Contemporary Online Language Education Journal, 2011, 1, 1-19.

COLEJ
Contemporary Online Language Education Journal

Interactional feedback, task-based interaction and learner uptake

İletişimli geribildirim, görev odaklı iletişim ve öğrencilerin edimsel çıkarımları

Mohammad Hossein Yousefi[1]
Reza Biria[2]

Abstract
The present descriptive and observational study is an attempt to investigate teacher- student interaction under two different situations (simple vs. complex tasks). Data were collected form sixty intermediate level EFL learners' interactions with the teacher/ researcher. The randomly selected participants, in dyadic condition, performed the desired task and in the face of an error were given different types of interactional feedbacks. Afterwards, the efficacy of each feedback was estimated through learner uptake. The findings include the distribution of feedback types and the comparison of the success of each feedback type in terms of learner success.

Keywords: recast, prompt, task-based interaction, uptake

Özet
Bu tanımlayıcı ve gözlemsel çalışmada iki farklı durum (basit ve karmaşık etkinlikler) kapsamında öğretmen-öğrenci iletişimini araştırmaktadır. Çalışmada kullanılan veriler araştırmacı/ öğretmen ile iletişim içinde olan altmış orta düzey yabancı dil öğrencilerinden toplanmıştır. Rastgele seçilen katılımcılar ikili olarak istenilen görevi tamamlamışlar ve yaptıkları hatalar için kendilerine iletişimli geribildirim yoluyla verilmiştir. Daha sonra, her geribildirimle görevleri öğrencilerin edimsel çıkarım yoluyla tamamlamaları incelenmiştir. Bulgular, geribildirim türlerinin dağılımı ve öğrenci başarısı açısından her geribildirim türünün öğrenci başarısıyla karşılaştırmasını içermektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: dolaylı düzeltme, yönlendirici, görev odaklı iletişim, edimsel çıkarım

Introduction

Since the 1990s, considerable attention in SLA research has been given to interactional feedback (Long, 1996, 2007; Lyster, 2004; Mackey et al. 2003; Swain, 1985, 1995).It is widely agreed that interactional feedback can promote L2 development (Long, 1996, 2007; Lyster 2004). As pointed out by Mackey et.al. (2003) one of the hypothesized benefit of interactional feedback is that it can lead learners to modify their output, which, in turn, may promote fluency,

[1] Ph.D. Candidate, Khorasgan Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran, mhh.yousefi@gmail.com
[2] Assistant Professor, Khorasgan Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran, r_biria@yahoo.com

autoimmunization of retrieval processes, and syntactic rather than purely semantic L2 processing (Swain, 19985, 1995).

Capitalizing on descriptive studies of teacher- student interaction (e. g. Lyster, 2002), Lyster and Mori (2007) classified feedback moves as: explicit correction, recasts, or prompts. It is argued that explicit correction and recasts supply learners with target reformulation of their nontarget output. In the case of explicit correction, Lyster and Mori (2007) believe that, the teacher supplies the correct form and clearly indicates that what the student said was incorrect.

Prompts, on the other hand, include a variety of signals that force learners to self-repair. It is generally agreed that these moves have been referred as negotiation of form (as Lyster & Ranta, 1997) or focus on form negotiation (Lyster, 2002). Following Lyster (2004a) and Lyster and Mori (2007) these moves are referred as prompts in the present study.

Lyster and Mori (2007) classified prompts as the following feedback types (a) *elicitation*, in which the teacher directly elicits a reformulation from the student by asking questions like" How do we say that in English?", or by pausing to allow the student to complete the teacher's utterance, or by asking the learner to reformulate his/ her utterance and (b) *metalinguistic clues*, in which the teacher provides comments or questions related to the well- formedness of the student's utterance such as "we don’t say it like that in English". (c) *Clarification request*, in which the teacher uses phrases such as "pardon" and ' I don't understand" after learner errors to indicate to students that their utterance is not well-formed in some way and that a reformulation is needed; and (d) repetition, in which the teacher repeats the student's ill-formed utterance, adjusting intonation to highlight the error. Lyster and Morri (2007: 272) hold the view by primping, a teacher provides cues for learners to draw on their own resources to self- repair, whereas by providing explicit correction or recasting, a teacher both initiates and completes within a single move.

