Analysis of Learner Uptake in Response to Corrective Feedback in Advanced Foreign Language Classrooms: A Case in the USA

 Ching-Hsuan Wu,[1]

[1]Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, West Virginia University, *The United States*

ABSTRACT

The article analyzed learner uptake in response to the instructor's corrective feedback (CF) to investigate its types and distribution in an advanced L2 learning environment. Six second language (L2) learners of Chinese at the Advanced-high level (ACTFL, 2002) participated in the study, and the data set showed 739 participant turns (n=739) in the recording of 480 minutes, 236 of them with at least one non-target-like item. The results revealed a high uptake rate (91%), in which self-repair in response to repetition CF accounted for the most among the ten uptake types, off-target was the most frequent needs-repair type, and same-error and hesitation took place infrequently among advanced learners. In addition, the findings suggested that value of non-learner-generated repair to one's L2 development was important, and that a high CF rate (86%) was observed even when communication did not breakdown. This study extends the literature in learner uptake in an advanced L2 instructional setting and urges L2 instructors to consider the content of learner uptake as an indicator of immediate linguistic and pedagogical support that learners can use in their L2 advancement.

Keywords: Corrective feedback; Learner uptake; Advanced language pedagogy.

Corresponding Author: Ching-Hsuan Wu

Phone: +1-614-5571614
e-mail: chinghsuanwu@gmail.com

1. Introduction

In a second language (L2) classroom, it is common for the instructor to address a gap between the form of learners' interlanguage and what is considered correct in the target language through offering focused feedback on linguistic items and correcting non-target-like language use. As such, corrective feedback (CF) and learner uptake have received theoretical and practical interest over the past few decades in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). The multifaceted phenomenon of CF has been researched from both the social and cognitive perspectives with regard to, for instance, its types and frequency, timing, effects, facilitative role, outcomes, and learners' motivational dispositions (e.g. Carroll & Swain, 1993; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000; Sheen, 2004; Coyle & Larios, 2014; Lee & Lyster, 2016; Yilmaz, 2016; Papi, Bondarenko, Mansouri, Feng, & Jiang, 2019; Wu, 2019). These studies in general support valuable pedagogical contributions that CF has made in learners' L2 learning process based on measurable learner uptake.

However, while CF and its outcomes, presented through learner uptake with repair, in relation to L2 teaching and learning at the beginning and intermediate levels have been extensively investigated, its interactions and repair results with advanced L2 learners need further examination.

The present study aims to highlight the important dimension of CF outcomes, namely learner uptake, in the context of feedback exchange process in an advanced L2 learning environment. The research draws on Focus on Form (FonF) (Doughty & Williams, 1998) to introduce CF as one of pedagogical options in a L2 classroom, operates on Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1993) that subsequent modified output in response to CF plays a facilitative role in language acquisition, and adopts Lyster and Ranta's (1997) coding scheme of CF in examining the types of CF and learner uptake in advanced L2 instructional settings. An investigation of learner uptake upon their receipt of CF is an important aspect of studying the process by which teachers' feedback can lead to L2 development. In the examination of learner uptake, the focus is specifically placed on analyses of the content of uptake with both repair and need-repair in relation to the corresponding CF prompts. Thus the research question is as follows: What are the types and distributions of learner uptake in relation to the corresponding CF strategies in advanced L2 instructional setting?

2.Literature Review

2.1 Pedagogical option: Focus on form

According to Doughty and Williams (1998), the underlying assumption of FonF instruction is that L2 learners must already be engaged in meaning making when their attention is directed to the linguistic apparatus necessary to communicate successfully. In the present study, FonF is thus characterized as a reactive-incidental, transitory pedagogical intervention that interactively (re)directs L2 learners' attention to form and form-function mapping during and after their performance of a communicative task. FonF is practiced in an attempt to improve one's accuracy and subsequently efficiency in communication. While FonF instruction does not supplant the primary focus on meaning in class, provision of CF offers L2 learners with the opportunity to take time out from constructing meaning to pay attention to specific linguistic forms that realize the meaning of the sentences and improve accuracy (Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004). Research findings show that the transition from focusing on getting meaning across to focusing on linguistic forms upon the introduction of CF can direct L2 learners' attention to notice linguistic characteristics and consequently can recall linguistic targets and lead to improved L2 formal knowledge (Spada, 1997; Muranoi, 2000), accuracy (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Harley, 1998; Lyster, 2004), and intuitive awareness of linguistic norms (Ellis, 2002; Bouffard &Sarkar, 2008). The FonF episodes in the studies above include a range of dimensions in their implementation, such as the level of explicitness in instruction, timing, whether the teaching of targets is planned or reactive, and the extent of instruction. Despite the difference in classroom practice of FonF, its overall effects have been reported as positive on L2 development. However, could such pedagogical intervention disturb the flow of communication? The research results conclude that FonF can be incorporated into a meaning-oriented L2 lesson without unduly interfering with the course content, flow, or objectives (Seedhouse, 1997; Doughty and Varela,1998; Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001a; Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001b; Wu, 2019).

In a FonF episode, L2 learners are offered linguistic elements while they are engaged in a communicative task. FonF works on an underlying assumption about L2 learners' cognitive capacity—they are able to attend to both content and form simultaneously. However, are learners equally able to do so, and are learner-initiated FonF more effective in improving their L2 use? The research findings suggest that more proficient learners are more likely to notice form than less proficient learners (William, 1999; Hanaoka, 2007). In Wu's study (2019), the advanced L2 learners noticed the linguistic gaps in lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic aspects of their own output and that of their peers. In short, these studies suggest a change in quantity and quality of learner-noticing-gap instances as they progress in their proficiency.

2.2 Corrective feedback

CF is a form of negative feedback and offered when L2 learners' production is not considered

native-like. Such feedback can inform learners about the comprehensibility in their output, and some CF includes acceptable examples of target language use. In a FonF classroom, CF is one commonly seen strategy to direct learner's attention to form, and its practical use has invited a considerable number of studies to investigate its effect on language learning. While feedback in general is considered positive in its contribution to L2 development, Krashen (1982) points out linguistic knowledge learned through negative evidence, which informs learners of what is deficient, is different from knowledge gained through positive evidence, which can be understood as input containing acceptable examples of target language use. Nevertheless, a sizable research reports positive effects of CF on L2 learning (e.g., Long, 1996; Doughty & Varela, 1998; Lyster, 1998; Schmidt, 2001; Iwashita, 2003; Sheen, 2007), and these positive effects include improved accuracy in the target structures and learners' awareness of comprehensibility in their utterances. Furthermore, in examining the effect of the combination of CF and subsequent modified output, McDonough (2005) suggests a beneficial role of CF in facilitating L2 learners' production of modified output in response to negative feedback. The modified output that immediately follows CF is interchangeably termed as learner uptake in some studies (e.g., Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Sheen, 2004)

Different types of CF can yield varying learning results. One way to dichotomize CF is based on whether an example of acceptable target-like form is included in the CF move: answer-providing CF and answer-prompting CF. Recast, which offers target-like reformulation of learners' incorrect production, is an interaction-induced CF strategy and is intended to offer correction with minimal interruption of communication, which leads some researcher to consider recast as an ideal CF move (e.g., Doughty, 2001, Ishida, 2004; Long, 2007). Other studies report an advantage of answer-prompting CF, such as metalinguistic feedback (e.g., Carroll & Swain, 1993; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006). In the investigation of CF in relation to learners, research studies have reported that CF episodes can result in learning and those who were engaged more often in CF activities are the ones who demonstrated considerable improvement in their use of the target structures (e.g., Ishida, 2004; McDonough, 2004; Shooshtari, et al. 2018; Adams, 2007). Ellis (2016) concludes that the extensive body of research in CF has provided strong support to its facilitative role in L2 acquisition in a FonF instructional setting by means of drawing learners' attention to the linguistic gap.

2.3 Learner uptake

Learner uptake refers to varying types of immediate learner reactions to the CF that was provided to learners due to an observed mismatch in their use of the language. Following CF, such learner uptake or modified input can potentially be in a form of repair of the preceding nontarget-like utterances or of continued needs before repair is achieved (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Ellis et al., 2001a). Apart from being part of the L2 learning process, learner uptake is an observable source for investigating effect of CF, though it may not capture the complete information of how learners process the preceding CF. Modified output that immediately follows the CF moves does not offer support to its lasting effect on second-language acquisition; however, Ishida's study (2004) shows a correlation between the long-term overall increased accuracy in the target structure and the number of uptake in response to recast feedback. Moreover, McDonough (2005) points out that modified output extends learners' linguistic repertoire by having them make use of their resources fully in an attempt to produce more precise and accurate output to enhance comprehensibility in their utterances. Stretching their fullest and pushing out modified linguistic items, learners, according to McDonough, are more likely able to sustain and subsequently produce these forms.

