

The Effect of Recast, Clarification and Repetition and Learner Uptake during Chatting

Kim, Sookhyun* | Wonkwang University

< 목 차 >

- I. Introduction
- II. Literature Review
- III. Methodology
- IV. Results
- V. Conclusion

국문 초록

본 논문은 다양한 형태의 피드백이 학생들의 영어 학습에 미치는 영향에 대해서 연구하였다. 한국과 같이 영어가 외국어로서 학습되어 지는 환경에서 채팅이라는 도구는 상위 영어 학습자와 하위 영어 학습자들 사이의 의사소통을 할 수 있는 도구로 사용되어 지고 있다. 본 연구에서는 채팅이라는 도구가 영어학습자들의 의사소통을 향상시키는 도구로서의 역할에 대해 상위 영어 학습자와 하위 영어 학습자의 채팅을 통한 대화를 분석함으로써 알아보고자 한다.

본 연구에 참가한 두 명의 상위 영어 학습자는 영어권 국가에서 3년

* 원광대학교 교양대학 교수

이상 수학을 하였고 하위 학습자 2명은 영어권 방문 경험이 없는 대학교 2학년을 대상으로 실험을 실시하였다. 상위 학습자를 대상으로 의도적으로 본 연구에 필요한 세 가지 피드백을 제공하는 훈련을 하였으며 이후 하위 영어 학습자들과의 채팅을 통한 대화 중 세 가지 피드백을 하위 학습자들에게 제시하였다. 참여자들의 채팅 사용경험이 변인이 될 수 있으므로 실제 실험 전 모의 채팅을 실시하여 영어 채팅에 대한 친숙도를 높였으며 실험 단계에서도 학생들의 영어 채팅에 대한 두려움과 불안감을 낮추기 위해 일상적인 대화 주제를 선택하여 실험을 진행하였다.

연구 결과에 의하면 학생들은 제시된 세 가지 피드백을 통해서도 학습이 이루어지지 않았음을 보여 주고 있다. 하위 학습자들은 대화동안 상위 학습자들에 의해 제시된 피드백이 본인의 영어에 대한 오류수정임을 인식하지 못하고 평범한 대화의 일부분으로 인식하였기 때문이다. 이는 하위 학습자들에게 제공된 오류 수정 피드백의 형태가 명시적인 오류 수정 피드백이 아닌 암시적인 형태의 피드백으로 제시되었기 때문이라고 볼 수 있다.

비록 채팅이라는 도구를 통한 영어 대화가 학습으로 연결될 수는 없지만 한국과 같은 영어를 외국어로서 학습하는 환경에서는 영어라는 언어에 노출 되고 사용해 볼 수 있는 기회를 제공하는 도구로서의 역할은 할 수 있다고 보여 진다.

■주제어: 오류수정 피드백, 재구성, 재요청, 반복, 오류 수정

I. Introduction

Importance of English as a global language is increasing in the world for communication and education as well. As we see the national

curriculum in Korea, the main objective of English education is fostering students' English communication skill. However, it is hard to give a plenty of opportunities to produce English as a communication tools in real classroom environment which is English as foreign language in Korea.

Development of technology leads the increase of using a computer and other computer-related equipment which are the main tools to support overall education in the classroom and real life situation. Especially, Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) is emerged as a useful tool to enhance English education. Chapelle¹⁾ used the metaphor that English get married with the computer to emphasize the importance of the computer. Fortunately, a computer is widely used as a tool to live and communicate. Learners can use computers as tools to improve second language learning. Korean learners are accustomed to using a computer, so online chatting and e-mail make possible to communicate with people who are in same place or not as synchronous and asynchronous tools. Even though online chatting through messenger or chattroom is different with face-to-face communication, CMC is offering a lot of opportunities to use English as a communication tool.