Recasts

There has been a growing research interest in "recasts' as one f the instances of interactional feedback (Ammar & Spada 2006; Doughty 2001; Egi, 2007; Iwashita 2003; Leeman 2003; long 1996, 2007). Long (2007:2) defines a recast as a reformulation of all or a part of a learner's immediately preceding utterance in which one or more non-target like (lexical, grammatical, etc.) items are replaced by the corresponding target form(s), and where, throughout the exchange, the focus of the interlocutors is on meaning not language as an object. In the same way, Doughty (2001) argued that recasts constitute the ideal means of achieving an "immediately contingent focus on form" and afford a "cognitive window" in which learners can rehearse what they heard and access material from their interlanguage.

Long (2007) forcibly argues that in instructional contexts, recasts represent a form of feedback that is pedagogically expeditious: A recast, according to him, is time-saving, less threatening to student confidence, and less disruptive of the flow of interaction than, for example, elicitation of self-repair. Long further notes that recasts also allow the teacher to maintain control. He concludes that it is perhaps for these reasons that recasts are so frequent in many language classrooms. Similarly, VanPatten (1990) argued that learners, particularly early-staged learners cannot attend to both meaning and form without difficulty. There are a number of advantages and benefits of using recasts as corrective feedback. One of the potential benefits of recasts in helping learners overcome this challenge, according to Long (2007), is their semantic transparency. Because a recast provide linguistic information that is semantically contingent to the learner's problematic utterance, its meaning might already be understood by the learner, at least partially. This might reduce the cognitive demands of processing meaning to form, potentially facilitating form-function mapping (Egi, 2007: 531). Recasts are believed to be an effective technique in the light of pedagogical research that shows learners' attention to be limited, selective, and partially subject to voluntary control (Ammar& Spada, 2006). Additionally, Leeman (2003:56) observed that recasts enhance the salience of target forms and thus increase the likelihood that the learner will attend to those forms. She raised the possibility that this enhanced salience could be sufficient in and of itself to account for the benefits of recasts, regardless of whether negative evidence is provided (or interpreted as such).

All in all, Iwashita (2003) claimed that recasts although not as frequent as simple modes, might be much more salient than native speaker interactional moves that contain positive feedback, thus leading to significant gains in L2 development. Long (2007) suggested that recasts might have delayed effects in language development and the efficacy of recasts should not be discounted due to the absence of an overt oral response. Doughty (2001) was in favor of recasts in that she argued that recasts are ideal because they facilitate cognitive comparison of interlanguage and target forms in a communicative context, thus, influence learner's competence. Likewise, Ellis and Sheen (2006) hold the idea that studying recasts serves as a means of investigating two issues of general theoretical importance in SLA. The first issue concerns the roles of positive and negative in SLA. The second theoretical issue that has to be addressed by researches on recasts concerns the relative impact of implicit and explicit types of negative feedback.

A number of researchers (e.g., Lyster, 1998a; Lyster and Ranta, 1997) have questioned the effectiveness of recasts, as least in communicative classroom contexts. The main reasons, according to Iwashita (2003), come from the low perceptual saliency, their low rate of incorporation in L2 classroom interaction, and the observed advantage of self-repair (Iwashita: 2003). In contrast, a number of studies (e.g., Doughty& Varela, 1998; Han, 2002) have shown, the ambiguity of recasts can be reduced by ensuring that they focus on a single linguistic feature and that their corrective force is linguistically signaled by, for example, the use of emphatic stress on the target item. The ambiguity of recasts can be reduced by ensuring that they focus on a single linguistic feature and that their corrective force is linguistically signaled by, for example, the use of emphatic stress on the target item. Ellis and Sheen (2006) argued that the ambiguity of recasts is actually an advantage, as learners clearly need to be able to not pay attention to linguistic form at least some of the time in order to focus on message context. They further noted that the multifunctional nature of recasts gives learners the choice of whether to focus on their communicative or linguistic context.