The role of learner uptake in L2 learning and the reasons why learner uptake is effective in research can also be theoretically constructed by Swain's (1993) output hypothesis. The hypothesis states that language production facilitates L2 learning and involves pushing learners to output accurate, appropriate, and complex language. Such learner-modified output in response to negative feedback is a learning opportunity for L2 learners. In structuring their modified output, learners review the linguistic gap, reinforce relevant knowledge representations that learners had previously encountered, try to be more comprehensible, and work to promote their acquisition of

the specific linguistic items or the target language on the whole (McDonough, 2005). Following this train of thought, uptake is a cognitive step in language acquisition. As Doughty (2001) puts it, teachers' immediate feedback and learners' instant response to it in combination constitutes a "window of opportunity" (p. 257) that invites learners to do cognitive comparison between what they tried to express and the form required to do so in a native-like manner. Furthermore, according to Schmidt (1990), noticing is necessary for language acquisition to take place, and learners' immediate response to CF in their modified output shows the target has been noticed (Mackey, 1999). While the reverse does not hold true that the lack or insufficiency of uptake is not the evidence of lack of noting, learners who produce uptake in general show accurate perceptions about recasts, the provided CF moves in the study (Mackey et al., 2000). The studies and theoretic frame reviewed above establish empirical evidence for learner uptake to be regarded as facilitative in L2 learning processes and justify examination of the role of CF on language acquisition.

3.Method

3.1 Participants

The current study considers uptake the measure of the CF outcome on advanced learners' acquisition and operates on the theoretical framework of FonF (Doughty & Williams, 1998) as well as Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1993). The research investigates the following question: What are the types and distributions of learner uptake in relation to the corresponding CF strategies in an advanced L2 instructional setting? The participants were six L2 learners of Chinese enrolled in an intensive Chinese as a second language program in a university in Taiwan during the time of the study. Three participants were native speakers of English from the United States and England, one was native speaker of Spanish from Spain, one was a native speaker of Italian from Italy, and one was a native speaker of Japanese from Japan. None of the participants was a Chinese heritage speaker. All participants' (n=6) speaking skills had reached Advanced-high on the ACTEL scale (ACTL, 2012) upon the beginning of the data collection. The researcher in this study had fifteen years of experience teaching Chinese language courses across levels in college in the United States.

3.2 Procedure

Six participants were recruited through their language programs and provided with explanations of the purpose of the research. They were compensated for their time and transportation costs. The participants were instructed to treat the eight one-hour data-collection sessions as supplementary learning opportunities in addition to their credit-bearing Chinese language courses and consider the researcher as their session instructor who would give out assignments and offer CF during the interaction. Chinese was the only language used for interaction during the recorded learning sessions and in all the teaching materials. All participants finished their readings (e.g., news articles and literature texts) and viewing assignments (e.g., Youtube videos and parts of a movie) prior to each session. During the sessions, the participants described and narrated the content of the assignments and discussed questions that the instructor or other participants raised. To accomplish these in-session activities, the participants were required to provide detailed description and narration in major time frames (i.e., advanced-high learners of Chinese were expected to describe events in the past, present time, and future and how events unfold over time using aspects) and presented and supported their arguments through developing hypotheses in both concrete and abstract senses. Example 1 shows a sample question:

(1)孟子曰：故天將降大任於斯人也, 必先苦其心志, 勞其筋骨, 餓其體膚, 空乏其身, 行拂亂其所為, 所以動心忍性, 曾益其所不能. 綜觀歷史及現代社會, 你覺得孟子的 這句話是否曾印證在那一位現今或歷史的人物上嗎? 請具體說明你的論點.

Mengzi said "before Heaven entrusts a man with the weight of the world's responsibilities, the individual's mind shall be distressed, his limbs shall be exhausted, his flesh shall be famished, his fortune shall be deprived, his endeavors shall be frustrated. Going through these hardships, his mind will be strengthened with perseverance, and he will become more competent. Looking into the world history and current society, do you think this wisdom has been manifested in any

influential character in the history or current society? Could you please explain and support your argument?

During the interaction with the participants, the instructor provided CF when non-target-like utterances were noticed and when the timing was appropriate in an effort to keep the communicative tasks minimally interrupted. Not all the errors noticed received CF, which was representative of typical language practice. The session content elicited a range of linguistic features from the participants in an attempt to develop their language skills and for the researcher to observe errors and then uptake in varying linguistic aspects in, for instance, syntax, semantics, and pronunciation. The exchanges in the sessions were audio-recorded, a total of four hundred and eighty minutes, with sixty minutes in each session. The recordings were transcribed and coded by a rater, and the data were subsequently verified by another rater. The inter-rater reliability 0.81 in the Kappa3 statistics (κ= 0.81), showing a substantial agreement between the two. In short, the study design required the instructor to offer feedback in response to the participants' non-target-like use of Chinese and allowed opportunities for participants to modify their output as part of L2 learning experiences.

3.3.Data Analysis

The participant turns recorded in this study were first categorized either "with error(s)" or "without." Following the coding scheme in Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study, unsolicited use of the participants' L1 or output that had little to no chance for mistakes to take place was not counted as a participant turn, such as fillers and proper nouns. Participant turns that included incorrect content information but without linguistic errors were coded "without" errors, such as Example 2.

(1)S: 師生是中國五倫關係之一。

Teacher to student is one of the Five Bonds.

T: 師生是其中之一嗎?

Is teacher to student one of them?

In this example, the instructor's comment is not considered a CF move because it was not produced in response to an erroneous participant turn. Example 3, however, was coded "with error" because it revealed non-native language use, not because its content is incorrect.

(3)S: 根據作者的看法，這個發展失衡的問題是一胎化以及中國快速發展的地方來的。

According to the author, the imbalance in the development stemmed from the place of the one-child policy and China's rapid growth.

T: 地方來的?

Stemmed from the place of?

The data set showed 739 participant turns, 236 of them with at least one non-target-like item. In response to the 236 participant turns with errors, 202 instructor turns with CF were documented. Subsequent to the 202 CF moves, 184 participant turns were learner uptake, with 128 repair and 56 needs-repair.

Table 1. *Frequency of Participant Turns with Errors, Instructor CF, and Learner Uptake*

Total participant turns	739
Participant Turns with Errors	236 (32%)
(% of total participant turns)	
Instructor turns with CF	202 (86%)
(% of total participant turns with errors)	
Participant turns with learner uptake	184 (91%)
(% of instructor turns with CF)	
Participant turns with repair uptake (% of instructor turns with CF)	128 (63%)
Participant turns with needs-repair uptake (% of instructor turns with CF)	56 (28%)
Participant turns with no uptake (% of instructor turns with CF)	18 (9%)
Participant turns with repair uptake (% of student turns with errors)	128 (54%)

3.4 The coding scheme

The types of CF, learner uptake repair, and learner uptake needs-repair are described below following Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study with examples from the data in this study. The instructor's feedback is marked as CF if such feedback immediately follows a student turn that includes at least one error. Every participant turn in response to the CF is first coded as learner uptake or no uptake. No uptake refers to continuation of the conversation. Learner uptake, subsequently, is further categorized into its subcategories, repair and needs-repair, and their types are explained below.

3.4.1 Six CF types

1)Explicit correction. The instructor points out what was non-native-like in the previous participant turn and offers a correct form.

(4)S: 我進入學校的時候，　學校又給我獎學金還有生活補助，所以我的情況並不太難。

When I entered the school, the school also provided me with scholarships and a subsidy for living expenses. Therefore, my situation wasn't too difficult.

T:"進入學校的時候"不可以这样说，你要說入學的時候。

You can't say "when I entered the school." You need to say "when I was admitted."

S: 好, 入學的時候

Ok, when I was admitted.

2)Recast. The instructor reformulates or paraphrases part or entirety of the erroneous utterance in the previous participant turn without changing the original meaning.

(5)S:最近那個男藝人的事情受到大家的肯定，去哪都在說這個事。

Recently the incident about the male celebrity has been positively recognized, and it is being discussed everywhere.

T:他是受到了很多關注。

He received a lot of bad publicity.

