Form in immersion classroom discourse: In or out of focus?

Roy Lyster
McGill University

Qualitative analyses of teacher-student interaction recorded during subject-matter lessons in grade 4 French immersion classrooms indicate that language form is often out of focus in immersion classroom discourse. Immersion teachers draw regularly on *negotiation of meaning* strategies to present content, by frequently repeating or recasting learner utterances and using numerous expansions, confirmations, and confirmation checks to do so. Because these interactional moves follow both ill- and well-formed learner utterances, they appear to respond to the meaning of learner utterances and, consequently, may not enable learners to notice the gap between their interlanguage and the target language. However, immersion teachers are still able to bring language form back into focus, without breaking the flow of interaction, by briefly engaging in the *negotiation of form* with students and then continuing to interact with them about content. With some reference to his past experience as an immersion teacher, the author discusses the pedagogical implications of these and other research findings related to corrective feedback.

Les analyses qualitatives des interactions entre enseignants et élèves enregistrées dans des classes d'immersion au niveau de la 4e année du primaire démontrent que le discours immersif met peu en relief la forme langagière. Les enseignants se servent systématiquement de la *négociation du sens* pour présenter les contenus et cela par le biais de nombreuses répétitions et reformulations enchâssées dans des expansions, des confirmations et des demandes de confirmation. Puisque ces modifications conversationnelles semblent répondre au sens des énoncés des élèves, que la forme soit correcte ou non, elles ne semblent guère en mesure d'attirer l'attention des élèves sur le décalage entre leur interlangue et la langue cible. Les enseignants ont toutefois l'occasion de mettre en relief la forme langagière en employant brièvement la *négociation de la forme* au cours de l'interaction, sans en ralentir le flot. L'auteur, en tenant compte de ces résultats ainsi que de ceux d'autres recherches sur la rétroaction corrective et en se référant également à son expérience antérieure en tant qu'enseignant en immersion, identifie certaines répercussions de cette recherche sur l'enseignement immersif.

My experience as a French immersion teacher spanned a decade, beginning in the early 80s at a Senior Public School in the Toronto area. Teaching at the grade 8 level was a task with many challenges, of which at least two were specific to the immersion context. First, a considerable amount of time was

spent searching for appropriate materials to use in the language arts class and an equal amount of time translating materials from English into French for use in subject-matter classes. Second, a great deal of energy went into trying to understand the nature of the students' interlanguage development in order to implement appropriate teaching strategies that would help them maintain their confidence in using French while improving their accuracy. As research has since clearly documented (e.g., Harley, *et al.*, 1990), immersion students develop almost native-like comprehension skills and high levels of fluency and confidence in second language production, albeit less native-like in terms of accuracy. Studies have specifically pointed to weaknesses in grammatical, lexical, and sociolinguistic development. Consequently, the emphasis in much current research in immersion is on how to promote greater accuracy while still maintaining the essential focus on communication.

As an immersion teacher in the 80s, however, I was not yet privy to this research focus and continued to hear and to read that target language accuracy would develop over time, as long as the classroom was communicatively rich enough. The writings of Stephen Krashen were influential in telling us that grammar instruction was virtually useless and perhaps even harmful (e.g., Krashen, 1982, 1985). This meant that many of us who taught grammar did so covertly, behind closed doors. Krashen and others at the time (e.g, Terrell, 1982) led us also to believe that corrective feedback was neither necessary nor effective, and served only to cause anxiety and impede real communication.

Then came Merrill Swain's seminal papers in 1985 and 1988. In the first, she proposed that comprehensible input alone is insufficient for successful second language learning. She argued in favour of ample opportunities for student output and the provision of negative input that would push students to express themselves more precisely and appropriately. In the second, Swain illustrated how subject-matter teaching does not on its own provide adequate language teaching; language used to convey subject matter, she argued, needs to be highlighted in ways that make certain features more salient for second language learners.

Many researchers now agree that target features that may otherwise be difficult for learners to notice need to be made more salient in classroom input. There is less agreement, however, on precisely how to do so and with what degree of explicitness. In classroom settings, teachers bring language form into focus as they draw on either proactive or reactive approaches to language teaching (Doughty and Williams, 1998; Lyster, 1998c; Rebuffot and Lyster, 1996). A proactive approach involves communicatively-based instruction planned from a language perspective to promote the perception and use of specific language features in a meaningful context (see Harley and Swain, 1984). A series of experimental studies undertaken in immersion classrooms has demonstrated that a proactive approach can benefit students' interlanguage development in

varying degrees, with respect to aspect (Harley, 1989), the conditional mode (Day and Shapson, 1991), sociostylistic variation (Lyster, 1994b), verbs of motion (Wright, 1996), and grammatical gender (Harley, 1998; Warden, 1998). In addition to the proactive approach, there is growing support for a reactive approach to language teaching whereby teachers focus on form during communicative interaction in content-based or theme-based lessons (Long, 1991). For example, Lightbown and Spada (1990), in their research in intensive ESL classrooms in Montreal, observed teachers who tended to focus on form on the fly, without interrupting the flow of communication. They found that teachers who did so were more effective than teachers who either never focused on form or did so only in isolated grammar lessons. One effective ESL teacher described by Spada and Lightbown (1993, p. 218) organized her teaching "in such a way as to draw the learners' attention to errors in their interlanguage development within the context of meaningful and sustained communicative interaction."

It is this reactive approach to second language teaching that I will explore further in this paper. In doing so, I would like to lend support to the argument that it is precisely at the moment when students have something to say that focus on form can perhaps be most effectively provided (Lightbown, 1991, 1998), an argument that runs counter to many current beliefs and practices in immersion. To do this, I will present some of my own classroom research with a view to pointing out both the limits of classroom interaction and also its strengths as a tool for second language learning. But first, I'd like to return for a moment to my experience back at that Senior Public School in Toronto, this time from a very different vantage point.

Background

By the end of the 80s, I was doing doctoral studies and found myself in a fortunate position with a totally new perspective: I was at the back of the very same classroom in which I had been teaching, observing Serge, the teacher who had replaced me when I took a leave of absence to begin doctoral studies. Serge had agreed to participate in the experimental study I was doing for my dissertation. As I observed his class, I was struck by the way he interacted with his students, providing them with lots of helpful feedback that pushed them to be more accurate, even when it was clear that he understood what they meant. I suspected that Serge did not agree with Krashen and that Krashen had never visited Serge's class, for there was absolutely no anxiety to speak of. Conversely, the other two teachers whom I was also observing behaved a bit more as I had when I taught, going for meaning, but often at the expense of form. Although feedback was not the focus of my study, these observations left me with the rather common-sense impression that the absence of clear feedback must have detrimental effects on language development over time, whereas the

provision of clear feedback about language must be beneficial in the long run. As Serge provided feedback, he appeared to negotiate with his students and it was with him in mind that I first wrote about the *negotiation of form* (Lyster, 1994a).

By that time, I had moved on to teach at the McGill Faculty of Education in Montreal where I set up a research project involving observations of six different immersion classrooms. In response to the need for more process-oriented studies of immersion, one of the overall goals of this research was to characterize specific features of immersion pedagogy as well as features of teacher-student interaction. I wanted to document the ways in which teachers appeared to integrate a focus on form and, specifically, to what extent and in what ways the teachers negotiated form with their students as Serge had done.[1]

Observational Study of Immersion Classroom Interaction

During the first year of the project, we observed six different teachers who had been recommended as having fairly interactive classrooms. There were two grade 6 teachers, three grade 4 teachers, and one teaching a split grade 4/5 class. The teachers were unaware of our research questions related to focus on form, although they knew that we were interested in classroom interaction. As we observed, we made audio recordings in stereo by using a mixer that allowed the teacher's voice to be recorded through a wireless lapel microphone on one track while students' voices were captured mainly on the other track by using flat PZM microphones strategically placed around the classroom. We collected approximately 100 hours of recorded interaction of which we transcribed about half. From the 50 hours of transcribed data, we selected 27 lessons from the grade 4 classrooms for a detailed turn-by-turn analysis of the interaction. These 27 lessons constitute the main database that was analyzed and to which I will refer throughout this paper. This database includes only subject-matter lessons and theme-based language arts lessons, because we wanted to capture how teachers focus on form outside of formal grammar and spelling lessons.

