Cognitive-Interactionist and Socio-Cultural Perspective of Corrective Feedback: A research synthesis

Eka Fadilah
Universitas Widya Kartika Surabaya
mref3k4@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper aims at synthesizing the utilization of corrective feedback second/foreign language (S/FL) teaching. It schewed on a three-main-tenet of corrective feedback seen from its forms, task instruction, timing, and mediating variables. As such, It encompassed into four subsequent steps: Reviewing and synthesizing, finding the discrepancies, and recommending. First is reviewing and synthesizing. In this step, I collected some papers pertaining to two schools of corrective feedback perspective: cognitive interactionist (e.g., recasts) and socio-cultural (e.g., scaffolded feedback) perspectives. Second is unveiling the discrepancies to resolve. After getting such discrepancies, efforts in resolving are highlighted both in the two types of CF. Later, suggestion and recommendation are elucidated later.

Key words: corrective feedback, cognitive-interactionist perspective, socio-cultural perspective

INTRODUCTION

The body of research on corrective feedback, henceforth CF, has been extensively reported by researchers and scholars until to date. The fundamental premise of the CF efficacy may be drawn from Lyster, Saito and Sato (2013) arguing that error is defined and refined many times and learners' errors have been there in EFL classrooms, and teachers have kept correcting errors in various ways even though the pedagogical value of error correction is still under discussion.

Drawing from the Audio-Lingual Method, so called ALM, it was explicated to be minimal or no tolerance for the errors and considering error correction as a distraction and violation from executing communication task (Han, 2002). In line with ALM's arguments, the natural approach sounds similar argument that error correction is unnecessary and counterproductive (Han, 2002). The shift of teaching-learning method from ALM to communicative language teaching (CLT) that has become dominant since the early 1990s counters such arguments. CLT views error as unavoidable and natural in second language learning. The shift of exclusiveness of focus on form towards on meaning becomes the issue yielded in CLT which primarily focuses on fluency rather than accuracy.

Two prominent views arise in responding the efficacy of CF in CLT. Those views could be seen into double lens namely

cognitive-interactionist and socio-cognitive perspectives. Although both perspectives value interaction, they unfold the provision of CF through interaction differently. The former explicates the provision of CF through, but not limited to, input hypothesis (Krashen, 1981), interactional hypothesis (Long, 1996), noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 2001), and output hypothesis (Swain, 2005), while the latter emphasizes on the roles of teachers and learners within the process of corrective feedback derived from Zone Proximal Development (ZPD)'s Vygotsky (1978). They also emphasize the context in which they work and the specific pedagogic activity in which they are involved (Ellis, 2009). Additionally, the former is based on the triadic distinction among learner, teacher and instruction in which linguistic knowledge is perceived as a commodity that is transferred from a teacher to a learner via instruction, while the later constitutes learning as a collaborative achievement between teachers' and learners' utterances that is more than linguistic evidence to trigger acquisition (Rassaei, 2014).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Cognitive-Interactionist Perspective: Recasts And Prompts

Lyster and Ranta (1997) developed a CF taxonomy comprising six different CF types: explicit correction, recasts, elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests and repetition that is later on, Lyster (1998) dropped those types into three categories: explicit correction, recasts and the negotiation of form, so called prompts. Elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests and repetition strategies are grouped into prompts. Moving on the recent category, Lyster (2007) categorize recasts and explicit types of CF strategy as reformulation. Eventually, the two categories of CF strategies fall into two: reformulations and prompts.

The distinction of types of CF dimension can be seen as the examples below. Utterances 1 and 2 are classified as recast and explicit correction (reformulation) strategy consecutively, while sentences 3 – 6 are categorized as prompts strategy that moves from clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition consecutively.

Learner's utterances: **'He buys book'**

> (1) Recasting : '**A** book';
> (2) Rejecting the error followed by providing the correct form: 'No, you should say "a book";
> (3) Asking for clarification: 'Sorry?';
> (4) Using metalinguistic response: 'You need an indefinite article';
> (5) Asking for elicitation: 'He buys …...?'; or
> (6) Asking for repetition of wrong utterance: 'He buys book?'