S: 啊，是這樣嗎？我覺得他真是太倒霉了，不過他現在是因禍得福了。

Is that so? I think he was very unlucky, but now it is a blessing in disguise.

3)Clarification requests. The instructor is confused or does not understand what the participant said and thus requests the participant to clarify.

(6)S: 川普有很多地方產，非常富有。

Trump owns a lot of place assets, very wealthy.

T: 什麼是地方產？

What is "place assets"?

S: 房子，大樓等之類的財產。

Assets, such as houses, buildings and so forth.

4)Metalinguistic feedback. The instructor repeats the mistake made in the previous participant turn and indicates the nature of the mistake by providing related metalinguistic information without rendering a correct form.

(7)S: 給外籍生的排擠不常見，但並不是沒有。

It is not uncommon to give an isolate on international students, but it happens.

T: 給外籍生的排擠？排擠是動詞。

"an isolate on international students"? isolate is a verb.

S: 喔，給外國人的排擠排斥 不多。

Oh, isolate and outcast given to international people are not often..

5)Elicitation. The instructor asks questions to elicit the correct form. Example questions are "what would a native speaker say in this case," "can you paraphrase it in a different way," and "we say a lion roars, and a dog what?"

(8)S:醫生說他大腸子和胃肚子這裡發染，住院住了三天，打了很多抗生素。

The doctor said his big colon part and stomach-abdomen areas are infected. He was hospitalized for thee day and had many injections of antibiotics.

T: (point to the stomach and lower abdomen) 這兩個部分一起，我們叫什麼?兩個字而已。

What do call these two parts together? Only two words.

S: (laugh)這麼多東西,兩個字?

So many things here, only two words?

6)Repetition. The instructor repeats what was perceived as non-native-like in the participant turn with or without using intonation to stress the original form.

(9)S: 學校現在已經促銷德文課了。

The school has promoted German classes.

T: 促銷德文？

Promoted German classes?

S: 對,促銷了。

Yes, promoted.

3.4.2 Four types of learner uptake- repair

1)Repetition. The participant makes correction by repeating the correct form offered by the instructor.

(10)S: 同志難民。

Comrade refugees. (Comrade and to govern share a similar pronunciation)

T: 統治。

To govern.

S: 統治。

To govern.

2) Incorporation. The participant incorporates the correct form that was offered in the instructor's CF to form a longer utterance.

(11)S: 有時候就算你很努力耕，但是不一定能有收得成功，但是沒辦法，這就是實際的情況。

Sometimes even when you plough and (weed) diligently, you can't always obtain success. However, it can't be helped. It is the reality.

T: 你是說努力耕耘並不能保證一定有收穫，是嗎？

You mean ploughing and weeding diligently does not warrant success in return, right?

S: 耕耘，對。就算一個人努力耕耘也不一定就會有豐富的收穫。

Ploughing and weeding, that's right. Even when people work hard to plough and weed, they don't always have glorious success in return.

3) Self-repair. The participant repairs the mistake in response to the instructor's CF, which, however, did not include a correct form.

(12)S: 使大家見聞罪惡。

To make everyone see and hear sin and wrongdoing.

T: 你證明一個人犯罪，那這樣就能讓大家見什麼他們的犯罪事實？

After one's crime is proved, then what word can we use to describe that everyone now has been made aware of his crime?

S: 見證犯罪事實嗎？

To witness the facts of the crime?

4) Peer-repair. A peer repairs the mistake in response to the instructor's CF, which did not offer a correct form.

(13)S: 我很喜歡我們學校，因為我覺得本地生和外籍生沒有什麼隔…

I really like our school because I don't think segre(gation) exits between the local and international students.

T: 沒有什麼隔？

Not much of segre-what?

S2: 沒有什麼隔閡。

There is not much of segregation.

3.4.3 Six types of learner uptake needs-repair

1) Acknowledgement. The participant recognizes that CF has been offered and responds to it by saying, for example, *that's right*, *yes*, and *that is what I meant*.

(14)S: 台灣以前是日本的知名地。

Taiwan used to be a well-known place of Japan. (well-known place and colony share a similar pronunciation)

T: 知名地？

Well-known place?

S:我說錯了嗎？那我不知道怎麼說。

Did I say it wrong. Then, I don't' know how to say it.

2)Same error. In response to CF, the participant repeats the same erroneous utterance.

(15)S: 有的時候他回答的時候，答案都很籠統，說話搖擺。

Sometimes when he answers, his answers are all vague, and he talks swinging.

T: 一個人說話避重就輕，感覺在閃躲，我們可以怎麼形容？

How do you describe someone who evades and avoids issues when he talks?

S: 可以說那個人說話不停搖擺。

We can say that the person talks swinging non-stop.

3)Different error. Upon receiving CF, the participant makes a different error without repairing or repeating the previous error.

(16)S: 現在歐洲政府通知這些難民，也照顧他們，給他們住的地方，還給他們手機打電話回非洲。

Now the European government informs these refugees, also takes care of them, gives them a place to stay, and additionally gives them a cell phone to call Africa. (To inform and to govern share a similar pronunciation.)

T: 不是通知，是统治，三聲然後四聲。

Not inform. It is to govern, third tone and then fourth tone.

S: 同志難民。

Comrade refugees. (Comrade and to govern share a similar pronunciation.)

4)Off target. In responding to CF, the participant, without making a new mistake, produces an utterance that excludes the intended linguistic focus in the CF.

(17)S: 審判納粹是重新給歷史一個道理。

To put Nazi on trial is to give the history a new justice.

T: 喔,是有歷史意義的。

Oh, it is meaningful and significant to the history.

S: 對，審判納粹的意義是讓全球知道不能因為時間久了，就忘記這這些嚴重的錯誤。

That is correct. The significance of putting Nazi on trial is to let the world know that even when a lot of time has passed, we do not forget about these serious crimes.

5)Hesitation. The participant is hesitant to produce output when prompted by the instructor's CF.

(18)S: 所以這個危機是日益增長的。

So this crisis is increasing by day.

T: 是一種慢性經濟危機的現象嗎？

Is it a phenomena of chronic economic crisis?

S: 慢性病的慢性嗎？但是經濟問題不是一種疾病.

Chronic as in chronic disease? However, economic problems are not a kind of disease.

6)Partial repair. The participant repairs part of the initial error in response to CF.

(19)S: 因為現在在我們國家政府實力投胎了。

Because now our nation' strength has incarnated.

T: 實力投胎了?

Strength has incarnated?

S: 勢力投胎?

Power is incarnated? (strength and power share a similar pronunciation, and to incarnate and to rise are in a reserved word order with a similar pronunciation)

4. Results

The 202 participant turns in response to CF were assigned into one of the eleven uptake categories.

Table 2 *Frequency of CF, No Uptake, Uptake-Repair, and Uptake-Needs-Repair*

Uptake	Corrective Feedback						Subtotal	Percentage
	Clarification Request	Elicitation	Explicit Correction	Meta-linguistic	Recast	Repetition		
1. Repetition-repair	0	0	17	0	12	0	29	14.3%
2. Incorporation-repair	0	0	6	0	4	0	10	4.9%
3. Self-repair	23	6	0	19	0	32	80	39.6%
4. Peer-repair	2	4	0	1	0	2	9	4.5%
Repair subtotal	25	10	23	20	16	34	128	63.3%
5. Needs-repair Acknowledge-ment	1	2	1	2	3	1	10	4.9%
6. Needs-repair same error	1	1	0	1	2	1	6	3%
7. Needs-repair different error	3	1	1	2	1	1	9	4.5%
8. Needs-repair off target	5	4	2	5	2	2	20	9.9%
9. Needs-repair hesitation	1	0	1	1	0	0	3	1.5%
10. Needs-repair Partial repair	1	2	1	2	1	1	8	4%
Needs-Repair subtotal	12	10	6	13	9	6	56	27.8%
11. No uptake	1	3	3	1	4	6	18	8.9%
Subtotal	38	23	32	34	29	46	202	100%
Percentage	19%	11%	16%	17%	14%	23%	100%	

Table 2 summarizes the frequency of each uptake type in response to the 202 CF moves. The primary category was repair (sum= 128, 63.3%), followed by needs-repair (sum=56, 27.8%) and then no-uptake (sum= 18, 9%). The participants most often responded the instructor's CF with self-repair (sum=80, 39.6%), repetition-repair (sum=29, 14.3%), and then needs-repair off-target (sum=20, 9.9%). The participants provided no uptake for 8.9% (sum=18) of the data, and the rest of eight uptake types altogether accounted for 27.3% (sum=55) of the uptake cases.