The present study attempts to investigate whether students can recognize implicit feedback. When Korean English learners who are accustomed to being given explicit feedback during learning receive implicit feedback, they can be aware of errors by understanding three different types of feedback. The current study examines which implicit feedback frequently occurs during English conversation and which implicit feedback links to uptake which means learners realize errors and correct them. If implicit feedback is connected to learning, Korean

1) Chapelle, Carol. CALL in the 21st Century: Looking Back on Research to Look Forward for Practice. CALL in the 21st Century CD-ROM, 2001. IATEFL.

learners can be exposed in various feedback including explicit and implicit feedback.

II. Literature Review

2.1 Computer-Mediated-Communication

Webchat as a synchronous interaction tools is used to discover patterns and conversation strategies that are used by participants in on-line context ²⁾. For this study, Sperling's ESL chat-centered is chosen to facilitate contacts among native and non-native speakers of English. The overall structure of interaction was connected with the on-line communication setting features. For analyzing the results, the conversation analysis is chosen. Even though on-line context has particular patterns and conversational strategies which are different from face-to-face communication, Webchat encourages to use English. Based on the study, the feature of Webchat is relevant to real communication.

Blake³⁾ and Toyoda and Harrison⁴⁾ chose chatting as a main method to investigate their studies. Blake examines that the incidental negotiation can occur in on-line discussions. Fifty English speaking students who enrolled the Spanish course have on-line discussions in

2) Negretti, Raffaella, Web-Based Activities and SLA: A Conversation Analysis Research Approach. *Language Learning and Technology*, 1999, 3.1: 75-87.

3) Blake, Robert, Computer Mediated Communication: A Window on L2 Spanish Interlanguage. *Language learning and Technology*, 2000, 4.1: 120-136.

4) Toyoda, Etsuko and Harrison, Richard, Categorization of Text Chat Communication Between Learners and Native Speakers of Japanese. *Language Learning and Technology*, 2002, 6.1: 82-99

pairs. The results show that computer-mediated communication has benefits in language learning. Due to the interaction hypothesis, synchronous chat has the value in communication..

The study of Toyoda and Harrison uses the discourse analyze method to analysis students' chat conversation. Five native speakers of Japanese and five non-native speakers of Japanese participate in this study. Both Blake, and Toyoda and Harrison conduct their studies based on social interaction approach. They examine that learners produce a wide range of discourse structures during chatting. Lee⁵⁾ has focus on net work-based collaborative project in the study. The results of her study demonstrate that native speakers assisted non-native speakers to recognize meanings and forms of a target language. Moreover, Lee controls learners' language proficiency, computer skills and age differences as variables in the study.

Lam⁶⁾ examines interactions between two Chinese and English bilingual students in chat room. The Lam's study shows that two Chinese and English bilingual students develop language learning through CMC interaction in chat room. This study suggests that computer-mediated communication helps learners to enhance language learning and it can be a new method to socialize with using English on computer as well.

The research investigates the effects of two different tasks between conversational tasks and information gap tasks in synchronous text chatting in Korea⁷⁾. Due to the results of this study, information gap

5) Lee, Lina, Learners' Perspectives on Networked Collaborative Interaction with Native Speakers of Spanish in the US. *Language Learning and Technology*, 2004, 8.1: 83-100

6) Lam, Wan Shun, Second Language Socialization in a Bilingual Chat Room: Global and Local Considerations. *Language Learning and Technology*, 2004, 8.3: 44-65.

7) Lee, Soyoun. The Effect of Task Type on Negotiation of Meaning in Synchronous Text Chatting, *English Teaching*, 2002, 57.3: 3-18.

task leads amount of turn-taking and conversational task brings high frequency in negotiation of meaning. The learners concentrate on completion of tasks rather than negotiation of meaning. This study shows that even if the results are influenced by different task types, synchronous chatting in a second language has more positive effects on communication than face-to-face oral interaction.

Actually, it is hard to have opportunities to communicate in English with native speakers likewise Korean EFL situation. Beyond the situation, computer-mediated communication can offer the environment that is similar with realistic communication. Yoon and Han⁸⁾ mention two different synchronous text-based CMC tools which are Chatterbot and messenger. Even though Chatterbot and messenger are different tools, both tools show that each tool can improve learner's writing and speaking skills from the results of the study. Moreover, learners develop their productive skills to use more complicate and longer sentences through chatting.