Two prominent CF types mostly discussed, seen from cognitive interactionist perspective, are recasts and prompts. Lyster and Ranta (1997) defined recasts as 'the teachers' reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance minus the error'. While, prompts are defined as CF strategies which come from various shapes and types: clarification requests, repetitions, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitations'. Some research reports have made an effort to compare the implementation of recasts and prompts (see, e.g., Fadilah, 2018; Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006). They revealed that both feedbacks were effective, while learners were more outperformed by providing prompts than recasts.

REVISITING RECASTS

Lyster and Ranta (1997: 46) define recasts as "teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance minus the errors". Rassaei (2014: 418) reported that recasts are the most frequently used type of CF in and out of classroom contexts (see also e.g., Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013; Brown, 2014). Doughty and Varela (2008) contend that recasts are ideal way to focus on form in the communication classroom. In addition, Long (2015) asserts that recasts provide correction without breaking down the communication flow so they are suitable for meaning-focused tasks based language learning and teaching (TBLT)

SOCIO-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE
Scaffolded Feedback

Recent CF research shows that the effectiveness of CF depends heavily on the grammatical structure being investigated (Lyster et al., 2013), however, what works for one linguistic structure may not be effective for another (Sheen, 2011). In addition, Rassaei (2014: p.418) argued "when two learners make the same errors, we cannot treat them the same remedy/feedback". In other words, knowing learners' level of proficiency is required to treat them based on their current language development. When the cognitive-interactionist perspective is still debating the dichotomy of implicit and explicit feedback, socio-cultural perspective postulates as more flexible move from implicit to explicit.

A central theme of Vygotskyan's socio cultural perspective is that knowledge is naturally social and constructed in the triadic process of collaboration, interaction and communication among learners in social setting. One notion to pay attention in Vygotskian framework is *Zone of proximal development*, so called ZPD, defined as 'the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult

guidance or in collaboration, with more capable peers' (Vygotsky, 1978:86). In addition, Ellis (2009) asserted "according to a socio-cultural perspective, which is associated with the work of Vygotsky, language development is rooted in dialogic and interaction and occurs *in* rather than *as a result of* interaction". From this prespective, scaffolded feedback, henceforth SF, emerges.

SF was coined by Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) with three mechanism of intervention *graduated, contingent and dialogic.* The first is Graduated intervention. It provides a help by a more experienced member in the joint activity to novice's ZDP to put in appropriate level of assistance. This stage normally starts from implicit strategy then to more concrete until appropriate level is reached. The second is contingent intervention. In this intervention, a help can be offered only when it is needed. It postulates that sometimes some learners reject a help only when they realize that they are able to do by themselves. The third is dialogic intervention. It unfolds between more capable and less capable learner that without it, it is impossible to discover the novice's ZDP. Formerly, Aljaafreeh and Lantolf developed 12 moves of negotiation in SF and eventually it is modified by

Rassaei into six moves of meaning negotiation.

Rassaei asserts that learners are not only invited to correct the non-targetlike utterances but also provided by different levels of implicit and explicit assistance to revise their erroneous utterances. The following is the examples of two learners' utterances with different levels of assistance:

EXAMPLE 1 :Student 1 with more assistance

(1) T: Now about the place, where?
(2) S: Where they playing?
(3) T: Would you repeat?
                                (Level 1)
(4) S: Where they playing?
(5) T: Is your sentence correct?
                                (Level 2)
(6) S: . . . um . . . Where they are playing?
(7) T: You improved your sentence, but it is still problematic.   (Level 3)
(8) S: um . . .
(9) T: They are or are they?
                                (Level 4)

(10) S: oh . . . When . . . um . . . are they playing? When are they playing?

EXAMPLE 2: Student 2 with less assistance

(1) T: Now, about the place, where . . .
(2) S: Where they playing?
(3) T: Would you repeat your sentence?
(4) S: Where are they playing?