The preceding description of the data shows that whereas the participants' reaction to the CF move strategies dominantly concerns the repair uptake, the repair cases were not evenly distributed across all four category types, with greatest percentage in self-repair (39.6%), followed by repetition-repair (14.3%), incorporation-repair 4.9%), and then peer-repair (4.5%). On the other hand, the needs-repair episodes occurred more widely across the all six subtypes in a descending order: off-target (9.9%), acknowledgement (4.9%), different-error (4.5%), partial-repair (4%), same-

error (3%), and hesitation (1.5%).

Table 3. *Self-Repair, Peer-Repair, and their Attributions to CF*

CF strategies	CF Overall occurrence		Self-repair		Peer-repair	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Clarification Request	38	19%	23	29%	2	22%
Elicitation	23	11%	6	7%	4	45%
Explicit Correction	32	16%	0	0%	0	0%
Metalinguistic	34	17%	19	24%	1	11%
Recast	29	14%	0	0%	0	0%
Repetition	46	23%	32	40%	2	22%
Total	202	100%	80	100%	9	100%

Table 3 displays descriptive statistics for the two learner-generated repair uptake: self- and peer-repairs. For a repair to be regarded as one of the two, a correct form needed to be formulated by the participant. That is, the CF that the participant responded to could not already include a possible correction form. Hence, these two repair types could not have been prompted by recast or explicit correction strategies because they included a correct form. Forty percent of the eighty self-repair cases was prompted by the instructor's repetition of the learners' errors (Example 20)[1], 29% by clarification request (Example 6), 24% by metalinguistic feedback (Example 21), and 7% by elicitation (Example 22). On the other hand, 45% of the 9 peer-uptake episodes was ascribed to the instructor's elicitation technique (Example 23), 22% to clarification request (Example 24), another 22% to repetition (Example 4), and 11% to metalinguistic feedback (Example 25).

The self-repair cases were more than peer-repair by 71. This indicated that peers infrequently offered repair in response to the instructor's CF. Peers stepped in mostly upon the instructor's elicitation strategy that, by nature, often looked for a more specific answer in a fill-in-blank format, as shown in Example 23, when specific vocabulary words might not have already been acquired by the original participant. In addition, more than a quarter of self-repair was prompted by the instructor's clarification requests. This result indicated that while the participants at the Advanced-high level could still be confusing initially, on their second try they were able to independently and successfully to clarify the instructor's misunderstanding or confusion upon 23 out of 38 requests. Moreover, close to a half of the self-repair cases followed the instructor's repetition of the participant's mistake. This indicated the participants' high level of awareness of what the instructor's repetitions meant in the instructional setting. Given that the repetition moves were accomplished instantly and without any additional linguistic information from the instructor, this strategy was cost-effective (Example 20).

---

1 Examples 20-51 are included in Appendix.

Table 4. *Repetition-Repair, Incorporation-Repair, and their Attributions to CF*

CF strategies	CF Overall occurrence		Repetition-repair		Incorporation-repair	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Clarification Request	38	19%	0	0%	0	0%
Elicitation	23	11%	0	0%	0	0%
Explicit Correction	32	16%	17	59%	6	60%
Metalinguistic	34	17%	0	0%	0	0%
Recast	29	14%	12	41%	4	40%
Repetition	46	23%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	202	100%	29	100%	10	100%

Table 4 shows repetition and incorporation repair cases, and they were attributed to only two out of the six CF strategies, explicit correction and recast. Both CF strategies provided a correct form for the learners to repeat after or to incorporate from. Since the participants did not offer their own corrections in response to the instructor's feedback, their uptake is not learner-generated. In other words, when the participants constructed these two types of uptake, they used the correct forms that had been provided, which could be included only in explicit correction and recast CF, not the other four CF moves.

Fifty-nine percent of repetition-repair and 60% of incorporation-repair were attributed to the instructor's explicit correction (Examples 4 and 26), and 41% of repetition-repair and 40% of incorporation-repair were ascribed to recast (Examples 10 and 11). The data indicated that repetition-repair and incorporation repair were similarly attributed to the two CF moves respectively. Additionally, the observation that explicit correction had more frequent distribution than recast in both repetition and incorporation repairs suggests a better usefulness in attaining repair. The content difference between explicit correction and recast was primarily the instructor's explicitness in pointing out which part of the participant's utterance was perceived as non-native-like. This indicated the clarity in knowing their mistake could facilitate the learners' repair process.

Table 5 reports the descriptive statistics of two types of needs-repair uptake: acknowledgement and hesitation. As Table 2 shows, hesitation (1.5%) and acknowledgement (4.5%) were the two least frequent uptake types. For acknowledgement, all the six types of CF contributed to its distributions with 30% accounted for by the instructor's recast (Example 27), 20% by elicitation (Example 8), 20%, by metalinguistic feedback (Example 28), 10% by clarification request (Example 29), 10 % by explicit correction (Example 30), and 10% by repetition (Example 14). Comparatively, only three types of CF played a role in hesitation, and each of them evenly contributed approximately 33% to hesitation. They are clarification request (Example 18), explicit correction (Example 43), and metalinguistic feedback (Example 44).

Table 5. *Needs-Repair Acknowledgement, Hesitation, and their Attributions to CF*

CF strategies	CF Overall occurrence		Acknowledgement		Hesitation	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Clarification Request	38	19%	1	10%	1	33.33%
Elicitation	23	11%	2	20%	0	0%
Explicit Correction	32	16%	1	10%	1	33.33%
Metalinguistic	34	17%	2	20%	1	33. 34%
Recast	29	14%	3	30%	0	0%
Repetition	46	23%	1	10%	0	0%
Total	202	100%	10	100%	3	100%

The content of hesitation and acknowledgement did not necessarily contain an error; however, these participant turns did not include a repair of the initial error, either. In some instances, coding learner uptake between acknowledgement and hesitation could be less straightforward than other uptake types. As shown in Examples 14 and 28, the learners' uptake demonstrated their awareness of the instructor's corrective intention. However, different from typical acknowledgement utterances that learners at a lower proficiency level would produce, the length of acknowledgement uptake in the present study was often more than "yes" or "that is what I meant," because it usually contained additional comments. These added comments on their own did not always provide the raters with enough definite evidence for uptake classification, as presented in Example 8. However, the context of the entire conversation would help differentiating acknowledgement and hesitation. An important indication of a participant's uptake turn being hesitation, instead of acknowledgement with additional comment, was that the participant attempted to repair but with doubts, as displayed in Example 44.

Table 6. *Needs-Repair Same-Error, Different-Error, Partial-Repair, and their Attributions to CF*

CF strategies	CF Overall occurrence		Same-error		Different-error		Partial-repair	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Clarification Request	38	19%	1	16.67%	3	34%	1	12.5%
Elicitation	23	11%	1	16.7%	1	11%	2	25%
Explicit Correction	32	16%	0	0%	1	11%	1	12.5%
Metalinguistic	34	17%	1	16.67%	2	22%	2	25%
Recast	29	14%	2	33.33%	1	11%	1	12.5%
Repetition	46	23%	1	16.66%	1	11%	1	12.5%
Total	202	100%	6	100%	9	100%	8	100%

Table 6 lists the attributions to CF across three types of needs-repair uptake. As Table 2 shows, same-error (3%), different-error (4.5%), and partial-repair (4%) all had a small percentage of observations in uptake. The content of these needs-repair turns all contained an error(s), which is qualitatively different from acknowledge and hesitation uptake turns, which usually did not

comprise a mistake in the dataset of the present study.

Table 6 illustrates that the instructor's explicit correction did not play a part in learners' same-error uptake, which suggested when being told what was incorrect in their use of the target language, the participants would steer away from the original error. The other five types of CF led up to same-error uptake with an even distribution, except for one. Approximately 33% was attributed to recast (Example 31), 17% to clarification request (Example 32), 17% to elicitation (Example 15), 17% to metalinguistic feedback (Example 7), and 17% to repetition (Example 9). In both Examples 9 and 31, the mistakes were both related to pronunciation, and the rest of the errors were vocabulary-oriented. On the other hand, 34% of different-error uptake turns was attributed to clarification request (Example 33), 22% to metalinguistic feedback (Example 34), 11% to elicitation (Example 35), 11% to explicit correction (Example 16), 11% to recast (Example 36), and another 11% to repetition (Example 37). Most different-error episodes were vocabulary-bound, except for Example 16, which was pronunciation related. Finally, 25% of partial-repair cases was attributed to elicitation (Example 45), 25% to metalinguistic feedback (Example 46), 12.5% to clarification request (Example 47), 12.5% to explicit correction (Example 48), 12.5% to recast (Example 49), and 12.5% to repetition (Example 19). Other than Example 19, which contained a mispronunciation, the rest of the errors observed in the partial-repair turns were related to the use of vocabulary, as the examples show.