The 27 lessons comprise well over 3,000 student turns. These were entered into a computer data-analysis program (Thornton and Pienemann, 1994) that allowed us to code and quantify the various types of positive and negative feedback used by teachers to respond to both well- and ill-formed utterances. We were also able to quantify what we called student *uptake*: different types of student responses immediately following the feedback. The notion of uptake enabled us to account for different degrees of student participation in the error treatment sequence and thus to describe various patterns of error treatment in teacher-student interaction. Uptake was considered neither as a sign of learning nor as a requirement for learning.

The quantitative results of this study have been presented in detail in Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Lyster (1998a,b) as well as at several conferences and workshops (see Lyster, 1999, for a summary in French). In this paper, I move away from the many charts and graphs that have been used to present the copious data. My intention is to present the classroom data more qualitatively, by examining teacher-student exchanges in selected lessons taught by three of the grade 4 teachers. But first, just a few numbers to set the scene.

We found that, overall, the teachers provided feedback after about 60% of the student errors. We found this relatively high rate of feedback quite impressive but we also found that uptake followed only about half of these feedback moves, being evenly divided between utterances that were repaired or still in need of repair. This means that after the other half of the feedback moves, there was no opportunity for uptake as teachers moved on with the lesson.

Results showed that this relatively low rate of uptake was due to the teachers' extensive use of recasts. In a recast, the teacher implicitly reformulates all or part of the student's utterance, without the error. This was by far the most frequent type of feedback, accounting for almost 400 of the 700 corrective feedback moves. A simple example is found in Extract 1[2] (English translations are found in the Appendix):

Extract 1

1) David: *[. . .] Qu'est-ce qui sent bon? Allen?*

2) St: *L'eau érable.*

3) David: *L'eau d'érable. C'est bien. Vous êtes prêts? [. . .]*

In response to the student's error, *L'eau érable*, David implicitly reformulates this as *L'eau d'érable*. As can also be seen in the example, there is no uptake on the part of the student. David recasts then continues the lesson. This was the case in over two-thirds of all recasts; less than a third were followed by uptake and even fewer led to actual repair. This finding led us to believe that recasts must serve functions other than corrective ones, so we designed a study to examine recasts more closely, with a view to understanding why teachers used them so frequently and what functions they fulfilled in classroom discourse.

We found that teachers tended to use recasts in the same way that they used other types of repetition after well-formed utterances. We see this in Extract 2 below, where David confirms the student's response, *des poussins*, by repeating it verbatim:

Extract 2

1) David: *Comment appelle-t-on le bébé d'une poule? Nicole?*

2) St: *Des poussins.*

3) David: *Des poussins, c'est bien.*

This kind of noncorrective repetition immediately followed over 600 student utterances, meaning that, together, recasts and noncorrective repetition followed close to a third of all the student utterances in the database. This made us wonder how easy it was for young learners in immersion classrooms to distinguish recasts from noncorrective repetition because their discourse functions appear to be identical. We found that recasts and noncorrective repetition were both used to provide or seek confirmation or additional information related to the student's message. So, in Extracts 1 and 2, when David utters *des poussins* and *L'eau d'érable*, he is confirming the students' messages in both cases, as he draws on what have been called *negotiation of meaning* strategies.

According to Long (1996), strategies used to negotiate meaning include a variety of input and conversational modifications, such as confirmations and confirmation checks, comprehension checks, and clarification requests, and also various kinds of implicit responses to learner utterances, including repetitions, expansions, and recasts. According to Long's (1996) updated interaction hypothesis, these responses are purported to provide learners with "negative evidence" that may in turn facilitate language development. Negative evidence refers to information about what is unacceptable in the target language.

However, as the student gets the content of his message confirmed in Extract 1, whether or not he perceives the teacher's recast as negative evidence remains uncertain. He may simply not notice the subtle modification or, even if he does notice the modification, he could conclude that it is simply an alternative way of saying the same thing, because there is really nothing disapproving in the teacher's feedback, nothing that points out that *l'eau érable* is not allowable in French.

In fact, what adds to the ambiguity here is the teacher's use of signs of approval as positive feedback: these include affirmations such as *oui*, *c'est ça*, and *O.K.*, and praise markers such as *Très bien*, *Bravo*, and *Excellent*. In Extracts 1 and 2, these accompany both the recast and the noncorrective repetition. We found that signs of approval were equally likely to occur with recasts and noncorrective repetition and also that they were equally likely to follow student turns with errors when teachers provided no corrective feedback. We see an example of this in Extract 3.

Extract 3

1) Rachelle: *[. . .] Alicia, j'voulais vérifier avec toi, ici, est-ce qu'on a tout fait ça?*

2) St: *Non. Mais moi . . . Non, on l'a pas tout fait.*

3) Rachelle: *Non, on l'a pas tout fait? O.K. très bien.*

4) St: *Moi, j'ai arrivée au fin.*

5) Rachelle: *O.K. très bien. Bon, on est supposé d'avoir presque le numéro un de fait. J'vais aller voir.*

Rachelle indiscriminately uses the same sign of approval (*O.K. très bien*) at line 3 after a noncorrective repetition (*Non, on l'a pas tout fait?*) and then again at line 5 after Alicia's nontarget utterance, *Moi, j'ai arrivée au fin*. The use of such positive feedback moves may be an inevitable feature of immersion pedagogy where we often need to respond affirmatively to students and to the content of their messages, irrespective of language form—this may be the trade-off for teaching language through content.

Let us now consider the ambiguity from the second language learner's perspective as we look more closely at interaction in subject-matter lessons. As we do so, take note of the following legend:

Errors:	*small caps enclosed by asterisks*
Recasts:	double underscore
Repetition:	single underscore
Approval:	outlined characters

Putting yourself in the shoes of a young second language learner, ask yourself what it is you notice (and what it is you do not notice) about the target language. Watch in particular how meaning is negotiated through various recasts and repetitions serving as confirmations and confirmation checks and how these confirmations and confirmation checks serve either to (1) confirm meaning but disconfirm form, (2) confirm form but disconfirm meaning, (3) confirm both form and meaning, or (4) disconfirm both form and meaning. We will first look at two lessons taught by Marie, who draws consistently on negotiation of meaning strategies to present content to her grade 4 mid-immersion students.

The water cycle

The first set of exchanges is extracted from a science lesson about the water cycle. The discussion centres around the adventures of a lone drop of water, brought to life as the young Perlette. The first exchange appears in Extract 4:

Extract 4
1) Marie: *Qu'est-ce que c'est un ruisseau encore? [. . .] Oui?*
2) St: *C'est comme un petit lac.*
3) Marie: *Un petit lac qu'on a dit?*
4) St: *C'est *UN PETIT* RIVIÈRE.*
5) Marie: *C'EST ÇA. C'est plus une petite rivière, O.K.? Parce qu'un lac c'est un, comme un, un endroit où y a de l'eau mais c'est un . . .*
6) Sts: *Comme un cercle.*
7) Marie: *[. . .] Pis là elle se retrouve près d'une forêt. Et qu'est-c'qu'ils font dans la forêt? Will?*

8) St: *Ils coupent des arbres*.

