The relationship between recasts and uptake in a Korean EFL communicative classroom context

Eulja Park
University of Wollongong


This paper is posted at Research Online. http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/47
NOTE

This online version of the thesis may have different page formatting and pagination from the paper copy held in the University of Wollongong Library.

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

COPYRIGHT WARNING

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents an analysis of the data in addressing the research questions posed in the present study. As discussed earlier, the study aims to examine what types of recasts in response to non-target-like forms are provided by peers and by the teacher, and to explore the different kinds of uptake provided by the learners in response to the recasts.

To illustrate the provision of recasts in response to non-target-like utterances and subsequent learner uptake, the examples in the chapter are taken from segments of NNS teacher – NNS learner and NNS learner – NNS learner dyadic interactions recorded while doing task activities. The complete analyses are found in ‘Appendices’. The analyses are reported by comparing two interactional contexts, teacher – learner (T – L) interactions and learner – learner (L – L) interactions.

4.2 TYPES OF RECASTS USED BY DIFFERENT INTERLOCUTORS

As discussed earlier, one of the purposes of the study is to examine how recasts differ depending on who is providing recasts in a semi-controlled context. This section reports on the findings relating to the first sub-question:

What different types of recasts are provided by peers and by the teacher?

4.2.1 Teacher – learner interactions

The analysis of twelve T – L dyadic interactions shows that the teacher used three different types of recasts: ‘Reformulation’ (R), ‘Repetition followed by Reformulation’
(R and R), and ‘Overlap Reformulation’ (OR). The teacher provided a total of 239 recasts in response to the learners’ non-target-like forms. These included 231 recasts with correct reformulation and 8 recasts with inaccurate reformulation. (The issue of inaccurate recasting by NNS interlocutors will be taken up in the Discussion Chapter.) The following excerpts present examples of the three types of recasts used by the teacher in response to student’s non-target-like forms.

Excerpt 4.2 – 1 from Task 1 Teacher/Student J (T1TJ): Example of Reformulation

   9 T: Umm. I have two cushions on the sofa.
   10 J: Only two. I .. I have.. sofa, I cushion two.
   11 T: Two [cushions ↘
   12 J: Two cushions
   13 T: On the sofa ↘
   14 J: On the sofa, two…
   15 T: Two cushions
   16 J: Yes, two cushions
   17 T: Okay.

As shown in Excerpt 4.2 – 1, the teacher provides recasts in Line 11 and Line 13 in the form of Reformulation (R) in response to student J’s morpho-syntactic errors in the use of ‘plural’ and ‘preposition’ respectively. These are incorporated by student J immediately after the recasts. In this type of ‘R’ recast the target-like model is provided with a falling intonation.

The following segment in Excerpt 4.2 – 2 from the recast episode of T1TJ shows the teacher using a recast in the form of Repetition and Reformulation (R and R). This type of recast involves repetition of the learner error with rising intonation followed by a target-like language model. In Line 84, the teacher provides a recast in the form of ‘R’ in response to J’s missing article ‘a’ for the single noun ‘briefcase’ in Line 83. This is not successfully incorporated by J following the recast. Again the teacher provides a
different form of recast ‘R and R’ in Line 86 and Line 88. This time, student J incorporates the recast immediately in Line 89.

Excerpt 4.2 – 2 from T1TJ: Example of Repetition and Reformulation
82 T: I have a briefcase behind the chair. Do you have a briefcase?
83 J: Oh, No, I haven't. I haven't briefcase.
84 T: You haven't a briefcase. 
85 J: I haven't briefcase.
86 T: Um. You haven't a BRIEFCASE?
87 J: Yes
88 T: You haven't A BRIEFCASE.
89 J: I haven't a briefcase.
90 T: Okay. Um.

In the following recast episode in Excerpt 4.2 – 3 from T3TB, the teacher used a recast in the form of Overlap Reformulation (OR). Recasts in the form of ‘OR’ simultaneously use confirmation check (though rising intonation) and reformulation. In the segment below, the teacher provides an ‘OR’ recast in response to student B’s missing article ‘a’ with the single noun, ‘cap’ in Line 42. However, student B responds saying “yes”, which is not considered as successful incorporation. Then the teacher again provides a ‘R’ recast form in Line 45. This time, student B incorporates the recast into her utterance successfully with expansion.

Excerpt 4.2 – 3 from T3TB: Example of Overlap Reformulation
42 B: Um…… cap is … hanging … hanging chair
43 T: Uh.. you mean…. a cap is hanging on the chair?
44 B: Yes
45 T: A cap is- 
46 B: A cap is hanging on the chair.
4.2.2 Learner – learner interactions

The findings showed that peers in L – L interactions used the same three types of recasts as can be seen in T – L interactions. These were in the forms of ‘Reformulation’ (R), ‘Repetition followed by Reformulation’ (R and R) and ‘Overlap Reformulation’ (OR). The findings from the analysis of twelve L – L dyadic interactions reveal that there were 119 recast episodes including 116 accurate recasts and 3 inaccurate recasts. The examples of the three types of recasts provided by peers are shown in the following excerpts.

The following Excerpt 4.2 – 4 shows examples of the provision of two recast forms, ‘R’ and ‘R and R’ within the one recast episode. At first, peer interlocutor H provides a recast in Line 17 in the form of ‘R’ in response to peer A’s phonological error of ‘/laksæk/’ instead of ‘/raksæk/’. This is incorporated by Peer A immediately in Line 18. It is difficult for Korean EFL learners to pronounce correctly the difference between /r/ sound and /l/ sound in English, and this kind of phonological error commonly occurs in the Korean EFL context. Secondly, peer interlocutor H provides a different recast type in Line 21 in the form of ‘R and R’ in response to A’s missing article ‘a’ before the singular noun ‘rucksack’ successively. This is incorporated by A immediately as well in Line 22.

Excerpt 4.2 – 4 from Task 1 Student H/Student A (T1HA): Examples of Reformulation and Repetition

16 A: No, I have not luksæc /laksæk/.
17 H: Rucksack /raksæk/  
18 A: Rucksack /raksæk/
19 H: Yes.
20 A: Rucksack
21 H: I have a ..., have not rucksack? I don't have A RUCKSACK, okay?
22 A: I don't have a rucksack.
In particular, at the end of Line 21, the peer interlocutor, H added ‘okay’ with a rising intonation after the ‘R and R’ recast. This may be considered as a way of drawing the learner’s attention to recasts and initiating learner uptake. That is, in response to peer A’s missing article ‘a’ before the singular noun ‘rucksack’, peer H first repeated the incorrect utterance with a rising intonation saying ‘have not rucksack?’ Learner H may have used this ‘R and R’ recast as an explicit signal drawing learner A’s attention to the incorrect utterance. The provision of a target-like language information with emphasis on the erroneous part provided a correct model for learner A. The word ‘okay?’ seemed to have added to draw learner A’s attention. The combination of the ‘R and R’ recast and the discourse marker ‘okay’ may have contributed to A’s successful incorporation in Line A. The learner’s deliberate use of prosodic and discourse signals may account for successful immediate incorporation in response to corrective recasting.

The following Excerpt 4.2 – 5 shows examples of the provision of recasts in the form of ‘OR’ and ‘R’ by a peer interlocutor in response to peer errors. In the interaction between peer L and peer M, peer interlocutor L provides a recast in the form of ‘OR’ in Line 48 in response to peer L’s error in the use of ‘plural’ in Line 47. Then L uses a different recast type in the following segment in Line 58, providing a recast in the form of ‘R’, saying “father is holding a cup”, which is in response to L’s lexical choice in Line 57.

Excerpt 4.2 – 5 T2LM: Examples of Overlap Reformulation and Recast

47 L: In my picture is on the table two cup.
48 M: Two cups? ↗
49 L: Two cups, one more
...
57 L: One cup, father, father is one, one hand, hand
58 M: Father is holding a cup. ↘
59 L: Holding a cup

The findings reveal that both the teacher in T – L and peers in L – L interactions
provided and used three different types of recasts in response to non-target-like forms by their interlocutors. These were recasts in the form of ‘Reformulation’, ‘Repetition followed by Reformulation’ and ‘Overlap Reformulation’. Sometimes, interlocutors in T – L and L – L interactions used mixed recasts with two different forms, and at other times, they provided one type of recast for a single error. Teacher and peer interlocutors in the study showed a similar pattern of providing and using recasts in the three different forms. This may be because both the teacher and learners in an EFL context have the same L1, educational, social and cultural background, and therefore may have similar concepts in and attitudes to the use of corrective feedback and respond to different characteristics for attentional focus contained in the three types of recasts. The fact that the teacher and peer interlocutors provided and used three recast forms in response to non-target-like forms in both T – L and L – L interactions is an important finding since it demonstrates that not only can the NNS teacher provide recasts in an EFL context, but that the NNS students themselves can provide recasts in response to peers’ errors. In addition, the quantitative analysis showed that recasts provided by NNS interlocutors were successfully incorporated by learners to a far greater degree than unsuccessful incorporation. This is significant as it demonstrates that EFL learners in NNS – NNS interactions across T – L and L – L interactions were able to perceive interlocutors’ recasts as corrective feedback and attempted to use the target-like models. This result provides positive evidence in terms of the short-term effect of recasts and learner uptake with immediate incorporation.

Although it is beyond the scope of the present study, it is surmised that the learners’ immediate incorporation following recasts could be sustained in consecutive interactional turns and in other interactional contexts, supporting the proposition that learner uptake might contribute to L2 acquisition since the practice provided in using items elicited by recasts might help the learners to automatize retrieval of them (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). This is supported by evidence in this study that learners were able to
use target-like forms provided by interlocutors’ recasts in following turns and in different dyadic interactions. Further discussion of the durability of learner uptake with immediate incorporation can be seen in Section 5.2.6.