Table 7. Needs-Repair Off-Target and the Attributions to CF

CF strategies	CF Overall occurrence		Off-target	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Clarification Request	38	19%	5	25%
Elicitation	23	11%	4	20%
Explicit Correction	32	16%	2	10%
Metalinguistic	34	17%	5	25%
Recast	29	14%	2	10%
Repetition	46	23%	2	10%
Total	202	100%	20	100%

Table 7 compares the percentage of each CF strategy that gave rise to the learners' needs-repair off-target uptake, which did not consist of any error but did not address the initial mistake. 25% of off-target was prompted by clarification request (Example 38) , 25% by metalinguistic feedback (Example 39), 20% by elicitation (Example 40), 10% by explicit correction (Example 41), 10% by recast (Example 17), and 10% by repetition (Example 42). Example 42 was considered off-target because while the uptake showed the use of grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary was correct on its own, given the age of the speaker, it was non-native-like socio-linguistically and did not address the error.

5.Discussions

Previous studies of CF provide extensive information as to how CF strategies and uptake interact in beginner and intermediate L2 teaching contexts. The findings of the present study, on the other hand, discuss the types and distributions of learner uptake in an advanced-high L2 instructional setting. The six main findings are:

1.An overall high uptake rate was observed.

2.The value of non-learner-generated repair to one's L2 development was more than it seemed.

3.Self-repair in response to repetition CF accounted for the most among the ten uptake types.

4.Off-target was the most frequent needs-repair type and served a conduit in communication.

5. Same-error and hesitation took place infrequently among advanced learners.

6. An overall high CF rate was observed even when communication did not break down.

With regard to the first finding of a high uptake rate, the results indicated that the participants responded to 91% of the instructor's CF. This rate is higher than the reported uptake rate of 55% in Lyster and Ranta's study (1997), 60% in Sheen's (2004), and 86% in Wu's (2019). The Advanced-high language proficiency level of the participants in this study was higher than that of the participants in the above-mentioned studies. The high uptake rate can possibly be attributed to the participants' stronger L2 skills that enabled them to acknowledge and respond to the instructor's feedback, which is consistent with what is suggested by William (1999) and Hanaoka (2007) that the more proficient learners are, the more likely they are to notice form. In the dataset, some uptake presented answers straight to what the instructor specifically tried to elicit (Example 25), some included elaborated comments on the CF (Example 18), and some showed that the participants were able to work around the CF to continuously carry on the communication without a breakdown even when they didn't repair the initial mistakes (Example 42). These uptake turns consisted of linguistic features that couldn't have been employed by L2 learners of less proficiency. In other words, after L2 learners acknowledge the corrective intention in their instructor's feedback, they require sufficient language skills to move past the acknowledgement and then repair their mistakes partially or completely. As a result, L2 learners with higher language skills are more likely to uptake CF in terms ranging from acknowledgement to the other nine uptake types that demand further L2 skills to achieve, which can explain the high uptake rate in the present study. In addition to L2 proficiency, the participants in this study generally had relatively more learning experience in comparison with learners at lower proficiency levels. These experiences in learning with their L2 teachers and peers, advancing their L2 skills through varying proficiency levels, making and correcting mistakes, and observing linguistic nuances may have conditioned them with readiness to interact with the instructor's CF and produce uptake on the side-track alongside with meaning-focused communication. Finally, all participants elected to travel overseas to enroll in an intensive Chinese language program at the time of the study, which can be a measurement of their commitment to improving their L2 skills and explain why they were responsively engaged in exchanging their answers or comments with CF and hence produced a high uptake rate— repair or not.

The second finding considers the role of non-learner-generated repair in L2 development. Repair in this study was regarded as important in L2 learning and an outcome of CF on language acquisition, though further study is required to understand how repair plays a role in long-term acquisition. Lyster and Ranta (1997) argue that learner-generated repairs, including both self-repair and peer-repair, is more significant than incorporation and repetition in terms of learner language development because when engaged in self-repair and peer-repair, learners are pushed to automatize the retrieval of their already-existing knowledge, confront their errors, and possibly revise their declarative knowledge about the target language (Example 50). On the other hand, since explicit correction and recast moves offer correct forms for learners to include in their modified output, incorporation and repetition repairs do not provide the same type of opportunities for learners to negotiate form as learner-generated repairs do. Hence, according to Lyster and Ranta, learner repetition of an instructor's utterance doesn't necessarily suggest that an understanding of the correction has occurred. However, the present study showed that while self-repair and peer-repair gave the participants opportunities to pull information actively from their knowledge to form correct answers, repetition and incorporation allowed them to approach repair through mimicking correct forms verbatim. At the Advanced-high level, incorporation and repetition involved more than simply a replay of a string of words (Example 51). Rather, the participants needed to listen attentively to the instructor's prolonged recast, reformulate their thoughts of the concepts that they had tried to convey, reconstruct the sentence structures to take in new words that might have different parts of speech and require the use of a different grammatical pattern, and move around or add words to conform with colocation rules. Such a process of modification is regarded as no less demanding than that of learner-generated repairs for the Advanced-high learners, and this repair process is significant for learner acquisition of their L2.

The research question asks the types and distributions of learner uptake in relation to CF in advanced L2 instructional setting, and the third to fifth findings continue to address the question. The third finding indicated that the participants' self-repair, when prompted with the repetition CF, comprised the most uptake counts (32 out of 184). An important question to answer is why this model produced the most uptake. In the present study, the individual participants in general would spontaneously engage with the CF that was specifically addressed to them. Even when they were unsure about the correct answers, they would still attempt to offer what they could, unless their peers were occasionally too fast to let them react with an answer (Example 25). This can explain why self-repair accounted for 40% of the entire uptake and peer-repair was responsible for 4%. Among the six CF attributions to self-repair, repetition of the errors was responded to the most. One possible explanation is that the participants had high language proficiency and abundant prior L2 experience, and the combination of the L2 skills and experiences enabled them to modify their output based on only a slight or indirect indication of their mistake, such as hearing their mistakes repeated back to them (Example 20). Another interpretation of this result concerns features of errors identified through repetition. When a mistake was repeated back to the participant, it was usually a short, repeatable, and focused phrase that was localized in one part of the utterance (Example 52). This was so probably because what can be repeated verbatim cannot be too lengthy by default. Such characteristics of the mistakes in the repetition cases may have played a role in explaining why they were relatively easier to repair and thus led to a high rate of self-repair.

The fourth finding revealed that in 10% of the cases when prompted with CF, the participants would modify their output by circumventing the mistakes specified in the CF and paraphrasing themselves without correcting the target error or creating a new one. One plausible explanation for off-target uptake is that while the participants were aware of the corrective intention of the instructor, they did not think it was necessarily to take a time-out from the conversation and modified the output as the conversation didn't appear to breakdown (Example 5). Another possible reason for circumvention is that participants simply did not know the answer but were aware that a modification was necessary for clarification (Example 39). Moreover, in Example 42, the participant chose to paraphrase and add more information instead of repairing the error that apparently was perceived only by the instructor but not the participant. It is likely because the CF seemed to convey the instructor's confusion rather than a request for correction. The results, on the whole, indicated that off-target represented the biggest portion among the six types of needs-repair uptake and was a common conduit for the Advanced-high participants to reflect on and respond to CF without addressing the mistakes directly or interfering with the conversational flow. One implication of this finding for language teaching highlights the language developmental value of off-target. L2 learners do not repair mistakes in off-target moves, but does this mean that off-target is less successful in their language development than those repair types of uptake? L2 learners' use of paraphrasing is a means of reflective communication that enables them to clarify interlocutor and learner intention and to sustain the conversational momentum in the absence of the correct form. From a teaching perspective, advanced L2 learners' off-target moves can be indicative of their needs in learning certain expressions in an effort to be on point and effective, and this information can be valuable for instructors.