9) Marie: <u>*Ils coupent des arbres*</u>. *[. . .] Qu'est-c'qu'on fait pour transporter le bois?*

Marie begins by asking students what a *ruisseau* or a stream is. She repeats the first student's response (*un petit lac*) in a confirmation check at line 3 because the answer is incorrect although well-formed. The next student's answer (*un petit rivière*) is correct in terms of content although the grammatical gender is incorrect. Marie approves the content with *c'est ça* and then unobtrusively modifies the gender in her recast before moving on with the lesson. Later at line 9, she confirms the student's answer which is correct in form and content by repeating it verbatim, *Ils coupent des arbres*.

By the second exchange (Extract 5), Perlette has made it down the stream and is talking to a fish:

Extract 5

1) Marie: *[. . .] Et au moment où il parle à Perlette, qu'est-c'qui lui arrive au beau poisson?*

2) St: *Il va la boire*.

3) Marie: <u>*Il va boire Perlette*</u>? *Non, y va pas boire Perlette*.

4) St: *Euhm, le poisson est *une ami de elle**.

5) Marie: OUI, C'EST ÇA, <u>*ce sont des amis pis*</u> *y parlent ensemble. Et tout à coup, qu'est-c'qui s'passe? Oui?*

6) StD: **UNE PERSONNE QUI PÊCHE A PRIS**.

7) Marie: EXACTEMENT. *Hein, y arrive un hameçon avec un p'tit vers de terre dedans et là le poisson s'retourne. Qu'est-c'qu'y fait? Il le mange le poisson et là il est pris avec son hameçon . . .*

When Marie asks what happens to the fish, a student at line 2 replies that it intends to drink Perlette. Marie repeats this at line 3 as a confirmation check because the student's well-formed statement is untrue and is subsequently disconfirmed by Marie in the same turn. A true but ill-formed statement is then proposed at line 4 (*le poisson est une ami de elle*) which is met first with approval (*oui, c'est ça*) then with a confirming recast (*ce sont des amis*) before Marie continues with her questions about what happens next. The next student's nontarget utterance at line 6 (*Une personne qui pêche a pris*) is again followed by approval (*exactement*) and then an expansion of the student's message, but without clearly recasting any specific forms.

In the third exchange (Extract 6), Marie's question about Perlette elicits two responses, each of which contains well-known errors in French as a second language:

Extract 6

1) Marie: *[. . .] Pourquoi est-ce qu'elle veut se faire réchauffer vous pensez? Oui?*

2) St: *Parce qu'ELLE *EST *TROP FROID pour aller dans toutes les [?]*

3) Marie: *Parce qu'elle a trop froid,* <u>O.K.</u> *Oui?*

4) StD: *ELLE *EST* TROP PEUR.*

5) Marie: *Parce qu'<u>elle a peur</u>,* OUI.

The first response at line 2 (*parce qu'elle est trop froid*) is followed by a recast at line 3 (*parce qu'elle a trop froid*) as well as by the approval marker *O.K.* The next nontarget utterance at line 4 (*elle est trop peur*) is also followed by a recast at line 5 as well as by a sign of approval, *Oui*. Given that *avoir* and *être* distinctions are known to be confusing to immersion students, as documented for example by Harley (1993), recasts provided as implicitly as this may be particularly ambiguous, and may even confirm that the two forms are interchangeable. I'll return to this point later.

Whippet cookies

The next two exchanges are extracted from a social studies lesson, again taught by Marie. The lesson is about Whippets — a well-known chocolate-covered marshmallow cookie that has been made in Montreal for more than a hundred years. The first exchange (Extract 7) is about the original manufacturer of this delicacy, Charles Théodore Viau:

Extract 7

1) Marie: . . . *Et qu'est-ce qu'il avait fait de spécial, Charles Théodore Viau, dans sa vie? Qu'est-c'qu'il avait fait de spécial?*

2) St: *IL *A* UNE COMPAGNIE.*

3) Marie: OUI, *une compagnie de quoi?*

4) St: *Ah, *DES* BISCUITS.*

5) Marie: <u>De</u> *biscuits. En quelle année est-ce qu'il a ouvert sa compagnie de biscuits, Charles Théodore Viau?*

6) St: *Mille neuf cent soixante-sept.*

7) Marie: Non, *pas <u>mille neuf cent soixante-sept</u>.*

Marie first asks what special feat Viau had accomplished in his lifetime. At line 2 a student replies, *Il a une compagnie*, which is understandable in terms of content but formally incorrect because the past tense is obligatory in this context. At line 3, Marie responds affirmatively with *Oui*, ignores the error in tense, and requests additional information about what kind of company it was. In response to the nontarget <u>*des biscuits*</u>, Marie's recast at line 5 confirms the message and modifies its form (<u>*de biscuits*</u>) before she moves on to ask more information about when the company began. At line 7, she repeats the student's well-formed but incorrect answer (*1967*) in order to disconfirm it and move on to elicit the correct response.

In the next exchange (Extract 8), Marie asks what Viau did to make his cookies known to people:

Extract 8

1) Marie: *Qu'est-ce qu'il a fait pour que les gens apprennent à connaître son biscuit?*
2) St: *IL A *VENDRE* À . . .*
3) Marie: <u>*Il a vendu des biscuits?*</u> <u>*Il a vendu des biscuits dans la ville?*</u> *. . .*
4) St: *Oui, *IL A DONNÉ DES PERSONNES UN BISCUIT CHAQUE* et . . .*
5) Marie: <u>*Il a donné des biscuits à des personnes.*</u> *Quelles personnes? À quelles personnes il a donné ça?*
6) St: *Dans une aréna.*
7) Marie: <u>*Dans une aréna,*</u> *des personnes qui étaient allées voir une partie de hockey. [. . .] Alors qu'est-c'que les gens ont dit quand ils ont goûté? Ils ont dit . . .*
8) St: **ILS ADORENT *. . .*
9) Marie: <u>*Qu'ils adoraient*</u> *ce fameux biscuit l'Empire,* EXCELLENT.

The student's response at line 2, which contains a nontarget form (*il a vendre*), is immediately recast by Marie (*Il a vendu les biscuits*), not once but twice, in a confirmation check that may have more to do with meaning, because the answer is incorrect in terms of content as we see at line 5 where the next student says that the cookies were given out, not sold. This student's ill-formed answer is then confirmed by Marie at line 5 in an almost imperceptible recast of a nontarget dative construction, which is immediately followed by her request for more information about whom the cookies were given to. At line 7, she confirms the student's rather brief but well-formed reply by repeating (*dans une aréna*)[3] and then elaborating, before asking what people said about the cookies. She sets up an obligatory context for the past with *Ils ont dit . . .*, and so in response to the student's use of the present form (*ils adorent)*, she uses the past tense (*qu'ils adoraient*) in a recast at line 9 that concludes with a sign of approval (*Excellent!*).

Ambiguity and the negotiation of meaning versus form

In the light of these exchanges, I would like to propose that the negotiation of meaning is not necessarily an effective teaching strategy for developing target language accuracy, although it is likely an effective strategy for content delivery. As we just saw, it allows teachers to keep their students' attention focused on content in spite of their gaps in L2 proficiency. The two lessons we just examined are typical of the interactive classrooms we observed, where meaning was indeed negotiated. The teachers drew regularly on negotiation of meaning strategies by frequently repeating or recasting learner utterances,

62

using numerous expansions, confirmations, and confirmation checks to do so. However, we did not find that these interactional moves helped to draw attention to form, precisely because they were equally likely to follow ill- and well-formed learner utterances and thus appeared to respond to the meaning of learner utterances.

Many researchers, however, argue that negotiation of meaning strategies provide opportunities for learners to notice target-nontarget mismatches (e.g., Long, 1996). The effects of the noticing, it is claimed, may show up as modifications of interlanguage grammar at some later point in time (e.g., Gass, 1997; Gass and Varonis, 1994). In this view, the absence of uptake in the exchanges we just looked at is considered to be inconsequential, because second language learning is a long-term process. That is, learner responses immediately following feedback are not necessarily signs of learning and their absence does not preclude a more cumulative effect over time.