4.3 MORE FREQUENTLY USED TYPES OF RECASTS

Still addressing the first major research question: How do recasts differ depending on who is providing recasts?, the following section reports on the findings relating to the second sub-question:

What types of recasts are used more frequently in response to non-target-like forms in both peer recasting and teacher recasting?

This question was dealt with by comparing the relative percentage distributions of peer recasting and teacher recasting. The recast type used more frequently according to different types of errors in both T – L and L – L interactions was classified in relation to three recast forms. The following table 4.1 displays descriptive statistics for the relative frequency of recasts in both T – L and L – L interactions in respect to three recast types provided by NNS teacher and NNS peers. It shows possible differences in the number of different types of recasts and the number of recasts NNS interlocutors provided in response to non-target-like utterances NNS learners made.

Table 4.1: The number and percentage of three recast types in T – L & L – L

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recast types</th>
<th>T – L</th>
<th></th>
<th>L – L</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformulation (R)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition + Reformulation (R and R)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap Reformulation (OR)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1 Overall more frequently used type of recast

Table 4.1 indicates that overall the proportion of each recast type used by NNS teacher and NNS peers was not markedly different in both T – L and L – L interactions. Recasts in the form of ‘Reformulation’ comprised the largest proportion of feedback; recast type in the form of ‘Overlap Reformulation’ was the second most frequently used; recast type in the form of ‘Repetition followed by Reformulation’ was the least used type in both interactional settings.

4.3.1.1 Teacher – learner interactions

For the most part, when recasts with correct models occurred in response to learner errors, the majority of recasts provided by NNS teacher were in the form of ‘Reformulation’ (165 – or 71%) while 39 (17%) were ‘Overlap Reformulation’ type recasts, and 27 (12%) were ‘Repetition followed by Reformulation’ type recasts. The teacher predominantly employed recasts in the form of ‘Reformulation’ in response to NNS learners’ non-target-like forms. Reasons why the teacher preferred the ‘Reformulation’ type of recast are discussed in the Discussion Chapter (see section 5.2.3 in Chapter Five).

Excerpt 4.3 – 1 from the recast episode of T1TA shows an example in which the teacher provided ‘R’ recasts several times. The teacher used 84% ‘R’ recasts to student A’s non-target-like utterances of the total recasts in this interaction. In response to student A’s error in the use of article ‘a’ before a singular noun in Lines 17, 19, and 21, the teacher provides recasts in the form of ‘R’ three times. However, student A does not incorporate them successfully. The teacher draws the student’s attention to the form asking again in Line 29. Student A still fails to notice the form and had difficulty in spite of two subsequent recasts. No successful incorporation occurs in A’s response until the teacher provides three recasts for the same error. In this dyadic interaction, the teacher used the
same recasts in the form of ‘R’ continuously for a single error until student A noticed and incorporated the teacher’s recasts successfully.

Excerpt 4.3 – 1 from T1TA: Examples of several teacher Reformulations

16 A:  Yes. .... Do you have rucksack on the sofa?
17 T:  I have a rucksack on the sofa. ❖
18 A:  I have rucksack on the sofa.
19 T:  You have a rucksack. ❖
20 A:  Yeah, yes. On the sofa and two cushions.
21 T:  Uh, okay. You have a rucksack. ❖
22 A:  Rucksack
23 T:  And.
24 A:  And
25 T:  Two cushions
26 A:  Yes.
27 T:  Again? sorry.
28 A:  Yes.
29 T:  What do you have on the sofa?
30 A:  .... I have .. rucksack and two cushion on the, the sofa.
31 T:  A rucksack ❖
32 A:  Yes.
33 T:  A rucksack ❖
34 A:  Rucksack.
35 T:  A rucksack ❖
36 A:  A rucksack
37 T:  Two cushions
38 A:  Yes, two cushions.

4.3.1.2 Learner – learner interactions

Like their teacher, the students used the ‘Reformulation’ recasts more frequently in response to their peer communicative partners’ incorrect utterances. In L – L interactions, 74 (64%) were ‘R’ recasts, 31 (27%) were ‘OR’ recasts, while 11 (9%) were ‘R and R’ recasts. Overall, in both T – L and L – L interactions, the proportion of each recast type was similar even though there was some difference. In particular, with
regard to the proportion of two recast types – ‘R’ and ‘R and R’ – both the teacher and peer interlocutors used 6 and 7 times more recasts respectively in the form of ‘R’ than of ‘R and R’ recast type. The following example shows a ‘Reformulation’ recast type provided by peer interlocutors in L – L interactions.

Excerpt 4.3 – 2 from T1BE: Example of ‘Reformulation’ recast by peer interlocutors

45 B: We are, we are picture same. Um…..I have lamp, I have a lamp on the television.
46 E: Me too, I have a table.., I have.., I have a TV on the lamp.
47 B: No, no, it's same. um … you have.., you have…, you have a lamp on the ___ TV. \u203e
48 E: Ah..., yes, I have lamp on the TV, on the TV.
49 B: Lamp on the TV, no? You have, you have a lamp on the TV. \u203e
50 E: (saying in Korean: I did like that.) I have, lamp on the TV.
51 B: Ah: yes, ha ha ... sorry, sorry, ....... I have a ... sofa.
52 E: Yes, yes, I have sofa. I have ..., I have ..., I have sofa on the two cushions.
53 B: You have .. you have a two cushions on the sofa. \u203e
54 E: Yes, how about you?

......

79 B: It's different. Um....... I have ..., I have a bowl in the drawer.
80 E: yes, I have a ... I have a bowl on the drawer, too. \u203e
81 B: It's same.

As shown in Excerpt 4.3 – 2 from T1BE in L – L interaction, students B and E provide several ‘R’ recasts in response to their interlocutors’ non-target-like forms. In Line 47, student B provides recasts in the form of ‘R’ in response to E’s incorrect word order, ‘I have a TV on the lamp’ in Line 46. Student E tries to incorporate the reformulated word order, but she makes an error in the use of the article ‘a’ before the singular noun ‘lamp’ again in Line 48. Peer interlocutor B provides a recast in the form of ‘R’ in response to the error again as in Line 49, which also is not successfully incorporated by E, who failed to notice the error. This kind of recast type occurred repeatedly between the two students B and E in the subsequent exchanges during their interactions (see Line 53 for
the use of target-like ‘word order’, and Line 80 for the use of an appropriate ‘preposition’).

However, interestingly, in contrast to the finding that peer interlocutors used many more recasts in the form of ‘R’ than ‘R and R’, the students themselves responded differently regarding their perceptions of providing and receiving recasts in debriefing questionnaires conducted immediately after all task activities. That is, over half of the students answered that they preferred to provide ‘OR’ recasts in response to partner’s errors; that they like ‘OR’ recast types because the two corrective features contained in ‘OR’ – ‘confirmation checks’ and ‘providing target-like models’ with rising intonation at the same time – may be helpful for negotiation of target-like forms and meaning by confirming and sharing target language models collaboratively. More detailed discussion of this is addressed in ‘Chapter Five’ (see section 5.2.3).

4.3.2 More frequently used type of recast according to the type of error

Here are considered the relative frequencies of recast use in response to the types of non-target-like utterances: morpho-syntactic, phonological or lexical. Table 4.2 displays the frequencies and percentage of the three recast types used in response to the types of non-target-like forms provided by the teacher in T – L and by peers in L – L interactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recast types</th>
<th>T – L</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>L – L</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and R</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(83%)</td>
<td>(6.4%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(60%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 4 4
4.3.2.1 Teacher – learner interactions

Of 231 recasts provided by the teacher with correct reformulations, the majority (191/83%) were in response to learners’ inaccurate morpho-syntactic forms, while 15 recasts followed phonological errors (6.4%), 12 followed lexical errors (5%), and 13 were for multiple recasts (5.6%) such as phonological and morpho-syntactic errors simultaneously.

In response to morpho-syntactic errors, the teacher more frequently used ‘R’ type recasts (142/191; 74%). ‘R and R’ recasts represented 19/191(10%), and ‘OR’ recasts were 30/191 (16%). Phonological errors did not attract many recasts. There were only 15 recasts for phonological errors in T – L interactions: 5 ‘R’, 6 ‘R and R’ and 4 ‘OR’. The numbers of different recast types did not vary greatly. Inaccurate lexical utterances produced by learners did not provoke many teacher recasts either. Only 12 recasts occurred in teacher recasting in response to lexical errors. Among these, the teacher used ‘R’ type recasts more frequently (7/12, 58%) than in the form of ‘OR’ (3/12, 25%) and ‘R and R’ (2/17, 17%). For multiple errors, the teacher used 11 of 13 (85%) recasts in the form of ‘R’, 2 of 13 (15%) in the form of ‘OR’, and no recasts in the form of ‘R and R’.

4.3.2.2 Learner – learner interactions

In relation to the more frequently used types of recasts in response to the types of errors in L – L interactions, out of 116 recasts provided by peer interlocutors with correct reformulations, more than half (69/60%) were responses to peer learners’ morpho-syntactic errors; whereas 34 were responses to non-target-like lexical utterances (29%); 6 responded to phonological errors (5%); and 7 were multiple recasts (6%) that included
over two reformulations directed towards both lexical and morpho-syntactic errors at the same time.

