The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning™

The Impact of Oral Corrective Feedback on Immediate Uptake and Retention

Şafak Müjdeci, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey, safakmujdeci@gazi.edu.tr

Recommended Citations:

APA

Müjdeci, Ş. (2022). The Impact of Oral Corrective Feedback on Immediate Uptake and Retention. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 12(1), 91-108.

MLA

Şafak Müjdeci. "The Impact of Oral Corrective Feedback on Immediate Uptake and Retention" The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning 12.1 (2022): 91-108.

The Impact of Oral Corrective Feedback on Immediate Uptake and Retention

Şafak Müjdeci [1]

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to investigate the effects of oral corrective feedback (CF) in the form of recasts and prompts on English language learners' immediate uptake and retention. The study consisted of four instruction sessions over a period of four weeks. Four A2 level EFL learners participated in this case study. While the instructor provided corrective feedback in the form of recast for two of them, two of the participants received prompts which allowed them to correct their own mistakes. The data of the study included treatment session transcriptions and acceptability judgement tests which were designed for each participant on the basis of their own errors and were administered after a two-week time interval. The study revealed that clarification request and metalinguistic explanation always led to uptake whereas the prompts least likely to lead to uptake were repetition, which resulted in uptake 86 percent of the time, and elicitation, which led to uptake 92 percent of the time. The results also indicated that recasts and prompts didn't affect the retention of corrected items differently when the participants tried to correct their previous mistakes. However, all the participants were able to identify the correct forms in the statements substantially when they were asked to judge their acceptability.

Oral corrective feedback is a requisite for second language acquisition (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013) as it provides learners with the opportunity to notice the gap between input and their interlanguage (Schmidt, 1990) and repair possible erroneous utterances. It is commonly acknowledged that positive evidence alone, i.e. grammatical or acceptable form in L2, is not sufficient to learn a language successfully (Krashen, 1982),

[1]Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey, safakmujdeci@gazi.edu.tr

for it is not always possible to notice the correct form just through exposure to target language. What learners rather need is to have opportunities to produce the language and modify their language through interactions (Swain, 2000). Therefore, oral corrective feedback, a type of negative evidence, plays a vital role in foreign language learning (Sheen, 2004).

Corrective feedback has always been one of the most controversial and interesting issues in second language teaching for decades. While some of the researchers (e.g. Krashen, 1981) claim that language learners need to pass through developmental stages on their way without corrective feedback, others assume that "learners require feedback on error in order to make progress in their ability to use a language in more target-like ways" (Nicholas, Lightbown & Spada, 2001, p. 720). Moreover, Lightbown and Spada (1999) assert that "allowing learners too much freedom without correction and explicit instruction will lead to early fossilization of errors" (p.119, as cited in Han, 2002). In the same vein, Lyster (2004) emphasizes the importance of inducing language learners to pay attention to linguistic forms. He points out that immersion learners have some problems with grammatical accuracy even after years of immersion education. That being the case, it is quite understandable for learners in an EFL context to have problems in accuracy.

By using form-focused activities, it is possible to draw learners' attention to language rules (Nassaji, 2009). These activities, supported with corrective feedback, may help learners notice the gap in their interlanguage and positive evidence (Swain, 2005). However, it is difficult to claim that the modifications performed during the interaction become permanent. Nevertheless, one can assume that feedback raises learners' awareness and helps them notice the correct form. Although learners can be aware of the difference between their interlanguage and target language, it is essential to observe long-term effects.

In order to show the effectiveness of CF, researchers mostly rely on immediate uptake and retention. On the one hand, the term uptake is used by Lyster and Ranta (1997) to refer to "a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance" (p. 49). It is commonly asserted that certain types of uptake are likely to cater for the development of target language accuracy (See Panova & Lyster, 2002). However, Lyster and Ranta (1997) claim that the presence of uptake does not necessarily refer to a plausible language learning process. Similarly, Sheen (2004) asserts that uptake does not indicate learning but it indicates whether the targeted language items are noticed by learners. On the other hand, Naeimi, Saedi, and Behnam (2017) define retention as "the ability of subsequent, and of course appropriate, production and perception of the target language" (p.59). They also underline the importance of distinguishing immediate uptake and retention and suggest measuring language performance on the basis of subsequent retention.

This study particularly focuses on how oral corrective feedback affects immediate uptake and subsequent retention with regards to data obtained from an EFL context in which learners have little or no opportunities to be exposed to interactional input. This very nature of the data eliminates the possible influence of natural use of English beyond schooling, and thus the impact that could be exerted via exposure and interaction. To this end, the present study investigates how different types of corrective feedback may benefit Turkish EFL learners to determine whether recasts and prompts have differential effects on retention of corrected language items.