Many studies show that CMC tools had positive effects on second language learning. Especially, chatting makes foreign language learners possible to have synchronous interactions. The learners can get immediate feedback from their partners during chatting. Moreover, chatting shows written texts as an input. From the written input, the learners can have more time to process cognitively rather than face-to-face communication which oral inputs are given.

2.3 Corrective Feedback based on Interaction Hypothesis

-
- 8) 윤숙경·한종임 (Yoon, Sook-Kyun and Han, Jong-Im), 「채터봇과 메신저를 이용한 채팅이 한국 대학생 영어학습자의 표현 능력에 미치는 영향에 관한 사례 연구」 (A Case Study on the Effects of the Use of Chatterbot and Messenger on the Productive Skills of Korean EFL Learners). 『한국멀티미디어언어교육학회 (Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning)』, 2004, 7.2: 269-292.

Various terms are used for identifying learners' errors and providing corrective feedback in the Second Language Acquisition (SLA). The terminology that used commonly are corrective feedback, negative evidence, and negative feedback. To verify definitions of each feedback used in this study, a brief review of the definitions of terms is presented.

Lightbown and Spada ⁹⁾ define corrective feedback as:

Any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect. This includes various responses that the learners receive. When a language learners says, 'He go to school everyday', corrective feedback can be explicit, for example, 'no, you should way goes, hot go' of implicit 'yes he goes to school every day', and may or may not include metalinguistic information, for example, 'Don't forget to make the verb agree with the subject'. (p. 171-172)

Implicit correction includes confirmation checks, repetitions, recast, clarification requests, silence, and facial expressions that express confusion ¹⁰⁾.

Due to the social international perspective, researches¹¹⁾¹²⁾ examine whether corrective feedback is effective or not. Some other studies has compared implicit feedback and explicit feedback¹³⁾¹⁴⁾¹⁵⁾¹⁶⁾¹⁷⁾. Havrnek¹⁸⁾

9) Lightbown, Patsy and Spada, Nina, How Language are Learned. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1999.

10) Schachter, Jacquelyn, Corrective Feedback in Historical Perspective. Second Language Research, 1991, 7: 89-102

11) Havranek, Gertraud, When is Corrective Feedback Most Likely to Succeed?. International Journal of Educational Research, 2002, 37: 255-270.

12) Park, Hye-sook, The Effects of Explicit Focus on Form in L2 Learning. English Language & Literature Teaching, 2002, 8.1: 39-53.

13) Ellis, Rhodes, The Differential Effects of Corrective Feedback on Two Grammatical Structures. In A. Markey, Conversational Interaction in Second Language Aquisition: A Series of Empirical Studies. pp. 339-360.

studied oral corrective feedback with 207 English learners from different ages and proficiency levels. The results are divided into situational factors and linguistic factors influenced by the success of corrective feedback. In linguistic factors which include grammar, lexicon and pronunciation, learners accept grammar errors than lexical errors through corrective feedback. According to the result, the success of corrective feedback depends on learner's ability of providing correct form. Again, if learners repeat the correct form, it shows that the development of language learning can increase.

Park¹⁹⁾ examines the effects of focus on form including grammatical explanation, input enhancement and output practice, and corrective feedback with 70 Korean college students in English composition classes. Her examination is focused on using an article in English through synchronous chatting. The results represent that the experimental group which receives grammatical explanation, input enhancement and output

Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2007.