Out of all the recasts in response to morpho-syntactic non-target-like forms in L – L interactions, 43 of 69 (62.3%) were recasts in the form of ‘R’, 5 of 69 (7.3%) were ‘R and R’ recasts; 21 of 69 (30.4%) were ‘OR’ recasts. In response to phonological errors by learners, there were not many recasts provided by peer interlocutors (only 6 recasts): ‘R and R’ (3/6), ‘R’ (2/6) and ‘OR’ (1/6). ‘R’ was the most commonly used recast form used by peer interlocutors in response to learners’ inaccurate lexical utterances: 25 of 34 (73%) with ‘R’, 3 of 34 (9%) with ‘R and R’ and 6 of 34 (18%) with ‘OR’. For multiple errors, ‘R’ and ‘OR’ recast forms were similarly used by peer interlocutors: 4 of 7 with ‘R’ and 3 of 7 with ‘OR’ recasts. In response to multiple errors, peer interlocutors did not use the form of ‘R and R’ at all.

4.3.2.3 Detailed breakdown of morpho-syntactic errors and recast responses

The following table 4.3 presents the several different types of morpho-syntactic errors that learners made which attracted recasts both in T – L and L – L interactions. These were the use of article, auxiliary verb, plural, word order, ~ing, ‘preposition’, negation, 3rd person singular, pronoun, object-omitted, copula and question-formation. The most frequent morpho-syntactic error related to the use of articles. In T – L interactions, learner errors in the use of the article attracted all three types of recasts: ‘R’ (50 of 142), ‘R and R’ (9 of 19), and ‘OR’ (14 of 30). Peer interlocutors in L – L interactions more frequently provided two types of recasts in response to peer learners’ errors in the use of the article: ‘R’ (12 of 43) and ‘OR’ (8 of 21). The other types of morpho-syntactic errors attracted smaller numbers of recasts of various types from both teacher and student interlocutors, as shown in the table.
Table 4.3: Frequencies of recast types used in response to various types of morpho-syntactic errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>T – L</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>L - L</th>
<th>OR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>R and R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R and R</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MSa (50)</td>
<td>MSa (9)</td>
<td>MSa (14)</td>
<td>1. MSa (12)</td>
<td>MSwo (2)</td>
<td>MSa (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. MSauxi (25)</td>
<td>MSplu (8)</td>
<td>MSing (5)</td>
<td>2. MSpre (11)</td>
<td>MSwo (11)</td>
<td>MSa (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MSwo (18)</td>
<td>MSc (1)</td>
<td>MSauxi (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSneg (1)</td>
<td>MSwo (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MSplu (15)</td>
<td>MSpre (1)</td>
<td>MSing (5)</td>
<td>4. MSplu (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSplu (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MSing (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSquestion-form (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. MSpre (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MSc (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MSa: Morpho-syntactic + article  MSwo: Morpho-syntactic + word order  MSauxi: Morph + auxiliary verb  
MSplu: Morpho-syntactic + plural  MSing: Morpho-syntactic + ing  MSpre: Morpho-syntactic + preposition  
MSneg: Morpho-syntactic + negation  MSc: Morpho-syntactic + copular  
MSquestion-form: Morpho-syntactic + question formation

This section discusses results in relation to the second sub-research question: ‘What types of recasts are used more frequently in response to non-target-like forms in both peer recasting and teacher recasting?’ From the findings, it is apparent that both teacher recasting and peer recasting in the form of ‘R’ were far more oriented to morpho-syntactic errors than phonological and lexical errors. That is, the relative statistics show that the majority of recasts provided by NNS interlocutors were more targeted toward learners’ morpho-syntactic non-target-like forms in both T – L and L – L interactions.

This is similar to the results in NS teacher – NNS learner interactions in French immersion classroom by Lyster (1998a) and Mackey et al. (2000) in which recasts were
more for syntactic (and phonological) errors while negotiation moves reacted to lexical errors. Lyster (1998a) justified this by proposing that NS teachers reacted with recasts for syntactic errors since “syntactic knowledge involves complex system-driven rules that might not be easily retrievable” by learners (p.201). This might also explain the reason for more recasts in response to morpho-syntactic non-target-like forms in the present study. It may also have been caused in this instance by the teacher’s focus on more accurate language use during communicative interactions, evident in both the teacher’s modelling before task activities and during T – L interactions.

In this study, peer interlocutors provided recasts for lexical non-target-like utterances in learner – learner interactions approximately six times more than did the teacher in teacher – learner interactions. This suggests strongly that peer interlocutors were much less tolerant of lexical errors than the teacher. This might be due to the fact that lexical information is considered to be crucial to the successful completion of an information gap task, as for example, perhaps in the following situations. Firstly, the teacher as a more experienced interlocutor in T – L interactions could give lexical information which learners need to negotiate at the point of contextual meaning during her turn before the student’s turn. Secondly, the teacher could better understand the content of communicative contexts that learners wanted to negotiate despite learners’ lexical errors than peer interlocutors in L – L interactions. The teacher might attend more to other features such as grammatical forms.

This is similar to the context in NS – NNS child interactions in Oliver’s (1995) study where recasts occurred in response to errors by the NNS child learner when the content of utterance was transparent but when the form was incorrect. Lastly, compared to the teacher, the students in L – L interactions are less competent interlocutors. Students might have less understanding of communicative contents when their partners uttered non-target-like words or omitted part of lexical items. Thus, they might need more
negotiation of lexical items in order to adjust target-like forms.

Thus, it can be concluded that during NNS – NNS dyadic interactions, more experienced NNS interlocutors may be more tolerant of lexical errors than less experienced ones. This is because more experienced interlocutors may give prior lexical information in their turn before partner’s turn; or they may have more orientation towards negotiation of other linguistic features such as those which are syntactic rather than lexical; or they may have more ability to make sense of the content of conversation involving the learner’s non-target-like lexical utterances during information gap activities.

4.3.3 Summary

The results show that, of the three frequently used types of recasts, overall teacher and peer interlocutors more frequently used ‘R’ recast forms in response to non-target-like utterances in both T – L and L – L interactions. Regarding the provision of recast types according to types of non-target-like forms, the teacher and peer interlocutors provided ‘R’ type recasts more frequently in response to learners’ morpho-syntactic errors in both T – L and L – L interactions. Use of ‘R’ recasts in response to inaccurate morpho-syntactic forms was, however, much greater in teacher recasting in T – L than peer recasting in L – L interactions. ‘R and R’ type recasts in response to morpho-syntactic errors were used in similar proportions in both teacher and peer recasting. The proportion of ‘OR’ type recasts to morpho-syntactic errors provided by peer interlocutors in L – L interactions appeared more than twice as often as those provided by the teacher in T – L interactions. In relation to recasts for morpho-syntactic errors in particular, the majority of the teacher’s recasts were in response to learners’ non-target-like use of the article. The teacher mainly used three types of recasts for learners’ use of non-target-like forms of the article. Peer interlocutors also used all three types of recasts
in response to peer learners’ errors in the use of the article.

In terms of phonological errors, the proportions of the three types of recasts provided were not greatly different between peer recasting in L – L and teacher recasting in T – L interactions. However, in terms of the proportion of recasts in response to lexical errors, it was noticeable that peer interlocutors in L – L interactions provided many more recasts than the teacher did in T – L interactions. Peer interlocutors, in particular, used ‘R’ recasts most frequently in response to lexical errors. This contrasts with Oliver’s finding (1995) that NS child interlocutors provided recasts most frequently to NNS children’s grammatical errors, and least frequently to lexical errors. Further discussion is presented in section 5.2.1 in Chapter Five.

4.4 LEARNER UPTAKE IN RELATION TO WHO IS PROVIDING RECASTS

With regard to the second major research question: *What is the relationship between recasts and uptake?*, this section reports on the findings relating to the first sub-question.

*Does the extent of learner uptake differ depending on who is providing recasts (peer/teacher)?*

To address this research question, this section details the findings on the extent NNS learners immediately incorporate recasts provided by the NNS teacher and by NNS peers; and the extent of learners’ successful repairs according to types of non-target-like forms following both recast providers.

4.4.1 The extent of immediate incorporation

First, the aspect of learner uptake was addressed in terms of the extent of immediate incorporation depending on who is providing recasts. Learner uptake with successful immediate incorporation is defined as learner repair of errors incorporating the recasts
with immediate repetition or repetition with longer expansion. Partially repaired learner uptake was considered as unsuccessful uptake following Lyster (1998a). Table 4.4 shows the total numbers and percentages of learner uptakes following teacher recasts in T – L and peer recasts in L – L interactions.

Table 4.4: Overall learner uptake following NNS interlocutor recasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th></th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T – L (n=231)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L – L (n=116)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1.1 Teacher – learner interactions

Out of a total of 231 accurate recasts in T – L interactions, there were 137 instances of immediate incorporation (59% of total teacher recasts) considered as successful uptake with repairs and 94 instances of unsuccessful learner uptake (41% of total teacher recasts). Among successful repairs, three recast forms generated different proportions of successful repairs as shown in Figure 4.1.

![Figure 4.1: Percentage distribution of successful uptake according to three recast types in T – L](image)
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Teacher recasts in the form of ‘R and R’ invited the largest proportion of successful repair by learners (74%), while the other two types of teacher recasts, ‘R’ and ‘OR’ invited a similar proportion of successful repair (58% and 56% respectively). The example of immediate incorporation after teacher recasts is reflected in Excerpt 4.4 – 1 below, which was cited above in section 4.2.1.

