owari*?

S : I'm finished.

T : Ok.

Or there may be multiple treatments provided until the treatment ends as in Example 2.

Example 2

(During an information gap task, a piece of information S1 needed to give to S2 was "1,000,000".)

S1 : one, zero, zero, zero, zero, zero, zero.

S2 : one, zero, zero, zero, zero, zero, zero.

T : one, zero, zero, zero, zero, zero, zero? Don't you remember the number?

S1 : I forgot.

T : You forgot? I taught you this.

S1 : One hundred thousand.

T : How many commas?

S1&2: Two.

S1 : One thousand.

S2 : One thousand, thousand.

T : One thousand, thousand? No.

S1 : Millions!

T : Yes.

S2: Million! One million!

One ETE episode may include non-treatment moves before the language problem on focus is successfully or unsuccessfully solved. The possible moves are

- Repair (by students either successful or unsuccessful)
- Repetition of the previous utterance
- Approval (or repair usually by Teacher)
- Enforcement (of correct forms usually by Teacher)
- Topic continuation

Teacher feedback types categorized by Lyster and Ranta (1997) are used for coding types of treatment within an ETE.

The treatment types are:

- A. **Explicit model (EM)**: “The explicit provision of the correct form. The interlocutor clearly indicates that what the other had said was incorrect” (e.g., “Oh, you mean,”)

Example

S : Cats are more dangerous animal than dog because they ... the keep going when they met a car. They never change their way, and the ... run over. ... Finish.

T : Ok. Yeah. ... Cats are ... Cats are at more danger. Ok. So something is dangerous is going to hurt something else. At danger is they can be hurt.

- B. **Clarification Requests (CR)**: Indication that the previous utterance has been misunderstood or is ill-formed in some way and that a repetition or a reformulation is required. CR includes phrases such as “What?” or “What do you mean by X?”

- C. **Metalinguistic Feedback (MF)**: “Comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student’s utterance without explicitly providing correct form.” This type of feedback includes comments such as “No, not X.” A word definition in the case of lexical errors is also metalinguistic feedback.

Example

S1: One hundred thousand.

T: How many commas?

- D. **Elicitation (EL)**: “Techniques usually teachers use to directly elicit the correct form from the student. The teacher either elicit completion of their own sentence by repeating the utterance but pausing to allow students to ‘fill in the blank’ or use questions to elicit correct forms.

Example

S: “Temporary housing and money. *Owari*.”

T: *Owari*? What’s *owari*?

S: I’m finished.

- E. **Recasts (R)**: “Paraphrasing or L2 translation of what the other had said. Recasts are generally implicit.”

1. **Isolated/Declarative (R-ID)**: Extracting the erroneous part of previous utterance and paraphrasing (or translating) it in declarative falling pitch.

Example

S: If you watch TV oftenly, then you will see a commercial.

T: Often.

2. **Isolated/Interrogative (R-II)**: Extracting the erroneous part of previous utterance and paraphrasing (or translating) it in interrogative rising pitch. (In the transcripts, it is with a question mark.)

Example

S: If I cannot persist them then I’m gonna resign.

T: Persuade them?

3. **Expanded/Declarative (R-ED)**: Paraphrasing (or translating) the erroneous part of previous utterance but the part is incorporated into elaborated response in declarative falling pitch.

Example

S: They were separate to small part and...

T: Small parts. Yeah, they probably transported in small pieces and then

reassembled it at the top.

- 4 . Expanded/Interrogative (R-EI): Paraphrasing (or translating) the erroneous part of previous utterance but the part is incorporated into elaborated response in interrogative rising pitch.