The fifth finding indicated infrequency of hesitation (1.5%) and same-error (3%). There were only three hesitation episodes documented in the dataset, and they were all triggered by the participants' questions about the CF. One possible explanation is that the high L2 proficiency level had equipped the participants with sufficient linguistic knowledge to challenge the instructor analytically and hesitate simply to follow the cues to make the repair. In other words, none of the hesitation cases in the dataset suggested that the participants were unclear about the corrective intention or content; instead, their hesitation stemmed from the inquiries they had about the CF (Examples 18, 43, and 44). One pedagogical implication of this finding is that L2 learners with approaching Superior language skills have formed linguistic knowledge substantial enough to examine critically the CF and extrapolate the knowledge across their use of the language. Therefore, L2 instructors of adult advanced learners, who wish to provide additional explanations alongside CF would benefit from more systematic training in pedagogical linguistics.

Same-error was not attributed to the instructor's explicit correction. Explicit correction feedback directly pointed out what was not native-like and continued to offer the correct form, and that can explain why the participants could avoid making the same mistake when prompted by explicit correction. The examination of the same-error cases suggested that the errors were either associated with pronunciation (Example 31) or vocabulary (Examples 7). In Example 31, the instructor's recast offered a correct form for the participants to model. Why was an identical error repeated? The observation showed that the participant intended to repair or improve the mistake by repeating after the instructor's recast. However, despite the intention, the participant was unable to repair the tone but proceeded with the same error. One possible interpretation is that the nuance between different tones of the same pronunciation in Chinese can take L2 learners more attempts to notice, model, practice and then repair than grammatical or lexical mistakes that can be more easily clarified using examples or context and mended when the facts were understood. This viewpoint can also shed light on why repetition of identical mistakes accounted for a small portion in learner uptake in the present study. Most mistakes in the dataset were lexical, and when the participants were made aware of the mismatch between their output and what was considered native-like, they would intentionally pursue a different word choice other than repeat the error, which could relate to why different-error uptake in the present study was mostly related to vocabulary. However, with mispronunciation, sometimes participants were not able to produce another sound, correct or not, that was different from the original error.

The sixth finding discovered the high frequency of CF (86%). In this study, the instructor on average provided one CF for almost every 1.2 erroneous utterances of the participants. The data showed the instructor's attempt to correct the students has a success rate of 63% in helping the participants repair their mistake on the spot. This outcome can incite L2 teachers to consider their use of CF in their advanced L2 classrooms. For L2 instructors, however, it is probably not the probability of success that entices them to provide feedback. Then why do L2 instructors offer CF? With the content-based instruction in this study, both comprehensible input and output were ample, and learner mistakes and error treatment occurred sporadically. An important question to ask is why was CF implemented when the instructional context was meaning-oriented and when the participants already had a high command in Chinese. This observation can be explained by Lyster and Ranta's (1997) comment on gaps in immersion pedagogy: "Subject-matter teaching does not on its own provide adequate language teaching; language used to convey subject matter needs to be highlighted in ways that make certain features more salient for L2 learners" (p.41). Hence, understanding the insufficiency that content-based instruction has in terms of supporting learners' L2 acquisition, the instructor rendered CF in an attempt to bring out the salience of linguistic features, directed students' attention to relevant linguistic forms during meaningful interaction and pushed them to move towards a higher degree of comprehensibility, precision, and accuracy in their use of the target language. Moreover, it is worth noting that not every CF move in the present study was offered due to incomprehensibility in learner output. The view of van Lier (1988) on the distinction between conversational and didactic functions of negotiation provides a plausible explanation of why CF takes place even when communication didn't break down. According to his terminological distinction between conversational and didactic corrections provided by a teacher, the functions of negotiation in a classroom can be understood to, respectively, seek mutual comprehension and to aim for additional accuracy. In Example 25, CF was intended for its didactic function and was motivated by negotiation of form with a goal to encourage repair to achieve a higher degree of accuracy and precision in the use of vocabulary. In other words, since the instructor understood that the participant meant "to deport" when "to dispatch" was mistakenly used, the CF was not attempted to resolve communication breakdown through negotiation of meaning. The observation of didactic repairs in the present study showed that in a content-based advanced language learning environment, where the L2 was not the content of the subject matter and a communicative teaching approach was predominantly implemented, the instructor still incorporated analytic language teaching in order to foster accuracy in participants' use of the target language.

The high CF and uptake rate in this study suggested that both didactic and conversational

repair and analytic teaching implemented through the provision of CF were well received overall. While L2 learners at the Advanced-high level do not often encounter challenges to get meaning across, they may struggle with precision in their L2 use, which serves a rationale for didactic repair. In addition, according to Carroll and Swain (1993), L2 learners who receive CF perform better than students who do not have their errors corrected. Therefore, L2 instructors' endeavor to seize teaching moments to "emphasize accuracy and focus on aspects of the L2 (including phonology, grammar, functions, discourse, and sociolinguistics)" (Lyster, 1994, p.264) and then guide learners to "the study and practice of language items and rehearsal of L2 skills" (p.264) can explain to some extent why instructors make use of CF in a L2 setting in general and in an advanced classroom in particular.

6.Conclusion

The study presented findings in the types and distributions of learner uptake in relation to the corresponding CF strategies in advanced L2 instructional setting. Readers are advised to interpret the results considering the limitations of the research in its nonprobability sampling procedure, researcher-instructor setting, and participant bias. That L2 advanced learners respond to CF as part of teaching and learning practice will continue. As such, a concomitant demand will persist to understand theoretical and pedagogical information conveyed through advanced learner uptake in terms that enhance learning outcome. Researchers and L2 instructors, therefore, are encouraged to examine learner uptake with reference to currently available advanced teaching materials, activities, and approaches.

References

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012). *ACTFL 2012 Proficiency Guidelines*. Retrieved on March 12, 2018, from https://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012

Adams, R. (2007). Do second language learners benefit from interacting with each other? In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language learning* (pp. 29-51). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their Classroom Practices. *Applied Linguistics Oxford*, *25(2),* 243-272.

https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.243

Bouffard, L.A. & Saker, M. (2008). Training 8-year-old French immersion students in metalinguistic analysis: An innovation in form-focused pedagogy. *Language Awareness*, 17 (1), 3-24.

https://doi.org/10.2167/la424.0

Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(3), 357-86.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100012158

Coyle, Y., & Roca de Larios, J. (2014). Exploring the role played by error correction and models in children's reported noticing and output production in a L2 writing task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 36, 451-485.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263113000612

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C.J. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206-257). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524780.010

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Issues and terminology. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 1-11). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2002). Does form-focused instruction affect the acquisition of implicit knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 223-236.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263102002073

Ellis, R. (2016). Focus on form: A critical review. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(3), 405-428.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816628627

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001a). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning,* 51, 281–318.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00156

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001b). Preemptive focus on form in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly,* 35(3), 407-432.

https://doi.org/10.2307/3588029

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060141

Harley, B. (1998). The role of focus-on-form tasks in promoting child L2 acquisition. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 156-174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hanaoka, O. (2007). Output, noticing, and learning: An investigation into the role of spontaneous attention to form in a four-state writing task. *Language Teaching Research*, 11 (4), 459-479.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807080963

Ishida, M. (2004). Effects of recasts on the acquisition of the aspectual form -te i-(ru) by learners of Japanese as a foreign language. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 54 (2), 311-394.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.00257.x

Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25(1), 1-36.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000019

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

Lee, A. H., & Lyster, R. (2016). Effects of different types of corrective feedback on receptive skills in a second language: A speech perception training study. *Language Learning,* 66(4), 809-833. *https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12167*

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic. *https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012589042-7/50015-3*

Long, M. H. (2007). *Problems in SLA*. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Lyster, R. (1994). The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion students' sociolinguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 263-287. *https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/15.3.263*

Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in l2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20(1), 51-81. *https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226319800103X*

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 26(3), 399-432. *https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263104263021*

Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake, negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 20, 36-66. *https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034*

Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction and second language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(4), 557-87. *https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263199004027*

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 22, 471-497. *https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100004010*

McDonough, K. (2004). Learner–learner interaction during pair and small group activities in a Thai EFL context. *System*, 32, 207–224. *https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.01.003*

McDonough, K. (2005). Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners' responses on ESL question development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 27(1), 79-103. *https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050047*

Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on form through interaction enhancement: integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classrooms. *Language Learning*, 50 (4), 617-673. *https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00142*

Papi, M., Bondarenko, A. V., Mansouri, S., Feng, L., & Jiang, C. (2019). Rethinking L2 motivation research: The 2 x 2 model of L2 selfguides. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. Doi: 10.1017/S0272263118000153. *https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263118000153*

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 129-158. *https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.2.129*

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. *https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524780.003*

Seedhouse, P. (1997). Combining form and meaning. *ELT Journal*, 51, 336–344. *https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/51.4.336*

Sheen, Y. H. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research, 8(3),* 263-300. *https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168804lr146oa*

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners'

acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255.

https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x

Shooshtari, Z. G., Jalilifar, A. & Ostadian, M. (2018). A mixed methods study of scaffolded corrective feedback and motivational scaffolding in EFL oral production accuracy and fluency, *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 2(3): 34–47.

https://doi.org/10.14744/alrj.2018.18209

Spada, N. (1997). Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition: a review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language teaching,* 30(2), 73-87.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800012799

Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50, 158-164.

https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.50.1.158

van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.