(Level 1)
cited in Rassaei, 2014, p.427)

In example 1, the teacher provides assistance to the learner from the most implicit to explicit CF. In (Turn 3), teacher provides student with verbal cues asking repetition *would you repeat?*. The student makes non-target-like utterance in (Turn 4),

then teacher reconfirm it by using utterance *is your sentence correct?* (Turn 5). It moves until the teacher provides the learner with the example used as a model *they are or are they?* (Turn 9). Contrarily, example 2 indicates the learner with a single move only (providing verbal cue) with minimal assistance. The examples indicate that SF is not only referred to learners' developmental path but also provides assistance that aligns well with their developmental stage (Rassaei, 2014).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In its development, however, some limitations and inconclusive findings arise. Due to the space constraints, It focuses only on two perspectives. First, researchers only schewed their study on CF forms seen from cognitive-interactionist perspective (e.g., recast, prompts, explicit correction), while only a few of those researchers view CF from another perspective: socio-culture (e.g., scaffolded feedback). Second, the discrepancies between teacher's belief and practice have been paid little attention to shed more light on the utilization of CF in the classroom context. Third, The various findings of CF in Task Based Instruction entail more studies to shed more light of the efficacy of CF based on the context in which the provision is supervised. Fourth, a few studies invoke mediating variables

(e.g., motivation, anxiety) as variables suspectively contributing the efficacy of CF.

This paper is aimed at synthesizing previous findings on CF pertaining to the aforementioned focus as the main discussion as well as providing suggestions how those feedbacks can be applied in Indonesian context.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This section provides some research findings pertaining to the efficacy of CF seen from both perspective on the learners' linguistic features (e.g., grammar, vocabulary). In responding to some recommendations of the previous researchers (see e.g., Lyster, Sato, & Saito, 2013; Sarandi, 2016) for not exclusively relying on one type (or move) CF, some studies have reported the novelty of CF by using term 'hybrid CF move' embedded in task based instruction (Li, Zhu, Ellis, 2016a, Li, Ellis, Zhu, 2016b; Quin, 2014 see Table 1). It is similar to corrective recast's Doughty and Varella (1998) and Nassaji's (2009) recast+prompts CF strategy. The plausible reasons to such a novelty CF strategy is to accomodate the learners' individual differences context as well as to "encourage the learners to retrieve the correct form from their linguistic reportaire and scaffolds learners'

performance when the need of assistance arises" (Li et al., 2016a, p. 280). In addition to such an argument, Quin (2014) opined "when memory is induced back into consciousness or reactivated, that memory becomes susceptible to change if it is exposed to a similar mental representation before the mind can return it to long term memory" (p. 55).

Li, Zhu, and Ellis (2016a), in their novel study, investigated four intact-class EFL learners (immediate CF, delayed CF, communicative task, and control groups) by providing prompt followed by recast in implicit task based instruction on the acquisition of learners' explicit and explicit knowledge of new grammatical feature, *Be* passive sentence. Their study reveals two important findings. First, they reported that there was no effect of CF strategy (prompt followed by recast) when given immediately and delayed on Elicited Imitation Test (EIT – measuring implicit knowledge). In contrast, they found significant effect for both immediate and delayed CF groups on Grammatical Judgement test (GJT – measuring explicit knowledge) in which immediate CF group outperformed over delayed CF group in post-test by using computer-based test. In other words, CF only aids only the development of declarative/explicit knowledge only on intermediate CF group

but not implicit one (see Table1). It contrasts to the Long's (2015) argument that recast facilitates and must result in implicit knowledge.

The study reported by Li et al. (2016a) was as a reaction of Quin's (2014) study which shares similar CF strategy i.e., hybrid CF move. Different from Li et al.'s (2016a) study, in Quin's study, explicit task based instruction i.e., explaining grammatical rules and examples, was carried out prior to task performances. Two important findings are reported. First, in qualitative data (open-questionnaire), learners preferred immediate CF to delayed CF although it constraints learners' noticeability and independence. The learners argue that delayed CF results in anxiety and embarrassment. Second, in quantitative data, there was no statistical-significant difference found between the conditions (delayed and immediate CF groups). In other words, the supervision for the two groups doesn't result in significant effect on the learners' new grammar acquisition, passive voice (see Table 1).