Index

- Affordance
102f, 122, 127, 131, 135-136,
139-140, 143
- Belief
34-35, 43, 44, 49
- Cognitive-interactionist
3-5, 7-10, 10f, 11-12, 12f, 23, 31,
59, 79, 92, 95-97, 99, 103-104,
107, 136-137, 139, 144
- Focus on Form
12f, 144
- Form-focused instruction
5, 8, 11-12, 142, 144
- Input Hypothesis
9, 93
- Interaction Hypothesis
9, 12, 93, 142
- Intersubjectivity
102, 108-109, 114, 116, 118, 120,
124, 126, 131, 136-137
- Negotiation of meaning
8, 93
- Output
3, 14, 77, 94, 114, 127
- Perception
21, 142
- Sociocultural Theory
4, 6, 21f, 99, 99f, 100, 102, 106,
139, 147
- Scaffolding
6, 101, 103, 106-108, 112, 120,
129-131, 144

List of Tables

Table 1 : Student Groups	25
Table 2 : Data Collection Schedule	27
Table 3 : GJ Test Item Numbers	33
Table 4 : Codes for Student Stimulated Recall Interview Protocols	40
Table 5 : Attention Categories	42
Table 6 : Students' Recalls with Respect to REs	43
Table 7 : Codes for Teacher Stimulated Recall Interview Protocols	45
Table 8 : Students' GJ Test Responses with Respect to REs	46
Table 9 : Students' GJ Test Responses with Respect to REs with Recall Data	47
Table 10: Summary of Datasets	49
Table 11: REs and Delivery Type	52
Table 12: REs and Error Type	53
Table 13: REs and Learner Reaction Type	53
Table 14: Group REs and Delivery Type	54
Table 15: Group REs and Error Type	54
Table 16: Group REs and Learner Reaction Type	54
Table 17: Distribution of RE Delivery Type and Learner Reaction Type	55
Table 18: Distribution of Error Type Across Delivery Type and Reaction Type	56
Table 19: Attention Recalls	62
Table 20: Attention Recalls and Delivery Type in Class	64
Table 21: Attention Recalls and Delivery Type in the Teacher-fronted Setting	65
Table 22: Attention Recalls and Delivery Type in the Group Setting	65
Table 23: Attention Recalls and Error Type in Class	66

Table 24: Attention Recalls and Error Type in the Teacher-fronted Setting	66
Table 25: Attention Recalls and Error Type in the Group Setting	67
Table 26: Attention Recalls and Learner Reaction in Class	68
Table 27: Attention Recalls and Learner Reaction in the Teacher-fronted Setting	69
Table 28: Attention Recalls and Learner Reaction in the Group Setting	70
Table 29: Correct Judgments in GJ Test 1	82
Table 30: Correct Judgments in GJ Test 2	83
Table 31: Correct Test 1 Responses (%) with Respect to REs in Class	85
Table 32: Correct Test 1 Responses (%) with Respect to Teacher-fronted REs	85
Table 33: Correct Test 1 Responses (%) with Respect to Group REs	86
Table 34: Correct Test 2 Responses (%) with Respect to REs in Class	86
Table 35: Correct Test 2 Responses (%) with Respect to Teacher-fronted REs	87
Table 36: Correct Test 2 Responses (%) with Respect to Group REs	87
Table 37: Correct Test 1 Responses (%) with Respect to Attention in All REs	88
Table 38: Correct Test 1 Responses (%) with Respect to Attention in Teacher-fronted REs	89
Table 39: Correct Test 1 Responses (%) with Respect to Attention in Group REs	89
Table 40: Correct Test 2 Responses (%) with Respect to Attention in All REs	90
Table 41: Correct Test 2 Responses (%) with Respect to Attention in Teacher-fronted REs	90

Table 42: Correct Test 2 Responses (%) with Respect to Attention in Group REs	90
Table 43: Scaffolding Functions and Feedback Characteristics	107
Table 44: Descriptions of REs	111

Toshiyo Nabei

Lecturer at the Institute of Foreign Language Education and Research at Kansai University, Osaka, Japan. She received a Ph.D. in Second Language Education from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto. Her research interests include L2/FL classroom interaction, and the interface of SLA and L2 teaching.