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CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The results gained from the present study showed that learners in Korean EFL form-focused learning context were highly motivated and active in providing recasts and responding to them in pairing interactions. This resulted from socio-cultural situations and personal needs that require English as an essential tool for global communication. Providing corrective recasts allows learners to be exposed to target-like language input and encourages language production. This was possible by making the corrective function of recasts more salient through making semi-modified instructional settings. That is, instructional approaches were semi-controlled for focus on forms through forming one-to-one interactional patterns, modification of recast types, and modeling of provision of recasts. As a result, this has led to learners’ more active involvement and language production.

This chapter discusses several issues emerged from this study to provide a better understanding of a semi-controlled focus on form classroom in Korean EFL learning context studies. This will be discussed in relation to theoretical perspectives reviewed in Chapter 2, comparing this study of NNS learners in an EFL context with other learning contexts such as ESL and immersion classrooms with NS – NNS interactions.
5.2 DISCUSSION

5.2.1 Patterns of interaction in teacher recasts and peer recasts

One issue was that of how the patterns of negotiated interaction differed between the teacher and peer interlocutors and the implications of this for learning.

Teacher – learner interactions

In the negotiated interactions between the teacher and learners, results reveal that teacher’s recasts were more oriented to negotiating linguistic forms rather than meaning than those in peer interactions. While there were a few recast episodes that involved negotiation of both meaning and form at the same time in teacher recasting in T – L interactions, most of the recast episodes in these interactions focused on the provision of conscious, direct and one-sided corrective recasts rather than negotiation of meaning. Excerpt 5.2 – 1 is a rare example of negotiation of both form and meaning in a recast episode between the teacher and the learner.

Excerpt 5.2 – 1 from T4TP

67 T: He, in my picture., he is reading a newspaper. That’s different.
68 P: No, I have., he is smoking a pipe. Um., newspaper., ah, catch a…
   hand newspaper
69 T: Um… taking a newspaper in his hand
70 P: Difference
71 T: Difference? Okay. Uh., Um., Uh. Behind the bench, there are two girls
   on the., no. no. no. There are two girls at the table.
72 P: Uh., yes, I have two girl, um … on the table.
73 T: Two girls
74 P: Two girls on the table
75 T: ON THE TABLE? UNDER THE PARASOL
76 P: Uh. yes, under the parasol.
77 T: Um..what are they doing?
78 P: Um..She is eating. Um.. One woman Um., a woman uh...is eating um.. ice cream?
79 T: Yeah, eating an ice cream.
80 P: Eating an ice cream,
81 T: U huh.

In this recast episode, the teacher provided a recast in Line 69 in response to student P’s non-target-like morpho-syntactic forms – word order (verb + object + prepositional phrase) as well as an alternative lexical item, ‘take’ with ‘-ing’ form instead of ‘catch’ uttered by P. This resulted in ‘null response’ by student P saying “difference” (Line 70). However, the teacher’s recast in the form of ‘R and R’ in Line 75 appeared to be a form of negotiation both meaning and form. In response to student P’s non-target-like use of the preposition saying “two girls on the table”, the teacher repeated P’s non-target-like utterance with rising intonation and then reformulated it, providing a target language model, ‘under the parasol’, since it does not make sense that people are on the table. She is thus negotiating both meaning and form. However, recast episodes that have this function occurred rarely in T – L interactions.

Learner – learner interactions
In the interactions between students, the study found more recasts that contain negotiated interactions for both meaning and form than those in teacher recasting. Evidence of peers’ negotiated interactions for meaning and form can be seen in the following recast episode shown in Excerpt 5.2 – 2. In Line 77, student B provided a recast for negotiation of meaning and form at the same time. Learner B provided a more specific target-like lexical sample and linguistic form in response to peer E’s utterance. Even though student E’s lexical choices of ‘running’, and ‘training’ in Line 76 are not
considered as non-target-like forms, peer B reformulated these lexical items to a more suitable lexical item ‘jogging’ in the situational context where a girl is running slowly for exercise not for a race. In addition, B’s recast serves as corrective feedback in relation to the auxiliary verb ‘is’ for present progressive.

Excerpt 5.2 – 2 from T4BE

76 E: Yes. In my picture, woman running, training. Woman training?
77 B: Jogging, jogging, she is jogging?
78 E: Yes, she is jogging.

It has been argued that negotiation of meaning is typically lexical in nature and not morpho-syntactic (Foster and Ohta, 2005). However, NNS peers in this study negotiated meaning and form in both lexical and morpho-syntactic forms. Recasts provided by peers tended to supply target-like lexical models which were adjusted for more suitable contextual meaning to confirm the content of their message but they also corrected their interlocutors’ grammatical forms at the same time.

Similarly, the following recast episode taken from T2LM (Excerpt 5.2 – 3) includes some negotiation of meaning as well as a corrective attempt at linguistic form between two NNS learners. In the segment, student M was asked to clarify the meaning of ‘swing place’ that student L uttered in Line 16. Peer L answered that it means ‘swing play’ in Line 17. The response was still not clear in meaning and linguistic form. Not satisfied with the answer, peer M provided recasts for a more target-like lexical item ‘swing seat’ in the form of ‘OR’. This recast was taken up by M. Again, peer M was not sure of the message involved in L’s question “children...play?” (Line 19). Following student L’s unclear utterance, student M provided a recast with expanded information of
more target-like question formation saying, “how many, you mean, how many children playing on swing?” in Line 20. Student M’s recast in Line 20 appeared to function as confirmation of message and provision of a correct linguistic model. That is, M tried to ascertain both the location of the children and what they were doing. In addition, M wanted to complete L’s non-target-like sentence form to a full interrogative using ‘-ing’ form and target-like preposition ‘on’ even though M’s reformulated sentence was not a fully target-like sentence.

Excerpt 5.2 – 3 from T2LM

13 L: Do you have swing?
14 M: Yes, I have two swings.
15 L: Swing, do you have a swing, swing place?
16 M: What's mean swing place?
17 L: Swing play.
18 M: Swing, swing seat? ≠ no?
19 L: Yes, swing seat, children, play?
20 M: Uh. How many, you mean, how many children playing on swing?
21 L: Yes.
22 M: Yes, I have two children swing, ah, I have two children playing on swing.
23 L: I have, too.

The analysis of data shows that there were many such recast episodes related to negotiation of both meaning and form in L – L interactions. That is, peer recasting was more likely to convey meaning expansion and clarification requests, and then offer more target-like linguistic items in context in contrast with the few such recast episodes form found in teacher recasting in T – L interactions. As mentioned above, recasts by the teacher appeared to be more focused on reformulation of linguistic forms and directly provided target-like models rather than eliciting further negotiation of meaning.
This might be because the teacher had a strong conscious intention to use corrective recasts to provide target-like linguistic forms, whereas NNS peers had less corrective intention in relation to their peer interlocutors’ non-target-like forms.

Regardless of the nature of teacher and peer input, both teacher recasting and peer recasting seemed to play a positive role in “interactional adjustments” (Long, 1996, p.451) since their recasts elicited more target-like output from learners. It could be argued that such focused input constituted a form of “micro-level scaffolding” (Hammond, 2001, p.6) as it provided feedback in context directed at specific needs.

“Effective scaffolding is support that is provided at the point of need, which is referred to as contingency” (Hammond, 2001, p.5). Furthermore, it presented opportunities to recall previous knowledge and extend understanding, thereby providing the potential for use independently in other contexts. In this sense, it was “future-oriented” (Gibbons, 2002, p.10), which is another characteristic of scaffolding. However, in terms of the different patterns of support provided by peers and the teacher, the peer interaction could be seen as closer to the ideal of scaffolding as it was more collaborative and involved an engaged struggle towards meaning rather than the more ‘one-way’ input of the teacher.

