

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Making errors is an unavoidable part of learning a foreign language and thus the business of error correction, or corrective feedback (CF) has long been of concern to language teachers and learners, as well as to researchers interested in second language acquisition.

While explicit correction of errors was thought to be necessary in classroom contexts dominated by the grammar translation method or audiolingual method in order to avoid the creation of bad habits, with the advent of communicative language teaching in the 1980s, researchers and teachers started seeing errors no longer as something to avoid, but rather as a necessary part of the learning process. The extreme form of communicative language teaching went as far as to dismiss explicit teaching of grammar rules and explicit correction, focusing mainly on communication and fluency.

However, teachers and researchers soon realized an exclusive focus on meaning with no attention to formal aspects of the language had its limits and interest in learner errors and the effects of error correction was renewed in the 1990s. Since then, research on CF has given rise to an important number of findings, involving several variables and approaches.

The relative effects of different types of CF have been compared and a number of studies have paid attention to the impact of individual differences such as proficiency and anxiety on learners' ability to profit from CF. Furthermore, CF can be given by language teachers, but also by other learners in the form of peer feedback.

The present volume aims to provide researchers and language teachers with an overview of the most relevant findings regarding

oral CF and to show which theories of second language acquisition and language teaching underlie CF research. It also hopes to shed light on areas which are in need of further investigation and it ends with a number of pedagogical recommendations for dealing with learners' spoken errors in the foreign language classroom.

1.1. ISSUES INVOLVED IN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

While language teachers have always had a practical interest in the question of how best to treat learners' errors, the study of CF has also attracted considerable attention from second language acquisition researchers. The question of whether or not CF plays a role in second language acquisition is linked to different acquisitional theories, such as innatism or cognitivism. From a theoretical point of view, it is useful to study oral CF to answer questions about the roles of interaction, input, output and noticing, and the interface between explicit and implicit knowledge. For instance, in order to test Long's (1996) hypothesis that learning is promoted by oral interaction and the negotiation of meaning, several studies have looked at native speaker/non-native speaker interactions and how speakers ask for clarification, check comprehension and provide feedback, and which aspects of language this feedback is targeted at (vocabulary, morphosyntax, pronunciation etc.).

Another theory in which CF plays a role is Swain's (1995, 2005) output hypothesis. Studies trying to test this hypothesis are interested in the role of pushed or modified output following oral CF and whether or not this output promotes acquisition.

Regarding the question of the explicit-implicit knowledge interface, researchers have attempted to test whether explicit feedback can contribute to the formation of implicit knowledge, or whether implicit oral CF works better than more explicit CF-types. Furthermore, some types of CF provide learners with the correct form, reformulating the erroneous utterance, while others attempt to elicit a self-correction from the learners and push them to produce output. By contrasting the effects of input-providing and output-pushing CF, researchers attempt to answer questions regarding the roles of input and output in language learning. Apart from comparing

CF-types, research has also asked the question as to which target structures can be effectively treated with CF. It is widely accepted in second language research that learners follow a predictable path in the acquisition of some structures (morphosyntax and some grammatical patterns (Goldschneider & DeKeyser, 2005; Pienemann, 1998). This begs the question whether CF aimed at a structure for which learners are not yet developmentally ready can make any difference. Different types of structures and different aspects of the second language may also be affected differentially by CF. While most CF-studies have taken L2 grammar as their focus, research has started looking at lexical and phonological targets as well, and there is even some limited work on the influence of CF on the acquisition of pragmatics (Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013).

Another field of research which intersects with the study of oral CF is that of individual learner differences, such as motivation, foreign language anxiety and foreign language aptitude. For instance, it has been hypothesized that recasts or reformulations are useful because they allow learners to compare their erroneous utterance with an error-free form of their intended message (Doughty, 2001). For such comparisons to be made, however, the learner needs to be able to store both their own utterance and the recast in their short-term or working-memory for a sufficient amount of time. This might explain why some learners, with a shorter working-memory span, may benefit from recasts to a lesser extent (Mackey et al., 2002).

In short, the main questions CF-researchers have ventured to investigate are:

- Is oral CF effective for second language acquisition?
- What types of CF are more effective? (explicit CF vs. implicit CF, input-providing vs. output-pushing CF)
- What kind of CF is effective for which target structures?
- Do all learners benefit equally from oral CF, or do individual differences play a role?