However, this argument relies faithfully on students noticing the mismatch at some point, regardless of whether or not the effect is immediate. Yet to notice the mismatch, learners would need, first, to know that their output was indeed nontargetlike and, second, to intentionally hold the nontargetlike utterance in memory long enough to make a cognitive comparison. This appears difficult for young learners to do in lessons where the focus is on content, as we just saw in Marie's class, because after recasting, teachers typically tend to move on with the lesson, without allowing time for learners to focus on form. However, even if students did notice the modification in a recast, they might conclude that it's just another way of saying the same thing. That is, some recasts might even serve to confirm the hypothesis that there is a great deal of variation in French: learners might conclude that they can say either *un petit rivière* or *une petite rivière*; either *elle a peur* or *elle est peur*, in the same way that they can say either *on est allé* or *nous sommes allés* and either *C'est beau la maison* or *Elle est belle la maison*. Recasts do not necessarily disconfirm wrong hypotheses because they compete with the student's own nontarget output serving as auto-input as well as with nontarget input from peers, both of which may be followed by approving and confirming moves from teachers. Because of this, I would agree with Vigil and Oller (1976) that the absence of clear negative feedback on the cognitive channel may even be a strong factor influencing fossilization.

The ambiguous use of feedback has been noted in other studies of immersion classrooms by Allen, *et al*. (1990), Chaudron (1977), and Netten (1991), as well as in ESL classrooms by Allwright (1975) and Fanselow (1977). The difficulty, as described by Chaudron (1988), lies precisely in feedback that can have more than one function — namely, contingent responses that serve both to confirm and to correct. This provides a strong argument for providing feedback that is less ambiguous and perhaps more explicit than recasts. This is what Spada (1997) found in a survey of more than 30 studies investigating the effects

of form-focused instruction, including either direct teaching or corrective feedback. She concluded that an explicit focus appeared particularly effective in communicatively-based and content-based L2 classrooms. Seedhouse (1997) argues that if teachers use only very implicit feedback on the grounds that it avoids embarrassing students, then this contradicts the pedagogical message of "it's OK to make linguistic errors" (p. 567). He argues that if it is really true that it's OK to make errors then drawing attention to errors should not be cause for embarrassment. He argues in favour of more direct and overt feedback so that pedagogy and interaction would work more in tandem.

Some studies have provided evidence that, for corrective feedback to be effective (i.e., not ambiguous), relatively explicit signals are employed. For example, Lightbown and Spada (1990) and Lightbown (1991) found that feedback that drew learners' attention to their errors was accompanied by explicit paralinguistic signals such as hand signals or dramatically raised eyebrows. With respect to recasts, Chaudron (1977) and others (Lyster, 1998a; Roberts, 1995) have shown them to be more noticeable when teachers shorten the learner's utterance to locate the error and then add stress for emphasis. Still other studies have operationalized corrective feedback as having a more explicit focus than recasts alone can provide. For example, in Doughty and Varela's (1998) experimental study in a content-based ESL classroom with learners ranging in age from 11 to 14, the teacher's repetition of the learner's error preceded the recast so as to highlight the target-nontarget mismatch. Similarly, in the Tomasello and Herron (1988, 1989) studies with young adult learners of French, in addition to providing recasts, the teacher wrote the correct and incorrect forms on the chalkboard in order to allow time for visual and cognitive comparison. Tomasello and Herron (1989, p. 392) concluded that, otherwise, "recasts do not seem to work in the L2 classroom" because "students in a classroom context believe that a teacher's positive response indicates that no correction is needed."

The implicit-explicit dimension, however, is not the only variable that needs to be taken into account when describing the various types of corrective feedback that teachers have at their disposal. Based on observations of immersion classroom interaction, Lyster and Ranta (1997) found six different types of corrective feedback that were divided into two main groups:

1. **Feedback that supplies learners with correct rephrasings of their nontarget output.**
   This includes, at the implicit end of the spectrum,
   (a) recasts,
   and, at the explicit end, what we called
   (b) explicit correction (i.e., teacher supplies the correct form and clearly indicates that what the student had said was incorrect: *"Oh, tu veux dire X"*).

2. **Feedback that provides learners with signals, rather than with alternative rephrasings, to facilitate peer- or self-repair of their nontarget output.**

This includes:

(c) elicitation (teacher directly elicits target forms from students by asking questions such as "*Comment ça s'appelle?*" or "*Comment ça se dit en français?*"; or by pausing to allow students to complete teacher's utterance);

(d) metalinguistic clues (teacher provides comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of student's utterance, e.g., "*Ça se dit pas en français,*" "*Non, pas ça,*" "*Est-ce que c'est masculin?*");

(e) clarification requests (phrases such as "*Pardon* " and "*Je ne comprends pas*" to indicate that a repetition or reformulation is required);

(f) repetition of a learner's error (teacher usually adjusts the intonation to highlight the error, as in *Le girafe?*).

The four interactional moves that provide learners with signals rather than with alternative rephrasings were considered to involve *negotiation of form* and were so named for two reasons. First, unlike recasts and explicit correction, these moves return the floor to students along with cues to draw on their own resources, thus allowing for negotiation to occur (i.e., bilaterally). Second, in contrast to the conversational function of the negotiation of meaning, which aims "to work toward mutual comprehension" (Pica, *et al.*, 1989, p. 65), the four moves comprising the negotiation of form serve a pedagogical function that draws attention to form and aims for accuracy in addition to mutual comprehension.

Swain (1985) pointed out that mutual comprehension can be achieved despite grammatically deviant and sociolinguistically inappropriate language. She argued, therefore, that negotiation of meaning strategies, in order to benefit the interlanguage development of immersion students, would need to incorporate ways of pushing learners to produce language that is not only comprehensible but also accurate. We did not find in the present study that many of the moves generally referred to as the negotiation of meaning pushed learners in their output nor even drew attention to form. For example, comprehension checks such as "Do you understand?" appeared unequivocally intended to draw learners' attention to meaning, not form. Other negotiation of meaning strategies—such as recasts, repetition, expansions, confirmations, and confirmation checks—overlapped in ways that created considerable ambiguity, as we saw in Marie's class. For example, recasts can be part of a confirmation, a confirmation check,

or an expansion and, in all cases, they serve the same discourse functions as non-corrective repetition.[4] The only negotiation of meaning strategies that tended to push learners to modify their nontarget output were clarification requests and repetition of error (cf. Pica, 1988). We found that teachers often used these two moves, not because they did not understand, but rather to draw attention to nontarget forms, and so we regrouped these moves, along with elicitation and metalinguistic clues, as negotiation of form. Van den Branden's (1997) comparison of negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form in student-student dyads and teacher-student dyads found that negotiation of form occurred only in the teacher-student dyads, thus confirming its specifically pedagogic function.

Well-adapted mammals

We will now enter a grade 4 science lesson taught by Rachelle on how various mammals defend themselves against their enemies. Keep in mind that, throughout this lesson, Rachelle also drew frequently on negotiation of meaning strategies to provide implicit feedback in the form of recasts serving as confirmations and confirmation checks — just as Marie did in her lessons about Perlette and Whippets. For the purposes of comparison, however, I've selected only exchanges during which Rachelle negotiates form with students — that is, when she draws attention to their nontarget output in ways that encourage them to peer- or self-repair. Rachelle is able to do this more frequently than Marie, because her early-immersion students have had more exposure to French than Marie's mid-immersion students.

As we consider these exchanges, take note of two additions to the legend: *learner repair* appears in bold italic letters and the NEGOTIATION OF FORM appears in small caps italic with double underscore. The first exchange is about hares and appears in Extract 9:

Extract 9

1) Rachelle: *Le lièvre. Joseph pourrais-tu nous dire quels sont les moyens que tu vois, toi, d'après l'illustration là?*

2) St: *Il court vite, puis il saute.*

3) Rachelle: *Il court vite.*

4) StD: **IL BOND*.*

5) Rachelle: *IL BOND*?