There is now substantial evidence that exposing learners to a rich diet of recasts can lead to acquisition both short-term experimental studies (e.g., Mackey& Philip, 1998) and longitudinal studies (e.g., Han, 2002) have demonstrated that recasts, especially when they are directed in a concentrated fashion at a specific grammatical structure, promote acquisition (Ellis& Sheen, 2006: 588). Various empirical studies have demonstrated that recasts are facilitative of L2 development for several linguistic forms: noun-adjective agreement in Spanish (Leeman, 2003), the past tense in English (Han, 2002), and the question development in English (Mackey & Philip, 1998).

Task-based instruction

Tasks have over the past 20 years become well established as a unit of design in a communicative curriculum. They are designed so as to engage learners in realistic communication that is communicating meaning is likely to lead to implicit learning (Crabbe, 2007). Research on task design attempts to find variables in task design that will lead to recognized second language acquisition processes such as negotiation or noticing (Ellis, 2003). Tasks-more specifically their components, characteristics, different types, and implementation conditions- have been the focus of much recent research (Albert and Komors, 2004). The great advantage of tasks is that they allow for learner engagement in realizing the communicative potential of the encoded semantic resource (Widdowson, 2003). The most important role for a language task is to confront learners with certain language problems in completing the task (Long, 1985). In the same way, Nunan (2003) pointed out that task-based language teaching is an approach to the design of language courses in which the point of departure is not an ordered list of linguistic items, but a collection of tasks. It draws on and reflects the experiential and humanistic traditions as well as reflects the changing conceptions of language itself.

Interactional feedback and uptake

There has been increased research into the learner 'uptake' during the past decade (Ellis et al., 2001a, 2001b; Loewen, 2004, 2005; Lyster 1998a, 1998b, 2001; Lyster and Mori, 2006; Lyster and Ranta, 1997). The term 'uptake' originally comes from speech act theory, when it described the relationship between

illocutionary and perlocutionary acts (Smith, 2005). Allwright (1984) uses the term to refer to the language items that learners themselves claim to have learned from a particular lesson. Lyster and Ranta (1997: 49) mentioned that Uptake … refers to a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance (this overall intention is clear to the student although the teacher's specific linguistic focus may not be). Ellis et al. (2001a) definition of uptake is summarized as follows:

1. Uptake is student move.
2. The move is optional.
3. The uptake move occurs in episodes where learners have a demonstrated gap in their knowledge.
4. The uptake move occurs as a reaction to some preceding move in which another participant either explicitly or implicitly provides information about a linguistic feature.

Similarly, Smith (2005) believes that recent research into the nature and the role of uptake has been twofold, attempting, on the one hand to demonstrate which factors tend to elicit uptake, and, on the other hand, to explore the effectiveness of learner uptake. The recent interest in uptake is due to its potential as an indication of second language acquisition (Loewen 2004). Ellis et al. (2001a) argue that there are theoretical grounds for believing that uptake might contribute to acquisition:

> Firstly, uptake can facilitate acquisition by "providing opportunities for learners to proceduralize target language knowledge already internalized in declarative form (Lyster 1998a: 191). So, producing the correct form may help learners automatize their production and lead to increased fluency (Swain 1995) Secondly, uptake constitutes one type of "pushed output" (Swain, 1995). It allows learners to reanalyze and modify their nontarget output as they test new hypotheses about the target language (Lyster, 1998a:191). Finally, this pushed output may be an indication of noticing, which Schmidt (1990, 2001) has

> argued is necessary for second language acquisition (Loewen, 2004: 156).

In line with the above statements, Lightbown (1998: 193) suggested that a reformulated utterance from the learner gives some reason to believe that the mismatch between learner utterance and target utterance has been noticed, a step at least toward acquisition. Swain (1985), in the same vein, argues that "the notion of uptake in classroom studies provides an effective tool for identifying patterns in teacher-student interaction that include a wide range of learner responses following teacher feedback, allowing for an operationalization of pushed output in classroom settings."