2. Literature Review

It is widely accepted that corrective feedback is vital for language learning process (Ellis, 2009, 2017; Loewen, 2012). According to Yang and Lyster (2010), "corrective feedback is considered effective in promoting noticing and so is conducive to L2 learning" (p. 237). There has been a plethora of studies that differentiated feedback in terms of how explicit or implicit it is (e.g., Carrol & Swain, 1993; Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006; Loewen & Erlam, 2006; Lyster, 1998). However, Yang and Lyster (2010) criticize comparing the

effects of different feedback techniques just in accordance with their implicit or explicit nature. Their alternative way of classification distinguishes between input-providing and output-pushing corrective feedback. They suggest that "Input-providing CF supplies the correct reformulation through recasts and explicit correction; output pushing CF withholds the correct reformulation and instead encourages learners to self-repair through prompts" (p. 237). Additionally, Lyster and Ranta (1997) describe the types of CF provided by teachers in the classroom as explicit correction, recasts and prompts. Teachers inform learners that their utterance is not correct and they provide the correct version when they give explicit feedback. In recasts, teachers repeat back the correct form of the learners' incorrect utterances. When it comes to prompts, teacher encourage learners to self-correct their inaccurate utterances by providing some clues.

After they are provided with feedback, learners correct or attempt to correct their errors, leading to the legitimate conclusion that learners have actually noticed the feedback (Lochtman, 2002). Lochtman (2002) defines repair as "a repetition by the learner of the corrective teacher feedback" (p. 281) and states that the correction moves comprising recasts appear to result in more successful uptake. However, the fact that learners repeat what the teacher said does not necessarily imply that learners have understood the feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). On the other hand, prompts, as explicit CF techniques, provide learners with more opportunities as they push these learners to produce output. Output is an important component of conversational interaction that leads to second language learning (Swain, 2000). Swain further argues that it is mandatory to push L2 learners to produce output so that they can be aware of their interlanguage and gain better control of it. Hence, learners may gain control of their interlanguage thanks to prompts. However, recasts leave little opportunity for learner-generated repair (Panova & Lyster, 2002).

Prompts, which include clarification requests, repetitions, metalinguistic clues, and elicitation, are conducive to learning because they foster production of pushed output through self-correction (Lyster, 2004). Lyster argues that prompts are discursive because they generate self-correction. Similarly, de Bot (1996) claims that "learners benefit more from being pushed to make the right connection on one's own than from hearing the correct structures in the input" (p. 549). Moreover, Han (2002) mentions four conditions which appear to affect the outcomes of providing corrective feedback. They include "individualized attention, consistent focus, developmental readiness, and intensity" (p. 568).

By accounting for all these supports and objections, this study focuses on the role of oral corrective feedback for immediate uptake and retention. Firstly, the frequency and distribution of oral corrective feedback together with the frequency and distribution of different types of learner reactions to the feedback, which is referred to as learner uptake, have been examined. Secondly, the study attempts to determine the efficacy of recasts and prompts on the retention of corrected language items. The effectiveness of corrective feedback is mostly measured based on the kind of learner uptake following the corrective feedback. However, this study considers retention as well and measures the effectiveness on the basis of whether feedback is recalled later.

The following questions are central to this study:
1)   What is the distribution of uptake following different types of corrective feedback?
2)   How do recasts and prompts affect the retention of corrected language items?

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

The participants were four (F=3, M=1) A2 level Turkish EFL learners who attended at a private English course and they were required to take the CEFR placement test after enrolling in the course. These four students were selected based on their willingness to participate. While two of them received recasts,

which provided the learners with corrective feedback immediately, two of them received prompts which allowed them to correct their own mistakes. Pseudo names were assigned for the participants.

Han (2002) claims that "studies of corrective feedback in real classrooms seldom generate positive findings because students rarely receive consistent and persistent feedback on their errors" (p. 569). By considering this assertion, this study was conducted not in the real classroom. Each participant received individualized attention from the researcher.

3.2. Linguistic Targets

In the present study, not just one specific language form was targeted. Some of the linguistic structures studied during their lessons were selected for analyses. They include Simple Present Tense, like/dislike, Simple Past Tense, comparatives, Present Perfect Tense, countable/uncountable nouns, too/enough, used to, all of which were delimited in the light of A2 proficiency level of the CEFR (CoE, 2001). Although the activities were selected to elicit these target forms, the participants were provided with feedback about some other non-target language items as well.