Furthermore, To seek for the different effect of explicit and implicit instruction in which CF is provided, Spada, Jessop, Tomita, Suzuki, and Valeo (2014) investigated two experimental groups: Isolated FFI (explicit instruction) and Integrated FFI (implicit instruction) groups

by providing metalinguistic explanation and CF provisions. They distinguish those two group interventions during task performances. For instance, Isolated FFI group was divided into separate blocks by providing (1) passive voice formation rules with examples, followed by (2) communicative/content-based activities. While integrated FFI group was not provided such an explicit provision, rather CF was provided. The finding reveals that that there is no statistical differences found in both Error Correction Test (ECT/explicit knowledge test) and Oral Production Test (OPT/implicit knowledge test) between groups over time i.e., pre-, post, and delayed-test. Interestingly, however, there was significant development within group across the tests. Such an interesting finding results in benefit for Isolated FFI on ECT and Integrated FFI on OPT. Indeed, their finding has led to two pedagogical importances pertaining to the dichotomy of task instruction in which explicit instruction i.e., Isolated FFI only benefits from explicit knowledge on the learners' acquisition of passive voice construction, while implicit instruction i.e., integrated FFI benefits only from implicit knowledge.

MISMATCHES BETWEEN BELIEF AND PRACTICE OF EXPERIENCED TEACHER, NOVICE TEACHER AND STUDENTS

Teachers' beliefs are shaped by their beliefs about what language, learning and teaching are (Borg, 2003). In addition, Borg contended 'teachers are active, thinking decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex, practically oriented, personalized, and context sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts and beliefs' (p. 81). In line with Borg's argument, Kumaravadivelu (2014) contended "Teaching is a dynamic, complex, and situated activity which requires teachers' online decision-making". Such online decision making is providing CF which is incidental rather than designed aspect of language teaching in most cases (Rahimi and Zhang, 2015). Regarding such arguments, this paper also presents what the teachers (novice and experienced teacher) believe and practice about CF as well as what students believe and think about CF.

Even though there is a consensus of the frequent recasts use in the classroom interaction, different views are presented by teachers (novice and experienced teachers) and students. regarding experienced teachers' views, Rahimi and Zhang (2015) reveal that experienced teacher views immediate feedback and after activity fit to give correction, while in Mori's (2011) study, it is revealed that timing for correction depends on students' development on the confidence and ability.

Those views are based on the teachers' beliefs and practices gained from their experiences in the classroom interaction considering students' cognitive and affective factors.

On the other hand, different views are derived from novice teachers. In Rahimi and Zang's study, they believe to give correction after students finish talking, contrasting to experienced teachers. However, Different view from pre-service teacher is reported by Ozmen and Aydin (2015) in which the consensus in considering fluency and accuracy in giving correction. If the focus is on fluency, delayed feedback will be appropriate, but if the concern is accuracy, immediate feedback fits to the timing for correction. Either Mori's or Ozmen and Aydin's study prefers recasts for grammatical error corrections. It means that the agreement of experienced and novice teachers refer to certain linguistic foci. Leaving out the immediate and delayed correction, research report conducted by Kaivanpanah, Alavi and Sepehrinia (2015) reveals that giving feedback should fit to learners' level of proficiency. Teachers believe that recasts and metalinguistic feedback fit to low level proficient students but they can be used interchangeability. It contrasts to Lee's (2013) study, revealing that teachers prefer

implicit feedback, recasts, for advanced-level adult student.

The mismatches are also presented in students's views regarding timing and linguistic foci. Within Kaivanpanah et al. study, students agree to get immediate feedback for pronunciation and vocabulary, while delayed feedback fits to their grammatical errors. Contrarily, Yang's (2016) study reveals that students prefer correction to phonological errors rather than to lexical and grammatical errors without considering timing in giving correction.