5.2.2 Dyadic interaction vs whole-class interaction

Another issue emerged from the data analysis is that the effects of recasts on learner uptake depend on interactional patterns: one-to-one in dyadic interactions adopted in the
present study and teacher-to-whole-class interactions used in other studies (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 1998a; Lyster, 1998b). This study suggests that one-to-one interactions seem to be more beneficial for initiating successful immediate incorporation in response to corrective recasting. However, other factors surrounding classroom interactions may affect learner uptake (Loewen, 2004). This is consistent with Long and Porter’s (1985) contention that two or three group work allows for more quantity of language practice, positive affective climate and increasing learner motivation.

Dyadic interactions provide learners with more opportunities to practice language than in whole-class approaches. The results gained from the present study showed that there was a greater proportion of successful immediate incorporation (59% in T – L dyads and 60% in L – L dyads, see section 4.4.1) in response to corrective recasting in both peer dyads and teacher-learner dyads. This means learners in paired interactions seemed to more actively engaged in negotiation ifo meaning through the provision of corrective recasting to achieve mutual understanding. Dyadic interaction patterns seemed more likely to encourage learner involvement in the task activities, thereby initiate more successful immediate incorporation each other.

As discussed in the literature review chapter, Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) study examined the effect of recasts in teacher-to-whole-class interactions. The results showed that recasts were the most frequently used type of feedback by teachers, but the least elicited learner uptake. This may suggest that recasts provided by teachers in a whole-class teaching episode did not play an effective role as corrective feedback in eliciting learner uptake. This is perhaps due to the fact that teacher-guided interactions in whole-class
activities contain more teacher-initiated moves than learner-initiated ones. According to Ellis et al. (2001), learners attend much more closely to form when they are actively involved in identifying and addressing the problems. Therefore, recasts are more likely to be perceived by learners in dyads as corrective feedback than the ones provided in whole-class interactions when the learners are actively engaged in the process of providing and receiving corrective recasts. The findings of this study suggest that learners' active engagement in dyadic interactions may have contributed to noticing of corrective recasts and successful uptake.

5.2.3 NNS interlocutors’ perspectives on preferable recasts

Among the three types of recasts, the ‘R’ form was the major type of recast provided by the teacher and peers in both T – L and L – L interactions. It is suggested that this was due to a concern for saving students' face. The teacher already had an understanding of students' attitudes and personalities through prior classroom interactions before data collection, talking about daily life and in free conversation. During these communicative interactions, the learners were very shy and sensitive to teacher recasting as corrective feedback, as noted in the field notes recorded during data collection. For the more sensitive and shy students in the classroom interactions, the teacher preferred to use recasts in the form of ‘R’ since it was considered as less obtrusive and didn’t inhibit the communicative flow, encouraging learners’ production. The teacher felt the need to “avoid marking the correction by pitch, loudness or a decrease in the tempo of speech” (Ellis, et al., 2001, p.289). Below are some examples of the prominent use of ‘R’ type recasts by the teacher in response to learners’ non-
target-like linguistic features.

As shown in the following interaction with student K (Excerpt 5.2 – 4), the teacher used only ‘R’ recasts in response to K’s linguistic errors (17 of 17 recast times). When the teacher provided the first recast in Line 15, which was in response to K’s non-target-like utterance in the use of lexical item and preposition in Line 14, she was embarrassed, blushed (incidentally supported in field note) and kept silent for a while (no response) after the teacher’s recast in Line 16. So, the teacher shifted to topic continuation in Line 17. Similar situations occurred in the interactions with other students C, A and D where the teacher provided 95% of (20 of 21) recast times, 84% of (16 of 19) recast times, and 83% of (33 of 40) recast times in the form of ‘Reformulation’ respectively in response to students’ non-target-like forms.

Excerpt 5.2 – 4 from T2TK

13 T: Uh.. do you have a couple?
14 K: Uh … I have a couple … right inside … in my picture.
15 T: Um ….. on the right hand side. 
16 K: ……..
17 T: Um …. okay .. what are they doing? what are they doing?
18 K: A couple … arms cross on.
19 T: Ah, .. they are=
20 K: There are,
21 T: =hugging, \ you mean?
22 K: Ah… yes, there are hugging.

Excerpt 5.2 – 5 from T4TD presents a similar situation of teacher’s overuse of ‘R’ recast form in T – L interactions. Student D produced a non-target-like form, ‘drinking a beer’ in Line 16 adding indefinite article ‘a’ in front of mass noun, ‘beer’, which is not necessary. In response to this, the teacher provided her first recast in the form of ‘OR’ in
Line 17. However, student D just kept silent in her response in Line 18 after teacher recasting. This might have resulted from the fact that she did not notice the teacher’s recasting or she was embarrassed by it. So the teacher continued her topic by saying, “okay, same, same as my picture” in an attempt to recover smooth communicative interaction and to change the uncomfortable atmosphere in Line 19. After the first recast, the teacher provided 83% of recasts in the form of ‘Reformulation’ such as in Lines 30, 39 and 41 during this dyadic interaction.

Excerpt 5.2 – 5 from T4TD

15 T: Uhmm. Uh, What are they doing?
16 D: I think they are, uh .. drinking a beer?
17 T: Drinking beer? ↗
18 D: ..... 
19 T: Um.. okay, same, same as my picture. Do you have a bench?
   ..... 
28 T: Okay. You know ..uh, old man, an old man is sitting on arm, on an arm chair.
29 D: Yes. Uh .. he is alone sitting.
30 T: Yeah, he is sitting alone. ↘
31 D: Ah, yes. Uh, and she, and he's a smoking pipe, uh. smoking a pipe.
   ..... 
38 D: Ah: another bench have .. uh.. sitting two peolpes.
39 T: There are two people. ↘
40 D: Yes.
41 T: There are two people on the bench. ↘
42 D: There are two people on the bench.

As shown earlier in the Results chapter, the quantitative results on relative provisions of recasts show that the majority of recasts provided by peer interlocutors in L – L interactions were in the form of ‘R’ (over 60%). This was the same as in teacher recasts
in T – L interactions. However, interestingly, learners gave different views on their preferred recast type in the debriefing questionnaires conducted after all task activities. Many students answered that they preferred recasts with more salience such as ‘R and R’ and a more negotiable recast type such as ‘OR’ since they enabled them to notice recasts and negotiate more. For instance, student K replied that when she provided recasts in the form of ‘Reformulation’, her peer interlocutor rarely noticed them and made the error again, so she preferred to use ‘R and R’ type for conversation partners to facilitate notice of their errors and recasts. According to her, this is because recasts in the form of ‘R and R’ included both a repetition with rising intonation and a target-like model. The acoustic emphasis in the repetition with rising intonation provided a signal for better noticing of errors and following recasts.

In the debriefing questionnaires (see Table 3.10 in section 3.8.4.3), nine of the 18 students (50%) answered that they preferred ‘OR’ recast type the most, five of 18 preferred ‘R and R’ (28%), and four of 18 (22%) preferred ‘R’ recast type. This was in contrast to the actual frequency of recast provision in L – L interactions (31/27%, 11/9% and 74/64% respectively). Although it is beyond the scope of this study to explain why the learners’ perceptions of preferred recast types differed from their actual provision in communicative interactions, some reasons for learners’ preference of recast type may be discerned from debriefing questionnaires conducted after all task activities.