- 14) Kang, Hyun-sook, The Relative Efficacy of Explicit and Implicit Feedback in the Learning of a Less-Commonly-Taught Foreign Language. *IRAL*, 2009, 47: 303-324.
- 15) Li, Shaofeng, The Differential Effects of Implicit and Explicit Feedback on Second Language (L2) Learners at Different Proficiency Levels. *Applied Language Learning*. 2009, 19: 53-78
- 16) Li, Shaofeng, The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning*, 2010, 60: 309-365.
- 17) Loewen, Shawn and Erlam, Rosemary, Corrective Feedback in the Chatroom: An Experimental Study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 2006, 19: 1-14
- 18) Havranek, Gertraud, When is Corrective Feedback Most Likely to Succeed?. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 2002, 37: 255-270.
- 19) Park, Hye-sook, The Effects of Explicit Focus on Form in L2 Learning. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 2002, 8.1: 39-53.

practice as focus on form shows better performance in using article than before. Also, even if a control group does not have focus on form instruction, the control group has negative feedback. The results indicate both the control group and the experience group show improvement. While the experimental group has focus on form instruction without corrective feedback, the control group directly receives corrective feedback from the teacher. The findings conclude that focus on form improved second language and feedback as well. According to the study of Park, findings support the positive aspects of focus on form instruction including corrective feedback. If learners have focus on form instruction and corrective feedback, it caused synergy effect on their language learning.

From Interaction hypothesis, language learners acquire the second language through interaction²⁰⁾²¹⁾. The reason why language learning occurs during interaction is that feedback can support to facilitate language learning. Mackey, Gass and McDonough examine the effects of interaction feedback. The feedback is categorized as morphosyntactic, phonological, semantic and lexical in this study. The results explain that the learners perceive lexical, semantic and phonological feedback. On the other hand, when the learners perceive morphosyntactic feedback, the learners misperceived semantic or no content feedback. Even if morphosyntactic feedback is not consistent with the rest of results related with feedback, the results provide that the feedback in conversational interaction is beneficial for language learning.

2.4 Research Questions

- 20) Mackey, Alison, Gass, Susan and McDonough, Kim, How Do Learners Perceive International Feedback?. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 2000, 22: 471-497.
- 21) Park, Hye-sook, The Effects of Explicit Focus on Form in L2 Learning. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 2002, 8.1: 39-53.

The study will investigate based on those following questions.

What types of corrective feedback are occurring during chatting?

When should students receive corrective feedback?

Do students produce uptake from teacher's feedback?

What types of corrective feedback lead students to correct their own error with grammatical accuracy and lexical precision within meaningful context?

III. Methodology

3.1 Participants

In this study, two students and two English teachers are participated in online chatting. Most of low-level students are afraid of speaking English because of their high anxiety level and low self-confidence. Only two students volunteer to participate in this study. All four participants have same first language and gender. L1 is Korean and two female students are early 20's and same major at same college. They have never been in America and any other English speaking countries as well. One of student has experience of chatting in English only one time. Their English proficiency are assumed as lower level based on under 400 from TOEIC. Two female teachers have assumption that they are high proficiency level based on their background. They are mid 30's and have studied English education in America for about 3 years and now they are teaching English at universities. Their TOEIC scores are over 900. Moreover, they are familiar with chatting in English. These two teachers intend to give implicit feedbacks for the purpose of the study. They have their own training session for an hour. They have

never been in America and any other English speaking countries as well. While participants have online chatting in English, two students will receive different types of feedbacks from teachers. Teacher will give three types of feedback on purpose.

3.2 Feedback types

Three different types of feedback are used by two teachers for high proficiency level learners in this study.

Recast involves the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error, recasts are generally implicit in that teachers are not introduced by 'You mean.' 'Use this word,' or 'You should say.' Moreover, it rephrases a student's utterance by changing one or more sentence components such as subject, verb or object, while still it is referring to its central meanings. Clearly indication that the student's utterance was incorrect, the teacher provides the correct form. The present study is divided into two different type of recast which are recast of lexical and grammatical, and syntactic errors.

A) Recast-Lexical and grammatical error

S: I want study

T: You want to study?

Recast-Syntactic error

S: You first go

T: You want me to go first?

Clarification Request includes phrases such as 'Pardon me'. It may also include a repetition of the error as in 'What do you mean by X?' by using phrases like 'Pardon me', 'Excuse me?' or 'I don't understand.' The teacher indicates that the message has not been understood or that the student's utterance contains some kind of mistake that a repetition or a reformulation is required. This is feedback type that can refer to problems in either comprehensibility or accuracy, or

both.

S: I'm training in vacation

T: Excuse me. Training?