One way in which uptake may facilitate acquisition is by "providing opportunities for learners to proceduralize target language knowledge already internalized in declarative form (Lyster, 1998a:91). Drawing to processing approaches (Mc Laughlin, 1987) to SLA, it can be argued that learners first resort to *controlled processing* in the second language. This controlled processing involves the temporary activation of a selection of information nodes in the memory, in a new configuration. No doubt, such processing requires a lot of attentional control on the part of the subject, and is constrained by the limitations of the short-term memory (Mitchel and Myles, 2003). Through repeated activation, sequences first produced by controlled processing become *automatic*.

Automatized sequences are stored as units in the Long-term memory, which means that they can be made available very rapidly whenever the situation requires it, with minimal attentional control on the part of the subject (ibid:101). Seen from this viewpoint, language learning is the movement from controlled to automatic processing via practice (repeated activation). With these tokens, it can be claimed that learners, by producing the correct form (uptake), shift from controlled processing to automatic processing smoothly and efficiently. As pointed out by Ellis et al. (2001) and Loewen (2004) uptake can lead to noticing of language forms. Therefore, it seems essential to review the role of noticing in language acquisition and interlanguage development. Obviously, one can find an overwhelmingly large body of research on the role of noticing in second language

acquisition (See for example: Schmidt, 1990, 2001; Robinson, 1995b, 2001, 2003a).

Schmidt (1990) claimed that consciousness, in the sense of awareness of the form of input at the level of "noticing" is necessary to subsequent second language acquisition. Nearly a decade later, Schmidt, himself, (2001) has argued for the importance of (preferably conscious) noticing as a vital stage in second language change. He proposed that as a first stage for development, the learner must direct attention to some (selective) aspect of input, and that this input feature, although not necessarily immediately acquired, has to become the focus for any subsequent learning that occurs. Moreover, Swain and Lapkin (1995) asserted that producing the language may engage the learners in mental processing that may generate linguistic knowledge that is new for them, or consolidate existing knowledge. With this in mind, it seems to me that learner uptake, as one of instances of output, contributes not only to the rehearsal of the structures learners have at their disposal, but triggers the new forms and structures to be noticed, on the part of the learners.

Unlike a majority of the researchers who believe that learner uptake can act as facilitative of language acquisition and/or noticing (Ellis et al., 2001a, 2001b; Loewen, 2004; Long 2007; Smith, 2005; Swain 1985, 1995, 2000, among others), some other researchers (Lyster, 1998a, 1998b, 2007, Lightbown, 1998) expressed reservations considering the potential value of acquisition of uptake. Lightbown (1998) asserts that uptake neither guarantees that a feature will be acquired nor is it always present when a feature is acquired:

> The fact that a learner does not make an immediate behavioral change cannot be taken as evidence that there is no effect of the focus on form. Nor can a corrected response from the learner be taken as evidence that the more correct or advanced form has been integrated into the learner's interlanguage.

However, she goes on to accept the idea that noticing the mismatch between the learner utterance and target utterance is a step toward acquisition. And likewise

Lyster (1998a) has quoted two arguments from Swain (1985) in favor of uptake, giving tacit approval to the acquisitional potential of uptake.

The Present Study

Research Questions

The present study was motivated by the need to investigate simultaneously the processes involved during task- based interaction (the type of feedback type provided by the teacher and their effects on immediate learner uptake) which is argued that provides learning potential for L2 learners to notice the gap in their interlanguage systems. Additionally, there is a need to bring other factors into consideration when we deal with the interactional feedback and learner uptake such as cognitive complexity of the tasks transacted by the learners during task-based interaction. Task complexity is the result of the attentional, memory, reasoning, and other information processing demands imposed by the structure of the task to the language learner (Robinson 2001b). Task complexity is operationalized through +/- reasoning It has been hypothesized that task complexity push learners to use linguistically complex language in terms of syntax and lexicon, to name just a few; Which, in turn, leads to more erroneous utterances on the part of the learners. The novel contribution of this study is that it treats task complexity as the moderator variable between interactional feedback and learner uptake. To this end two research questions were addressed:

1. What is the distribution of different types of interactional feedback in simple and complex tasks?
2. What is the distribution of uptake following different types of feedback (e.g. prompts vs. recasts) in complex and simple tasks?

