Less Is Not More: A Small-scale Study of Corrective Feedback

M.H. van Spaandonk

Abstract

This study deals with one specific aspect of classroom interaction through an additional language: corrective feedback. By drawing on research and theories from bilingual, immersion and international contexts the study attempts to chart the grey area between corrective feedback and scaffolding, and to distil results that might be relevant across all contexts. As such, this study examines how subject teachers in an international setting correct language mistakes when interacting with students in the classroom, which types of corrective feedback are used in response to different types of errors, and which language goals can be deduced from the types of corrective feedback used. In order to find the answers to these questions, several lessons given by two international school teachers were observed, transcribed and analysed. The results show that the subject teachers focused mainly on meaning and mostly used recasts, but also used two as yet uncharted types of corrective feedback ('confirmative' feedback and corrective feedback in response to non-verbal language) in order to negotiate both meaning and form.

Introduction

Recent research into bilingual classroom settings has stressed the need for studies that try to find (productive) common ground rather than (unproductive) differences. Dalton-Puffer and Nikula (2014) argue that "there is great potential in researching [Content and Language Integrated Learning] precisely to showcase the integration of epistemologies that are traditionally separate in policy and research but inevitably converge in the mind of the learners as they experience formal education" (p. 121). Similarly, Dalton-Puffer, Llinares, Lorenzo, and Nikula (2014) "call for researchers from different research traditions to develop a common non-hierarchical matrix, for the identification of features of bilingual/multilingual education programmes all over the world, to help researchers carry out comparative studies across contexts" (p. 217). According to Llinares and Lyster (2014), "comparing contexts is key for understanding the effect of different interactional patterns on successful second language acquisition" (p. 192). This research paper attempts to contribute to the "non-hierarchical matrix" by drawing on research and theories from bilingual, immersion and international education contexts while analysing a specific aspect of interaction in the international classroom that might be relevant across all contexts: oral feedback.

This research paper will zoom in on one aspect of international education and classroom interaction, namely oral feedback during classroom interaction. As such, this paper addresses the grey area between corrective feedback (correcting mistakes implicitly and explicitly) and scaffolding (helping students to express themselves accurately). The main questions guiding this research are: *How do teachers in an international setting correct language mistakes when interacting with students in the classroom? Which types of corrective feedback are used in response to different types of errors? Which language goals can be deduced from the types of corrective feedback used?* In order to find the answers to these questions, several lessons given by two international school teachers were observed. The theoretical framework, and in particular the linguistic setting and the concepts of corrective feedback and scaffolding, will be discussed as well as the methodology used. The research findings will be shared

and discussed. This article will end with the main conclusions of the project and offer suggestions for further research.

Theoretical framework

As touched upon in the Introduction, both CLIL and immersion settings "share the goal of developing functional proficiency in an additional language by teaching content through that language (Llinares & Lyster, 2014, p.181). While the label "CLIL" explicitly indicates that this approach aims to integrate language and content, various theories applied to other settings (such as immersion) have demonstrated a similar focus. One example is the so-called "counterbalanced approach" that "calls for a more systematic integration of form-focused and content-based instruction in order to ensure continued language growth in immersion settings" (Llinares & Lyster, 2014, p.182). What many of these theories have in common is that they are rooted in systemic functional linguistics and constructivism, and that they stress the importance of feedback and scaffolding.

Gibbons (2015) places her discussion of (language) learning within the framework of constructivism, specifically Lev Vygotsky's "zone of proximal development," which "refers to the distance of the cognitive gap between what a child can do unaided and what the child can do jointly and in coordination with a more skilled expert" (p. 13). Gibbons explicitly links the zone of proximal development to the integration of content and language. When Gibbons argues that "all learners" can benefit from lessons that integrate content and language, she means both native speakers and second language learners. However, in order for this latter group to make as much progress as possible, "they need ongoing language development across the whole curriculum and the recognition by all teachers that they are teachers of English, not simply of subject 'content'" (Gibbons, 2015, pp. 10-11). Gibbons suggests that teachers can support language development by offering "scaffolding … a special kind of help that assists learners in moving toward new skills, concepts, or levels of understanding" (p.16). In other words, scaffolding helps learners to move from conversational language to academic language, defined by Cummins (2000) as "basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS)" and "cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP)" (p. 58). Feedback is one of the ways in which teachers can scaffold learning.

The importance of giving feedback has been recognized both in CLIL methodology and in immersion settings. CLIL teachers are expected to "give feedback on content as well as language" (Dale Van der Es, & Tanner, 2011, p. 172). Equally, Lyster's counterbalanced approach calls for "corrective feedback" as a strategy to ensure that "a reactive approach to focus on form" is integrated "into subject-matter instruction" (Llinares & Lyster, 2014, p. 182). Lyster's research into corrective feedback has resulted in several landmark studies in this area (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 1998; Llinares & Lyster 2014). These studies have both defined the different types of corrective feedback that teachers use and analysed the effectiveness of these types of feedback.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) define six different types of feedback: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition (pp. 46-48). Llinares and Lyster (2014) have simplified this list into explicit correction, recasts and "prompts – which include elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests and repetition" (p. 182).[1] In this simplified list "prompts" have been grouped together because they "withhold correct forms and instead provide clues to prompt students to self-repair" (Llinares & Lyster, 2014, p. 182). In addition, Lyster and Ranta (1997) have