3.3. Procedure

The study consisted of four instruction sessions over a period of four weeks and the participants were assigned some different activities each week. The treatment consisted of activities during which prompts or recasts were provided when learners made a mistake. While two of the participants received immediate corrective feedback in the form of recasts, two of them received prompts which allowed them to correct their own mistakes. After the treatment procedure was over, the participants were administered acceptability judgment tests. In order to ascertain the influence of CF on the participants' retention, acceptability judgement tests were carried out after a two-week time interval.

Data included treatment session transcriptions and acceptability judgement tests which were designed for each participant on the basis of their own errors. The data set consisted of about 5 hours of transcribed interaction, comprising 376 student errors. It was coded in accordance with the categories identified in the model by Lyster and Ranta's (1997). Instances of error correction pass unnoticed when teachers reformulate learner utterance implicitly (Slimani, 1992, as cited in Panova & Lyster, 2002). However, the researcher tried to involve students in the process so that feedback wouldn't pass unnoticed. For this reason, participants in this study were pushed to notice forms. It is mostly asserted that recasts do not promote immediate learner repair (Panova & Lyster, 2002), however; they were mostly noticed in this study because they were made salient by the instructor. With the recast group, the instructor mostly waited for the correct utterance after providing recast while the prompt group were pushed to self-repair. If the participants in the prompt group were not able to correct their mistakes, they were provided with recast.

3.4. Data Analysis
3.4.1 Feedback types
3.4.1.2. Recast

Recast is defined as "the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance minus the error" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 46). The teacher does not clearly indicate that an error has occurred, and s/he provides the learners with the correct form. In some studies, to allow for learner responses following recasts to flow naturally, teachers are not explicitly requested to discourage repair (e.g., Yang & Lyster, 2010). However, in this study, repair was encouraged to see retention of corrected language items later.

(Excerpt from the study)
Student: She got up 6.30
Teacher: At (Recast)
Student: At 6:30. She went to the station by her car
Teacher: Yeah

3.4.1.3. Prompts

Prompts are teacher-initiated moves which can lead to the learners correcting themselves (Lyster, 2004). Teacher does not provide learners with the correct form directly but provide some clues for self-correction. Prompts include four categories:

Clarification requests
They provide learners with opportunities to clarify their own erroneous utterance. Phrases such as "Pardon me" and "I don't understand" are included in this category (Lyster, 2004).

(Excerpt from the study)
Student: He combs him's hair
Teacher: Pardon? (Clarification request)
Student: He combs him...
Teacher: Be careful
Student: His hair
Teacher: Good

Metalinguistic feedback
With metalinguistic feedback, the teacher indicates that an error has occurred. Grammatical explanations are also included in this category. As Lyster (2004) stated, "They provide comments, information or requests related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance" (p. 405).

(Excerpt from the study)
Student: Istanbul have… has a lot of facility
Teacher: plural (Metalinguistic feedback)
Student: facilities.

Elicitations
The teacher pauses to let students fill in the blanks or indicates that learners need to reformulate their utterances.

(Excerpt from the study)
Student: When the course finished, I went to dormitory and I weared
Teacher: I... (Elicitation)
Student: ....
Teacher: weared or... (Elicitation)
Student: wore
Teacher: Good

Repetitions
The teachers repeat learners' error, mostly with a rising intonation.

(Excerpt from the study)
Student: Generally, I go to the Istanbul
Teacher: I go to… (Elicitation)
Student: the Istanbul
Teacher: the Istanbul? (Repetition)
Student: Istanbul. I go to Istanbul.

3.4.2. Uptake

Uptake refers to "a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 49). Lyster and Ranta (1997) make a distinction between correct and incorrect uptake, which are referred to as repair and needs-repair respectively. Repair includes repetition, incorporation, self-repair, and peer-repair. Student acknowledgements such as "yes" are included in the category of needs-repair. The same errors, different errors, off-target errors, hesitations and partial repair are other examples of needs-repair. If there is no uptake, the topic continues, or the teacher uses another type of corrective feedback. If learners correct themselves, it is possible that they have noticed the feedback. However, uptake is not always considered to be an instance of learning. This study also didn't consider uptake as an instance of learning.

3.5. Tests

For the second research question, acceptability judgement (AJ) tests were designed for each participant based on their own errors. The tests consisted of thirty sentences including both the correct and incorrect forms of the same items for each participant. These sentences were presented in PowerPoint one by one and participants were asked to judge their acceptability. For each participant in the recast group, 15 errors which occurred more than twice were selected randomly. For each participant in the prompt group, 15 errors, which were not able to be corrected after the first prompt but the following prompts, were selected randomly.

Errors which followed recasts for the prompt group were not included in the test. To check the noticing of participants as well, the test included both the correct and wrong forms of the same items. A retention score for each participant was calculated based on whether the learner corrected the mistakes in their AJ tests. A noticing score for each participant was also calculated by considering whether the participants could identify correct sentences.