Participants

Participants included 60 male learners of English, aged between 17 and 25 (mean= 20) who had been in lower intermediate level of oral proficiency in English. Based on the levels of the courses they had enrolled in and on the results of their in-house language placement tests (including written and oral interview tests), the participants were considered as homogeneous. They also could pass two immediate last terms with an average of over 85 out of 100. Before participating in the research, the participants (in both institutes) had received

English education for approximately 5 years. The participants were from different L1 backgrounds, including Turkish, Persian, and Kurdish. Deliberate attempts have been made to select participants randomly and avoid any bias towards any group of the learners. The selection procedure was done according to the student number allocated to each student through drawing lots procedure. All the participants in this study expressed their satisfaction prior to the research and they were told that the result would not have any effect on the students' grades in the courses they were taking.

Data Collection Procedure

In performing the decision-making tasks, participants sat at a table looking at the pictures. No other people, apart from each participant and the researcher were present. And the data collection was conducted in a quiet room in language institute. After gathering personal information and achieving rapport with the participants, the researcher told them about the demands of each task and they performed the specified task (either simple or complex). Apart from age and first language background, no personal information was sought. The participants were randomly assigned to two groups and the first group performed the simple task and the latter group did the complex task. Each participant was given up to seven minutes to do the required task.

The researcher provided participants with one or two words (e.g., fire truck) which have found to be problematic during piloting. Each participant did the required task and in the face of an error, they were given negative feedback to come up with the erroneous utterances. The whole procedure of task performance was audiotaped. The process of transcribing and coding and analyzing the collected data was done through using personal computer. It should be mentioned the data analyzed here were originally collected to investigate the effect of task complexity on learner uptake. And at the time of data collection, feedback type was not the focus of the researcher and thus researcher's tendency had little or no impact on the distribution of different types of interactional feedback.

Materials

Two versions of the same decision-making task (one simple and the other complex task) were partially replicated from Gilabert (2007). A simplified 'fire chief' task used in cognitive psychology was utilized. In this task, (see the appendix) learners are presented with a building where a fire has broken out and where a number of people need to be rescued. The problem in the complex version required from learners not just one decision, but a long series, in which early decisions condition later ones. In both versions of the task learners were instructed to specify the actions they would take, determine the sequence of their actions, and justify their choice for actions and specific sequence. In the simple task, there are similar types of people (i.e. people with no particular roles) in the building who were faced with similar degrees of danger; the fire being relatively static, the smoke blowing away from the building. In the complex one, learners have to deal with specific types of people (e.g. a pregnant woman, an elderly man, an injured person, a hero). The factors in the task are also intricately related and dynamic (e.g. the different fires moving towards the people and the smoke blowing into building through the ventilation system) and they have fewer resources (i.e. a single fire truck), which is thought would force learners to prioritize, and later justify their actions (Gilabert, 2007).

Results

Table 1 presents a comparison of the total number of student turns in each task situation, as well as the number of student turns with error and student turns followed by feedback. Total turns of students are 531 and 603 for simple and complex tasks respectively. A large proportion of student turns with error occurred in complex task (69.65% n= 603)) than in simple task (43% n= 233). Although the researcher provided the interactional feedback similarly in both task conditions: of all student turns with error, 52% were followed by feedback in simple task situation and 72% were followed by feedback in complex task situation.

Table 1. Student turns, turns with error, and turns followed by feedback

Student turns	**Simple Task**	**Complex Task**
total turns	531	603

with errors	233	420
followed by feedback	122	305

Table 2 displays the number and percentage distribution of prompts and recasts in each task condition. In both task conditions recasts were the largest interactional feedback was used by the researcher. (54% and 75.73% for simple and complex task conditions respectively). That is to say the occurrence of recasts in two task conditions was higher than the prompts with a large proportion. (It was 75.73% vs. 13. 44% in complex task and 54% vs. 26% in simple task). On the other hand, prompts were 32 in simple task and 41 in complex task which is 26% and 13.44% for simple and complex tasks respectively. it can be said in the present study recasts compromise the most prevalent interactional feedback and prompts stand second with a much less frequency.