Excerpt 4.4 – 1 from T1TJ: Example of successful uptake in response to T’s recasts

18 T: Umm. I have two cushions on the sofa.
19 J: Only two. I . I have.. sofa, I cushion two.
20 T: Two cushions
21 J: [Two cushions
22 T: On the sofa
23 J: On the sofa, two...
24 T: Two cushions
25 J: Yes, two cushions
26 T: Okay.

In this excerpt, the teacher provides two phrase level recasts in response to student J’s multiple non-target-like language use in Line 19: one is in reaction to non-target-like ‘preposition’, and the other one to a missing ‘plural morpheme’. After the teacher’s recast modeling the target-like use of ‘plural morpheme’ in Line 20, Student J incorporates the recast immediately – even before the teacher has finished recasting, as seen in Line 21. Again, the teacher provides the second recast in the form of ‘R’ with more information on the use of target-like ‘preposition’ by saying “on the sofa”. Following this, Student J incorporates it successfully in Line 23.

4.4.1.2 Learner – learner interactions

The findings on L – L interactions presented in Table 4.4 represent 70 instances of successful repair followed peer recasts (60%) out of a total 116 accurate recasts with learner uptake. More than half of the recasts were followed by successful incorporation, which was almost the same as in T – L interactions (see Table 4.4). In addition, of the
total successful learner repairs, recasts in the form of ‘R and R’ provided by peers resulted in the largest proportion of successful repair (82%) compared to the other two types of recasts (see Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.2: Percentage distribution of successful uptake according to three recast types in L – L

The following segment in Excerpt 4.4 – 2 presents an example of learner uptake with immediate incorporation of peer recasts. In response to student A’s non-target-like pronunciation of consonant /l/ instead of /r/, peer interlocutor H reacts by providing a recast in the form of ‘R’ in Line 24. Following peer H’s recast, learner A immediately incorporates it in Line 25. In Line 28, Student H again provides a recast in the form of ‘R and R’ with rising intonation which may be used to signal error and make the recasts noticeable. This recast is successfully incorporated by learner A in Line 29.

Excerpt 4.4 – 2 from TIHA: Example of successful repair in response to peer recasts

23 A: No, I have not luksæk /lʌksæk/.
24 H: Rucksack /rʌksæk/ ▸
25 A: Rucksack /rʌksæk/
26 H: Yes.
27 A: Rucksack
28 H: I have a ..., have not RUCKSACK ▸ I don't have A RUCKSACK, ▸ okay?
A: I don’t have a rucksack.

The extent of immediate incorporation following interlocutors’ recasts is similar in both T – L and L – L interactions; about 60% successful repair and 40% unsuccessful repair. In addition to the relationship between successful repair and types of non-target-like forms, the study shows that learners responded more successfully to recasts for phonological and lexical non-target-like utterances in both T – L and L – L interactions. As can be seen in Table 4.5, although recast episodes containing phonological and lexical errors occurred less frequently than those of morpho-syntactic errors in both T – L and L – L interactions, the proportion of successful repair after recasts for these types of errors was much higher than for morpho-syntactic errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-target-like forms</th>
<th>T – L</th>
<th>L – L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>106/191</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>13/15</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>9/13</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To recap: As discussed earlier, both the teacher and student interlocutors provided most recasts in the form of ‘R’. This was followed by ‘OR’ recast forms and the least provided form was ‘R and R’. However, in contrast to the total provision of recast types, the proportion of recasts resulting in successful repair was reversed for recast forms ‘R’ and ‘R and R’. That is, recasts in the form of ‘R and R’ resulted in more successful repairs than ‘R’ recasts in both T – L and L – L interactions (see Figures 4.1 and 4.2).
This result supports Doughty and Varela (1998)’s argument that if recasts include an attentional source with emphasis such as repetition of learner errors with rising intonation, they are more likely to draw learners’ attention to form and corrective feedback, thereby initiating more successful repair after those recasts.

The result showed that phonological and lexical recasts by students and by the teacher generated higher proportion of successful repairs, although the number of such recast episodes was far less than recast episodes for morpho-syntactic errors in both T – L and L – L interactions. Why then, despite their considerably less frequent use, did phonological and lexical recasts generate more successful learner repairs during NNS – NNS interactions?

Firstly, the cognitive processes involved in the retrieval of lexical items are less complex and easier than accessing grammar rules (Lyster, 1998a). Learners’ perceptions about recasts support this view in the present study. For example, learners in L – L interactions had less confidence in their own grammatical knowledge as well as that of peer interlocutors as shown in their answers to debriefing questionnaires conducted immediately after all task activities (see Question 8 in Table 3.10 in section 3.8.4.3). This might result in less successful repair after morpho-syntactic recasts even though they received target-like models through recasts from their interlocutors. In T – L interactions, although learners were more confident of and believed in the teacher’s grammatical knowledge, as shown in the debriefing questionnaires, they might not have been able to incorporate teacher recasting into their uptake successfully due to failure in noticing them.

Secondly, learners were more used to listening to their interlocutors’ recasts for phonological errors since they share the same L1. In addition, since recasts for lexical errors might be important to understand the contents of communication and to complete
task activities, it could possibly be presumed that learners were more alert to recasts for target-like lexical models. This might resulted in more successful repair. Thus, it may be concluded that interactional contexts whether NS – NNS or NNS – NNS are closely interconnected with immediate incorporation after recasts in response to different error types.

With regard to research question 2a) – ‘Does the extent of learner uptake differ depending on who is providing recasts (peer/teacher)?’ – the results showed that overall, both teacher recasting and peer recasting generated similar patterns of learner uptake in terms of successful and unsuccessful repair. In the relative quantitative analysis, recasts provided by both the teacher in T – L and peers in L – L interactions invited around 60% of successful repair and 40% of unsuccessful repair. Overall, a higher percentage of successful learner uptake was generated after recasts provided by NNS interlocutors than unsuccessful learner uptake. Both teacher recasting and peer recasting appeared to be effective for EFL learners in negotiation of form for more target-like linguistic forms in communicative interactions.

However, the percentage of unsuccessful uptake (40%) is still quite a large proportion, and this has an implication in terms of pedagogical effectiveness and efficiency of recasts in form-focused EFL communicative contexts. One of the factors that has triggered a higher percentage of unsuccessful learner uptake may be that both the teacher and peer interlocutors predominantly reacted in the form of ‘R’ in response to learners’ erroneous utterances. That is, as indicated (section 4.4.1 in Chapter Four), the results show that in both T – L and L – L interactions, ‘R’ recasts invited far less successful immediate incorporation than ‘R and R’ recasts which included emphasis on learner errors with repetition and rising intonation.

Depending on differences in negotiation strategies in the provision and use of recasts in
response to learner errors, recasts as corrective feedback tended to influence the degree of successful learner repair in the present study. Thus, rather than using a less salient recast such as ‘R’ recast type, more salient recasts such as ‘R and R’ type with repetition with rising intonation are more recommended as corrective feedback in EFL form-focused classroom interactions.

In addition, recasts by teacher and peers in response to morpho-syntactic non-target-like forms resulted in a greater proportion of immediate incorporation (successful repair) by EFL learners in this study. This is contrary to the results for NS – NNS interactions by Lyster (1998a) and Mackey et al. (2000), and for NNS – NNS interactions by Morris (2002). That is, in Lyster (1998a) and Mackey et al. 2000, the NS teacher’s implicit negative feedback in the form of recasts was less accurately perceived by ESL learners as feedback on morpho-syntactic errors than feedback on lexical and phonological error. In addition, Morris (2002) reports the results that although NNS Spanish learners provided recasts in response to syntactic errors the most, the percentage proportion of learner repairs of syntactic errors receiving recasts was ‘zero’ in NNS learner – NNS learner interactions. Unlike learners in both dyadic interactions with NS – NNS and NNS – NNS dyadic interactions in ESL and immersion classrooms (Lyster, 1998a; Mackey et al., 2000; Morris, 2002), EFL learners in interactions with both the NNS teacher and NNS peers in this study apparently incorporated recasts for morpho-syntactic errors to a much greater extent. This might be caused by EFL contextual situations where learners have been more used to learning grammatical rules during classroom instruction in their secondary schooling, thereby becoming more capable of responding to recasts for syntactic errors.

4.5 THE NATURE OF UPTAKE AFFECTED BY THE NATURE OF RECASTS

With regard to the second major research question: What is the relationship between
recasts and uptake?, this section now reports on the findings relating to the second sub-question:

*How is the nature of uptake affected by the nature of recasts?*

This question relates to how the nature of uptake was affected by the nature of recasts provided by NNS interlocutors in both T – L and L – L interactions. In order to address the question, the nature of learner uptake is examined in terms of the frequency of recasts, the saliency of recasts, and the length of recasts.

**4.5.1 Learner uptake and the frequency of recasts**

The nature of learner uptake appeared to be influenced by the frequency of recasts. In order to address this issue, recast episodes were codified into two categories: single recast episode with one recast; and extended recast episode with repeated recasts in both T – L and L – L interactions.

**4.5.1.1 Teacher – learner interactions**

In T – L interactions, recasts used by the teacher consisted of both single recasts and extended recasts with repeated recasts referring to one specific non-target-like utterance. In repeated recasting by the teacher, the repetition did not necessarily result in successful uptake but often had the effect of making students confused as they appeared not to perceive subsequent recasts as corrective feedback but as meaning exchange. Excerpt 4.5 – 1 from T1TA shows an example of lack of learner uptake in response to the teacher’s repeated recasts, which initiated learner uptake in Line 38 after providing recasts three times.