6) Sts: *Il bondit*.

7) Rachelle: *Il bondit, c'est le verbe . . . ?*

8) Sts: *Bondir*.

9) Rachelle: *Bondir. Il fait des bonds. Hein, il bondit. Ensuite, Joseph?*

Rachelle begins at line 3 by repeating *Il court vite* to confirm one of Joseph's contributions from line 2. Then at line 5 she uses a negotiation of form technique as she repeats the student's ill-formed utterance to draw attention to the nontarget form, *Il bond*. Other students immediately provide the target form, *Il bondit*, which Rachelle confirms by repeating at line 7 then asks for its infinitive form. At line 8, several students propose *bondir* which Rachelle confirms by repeating at line 9, then provides a synonym (*Il fait des bonds*) along with a final repetition of *Il bondit* before calling on Joseph to continue. It is important to stress here that the lesson continues, uninterrupted by the negotiation of form, which serves as an insertion sequence at lines 5 and 6, composed of a feedback/uptake adjacency pair.

In the next exchange about the giraffe (Extract 10), Rachelle very simply repeats the student's nontarget *le girafe*, which incites him to self-repair at line 4 before Rachelle proceeds to ask for more information about giraffes.

Extract 10

1) Rachelle: *Plus grand que toi ça serait qui? [. . .]*
2) St: **LE . . . LE GIRAFE*?*
3) Rachelle: <u>*LE GIRAFE*</u>?
4) St: ***La girafe***.
5) Rachelle: <u>*La girafe. Mais la girafe est-ce que c'est un animal du Canada?*</u>

In Extract 11, the topic is porcupines and the negotiation is about the precise word for quills:

Extract 11

1) Rachelle: *. . . Le porc-épic? Sara?*
2) St: *C'est *LES PIQUES* sur le dos, c'est. . .*
3) Rachelle: <u>*LES PIQUES. EST-CE QU'ON DIT LES PIQUES*</u>?
4) StD: **LES ÉPIQUES*.*
5) Rachelle: <u>*LES . . .*</u>?
6) StD: ***Les piquants***.
7) Rachelle: <u>*Les piquants*</u>. TRES BIEN. <u>*Les piquants*</u>.

In response to Sara's suggestion at line 2 (*les piques*), Rachelle negotiates form at line 3 by repeating the error and giving a metalinguistic clue as she asks, *Est-ce qu'on dit les piques?* Another student proposes an equally erroneous term at line 4 (*les épiques*), which incites Rachelle to use an elicitation move at line 5 (*Les . . . ?*) that not only aims to elicit the target form but also serves as a rejection of the nontarget form and thus as negative evidence. This simple move succeeds in eliciting *Les piquants* from Anne at line 6, the correct term approved and repeated by Rachelle at line 7.

Form is again brought into focus in Extract 12 in an exchange about the skunk's means of defense:

Extract 12

1) Rachelle: *Alors la mouffette qu'est-ce qu'elle fait, elle? Karen?*
2) St: *Eh . . . *ELLE JET* . . . Ben y a *UN JET DE PARFUM* qui sent pas très bon. . .*
3) Rachelle: <u>*ALORS UN JET DE PARFUM, ON VA APPELER ÇA UN . . .*</u>?
4) Sts: ***Liquide***.
5) Rachelle: *Liquide.* <u>*UN LIQUIDE . . .*</u>
6) StD: ***Puant***.
7) Rachelle: <u>*Un liquide puant.*</u> <u>*AUSSI ON APPELLE ÇA*</u> *[. . .]*

At line 2, Karen describes it as a stream of perfume (*un jet de parfum*) that doesn't smell very good. Although the meaning is clear, Rachelle looks for a more accurate term than *parfum* at line 3 — her repetition of Karen's non-targetlike utterance is followed by an elicitation move (*On va appeler ça un . . . ?*). Students then provide the more accurate term *liquide* at line 4, which Rachelle repeats at line 5 first to confirm then again to elicit a qualifier which is produced by a different student at line 6 (*puant*). At line 7, Rachelle puts it all together (*Un liquide puant*) but then elicits a better term than *puant* by asking, *Aussi, on appelle ça . . . ?* This leads to a long sequence not reproduced here (see Lyster, 1998c, p. 75) in which Rachelle tries to elicit the word for foul-smelling (*malodorant*). Students come up with the base (*odorant*) as well as the prefixes *in-* and *dé-* and thus propose off-target words such as *déodorant* and *désodorant* until Rachelle herself finally provides the appropriate term *malodorant*. We know from research that immersion students are limited in their productive use of such derivational morphology (Harley, 1992; Harley and King, 1989) and that immersion teachers tend not to focus on structural information about vocabulary outside of separate grammar lessons (Allen, *et al.*., 1990). This sequence on prefixes, integrated into a lively discussion about skunks, may be an exemplary way of doing so. In Extract 13, the lesson about skunks continues, as Rachelle asks what other means the skunk uses to escape from its predators:

Extract 13

1) Rachelle: *. . . Ensuite qu'est-ce qu'elle aurait la mouffette [. . .] pour échapper à ses prédateurs, à ses ennemis? Il y aurait toujours . . . ?*
2) St: *Des griffes peut-être?*
3) Rachelle: <u>*Des griffes?*</u> *Pas tellement.*
4) StD: **LA FUIT*.*
5) Rachelle: <u>*HEIN?*</u>
6) St: ***La fuite***.

7) Rachelle: *La fuite,* OUI. *La fuite*.
8) StD: La fuite dans les arbres

At line 3, Rachelle repeats a student's well-formed but incorrect answer (*des griffes*) in a confirmation check immediately followed by a disconfirmation (*pas tellement*). At line 5, she uses a clarification request (*Hein?*) in response to a student's phonological error (*la fuit*) which succeeds in getting him to self-repair at line 6 (*la fuite*). Rachelle confirms this answer at line 7 by repeating it twice along with a sign of approval (*oui*). A different student then continues the exchange at line 8 by proposing additional information about the skunk's means of escape.

Semaine de relâche

The final two exchanges are from two different classrooms in which both teachers lead discussions about what students did during their week off. The first, Extract 14, is from Rachelle's class:

Extract 14
1) St: *[. . .] pis là elle est allée avec ses parents et puis on a fait du ski ensemble. Pis là moi *J'AI REVENU* euh vendredi . . .*
2) Rachelle: *J'AI REVENU?*
3) St: **Je suis revenue** *euh vendredi faire des [?]*
4) Rachelle: TRES BIEN. *Tu, tu es demeurée au Mont Ste-Anne toute la semaine?*

Very simply, we see that Rachelle's repetition of the student's nontarget output at line 2 (*j'ai revenu*) draws attention to it in a way that incites the student to self-repair at line 3 (*Je suis revenue*) and then to continue her story. During this lively discussion, Rachelle pushed students quite consistently in this way, rarely recasting and instead drawing on the negotiation of form to get them to self-repair. In comparison, an exchange from a similar discussion in Marie's class, involving a similar nontarget utterance, appears in Extract 15:

Extract 15
1) Marie: *T'as été à Toronto?*
2) St: *Oui. Mais *J'AI REVENIR HIER*.*
3) Marie: *Tu es revenue hier?*
4) St: *Oui*.
5) Marie: *Et qu'est ce que tu as fait à Toronto?*

In response to the student's nontarget utterance at line 2 (*J'ai revenir hier*), Marie provides a recast at line 3 in the guise of a confirmation check (*Tu es revenue hier?*), which fails to draw attention to the nontarget auxiliary and may even serve to reinforce the error because the auxiliaries in *tu es* and *j'ai* sound alike.