Table 2. Distribution of feedback types

Feedback types	**Simple tasks**		**Complex tasks**	
	n	%	n	%
prompts	32	26	41	13.44
recasts	66	54	231	75.73
others	24	19	33	10.8

Table 3 shows the number and percentage distribution of learner uptake moves across different interactional feedback. It can be seen that out of 66 recasts in simple task, 38 of them led to learner uptake (which shows the percentage of over 57%). That is to say recasts were the most successful interactional feedback for leading to learner uptake. Although prompts show a slight difference in occurrence (Out of 32 prompts there have been 17 learner uptakes that are 53%). The picture for other types of interactional feedback, say explicit feedback, that is not concern of the present study, is blurry.

Table 3. Uptakes in simple tasks

	prompts	**recasts**	**others**
number	32	66	24

uptakes	17 (53%)	38 (57%)	10 (41%)

Table 4. Uptakes following each feedback types in complex tasks

	prompts	**recasts**	**others**
number	41	231	33
uptakes	26 (63%)	156 (67%)	11 (33%)

Discussions

To discuss the results of the present study, we return to our two research questions. The first research question asked what the distribution of different interactional feedback in task-based interaction was. We found that recasts constitute the greatest proportion of the interactional feedback in two task situation (simple vs. complex). It was (66- 55%) for simple task and (231-75.73%) for the complex task. This can partially attributed to the multiplicity of recasts functions in interaction. They are so versatile that at the same time encourage learners to continue their L2 production and at the same time tell them that there is something wrong with their utterances. As put it by a lot of researchers and applied linguists, say Long (2007), one of the advantages of recasts is that they never break the information flow. This study is similar to Sheen (2004) in that recasts provided in this context were characterized by rising intonation or emphasis, often accompanied by stress. That is why learners in the present study were able, at least most of the time, to perceive recasts as corrective. We would like to hypothesize if recast associate with some manipulation in stress, or intonation in order to give them saliency, learners most likely would be able to grasp it as corrective.

The findings of the present study are in line with Lyster and Morri (2000) in that they believe recasts are ideal for facilitating the delivery of complex subject matter because they provide supportive, scaffolded help, which serves to move lessons ahead when the target forms in question are beyond the students' current abilities. We would like to add that recasts are ideal interactional feedback when the cognitive complexity of the task in question is high vs. mere description or narration. When learners are under pressure to put forward reasons, to make informed or logical decisions, to solve or resolve a dilemma, or put it simply other

way, they deal with something both linguistically or cognitively complex , teachers should give them corrective feedbacks through "recasting". Unlike prompts that push learners to self- repair, recasts provide them with positive evidence and by doing so learners' attention would be drawn to the demands of the task at hand.

The findings of the present study also sit well with Nicholas et al. (2001) in that they argued that the effectiveness of recasts depends on the overall communicative orientation of a given instructional setting, with effectiveness increasing in more form-focused classroom and decreasing in more meaning-focused classrooms. The high frequency of recasts can be justified in the argument of Nicholas et al. (2001). Deeply rooted in focus on forms approach to language learning, Iranians foreign language instruction is strongly form-focused rather than meaning-oriented one.

It is by no means evident that in Iranian foreign language setting when learners are provided with interactional or corrective feedback by the teacher, most of the time, their attention are drawn on the form of the utterances rather than some aspects of meaning. That is to say, in their language learning setting, they perceive that teachers tell that there is something wrong with the form rather than having something to do with the message to be understood. We would like to suggest that factors such as language teaching system orientation as suggested by Sheen (2004) may have effect on the frequency of feedback type by the teachers and perceiving those feedbacks as corrective by the learners. One of the justifications of high frequency of recasts in this study is the inclination of teachers no to interrupt learners with their L2 production and leaving floor left to them to continue to talk and at the same time proving them with the corrective feedback. Comparing the frequency of recasts in simple task (55%) with that of complex task (75. 73%), it can be concluded that when task complexity, defined as "the result of attentional, memory, reasoning, and other information processing demands imposed by the structure of the task to the language learner (Robinson, 2001b), is higher, learners are under online pressure to attend to some aspects of accuracy, fluency, and complexity of their utterances. When, in turn, this happens, learners prioritize getting message across rather than attending to some aspects of

language form. On the other hand, teachers show concern over language accuracy. One of the best interactional feedbacks that teachers can employ in this situation, among many others, is recasting learners' erroneous utterances.