When it comes to second or foreign language teaching, the same questions can potentially be of interest to teachers. However, studies on teachers' and students' beliefs reveal that teachers also have practical concerns when thinking about how to correct spoken language errors (e.g., Mori, 2011; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Roothoof, 2014). Most teachers do not appear to question that oral CF can be

helpful for students, but they would like to know how much CF is appropriate, what is the right time to provide CF (task-type, immediate vs. delayed CF) and how different ways of CF may affect not only their students' learning but also their motivation and emotional state.

In 1978, Hendrickson formulated a number of guiding questions for CF research, which are still relevant today:

1. Should learner errors be corrected?
2. If so, when should learner errors be corrected?
3. Which learner errors should be corrected?
4. How should learner errors be corrected?
5. Who should correct learner errors?

Despite the fact that some scholars working in an innatist framework continue to contest this (Krashen, 1982, 1998; Truscott, 1999, 2005), there is a substantial body of research which indicates that oral CF or error correction is useful. The answers to the other four questions, however, have either not been sufficiently researched or are still being debated. While language teachers attach a great deal of importance to the question of CF timing, there is hardly any research comparing immediate and delayed CF. This is because most CF research is carried out within an interaction framework, which assumes that oral CF should be provided as part of meaningful interaction, at the moment the errors are made, rather than when the interaction has already finished.

Regarding question 3, the vast majority of oral CF studies have focused on one specific grammatical structure, for example articles (e.g., Sheen, 2007) or question forms (e.g., Loewen & Nabei, 2007). Only a few studies have compared the impact of CF on two or more structures (e.g., Ellis, 2007), and very few studies have looked at the provision of extensive CF, which targets a wide range of learner errors (e.g., Nassaji, 2009).

The question as to how to correct has received a lot of attention from researchers, and has led to some controversy (see for instance Goo & Mackey, 2013). Finally, correction in CF research is either done in laboratory settings where native speakers interact with learners, or in classroom studies where the teacher or researcher is the one who provides CF. On the other hand, the option of peer CF

has received less attention, even though interaction research on the negotiation of meaning shows the potential of having learners correct each other.

For teachers, we could rephrase Hendrickson's questions as follows:

1. How much oral CF should we give to learners?
2. When should we correct learners' spoken errors? While they are speaking, or after they have finished? During what kind of classroom activities/tasks should we provide CF: oral correction of functional exercises, reading aloud, controlled practice, communicative exercises/free practice?
3. Which errors should be corrected? For example, errors impeding communication, habitual errors, etc.?
4. How should learner errors be corrected?
5. Who should correct learner errors?
6. How do learners feel about being corrected? Should we correct shy/anxious and confident/non-anxious learners in different ways?
7. We might also add a question about the level and age of learners: Should we provide different amounts and types of CF to low and high levels, to children, adolescents and adults? In the early stages of primary, for instance, it is often said that children learn in a more intuitive, implicit way (e.g., Murphy, 2014; Nikolov & Mihaljevic, 2006) and thus explicit instruction and correction may be less advisable or effective with (very) young learners.

1.2. SOURCE AND TYPES OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

Even though the primary source of CF in the foreign language classroom is usually the teacher, learners can provide each other with useful feedback as well. While this book mainly focuses on teacher feedback, a brief introduction to the role of teacher and peer feedback will be given here. This will be followed by a discussion of the different types of oral CF.

1.2.1. *Teacher versus peer feedback*

A number of studies have focused on feedback given by peers during pair work, mainly in the framework of the interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996), to study what is known as the “negotiation of meaning” (see 1.1.3.). A lot of these studies have been descriptive in nature and have tried to determine if learners are able to provide each other with feedback and how different variables such as task type, gender and age influence the amount and type of feedback used by students. Mackey, Oliver and Leeman (2003), for example, compared the interactional modifications taking place when pairs of native speaker and non-native speaker children and adults interacted with each other. One of their findings was that native speakers appeared to give more feedback than non-native speakers. On the other hand, they observed that children modified their speech more frequently in reaction to feedback during interaction with other non-native speaker children than with native speaker children. With regard to task type, Pica (1987) concluded that a task which requires learners to exchange information results in more negotiation than a task in which this is not strictly necessary. Descriptive studies of learner interaction have generally noted that although learners provide each other with feedback, this feedback is more often directed at lexical than at grammatical targets (e.g., Fujii & Mackey, 2009; Pica, 1992).