Interestingly, there is discrepancy to what teachers' beliefs and students' beliefes on CF in Kaivanpanah et al., in which teachers view that students dislike being corrected in the classroom, in contrast, students expect more feedback from their teachers. Another issue in this study is regarding peer-feedback which is more preferable for students, while most teachers do not support peer-feedback. Such gap is found in Lee's (2013) study also in which students agree to get explicit correction immediately, while teachers prefer implicit feedback.

Mehdizadeh and Sepehrinia (2016) tried to fill the gap between teachers' beliefs and practices. They took 37 teachers by using subsequent observation and interview

regarding teachers' beliefs and practices. Again, recasts are mostly prefered by the teachers accounting 67% of all CF types leaving out timing and linguistic foci. In their study, teachers view that recasts fits to the advanced discussion-based class while prompts are suitable for higher proficient learners. It contrasts to Kaivanpanah et al finding eliciting recasts to be potent for lower proficient learners

RECASTING AND MEDIATING VARIABLES

Previous research emphasis heavily on learner-external factors ignoring learner-internal factors (i.e. Discourse context, instructional setting, characteristics of linguistic targets, and length and number of changes) posited recasts less effective than the other type of CF. To challenge those findings, however, some recent researchers provide some evidence on which confirming or disconfirming the previous findings of recasts. Shaofeng.Li (2013:636) asserts that "unequivocal advantage of explicit feedback compared to implicit feedback needs to be reconsidered that the investigation of the mediating variables for CF should be prioritized. For instance, Labeling recasts either implicit or explicit feedback also leads to perception of "superiority" of one type feedback compared to the others.

Regarding learner-internal factors refers learners' *anxiety* (Table 2), Rassaei (2015) reports a surprising finding about the efficacy of recasts (implicit CF) which are more effective than metalinguistic feedback (explicit CF). Rassaei took 101 EFL learners classified into high and low anxiety learners' groups. Each anxiety groups was subdivided randomly by giving either recasts or metalinguistic CF. In this case, recasts more outperformed than metalinguistic feedback for high-anxiety learners. Furthermore, Rassaei (2015: 108) contends that "to the best of the researcher's knowledge, this current study is the first study providing evidence that for some learners' recasts can be more effective than metalinguistic CF".

In line with Rassaei's finding, Sheen (2008) reports that that anxiety plays important role in how recasts promote learning. In contrast to Rassaei finding, Sheen pinpoints that low-anxiety learner who receives recasts more outperformed than high-anxiety learners across testing measures. Furthermore, low-anxiety learners produced more modified output following recasts than did other groups in the study.

In Rassaei study, the distinguishing low and high anxiety learners is based on categorical variable as independent variables by ignoring middle anxiety scores (preferably continuous variable). Thus, it is

difficult to make generalization regarding learners' level of anxiety. In addition, no delay tests are conducted. It is necessary connect working memory of recasts as implicit feedback to the long-term memory (in delayed test). Another limitation is based on the anxiety item scale which consists of only an eight-item scale and not specified on language skills. In addition, the criterion of measure is in written tests only. In Sheen study, there are some limitation exposed: (1) Limited in that the treatment of recasts was relatively short, involving a relatively small group size, (2) Because this study focused on only two major functions of English articles ("a" as first mention and "the" as anaphoric), the results cannot be generalized to other aspects of English articles, (3) the anxiety questionnaire consists of only an eight-item scale and took a rather undifferentiated view of classroom language anxiety not specified on certain language skills (grammar, speaking, writing, etc.), and (4) The criterion measures of L2 learning involved only written tests. This is unavoidable due to logistic constraints. It would have been ideal to have included an unplanned oral production test.