Implications for Teaching

Our initial findings about the ambiguous use of recasts, noncorrective repetition, and signs of approval suggested that language form was often out of focus in immersion classrooms during content-based lessons. However, the same teachers we observed were also able to bring language form back into focus, without breaking the communicative flow, as they briefly negotiated form with students and then continued to interact with them about content. By drawing attention to form in this way, precisely at the moment when students had something to say and with the intention of "helping them to say what they [students] themselves had already decided to say" (Lightbown, 1991, p. 211), teachers made use of ideal conditions for providing helpful feedback in a meaningful context.

Negotiation of form proved to be less ambiguous than recasts in at least two ways. First, some of its constituent moves — such as metalinguistic clues — are more explicit than recasts in their attempt at drawing attention to nontarget output. Second, and more importantly, negotiation of form cannot be perceived as a confirmation of the learner's message or as another way of saying the same thing. Instead, it aims to get learners first to notice their nontarget output and then, in Swain's (1995) terms, to "reprocess" or modify their output. To self-repair after a teacher's metalinguistic clue, elicitation move, clarification request, or repetition of error, learners must attend to the retrieval of alternative forms. This pushes them to make use of what they already know at some level and may even contribute to a destabilization of interlanguage forms. Conversely, on the small number of occasions when learners do modify their nontarget output after a recast, the modification is merely a repetition of the alternative form provided by the teacher. In this case, learners' attention is drawn neither to the retrieval of alternative forms nor even to their nontarget output.

In the case of peer-repair resulting from negotiation of form, although the learners who actually produce the initial errors do not self-repair, they have a good chance of noticing the target forms provided by their peers. Target forms provided in this way by peers are likely to be more salient than recasts provided by teachers, precisely because they follow the teacher's negotiation-of-form move, which already serves as negative evidence. Thus, peer-repair moves serve more clearly to disconfirm nontargetlike forms than do recasts provided by teachers.

Although the effects of the negotiation of form clearly need to be tested experimentally, there exists at least some evidence from research that classroom learners may notice features that have been targeted by the negotiation of form but not features that have been recast. In her 1992 study, Slimani asked young adult students to complete Recall Charts on which they were to claim language items that they had noticed during ESL lessons. Classroom observations and

audio recordings of the lessons allowed Slimani to conclude that students failed to claim 36% of the language items that were focused on during the lessons. Slimani found that the majority of these unnoticed or 'lost' items had been focused on as error correction. Although Krashen (1994) has added this finding to his list of arguments against error treatment, a closer look at the data provides us instead with an argument against feedback that is too implicit — and, more specifically, against recasting. Slimani indicates that what went unnoticed were instances when teachers provided correct forms, without any metalanguage or further involvement from students. These are recasts, as illustrated in the following example:

L: . . . I looking for my pen.
T: You are looking for your pen.   (Slimani, 1992, p. 212)

In contrast to this, however, Slimani gives several examples of items that were claimed as being noticed. Among these were items that had arisen incidentally during classroom interaction, and some of these resulted from the negotiation of form, as in the following example:

T: OK. Did you like it?
L: Yes, yes, I like it.
T: Yes, I . . . ?
L: Yes, I liked it.
T: Yes, I liked it.   (Slimani, 1992, p. 208)

The teacher simply uses an elicitation move ("Yes, I . . . ?") to elicit the target form, "I liked it." Thus, learners tended to notice forms that they were pushed to self-repair more than forms that were implicitly provided by teachers. That this study can be used as an argument against error treatment points to a limitation in research that has often operationalized error treatment in only very narrow terms, not necessarily including techniques other than those that provide correct forms.

Another argument against error treatment is often presented in the guise of a paradox. The paradox is summarized by Chaudron (1988, p. 134) as follows: "teachers must either interrupt communication for the sake of formal correction or let errors pass 'untreated' in order to further the communicative goals of classroom interaction." However, this may be a false paradox. Nowhere in our database were we able to locate instances of the communicative flow being truly broken. Whether teachers provided recasts or negotiation of form or even explicit correction, they were able to do so in ways that allowed the communicative flow to continue. Nor did we find that the teachers' interventions caused any apparent anxiety, contrary to Krashen's predictions. It has often been pointed out to me, though, that this may be the case at the grade 4 level but perhaps not in later grades with adolescent learners. However, Serge, the teacher

71

I described earlier, and Leonard, described by Lapkin and Swain (1996), were both adept at providing feedback to groups of young adolescent students at the grade 8 level. I will never forget my own classes of grade 8 students whom I asked each year whether or not they wanted me to provide corrective feedback. They invariably replied in the affirmative, pointing out that it was, after all, part of my job to do so!

The option that a teacher is faced with, therefore, does not involve choosing between communication on the one hand and corrective feedback on the other, because classroom studies have shown that both can be successfully integrated (e.g., Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Spada and Lightbown, 1993). The challenging options a teacher must confront in this respect have more to do with deciding, first of all, which features to provide feedback on and, second, what type of feedback to use.

Concerning the type of error to target, choices need to be made, of course, because it would be undesirable, ineffective, and likely impossible to provide feedback on all errors. Calvé (1992) proposes that teachers should target the following types of errors: errors that recur frequently, errors that are the current focus of the lesson, errors that the learner could have avoided or at least appears ready to acquire, and errors that either impede communication or bother the interlocutor. Specifically taking account of interlanguage data collected from immersion students over the years, Harley (1993) outlined a number of linguistic domains where nonnative patterns of use tend to persist and which may require form-focused instruction — ideally combining a proactive approach (planned instruction and meaningful opportunities for productive use) with a reactive approach (provision of corrective feedback). These domains include second language features that (a) differ in nonobvious or unexpected ways from the L1; (b) are irregular, infrequent, or otherwise lacking in perceptual salience in the input; (c) do not carry a heavy communicative load. Her list of prime candidates for focus on form in French immersion classrooms include gender distinctions, distinctions in the use of *avoir* and *être*, various features of the verb system, the *tu/vous* distinction, and certain lexical features.

In view of these criteria, teachers can then choose the appropriate type of feedback from options along two dimensions: they can provide feedback either implicitly or explicitly, and they can provide either correct forms to learners or signals that push them to self-repair. For example, teachers may decide, on the one hand, to recast or even ignore nontarget forms that are far beyond their students' current interlanguage and, on the other, to push learners to self-repair nontarget items such as those that confuse *avoir* and *être*. This particular error recurs persistently, even though the distinction is usually presented early on, and its misanalysis, according to Harley (1993), is considered to block entry into a major subsystem of the target code.

Decisions about type of feedback need also to take into account the context and the nature of the lesson. For example, there are good reasons for responding to certain nontarget forms at times with recasts, in order to move the lesson ahead and to facilitate the delivery of complex subject matter, as Marie did in her lesson about the water cycle. There are also good reasons for drawing on the negotiation of form, as Rachelle did when her students discussed mammals that they had already researched or simply talked enthusiastically about their week off. In these lessons, the students themselves were more in control of the content. This break from content delivery may have allowed Rachelle to focus more consistently on ubiquitous target features known to be difficult for second language learners of French — such as *avoir/être* distinctions, prepositions, grammatical gender, and verb inflections.

The four teachers we observed followed fairly distinct patterns in selecting feedback types in accordance with error types (see Lyster, 1998b). They tended to use recasts after phonological and grammatical errors and negotiation of form after lexical errors. Our analysis of learner repair revealed indeed that most phonological repairs followed recasts and most lexical repairs followed negotiation of form. However, the majority of grammatical repairs also followed negotiation of form, not recasts. This pattern suggests that the teachers were on the right track in their decisions to recast phonological errors and to negotiate lexical errors. It also suggests that perhaps teachers could draw more frequently on the negotiation of form in response to grammatical errors.