4. Results and Discussion

In the present research study, during 300 minutes of recordings, which included 848 student turns, 376 corrections and 352 corrective feedback were identified. All these discursive instances were analysed to find out how CF is negotiated between learners and teachers. The following analyses of these instances are carried out on the basis of the research questions of this study.

Research question 1: What is the distribution of uptake following different types of corrective feedback?

To find the distribution of uptake, which includes repair and needs-repair, the data were coded in accordance with the categories identified in Lyster and Ranta's (1997) model.

4.1. Recast group

Participants in this group were provided with recasts for their ill-formed utterances. Of 411 student turns in the group, 40 percent included an error. A few errors were not noticed by the researcher during the treatment or the students continued with the topic. That is why they were not corrected.

Table 1.
Frequency of Turns with Student Error, Teacher Feedback and Student Uptake

	Student Turns	Error	Cor. Feedback	Uptake	No-uptake	Repair	Needs- repair
Deniz	222	94 (42%)	86	81	5	60 (74%)	21 (26%)
Melike	189	70 (37%)	66	66	0	61 (92%)	5 (8%)

Table 1 shows that corrective feedback led to uptake mostly because repair was encouraged in this study to check retention of corrected language items later. The table also shows the percentage of needs-repair in the group. Although learners are provided with recast, Melike was able to react to these recasts with repetition or integration. On the other hand, Deniz reacted to some recasts with only acknowledgment. Deniz's uptake, which included mostly acknowledgements, implies that recasts may lead to different results on learners. This finding can be explained with their developmental readiness or individual differences and supports the claim of Mackey and Philp (1998) and Han (2002) who emphasized that learners were able to perceive the corrective nature of the recast when they are developmentally ready to learn the target form.

In Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study, it was found that the recast was the least likely to lead to uptake. In this study, uptake rate for recast was high because learners were encouraged to react. However, as mentioned before, uptake doesn't mean learning.

4.2. Prompt group

Participants in this group were provided with prompts for their ill-formed utterances. Of 437 student turns in the group, 47.5 percent included an error. A few errors were not noticed by the researcher during the treatment or the students continued with the topic. Participants' not giving answer to a prompt was also considered as no-uptake.

Table 2.
Frequency of Turns with Student Error, Teacher Feedback and Student Uptake

	Student Turns	Error	Cor. Feedback	Uptake	No-uptake	Repair	Needs- repair
Taha	248	132 (53%)	125	119	6	73 (61%)	46 (39%)
Sinem	189	80 (42%)	75	66	9	45 (68%)	21 (32%)

Table 3.
Prompt Group: Uptake Following Teacher Feedback

	Repair	Needs Repair	No uptake
Clarification request (n=19)	9 (47%)	10 (53%)	0
Elicitation (n=94)	58 (61%)	29 (31%)	7 (8%)
Repetition (n=30)	10 (33%)	16 (53%)	4 (14%)
Metalinguistic (n= 24)	20 (83%)	4 (17%)	0
Recast (n= 33)	28 (84%)	1 (3%)	4 (13%)

To find out whether all types of feedback were equally effective in leading to learner uptake, learners' responses that followed teacher feedback were coded according to whether or not there was evidence of uptake. Uptake included repair and needs- repair.

Although Table 3 shows repair and needs-repair for recasts, it would be misleading to refer to the repetition of recasts as repair. Recasts, which were provided when students couldn't repair their ill-formed utterances, elicited no repairs other than repetition although their uptake rate was high as students were encouraged to produce the correct utterance.

Table 3 shows that the prompt group always reacted to clarification requests and metalinguistic feedback, while they didn't show a reaction to some of the elicitation, repetition or recast. Among the prompts, the feedback types least likely to lead to uptake were the repetition, which resulted in uptake 86% of the time, and elicitation, which led to uptake 92% of the time. The most likely to succeed was clarification request and metalinguistic explanation with one hundred percent of these moves leading to uptake. This finding differs from Lyster and Ranta's study (1997) which found that elicitation led to uptake one hundred percent. It is compatible with the finding of Lochtman (2002) who found that metalinguistic feedback was one of the most successful techniques for eliciting learner uptake. Similar to Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study, it was found that among the prompts, repetition was least likely to lead to uptake.

Metalinguistic feedback proved to encourage repairs more, which resulted in student-generated repair 83 percent. Elicitation and clarification requests were the next most effective prompts, eliciting student-generated repair 83 percent and 61 percent of the time, respectively.

Research question 2: How do recasts and prompts affect the retention of corrected language items?

As mentioned earlier, uptake is not always considered to be an instance of learning and it is asserted that certain types of uptake are likely to benefit the development of target language accuracy (Panova & Lyster, 2002).