---

[1] Lyster (1998) also simplifies the list, but uses the term "negotiation of form" where Llinares and Lyster (2014) use "prompts." Because their definition is the same but their terminology different, and because Lyster and Ranta (1997) use the term "negotiation of form" with a different definition, I have adapted citations from Lyster (1998) to say "prompts" where he uses "negotiation of form" for the same concept.

further defined the different types of negotiation in the second language classroom by building on theories by Pica and Swain. Lyster and Ranta distinguish between "negotiation of meaning" and "negotiation of form," which they link to Van Lier's "distinction between conversational and didactic repair" (pp. 41-42). Whereas negotiation of meaning is concerned with "mutual comprehension," negotiation of form is concerned with "accuracy and precision" (Lyster and Ranta, 1997, p. 42). Most types of corrective feedback fall within the latter category. An exception is formed by "conversational recasts" (as opposed to "didactic recasts"), since they "implicitly reformulate a student utterance in an attempt to resolve a communication breakdown and often take the form of confirmation checks" (Llinares and Lyster, 2014, p. 188). The occurrence and effectiveness of the different types of corrective feedback has been analysed in a number of research papers.

After comparing the results of several studies, Llinares and Lyster (2014) conclude that recasts occur most frequently, followed by prompts and explicit correction (p. 188). Although there are no studies that have been able to analyse the effectiveness of corrective feedback over an extended period of time (e.g. a form is corrected in January and used correctly by the student in May), several projects have studied the immediate effect of corrective feedback. As Llinares and Lyster have pointed out, "recasts and explicit correction can lead only to repetition of correct forms by students, whereas prompts can lead, not to repetition, but either to self-repair or peer-repair (p. 182). Both repetition and repair by students are defined as "learner uptake" (Llinares and Lyster, 2014, p. 182). Lyster (1998) concludes that

> lexical errors favoured [prompts]; grammatical and phonological errors invited recasts, but with differential effects on learner repair. Overall, [prompts] proved more effective at leading to immediate repair than did recasts or explicit correction … [p]honological repairs resulted primarily from recasts. (p. 184)

Llinares and Lyster (2014) conclude that recasts of a "didactic and explicit nature" tend to lead to repair, while recasts of a "conversational and implicit nature" do not (p. 192). Similarly, in their study of cognitive engagement in a content-based language teaching environment, Kong and Hoare (2011) found that language learning was maximized by the "use of questions and elicitation in the [feedback] move in the predominantly [initiation-response-feedback] pattern of classroom interaction" (p. 322).

Gibbons (2015) suggests that teachers scaffold classroom conversations by "clarifying, questioning, and providing models for the speaker" and refers to this technique as "teacher-guided reporting" (p. 34). In principle, then, students and teachers are negotiating meaning and form simultaneously. This paper will therefore not only investigate which types of corrective feedback can be observed in an international classroom where many students are learning through an additional language and which aspects of language this corrective feedback addresses, but also which connections can be observed between negotiation of form and negotiation of meaning and between corrective feedback and scaffolding.

Method

Context of study and participants

This research project aims to chart instances of corrective feedback given during subject lessons by two different teachers at an international school. The chief aim of the project is to analyse different types of linguistically incorrect student utterances in English and how teachers responded to these errors. The school was selected for practical reasons (convenience sample). However, since the students and

teachers were not explicitly prepped for the project and the school does not have an explicit focus on CLIL or immersion methodologies, the school could be said to represent a fairly average example of an international, multilingual, multicultural educational environment in which many students learn through an additional language.

In order to observe authentic student and teacher utterances, subject lessons given by two different teachers were observed in Grade 8. The lessons were observed in an international school in Austria. The school implements the International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme (IB MYP) and generally teaches through English (exceptions are additional language classes such as German, Spanish and French, and the mother tongue programme that enables IB students to take Language A in their mother tongue with the help of a tutor).

The decision was made to focus on two humanities subjects that make extensive use of language: History and Geography. Other subjects, such as mathematics and physical education, are also taught through English. These subjects could also provide interesting data and might benefit from future research. However, for the sake of the current project, subjects were chosen that require more extensive reading and writing by students in English. These subjects were not only more likely to produce relevant data during lessons, but students would also benefit to a larger extent from correct language use in these subjects in exam situations. Biology and other language-heavy subjects could also have been used instead of or in addition to Geography and History, but here practical (scheduling) considerations also played a role.

The decision to observe only Grade 8 lessons was based partly on practical considerations: it was possible to schedule observations for both History and Geography lessons given by two different teachers. In addition, Grade 8 students are an interesting group because they are halfway through the IB MYP, and can therefore be expected to be both subject and language learners (since even native speakers need to develop proficiency in academic and subject-specific language use, see. The linguistic background of the students will be explored further below.

The Geography group consisted of seventeen students and the History group of eighteen students, although not all students were present at all lessons (on average there was one student absent during each lesson). There was no overlap of students between the two classes.