Excerpt 4.5 – 1 from T1TA

31 T:  What do you have on the sofa?
32 A:  ….. I have .. rucksack and two cushion on the, the sofa.
33 T: A rucksack
34 A: Yes.
35 T: A rucksack
36 A: Rucksack.
37 T: A rucksack
38 A: A rucksack
39 T: Two cushions
40 A: Yes, two cushions.

In this episode, as can be seen, the teacher provides four recasts in response to a single error by student A. In Line 32, student A produces two non-target-like forms in the use of the indefinite article before ‘rucksack’ and in the use of the plural morpheme ‘-s’ at the end of the word ‘cushion’. The teacher provides recasts three times in the form of ‘Reformulation’ (in Lines 33, 35, and 37) in response to A’s non-target-like form, ‘rucksack’ in Line 32, until A produces a correct form using the indefinite article, ‘a rucksack’ in Line 38. However, the teacher’s first and second recasts (Lines 33 and 35) in the form of ‘R’ did not seem to be perceived as corrective recasting as there is no evidence of immediate incorporation. The first two recasts are interpreted by the learner as a form of confirmation of message. It is only after the third recast that student A notices it and incorporates it successfully in Line 37.

In the same way, the teacher provides repeated recasts with three recasts in the following pair work (see Excerpt 4.5 – 2). It is apparent that student K does not perceive the teacher’s endeavour as corrective feedback. The teacher provides recasts three times (Lines 63, 65 and 67) in response to the omission of an article that K makes repeatedly (Lines 62, 64, 66 and 70) in this episode. Eventually the teacher continues to a different topic.

Excerpt 4.5 – 2 from T2TK
61 T: Okay, do you have a swing?
62 K: Yes, I have swing.
63 T: You have a swing. ∨
64 K: Swing, I have swing.
65 T: You have a swing. ∨
66 K: Swing
67 T: You have a swing. ∨ right?
68 K: Yeah,
69 T: Um ……
70 K: Yes, I have swing.
71 T: Um.. uh, I have two girls swinging. Do you have two girls swinging?

4.5.1.2 Learner – learner interactions

In contrast to the teacher recasts in the T – L interactions that included many more repeated recasts, there were few repeated recasts used by peer interlocutors in L – L interactions. No recasts with over three repetitions were found in peer recasting. In a few repeated recasts with two recasts used by peer interlocutors, the peer recasters tended to ignore their partner’s unsuccessful repair following the recast, and shifted to another topic. Thus, extended recasts used by peer interlocutors did not result in elicitng successful learner repair. Excerpt 4.5 – 3 shows an example of an extended recast used by peer interlocutors which did not result in successful uptake.

Excerpt 4.5 – 3 from T1BE

46 E: Me too, I have a table.., I have.., I have a TV on the lamp.
47 B: No, no, it’s same. Um … you have.., you have…,
you have a lamp on the TV. ∨
48 E: Ah.., yes, I have lamp on the TV, on the TV.
49 B: Lamp on the TV, ∨ no? You have, you have A lamp on the TV. ∨
50 E: (saying in Korean: I did like that.) I have,, lamp on the TV.
51 B: Ah: yes, ha ha … sorry, sorry. …….. I have a … sofa.
52 E: Yes, yes, I have sofa. I have .., I have …, I have sofa on the two cushions.

In Line 47, student B provides the first recast in the form of ‘R’ in response to peer E’s error in the use of word order (Line 46). However, student E responds by amending the
word order, but now she omitted the indefinite ‘a’ before ‘lamp’ (Line 48). After that, peer interlocutor B provides another recast in the form of ‘R and R’ (Line 49) in relation to the use of the indefinite article ‘a’ before ‘lamp’, but peer E still does not notice the recast and does not incorporate it into the utterance. It is also apparent that student E seems to notice peer B’s recast as corrective feedback and thought that she has repaired it by saying, “I did like that” in Korean, but in fact, she does not appear to notice it or is confused in the situation of receiving corrective recasts.

Excerpt 4.5 – 4 from T3JY shows an example of unsuccessful repair after a peer’s repeated efforts. In Line 98, peer interlocutor J provides his first recast in the form of ‘OR’ in response to a non-target-like scrambled sentence uttered by learner Y. However, this first recast is not incorporated successfully by peer Y. Rather than incorporating the target-like language form, indefinite article ‘a’, student Y may have interpreted the recast as a confirmation of the message, i.e., the location of the lamp. Peer J provides his second recast in the form of ‘R’ in Line 100. Again, after J’s second recast, Y responds by saying “Only lamp?” in Line 101, indicating that he interprets the recast as an information move.

Excerpt 4.5 – 4 from T3JY

97 Y: My picture… radio and lamp. Radio, pipe, glasses, lamp on the take
desk. On the table, on the table, .. repeat, radio, pipe, glasses and lamp

98 J: Lamp on the table? ✔

99 Y: On the, on the table

100 J: Um., my picture, there is a lamp on the table. ▼

101 Y: Only lamp?

4.5.1.3 Repeated recasts in response to multiple errors

When the teacher provided repeated recasts with different forms, learners responded differently in their uptake. In the following segment from T4TF, Excerpt 4.5 – 5, the
teacher provides a sentence-level recast in response to student F’s multiple errors including morpho-syntactic non-target-like forms (the use of unnecessary indefinite article ‘a’ for a plural noun and redundant auxiliary verb ‘are’ before ‘playing with a ball’). The teacher provides the same recasts seven times in response to F’s non-target-like utterances (Lines, 123, 125, 127, 129, 131, 133, and 135), until F incorporates the recasts into her successful repair in a full sentence in Line 136. In this recast episode, the teacher uses recasts in mixed forms such as ‘R’ recast form (Lines 123, 125, 133, and 135) and ‘OR’ recast form (Lines 127, 129 and 131). This time, the teacher’s extended recasts may be seen as attempts to draw the student’s attention to linguistic forms and corrective functions by using different recast forms, thereby prompting immediate incorporation.

Excerpt 4.5 – 5 from T4TF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>F: I have a two children are playing with a ball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>T: You have two children playing with a ball. 🗣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>F: I have a two children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>T: You have two children. 🗣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>F: Yes, I have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>T: You have two children? 🗣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>F: ....... I have two children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>T: You have two children....You have two children? 🗣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>F: Yes, I have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>T: You have two children? 🗣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>F: Pplaying with a ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>T: Playing with a ball? Um. You have two children playing with a ball. 🗣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>F: I have a two children playing with a ball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>T: You have two children playing with a ball. 🗣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>F: I have two children playing with a ball.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On one hand, Excerpt 4.5 – 5 indicates that the teacher’s repeated recasts can to be effective in drawing the learner’s attention to form and corrective function when they are provided with consistency. That is, the teacher’s repeated recast in the form of ‘OR’
in Line 131 appears to function as an elicitation and a signal for student F to incorporate another target-like form in the use of the redundant auxiliary verb ‘are’ in F’s original utterance in Line 122. This results in successful learner repair in saying “playing with a ball” (Line 132). As previously indicated by Mackey et al. (2000), repeated recasts in response to learner errors in the above excerpt are more likely to clearly convey its corrective intention and to be effective in generating successful learner repair. Thus, it can be concluded that when interlocutors provide repeated recasts, using different types of recasts is more likely to draw EFL learners’ attention and to help them to notice and incorporate recasts into successful repair. This facilitates a successful learner repair at full sentence level in response to multiple errors contained in one learner turn. Different types of recasts for more effective negotiation strategies will include reformulations with constant confirming (eg., ‘OR’ type recast) and elicitation (eg., ‘R’ type recast) or repetition of error with emphasis (eg., ‘R and R’ type recast).

On the other hand, however, the situation of the teacher providing repeated recasts in response to multiple errors made in one learner’s turn appeared to cause learner confusion whether they were for the negotiation of meaning or providing corrective feedback for target-like form. As can be seen in the above excerpt, the teacher provides recasts in two parts in response to student F’s two types of errors (see Lines 122 to 128 for the first part, and Lines 129 to 136 for the second part). The teacher provides recasts three times (Lines 123, 125, and 127) in response to student F’s first non-target-like form in the use of ‘a’ before the plural ‘two children’, until F incorporates them into successful repair in Line 128. During the recast episode occurring, for example, in Line 126, student F responds to meaning rather than recognizing an error in form after the teacher’s second recasting in Line 125 by saying, “Yes, I have.” Again, although F shows evidence of successful incorporation in Line 128, the teacher provides recasts to confirm F’s noticing recasts for target-like forms using the ‘OR’ type recast in Line 129. This repeated teacher recast again appears to be interpreted by student F as a confirmation check of meaning. Thus, F responds by saying, “Yes, I have.” This kind of
communicative strategy of providing repeated recasts to draw learner attention can influence learners’ cognitive processing for interlanguage restructuring of linguistic form and meaning.

To summarize, the teacher in T – L interactions provided more repetition of recasts in response to a single error, resulting in eventual uptake by learners, than peer interlocutors in L – L interactions. However, although providing repeated recasts with several recasts or using different forms of recasts were beneficial to some learners, they were not effective for others since repetitive recasts tended to confuse learners who saw them as simple repetition or confirmation of the prior utterance or as another conversational move. The quality of recast even in a single turn appears to be more important than the frequency of the recasts provided. That is, regardless of the frequency of recasts, how recasts are provided may be more crucial in eliciting successful learner uptake.

4.5.2 Learner uptake and the length of recasts

It was evident that learner uptake was affected by the length of recasts. That is, shorter recasts at word level or phrase level were more likely to make learners notice the recasts with immediate successful repair than longer recasts at the sentence level. In both T – L and L – L interactions, similar results were found in terms of more noticing and immediate incorporation following recasts at shorter level.