The students’ responses show that their linguistic, socio-cultural and psychological factors may account for the different preferences for recast provision and uptake in Korean EFL classroom settings. Firstly, the students had weak ability to retrieve linguistic knowledge as they had been taught in a traditional grammar-translation
method in their secondary levels and relied heavily on explicit cues for retrieving target-like forms. This has been shown in the students’ frequent use of ‘R’ type recasts. This may have been due to learners’ lack of English knowledge, limiting their ways of negotiation of meaning.

Next, it is well documented that Korean EFL classrooms, are teacher-centered and dominated. Students in the study have shared the same ethnic patterns in the process of learning in their secondary schooling. Students who had teacher-centered instruction in their secondary schooling were used to one way information exchange. In teacher-centered classroom settings, students took on a passive role and did not have many opportunities to take part in class discussion. It may be assumed that students were more prone to simple reformulations such as ‘R’ recast, which is a direct but not a negotiable form of recasts. However, despite students’ perception of the value of ‘OR’ and ‘R and R’ recasts, the results showed that fifty percent of students preferred more negotiable type of corrective recasting such as ‘OR’. This may be accounted for by psychological factors which will be discussed below.

As shown in the students’ opinions about the questions, students seemed to greatly consider their partners’ affective feelings when they provide recasts. That is, they were aware that reformulating their friends’ incorrect utterances may offend and hurt their friend’s feelings. This has been demonstrated in learners’ responses on the reasons for preferring the ‘OR’ recast form. They commented that ‘OR’ recasts were preferable as the confirmation checks and provision of correct models were useful face-saving strategies that also generate collaborative negotiation of meaning and form with peers.
Peers apparently believed that they could save their friend’s face by appearing to confirm their partner’s prior utterance through corrective recasts in the form of ‘OR’.

5.2.4 Why high proportion of immediate incorporation?

Overall, in these Korean EFL communicative classroom interactions, all three recast types provided by the teacher and peer interlocutors in response to non-target-like forms by learners generated a high proportion of immediate incorporation (58%, 74% and 60% in T – L; 60%, 82% and 58% in L – L, ‘R’, ‘R and R’ and ‘OR’ respectively). On average, the three recast types resulted in successful immediate incorporation in 64% in T – L and 66% in L – L interactions. This is much greater than rates reported for the context of NS – NNS in ESL contexts (Mackey et al., 2000; Oliver, 1995, 2000; Panova and Lyster, 2002), NS – NNS in immersion classrooms (Lyster, 1998; Lyster and Ranta, 1997), and NNS – NNS interactions (Morris, 2002) in a Spanish L2 classroom. However, the result is in contrast to the reports by Ellis et al. (2001) and by Sheen (2004), where much higher levels of successful repair occurred (74% and 70% of uptake respectively).

There are several possible explanations for the relatively high levels of successful learner uptake here. Firstly, the three types of recasts, whether they involve acoustic salience or not, can be perceived as salient for EFL learners as negative feedback. The enhanced salience could be due to the immediate context of an exchange in an EFL situation (Carpenter, Seon Jeon, MacGregor & Mackey, 2006). Secondly, learners’ limited linguistic ability might have resulted in more successful immediate incorporation of interlocutors’ recasts. That is, learners may have tended to rely more on
their interlocutors to reformulate their own utterances because they are less able to access the target-like forms themselves (Mackey et al., 2003). Thus, for learners in the present study who have no confidence of their linguistic ability, recasts provided by the teacher and peer interlocutors could have worked as scaffolds for interlanguage cognitive processing. The outcome is that learners could retrieve their prior knowledge and perceive interlocutors’ recasts as corrective feedback, and more immediately incorporated these into successful repairs.

Thirdly, learners may have become accustomed to perceiving their NNS interlocutors’ corrective intentions to provide recasts as task activities went on. This was evidenced by learners’ answers about their perceptions of noticing interlocutors’ recasts in debriefing questionnaires conducted after the task activities (Question 7, ‘Did you notice your partner’s recasts in response to you?’). For instance, in their responses to the question, some students answered that, “I noticed them easily because interlocutors gave a signal with rising intonation of the position of error, or with repeated recasts times” (14 of 18) or “I noticed them a little at the beginning, but as interactions went on, could be aware of them more” (4 of 18). This might have been because EFL learners in NNS – NNS interactions share the same L1 and cultural background, and may, therefore, have a better understanding of interlocutors’ attitudes and speaking patterns. It could also be due to their increasing familiarity with their interlocutors’ style of providing corrective recasts during communicative interactions. This may explain the greater rates of learner uptake in EFL NNS – NNS interactions, which is contrary to ESL or immersion contexts with NS – NNS interactions where interlocutors are from different cultural and language backgrounds.
Fourthly, the fact is that learners here were at tertiary level. This is supported by Loewen’s (2004) argument that adult learners might be more likely to produce uptake and successful repair than school-aged younger children such as in Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Oliver (1995).

Finally, the teacher’s modelling of how to provide recasts before the main task activities could have primed the learners as to how to respond following corrective feedback. That is, since the learners developed a prior understanding of recasts as corrective function via the teacher’s prior modelling, they may have noticed recasts more easily and incorporated them more successfully during their own interactional process.

The methodological approach used in the present study differs from those of previous studies of implicit negative feedback such as recasts conducted in the contexts of NS – NNS interactions, where NS teacher’s feedback was mostly provided for meaning-oriented purposes. In the context of NNS – NNS interactions in an EFL form-focused communicative classroom, the teacher’s instructional purpose in using recasts and modeling in the provision of recasts may have affected learners’ noticing and immediate incorporation of recasts. This has significant pedagogical implications for EFL teachers since the explicit teacher’s provision of recasts here may give evidence of the important role of modeling. That is, through the teacher’s prior modeling, EFL learners, in their initial stages of communicative negotiation, may get information of how to use and provide recasts in response to interlocutors’ non-target-like forms. Eventually, through such demonstrations, learners can gain empowerment in using and providing recasts, particularly when students initially have no confidence in speaking and even feel afraid to start communicative negotiation.
With regard to successful immediate incorporation of recasts according to types of non-target-like forms, there were much smaller numbers of recast episodes for both phonological and lexical non-target-like forms in both T – L and L – L interactions. However, both teacher recasting and peer recasting elicited greater percentages of successful repair in terms of phonological and lexical non-target-like forms than recasts for morpho-syntactic non-target-like forms. This result corresponds with Mackey et al.'s (2000) finding that learners were more likely to perceive the corrective recasts for phonological and lexical errors than recasts for morpho-syntactic errors during NS – NNS interactions in ESL contexts. (Although in the present study EFL learners also incorporated recasts for morpho-syntactic errors successfully more than half of both T – L and L – L interactions).

To sum up, notwithstanding different results for the three recast forms in eliciting immediate incorporation, overall, recasts provided by the teacher and peer interlocutors generated a greater percentage of learner uptake with successful repair than unsuccessful repair in both T – L and L – L interactions. This points to the corrective function of the three recast forms in EFL classroom interactions. The saliency of recasts as corrective function may be reduced, however, since recasts fulfil other functions such as providing and seeking confirmation and additional information (Lyster, 1998b) in meaning-based classroom interactions. However, recasts provided by NNS interlocutors in form-focused EFL classroom interactions, regardless of the different types of recasts, were more likely to be perceived as corrective feedback by learners.
5.2.5 Inaccurate recasts and learner uptake

The analysis yields a qualitative finding relating to inaccurate recasts provided by the teacher and peer interlocutors during NNS – NNS interactions. How learners responded to those inaccurate recasts is discussed in this section, with some examples from T – L and L – L interactions.

In the following segment (Excerpt 5.2 – 6), the teacher provided a recast in response to learner K’s missing auxiliary verb ‘have’ in Line 118, and this was incorporated immediately by K in Line 119. However, since the teacher’s question in Line 116 involved a non-target-like form in the use of determiner ‘some’ instead of ‘any’ for questions and negative statements, student K’s immediate incorporation following teacher’s recast was still a non-target-like form.