Only a limited number of studies on peer feedback have investigated a link between learner-learner interaction and language development. For instance, McDonough (2004) found that learners working in pairs or small groups provided each other with feedback, predominantly in the form of clarification requests, and that the interaction had a positive impact on the learners’ production of conditional sentences. Another study which indicated peer feedback can result in language learning is by Adams (2007), who found a link between the feedback provided by learners during pair work and their performance on a tailor-made grammaticality judgment test. Note that the nature of the tasks induced the learners to focus on grammatical targets such as question forms and the regular and irregular past tense. Some potential problems related to peer feedback have also been identified, for instance the danger of learners

taking over non-targetlike forms from each other (Adams, 2007) or the fact that learners may not be willing to accept feedback from each other (Yoshida, 2008).

Learners can also be trained to give each other CF, as in Sato and Lyster (2012) and Sippel (2019). In Sato and Lyster (2012), 167 EFL students at a Japanese university were divided into four groups, two of which received training on how to provide either recasts or prompts to each other during peer interaction. The remaining groups were a peer interaction only group and a control group. Sato and Lyster (2012) did not only measure the impact of peer feedback on accuracy (general accuracy, not focusing on any specific linguistic target), but they also wanted to investigate the impact of CF on fluency development, by calculating the learners' speech rate. Both prompts and recasts provided by peers affected learners' accuracy development positively. In the case of fluency, both the CF groups and the interaction only group improved, which indicates that CF does not have a negative impact on fluency development. Sippel (2019) used a similar procedure to Sato and Lyster (2012), training students to provide each other with CF, but focusing exclusively on vocabulary as the target structure. Confirming Sato and Lyster's (2012) findings, Sippel (2019) also found peer feedback to be effective. This study is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4 (4.3.2.4).

1.2.2. *Types of oral CF*

In the past, a number of descriptive studies have investigated the ways in which language teachers deal with their students' spoken errors (e.g., Allwright, 1975, 1979; Chaudron 1977, 1988; Doughty, 1994; Kasper, 1985; Salica, 1981; Wren, 1982). Based on classroom observations, these authors attempted to classify the range of corrective techniques teachers use and to investigate how learners respond to these corrections. For instance, Allwright (1975, p.100) listed the different options teachers have at their disposal when a learner makes an error, such as "to treat or to ignore completely", "fact of error indicated", "error type indicated" or "model provided", amongst others. With regard to students' reactions to feedback, Salica (1981) and Wren (1982) found that most of the corrective feed-

back episodes in the classrooms they observed helped students correctly reformulate their initial errors.

Even though the authors quoted above have presented different taxonomies of CF-types, one highly influential typology which has been applied to an important number of more recent descriptive and experimental CF-studies (e.g., Ammar & Spada, 2006; Dilans, 2010; Junqueira & Kim, 2013; Lochtman, 2002; Mori, 2011; Sheen, 2004; Tsang, 2004) is that of Lyster and Ranta (1997). These authors observed four French immersion classrooms at the primary level in Canada and they found that the four teachers they observed tended to use six different types of feedback. Since the publication of this study, Lyster and Ranta's (1997) model has been successfully applied to a wide range of contexts, such as English and Spanish immersion in Senegal (Vicente-Rasoamalala, 2009), secondary school level German classes in Belgium (Lochtman, 2002), adult ESL classrooms in Canada (Panova & Lyster, 2002) and adult EFL classrooms in Korea (Sheen, 2004) (see 4.2 for more information about these studies). The feedback-types identified by Lyster and Ranta (1997, pp. 46-48) are described below. To make the definitions more concrete, I have added my own examples of oral feedback aimed at a past tense error.

1. **Explicit correction:** "the explicit provision of the correct form" where the teacher "clearly indicates that what the student ha[s] said [is] incorrect (e.g. "Oh you mean", "You should say")."

Example:

S: Yesterday I go to the cinema.

T: Not "go", "went".

2. **Recasts:** "the teacher's reformulation of all or part of the student's utterance, minus the error"

Example of a *complete recast*:

S: Yesterday I go to the cinema.

T: You went to the cinema.

Example of a *partial recast*:

S: Yesterday I go to the cinema.