4.5.2.1 Teacher – learner interactions

It was found that the teacher provided recasts by dividing a sentence level into two or three phrase levels. When the teacher provided a longer recast in response to learner O’s non-target-like form in the use of sentence order in Line 92, learner O could not incorporate them successfully (see Line 94 in Excerpt 4.5 – 6). However, when the
teacher used extended recasts divided into shorter phrase levels, learners were more likely to notice and incorporate them successfully than recasts at the sentence level, as exemplified in the following recast episodes in Excerpt 4.5 – 6 from T2TO.

Excerpt 4.5 – 6 from T2TO

92 O: Big tree, in the garden, big tree.
93 T: There is a big tree in the garden. ◄
94 O: Ah.. yes, there is a garden in the big tree.
95 T: There is a big tree= ◄
96 O: Ah.. there is a..
97 T: =in the garden. ◄
98 O: There is a big tree in the garden.

......

113 T: All right. ... Do you have a girl who is playing with a ball in the middle of the picture? Do you have?
114 O: Yes, I have, ... middle of the picture,
115 T: You have a girl ◄
116 O: I have a girl.
117 T: In the middle of the picture. ◄
118 O: I have a girl in the middle of the picture.

In the first recast episode of Excerpt 4.5 – 6, the teacher starts by modeling a complete target-like sentence in response to student O’s non-target-like phrase level utterances (Line 93). Student O appears to notice it saying “ah..yes”, and tries to incorporate the modeling, but it is still non-target-like in terms of word order (Line 94). After that, the teacher provides extended recasts with two split parts (Lines 95 and 97), which are incorporated by student O in a full sentence (Line 98). In a similar manner, in the second recast episode, the target of the teacher recast is the whole sentence. The teacher provides a recast in Line 115 in response to student O’s utterance, “yes, I have ...middle of the picture” (Line114). Although student O omits the object ‘a girl’, her utterance appears to be target-like. However, since the teacher’s goal of the recast is a complete sentence, the teacher provides her first recast by providing the object item, ‘a girl’,
which is incorporated by O immediately. The second recast for the prepositional phrase, ‘in the middle of the picture’ (Line 117) is provided by the teacher again. Lastly, student O utters a target-like complete sentence incorporating the two parts of the teacher’s recasts.

4.5.2.2 Learner – learner interactions

In a similar fashion, successful immediate repair by the learner benefited from peer recasts at a shorter level. However, the provision of recasts at a shorter level in L – L interactions showed slightly different patterns from T – L interactions. That is, unlike the teacher recasts, students tended to use shorter recasts to target a specific error. This seemed to elicit more noticing and successful immediate repair by peer learners. Below are found instances of such recasts in L – L interactions.

Excerpt 4.5 – 7 from T4KS

8 K: Yes. Around, around the pond, a mother, a mother pushes the baby carriage.
9 S: In my picture, um..around the pond, mother, carriage, carriage?
10 K: Baby carriage ✓
11 S: Mother push
12 K: Push, pushes ✓
13 S: Mother pushes baby carriage, too. ….

As shown in Excerpt 4.5 – 7, peer interlocutor K provides a word level recast for a target-like lexical item ‘baby carriage’ (see underlined 10) in response to student S’s non-target-like lexical choice in Line 9. Also, K provides the second word level recast (see underlined 12) in response to peer S’s non-target-like use of the 3rd person singular verb ‘mother push’ in Line 11. Peer interlocutor K’s two recasts at word level appear to be effective for the peer learner to notice and incorporate since S successfully incorporates them in Line 13. Although S’s immediate incorporation is not fully target-
like because she omits the indefinite article ‘a’ before a single noun ‘baby carriage’, peer K’s two recasts targeting errors at word level contribute to peer S’s successful repair of the two errors that she made. It is apparent that peer interlocutors’ recasts at the word level are more likely to elicit successful repair.

Similarly, in the following recast episode in Excerpt 4.5 – 8, peer interlocutor B provides a recast at the sentence level (see underlined 77) in response to peer E’s prior utterance with non-target-like ‘word order’ saying “I have sofa under slippers, too.”, although it still has a non-target-like form. Peer B’s sentence level recast is not incorporated by E successfully. Peer interlocutor B then provides the second recast at shorter phrase level focusing on the erroneous part for target-like word order saying “slippers under” (see underlined 79). Student E now successfully incorporates the target-like word order into her utterance (‘slippers under sofa’) even though it is still non-target-like in form, missing the definite article ‘the’ before ‘sofa’. The second recast at the shorter level provided by peer interlocutor B appears to have elicited a successful repair.

Excerpt 4.5 – 8 from T3BE

75 B: I have a book under sofa. I have slippers under the sofa.
76 E: Yes, I have sofa under slippers, too.
77 B: You have a slippers under sofa?
78 E: Yes, I have sofa.
79 B: Slippers under
80 E: Slippers under sofa, too. I have slippers under sofa, too.

The results show that both teacher recasts and peer recasts at a shorter level tended to foster more noticing and successful learner repair than recasts at the longer level. In particular, when the purpose of her recasts was to elicit immediate incorporation of a target-like complete sentence from learners, the teacher tried to provide recasts splitting
them into two or three parts more than peer interlocutors did. The teacher tended to provide shorter recasts several times until the learner incorporated them successfully. Unlike the teacher, however, peer interlocutors appeared to provide recasts focusing on only the error part at a shorter level such as the word or two-word phrase level, otherwise they just carried on when peer learners did not notice and incorporate the recasts.

It is clear that shorter level recasts were more likely to benefit for learners to notice them as corrective feedback and generated more learner uptake. This result gives evidence to support the argument from previous studies that when recasts have been shortened, they are beneficial for learners to notice the corrective quality (Philp, 2003), thereby initiate more learner uptake (Sheen, 2004).

4.5.3 Learner uptake and the saliency of recasts

It is apparent that the saliency of recasts relates to the nature of learner uptake in NNS – NNS interactions. This is discussed in terms of three different types of recasts, since each recast form used and provided by NNS interlocutors in the present study has a characteristic saliency.

4.5.3.1 Learner uptake following ‘R’ recasts

As discussed in the Literature Review (Chapter Two), recasts in the form of ‘Reformulation’ (R) are usually believed to be less salient than the other recast forms since they do not include a signal to draw the learner’s attention. ‘R’ recasts that provide target-like models with falling intonation are regarded as less salient than those with rising intonation (Hatch, 1983) since falling intonation is not a nucleus accent for
signaling semantic and phonetic focus (Alan, 1997). In this study, teacher and peer interlocutors provided and used ‘R’ recasts most among the three recast forms. However, as shown in Figures 4.1 and 4.2, they did not generate immediate incorporation to the same degree when compared with the total number of recast provisions. This may have been due to the fact that ‘R’ recasts were likely to be perceived as agreement with and confirmation of information about a previous utterance, or mere repetition.

In the following excerpt 4.5 – 9, previously discussed in section 4.4.1, the response by student A following the teacher’s ‘R’ recasts provides a good example. In this interaction, the teacher provides ‘R’ recast forms three times in response to student A’s non-target-like form in the use of indefinite article ‘a’ (Lines 39, 41, and 43). It is clear that the student does not notice the difference between his non-target-like utterance and the target-like form. In student A’s first response (Line 40), he fails to incorporate the teacher’s recast successfully, still omitting indefinite article ‘a’, but his responses (Lines 42 and 44) indicates that the learner takes the teacher’s responses as a request for additional information. In Line 42, the student responds by providing further information about the location of the ‘rucksack’. In Line 44, the student merely repeats the word to confirm the message.

Excerpt 4.5 – 9 from T1TA

38 A: Yes. . . . . Do you have **rucksack** on the the sofa?
39 T: I have **a rucksack** on the sofa. 
40 A: I **have rucksack** on the sofa.
41 T: You have **a rucksack**.
42 A: **Yeah, yes, on the sofa and two cushions.**
43 T: Uh, okay. You have a rucksack.
44 A: **Rucksack**
45 T: **And.**
46 A: **And.**
47 T: **Two cushions**
As can be seen in the case of T – L interactions, students in L – L interactions show the same response following peer interlocutors’ recasts in the form of ‘R’. That is, ‘R’ recasts in peer – peer dyads were likely to be perceived as confirmation of information being sought by partners. In the following segment, two learners, B and E provide ‘R’ recasts in response to their partners’ non-target-like forms. First, after student B’s ‘R’ recast in relation to target-like ‘word order’ (Line 21), student E responds by saying “yes, there is, yes, there is...” in Line 22. Student E also provides an ‘R’ recast in response to learner B’s non-target-like form in the use of ‘preposition’ (Line 80). After peer interlocutor E’s ‘R’ recast, student B reacts by saying “it’s same” in Line 81. Both learner responses following peer interlocutors’ recasts in the form of ‘R’ can be seen as confirmation and request for additional information by peer interlocutors.

Excerpt 4.5 – 10 from T1BE

19 B: You have not guide, guide book on the table?
20 E: Um.... I don't have on the table, guide book.
21 B: Oh: I have, you have not guide book on the table. \n22 E: Yes, there is, yes, there is .......
    ...
79 B: It's different. Um...... I have ...., I have a bowl in the drawer.
80 E: Yes, I have a .... I have a bowl on the drawer, too. \n81 B: It's same.