Excerpt 5.2 – 6 from T2TK

116 T: Do you have some food on the table?
117 K: No, ...don't. No, I don't some food.
118 T: You don't have some food on the table. \_
119 K: Uh ... um .... I don't have some... I don't have some food.

The following recast episode in Excerpt 5.2 – 7 from T3TC shows another example of how the teacher’s inaccurate utterance affects the learner utterance. In this recast episode, learner C used a target-like form in the use of the definite article ‘the’ by saying “on the TV” in Line 78. However, the teacher appeared to be confused in the use of the definite article ‘the’ before ‘TV’. In Line 79, the teacher used a target-like form saying “on the TV” but in Line 81, she used a non-target-like form omitting ‘the’. This was immediately incorporated by learner C in Line 82. The impact of the teacher recasting
with inaccurate utterances in response to the learner utterance appeared in consecutive turns in Line 132. Following the teacher’s inaccurate recasts in Line 81, learner C also used the non-target-like forms in Lines 82 and 132.

Excerpt 5.2 – 7 from T3TC

77 T: Where is the cup?
78 C: I..have a cup on the TV.
79 T: Uh, on the TV
80 C: On the TV
81 T: Ah: Yeah, yeah, ya. Me, too. I have a cup on TV.
82 C: On TV.

....

132 C: Do you have a pen on the TV? Ah, Do you have.. a pen on TV?
133 T: Yes, I have a pen on TV.

Learners in T – L interactions tended to simply incorporate the teacher’s recasting without question. As such, teacher recasting with inaccurate utterances was also likely to be incorporated by learners. Almost all of the teacher’s recasts with inaccurate utterances occurring in T – L interactions were immediately incorporated by learners (8 of 9 total inaccurate teacher recasts). This result is significant in form-focused EFL communicative settings, since teacher recasts with inaccurate utterances during T – L interactions might have a negative influence on learners.

However, there is some evidence that when learners have a confident grasp of the target form, they might be more resilient in the face of incorrect teacher recasts. In the following Excerpt 5.2 – 8 from T1TA, the teacher uttered non-target-like forms (Lines 85 and 89) and also provided inaccurate recasts ‘on TV’ to expand A’s production in Line 87. Student A immediately incorporated it in Lines 90 and 92. It could not be
presumed whether learner A realized teacher’s inaccurate model. However, in Excerpt 5.2 – 9, the student A did not make the same error in the interaction with another learner H. Learner A used the target-like form by saying “on the TV” in Lines 26, 32 and 34.

Excerpt 5.2 – 8 from T1TA
85 T: Um. Uh, I have two passports=
86 A: Two passports.
87 T: =On TV. Do you have passports?
88 A: No, I have not a passport.
89 T: On TV \-
90 A: Yeah, on TV.
91 T: Um. What about lamp? Do you have a lamp on TV?
92 A: Yes, I have a lamp on TV.

Excerpt 5.2 – 9 from T1HA
26 A: I have passport on the TV.
27 H: Um...no.. What?
28 A: Passport?
29 H: Do you have? I have? Do you have?
30 A: I have a passport=
31 H: Yes.
32 A: =On the TV, do you have a passport?
33 H: No, I have not. No I haven’t passport on the TV. But I have the lamp, I have a lamp on the TV. Do you have?
34 A: Yes, yes I have a lamp on the TV.

The following segment from Excerpt 5.2 – 10 in T – L interaction shows an interesting example of a student’s response to inaccurate teacher recasting in EFL contexts. The teacher provided an inaccurate model in the form of ‘R’ recast in Lines 50, 52, 54, 60, 66 and 72. However, even though student H incorporated this in Line 53, it appears that he was somewhat ambivalent about it in Lines 55 and 57 by saying “I think... I think on
TV, I think....” In addition, student H said “huh” with prolongation as if to query its accuracy. This was followed by a long pause without completing the turn. This might have been due to his lack of command of English or to not wanting to cause the teacher to lose face by correcting her error. Although student H incorporated the teacher’s inaccurate recast ‘on TV’ in Line 73, it appeared to be only a temporary incorporation, as evidenced in his production in the pair work with peer A (see Excerpt 5.3 – 4).

Excerpt 5.2 – 10 from T1TH

50 T:  Okay. What about passport? I have two passports on TV.
51 H:  No, I. No, I haven't two passports on the TV.
52 T:  Okay. On TV. \n
53 H:  On TV.
54 T:  Yeah. How about lamp? There is a lamp on TV.
55 H:  ........ I think...
56 T:  Uhhh...
57 H:  ...I think on TV, I think......
58 T:  In your picture?
59 H:  Yes.
60 T:  Is there a lamp on TV?
61 H:  ...... Huh: (as if querying)
62 T:  Lamp, lamp
63 H:  Yes.

....

66 T:  Okay. There is a lamp on TV in my picture. What about you?
67 H:  ...I think... glass.
68 T:  Oh: You have glass?
69 H:  Yes.
70 T:  Do you have glass?
71 H:  Yes.
72 T:  Um...Okay. So, do you have a glass on TV?
73 H:  Yes, I have an, yes, I have a glass on TV.
It was not the case that the teacher’s inaccurate recasts remained consistent, however. In the dyadic interaction with student O (see Excerpt 5.2 – 11) in task 2, the teacher provided inaccurate recasts twice using the incorrect form, ‘grasses’ in Lines 101 and 107.

Excerpt 5.2 – 11 from T2TO
100 O: Uh, tree under the flower, and some grass.
101 T: Ah, ... you mean, ... there are some grasses and flowers under the big tree. \n
102 O: Ah, ... under the big tree.
103 T: Again, say again, ... what else?
104 O: [There
105 T: [There are ...
106 O: Uh..., there are flower, ... and ...... flower ......
107 T: Grasses? \n
108 O: Ah, .. grasses under the tree.

However, in Excerpts 5.2 – 12 and 5.2 – 13, the teacher used and provided correct models in other pair work with students P and F in Task 4 conducted three weeks later. As can be seen in the following Excerpt 5.2 – 12 (underlined Lines 51 and 54), and 5.2 – 13 (underlined Lines 29 and 31), the teacher provided accurate recasts with target-like models in the interactions with student P and student F, showing that she had realized her inaccuracy.

Excerpt 5.2 – 12 from T4TP
51 T: In my picture, um, there is a man playing the guitar on the grass. Same. Okay. In front of the man who is playing the guitar, there is a man sleeping on the grass.
52 P: Um ...
53 T: What about you?
54 P: No, I have .. a, one woman sleeping on the grass. Um..

Excerpt 5.2 – 13 from T4TF

25 T: Where?
26 F: In the .... floor
27 T: On the floor?
28 F: Floor
29 T: You mean ... on the grass? \n30 F: Ah: on the grass
31 T: I see. Uh.. but in my picture, there is a girl who is sleeping on the grass?

The findings show that both the teacher and peer interlocutors provided and used accurate recasts in interactions with other partners even when they had provided inaccurate recasts previously. This may explain why learners have the ability to use target-like forms regardless of the teacher’s inaccurate recasts.