For the second research question, AJ tests were designed for each participant based on their own errors.

4.3. Recast group

For the recast group, 15 errors which occurred more than twice were selected randomly.

Deniz

Deniz exhibited 94 errors and could react to 81 out of 86 recasts. Deniz's uptake included 21 needs-repair, which included mostly acknowledgements, and 60 repair. (See the Appendix 1 for her AJ test and her performance on the test).

(Excerpt 1)

Week 1

Student: I absolutely love read book.

Teacher: You absolutely love reading.

Student: Reading...reading book.

(Excerpt 2)

Week 2

Student: I used to short hair

Teacher: You used to have short hair

Student: have short hair. I have tall hair now.

Teacher: You have long hair

Student: Long hair. Sorry.

Week 1

Student: He likes play tennis

Teacher: He likes playing

Student: playing tennis

Week 4

Student: I used to hair short

Teacher: You used to have short hair

Student: have short hair but now I have tall hair

Teacher: long hair

Student: long, yes ☺

Deniz was able to correct 5 out of her 15 ill-formed utterances although she could identify all of the correct utterances in the test.

Melike

Melike made 70 errors and could react to all the corrective feedback. Melike's uptake, which included mostly repetitions, included 61 needs-repair and 5 repair. (See the Appendix 2 for her AJ test and her performance on the test).

(Excerpt 1)

Week 3

Student: When I was a child, I used to have a free time.

Teacher: free time

Student: free time but now I haven't got a free time.

Teacher: You don't have much free time?

Student: Yes.

(Excerpt 2)

Week 2

Student: I used to have a short hair

Teacher: short hair

Student: have short hair but now I have long hair

Week 3

Student: ...sometimes I prefer eating in restaurants because I haven't got a free time

Teacher: free time

Student: free time

Week 4

Student: When I was a child, I have got a short hair

Teacher: You had short hair

Student: I had short hair

Melike was able to correct 4 out of her 15 ill-formed utterances. Her answers indicated that some of the recasts were not noticed. For example, when she was asked to judge the acceptability of correct utterances, she couldn't identify 5 of them and tried to modify these correct utterances in the test. Her incorrect modifications are as follows:

Sentence 11: A bus is more crowded than a taxi. Her judgement: False; crowder

Sentence 13: I go to dormitory when the course finishes. Her judgement: False; finished

Sentence 22: While I was going to Çanakkale, I was bored. Her judgement: False; I bored

Sentence 23: You shouldn't drive fast. Her judgement: False; fastly
Sentence 30: I hardly ever watch football matches. Her judgement: False; watching

4.4. Prompt group

For the prompt group, 15 errors that the participants couldn't correct after the first prompt were selected randomly.

Taha

Taha made 132 errors and could reacted to 119 out of 125 prompts. Taha's uptake included 46 needs-repair, which were later provided with another type of feedback, and 73 repair, which is the number of errors corrected after the first prompt. (See the Appendix 3 for his AJ test and his performance on the test).

(Excerpt 1)
S: He likes listening to music. I'm quite likes
T: Pardon?
S: I'm quite like
T: Pardon?
S: I'm quite
T: I'm?
S: like…
T: Are you sure with I'm? Or I?
S: I quite like
T: Yes

(Excerpt 3)
S: I was stomachache
T: I was? I…
S: Karnım ağrıdı.
T: I…
S: I was…
T: was… Are you sure? We use to be or have?
S: I was be …I am confused.
T: For example, I say I have a headache. In this sentence do we use have or to be?
S: To be
T: You sure? We use to be or have?
S: I have stomach ache
T: past form
S: had stomach ache
T: OK

(Excerpt 2)
S: I was do crossword
T: Pardon?
S: I was did crossword
T: I was did?
S: I did crossword

Taha was able to correct 6 out of his 15 ill-formed utterances. His answers indicated that some of the prompts were not noticed. For example, when he was asked to judge the acceptability of correct utterances, he couldn't identify two of them and tried to modify these correct utterances in the test. His incorrect modifications are as follows:

Sentence 3: I quite like playing football. His judgement: False; I'm quite like
Sentence 24: There is a lot of food in the fridge. His judgement: False; there are a lot of foods

Sinem

Sinem made 80 errors and could react to 66 out of 75 prompts. Sinem's uptake included 21 needs-repair, which were later provided with another type of feeback, and 45 repair, which is the number of errors corrected after the first prompt (See Appendix 4 for her AJ test and her performance on the test).

(Excerpt 1)

S: He combs him's hair
T: Sorry?
S: He combs him...
T: Be careful
S: His hair
T: Good.