S: Yes, training in Hotel.

T: You take training in a hotel for a vacation?

Repetition refers to the teacher's repetition, in isolation of the student's erroneous utterance. In most cases, teachers adjust their intonation in speaking as to highlight the error.

S: I'm not good to exhort.

T: Exhort?

T: Explain?

S: Exhort

T: Exhort whom?

3.3 Uptake

Uptake is defined as "a student's utterance that immediately follows the teachers' feedback and it constitutes a reaction in some way to the teachers' intention to draw attention in some aspect of the student's initial utterance"(Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Two types of student uptake appeared in the data. Uptake is divided into uptake that results in repair of the error which was the focus of the feedback, and uptake that results in utterances that still need to repair. Although uptake is indeed student's response to corrective feedback, it is not necessary to be a response which has to be repair. Uptake in the present study refers to a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback. This case categorizes that needs-repair; acknowledge, different error, same error, hesitation, off target and partial repair²²⁾.

22) Lyster, Roy and Ranta, Leila,. Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. Studies in Second

Acknowledgement generally refers to a simple 'yes' on the part of student in response the teacher's feedback.

Same error refers to uptake that includes a repetition of the student's initial error.

Different error refers to a student's uptake that is response to the teacher's feedback but it neither corrects nor repeats that initial error; instead a different error is made

Off target refers to uptake that is clearly in response to the teacher's feedback turn but that circumvents the teacher's linguistic focus altogether, without including any further errors.

Hesitation refer to a student's hesitation in response to the teacher's feedback

Partial repair refers to uptake that includes only part of a correction from the initial error.

Present study counts uptake for each category of 'need-repair' and 'repair'. All these categories count as uptake.

3.4 Procedures

Two teachers and two students are divided into two different groups. Two groups have the first session to communicate through chatting program for an hour. One week later, they have another session for an hour. Topics are chosen from various fields such as hobbies, friends, schools, future, and family which are familiar with students. The reason why familiar topics are selected is that students do not have enough ability to discuss academic topics in English. Students need to practice to use English before they start experimental sessions. The computer will be used as a communication tool instead of face to face communication situation. To avoid the variable of a computer using skill,

Language Acquisition, 1997, 19: 37-66.

two groups have the pilot session to be accustomed to using computers for 30 minutes, one day before the experimental session. Also both teachers need to have opportunities to present three different types of corrective feedback because teachers do not have experience about corrective feedbacks either.

During the experimental session, teachers try to give students enough time to produce what they want to say and express. Reply or feedbacks are not given quickly for reducing their anxiety. When students take replies from teachers quickly than they expect, students have stress to produce as quickly as they can. The teachers give corrective feedback to students without recognizing that they may receive different kind of feedback from teachers. The teachers give an informal situation such as talking with friends as possible as they can.

IV. Results

The data from online chatting shows that students receive three different implicit feedbacks from teachers. Students do not recognize implicit feedback during online chatting. However, teachers intend to give three different corrective feedbacks to follow the purpose of the study. Students receive three types of feedback which are recast, clarification and repetition during online chatting.

<Table 1> Frequency of Each Corrective Feedback Type during 1st session

	Recasts	Clarification	Repetition
Student 1	17	5	1
Student 2	20	3	1
Total	37	8	2

During 1st session, participants chatted about various topics. Students

received corrective feedbacks mostly by Recast. In Table 1, Clarification and repetition sometimes happened, but recast was often presented to both student. Previous studies²³⁾²⁴⁾²⁵⁾ concluded that most of feedback that students received from a teacher was recast. The results confirm recast is most frequently given in this study.

Recast

T1: Which country do you want to go for studying?

S1: I want go Italy

T1: Wow, You want to go Italy!

S1: Yes.

S2: Kim professor class study

T2: Professors Kim's class!

S2: pace bed

T2: Your face is not bad.

Clarification

S1: She work massage

T1: Pardon me, Message?

S1: Yes.

T1: What is the Message?

23) Havranek, Gertraud, When is Corrective Feedback Most Likely to Succeed?. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 2002, 37: 255-270.