Overall, the results show clearly that L2 learners in EFL classroom interactions have the ability to recognize what is correct and what is incorrect even in the absence of native speakers and even when their own forms are not consistently in conformity with the target language form (Gass & Varonis, 1989). Also, it could be interpreted that sociocultural factors in the Korean EFL classroom made learners reluctant to embarrass the teacher when she provided a questionable model. Furthermore, there is some evidence that the teacher was able to realize her own inaccurate recasts and then provide accurate recasts in response to the same errors that learners made later on. This indicates that both the teacher and learners in EFL classroom settings have the opportunity for self-regulation of knowledge in the process of interactions.
A related issue is that of the students’ perceptions of their peers’ and their own ability to identify non-target-like forms and to provide accurate recasts. In response to the questionnaire, learners answered that they were not sure whether their peer interlocutors’ recasts provided target-like forms with correct grammatical knowledge and they were not even sure of their own grammatical knowledge for target-like utterances. For example, in regard to question 3, ‘How did you feel about using and providing recasts?’, two thirds of the students (12 of 18) answered that they did not have confidence and were not sure of their own grammatical knowledge although they noticed peer interlocutors’ errors and provided recasts. In addition, in response to the question regarding any difference found between interaction with the teacher and with peers (question 8), learners answered that in interactions with peers, they felt some limitations in using correct grammatical forms and a lack of receiving recasts due to low confidence in their grammatical proficiency. No such feelings were reported in interactions with the teacher by any of the 18 students. As an example, an interview segment transcribed by the researcher is cited as follows in Excerpt 5.2 – 14.

Excerpt 5.2 – 14

Researcher: How did you feel about using or providing recasts?

Student S: Uh… when I heard my friend’s errors, I thought those were not correct… and then I provided recasts to her but I was not sure all my recasts were correct.

Researcher: Is there any difference between the interaction with peers and With the teacher in terms of noticing or using recasts?

Student S: Well… we are in the position of learning as students but the teacher is a teacher. I believe that the teacher has lots of grammatical knowledge of English, and so I learn more about English from the teacher and use more grammatically correct forms following teacher’s recasts.

Researcher: Then… you mean you trust the teacher’s recasts more than your
friends’ recasts since you guess the teacher has more grammatical knowledge of English?

Student S: Yes, of course.

Despite the distrust of and lack of confidence in peers’ and even their own English knowledge, students thought that providing and receiving recasts in learner – learner interactions was helpful for both peer interlocutors since they could brainstorm grammatical knowledge with each other through negotiated interaction. For instance, students rarely provided and noticed recasts at the beginning of task activities, but as negotiated interaction progressed they could gradually provide and notice recasts more and more. This indicates that learners were increasingly able to retrieve their grammatical knowledge from previous instruction and share their knowledge by providing recasts in response to interlocutors’ errors through negotiated interaction collaboratively even in NNS learner – NNS learner dyads.

The evidence of the above results can be seen in the numerical patterns in terms of the provision of recasts and successful immediate incorporation in both T – L and L – L interactions. That is, the findings showed that the proportion of recasts provided by the interlocutors in task 4 activities was much larger than that in task 1 and task 2 activities in both T – L interactions and L – L interactions. As tasks were progressed, learners were more likely to use and provide recasts in response to their partners’ errors. For example, interlocutors in T – L interactions used 57 (24%), 54 (23%), and 44 (18%), 84 (35%) recasts in task 1, task 2, task 3 and task 4 activities respectively. Peer interlocutors in L – L interactions provided 37 (31%) recasts in task 4, and 20 (17%), 27 (23%), 35 (29%) and 37 (31%) recasts in task 1, task 2, task 3 and task 4 activities
respectively. In regard to successful immediate incorporation following recasts, the proportion was increased greatly in both T – L interactions and L – L interactions. In T – L interactions, there were 33 (24%) in task 1, 33 (24%) in task 2, 19 (14%) in task 3, and 52 (38%) in task 4. In L – L interactions, 10 (14%) in task 1, 13 (19%) in task 2, 22 (31%) in task 3 and 25 (36%) in task 4.

5.2.6 Durability of immediate incorporation following recasts

The analysis shows another qualitative finding relating to durability of immediate incorporation following recasts. As revealed in the results (Chapter Four), immediate incorporation following NNS interlocutors’ recasts was relatively high in both T – L and L – L interactions. In relation to incorporation and intake (Gass, 1997), the issue of durability is regarded as an important factor (Lightbown, 1994, cited in Mackey & Philp, 1998). That is, although learners’ immediate incorporation of recasts by interlocutors may not be a reliable indicator of L2 acquisition (Ellis et al, 2001; Gass, 1997; Mackey & Philp, 1998), the efficacy of recasts may increase with ongoing interactions. Learners’ immediate incorporation of recasts in a specific dyadic interaction may allow learners to use it not only in consecutive turns in that interaction but also in other interactional contexts. Below are some examples of how immediate incorporation of recasts endures in terms of target-like forms from one context to another.

In the following segment in Excerpt 5.2 – 15, the teacher provided recasts for the use of the auxiliary verb for present progressive verb tense (Lines 43 and 47). Student P incorporated the recasts provided by the teacher successfully in Lines 44 and 48. In Line
44, student P used the target-like forms of the auxiliary verb after the first teacher recast in Line 43, and later he used the target-like form on his own initiation saying, “one woman, um…… is talking on the phone”.

Excerpt 5.2 – 15 from T4TP
41 T: Umm. What are they doing?
42 P: Uh … one … one man. a man writing
43 T: One man is writing. ↘
44 P: A man is writing. And one woman, uh … and one woman, um … . is talking on the phone.
45 T: Um. In my picture, a man is writing. But, an old man, a, an no. no. I'm sorry. An old woman is knitting. ..That's different. Um. Alright.
46 P: Um… uh… in the picture, .. a man playing the guitar.
47 T: A man is playing the guitar. ↘
48 P: A man is playing the guitar, on the grass. Uh… left side.
49 T: on the left hand side?
50 P: Yes, .. on the left hand side

In consecutive turns, student P greatly used the target-like form of the auxiliary verb for present progressive tense as can be seen in Excerpt 5.2 – 16. After the teacher recasts, student P’s ability to use target-like forms appeared to last quite well within the interactional context with the teacher. Student P could even use the target-like forms on his own initiation without the teacher’s target-like models. For example, in Lines 62 and 78, student P could use target-like forms after teacher’s questions for present progressive tense. In Line 104, student P could make the target-like form in his utterance without prompting through teacher recasting.

Excerpt 5.2 – 16 from T4TP
61 T: On the right hand side, there is an old man. Uh, what about you? On the armchair.
62 P: Uh… he is smoking. Uh. he is smoking /faip/.
63 T: /faip/ ?
64 P: /faip/
65 T: Pipe /paip/
66 P: Pipe / paip /
67 T: He, in my picture., he is reading a newspaper. That's different.
68 P: No, I have. he is smoking a pipe. Um.. newspaper .. ah, catch a...

hand newspaper

... 

76 P: Uh. yes, under the parasol.
77 T: Um..what are they doing?
78 P: Umm.. she is eating. Um. one woman, um., a woman uh... is eating um...

ice cream?

...

103 T: Umm.. And beside the girl, the...I mean beside the old lady. There are two girls playing with a ball. ...What about you?
104 P: Yes, I have. She..uh, uh, They are playing, playing with a ball.

The durability of target forms following recasts was also seen in other interactional contexts. Learner P was able to use more target-like forms in interaction with learner C in the use of auxiliary verb for present progressive tense. (See Appendix Four for the entire segment demonstrating learner P’s durable use of target-like auxiliary verb forms in consecutive turns and other interactional contexts.)