Instruments

In total, three Geography lessons (240 minutes in total) by one teacher and two History lessons (120 minutes in total) by another teacher were observed, resulting in a total of five lessons and 360 minutes of observed teaching.[2] This quantity was expected to produce sufficient data for a qualitative analysis.

In order to gain insight into the students' linguistic background and level of English, the students in both groups were asked to fill in a questionnaire (see Appendix A). The questionnaires were filled in during lesson time.[3]

---

[2] The Geography teacher gave permission for the lessons to be recorded, the History teacher did not. Although it was beneficial to listen to the Geography lessons afterwards in order to transcribe specific student-teacher dialogues in more detail, enough notes were made during the History lessons to enable an analysis of the types of corrective feedback given. See Appendix B for transcribed lessons and Tables 6-11 for observation results.

[3] For the purposes of this research project, the students' self-description and self-assessment was deemed sufficient. Therefore, the students' language abilities were not formally assessed. A larger-scale project, in particular a project with a focus on learner uptake and error repair, might choose to include formal assessment of language abilities, and link specific student utterances to the speaker's language ability, especially in a group with many different levels. In this paper, student utterances will not be linked to specific speakers or their language abilities.

Data analysis

The observations were transcribed, and instances of corrective feedback were categorized by type (see below for the types of corrective feedback defined by Lyster and Ranta (1997))[4] and by aspect of language (grammar, vocabulary, style). The vocabulary category was further divided into pronunciation, lexis and CALP (subject-specific and/or academic lexis).[5]

Due to the small-scale nature and practical limitations of the current research project, learner uptake and repair will not be analysed in this paper, which will focus instead on the different types of feedback used by teachers. The findings will, however, provide insight into those aspects of language that are addressed by specific instances of corrective feedback and into the length and depth of verbal exchanges occurring between teachers and students. One of the difficulties anticipated in this project is that negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form might be tricky to separate when lessons integrate content and language goals. This issue will be discussed further.

Language is socially constructed and always changing. The purpose of the current project is not to chart the use of prescriptive language rules, nor to encourage teachers to start imposing these rules. Rather, the project aims to chart constructive and productive exchanges between students and teachers. Language needs to be understandable, and in exam situations, of a high linguistic standard. Students need to master academic language, and subject-specific terms (see the discussion of scaffolding). The current project hopes to identify opportunities for teachers to help students to use appropriate language in an understandable manner.

Findings

Students' linguistic background

The questionnaire was filled in by thirty-five students: eighteen in the History group and seventeen in the Geography group. Students were asked to indicate which languages they speak and at what level, ranging from beginner to (near-)native speaker. In total, the students listed nineteen languages, thirteen of which are spoken at (near-)native level (see tables 1 and 2). Many of the students indicated that they are native speakers of more than one language. However, English is not a native language for the majority of students.

The most common native languages among the students are English (fifteen students), German (fifteen students) and Russian (ten students). Fifteen students indicate that they speak more than one language at (near-)native level, six of whom speak both German and English at this level. Interestingly, two students indicate that they do not speak any languages at (near-)native level. For example, one Geography student speaks Dutch with both parents and siblings, but assesses his language ability in Dutch as mediocre (3 out of 5, see table 3) and has not assessed his speaking ability in any language above good (4 out of 5).

---

[4] In Appendix B, the types of corrective feedback have been coded: 1=explicit correction, 2=recast, 3=clarification request, 4=metalinguistic cue, 5=elicitation, 6=repetition.
[5] Although every effort was made to only categorize subject-specific or advanced vocabulary as CALP, it stands to reason that different readers may interpret utterances differently. For transparency, all categorized utterances are clearly marked as such in Appendix B.

Speak						
	1	2	3	4	5	Totaal
English	0,00% 0	5,88% 1	11,76% 2	35,29% 6	47,06% 8	17
German	5,88% 1	5,88% 1	23,53% 4	23,53% 4	41,18% 7	17
Russian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	16,67% 1	83,33% 5	6
Spanish	25,00% 3	50,00% 6	16,67% 2	0,00% 0	8,33% 1	12
Italian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	50,00% 1	0,00% 0	50,00% 1	2
Georgian	50,00% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	50,00% 1	2
Armenian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	100,00% 1	1
Chinese	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0
Ukranian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0
French	33,33% 2	33,33% 2	33,33% 2	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	6
Thai	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0
Bulgarian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	100,00% 1	0,00% 0	1
Latvian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0
Japanese	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0
Croatian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0
Arabic	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	100,00% 1	0,00% 0	1
Serbian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	100,00% 2	0,00% 0	2
Dutch	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	100,00% 1	0,00% 0	1
Irish	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	100,00% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	1

TABLE 1. Languages spoken by Geography students, sorted by (near-)native ability (5)

Speak						
	1	2	3	4	5	Totaal
German	6,67% 1	0,00% 0	33,33% 5	6,67% 1	53,33% 8	15
English	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	5,56% 1	55,56% 10	38,89% 7	18
Russian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	100,00% 5	5
Ukranian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	50,00% 1	0,00% 0	50,00% 1	2
Italian	0,00% 0	75,00% 3	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	25,00% 1	4
French	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	66,67% 2	33,33% 1	3
Thai	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	100,00% 1	1
Bulgarian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	50,00% 1	50,00% 1	2
Latvian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	100,00% 1	1
Arabic	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	100,00% 1	1
Spanish	40,00% 4	30,00% 3	30,00% 3	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	10
Chinese	100,00% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	1
Japanese	0,00% 0	100,00% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	1
Croatian	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	100,00% 1	0,00% 0	1