24) Lyster, Roy, Recasts, Repetition, and Ambiguity in L2 Classroom Discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 1998, 20: 51-81.

25) Lyster, Roy and Ranta, Leila, Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 1997, 19: 37-66.

The Effect of Recast, Clarification and Repetition and Learner Uptake during Chatting

S1: Beauty shop.

Repetition

S1: because... tast

T1: Tast? Test?

[Table 2] Frequency of Each Corrective Feedback Type during 2nd session

	Recast	Clarification	Repetition
Student 1	10	5	0
Student 2	18	7	0
Total	28	12	0

During 2nd session, teachers were intended to give other feedbacks rather than recast to expose various feedback during online chatting.

Recast

S1: I'm before transfer

T1: before you transfer...

S1: I leaving 00 university.

T1: You left 00 university.

S2: I'm very good sport fan

T2: You're a good sports fan!

Clarification

S1: now second college

T1: Excuse me?

S1: This is my second college.

S2: What's day?

T2: Excuse me? what do you mean by that?

S2: sorry

S2: next week.

T2: probably Saturday. See you.

Most of feedbacks were given when students made grammatical errors. Students usually omitted the third person singular verb -s in the end of the verb; She work and He like, and sometimes students forgot to use verbs; face..bad, my boy friend a soldier, my home..seoul, I going to seoul, and I leaving. Students tended to make errors in verb; I leaving, I'm before transfer, and I choice. When the plural -s; three sister, many friend, twenty day, and eleven subject, were omitted, teachers gave corrective feedbacks. Students were not focused on using the preposition and article; I like study English, I'm worry, I want study, she work Message, I want go Europe, and I like movie, I have man. Some of misspell were received corrective feedback; hand→had, friesd→friend, holi→holiday and tast→test. Most of grammatical errors were corrected by recast and some of semantic errors were received by clarification;

T2: What is your major?

S2: Hotel.

T2: Excuse me, Hotel?

S2: Hotel management.

T: Good night.

S: Don't dream.

T: Excuse me, don't dream?

S: I mean deep sleep

T: Oh, Thanks.

<Table 3> Total Frequency of Each Corrective Feedback Type

	Recast	Clarification	Repetition	Total
1 st Session	37	8	2	47
2 nd Session	28	12	0	40
Total	65	20	2	87

Due to the Table 3, recast was most frequently occurred and repetition was rarely given to students in both sessions. Frequency of clarification in the second session reflected strong intention of teachers to give clarification. Also, there was no significant difference between 1st session and 2nd session. Expectation was that students learned from teachers' feedbacks, but it was hard to conclude that students learned from corrective feedback in 1st session. Students received recast when they made grammatical errors. Students were given clarification when they had semantic errors. In 2nd session, frequency of recast was decreased and clarification was more occurring than 1st session. It was possible to say students made semantic errors in 2nd session rather than 1st session. The problem was that increasing of clarification and decreasing of recast were affected by teacher's intention. The data could not clearly explain this.

<Table 4> Feedback and Uptake

	Feedback	Uptake
1 st Session	47	39
2 nd Session	40	27
Total	87	66

Most of students' response as uptake were 'Yes', 'No' and 'right'. Students almost didn't repair their errors during the sessions. Students recognized that they made errors, but they were not sure whether they should correct them or not. Actually, it was never happened during both sessions. However, student corrected the errors before the students received corrective feedback.

T: Which country do you want to go?

S: I want go many country

S: countries.

In this case, the student corrected her own error without feedback from a teacher. When a students recognizes errors, the student has ability to correct own error.

V. Conclusion

According to the results, it is hard to conclude that corrective feedback in online chatting room is not directly related to language learning. However, students learn from teachers' reply that students imitate. If teacher produces a correct sentence during conversation, it is possible to say that a student can learn through repeating a correct sentence.

T1: I like this kind of student!

S1: I like this kind of teacher, too !!

One interesting finding is that the teacher can not expect that teacher receives corrective feedback from the student. When one of students receives uncomprehended sentence, the student requests to clarify meaning of the sentence.