The following Excerpt 5.2 – 17 shows another example of learners’ durable use of target-like models gained from recasts by peer interlocutors. In these segments, learner E had difficulty in the use of target-like word order at the phrase level. Peer interlocutor B appeared to perceive partner learner E’s frequent non-target-like use of word order, and provided recasts many times in response. In Line 4, learner E uttered non-target-like word order saying “table on the map”, which was reacted to with recasts in the form of ‘R and R’ by peer interlocutor B (split in Line 5 and Line 7). Learner E incorporated the
recast successfully in Line 8. Following recasts by peer interlocutor B, peer learner E employed target-like forms in word order in consecutive turns and in other similar linguistic patterns quite effectively (see Lines 38, 48, 100, 102 and 104). However, as can be seen in Lines 20, 46 and 52, learner E still had difficulty with target-like use of similar forms, and made non-target-like errors in word order again intermittently. Learner E’s immediate incorporation following recasts by peer interlocutor B could not guarantee the consistent use of target-like forms of word order. That is, the durability of learner E’s target-like forms in word order did not appear to be stable in consecutive turns and other similar patterns.

Excerpt 5.2 – 17 from T1BE

4 E: Um... in my picture, ........one table, passport, ah! no, no. In my picture........in my picture, table on the map.
5 B: Um.....You have A TABLE ON THE MAP? ↗
6 E: Yes, I have.
7 B: You have A MAP ON THE TABLE. ↘
8 E: You have a map on the table?
9 B: Yes, ha ha.

....

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. ↘
22 E: Yes, there is , yes, there is .......

....

35 B: You don't have chair?
36 E: Chair?
37 B: Chair~ chair~ ~ sit down~ ha ha... sit down.
38 E: Ah!.. ha ha .. ah! OK.  Um, I have a TV on the table.

....

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.
....
99 B: Briefcase, ...suitcase ... um ........ right corner .., tele, television near.
100 E: I don't have. I don't have. .... I have two, two cushions on the sofa. You have, you don't have....
101 B: Oh..no, no...I have, I have two cushions on the sofa. It's same.
102 E: Same? .... I have .., I have .., I have a money on the table.
103 B: I have.., I don't have .., I don't have money on the table.
104 E: Um ... I don't .. I don't have map on the desk.

However, in spite of the unstable durability of target-like forms in word order on occasion, the recasts provided by peer interlocutor B were likely to be effective for peer learner E’s use of target-like forms in word order in the longer term. Overall, the interactional segments between learner B and learner E clearly showed that learner E improved in the use of target-like forms in word order following B’s recasts. In terms of durable use of the target-like forms of word order, the evidence of remarkable improvement is also found in the segments of interactions for task 3 activities carried out two weeks later (see Appendix Four). Learner E used target-like forms of word order in a more stable way in the interaction with peer B for task 3 activity than for task 1 activity.

Even though longitudinal results are beyond the scope of this study, the findings in terms of short-term durability are promising.
5.3 SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION AND ISSUES

The study reveals that learners in NNS – NNS interactions could use and provide recasts in response to interlocutors’ non-target-like forms, and could also incorporate recasts provided by NNS interlocutors. Learners could make language modifications from non-target-like to target-like forms through recasts during NNS – NNS interactions. This kind of language modification in the study is similar to the results of Gass and Varonis (1989, p.77) where learners made “unprompted change” following recasts, referred to as “correction by permeation”, with the target-like form progressively over time. That is, following recasts provided by the teacher and by peer interlocutors, EFL learners in NNS – NNS dyads were likely to utilize target-like forms better as interactions went on, and they were even able to use them in other contexts without prompting.

Recasts by NNS interlocutors generated a relatively higher proportion of learner uptake with successful repair in both T – L and L – L interactions. This result is significant since both teacher recasting and peer recasting seemed to play an important role in eliciting target-like production by learners in NNS – NNS interactions. At least in the short term effect, learners’ immediate incorporation after recasts was sustained in successive negotiation turns and in other interactional contexts using target-like utterances provided by interlocutors’ recasts.

Learners in the present study could have been exposed to “resuscitation of latent prior knowledge” (Long et al., 1998, p.368), through opportunities within the context of negotiation of meaning to revisit the grammatical knowledge learnt previously in more
structured ways. Thus, for learners in communicative classrooms at college level who are strongly interested in and motivated to learn and practice English by social and personal demands, recasts are considered to be a valuable and less obtrusive way of providing corrective feedback than direct teaching of linguistic features with explicit explanation which may trigger boredom in the learners.

As in the context of NS – NNS interactions in immersion (Lyster, 1998a) and ESL classrooms (Mackey et al., 2000), both the teacher in T – L and peer interlocutors in L – L interactions used more ‘R’ recasts in response to morpho-syntactic errors than lexical or phonological errors. This result supports Lyster’s justification that the teacher reacts with recasts more in response to grammatical errors since syntactic errors are more complex to be retrievable by learners than lexical errors. This result may also have occurred because the teacher focused on more accurate language in her prior modeling of providing and using recasts in response to interlocutors’ errors before the task activities.

The result showed that peer interlocutors in L – L interactions were far more (about six times) likely to provide recasts in response to lexical non-target-like utterances by peer learners than the teacher in T – L interactions. Between two learners, lexical information would be important for successful task completion (information gap task) since lack of lexical information could cause more comprehension difficulties during meaning negotiation. This might result in more adjustment for target-like lexical items between two learners in L – L interactions. On the contrary to the situation in L – L interactions, the teacher in T – L interactions, as a more experienced interlocutor, might have greater ability to assume the content of negotiation despite learners’ errors and more tolerant of
lexical errors. Perhaps, also, lexical information might already have been given to learners in the teacher’s prior turn, so learners use those lexical items in their subsequent turns, or the teacher might orient the negotiation to other forms such as for grammatical more than lexical.

With respect to learner uptake in relation to who is providing recasts, patterns were similar for both the teacher and peer interlocutors. Recasts provided by the teacher in T–L and peer interlocutors in L–L interactions generated similar proportions of successful and unsuccessful learner uptake. Overall, recasts by both the teacher and peer interlocutors invited higher percentages of successful repair than unsuccessful uptake. This indicates that in EFL form-focused communicative classrooms, recasts are likely to be useful for learners to negotiate forms for target-like language use. However, the percentage of unsuccessful learner uptakes after recasts was still quite high. This is possibly because both the teacher and peer interlocutors largely used and provided recasts in the form of ‘Reformulation’ which is considered a less salient way to draw learners’ attention, thereby initiated less successful immediate incorporation than a more salient form such as ‘Repetition followed by Reformulation’. This indicates that negotiation strategies for providing recasts can influence the degree of learners’ uptake with immediate incorporation. This view is significant for EFL contexts in pedagogical efficacy of how to provide recasts in order to initiate more immediate successful repair according to conversational situations.

In addition, both the teacher and peers reacted with recasts in response to morphosyntactic non-target-like forms made by learners, and this resulted in a greater proportion of successful repair by EFL learners in the present study. This is unlike to NS
NNS interactions in which learners are less likely to accurately perceive implicit negative feedback such as recasts as corrective feedback for grammatical errors than for lexical and phonological errors. This suggests that providing recasts during NNS – NNS communicative interactions can be effective for EFL learners’ interlanguage development in grammatically more target-like language use.

Learner uptake with successful immediate incorporation appears to have been influenced by the characteristics of recasts such as their frequency, length and saliency in the present study. Firstly, the effect of the frequency of recasts on learners’ errors was likely to vary depending on the conversational situations. For example, repeated recasts provided by the teacher in response to single errors were helpful in drawing learners’ attention, thereby generating more successful repair. However, repeated recasts in response to multiple errors within one learner’s turn appeared to trigger confusion and a heavy load for interlanguage cognitive processing by learners, when immediate incorporation at a full sentence level was required.

Secondly, shorter recasts were show to be more effective for generating successful repair than longer recasts. In order to facilitate immediate incorporation by learners, the teacher in the present study used extended recasts, breaking them into shorter units, unlike peer interlocutors who were less likely to be conscious of using this kind of technique.