TABLE 2 Languages spoken by History students, sorted by (near-)native ability (5)

	Speak
Russian	
German	3
English	4
Spanish	
Chinese	
Ukranian	
Italian	
French	2
Thai	
Bulgarian	
Latvian	
Japanese	
Croatian	
Arabic	
Serbian	
Dutch	4
Georgian	
Armenian	
Irish	

TABLE 3 Self-assessment for spoken language by a Geography student (scores are out of 5)

All students indicate that they speak English, but only fifteen students assess their spoken English as (near-)native: seven in the History group and eight in the Geography group. Moreover, only five students indicate that they speak English with one or both of their parents: two in the History group and three in the Geography group (see tables 4 and 5 in Appendix B). Although sixteen students assess their level of spoken English as good (4 out of 5), four students assess their level of English as mediocre (2 or 3 out of 5).

Main language

	Russian	German	English	Spanish	Chinese	Ukranian	Italian	French	Thai	Bulgarian	Latvian	Japanese	Croatian	Arabic	Serbian	Dutch	Georgian	Armenian	Irish	Totaal
Mother	23,53% 4	29,41% 5	11,76% 2	5,88% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	5,88% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	5,88% 1	0,00% 0	5,88% 1	5,88% 1	5,88% 1	0,00% 0	17
Father	23,53% 4	29,41% 5	17,65% 3	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	5,88% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	5,88% 1	0,00% 0	5,88% 1	5,88% 1	5,88% 1	0,00% 0	17
Stepmom	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	50,00% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	50,00% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	2
Stepdad	0,00% 0	33,33% 1	33,33% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	33,33% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	3
Siblings	26,67% 4	46,67% 7	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	6,67% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	6,67% 1	6,67% 1	6,67% 1	0,00% 0	15
Other	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0

TABLE 4 Main language Geography students speak with family members

Main language

	Russian	German	English	Spanish	Chinese	Ukranian	Italian	French	Thai	Bulgarian	Latvian	Japanese	Croatian	Arabic	Totaal
Mother	27,78% 5	27,78% 5	5,56% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	11,11% 2	0,00% 0	5,56% 1	5,56% 1	5,56% 1	0,00% 0	5,56% 1	5,56% 1	18
Father	27,78% 5	38,89% 7	5,56% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	11,11% 2	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	5,56% 1	5,56% 1	0,00% 0	5,56% 1	0,00% 0	18
Siblings	33,33% 5	40,00% 6	6,67% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	6,67% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	6,67% 1	0,00% 0	6,67% 1	0,00% 0	15
Stepmom	33,33% 1	33,33% 1	33,33% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	3
Stepdad	0,00% 0	50,00% 1	50,00% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	2
Other	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0

TABLE 5 Main language History students speak with family members

Concluding, it seems fair to say that the majority of students in these two groups are English language learners. Although many students have learned *through* English for a number of years, the majority do not speak English with their parents, and assess their own level of English as below (near-)native.

Observed lessons

In total, forty-five instances of corrective feedback were observed during 360 minutes of teaching; see table 6 below. Thirty-one instances occurred during 240 minutes of Geography and fourteen during 120 minutes of History, which means that on average both teachers made equal use of corrective feedback (see tables 7 and 8).

Type of feedback	Grammar	Vocabulary	Style	Total
1	0	13	0	13
2	4	14	1	19
3	0	3	0	3
4	0	0	0	0
5	0	8	1	9
6	0	1	0	1
Total	4	39	2	45

TABLE 6 All instances of corrective feedback

Type of feedback	Grammar	Vocabulary	Style	Total
1	0	8	0	8
2	3	8	1	12
3	0	3	0	3
4	0	0	0	0
5	0	6	1	7
6	0	1	0	1
Total	3	26	2	31

TABLE 7 All instances of corrective feedback, Geography lessons

Type of feedback	Grammar	Vocabulary	Style	Total
1	0	5	0	5
2	1	6	0	7
3	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0
5	0	2	0	2
6	0	0	0	0
Total	1	13	0	14

TABLE 8 All instances of corrective feedback, History lessons

The type of corrective feedback used most was recast (19 out of 45 instances), followed by explicit correction (13/45) and elicitation (9/45). Similar patterns were observed during Geography (12/31, 8/31 and 7/31) and History (7/14, 5/14, 2/14). Interestingly, not a single occurrence of a metalinguistic cue was observed, and only one instance of repetition. In addition, there were a few small differences between the teachers: the History teacher did not use clarification requests and relatively little elicitation (2/14 compared to 7/31).

The aspect of language that was corrected most often was vocabulary (39 out of 45 instances). Again, a similar pattern was observed during the Geography lessons (26/31) and the History lessons (13/14). Most of the corrective feedback in response to vocabulary concerned CALP (23/39; see table

9). The feedback during the Geography lessons showed a similar pattern, but the History lessons did not (17/26 compared with 6/13; see tables 10 and 11).