Back to our second research question that asked what was the distribution of uptake following different types of feedback (e.g. prompts vs. recasts) in simple and complex task, it can be summarize that the percentage of recasts led to uptake was 38% that is sharp contrast with prompts (17%). This finding is in contrast with the finding of Lyster and Ranta (1997). It can be said that because of the orientation of the language teaching setting that is strongly form-focused, learners confronting with teacher interactional feedback lean towards the form of the language rather than some aspects of meaning or communication purpose.

The greatest proportion of uptake followed reacts in both tasks (57%, 67% for simple and complex task respectively). as it was discussed a number of factors may contribute to this high frequency of uptake following recasts. First of all is the inclination of students, in Iranian language teaching setting, to focus on some formal properties of L2 production. Secondly, teachers in Iranian foreign language learning setting have propensity to prioritize accuracy over fluency which in turn make both learner and teachers oversensitive to accuracy and giving immediate feedback to learners after their erogenous utterances. Another factor at work may be comes from the fact that most of the interactional feedbacks given by teachers in the current study in the form of "short recasts". This may lend countenance to the claim that short recasts have high possibility of noticing as corrective feedback and giving rise to "successful uptake". Example (1) which obtained from the data collected for the present study illustrates this:

Example (1):

L: …..then I go to second level.

T: second **floor**?

L: Yeah, second floor.

In the example given, the student immediately notices the mismatch between his utterance and teacher's one then tries to repair his utterance.

Considering the fact that overall successful uptake following prompts is higher in complex task, it can be justified based on the research findings with respect to task complexity. As the complexity of a task is raised, the accuracy and complexity of learners' utterances will be enhances. As learners attempt to satisfy the demands of the specific task, their utterances become more vivid in terms of lexicalization (hence, linguistic complexity0 and more accurate with respect to grammaticality. Notwithstanding, task complexity push learners to use developmentally late structures beyond learners' current level of proficiency and their utterances tend to be problematic syntactically. Incidentally, teachers would like to provide learners with corrective feedback. Consequently, both the rate of corrective feedback and learner uptake would be high in complex task.

Conclusion

It is worth emphasizing that the findings of the present study are suggestive and caution should be exercised with respect to generalizing them. We would like to suggest that much classroom and longitudinal research is needed to explore the delayed effects of recasts and prompts in L2 development both in meaning-oriented and form- focused classrooms. Of much interest for SLA researchers and language teachers should be the investigating the frequency of recasts vs. prompts across task types (open vs. closed tasks), task conditions (one way vs. two ways).

References

Albert, A., & Kormos, J. (2004). Creativity and narrative task performance: An explanatory study. *Language learning*, 54(2), 227-310.

Allwright, D. (1984). Why don't learners learn what the teachers teach? The interaction hypothesis. In D. Singleton & D. Little (Eds.). *Language learning in formal and informal contexts (pp.3-18)*. Dublin, Ireland: IRAAL.

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One Size Fits All: recasts, prompts, and l2 learning. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 543-574.

Braidi, S. M. (2002). Re-examining the role of recasts in native-speaker/ nonnative-speaker interactions. *Language learning*, 52, 1-42.

Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M. (2001). 'Introduction' in M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & Swain, M. (Eds.). *Researching Pedagogic Tasks, Second Language learning, Teaching and Testing*. Harlow: Longman.

Crabbe, D. (2007). Learning opportunities: adding learning value to tasks. *ELT Journal*, 61(2), 117-125.

Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinning of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.). *Cognition and second language instruction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Doughty, C., & Williams. J. (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Egi, T. (2007). Interpreting Recasts as Linguistic Evidence: The Role of Linguistic Target, Length, and Degree of change. *Studies in Second language acquisition*, 29, 511-537.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language teaching and learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001a). Learner uptake in communicative ESL Lessons. *Language Learning*, 51, 281-326.