Thirdly, recasts in the form of ‘Repetition followed by Reformulation’ generated a greater proportion of successful repair even though the actual number occurring in the present study was much fewer than ‘Reformulation’ recasts. Depending on
characteristics of acoustic salience of recasts, that is whether they included emphasis with repetition and rising intonation or not, the effectiveness of recasts as corrective feedback differed.

Another finding is related to a different aspect of teacher and peer recasting. That is, teacher recasting was more likely to provide simple help with direct target language models focusing on linguistic forms, while peer recasting appeared to provide collaborative scaffolding with more elaboration of meaning negotiation with confirmation checks or clarification requests. Both teacher and peer recasting might be helpful for EFL learners as a means of solution when learners have difficulty of access by themselves due to the lack of knowledge. However, compared to ‘one-way’ input by the teacher, the peer interaction could be considered as a more ideal way to provide input through recasts since it was more collaborative and involved an engaged struggle with meaning negotiation.

Interactional patterns such as pair or whole-class work can affect the effect of corrective recasts on the likelihood of successful learner uptake. As discussed earlier, one-to-one interaction is more beneficial for making interlocutor recasts salient as corrective feedback, thereby prompting more immediate successful incorporation. This can be seen in the results of the present study that there was around 60% of successful immediate incorporation after interlocutor recasts in both T – L and L – L dyadic interactions. This is contrary to the teacher-to-whole-class interactions adopted in Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) study, where recasts initiated the least learner repair. This study suggests that dyadic interactions encourage learners’ active involvement in providing and receiving
recasts as learners in dyadic interactions have more opportunities for language use in a relaxed environment. In the process of doing pair work, two learners can attend more to each other’s corrective recasting and responses leading to more target-like language use. This allows two learners to improve target-like language use.

NNS interlocutors in the present study, both the teacher and peers preferred to use and provide ‘Reformulation’ recasts predominantly than the other two types of recasts in both T – L and L – L interactional contexts. This is because the teacher brought to the classroom an understanding of students’ attitudes and personalities and sensitivity to learner shyness from previous non-task conversations. This might influence the teachers’ preference for ‘Reformulation’ recast type, which is considered as a less salient and obtrusive way eliciting learner uptake. However, peer interlocutors showed contradictory views between their perspectives and actual use of recasts. In their responses on questionnaires, students answered that they preferred a more salient recast such as ‘R and R’, or a more negotiable recast such as ‘OR’ type recasts.

Korean EFL learners responded with a high proportion of successful immediate incorporation following all three recast types in both T – L and L – L interactions. This result is contrary to the context of NS – NNS interactions in ESL or immersion classrooms. The result might be accounted for the following reasons. Firstly, for EFL learners, all three types of recasts, regardless of whether they contain acoustic salience or not, can be enhanced as corrective feedback providing target language models by the immediate context of an exchange. Secondly, due to EFL learners’ lower confidence in their own knowledge, they were more likely to depend on interlocutors’ target-like
models conveyed through recasts and to incorporate them in their uptake with successful repair. Thirdly, learners became increasingly able to perceive recasts’ corrective function as task activities went on. That is, since Korean EFL learners share the same ethnic and cultural background and the same L1, they could better understand interlocutors’ conversational intention and spoken recasts providing corrective feedback. This resulted in increasing learner uptake with successful immediate incorporation. Fourthly, since learners in the present study were at college level, they were more likely to respond with successful repair in response to interlocutors’ recasts than younger children. A final reason may be methodological approach of having the teacher’s prior modeling of providing recasts before the main task activities. Through the teacher’s prior modeling, learners might have gained experience in how to use and provide recasts in response to interlocutors’ non-target-like utterances, and this could contribute to learners noticing recasts more easily and incorporating them more successfully. This has important pedagogical implications for EFL contexts in initial stage of communicative negotiation using recasts: Teacher’s prior modeling of how to use and provide recasts as corrective feedback may play an important role in leading learners to become independent recast providers themselves in response to interlocutors’ errors appropriately.

When inaccurate recasts occurred during conversational negotiations in NNS – NNS dyadic interactions, learners appeared to simply incorporate them. This could impact negatively on EFL learners in form-focused communicative interactions. However, both the teacher and peer interlocutors provided correct models in other pair work conducted later. This indicates that EFL learners have the ability to recognize what is correct and
what is incorrect when their own forms are not in accordance with the target language and even in NNS – NNS interactions. The findings also give some indication that if learners were confident of the target form, they might be more resilient in the face of teacher’s incorrect recasts. This might result from sociocultural circumstances in Korean EFL classrooms where learners are unwilling to embarrass the teacher when she provides an unreliable model. The teacher was also able to become aware of her own inaccurate recasts and then provide accurate recasts in response to the same errors made by learners later on. These findings show evidence that both the teacher and learners in EFL communicative classroom interactions have opportunities for self-regulation of their own knowledge in the process of interactions. These qualitative findings are valuable for EFL settings, particularly in large classes and no native speaking teachers.

With regard to immediate incorporation after recasts and intake, there is a suspicious view that learners’ immediate incorporation of recasts may not be a trustworthy indicator of L2 learning. Nevertheless, it appears from the present study that the usefulness of recasts appears to be valid as interactions proceed. Learners could use target-like forms far better in successive turns and in other similar patterns conducted later on after receiving recasts from interlocutors in previous turns and in a previous task activity. Although the result here shows a short-term durable effect of learner uptake with immediate incorporation, this is promising in EFL classroom settings for teaching more target-like language use through NNS – NNS communicative interactions providing recasts.
5.4 CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY

This study was intended to increase understanding of negotiated interactions in L2 learning. In particular, the study sought to shed light on the use of corrective recasts and learner uptake in EFL classroom interactions with NNS – NNS dyads. In terms of empirical findings, the present study will contribute to a better understanding of negotiated interactions providing recasts and learner uptake in EFL contexts as follows:

1) There is evidence that both teacher and peer interlocutors were capable of providing recasts in interactive contexts.

2) NNS interlocutors typically provided three types of recasts in teacher – learner and learner – learner interactions.

3) The ‘R’ recast form was most frequently used by NNS interlocutors and most widely provided for morpho-syntactic errors.

4) In form-focused EFL communicative interactions, the recasts generated relatively high levels of immediate incorporation by learners.

5) Learners’ immediate incorporation appears to have a positive durable short-term effect with potential longer term effects.

Further information about the relationship between recasts and learner uptake allows for a better understanding of what types of recasts are used and provided by NNS teacher and NNS peer interlocutors in EFL classroom interactions. The findings here can give insights into the following:

1) What types of recasts were frequently used according to types of errors.

2) To what extent those recasts generated immediate learner uptake and thus, what types of recasts could be more effective in terms of generating
successful learner repair.

3) Recasts by NNS interlocutors could be effective for learners to negotiate target-like linguistic forms in communicative interactions.


5) The nature of recasts such as frequency, length, and acoustic saliency could influence learner uptake with immediate incorporation.

6) How teacher recasts with inaccurate recasts influence learner uptake.

7) A positive effect of recasts eliciting learner uptake with immediate incorporation was found in a short term period in terms of learner usability in consecutive turns and in other interactional contexts.

An interactional paradigm involving input, interaction, noticing, and output hypotheses supported the present study. Communicative interactions across NNS teacher – NNS learner and NNS learner – NNS learner dyads encouraged negotiation of forms (Long, 1996; Long & Robinson, 1998) providing and receiving recasts if they failed to understand each other. It is posited that if recasts as negative input are perceived by NNS learners as corrective feedback, they may enable EFL learners to notice the gap between their interlanguage forms and the target language forms (Schmidt, 1990; Schmidt & Frota, 1986). The cognitive contrast may trigger a destabililization and restructuring of the target language grammar (Gass, 1997). The present study provides further empirical evidence that recasts are an important source of corrective input (Nicholas et al., 2001) for EFL learners. The NNS interlocutors’ recasts were generally noticed as corrective feedback by learners and incorporated successfully, thus
confirming the hypotheses regarding input, output and interaction.