Type of feedback	Vocab	Pronunciation	Lexis	CALP
1	13	6	4	3
2	14	0	3	11
3	3	1	1	1
4	0	0	0	0
5	8	0	1	7
6	1	0	0	1
	39	7	9	23

TABLE 9 Corrective feedback related to vocabulary

Type of feedback	Vocab	Pronunciation	Lexis	CALP
1	8	4	1	3
2	8	0	2	6
3	3	1	1	1
4	0	0	0	0
5	6	0	0	6
6	1	0	0	1
	26	5	4	17

TABLE 10 Corrective feedback related to vocabulary, Geography lessons

Type of feedback	Vocab	Pronunciation	Lexis	CALP
1	5	2	3	0
2	6	0	1	5
3	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0
5	2	0	1	1
6	0	0	0	0
	13	2	5	6

TABLE 11 Corrective feedback related to vocabulary, History lessons

Recast (14/39) and explicit correction (13/39) were used most in response to incorrect vocabulary. CALP issues were mostly addressed with recast (11/23) and elicitation (7/23). Pronunciation errors were mostly responded to with explicit correction (6/7), while lexis was corrected both with explicit correction (4/9) and recast (3/9). The type of corrective feedback used most in response to grammatical errors was recast (4 out of 4 instances). There were only two responses to stylistic errors: one recast and one instance of elicitation.

Some of the observed exchanges did not entirely fit within the predefined categories. There was one instance of explicit correction that contained both vocabulary and grammar but addressed content rather than language.[6] On five occasions, a correct answer was recast (and in four of these cases also repeated), with a focus on both vocabulary and grammar.[7] On two occasions, the Geography teacher responded to non-verbal language with a verbal recast.[8] In both of these instances the students struggled to find the right vocabulary and used pauses and gestures to aid understanding. If one were to add these exchanges to the totals previously mentioned, the observed patterns do not change drastically. Rather, the reign of the recast would merely be affirmed.

---

[6] This instance was labeled "1a" in the observation transcript.

[7] These recasts were labeled "2a" in the observation transcripts.

[8] These recasts were labeled "2b" in the observation transcripts.

Discussion of Findings

The majority of students observed during this project were found to be English language learners, which means that the educational setting is not only international but also falls within the scope of CLIL and immersion.

Since most corrective feedback occurred in response to vocabulary issues, and within this category in response to the development of academic and subject specific language, the observed lessons clearly demonstrate more negotiation of meaning than negotiation of form. In other words: the teachers place the emphasis on comprehension of the lesson content rather than accuracy in language use. This emphasis becomes more tangible through the teachers' use of different types of corrective feedback.

In line with the findings by Llinares and Lyster (2014), this study shows that recasts were the most-used type of corrective feedback. However, whereas Llinares and Lyster observed considerable more use of prompts than of explicit correction, this study shows equal use of prompts and explicit correction. In line with findings by Lyster (1998), this study has found that recasts were used in response to grammar issues. However, in contrast with Lyster's observations, this study also found that explicit correction was used in response to pronunciation issues (rather than recasts), and that both explicit correction and recasts were used in response to vocabulary issues (rather than prompts).

A limitation of the present study is that it has not gathered data on learner uptake and repair. Therefore, it is not possible to say whether these different findings affected student performance positively or negatively. However, previous studies and theories do provide food for thought. After all, Kong and Hoare (2011) stress the importance of questions and elicitation (which both fall within the category of prompts) for language learning, while Gibbons (2015) stresses the importance of clarifying and questioning in order to scaffold learning successfully. Taking these studies and theories into account, the relative lack of prompts could be seen as a negative factor. In addition, a few comments can be made on the use of prompts in combination with the length of exchanges and the apparent goal of comprehension.

Two of the longer exchanges observed during the Geography lessons contain one or more prompts and relatively more language production by students. During the first exchange the student manages to communicate the incorrect form ("lava plate") successfully and repeatedly, encouraged by a clarification request ("A lava what?") and repetition ("Plate or plain?"). When the student keeps repeating the incorrect form, the teacher responds with an explicit correction ("No, I think they talked about the plain, the pumice plain"). During the second exchange, the teacher interacts with multiple students at the same time, and elicits vocabulary from them. In response to the teacher's first recast ("They carry what?), the students start offering various forms, which the teacher writes down. He elicits further suggestions by repeating answers and pausing in between each suggestion. When the students appear to have depleted their supply of words, the teacher concludes with a recast that includes a new, and better, form ("Sediment is a good summary of everything in there"). These two exchanges demonstrate the usefulness of prompts.

One of the feedback types that did not quite fit the mould also relates to negotiation of form as well as meaning. The feedback type described as type 2a is not strictly corrective, as it recasts (and often repeats) a correct answer. However, this feedback does address issues of both form and meaning. For example, the Geography teacher introduces an adjective and a type of eruption by repeating and expanding on a student's answer: "Pliny. Plinean, this is called a Plinean eruption." Similarly, the History teacher introduces a noun and an alternative adjective by repeating and expanding on a student's answer within his response: "Roman-Catholic, yeah. Catholicism. … Most people were Catholic." Since Llinares and Lyster (2014) found that didactic recasts that explicitly correct result in more learner uptake and repair, this feedback type would probably be more effective if it had an explicit didactic nature.