Conclusion

To conclude, I would like to return again briefly to my experience back at that Senior Public School in Toronto. I mentioned at the beginning some of the challenges I faced there, not the least of which was knowing how to reconcile, on the one hand, the observed urgency for effective focus on form and, on the other, the strong message at the time that focus on form was not really necessary. I also mentioned the opportunity that I had for a new perspective at that same school, as I adopted the role of researcher and undertook observations of Serge during my dissertation study (Lyster, 1993). This experience triggered my interest in how teachers and students negotiate form.

But now I have a confession to make. I was not much of a negotiator of form myself. I've since had the opportunity to observe myself teaching at that school in Toronto, thanks to my participation (and my students') in a video produced by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in 1988. In addition to the final product (a professional video about 75 minutes long used for immersion teacher education), I was given a video tape that includes hours of unused footage. So, in a sense, I have access to the 'uncensored' version. Although I like to think that I appear effective at pushing students to

think critically and to refine their ideas, I now think that I may have wrongly assumed that, if I did so, their accuracy would somehow improve. The truth is, I provided very little corrective feedback — other than recasts. Given what I've since learned from research about classroom interaction, I imagine that, if I were to return to teaching school-age learners in immersion classrooms, I would interact with them differently by drawing on a wider range of feedback to draw their attention to differences between target and nontargetlike forms and to push them towards peer- or self-repair. I believe I would make this change as a result of the awareness I gained from viewing the video tape (which revealed to me many things about my teaching of which I was unaware) and from the many detailed transcripts of teacher-student interaction I've since analyzed for research purposes.

But without the help of many hours of video tape and lots of transcribed data, it remains difficult for teachers to first identify clear patterns of teacher-student interaction in their classrooms and then determine ways of making effective changes. This became evident when I presented the results of our descriptive classroom study of corrective feedback to two of the participating teachers. I was a bit worried at first that they might feel too much under scrutiny and even perhaps under attack. On the contrary, though, their reaction was extremely positive — but also one of great surprise. They both claimed that, before seeing the results, they truly did not have a clear idea of how they interacted with students and even less of an idea of how they focused on form, since they both acknowledged that their real concern was content. They were grateful for being made aware of a wide range of feedback techniques and both were determined to expand their repertoire.

I end, therefore, with a comment regarding implications for teacher education and reflective practice. Because these two experienced teachers (as well as myself back at that school in Toronto) were quite unaware of their interactional patterns and feedback preferences, it seems that there is a twofold need for increased awareness: first, awareness of the benefits of providing clear feedback during meaningful interaction and, second, awareness of a wide range of feedback types as well as their differential effects on students' involvement in classroom interaction. The model that we developed in Lyster and Ranta (1997) to analyze corrective feedback and student uptake may be one helpful tool for teachers in this respect (see Spada and Lyster, 1997). Results obtained by using this model, as well as other results obtained in the follow-up studies, revealed considerable ambiguity from the second language learner's perspective as well as limitations in teaching language through the negotiation of meaning. However, the studies also revealed potential solutions that may help to exploit more effectively the strengths of classroom interaction as a tool for second language learning.

Notes

[1] This research was funded by grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (410-94-0783) and from the *Fonds pour la formation de chercheurs et l'aide à la recherche* (97-NC-1409).

[2] The following conventions are used in the extracts: St = student; Sts = more than one student; StD = a different student from the previous student turn. David is a bilingual (French/English) male and Marie is a francophone female, both of whom teach Grade 4 in a mid-immersion program. Rachelle is francophone female teaching Grade 4 in an early total immersion program.

[3] Although the prescribed gender of *aréna* is masculine, its feminization is a frequently attested form in spoken French and was thus not considered ill-formed in our analysis.

[4] The overlap results from the confounding of formal categories (i.e., recasts and repetition) with functional categories (i.e., confirmations, confirmation checks, and expansions) in Long's (1996) specification of negotiation of meaning strategies.

Bibliography

Allen, P., M. Swain, B. Harley and J. Cummins. 1990. "Aspects of classroom treatment: Toward a more comprehensive view of second language education." In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins and M. Swain (eds.), *The Development of Bilingual Proficiency*, pp. 57–81. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Allwright, D. 1975. "Problems in the study of the language teacher's treatment of learner error." In M. Burt and H. Dulay (eds.), *New Directions in Second Language Learning, Teaching and Bilingual Education: On TESOL '75*, pp. 96–109. Washington, DC: TESOL.

Calvé, P. 1992. "Corriger ou ne pas corriger, là n'est pas la question." *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 48, pp. 458–471.

Chaudron, C. 1977. "A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors." *Language Learning*, 27, pp. 29–46.

—— . 1988. *Second Language Classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Day, E. and S. Shapson. 1991. "Integrating formal and functional approaches to language teaching in French immersion: An experimental study." *Language Learning*, 41, pp. 25–58.

Doughty, C. and E. Varela. 1998. "Communicative focus on form." In C. Doughty and J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, pp. 114–138. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fanselow, J. 1977. "The treatment of error in oral work." *Foreign Language Annals*, 10, pp. 583–593.

Gass, S. 1997. *Input, Interaction, and the Second Language Learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gass, S. and E. Varonis. 1994. "Input, interaction, and second language production." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, pp. 283–302.

Harley, B. 1989. "Functional grammar in French immersion: A classroom experiment." *Applied Linguistics*, 10, pp. 331–359.

——— . 1992. "Patterns of second language development in French immersion." *Journal of French Language Studies*, 2, pp. 159–183.

——— . 1993. "Instructional strategies and SLA in early French immersion." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, pp. 245–260.

——— . 1998. "The role of form-focused tasks in promoting child L2 acquisition." In C. Doughty and J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, pp. 156–174. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harley, B. J. Cummins, M. Swain and P. Allen. 1990. "The nature of language proficiency." In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins and M. Swain (eds.), *The Development of Bilingual Proficiency*, pp. 7–25. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Harley, B. and M. King. 1989. "Verb lexis in the written compositions of young L2 learners." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, pp. 415–439.

Harley, B., and M. Swain. 1984. "The interlanguage of immersion students and its implications for second language teaching." In A. Davies, C. Criper and A. Howatt (eds.), *Interlanguage*, pp. 291–311. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Krashen, S. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.

——— . 1985. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. London: Longman.

——— . 1994. "The input hypothesis and its rivals." In N. Ellis (ed.), *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*, pp. 45–77. London: Academic Press.

Lapkin, S. and M. Swain. 1996. "Vocabulary teaching in a grade 8 French immersion class: A descriptive case study." *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 53, pp. 242–256.

Lightbown, P.M. 1991. "What have we here? Some observations on the role of instruction in second language acquisition." In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith and M. Swain (eds.), *Foreign/Second Language Pedagogy Research: A Commemorative Volume for Claus Færch*, pp. 197–212. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

——— . 1998. "The importance of timing in focus on form." In C. Doughty and J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, pp. 177–196. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Long, M. 1991. "Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology." In K. de Bot, D. Coste, R. Ginsberg and C. Kramsch (eds.), *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, pp. 39–52. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

——— . 1996. "The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition." In W.C. Ritchie and T.K. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of Language Acquisition*. Vol. 2: *Second Language Acquisition*, pp. 413–468. New York: Academic Press.

Lyster, R. 1993. "The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of sociolinguistic competence: A study in French immersion classrooms at the grade 8 level." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

——— . 1994a. "La négociation de la forme : Stratégie analytique en classe d'immersion." *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50, pp. 446–465.

——. 1994b. "The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion students' sociolinguistic competence." *Applied Linguistics*, 15, pp. 263–287.

——. 1998a. "Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, pp. 51–81.

——. 1998b. "Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms." *Language Learning*, 48, pp. 183–218.

——. 1998c. "Immersion pedagogy and implications for language teaching." In J. Cenoz and F. Genesee (eds.), *Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education*, pp. 64–95. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

——. 1999. "La négociation de la forme : La suite . . . mais pas la fin." *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55, pp. 355–384.

Lyster, R. and L. Ranta. 1997. "Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, pp. 37–66.