Williams, J. (1999). Learner-generated attention to form. *Language Learning,* 49(4), 583-625.

https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00103

Wu, C.H., (2019). Corrective feedback and learner uptake by English learners of Chinese in advanced second language classrooms in the USA. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 3(3), 1–21

https://doi.org/10.14744/alrj.2019.08370

Yilmaz, Y. (2016). The role of exposure condition in the effectiveness of explicit correction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 38(1), 65-96.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263115000212

Appendix

Example 20

S: 我不隨便接受別人的禮物。因為我覺得就像中文說的武功不受祿。

I don't easily accept gifts from others. It is because, as Chinese put it, no martial art, no awards.

T: 武功?

Martial art?

S: 對不起，無功。

I am sorry. No meritorious contribution. (meritorious contribution and martial art share a similar pronunciation)

Example 21

S: 台灣人常常抱怨他們的健保制度，但是，從我的角度看來，我認為台灣的福利很發達。

Taiwanese people often complain about their national healthcare system. However, from my perspective, I think the welfare in Taiwan is flourishing well.

T: 發達? 形容福利能用發達嗎?

Flourishing well? Can "flourishing well" describe welfare?

S: 台灣的福利很健全。

The welfare system in Taiwan is matured and well-developed.

Example 22

S: 一下說這樣，一下說那樣。沒有說實話。比方說，我男朋友打電話給他也不接，簡訊也不回，然後他很晚才回家。然後我問他你去哪裡，然後很搖擺，不說重點。

He changed his story back and forth. He did not tell the truth. For example, my boyfriend didn't pick up the phone when I called him, he didn't reply my texts, and he came home very late. When I asked him where he went, he swung a lot and did not address the key points.

T: 這個情況，你記得我們之前說過，是要用另一個詞，閃開頭的。

In this situation, do you remember what the term that we learned recently you need to use? It starts with "eva-."

S: 閃爍其詞。

Speaking evasively.

Example 23

S: 喔，我的聽力受到了障礙，這都是因為電視的字幕讓我中文進步得很慢。

Oh, my listening comprehension has received obstacles, and this is all because the TV subtitles make my Chinese learning progress very slowly.

T: 我們通常提到在事業上， 人生上，或是在學習的道路上有些不順的時候， 我們會說遇到了阻什麼?

When we describe challenges in our career, life, or learning, we would say that we have encounter impe-what?

S2: 遇到了阻礙。

Encounter impediment.

Example 24

S1: 歐洲難民的問題，不但是社會問題，也會引起有點不緊急的經濟危機。

The problem of refugees in Europe not only is a social issue but can also cause a non-urgent economic crisis.

T: 什麼是不緊急的經濟危機?

What is a non-urgent economic crisis?

S2: 就是一下子並不會有巨大的影響，可是慢慢影響一定會越來越大。

It means although the impact wouldn't be enormous immediately, it will gradually get more and more seriously.

Example 25

S1: 在歐盟，這些造成社會問題的難民，還是值得我們的幫助。但是，有些義大利人，因為這些難民影響了他們的生活，他們希望能把難民派回他們的國家。

In European Union, the refugees that have caused social problems still deserve our help. However, some Italian people would like to dispatch them back to their country because the refugees have affected their lives.

T: 派回國? 把難民送回國，不是個好事或工作吧，所以能用派回嗎?哪一個字可以用表示送非法移民回國的?

To dispatch them back to their country? Sending refugees home is not a honorable assignment or a job so can you use "dispatch"?

S2: 很多的當地居民希望把難民遣送回國。

Many local residents wish to deport the refugees back to their country.

Example 26

S: 到了最後，法官判決孩子給媽媽。

In the end, the judge ruled the child to the mother.

T: 判決孩子給媽媽，不行。把孩子判給了媽媽。

You can't say "ruled the child to the mother." Ruled the custody to the mother.

S: 最後，判決的那天，法官終於把孩子判給了媽媽。

In the end, on the day of the hearing, the judge at last ruled custody to the mother.

Example (27)

S: 在決定調薪的時候，員工在公司工作的長度應該要考慮，如果員工請假是不給薪水，但還是在公司裡，那我認為這時間還是算在公司的工作時間。

In consideration of a raise, the length of time that employees have worked in the company should be factored in. The unpaid leave, during which if employees are still with the company, should also be counted towards the employment time.

T: 你的意思是調薪的時候，員工的年資要考慮，而這個年資也應該要包括那些不支薪的請假期間，是吧。

You meant when a raise is calculated, seniority needs to be considered. The seniority should include those unpaid leaves, right?

S: 對，我的意思是這樣的。

Yes, that is what I meant.

Example 28

S: 犯罪的事實應該要在陽光下攤開，讓大家見識。

Facts about crimes should be exposed under the sunlight, to let everyone see and appreciate.

T: 讓大家見識? 見識通常是讓人看好的事，還是不好的事?

let everyone see and appreciate? Does "see and appreciate" usually refer to good or bad things?

S: 所以我錯了。好的事, 所以不能用見識。

So I am wrong. For good things, "see and appreciate" can't be used.

Example 29

S: 好幸極右派的人智齒難民船靠岸。

Good luck, the far-right politics wisdom tooth to dock refugee ships on shore. (wisdom tooth and to support share a similar pronunciation)

T: 什麼?

What?

S: 啊， 我說錯了, 對不對?

Ah, I got it wrong, right?

Example 30

S: 學期的前一半, 我的文學課, 我上了都市文學。

The front half of the semester, in my Literature class, I learned City Literature.

T：學期的前一半, 不這麼說. 你要說前半學期。

"The front half of the semester" is not the way we say it. You need to say "the first half of the semester."

S：懂了， 所以， 後面一半叫後半學期嗎? .

Understood. So, the other half on the back is called the second half of the semester?

Example 31

S: 同志難民。

Comrade refugees. (Comrade and to govern share a similar pronunciation.)

T: 統治難民。

To govern refugees.

S: 同志難民。

Comrade refugees.

Example 32

S: 讓人受害者應該要受到法律處罰，為什麼我們要保護他們的權利?

Those who victimizes others should be punished by law. Why do we need to protect their rights?

T: 你指的是受害人的權利嗎?

Did you refer to the rights of victimizers?

S: 不是受害人, 是讓人受害的人。

No, not victimizers. People who victimize others.

Example 33

S: 可以說那個人說話不停搖擺.

You can say that person talks swinging non-stop.

T: 不停搖擺的意思是什麼?

What do you mean by swinging non-stop?

S: 一下說這樣，一下說那樣。沒有說實話。比方說，我男朋友打電話給他也不接，簡訊也

不回，然後他很晚才回家。然後我問他你去哪裡，然後很搖擺，不說重點。

He changed his story back and forth. He did not tell the truth. For example, my boyfriend didn't pick up the phone when I called him, he didn't reply my texts, and he came home very late. When I asked him where he went, he swung a lot and did not address the key points.

Example 34
S: 可以提倡人氣。
It can promote prevalence.
T: 提倡人氣，人氣通常是指好的事情吧。
Promote prevalence, prevalence usually refers to positive things, right?
S: 降低受歡迎度，損失學校的名譽。
Decrease the extent of popularity, damage school reputation.

Example 35
S: 發染?
To instigate infection?
T: 發什麼?
To instigate what?
S: 發病?
To instigate sickness?

Example 36
S: 我阿姨那裡的小吃生意就越來越不興隆了，所以我們就想辦法改成美食網購，讓大家一起買.
The business of my aunt's eatery became less and less prosperous so we tried to change it to online food shopping, to entice everyone to buy.
T: 所以因為阿姨小吃店的生意走了下坡，所以你們就改成了現在很流行的美食團購。
So, because the business of your aunt's eatery declined, you changed the food service to group buying online.
S: 對，但是不走下坡以後，一下訂單很大，有時又沒有單子來，不太穩定，很不安心。
Yes, but after the business did not decline, the orders suddenly became a lot, but sometimes there were no orders. It is unstable, and it doesn't feel secured.