However, even in its current form, this feedback type appears well-suited for classrooms in which content and language are integrated.

Finally, the occurrences of feedback type 2b (see Appendix B) raise an interesting question. Should verbal recasts of non-verbal language be included as a specific type of corrective feedback? After all, these recasts provide the student with the vocabulary and grammar that they could not produce independently. For example, during one of the Geography lessons, a student paused at the end of a question due to a lack of vocabulary ("Is that the reason the animals looked like…"). As a result, the teacher's response did not provide an answer and the student tried again, pausing at the same point ("Yeah, that is what I meant. Is that's is that the reason why they looked so…") and the teacher provided several suitable options ("Like coal. Charcoal. Like charcoal, burnt"). During another Geography lesson, one of the students used sign language to complete an answer ("Because it's [gestures steep]"), and the teacher repeated the utterance including the correct word ("Because it's steep."). Of course, teachers can also respond to non-verbal language by asking questions or providing metalinguistic cues: information that "provides either some grammatical metalanguage that refers to the nature of the error ... or a word definition in the case of lexical errors" (Lyster and Ranta, 1997, p. 47). The question, then, becomes whether non-verbal language should be included in future research into corrective feedback. Based on the exchanges observed during this project, and their link to the discussion about scaffolding and CALP, it is tempting to say that they should. Including non-verbal 'errors' would still make it possible to analyse learner uptake and repair in response to different types of corrective feedback.

Conclusion

This research paper has analysed several Geography and History lessons in an international school in order to chart the use of corrective feedback in an educational setting that does not explicitly focus on (bilingual) language teaching. In line with the results of previous research projects in immersion settings, the current project found that the subject teachers mostly used recasts, and that recasts were used in response to grammatical issues. Interestingly, the observed subject teachers used explicit correction only in response to pronunciation and vocabulary issues. Previous research in immersion settings had not only found that recasts were generally used for these types of errors as well but also that explicit correction actually tends to be more effective than recasts. Although learner uptake and repair were not analysed in the current project, the teachers' preference for explicit correction in these situations suggests they have indeed experienced success with this strategy.

This paper has also charted the grey area between corrective feedback (negotiation of form) and scaffolding (negotiation of meaning and form). The research results showed a distinct focus on meaning, since the subject teachers mostly focused on vocabulary and the development of academic and subject-specific language. The exchanges between the teachers and the students therefore mainly scaffolded content knowledge. Although the subject teachers made less use of prompts than the immersion teachers observed in other projects, several exchanges that did include prompts were shown to encourage negotiation of form. Therefore, it can be concluded that an increased use of prompts might indeed help subject teachers to include more language scaffolding.

Interestingly, the subject teachers used additional types of corrective feedback in order to negotiate both meaning and form. Both teachers used a type of corrective feedback that combined repetition and recasting, and could be described as 'confirmative' feedback. This type of feedback was used to introduce new or more suitable linguistic forms such as adjectives and nouns. Although this type of feedback encourages negotiation of meaning and form, it lacks an explicit didactic nature and might therefore be less successful than intended. Future research projects could investigate the use of 'confirmative' feedback further and analyse its effect on learner uptake and repair. The Geography

teacher also used corrective feedback in response to non-verbal language (e.g. pauses and gestures). Again, future research projects could investigate this type of corrective feedback further.

Finally, the research results raise questions regarding the specific aspects of language that subject teachers could or should dedicate attention to during their lessons. Should they focus on all issues that students' oral output presents? And if subject teachers focus mostly on vocabulary and subject-specific language, does that mean that language teachers should focus more on grammar? In order for all teachers to negotiate both meaning and form, and to scaffold language as well as content learning, it appears that subject teachers and language teachers need to collaborate. Collaboration enables them to define specific linguistic issues and skills that subject teachers should focus on in a particular class. Equally, the content that subject teachers use to negotiate meaning could be used by language teachers to negotiate form.

Bibliography

Cummins, J. (2001) Bilingual Children's Mother Tongue: Why Is It Important for Education? *Sprogforum, 19*, 15-20.

Cummins, J. (2000) *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dale, L., Van der Es, W., & Tanner, R. (2011) *CLIL Skills*. Haarlem: European Platform.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011) Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 182-204.

Dalton-Puffer, C. & NIKULA, T. (2014) Content and Language Integrated Learning. *The Language Learning Journal, 42*(2), 117-122.

Dalton-Puffer, C., Llinares, A., Lorenzo, F., & Nikula, T. (2014) 'You Can Stand Under My Umbrella': Immersion, CLIL and Bilingual Education. A Response to Cenoz, Genesee and Gorter (2013) *Applied Linguistics, 35*(2), 213-218.

Gibbons, P. (2015) *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning: Teaching English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom.* 2nd Ed. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Kong, S. & Hoare, P. (2011) Cognitive Content Engagement in Content-Based Language Teaching. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(3), 307-324.

Llinares, A. & Lyster, R. (2014) The Influence of Context on Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: A Comparison of CLIL and Immersion Classrooms. *The Language Learning Journal, 42*(2), 181-194.

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. & Ranta, L. (1997) Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *SSLA, 20*, 37-66.