Netten, J. 1991. "Towards a more language oriented second language classroom." In L. Malavé and G. Duquette (eds.), *Language, Culture and Cognition*, pp. 284–304. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pica, T. 1988. "Interlanguage adjustments as an outcome of NS-NNS negotiated interaction." *Language Learning*, 38, pp. 45–73.

Pica, T., L. Holliday, N. Lewis, and L. Morgenthaler. 1989. "Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, pp. 63–90.

Rebuffot, J. and R. Lyster. 1996. "L'immersion au Canada : Contextes, effets et pédagogie." In J. Erfurt (ed.), *De la polyphonie à la symphonie. Méthodes, théories et faits de la recherche pluridisciplinaire sur le français au Canada*, pp. 277–294. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag GmbH.

Roberts, M. 1995. "Awareness and the efficacy of error correction." In R. Schmidt (ed.), *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning* (Tech. Rep. No. 9), pp. 162–182. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Seedhouse, P. 1997. "The case of the missing 'no': The relationship between pedagogy and interaction." *Language Learning*, 47, pp. 547–583.

Slimani, A. 1992. "Evaluation of classroom interaction." In C. Anderson and A. Beretta (eds.), *Evaluating Second Language Education*, pp. 197–221. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spada, N. 1997. "Form-focussed instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research." *Language Teaching*, 30, pp. 73–87.

Spada, N. and P.M. Lightbown. 1993. "Instruction and the development of questions in L2 classrooms." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, pp. 205–224.

Spada, N. and R. Lyster. 1997. "Macroscopic and microscopic views of L2 classrooms." *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 787–795.

Swain, M. 1985. "Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development." In S. Gass and C. Madden (eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, pp. 235–253. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

—— . 1988. "Manipulating and complementing content teaching to maximize second language learning." *TESL Canada Journal*, 6, pp. 68–83.

—— . 1995. "Three functions of output in second language learning." In G. Cook and B. Seidlhofer (eds.), *Principles and Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honour of H.G. Widdowson*, pp. 125–144. New York: Oxford University Press.

Terrell, T. 1982. "A natural approach to second language acquisition and learning." *Modern Language Journal*, 66, pp. 121–132.

Thornton, I. and M. Pienemann. 1994. *COALA: Computer-Aided Linguistic Analysis*. Sydney, Australia: Language Acquisition Research Centre.

Tomasello, M. and C. Herron. 1988. "Down the Garden Path: Inducing and correcting overgeneralization errors in the foreign language classroom." *Applied Pycholinguistics*, 9, pp. 237–246.

—— . 1989. "Feedback for language transfer errors: The Garden Path technique." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, pp. 385–395.

Van den Branden, K. 1997. "Effects of negotiation on language learners' output." *Language Learning*, 47, pp. 589–636.

Vigil, N. and J. Oller. 1976. "Rule fossilization: A tentative model." *Language Learning*, 26, pp. 281–295.

Warden, M. 1998. "The effect of form-focused instruction on control over grammatical gender by French immersion students in grade 11." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

Wright, R. 1996. "A study of the acquisition of verbs of motion by grade 4/5 early French immersion students." *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 53, pp. 257–280.

Appendix

Extract 1
David: [. . .] What smells so good? Allen?
St: Sap maple.
David: Sap of the maple [maple sap]. That's good. Are you ready? [. . .]

Extract 2
David: What do we call the baby of a hen? Nicole?

St: Chicks.

David: Chicks, that's good.

Extract 3 (T3-Jan. 16-maths)
Rachelle: [. . .] Alicia I wanted to check with you, here, did we do all that?

St: No. But I . . . No, we didn't do it all.

Rachelle: No we didn't do it all? O.K. very good.

St: I gotted to the end.

Rachelle: O.K. very good. O.K. we're supposed to have almost all of number one done.

Extract 4
Marie: What's a stream again? [. . .] Yes?

St: It's like a small lake.

Marie: A small lake we said?

St: It's a little river.

Marie: That's it. It's a little river, O.K.? Because a lake is a, it's like a, a place where there's water but it's a . . .

Sts: Like a circle.

Marie: [. . .] And so she finds herself near a forest. What do they do in the forest? Will?

St: They cut down trees.

Marie: They cut down trees. [. . .] What do they do to transport the wood?

Extract 5
Marie: [. . .] And when he's talking to Perlette, what happens to the fish?

St: He's going to drink her.

Marie: He's going to drink Perlette? No, he's not going to drink Perlette.

St: Uhm, the fish is a friend of her.

Marie: Yes, that's it, they're friends and they talk together. Then suddenly what happens? Yes?

StD: A person fishing took.

Marie: Exactly. Right, there's a hook with a little worm on it and so the fish turns around.[. . .]

Extract 6

Marie: [. . .] Why does she want to warm up do you think? Yes?

St: Because she has too cold to go into all the [?]

Marie: Because she is too cold, O.K. Yes?

StD: She has too frightened.

Marie: Because she is too frightened, yes.

Extract 7

Marie: . . . And what did Charles Théodore Viau do that was special in his lifetime? What did he do that was special?

St: He has a company.

Marie: Yes, a company of what?

St: Ah, of the cookies.

Marie: Of cookies. In what year did he open his cookie company, Charles Théodore Viau?

St: Nineteen sixty-seven.

Marie: Non, not nineteen sixty-seven. [. . .]

Extract 8

Marie: What did he do so that people knew about his cookies?

St: He selled to . . .

Marie: He sold cookies? He sold cookies in the city? . . .

St: Yes, he gave people to a cookie each and . . .

Marie: He gave cookies to people. Which people? To which people did he give cookies?

St: In an arena.

Marie: In an arena, people who had gone to see a hockey game [. . .] So what did the people say when they tasted it? They said . . .

St: They love . . .

Marie: That they loved this famous Empire cookie, excellent.

Extract 9

Rachelle: The hare. Joesph could you tell us which means of defense you see in this picture?

St: It runs fast and it hops.

Rachelle: It runs fast.

StD: It jump

Rachelle: It jump?

Sts: It jumps

Rachelle: It jumps, from the verb . . . ?

Sts: To jump

Rachelle: To jump. It jumps about. Right, it jumps. Next, Joseph?

Extract 10

    Rachelle: Bigger than you would be what? [. . .]

    St: The giraffe?

    Rachelle: The giraffe?

    St: The giraffe.

    Rachelle: The giraffe. But is the giraffe an animal from Canada?

Extract 11

    T3: . . . The porcupine? Sara?

    St: It's the pines on its back, it's . . .

    T3: The pines.

    StD: The upines.

    T3: The . . . ?

    StD: The quills

    T3: The quills. Very good. The quills

Extract 12

    T3: And so the skunk, what does it do? Karen

    St: Uhm . . . it does . . . Well there's a stream of perfume that doesn't smell very
        good . . .

    T3: And so a stream of perfume that doesn't smell very good, we'll call that a
        . . . ?

    Sts: Liquid

    T3: Liquid. A liquid . . .

    StD: Smelly

    T3: A smelly liquid. We also call that [. . .]

Extract 13

    Rachelle: What else does the skunk have [. . .] to escape from its predators, from
        its enemies? There would always be . . .

    St: Claws maybe?

    Rachelle: Claws? Not really.

    StD: It flee.

    Rachelle: What?

    St: It flees.

    Rachelle: It flees, yes. It flees.

    StD: It flees up the trees.

Extract 14

    St: . . . and so she went with her parents and then we skied together. And so I
        camed back uhm Friday . . .

Rachelle: I camed back?

St: I came back uhm Friday to do some [?]

Rachelle: Very good. Did you stay at Mont Ste-Anne all week?

Extract 15

Marie: You went to Toronto?

St: Yes. But I comed back yesterday.

Marie: You came back yesterday?

St: Yes.

Marie: And what did you do in Toronto?