T: went

(see also 4.3.2.1 for a discussion of the different types of recasts)

3. **Clarification requests:** “indicate to students either that their utterance has been misunderstood by the teacher or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way”

Example:

S: Yesterday I go to the cinema.

T: Pardon?

4. **Metalinguistic feedback:** “comments, information or questions related to the well-formedness of the students’ utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form.”

In later publications, Lyster et al. (2013) use the term “**metalinguistic clue**” to indicate that this type of CF only gives learners a clue or prompt and does not contain the right answer. It is important to note that some authors use the term metalinguistic feedback to refer to a combination of explicit correction and a grammatical explanation (e.g., Sheen, 2007).

Example of a *metalinguistic clue*:

S: Yesterday I go to the cinema.

T: You should use past tense.

Example of *explicit correction with metalinguistic feedback*:

S: Yesterday I go to the cinema.

T: You should use the past tense “I went to the cinema” because you are speaking about what you did yesterday.

5. **Elicitation:** This type encompasses three related strategies used by teachers. In the first one, “teachers elicit completion of their own utterance by strategically pausing to allow students to fill in the blank”. Second, teachers ask questions such as “how do we say X in French?” and third, they ask their students to reformulate their utterance.

Example:

S: Yesterday I go to the cinema.

T: Yesterday I...?

6. **Repetition:** “the teacher’s repetition, in isolation, of the student’s erroneous utterance” (usually with adjusted intonation).

Example:

S: Yesterday I go to the cinema.

T: I GO to the cinema?

Based on an observational study of an adult EFL teacher, Panova and Lyster (2002) added a seventh type to the original feed-

back typology: the **translation** of utterances in the student's first language.

Several authors have proposed a categorization of these feedback types, according to two different criteria: explicitness and whether or not the correct form is provided (see Table 1). The criterion of explicitness is important for research which builds on Long's (1996) updated interaction hypothesis (see 2.1.2.1.), as Long (1996) suggests CF can help learners notice certain language forms during meaningful interactions. Studies which have found greater effects for more explicit feedback types than for implicit ones have referred to the importance of noticing to explain their findings, as more explicit types are arguably easier to notice, but this will be explained in more detail later on (see 2.1.2.1). As Lyster et al. (2013) also note, it can be difficult to classify a specific type of feedback as either explicit or implicit and some disagreement exists between different authors. Take for instance, the case of elicitation, which was seen as rather explicit by Loewen and Nabei (2007) but classified as implicit by Li (2010). This problem can best be solved by seeing degree of explicitness as a continuum, rather than as a dichotomy. Another problem related to the explicit-implicit classification is what to do with recasts, as their degree of explicitness varies considerably according to whether or not they are reformulations of an entire utterance or only partial reformulations, for example. This is why Lyster et al. (2013) propose distinguishing between implicit conversational recasts, on the one hand, and more explicit didactic recasts, on the other, as can also be seen in Table 1.

On the other hand, Swain's (1995) output hypothesis (see 2.1.2.1.) suggests that students make progress in the second language when they are pushed to produce more accurate and more precise language. Similarly, de Bot (1996) posits that learners benefit more from having to retrieve the correct form than from being told the correct answer, as the former is thought to strengthen the development of connections in memory. Based on these theoretical arguments, Yang and Lyster (2010) proposed grouping feedback-types according to whether or not they provide the correct answer to students. In this way, recasts and explicit corrections are both seen as input-providing feedback or reformulations, whereas metalinguistic feedback (MF), clarification requests, repetitions and elicitations

are classified as output-pushing corrective feedback or prompts (see Table 1). Ranta and Lyster (2007) referred to these two groups as “reformulations”, which comprise recasts and explicit correction and “prompts”, because the types of feedback in this group prompt learners to reformulate their utterance. It can be argued that both the degree of explicitness and the distinction between input-providing and output-pushing feedback types are of importance in order to account for the effects different types of feedback can have on language development.