T1: If you want to talk with me or ask something

T1: Please let me know

S1: What do you mean?

S1: Please let me know

T: Sorry, You make me know that you want to talk with me.

S: ok.

From results, it is possible to mention that providing many corrective feedbacks makes negative effects on students. When students very often receive clarification and repetition, those corrective feedbacks make students think teachers can not understand their English. Overall students' feeling of chatting in English is fun and not too difficult. However, too many corrective feedbacks disturb students' attitude toward chatting in English and cause communication breakdown. It can make passive English learners.

Recast seems not disturb students' chatting. When students receive recast, their responses are not negative and it does not make communication breakdown.

Even though it is possible to say that students can not occur their learning through chatting, it can be opportunities to use English that students learn in their classrooms. For instance, students use 'What kind of sports do you like?', 'What is your hobby?', 'Have you ever been in America?'. Those are well-known sentences from English conversation class. Students already know many English expressions to use from their previous learning. One of problems in EFL environment is that it is hard to have opportunities to use English Online chatting might be different with real situation, but online chatting offers opportunities to use English anytime and anywhere. Moreover, even though corrective feedback in English chatting room can not lead students learning directly, chatting has positive effects on improvement of attitude toward writing and speaking in English. During online chatting, one of students mentions chatting in English is difficult but the student likes it.

T1: What do you think about chatting in English?

S1: I love it!

For these reasons, chatting is possible to be a one of tools with certain context and subject. Finally, corrective feedback can not lead to repair errors. However if students recognize that teachers intend to present corrective feedbacks, students are focused on corrective feedbacks and try to repair. It can cause different results from the present study. For further study, teachers give notice that students receive different types of corrective feedbacks. If students receive corrective feedback more consciously, they will recognize their errors and try to repair and follow the correct feedback.

It is hard to define that feedback in present study leads learning through recognizing errors because of a small number of participants and a short period of experiment. A deeper and more concrete understanding on effects of implicit feedback can be investigated through longitudinal research and expanded participants. Also, other implicit feedback that is not given in this study can lead different result from English conversation.

Furthermore, in term of tool for communicating, online chatting and messenger can give more opportunities to produce English in EFL circumstance. The language learners in EFL circumstance have limitation of using target language. The learners are lack of opportunities to expand their language out of class. The present study uses online chatting to communicate in English. Learners can reduce anxiety level and have more time to produce English through online chatting on the computer and cellular phone as well. Considering limitation of EFL circumstance, online chatting tool can be the solution to overcome the current circumstance.

References

- Ellis, Rhodes. 2007. The Differential Effects of Corrective Feedback on Two Grammatical Structures. In A. Markey, *Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquisition: A Series of Empirical Studies*. pp. 339-360. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lightbown, Patsy and Spada, Nina. 1999. *How Language are Learned*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- 윤숙경·한종임 (Yoon, Sook-Kyun and Han, Jong-Im). 2004. 「채터봇과 메신저를 이용한 채팅이 한국 대학생 영어학습자의 표현 능력에 미치는 영향에 관한 사례 연구」 (A Case Study on the Effects of the Use of Chatterbot and Messenger on the Productive Skills of Korean EFL Learners). 『한국멀티미디어언어교육학회 (Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning)』, 7.2: 269-292.
- Alvarez-Torres, Maria. Jose. 2001. On "chatting" in the Foreign Language Classroom. *The Clearing House*, 313-316.
- Blake, Robert. 2000. Computer Mediated Communication: A Window on L2 Spanish Interlanguage. *Language learning and Technology*, 4.1: 120-136.
- Chaudron, Craig. 1977. A Descriptive Model of Discourse in the Corrective Treatment of Learners' Errors. *Language Learning*, 27:29-46.
- Chapelle, Carol. 2001. CALL in the 21st Century: Looking Back on Research to Look Forward for Practice. *CALL in the 21st Century CD-ROM, IATEFL*.
- Doughty, Catherine and Long, Michael. 2003. Optimal Psycholinguistic Environments for Distance Foreign Language Learning. *Language Learning and Technology*, 7.3: 50-80.
- Havranek, Gertraud. 2002. When is Corrective Feedback Most Likely to Succeed?. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37: 255-270.