Appendix

Appendix A: Questionnaire

Which languages do you speak?

1. Which language(s) do you speak?

Please circle the correct number: 1=beginner, 5=very good / native speaker

Language	Speak	Read	Write	Listen
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

In which language(s) can you easily…

2. … read a book or newspaper?

_____

3. … follow a movie?

_____

4. … tell / understand a joke?

_____

In which language(s) do you usually…

5. … think?

_____

6. … swear / curse? (if you do this at all ;-))

_____

7. Which language(s) do you speak with family members?

Family member	Main language	Other language(s)
Mother		
Father		
Stepmom		
Stepdad		
Brother(s) or sister(s)		
Other: …		

8. Which country/countries have you lived in?

_____

9. Have you been to a school that taught through a different language? Which language?

_____

Thank you!

Appendix B: Transcribed lessons

Geography 22 April 2015, 13:45-15:05

1	S	Until tomorrow, right?				
	T	By tomorrow.			2	grammar
2	S1	Strato?				
	T	Composite or strato.				
	S2	Stratus.				
	S3	StraTO				
	T	Layers, stratifying layers. That was our first type, remember. That's the most common type. Strato or composite.			2	CALP
3	S	May 18 1980				
	T	1980, May 18th			2	grammar
4	T	Is that a lot?				
	S1	Yeah!				
	T	Is that a lot?				
	Ss	[inaudible]				
	T	Shh, one at a time.				
	S2	Compared to how many people die in a tsunami, it's very less.				
	T	Of course fifty-seven is a lot, but it's not compared to other eruptions of other natural disasters. In that way, not so many.			2	grammar
5	S1	Four hundred square metres, um, metres squared.				
	Ss	Square miles.				
	T	So we're talking here roughly four hundred square kilometres then. In America, it's square miles.			1a	content
6a	S1	But isn't there also a lava plate as well?				
	T	A lava what?			3	CALP
6b	S1	A lava plate?				
	T	PLATE or plain?			6	CALP
6c	S1	Plate. Didn't it say there was a lava plate?				
	T	No. I think they talked about the plain, the pumice plain, but we're going to write about this now, don't worry about that, I just want you to look at the main shape of the volcano.			1	CALP
7	T	They saw something there which was very conspicuous, that would indicate something's going to happen. […] Just by looking at it. They took photos every day, every hour, and they saw something was happening on this mountain. […]				
	S1	Maybe the smoke?	S2	The bult.		
	T	That's another thing. There was smoke, but what did they see with the cameras?				
	S3	Like, ah, I don't know what it's called.				
	S2	The bult.				
	T	The bulGE. The gorge is there. The bulge was the main indication .			1	lexis
8	T	So there would have been the lava, the ash and… A special rock which is then found there, which is?				
	S	Pummick.				
	T	PumiCE.			1	pronunciation
9a	T	And they call this the?				
	Ss	Blast	Ss	[inaudible]		
	T	What kind of blast would they call this? […] Because it goes out to the side. [2]				
	Ss	Side blast.				
	T	It's like a side blast but it has a special name. [4] For people that are interested in medicine as well, how do you call the side of the body? [3] When you go to the doctor you talk about? Anterior, this is the posterior, and this is the?			5	CALP
9b	S	Interior.				
	T	That is inside. [3] LATERAL. Have you heard about that? It's a lateral blast. Or it also talked about a HORIZONTAL blast.			1	CALP
9c	S	So that is what collateral damage means.				
	T	No. Well, collateral. Side damage. These muscles are called what again? Latissimus, LAT-issimus. Side.				
10	T	And then ash will fall everywhere. This is all going to come down, all this ash. We then have massive ash fall.				
	S	Is that the reason why the animals looked like…				
	T	No. That deer you saw is [inaudible].				
	S	Yeah, that's what I meant. Is that's is that the reason why they looked so…				
	T	Like coal. Charcoal. Like charcoal, burnt.			2b	lexis
11	S	Hunger!				
	T	Hunger. Famine. They couldn't grow crops.			2	CALP