Although it was beyond the scope of the present study to demonstrate the long-term effects of recasts on learner uptake, there is evidence that learners could use target-like forms provided through recasts in consecutive turns and in other contexts within a short-term period. This reinforces Swain’s (1985, 1995, 2000) hypothesis regarding the value of pushed output in showing evidence of learners’ noticing the gap between their current interlanguage and the target language and helping learners to test hypotheses about correct linguistic structures.

Pedagogically, the present study provides evidence of the benefit of recasts in the development of more accurate interlanguage. The study showed that NNS – NNS interactions can make recasts available to learners as usable corrective feedback in response to interlocutors’ non-target-like forms, thereby facilitating L2 development. Recasts have the potential to be effective if learners have already begun to use a particular linguistic feature and are in a position to choose between linguistic alternatives (Nicholas et al., 2001). This broadly corresponds to the learning situation and position of Korean EFL learners at college level who have a learning experience of over six years with direct grammar teaching in their secondary EFL learning. Due to the socio-cultural pragmatics in Korean EFL contexts where English ability seems to represent individuals’ social capability in work places, the present study will be significant for Korean EFL adult learners in speaking with more target-like language forms.

In addition, in terms of a practical contribution, the study provides insights for teachers
into how they might employ the use of dyadic interactions to elicit more effective learner uptake of target-like forms by means of recasts. The process adopted demonstrates that, even in EFL contexts with NNS interlocutors, there is value in addressing non-target-like production in the context of communicative interaction, and that students can be trained to provide and respond to recasts.

5.5 IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The primary implications of this study relate to pedagogical considerations. The study provides assistance to NNS teachers in EFL communicative classroom settings in indicating more appropriate recast forms according to types of errors. Teachers need to consider what types of recasts they want their students to engage in during NNS – NNS interactions, and how different forms of recasts would benefit in correcting different types of errors. For example, in response to morpho-syntactic non-target-like forms, ‘R’ recasts were more frequently used by NNS interlocutors than the other two types of recasts. However, ‘R’ recasts were less effective than ‘R and R’ recasts to generate immediate successful repair by learners. Thus, teachers can choose ‘R and R’ recast forms more frequently for accurate language use if learners are not concerned with saving their face during interactions. This is because ‘R and R’ recast forms are considered the most salient way to elicit learner attention to mismatches between target-like and non-target-like linguistic forms, thereby generating the most successful repair among the three types of recasts in the study. In terms of the appropriate frequency of recasts in response to learner errors, the study showed that repeated recasts might cause corrective confusion due to heavy cognitive load. This implies that using mixed recasts with different forms need to be considered for drawing learner attention as corrective
feedback depending on learners’ responses in a conversational negotiation. EFL teachers could use and provide shorter recasts splitting longer recasts into two or three parts if the target of recasts is for multiple errors within one learner turn and to initiate more immediate successful repair.

In addition, the study can provide teachers with a greater understanding of contextual factors in interactional dyads. That is, learner – learner interactions are helpful for EFL learners in large classes as a productive means of communicative exchange with language modification. Rather than whole-class instruction with direct grammatical explanation, more interactions with peers and with the teacher in dyads could be encouraged in EFL classroom settings. Students in EFL communicative interactions would have the benefit of developing more target-like forms during NNS – NNS interactions.

Further, this study has important pedagogical implications for EFL teachers who are challenged by some affective and socio-cultural constraints in language learning. The dyadic interactions adopted in this study help to create a relaxing environment which encourages language production and active involvement in negotiation of meaning. Regarding learners’ perceptions of preferred recast types, students showed some contrastive opinions between actual use of recasts in task activities and ideal answers. They greatly preferred ‘OR’ or ‘R and R’ recast types which have negotiable cues such as confirmation checks or rising intonation that requires something adjusts more. This means that students are eager to learn with more active and cooperative interactions rather than receptive learning attitudes. This approach can be applied to other EFL
contexts to create more interactive teaching environment for effective provision of corrective recasts and initiation of successful learner uptake. Thus, this study will contribute to understanding of how to elicit students’ language practice and use in EFL communicative classrooms. It will be of particular significance to college EFL classes in Korea where teacher-centered lecturing is a dominant instructional mode.

5.6 LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study explored the relationship between recasts and learner uptake during NNS – NNS interactions across teacher – learner and learner – learner dyads in EFL learning at college level. The focus of the study was NNS – NNS dyads among peers and with the teacher at college level. However, the present study has limitations in terms of interactional contexts, task implementation, time period for conducting the study, and the nature of the study.

With respect to the limitation of the interactional context, further research will be needed into contexts with different age and gender dyads, different types of group interactions, and different language proficiency dyads. In relation to different language proficiency between peers, advanced learners in peer – peer dyads are considered as a “richer source of modified input” for peer learners (Mayo and Pica, 2000, p.276). The present study did not consider interactional dyads with different proficiency levels in the learner – learner interactions. The provision and use of recasts will be clearly different depending on the combinations of students with more advanced level, intermediate and low level proficiencies.

Peer dyads in pedagogical situations also need to be considered in terms of the degree of
members' familiarity with each other; that is, whether two peers feel comfortable with each other or not. According to Plough and Gass, (1993), familiar dyads tend to use more clarification requests and confirmation checks than unfamiliar dyads, while Morris and Tarone (2003) found that learners in unfavorable dyads with negative attitudes toward each other even tended to perceive peer recasts with verbatim repetitions as mockery. Thus, interlocutor familiarity also needs to be considered in future research.

The influence of dyads versus whole classes in shaping uptake will be a worthwhile study. It has been argued that pair work or small group work can promote more positive environmental conditions than whole class work in terms of affect, the quality of student talk, learner’s motivation, language practice opportunities, and even students’ grammatical accuracy in their production (Long & Porter, 1985). Further studies are needed to examine the effect of different interactional patterns on learner uptake following corrective recasts.

A further limitation of the study was its restricted range of task types during interactions. The task used in the study involved single type; spot-the-difference, two-way information gap activities. Task implementation such as task repetition and use of different tasks needs to be considered in future research because tasks influence the kind of interaction and communicative effectiveness in L2 learning (Ellis, 2003). Since different tasks have different categories of interactant relationship and interaction requirement (Pica et al. 1993), comparing the results with different tasks in NNS – NNS interaction requires further study.
Perhaps most significantly, the present study did not show the long-term effects of recasts and immediate incorporation. In order to reveal how the nature of learner uptake following recasts changes as learners become accustomed to their provision of recasts, and the long term effects of recasts for more target-like language use in EFL NNS – NNS interactions, a longitudinal study of recasts and learner uptake is necessary.

5.7 CONCLUSION

The present study demonstrates that learners in Korean EFL classroom contexts can be supported by engaging in negotiated interactions involving providing and receiving corrective recasts and as a result, are able to use more target-like language. This support is more beneficial when corrective recasts are made salient. For Korean EFL learners at college level, the use of target-like linguistic forms is necessary in their spoken and written language in order to facilitate their more comprehensible communication with others. Providing recasts as implicit negative feedback is a useful strategy for such learners in terms of eliciting and practising target-like language use. In the present study, learners in negotiated interactions in NNS – NNS dyads were quite active in providing recasts and responding to the recasts of others, thus they had more opportunities to practise and use target-like language and extend their knowledge of English.