- Kang, Hyun-sook. 2009. The Relative Efficacy of Explicit and Implicit Feedback in the Learning of a Less-Commonly-Taught Foreign Language. *IRAL*, 47: 303-324.
- Lam, Wan Shun. 2004. Second Language Socialization in a Bilingual Chat Room: Global and Local Considerations. *Language Learning and Technology*, 8.3: 44-65.
- Lee, Lina. 2004. Learners' Perspectives on Networked Collaborative Interaction with Native Speakers of Spanish in the US. *Language Learning and Technology*, 8.1: 83-100.
- Lee, Soyoung. 2002. The Effect of Task Type on Negotiation of Meaning in Synchronous Text Chatting, *English Teaching*, 57.3: 3-18.
- Li, Shaofeng. 2009. The Differential Effects of Implicit and Explicit Feedback on Second Language (L2) Learners at Different Proficiency Levels. *Applied Language Learning*, 19: 53-78
- Li, Shaofeng. 2010. The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning*, 60: 309-365.
- Loewen, Shawn and Erlam, Rosemary. 2006. Corrective Feedback in the Chatroom: An Experimental Study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 19: 1-14
- Lyster, Roy. 1998. Recasts, Repetition, and Ambiguity in L2 Classroom Discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20: 51-81.
- Lyster, Roy and Ranta, Leila. 1997. Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19: 37-66.
- Mackey, Alison, Gass, Susan and McDonough, Kim. 2000. How Do Learners Perceive International Feedback?. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22: 471-497.
- Negretti, Raffaella. 1999. Web-Based Activities and SLA: A Conversation Analysis Research Approach. *Language Learning and Technology*, 3.1: 75-87.
- Park, Hye-sook. 2002. The Effects of Explicit Focus on Form in L2

The Effect of Recast, Clarification and Repetition and Learner Uptake during Chatting

- Learning. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 8.1: 39-53.
- Schachter, Jacquelyn. 1991. Corrective Feedback in Historical Perspective. *Second Language Research*, 7: 89-102
- Tatawy, Mounira El. 2005. Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition. *Working Paper in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 5.1.
- Tedick, Diane and Gortari, Babara De. 1998. Research on Error Correction and Implications for Classroom Teaching. *American Council on Immersion Education*, 1.3.
- Toyoda, Etsuko and Harrison, Richard 2002. Categorization of Text Chat Communication Between Learners and Native Speakers of Japanese. *Language Learning and Technology*, 6.1: 82-99.

*Abstract***The Effect of Recast, Clarification and Repetition
and Learner Uptake.**

Kim, Sook-hyun(Wonkwang Univ.)

The study investigates the effects of different types of feedback. Within the EFL environment in Korea, chatting is used as a communication tool between high-level Korean English speakers and low-level Korean English learners. High-level English speakers who have studied English in America more than three years are trained to intentionally give different types of feedback. Low-level learners who do not have any experience in the English country are selected from one of the same classes as the high-level Korean English speakers. To avoid using computer skills, participants have pilot sessions to train using computers. Also, common topics which are hobbies, school life and friends are chosen to communicate for reducing anxiety of using English. The low-level English learners receive the different types of feedback from the high-level English speakers. Students are given three different types of feedback to correct their errors. The feedback does not connect to the students' learning because the students do not recognize the corrective feedback when it is presented. The feedback that used in the study is provided implicitly to the low-level learners. When the corrective feedback is given, students ignore it. If learners can not recognize their errors, it is hard to fix their errors. Even though chatting can not be used as the learning tool from the study, it is a useful tool to give opportunity to produce English considering EFL environment.

The Effect of Recast, Clarification and Repetition and Learner Uptake during Chatting

■Key words: corrective feedback, recast, clarification, repetition, uptake

접수일자: 2016. 6. 29 심사일자: 2016. 7. 15 게재결정: 2016. 8. 22