Table 1
Classification of oral CF-types

Student error: <i>Yesterday I go to the cinema</i>	Input-providing (reformulations)	Output-pushing (prompts)
Implicit feedback	Conversational recast: <i>Oh, you went to the cinema. Which film did you see?</i>	Clarification request: <i>Pardon/Excuse me?</i> Elicitation: <i>Last weekend I ...?</i>
Explicit feedback	Didactic recast: (With emphasis) <i>You WENT to the cinema.</i> (With reduction) <i>Went.</i> Explicit correction: <i>Not go, went.</i>	Repetition: <i>Yesterday I GO to the cinema?</i> Metalinguistic clue: <i>You need past tense.</i>

Apart from the six types of oral CF proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), these authors also noted that in some cases teachers use a combination of CF types. In Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) data, based on observations of French immersion classrooms in Canada at the primary level, about 15% of all CF moves turned out to be instances of multiple CF. An example of combinations of CF that occurred is repetition in combination with different CF types, for example in a clarification request: “What do you mean, “yesterday I GO”? They also observed recasts followed by metalinguistic feedback, which they recoded as explicit correction. A third combination which

sometimes occurred was elicitation together with metalinguistic feedback. With respect to our example of the past tense error, this combination can take the following form: "Don't say yesterday I go, use the past tense: yesterday I...?".

Another option which teachers have, and which is not included in most categorizations of CF-types, is non-verbal CF in the form of gestures, body language, intonation or the use of the blackboard or other teaching aids. Non-verbal CF can be combined with verbal CF to make it more salient. An example is proposed in a study by Nakatsukasa (2016), which is the only study, to the best of my knowledge, which has investigated the effectiveness of using gestures in combination with oral CF. (Davies 2006 looked at uptake, but not at subsequent learning). This author found that combining recasts with gestures had positive effects on the acquisition of locative prepositions in English, since the group who had received the gestures on top of the verbal CF outperformed a recast only and control group on a delayed post-test.

Some methodology courses also advise teachers to use a method known as finger correction, which involves holding up a finger for each word uttered by the student, and then signaling where the error is located. Gower et al. (1995) give some examples of finger correction, for instance to show that there is one word too many in a sentence. An example would be the following error: "I called to my mother". The teacher would repeat the utterance, holding up one finger per word: "I" – "called" – "to" – "my" – "mother". Then, the teacher can bend the third finger, which corresponds to the unnecessary preposition, to indicate that this word needs to be removed. Another error for which finger correction might be useful is word order. If a student says, for example: "What time it is?", the teacher could hold up four fingers and with the index finger of his/her other hand show that "it" and "is" are in the wrong order. Whether or not finger correction is an effective CF technique still needs to be investigated.

There is also the possibility of pointing to an explanation or picture on the board, or to write or draw in order to clarify a mistake that occurred. For a typical mistake at different levels of English, not using the suffix *-s* in the third person singular, teachers could point to a flashcard of an "s" which is on display in the classroom, or they

could draw an “s” in the air with their finger, for instance. In order to indicate tense errors, Gower et al. (1995) make the following suggestions:

- Past time: *hitch-hiking gesture over the shoulder*
 - Present time: *pointing down to the floor*
 - Future time: *pointing into the distance in front*
- (Gower et al., 1995, p. 12)

For a study on adult EFL teachers’ oral CF practices and beliefs, details of which can be read in Roothoof (2014), I observed 10 teachers working in private language schools, with small groups of adult learners. While the majority of the CF moves identified in these classes were reduced recasts, I also came across other CF types, such as a combination of oral and written CF, or oral CF and gestures.

For instance, in an A2 level class, one teacher combined oral CF with written CF in the following way:

- (1) T: escuchar música, ¿cómo se dice en inglés? (Listen to music, how do you say that in English?)
 S: listen music
 T: [writes on the board: listen _ music]
 S: to

The same teacher also used hand gestures to support his oral CF:

- (2) S: I can start yesterday.
 T: yesterday? [points over his shoulder with his finger]
- (3) S: She speak a lot of language
 T: She ...? [draws a letter S in the air with his finger]

Another teacher, working with a B2 group, wrote the rules for the pronunciation of the *-ed* ending on the board as a reaction to various errors made by his students. Later on, when they made a similar error, he pointed to the board to remind them of the rule. In another example from this study, a teacher working with an elementary group sometimes used his voice or facial expression to indicate that the students had made an error, for instance by making a disapproving noise.