(Excerpt 2)
S: my wallet falled
T: falled?
S: My wallet was..were..fall
T: past form. It is irregular

S: my wallet falled
T: falled?
S: My wallet was..were..fall
T: past form. It is irregular
S: my wallet falled

Excerpt 3)
S: I don't like iron
T: I don't like...
S:...
T: after iron we use what? Iron...
S: ironing. I don't like ironing.
T: OK

Sinem was able to correct 5 out of her 15 ill-formed utterances. Her answers indicated she was not able to notice one correct form. For example, when she was asked to judge the acceptability of correct utterances, she couldn't identify only one of them and tried to modify this correct utterance in the test. Her incorrect modification is as follows:

Sentence 10: I like going outside. Her judgement: False; I like go outside.

Table 4.
Retention and Noticing Scores in AJ Tests

	Retention score	Noticing score
Deniz	5	15
Melike	4	10
Taha	6	13
Sinem	5	14

The scores of the participants in the AJ tests showed that recasts and prompts didn't have differential effects on retention of corrected items when the participants tried to correct their previous errors. This finding contradicts with the assertion of Panova and Lyster (2002) who claimed that certain types of uptake are likely to benefit the development of target language accuracy. Moreover, Mackey, Gass and McDonough (2000) also found that when learners repeated a recast, it was more likely that they have correctly perceived its corrective intention. Similar effects of recasts and prompts on retention appear to indicate that students in the recast group have also perceived the corrective intention of recasts and could correct their erroneous utterances later.

When it comes to noticing, the findings of the current study support the assertion of Lochtman (2002) who claimed that after they are provided with feedback, learners correct or attempt to correct their errors, which leads to the conclusion that learners have actually noticed the feedback. Similarly, Yang and Lyster (2010) stated that corrective feedback is considered effective in promoting noticing and so is

conducive to L2 learning. In the same vein, Han (2002) found that recasts could heighten the awareness of what counted as appropriate use. The participants' identification of the correct forms may prove that their noticing of these language items increased thanks to corrective feedback.

On the other hand, the results contradict with the claim of Panova and Lyster (2002) who claimed that immediate learner repair doesn't prove noticing. The findings revealed that corrective feedback enabled learners to identify correct forms although they could not correct their errors. It is likely that linguistic and affective factors affected uptake and retention of the corrected language items in this study as Storch and Wigglesworth (2010), which explored uptake and retention of different types of feedback on L2 writing, suggested.

5. Conclusion

This study set out to investigate the effects of oral corrective feedback (CF) in the form of prompts and recasts. Four A2 level Turkish EFL learners participated in the study. While the teacher provided corrective feedback in the form of recast for two of them, two of the participants received prompts which allowed them to correct their own mistakes. The study lasted about six weeks, including four treatment sessions for each participant and a final session for delayed acceptability judgement tests to check the retention of the corrected language forms.

There were two research questions designed for the study. The first research question of the study was concerned with the distribution of uptake following different types of corrective feedback. The findings of the first research question indicated that learners were able to perceive the corrective nature of the recasts when they are developmentally ready to learn the target form. It was also found that among the prompts, the least likely one to lead to uptake was the repetition while the most likely ones to lead to uptake were clarification request and metalinguistic explanation.

The second research question sought to find out whether recasts and prompts had differential effects on the retention of corrected language items. Results indicated that recasts and prompts didn't affect the retention of corrected items differently when the participants tried to correct their previous errors. However, the participants were able to identify the correct forms in the sentences when they were asked to judge their acceptability. Similar effects of recasts and prompts may indicate that if recasts are made salient and learners were encouraged to repair their ill-formed utterances, recast can prove to be effective for retention.

The primary concern with this study is that it was conducted with a small sample size, limiting the generalizability of the claims. Future studies might gather data from a greater number of participants to enhance the external validity and generalizability. Moreover, additional research can be conducted in order to find out the differential effects of different types of prompts for retention.

References

Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15(03), 357-386.

Council of Europe. Council for Cultural Co-operation. Education Committee. Modern Languages Division. (2001). Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Cambridge University Press.

de Bot, K. (1996). The psycholinguistics of the output hypothesis. Language Learning, 46, 529- 555.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28(02), 339-368.

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

Ellis, R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in L2 classrooms: What we know so far. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (eds.), Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning: Research, theory, applications, implications. New York: Routledge, 3–18.

Han, Z. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on tense consistency in L2 output. Tesol Quarterly, 36(4), 543-572.

Krashen, S. (1981). Second language acquisition and second language learning. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.

Lightbown , P. M. , & Spada , N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12 , 429 – 448 .

Lochtman, K. (2002). Oral corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom: how it affects interaction in analytic foreign language teaching. International Journal of Educational Research, 37, 271-283.