1	T	What would a typical earthquake be measured in? That is a?				
	S	Rischter				
	T	Richter, that is a measuring scale			1	pronunciation
2	S1	It's the thing that [inaudible].				
	T	It's a thing, what is this thing?			5	CALP
	S1	It's a thing that measures the waves.				
	S2	A device, that measures.				
	T	A simple one was mounted on a stand [etc].				
3	S1	I have the Mediterranean Strogli island.				
	T	What was it called?			3	lexis
	S1	STROGLI.				
	T	I'm not so happy with the [inaudible].	S2	I have San Torini.		
	T	SAN TORINI, Thera or San Torini, very famous tourist destination				
	S3	It's in Greek				
4	S	Is he doring?				
	T	Is this thing sleeping, yes.			2	lexis
5	T	There was an eye witness though. Who was that person? That was the person that also gave this kind of eruption its name.				
	S	Pl… pl… pleen something.				
	T	Pliny.			1	pronunciation
	S	Yeah, Pliny.				
	T	Pliny. Plinean, this is called a Plinean eruption.			2a	vocab+grammar
6	T	When was that?				
	S1	Fifteenfifty---				
	T	FifTEEN, fifty?			3	pronunciation
	Ss	Six.				
7	S	Gas!				
	T	Pipes break. That's the problem, huh. Earthquake, the pipes break, the gas leaks out.			2	style
8	S	Laher?	Ss	[inaudible]		
	T	LaHAR, what is a lahar?			1	pronunciation
	S	It's when the mud and water [inaudible].	Ss	[inaudible]		
	T	Mud! They drowned in mud. Now you tell me how this can happen. Think. [pause] The Andes, snow-capped mountains.				
	S	They just fell.	Ss	They fell [inaudible].		
	T	A volcano erupts on a snow-capped mountain.				
	S	Which is hot.				
	T	What is the snow doing. It melts, right?				
9	S	The waves did not go…				
	T	The waves hit those beaches as well, but?			2	CALP
10	S1	Because the people are uncivilized maybe.				
	T	Okay, that's not the right word, but I know what you mean.			5	CALP
	S2	Maybe it wasn't organized.				
	T	Yeah, they're not registered. They live in squatter camps, they don't know how many people live there. When they get to a very organized country they get told there are exactly 543 people missing. But in a lot of these economically less developed countries you see the numbers vary immensely.			2	CALP
11	T	How many deaths?				
	S	Um, many deaths.				
	T	Many, I don't like many, I can't work with many. [pause] 15000?			5	style
	S	15891				
	T	How come this number is so exact? Because it's Japan, not Haiti.				

Geography 6 May 2015, 13:45-15:05

1	T	… formed by which two main agents?				
	S1	Glaciers				
	T	And				
	S1	Rivers				
	T	Frozen water, which is ice, and flowing water. So you could say glaciers and rivers. Water in its frozen or liquid state.			2a	vocab+grammar
2	T	And what does the water do?				
	S1	It cleans				
	T	It cleans, another good word is?			5	CALP
	Ss	Purify				
	T	Purify. Purification. It purifies the soul. … Water for them is a purification symbol.			2a	vocab+grammar
3	T	These rivers, what do they do?				
	S	They carve out their soil.				
	T	They carry what?			2	lexis
	Ss	Material, soil [inaudible]				
	T	… [draws] So I see a lot of material in here. Huge amounts of sediments. Of course in brackets you could say it's soil, it's sand, it's pebbles…			2, 5	CALP
	S1	Mud.				
	T	Mud. It's sediment. Sediment is a good summary of everything in there.			2	CALP
4	T	What else do they use the water for, apart from drinking it.				
	S1	Farming	S2	Washing		
	T	How do they farm, what is it called?			5	CALP
	S1	Watering	S2	Irrigation!		
	T	If irrigation systems fail…				
5	S1	Because it's [gestures 'steep']				
	T	Because it's steep			2b	lexis
6	T	What is this river used for, what is thrown into it?				
	S	[inaudible]				
	T	And from about here [marks] I would say 'I would drink this water no more' By the time it's here, it's sewage, basically.				
	S1	Industrial waste				
	T	Industrial waste, what else?				
	S2	Rubbish.				
	T	Rubbish				
	S3	Ashes.				
	T	Ashes from funeral pyres. There are funeral sites. They burn corpses on the river. What else?				
	S4	Garbage				
	S5	He said that				
	T	SEWAGE. Let's change the word into sewage. Garbage is just solid waste, but faeces, lulu und?			1	CALP
	Ss	[inaudible] [laughing]				

History 28 April 2015, 12:00-13:00

1	S	Trinidad? (German pronunciation)		
	T	Trinidad, yeah. (US-EN pronunciation)	1	pronunciation
2	S	… voyage … (French pronunciation, chuckles)		
	T	Voyage. (US-EN pronunciation, smiles)	1	pronunciation
3	S	… slow …		
	T	They slew, so they killed …	2	grammar
4	S	… make it up …		
	T	… make it up, or FICTIONALIZE it …	2	CALP
5	S	… exaggerating …		
	T	Now there's a good word. It makes it hard to believe and it makes us question how reliable the source is.	2a	CALP
6	S	… it skipped things …		
	T	… it is only an EXTRACT, only a piece …	2	CALP
7	S	… overreacted a little …		
	T	EXAGGERATED	1	lexis

History 5 April 2015, 12:00-13:00

1	S	Roman-Catholic		
	T	Roman-Catholic, yeah. Catholicism. [later] Most people were Catholic.	2a	vocab+grammar
2	S1	Evangelisch (German pronunciation)		
	T	Yes, Evangelisch or EVANGELICAL. Another word, does anyone know? […] [Name] you just said it.	1, 5	lexis
	S2	Protestants?		
	T	Yeah, Protestants		
3	S	… when you are against something …		
	T	Alright, like a protest…	2	lexis
4	S	A representative of the Church		
	T	Yeah, a representative of the Church. Any other words that come to mind?	5	CALP
5	S	… you could buy them …		
	T	It was a DOCUMENT …	2	CALP
6	S	… Church readings, I don't know what they're called.		
	T	Mass.	1	lexis
	S	Yeah. [continues]		
7	S1	… journey to another country …		
	T	… journey to a HOLY PLACE …	2	CALP
	S2	… important objects …		
	T	… HOLY objects … [later] RELIGIOUS objects	2	CALP