While the vast majority of research on oral CF focuses on immediate CF, there is also the option of providing CF after the speaking activity has finished. Very little has been written about delayed CF, but presumably teachers have similar options as those that exist for immediate CF. The fact that the CF is separated from the speaking task automatically means it is more explicit, but teachers can still opt for input-providing or output-pushing techniques. Delayed feedback that is input-providing involves the teacher telling the students what they did wrong and how they should correct it, while output-pushing delayed feedback gives the students clues, while inviting them to correct the errors themselves. Rolin-Ianziti (2010) analysed episodes of delayed correction which occurred in French beginner classrooms at an Australian university. The four teachers in the study took notes of students' errors during a role play, and afterwards discussed the errors with the students. Rolin-Ianziti (2010) noted that the delayed error correction sequences could be classified into two different types: one in which the teacher provided the correct answer, and another in which the teacher prompted the student to correct the error. An example of the first one, which we could call input-providing delayed feedback, is the following, in which the teacher responds to a pronunciation error. As can be seen, the correction is very explicit and it is also accompanied by what we can call metalinguistic feedback, since the teacher formulates a pronunciation rule.

(4) T3: Hum just a few points about pronunciation hum (1.0) again usually you don't say the end of- hum the last letter of a word so hum (1.0) vous avez quel âge? Hum J'ai vingt cinq **ans** (/ã/).

S4: Ans (/ã/).

T3: So ans (/ã/) not **ans** (/ãs/) with the s on the end.

(Rolin-Ianziti, 2010, pp.189-190)

The second type of delayed feedback corresponds to output-pushing delayed CF. An example from Rolin-Ianziti's (2010) study is given here.

(5) T4: D'accord je suis **islande**? (2.0) You should say je suis

S1: Islandais.

T4: Oui islandais.

(Rolin-Ianziti, 2010, p.191)

In the example above, the teacher combines repetition (repeating the original error) with elicitation. The ten teachers in my observational study (Roothoof, 2014) also expressed a preference for delayed feedback, as many of them stated it is sometimes better not to interrupt students, especially when they are shy or when the focus of the activity is fluency development. However, in the one or two classes I observed for each teacher, I only witnessed the use of delayed CF for two teachers. Both of them took notes while students were speaking in pairs, and afterwards wrote a number of sentences containing errors on the board. They then invited their students to try to correct these errors. These are thus examples of what I have called output-pushing delayed CF. Here are two examples from the same lesson by a female native speaking teacher with eight upper-intermediate adult learners. The first example, (6), concerns a grammar error, while the second one, (7), deals with a pronunciation problem. For both errors, the teacher first invites students to correct them and then she provides further explanations.

(6) T: Can we look at some of the mistakes that you made? I would say one of the most common mistakes I've just heard is that you are using the present form of the verb, instead of, for example the time before "what I mean was", no, "what I meant was". So... can you correct this for me please?

[Writes on the board]

S: I didn't said?

T: perfect. "I didn't say that."

S: say that

T: erm, why does say remain in the present form? Such a simple reason... Think of present, sorry not present, erm, past simple: I said, I ran, I jumped. How do you make the question formation in past simple?

S: with did

T: When we've got the question formation with the word did we use the present form of the verb even though it is past simple.

(7) T: How do you pronounce this word?

S: young

T: everybody

Ss: young

T: Okay, that's pretty good, I was hearing ... dzjung, dzjung. Not dzjung, it's... young, yeah, young

- S: young
T: okay, be careful of that: dzjung, no: young. To say this word, the incorrect pronunciation, your tongue has to touch the top of your mouth, dzjung dzjung, there is contact with your tongue and the top of your mouth. To say the correct word “young” “young” your tongue never touches the top of your mouth, it stays in the middle of your mouth always “young”, “young”.

Methodology books tend to advise teachers to take notes of students' errors while they speak, and afterwards put some erroneous utterances on the board to ask students to correct them (e.g., Harmer, 2006). The recommendation to delay the feedback until after the activity is usually made with regard to so-called fluency-focused activities, in contrast with accuracy-focused ones (Harmer, 2006; Kolker Horwitz, 2008; Scrivener, 2005). However, as we will see in Chapter 3, this distinction between accuracy- and fluency-focused activities is not supported by those authors promoting form-focused instruction, and research on oral CF tends to focus on the use of immediate correction during meaning-focused activities, rather than during controlled practice activities where accuracy is the main goal. Recently, research has started to look at the effectiveness of delayed CF in comparison with immediate CF, but there are still not enough studies to make generalizations (see 4.3.2.6.).

Of all the types of oral CF discussed in this section, the majority of research focuses on the six types of immediate oral CF proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), while other ways of providing feedback, such as the use of body language or feedback delivered at the end of a communicative activity are in urgent need of further research.