Loewen, S. (2012). The role of feedback. In S. M. Gass & A. Mackey (eds.), The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition. New York: Routledge, 24–40.

Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Corrective feedback in the chatroom: An experimental study. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 19(1), 1-14.

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. Language Learning, 48(2), 183-218.

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26(03), 399-432.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19, 37-66.

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

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22, 471-497.

Mackey , A. , & Philp , J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? Modern Language Journal, 82, 338 – 356.

Naeimi, A., Saeidi, M., & Behnam, B. (2017). Effect of oral corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' phonological uptake and retention. International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 5(17), 57-75.

Nassaji, H. (2009). Effects of recasts and elicitations in dyadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. Language Learning, 59(2), 411-452.

Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. Language Learning, 51(4), 719-758.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. Tesol Quarterly, 36(4), 573-595.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 11(2), 129-158.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. Language Teaching Research, 8(3), 263-300.

Slimani, A. (1992). Evaluation of classroom interaction. Evaluating Second Language Education, 197-221.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' processing, uptake and retention of corrective feedback. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32, 303–334.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning, 97, 114.

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

Yang, Y., & Lyster, R. (2010). Effects of form-focused practice and feedback on Chinese   EFL learners' acquisition of regular and irregular past tense forms. Studies in Second   Language Acquisition, 32(02), 235-263.

Appendix 1

Acceptability Judgement Test (Deniz)

Sentence	Judgement of the participant
1) I get up 8 o'clock. *	True
2) He is wake up at 9 o'clock.*	False; He wakes up
3) I don't want to go outside now because I tired.*	True
4) **I get up at 10 o'clock every day.** (S1)	True
5) **He wakes up at 10 a.m.** (S2)	True
6) I dislikes collecting stamps.*	False; dislike
7) He likes play tennis.*	False; playing
8) **I dislike going to theatre. (S6)**	True
9) **He likes playing chess. (S7)**	True
10) **I'm sorry I can't help you. I am very tired. (S3)**	True
11) A plane faster than a taxi.*	True
12) **A taxi is faster than a bike. (S11)**	True
13) My hobbies cooking and listening to music. *	True
14) **My hobbies are playing chess and volleyball. (S13)**	True
15) I really happy when I go on holiday. *	False; I am really happy
16) I have got tall hair. *	True
17) **I am happy to see you.** (S15)	True
18) **She has long hair. (S16)**	True
19) I want to eating in a restaurant. *	True
20) She has got too many bag. *	True
21) There are a lot of rubbish in the park. *	True
22) They didn't use to wearing uniforms.*	True
23) **I want to go to Istanbul. (S19)**	True
24) **There are too many students in the classroom. (S20)**	True
25) **There is a lot of rubbish in the park. (S21)**	True
26) I used to smoke but now I didn't smoke.*	True
27) She goes to school because she a student.*	False; is a student
28) **She is a student now. (S27)**	True
29) **They didn't use to wear uniforms. (S22)**	True
30) **I used to wear glasses but now I don't. (S26)**	True

*The sentence includes a mistake the learner makes repeatedly.

- Sentences in bold include the correct form of the mistakes the learner makes.

- The numbers following the sentences in bold indicate the sentences that include incorrect form.

- **Retention score:** 5/15 (calculated based on whether the learner corrected the mistakes)
- **Noticing score:** 15/15 (calculated based on whether the learner identified the correct sentences)

Appendix 2

Acceptability Judgement Test (Melike)

Sentence	Judgement of the participant
1) She got up 6:30 yesterday. *	False; at
2) After the school finish, I meet my friends. *	True
3) He gets up at 8:30 every day. (S1)	True
4) I and my friends go shopping together.*	True
5) A bus is crowder than a taxi. *	True
6) After the school finishes, I go to dormitory. (S2)	True
7) My friends and I go to cinema after the school. (S4)	True
8) A train is slowlier than a taxi. *	True
9) I am going to play tennis when the course finished.*	True
10) I am boring because I have a lot of homework. *	False; bored
11) A bus is more crowded than a taxi. (S5)	False; crowder
12) A train is slower than a taxi. (S8)	True
13) I go to dormitory when the course finishes. (S9)	False; finished
14) They went to in Bursa on holiday. *	True
15) My boyfriend and I went to Çanakkale. (S14)	True
16) He is bored because he has lots of things to do. (S10)	True
17) While they were going to Bursa, they bored. *	True
18) She has got a long hair. *	F; not a
19) I don't have a free time. *	True
20) She drove fastly so she had an accident. *	True
21) There are a few hamburger on the table. *	F; hamburgers
22) While I was going to Çanakkale, I was bored. (S17)	F; I bored
23) You shouldn't drive fast. (S20)	F; fastly
24) When I was a child, I had short hair. (S18)	True
25) There aren't enough food for us.*	True
26) I hardly ever watching football matches. *	True
27) He doesn't have much free time. (S19)	True
28) There isn't enough food for us. (S25)	True
29) There are a few apples on the table. (S21)	True
30) I hardly ever watch football matches. (S26)	F; watching

*The sentence includes a mistake the learner makes repeatedly.