As discussed so far, the results show that recasts in the form of ‘R’ appeared to be a less salient way of recasting since they involve falling intonation, and thereby were less likely to be perceived as corrective feedback. In the study, ‘R’ recasts tended to be perceived as a means of seeking information, thereby initiating less successful repair compared to their total number of provision.
4.5.3.2 More ‘successful repair’ following ‘R and R’ recasts

Recasts in the form of ‘Repetition followed by Reformulation’ (R and R) are considered to be more salient for eliciting immediate incorporation by L2 learners than the other two forms of recasts. As discussed earlier in the Literature Review (see Chapter Two), ‘R and R’ recasts consist of repetition of error with rising intonation for emphasis followed by the correct model. Repetition of erroneous forms with a rising intonation and provision of the correct model can give a signal highlighting the location of an error, thereby enhancing the students’ noticing of mismatches between target-like forms and non-target-like utterances (Doughty & Varela, 1998). Since noticing recasts is one of the essential conditions for learner uptake (Schmidt, 1990), this may be what makes ‘R and R’ recasts so useful for learners to incorporate the recasts successfully.

Thus, as shown earlier in section 4.4.1, in this study the highest percentage distribution of successful repair occurred after recasts in the form of ‘R and R’ in both T – L (74%) and L – L interactions (82%). The following excerpts show that ‘R and R’ recasts appeared to be noticed better and initiated more successful repair by learners than ‘R’ recast forms in both T – L and L – L interactions. In the episode from Excerpt 4.5 – 11, the teacher provides two different forms of recasts in response to student O’s non-target-like form in the use of the unnecessary indefinite article ‘a’ before plural noun ‘five birds’. One is an ‘R’ recast form (Line 47) and the other is an ‘R and R’ recast form (Lines 49 and 51). As shown in the excerpt, the ‘R’ recast does not elicit successful repair from learner O. However, teacher’s second recast in the form of ‘R and R’ generates immediate successful repair by student O in Line 52.

Excerpt 4.5 – 11 from T2TO

44 O: Um... yes., I same. Uh... I have a five birds.
45 T: In the garden?
46 O: Ah ... ye, yes, in the garden.
47 T: Um .... you have five birds.
48 O: Yes ..., I have a ..., in the garden ..., I have a five birds.
49 T: Have A five birds?-
50 O: I have a five birds.
51 T: Have five BIRDS.
52 O: Ah ..., have five birds.

Subsequently, as can be seen in the following Excerpt 4.5 – 12, the teacher provides two different forms of recast in response to student J’s non-target-like form in the use of ‘article’. The first one is recast in the form of ‘R’ (Line 85) and the second one is recast in the form of ‘R and R’ (Lines 87 and 89). The first ‘R’ recast form does not result in successful repair, while the second ‘R and R’ recast form initiates immediate successful repair by learner J.

Excerpt 4.5 – 12 from T1TJ
84 J: Oh, no, I haven't. I haven't briefcase.
85 T: You haven't a briefcase.
86 J: I haven't briefcase.
87 T: Um. You haven't ... BRIEFCASE?
88 J: Yes
89 T: You haven't A BRIEFCASE.
90 J: I haven't a briefcase.

The ‘R and R’ recast form provided by peer interlocutors in L – L interactions also appears to be a more effective way to generate successful learner repair. In the following episode (Excerpt 4.5 – 13) from learner – learner dyadic interaction, peer interlocutor H provides recasts in the form of ‘R and R’ in response to peer learner A’s non-target-like form. Peer interlocutor H provides two recasts in the form of ‘R and R’ for the accurate use of the article (Line 21) and pronunciation (Line 39). The repetition of the erroneous form in ‘R and R’ recasts provided by Peer interlocutor H serves as an indicator to signal the occurrence of the error. This prompts the learner to notice the difference between his non-target-like utterance and the target-like form provided by
peer interlocutor H’s ‘R and R’ recast.

Excerpt 4.5 – 13 from T1HA

16 A: No, I have not luksac /luksæk/.
17 H: Rucksack /rʌksæk/...
18 A: Rucksack /rʌksæk/
19 A: Rucksack
20 H: I have a ..., have not RUCKSACK? I don't have A RUCKSACK, okay?
21 A: I don’t have a rucksack.

...  
35 H: Okay, I have a bowl, bowl on the drawer. Do you have it?
36 A: Yes, I have /bəʊl/ on the drawer.
37 H: /bəʊl/?
38 A: Ah .. I have a ...
39 H: I have a BOWL /bou/l/  BOWL /bou/l/ ...
40 A: Bowl /bou/l/

It is clear that in both T – L and L – L interactions, recasts in the form of ‘R and R’ appeared more effective in generating successful learner repair as they are more salient and are more likely to draw students’ attention to the difference between their utterances and target-like forms. Both repetition with rising intonation of the erroneous form and providing target-like examples conveyed with ‘R and R’ recasts proved to be far more useful to EFL learners in communicative interactions that are oriented towards linguistic features.

4.5.3.3 More ‘null response’ following ‘OR’ recasts

Recasts in the form of ‘Overlap Reformulation’ (OR) are regarded as an ambiguous form of recast and thus are less likely to generate successful learner repair. As Oliver (2000) argues, ‘OR’ recasts are generally considered as a form of negotiation move since ‘OR’ recasts comprise moves that function both as confirmation check and reformulation when they are modulated with rising intonation. Thus, the ‘OR’ recasts
may make the interlocutor’s intention difficult to interpret.

As indicated, this study found relatively fewer provisions of recasts in the form of ‘OR’ than ‘R’. There were also different results in learner uptake for the two forms in terms of ‘null response’ in both T – L and L – L interactions (see Figure 4.3). Recasts in the form of ‘OR’ generated the largest proportion of null responses such as ‘yes’, ‘no’ or ‘silence’ among the three types of recasts in both teacher recasting and peer recasting.
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**Figure 4.3: Percentage distribution of null response according to three recast Types**

With regard to the percentage distributions of ‘null response’ according to the three types of recasts, teacher recasting in the form of ‘OR’ caused many more null responses than peer recasting in the form of ‘OR’. The apparent reason for this was that the teacher’s recasts mostly included reformulations with prolongation (oh:), clarification (you mean..) and rising intonation which seemed to confirm the content of the learners’ prior utterances. This suggests that teacher recasts in the form of ‘OR’ might have been too ambiguous for students to perceive them as corrective feedback. Learners may have interpreted the recasts as a confirmation of prior learner utterances. This may be because the ‘OR’ recast form often occurs with a confirming and a reformulation simultaneously.
This is reflected in the following excerpts.

Excerpt 4.5 – 14 from T3TB

12 B: Um … on the couch … um … handbag, … and knitting… and cushion …
13 T: Oh, you have a cushion, too, on the couch?
14 B: Yes

…

41 T: Do you have a cap?
42 B: Um…… cap is …… hanging … hanging chair
43 T: Uh, you mean, a cap is hanging on the chair?
44 B: Yes

…

66 B: /was/, /wast/ basket
67 T: A basket?
68 B: /wast/ basket.
69 T: Uh, you mean, uh, waste /weist/ basket?
70 B: Yes

In Excerpt 4.5 – 14 from T3TB, the teacher provides recasts in the form of ‘OR’ in response to non-target-like forms produced by student B. These are for two morphosyntactic errors in the use of the article (Lines 13 and 43) and one phonological error (Line 69). The three ‘OR’ recasts provided by the teacher result in null responses by learners saying “yes.” In Line 13, the teacher responds to student B’s misuse of the indefinite article ‘a’ in front of a singular noun by providing an ‘OR’ recast with a rising intonation. Here, the teacher’s prolongation ‘oh:’ at the beginning of her turn and ‘too’ at the end of her turn sounds as if she is accepting of student B’s utterance and confirming the message as to whether learner B also has a ‘cushion’. Thus, learner B responds by saying just “yes.” The ‘OR’ recasts the teacher provided in response to student B’s errors are more likely to have been interpreted by learners as a request for clarification rather than corrective feedback.

During L – L interactions, recasts in the form of ‘OR’ also result in a higher percentage
of null responses than other types of recasts. Excerpt 4.5 – 15 shows an example of null response from the learner in response to the peer interlocutor’s ‘OR’ recast. In the interaction between the two learners L and M, learner M provides ‘OR’ recasts in response to four of peer L’s errors. These were targeted toward the use of word order and plural (Line 25), negation (Lines 32 and 36), article and word order (Line 62). All ‘OR’ recasts provided by the peer interlocutor M led to no responses.

Excerpt 4.5 – 15 from T2LM

13 L:  I have people, peoples, thirteen?
14 M:  Do you have thirteen people?
15 L:  Yes, I have.
...
30 M:  I have five birds, too. Do you have, do you have a girl play with, with a
       ball in your picture?
31 L:  No, I have.
32 M:  You don't have a girl?
33 L:  Yes.
34 M:  Do you have a slide? slide.
35 L:  slide? no, I have, no.
36 M:  You don't have slide?
37 L:  Yes.
...
61 L:  Do you have, your picture, right couple? Has?
62 M:  Do you have a couple on your right part in my picture?
63 L:  Yes.

The results in T – L and L – L interactions show that ‘OR’ recasts provided by the teacher and peer interlocutors were more likely to be interpreted as confirmation of the content of the prior utterances by learners. Due to the potential ambiguity of ‘OR’ type recasts, which includes confirmation check and reformulation with a rising intonation simultaneously, learners can interpret the ‘OR’ recasts as alternative ways of meaning negotiation. These results confirm recasts can be ambiguous and complex (Lyster, 1998;
Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Nicholas et al, 2001; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Carpenter et al, 2006) as they can not only serve as corrective feedback on error, but as a form of confirmation check and understanding of communicative content which also involves repeating with a rising intonation.