Example 37
S: 有些傳統是約制而來的。
Some traditions were formed based on restraints.
T: 約制而來的?
Formed based on restraints?
S: 約制成俗。
Conventions were established from restraints.

Example 38
S: 對,促銷了。
Yes, promoted.
T: 什麼意思?

What do you mean?

S: 現在沒有德文課可以上了。

We don't have any German classes to take anymore.

Example 39

S: 當時部隊犯罪的地址，現在是由博物館保存維修。

The address of the crime that were committed by the troop then is now conserved, maintained by the museum.

T: 地址？地址是現在的。你現在說的是之前的地點吧。之前的叫什麼？

Address? Address refers to current one. You meant the historical site. How do you call a historical one?

S: 對，之前犯罪的地方現在還保存著。

Yes, the place where the previous crime was committed is still being conserved.

Example 40

S: 降低受歡迎度，損失學校的名譽。

Decrease the extent of popularity, damage school reputation.

T: 好，我懂你的意思，但是你知不知道有另外一個詞，就是當一件不光彩的事發生時，雖然有損名譽，但是可以增加什麼率？

Ok, I understand what you meant. But, do you know another term that can be used when referring to a shameful incident? Although it would harm reputation, it can increase the rate of what?

S: 增加別人認識這個學校的機率。

Increase probability for others to know this school.

Example 41

S: 權利義務沒有公平的分，所以大家就反對很激烈。

Obligations and rights are not divided fairly, and as a result, people oppose fiercely.

T: 公平的分，不行。公平分配。

Divide fairly, can't. equal distribution.

S: 不公平造成了很嚴重的後果。

Unfairness has caused serious consequences.

Example 42

S: 我最近已經不年輕了。

Lately, I am no longer young.

T: 你最近已經不年輕了？

You lately are no longer young?

S: 不年輕了？就是老了，以前很熱衷的事情，現在都變得沒有什麼興趣。

No longer young? It means old. What I was passionate about before does not interest me anymore.

Example 43

S: 女性仇殺其實是常發現的現象。

Female vendetta is actually a phenomena that discovers often.

T: 仇殺常發現，不行，是人發現.事情發生，然後人發現。

Female vendetta often discovers, can't. People discover and events take place.

S:那，可以說常被發現的現象嗎?

Then, can I say a phenomena that is often discovered?

Example 44

S: 喔，給外國人的排擠排斥不多。

Oh, isolate and outcast given to international people are not often.

T: 給外國人的排擠,你這樣用的話，排擠還是一個名詞.

Isolate given to international people. Isolate is still treated as a noun in the way you use it.

S: 排擠什麼什麼的? 聽起來很奇怪。

To isolate something or someone? It sounds really strange.

Example 45

S: 台灣電視節目都有字幕，關不掉，我覺得看字幕並不能進步我的中文，而且反而還會障礙我的聽力能力。為什麼台灣的電視字幕不能關掉?我覺得超奇怪的。

All the TV programs in Taiwan have subtitles, and I can't turn it off. I think reading subtitles can't improve my English. To the contrast, it will obstacle my listening skills. Why can't I turn off TV subtitles in Taiwan? I think it is extremely strange.

T: 你說你的聽力能力、字幕、還有中文程度怎麼了? 受到了什麼? 可以想一想，然後再說一次嗎?

What did you said happened to your listening compression, subtitles, and Chinese proficiency? What was received? Can you think about it and say it again?

S: 喔，我的聽力受到了障礙，這都是因為電視的字幕讓我中文進步得很慢。

Oh, my listening comprehension has received obstacles, and this is all because the TV subtitles make my Chinese learning progress very slowly.

Example 46

S: 讓那個藝人來上課可以提倡那個學校的名譽。

Letting that celebrity to come to class can promote reputation of that school.

T: 提倡名譽? 你確定嗎? 名譽可以提倡嗎? 還有，那個藝人的事情是個名譽的事嗎?

Promote reputation? Are you sure? Can reputation be promoted? Additionally, is what happened to that celebrity something reputational?

S: 可以提倡人氣。

It can promote prevalence.

Example 47

S: 有些人遇到危險情況是會強成。但我覺得這樣很愚蠢。

When in danger, some people would force-success. However, I think it is dumb.

T: 強成什麼?我不懂你的意思。

Force-success what? I don't understand what you meant.

S: 一直堅持，努力勉強。

Keep persisting, and try hard to force.

Example 48

S:現在大多數的人都是使用智慧型手機，所以新的電腦產品都應該要遵守這個潮流，產品之間要互相合適，才可以溝通。

Nowadays most people use smart phones so new computer products should obey this trend. It needs to be suitable among products so that they can communicate.

T: 潮流是符合潮流，不能遵守潮流，還有產品之間是相容，不是合適。

Trend, in line with the trend. You can't say to obey the trend. In addition, it is compatible among products, not suitable.

S: 好，所有電腦產品，包括手機，都要符合潮流，才能比較好地溝通。

Ok, all the computer products, including cell phones, need to be in line with the trend so that communication would be easier.

Example 49

S: 他到哪都有媒體跟著想訪問他，他現在是身處於媒體的重點。

Wherever he goes, the media follows him and wants to interview him. He now is positioned as a key point of the mass media.

T: 都有媒體跟拍，是媒體的焦點。

The media always follows and takes picture of him. He is a major focus of the mass media

S: 媒體跟拍，是媒體的重點。

The media always follows and takes picture of him. He is a key point of the mass media.

Example 50

S1:   我們班上有一個本地的學生，好像有穿衣服就可以出門，衣服鞋子什麼的都是怎麼說，很不時髦。

A local student in our class seems to act as if so long as he has some clothes on he can go out. How do I describe his clothes, shoes, or things? They really are not stylish.

T: 一個人穿著不夠用心有沒有什麼形容詞可以用？

What is the adjective that we use to describe someone who does not make efforts in dressing up?

S2: 穿得比較邋遢不得體，是不是上次提到的那個字？好像也可以說是不體面。

Dressed in a rather unkempt, inappropriate way. Is it the word that was mentioned last time? It seems that "shabby, indecent" would also work.

Example 51

S: 孟子所謂"物之不齊物之行也"，他說明了天上地上事情本身自然不同，正因如此，造就了多樣性。本來差距不是件壞事，但問題來了，並非每一人都能熱愛人與人的不同，有些人會因為別人跟我不一樣，就分奴。這就有了西方宗教屠殺，種族歧視。

The so-called "heterogeneity is the way things are" by Mengzi is to illustrate that things in heaven and on earth by nature are different. Exactly because of so, it creates diversity. Differences are not a bad thing initially; however, here comes the problem- not everyone can be passionate about differences among people. Some people would divide slaves simply because others are different from themselves. This then resulted in religious massacres and racism in the west.

T: 你說的是孟子物之不齊的引申意義。天地萬物與生俱來就不盡相同，而正是這些不同的特質與本質創造了我們這個多采多姿的世界。然而，很可惜的是，並非每個人都能理解、包容、接受、甚至欣賞這些差異為我們這個世界帶來的多樣性。也因此而有了西方世界的宗教屠殺及種族歧視。

You meant the extended meaning of heterogeneity by Mengzi. Every single being in this world was created to be different. It is these different characteristics and natures that have made our world vibrant. However, unfortunately, not everyone is able to understand, embrace, accept, or

even appreciate the diversity that these differences have brought to this world. As a result, the religious massacres and racism happened accordingly in the west.

S: 對的，孟子物之不齊的引申意義主要讓我們了解萬物不盡相同，但是不同的特質和本質能讓我們的世界多采多姿。如果我們學會了包容和欣賞，那麼，我們可以避免宗教屠殺和種族歧視。

That is correct. The extended meaning of "heterogeneity" by Mengzi is primarily to help us understand that not every single being can be the same. However, different characteristics and natures can make our world vibrant. Once we learn to embrace and appreciate, then we will be able to avoid religious massacres and racism.

Example 52

S: 就是別的國家政府入侵，然後統治了這個地方，這裡的語言、文化、政治什麼的都被入侵國家同化。然後這個地方就變成了"至名地。"

The governments of other nations invaded and then ruled the place. The language, culture, politics and so forth are assimilated by these nations that invaded. Then, this place would become "to-famous-place." (To and famous combined share a similar pronunciation with colony)

T: 至名地?

To-famous-place?

S: 殖民地。

Colony.