- Sentences in bold include the correct form of the mistakes the learner makes.

- The numbers following the sentences in bold indicate the sentences that include incorrect form.

- Retention score: 4/15 (calculated based on whether the learner corrected the mistakes)
- Noticing score: 10/15 (calculated based on whether the learner identified the correct sentences)

Appendix 3

Acceptability Judgement Test (Taha)

Sentence	Judgement of the participant
1) He likes go to the theatre.*	True
2) I'm quite like listening to music. *	True
3) I quite like playing football. (S2)	False; I'm quite like
4) She likes listening to music. (S1)	True
5) A taxi more expensive than a bus.*	False; is
6) A taxi is more comfortable than a bus. (S5)	True
7) I used to play the chess.*	True
8) I was do crosswords when I was a child.*	False; did
9) He did his homework. (S8)	True
10) The book is very excited. *	False; exciting
11) The film was very exciting. (S10)	True
12) His boss fired his. *	True
13) I went to the Mersin by car. *	False; to Mersin
14) I don't want to see him. (S12)	True
15) We swimmed in the pool. *	True
16) He swam in the pool. (S15)	True
17) I went to Mersin by coach. (S13)	True
18) I like playing chess. (S7)	True
19) When I tired, I don't want to cook. *	False; was
20) There are a lot of monkey. *	False; monkeys
21) There are a lot of food. *	False; foods
22) I am very tired now. (S19)	True
23) There are a lot of chairs. (S20)	True
24) There is a lot of food in the fridge. (S21)	False; there are a lot of foods
25) I used to smoke but I was give up smoking. *	True
26) I ate too much ice-cream yesterday so I was stomach ache. *	True
27) I gave up smoking. (S25)	True
28) My best friend name is Samet. *	False; best friend's
29) She had stomach ache. (S26)	True
30) His best friend's name is Ahmet. (S28)	True

*The sentence includes a mistake the learner makes repeatedly.
- Sentences in bold include the correct form of the mistakes the learner makes.
- The numbers following the sentences in bold indicate the sentences that include incorrect form.

- Retention score: 6/15 (calculated based on whether the learner corrected the mistakes)
- Noticing score: 13/15 (calculated based on whether the learner identified the correct sentences)

Appendix 4

Acceptability Judgement Test (Sinem)

Sentence	Judgement of the participant
1) When the weather hot, I go to the beach.*	True
2) He brushes him teeth. *	True
3) The weather is very hot. Shall we go to the beach? (S1)	True
4) I sometimes talk my friends. *	True
5) When I tired, I go to sleep early. *	True
6) He brushed his teeth before going to bed. (S2)	True
7) He likes read a book. *	True
8) She interested in playing tennis. *	True
9) She rarely talks to her roommates. (S4)	True
10) I like going outside. (S7)	False; I like go outside
11) As she was tired, she went to bed early. (S5)	True
12) I weared my dress and went to the course.*	False; wore
13) She wore her coat before she went outside. (S12)	True
14) I am interested in dancing. (S8)	True
15) He falled down and hurt his ankle. *	True
16) I was shock when I heard the news. *	False; shocked
17) He fell off the bicycle. (S15)	True
18) I want to change lots of thing in my life. *	True
19) I was shocked when I saw him. (S16)	True
20) She feel shy when she failed in the exam. *	False; felt
21) Lots of things changed in my life. (S18)	True
22) She felt embarrased when everybody looked at her. (S22)	True
23) There aren't enough food for us. *	False; There isn't
24) She hasn't enough money. *	True
25) Her best friend name is Selin. *	True
26) There are two table in the house. *	False; tables
27) He hasn't got enough money. (S24)	True
28) There isn't enough food for everybody. (S23)	True
29) There are two cars in front of the house. (S26)	True
30) **My best friend's name is Gamze. (S25)**	True

*The sentence includes a mistake the learner makes repeatedly.

- Sentences in bold include the correct form of the mistakes the learner makes.

- The numbers following the sentences in bold indicate the sentences that include incorrect form.

- **Retention score:** 5/15 (calculated based on whether the learner corrected the mistakes)
- **Noticing score:** 14/15 (calculated based on whether the learner identified the correct sentences)