To fill the gap, Lee (2016) provides learner-internal factors as dependent variables. Anxiety, attitude, motivation and self confidence are considered as dependent variables. Both teachers and students are involved by using questionnaire and interview. However, some limitation are risen that is (1) the homogeneity of participants (all in advanced-level) ignoring the heterogeneity of learners' individual differeces, (2) positing the four variables in one article and only using questionnaire only unfolds partial results of the finding.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The intent of this paper is to reassert in the efficacy of CF in CLT. The issue on the form-based instruction within a communicative context is considerably applied. The terms of accuracy, fluency, and overall communicative skills are best developed through instruction that is primarily meaning-based but in which guidance is provided through timely form-focus activities and correction in context. Two bold perspectives, cognitive-interactionist and sociocultural interactionist of CF are presented whether applicable or not in recent CLT. The former regards form-focused instruction through input, interaction, output, and noticing; while the later concerns meaning-focused instruction through collaboration between experts and novices. In addition, the former constitutes a rigid distinction for CF types with implicit and explicit dichotomy, while

the later is more flexible moving from implicit to explicit within ZDP.

The consistency of research finding regarding efficacy of both perspectives in CLT has been reported by scholars until to date. Both cognitive-interactionist and sociocultural perspectives provide considerable evidence to the effectiveness of their CF in facilitating learning during communicative tasks. Krashen's (1982) doubt that considered CF as detrimental factor to increase L2 anxiety might not come to the consensus. The recent research reported that anxiety is a mediating factor in CF in which learners with high and low anxiety gets benefit from CF

Previous CF studies also have shed more light on the arguments regarding the role of input, interaction, output and noticing in SLA. They postulate whether learners enable access of positive evidence (what is acceptable) and if it is not enough, learners can be provided by negative evidence (what is not acceptable, through corrective feedback) to bring an optimal change on their language development.

Furthermore, he recommend some considerations to take into consideration for the future research on CF regarding cognitive-interactionist perspective.

1. CF strategies: Combining the types of CF strategies will be more effective than just relying on the exclusiveness of one type of CF strategies in facilitating learners to target language. The nature of classroom setting that changes overtime regarding social, contextual, psychological, and cultural factors enable teachers to use different CF strategies interchangeably. More research in CF should elaborate the collective application of CF strategies in facilitating learners to the target language (see also Sarandi, 2016). The main intention of CF is not to find out which type is more "superior" than the others that lead to the exclusiveness of one type of CF strategy, but rather how such types of CF can be effectively used and intended to facilitate learners' L2 development.

2. Moderating variables: the most recent studies report the factors mediating the efficacy of CF such as anxiety (learner difference) and assert that CF mediated by anxiety provides new insightful evidence on recasts. Other learner differences such as motivation, self-confidence, perception, etc. Need to take account. Besides, other moderating variables such as teachers' cognition, learners' working

memory, analytic ability, modified recasts leading to uptake, and modality need to take account also for future research of CF.

3. Bridging the gaps among researchers, teachers, and students: it may be more effective to include those all actors into a research. To adjust the teachers' belief and practice based on their knowledge of CF is considerably important. However, it cannot be effective when ignoring learners' needs and condition. Further research may need to compromise those three actors to get a real picture of the CF efficacy.

REFERENCES

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation: Second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal,* 78, 465–483.

Andringa, S., de Glopper, K., & Hacquebord, H. (2011). Effect of explicit and implicit instruction on free written response task performance. *Language Learning*, 61(3), 868–903.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching,* 36 (2), 81-109.

Brown, D. (2014). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research.*

http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168814563200.

Doughty, C. & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In Doughty & J. Williams (eds.), focus on form in classroom second language.

Ellis, R. and Y. Sheen. (2006). Re-examining the role of recasts in L2 acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28 (4), 575–600.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., Erlam, R. (2006). *Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar*. Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. L2 Journal, 1, 3–18.

Fadilah, E. (2018). Oral corrective feedback on students' grammatical accuracy and willingness to communicate in EFL classroom: the effects of focused and unfocused prompts. *The Asian EFL Journal,* 20 (4), 57-85.

Finn, B. & Metcalfe, J. (2010).Scaffolding feedback to maximize long-term error correction. *Memory & Cognition*, 38 (7), 951-961

Goo, J. (2012). Corrective feedback and working memory capacity in interaction-driven L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 34, 445– 474.