To summarize, when learner uptake is affected by the saliency of recasts, it may be related to the prosodic features of recasts such as a rising or a falling intonation. If recasts include repetition of errors with a rising intonation and provision of target-like models such as ‘R and R’ recast form, they appear to draw students’ attention to recasts and initiate more successful repair. However, ‘OR’ recasts may involve confirmation check and provision of target-like modes with rising intonation simultaneously. This type is less effective in generating immediate incorporation. The teacher and peer interlocutors’ use of ‘OR’ recast form with rising intonation might be construed by learners as a way of confirming the content of previous learner utterances rather than corrective recasting for linguistic forms.

With regard to research question 2b) – ‘How is the nature of uptake affected by the nature of recasts?’ – there is evidence that different recast forms resulted in different learner uptake. Recasts in the form of ‘R and R’ elicited a greater proportion of successful repairs compared to the other two forms of recasts in both teacher recasting in T – L and peer recasting in L – L interactions. This result is supported by Doughty and Varela (1998), who found that the ‘R and R’ recast type is more salient to learners because repetition of the learner utterance with rising intonation followed by provision of the correct model is perceived as a signal highlighting the presence of errors. The nature of ‘R and R’ recast type may elicit more attention to the contrast between non-target-like linguistic forms and target-like language, thus generating more successful repair.
Recasts were categorized according to their frequency, length and saliency. With regard to frequency, the teacher tended to provide and use more repeated recasts in consecutive turns for a single error or multiple errors in order to generate immediate incorporation by learners than peer interlocutors did. This negotiation strategy of providing repeated recasts was more likely to draw the learner’s attention to errors and recasts as corrective feedback when it was for a single error, thus initiating more successful immediate incorporation. However, repeated recasts provided by the teacher in response to multiple errors the learner made in one turn, which was specifically intended to generate immediate incorporation in a full sentence level, tended to cause a heavy cognitive load and thus confused the learners as to the nature of recasts. That is, in the process of the teacher’s endeavour to elicit immediate incorporation with repeated recasts, some cases occurred where learners interpreted those repeated recasts as confirmation of meaning or simple repetition rather than reformulations of linguistic forms. The following segment from Excerpt 4.2 – 2 (see Section 4.2.1) shows an example of this.

In Line 83 (‘R’ recast) and Line 92 and 94 (‘R and R’ recast), the teacher interlocutor provided repeated recasts in response to student J’s missing infinite article ‘a’ before the single noun ‘briefcase’. However, student J did not successfully incorporate them in Line 91 and Line 93. Also, in the process of teacher’s repeated recasts, in Line 93, student J respond saying ‘yes’ after the first part of the teacher’s ‘R and R’ recast. This shows that student J considers it as confirmation of meaning rather than the repetition of his error with rising intonation, which goes with a target-like reformulation afterwards in Line 94.

Excerpt 4.2 – 2 (taken from Section 4.2.1)

82 T: I have a briefcase behind the chair. Do you have a briefcase?
83 J: Oh, No, I haven't. I haven't briefcase.
84 T: You haven't a briefcase. ❯
91 J: I haven't briefcase.
92 T: Um. You haven't ...BRIEFCASE? ❯
93 J: Yes
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94 T: You haven't A BRIEFCASE.
95 J: I haven't a briefcase.
96 T: Okay. Um.

The teacher’s repeated recasts here seemed to push learners to perceive recasts as corrective reformulations when the purpose was for initiating successful immediate incorporation at the full sentence level. This could cause a heavy load in cognitive processing by learners. Thus, in order to get a better outcome in terms of drawing learner attention and initiating more successful immediate incorporation after recasts, it is important that effective ways of providing recasts need to be devised depending on communicative situations.

In terms of length, shorter recasts resulted in more immediate incorporation by learners than longer recasts, possibly due to the learner’s ability to notice and retain them in working memory (Philp, 2003). Philp (2003) argues that longer recasts may be less accurately recalled than shorter recasts since they may exceed the limits of temporary phonological store. In this study, when the teacher used more extended recasts, she then broke them into shorter units in order to elicit immediate incorporation. In contrast, peer interlocutors were less likely to be conscious of using extended recasts or breaking them into shorter units.

With regard to saliency, the nature of learner uptake appeared to differ depending on the intonational saliency of recasts, supporting the psycholinguistic observation that specific visual or auditory features make an item more prominent (Dulay, Burt & Krashen, 1982). Rising or falling intonation may be considered as an influential factor in terms of salience. Recasts in the present study involved different intonational features relating to saliency as corrective feedback. For example, among three types of recasts used by the interlocutors, ‘R and R’ recasts were more likely to elicit immediate incorporation than the other two recasts forms, ‘R’ and ‘OR’, possibly due to the fact
that the ‘R and R’ recast forms included repetition of learner errors with rising intonation before providing reformulation as correct models. Both repetition of errors with rising intonation and correct models provided immediately functioned more effectively in drawing the learner’s attention to the recasts. On the other hand, ‘R’ recast forms which simply provided a correct model might be perceived by learners as a form of seeking agreement or confirmation of preceding utterances. ‘R’ recasts were thus less salient for learners to notice as corrective recasting since a falling intonation unit does not involve the use of accent for signaling semantic and phonetic focus (Alan, 1997). In addition, ‘OR’ recast forms appeared to provide ambiguous signals as learners tended to confuse ‘OR’ recasts with confirmation of meaning rather than corrective recasting for linguistic forms, thus reducing the salience of ‘OR’ recast forms.

In the context of investigating the research questions, certain issues came to light which will be discussed in greater detail below.

4.6 SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

Analysis of transcribed verbal data identified several aspects of recasts and learner uptake in EFL classroom interactions with NNS – NNS dyads. The teacher and peer interlocutors used three different types of recasts in response to non-target-like forms by learners: ‘Reformulation’ (R), ‘Repetition followed by Reformulation’ (R and R) and ‘Overlap Reformulation’ (OR) during negotiated interactions. The more frequently used type of recast was ‘Reformulation’ in both T – L and L – L interactions.

The findings show that, overall, recast episodes that occurred during NNS – NNS interactions were directed more to negotiation of linguistic forms with communicative purpose. Teacher recasting in T – L interactions and peer recasting in L – L interactions were mainly related to morpho-syntactic linguistic features, and fewer were related to phonological and lexical non-target-like utterances. Both teacher recasts and peer
recasts overwhelmingly focused on grammatical forms. Among morpho-syntactic errors receiving recasts, non-target-like forms in the use of the article received a much greater number of recasts in the form of ‘R’ than other types of non-target-like forms in both T – L and L – L interactions. Other types of non-target-like forms such as the use of auxiliary verb, word order plural and -ing’ were also major types of errors receiving recasts in both T – L and L – L interactions. Unlike the teacher recasting in T – L interactions, however, peer recasting in L – L interactions was directed to inaccurate lexical items. Peers in L – L interactions provided more than five times as many recasts as the teacher in T – L interactions focusing on NNS learners’ lexical non-target-like forms.

Learner uptake varied depending on the recast provider and the focus of negotiated interaction. The percentage and distribution of successful repairs were similar in response to teacher recasts in T – L and peer recasts in L – L interactions in terms of the three recast types, ‘R’, ‘R and R’ and ‘OR’. However, recasts in the form of ‘R and R’ invited more successful repair than those in ‘R’ recast type in both T – L and L – L interactions. Regarding types of errors in successful repairs, learners in EFL classroom interactions tended to incorporate recasts for phonological and lexical errors much more successfully than recasts for morpho-syntactic errors, even though there were far fewer recast episodes for phonological and lexical non-target-like utterances both in teacher recasting in T – L interactions and peer recasting in L – L interactions. The teacher tended to provide recasts directly to correct linguistic forms without confirming or eliciting further negotiation of meaning. Thus, learners appeared to respond to teacher recasting by simply accepting the target language models and incorporating reformulated forms into their utterances. On the other hand, NNS peers were more likely to use recasts as a means of cooperative assistance for negotiation of form and meaning simultaneously. That is, peer recasting tended to include more elicitation with confirmation check and seeking cooperative efforts for negotiation of meaning and form.
in order to elicit more target-like utterances from each other. The findings further demonstrate that the nature of learner uptake was influenced by the nature of recasts according to the frequency, length, and saliency of recasts. First, the frequency of recasts tended to affect the rate of uptake. More learner uptake was likely to be initiated by repeated recasts. The teacher used several recasts using different forms of recasts for a single error to elicit successful learner repair. The teacher’s repeated recasts for an error to be helpful to some learners. However, this was not the case with all learners since repeated recasts for the same learner errors within one recast episode might have been interpreted by the learner not as corrective reformulations but as mere repetition of prior learner utterances, resulting in unsuccessful uptake. The use of repeated recasts was much greater in teacher recasting in T – L interactions than in peer recasting in L – L interactions.

Second, the length of recasts was likely to influence learner uptake in terms of generating more successful repair. Shorter recasts at word or phrase levels appeared to be a more effective way to generate immediate learner incorporation than longer recasts at the sentence level. That is, when the first sentence level recast did not generate immediate incorporation by learners, the teacher divided it into smaller word or phrase units to make them salient for the learners to notice corrective recasting. The teacher was more likely to use recasts as intentional corrective feedback for target-like linguistic forms than NNS peer interlocutors.

Third, the saliency of recasts tended to affect the nature of learner uptake. That is, learners reacted differently to recasts containing repetition of erroneous forms and prosodic features such as rising and falling intonation. For instance, ‘R and R’ recasts, which include repetition of errors learners produce with rising intonation and reformulations, appeared to be the most helpful for EFL learners to attend to interlocutors’ recasts and more likely to be incorporated successfully compared with other two recast forms.