Han, Z-H. (2002). Rethinking the role of corrective feedback in communicative language teaching. *RELC*, 30 (1), 1-34

Kainvanpanah,S.,S.M.Alaviand, S.Sepehrinia. (2015). Preferencesforinteractionalfeedback: Differencesbetweenlearners and teachers. *The Language Learning Journal*, 43 (1), 1–20.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2014). Afterword: Rethinking global perspectives and local

initiatives in language teaching. In S. Ben Said (Ed.). *language teachers and teaching: Global perspectives, local initiatives* (pp. 317-323). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lee, E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41(2), 217-230.

Lee, E., J. (2016). Reducing international graduate students' language anxiety through oral pronunciation corrections. *System,* 56, 78-95.

Li. S., Zhu, Y., & Ellis, R. (2016a). The effects of the timing of corrective feedback on the acquisition of a new linguistic structure. *The Modern Language Journal,* 100 (1), 276-295

Li. S., Ellis, R., Zhu, Y. (2016b). Task-based Versus task-supported language instruction: an experimental study. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistic, 36,* 205-229.

Long, M., H. (2015). Second language acquisition and task based language teaching. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Long, M.H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48, 183–218.

Lyster, R., & Satio, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition 32*(2), 265–302.

Lyster, R., & L. Ranta. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*, 37-66.

Lyster , R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach* . Amsterdam : Benjamins .

Lyster, R. and L. Ranta. (2013). Counterpoint piece: the case for variety in corrective feedback research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 35 (1), 167–84.

Lyster, R., K. Saito & M. Sato (2013).Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching* 46 (1), 1–40.

Nassaji, H. (2009). Elicitation and reformulation and their relationship with learner repair in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning,*57, 511–48.

Ozmen, K. S., & Aydın, H. Ü. (2015). Examining Student Teachers' Beliefs about Oral Corrective Feedback: Insights from a Teacher Education Program in Turkey. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(12), 141-164.

Panova, I. and R. Lyster. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly,* 36 (4), 573–95.

Spada, N., Shiu L-J, J., & Tomita, Y. (2015). Validating an elicited imitation task as a measure of implicit knowledge: comparisons with other validation studies. *Language Learning,* 64 (3), 723-751.

Spada, N., Jessop, L., Suzuki, W., Tomita, Y., & Valeo, (2014). Isolated and integrated form-focused Instruction: Effects on different types of L2 knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 18, 453–473.

Quinn, P. (2014). Delayed versus immediate corrective feedback on orally

produced passive errors in English. (Unpublisheddoctoraldissertation).University of Toronto, Toronto.

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L-J. (2014). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes. *System,* 42, 429-439.

Rassaei, E. (2014). Scaffolded Feedback, Recasts, and L2 Development: A socio cultural perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98 (1). 417-431

Rassaei, E. (2015). Oral corrective feedback, foreign language anxiety, and L2 development. *System,* 49, 98-109.

Sarandi, H. (2016). Oral corrective feedback: A question of classification and application. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50, 1, p. 235-246.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp.3–32). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sepehrinia, S.& Mehdizadeh, M. (2016): Oral corrective feedback: Teachers' concerns and researchers'orientation. The Language Learning Journal. DOI: 10.1080/09571736.2016.1172328

Shaofeng, L. (2013). The interaction between the effects of implicit and explicit feedback and individual differences in language analytic ability and working memory. *The Modern Language Journal,* 97, 634-654

Shaofeng, L., Zhu, Y., & Ellis, R. (2016). The effects of the timing of corrective feedback on the acquisition of a new linguistic structure. *The Modern Language Journal,* 100 (1), 276-295

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research,*10 (4), 361–92.

Sheen, Y. (2008). Recasts, Language Anxiety, Modified Output, and L2 Learning. *Language Learning,*58 (4), 835–74.

Sheen, Y., (2012). Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471–483). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Vygotsky, L., S. (1978). Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard university Press.

Yang, J. (2016). Learners' oral corrective feedback preferences in relation to their cultural background, proficiency level and types of error. *System,* 61, 75-86