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

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

Ellis, R., & Sheen,Y. (2006). Re-examining the role of recasts in L2 acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 575-600.

Gilabert, R. (2007). Effects of manipulating task complexity on self-repair during L2 oral production. *IRAL* (45), 215-240.

Han, Z. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on test consistency in L2 output. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 543-572.

Hardy, I & Moore, J. (2004). Foreign language student's conversational negotiations in different task environments. *Applied Linguistics*, 25, 340-370.

Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in Task-based interactions: Differential Effects on L2 development, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 1-36.

Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and second language development: beyond negative evidence. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 37-63.

Loewen, S. (2004). Uptake in incidental Focus on form in meaning-focused ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 54, 153-188.

Loewen, S. (2005). Incidental focus on form and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 361-386.

Loewen, S., & Philip, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult English L2 Classroom: Characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *Modern Language Journal*, 90, 536-556.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie& T. K. Bhatia (Eds.). *Handbook of second language acquisition*. (pp.413-463). San Diego; Academic Press.

Long, M. (2007). Recasts in SLA: The story so far. In M. Long (Ed.), *Problems in SLA*, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Long, M. H, Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 357-371.

Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). 'Focus on form: theory, research, and practice' in C. Doughty and Williams, J. (Eds.). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. (pp. 15-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyster, R. (1998a). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48, 183-218.

Lyster, R. (1998b). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studie*s *in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 51-81.

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 399-432.

Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in second Language Studies*, 28, 269-300.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). 'Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.

Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction and second language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 21:557-587.

Mackey, A. & J. Philips. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herring*? Modern Language Journal*, 82, 338-356.

Mackey, A., Oliver, R., & J. Leeman (2003). Interactional input and the incorporation of feedback: An exploration of NS-NNS and NNS- NNS adult and child dyads. *Language Learning*, 53, 35-66.

McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (2003). *Second language learning theories*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Nabei, T. (2002). *Recasts in classroom interaction: A teacher's intention, Learner's Attention, and Second Language Learning*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Canada.

Nassaji, H. (2007). Elicitation and reformulation and their relationship with learner repair in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning*, 57(4), 511-548.

Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P., and Spada, N. (2001). 'Recasts as feedback to language learners'. *Language Learning*, 51, 719-758.

Philip, J., Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2006). The impact of planning time on children's task-based interactions. *System*, 34, 574-565.

Philip, J., Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2002) *Task-based syllabi*. Paper presented at AILA conference 16-21 December, 2002. Singapore.

Robinson, P. (1995a). Task complexity and second language narrative discourse. *Language learning*, 45, 99-140.

Robinson, P. (1995b). Attention, memory and the "noticing" hypothesis. *Language Learning*. 45, 283-331.

Robinson, P. (2001a). Task complexity, cognitive resources, and syllabus design: A triadic framework for investigating task influences on SLA. In *Cognition and second language instruction*, P. Robinson (Ed.), 287-318. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. (2001b). Task complexity, task difficulty and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 27-57.

Robinson, P. (2003b). The cognition hypothesis, task design and adult task-based second language learning. *Second language studies*. 21(2), 45-105.

Robinson, P. (2005a). Cognitive complexity and task sequencing: A review of studies in a componential framework for second language task design.

International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching. 43(1), 1-33.

Robinson, P. (2007a). Criteria for grading and sequencing pedagogic tasks. In *investigating tasks in formal language learning*, Maria del Pilar Garcia Mayo (Ed.), 2-27. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Robinson, P. (2007c). Task complexity, theory of mind, and intentional reasoning: Effects on L2 speech production, interaction, uptake and perceptions of task difficulty. *IRAL*, 193-213.

Robinson, P. and R, Gilabert. (2007). Task complexity, the cognition hypothesis and second language learning and performance. *IRAL* 45, 161-176.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistic*s, 11, 17-46.

Schmidt, R. (2001). 'Attention" in P. Robinson (Ed.): *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(4). 361-392.

Smith, B. (2005). The relationship between negotiated interactions, learner uptake, and lexical acquisition in task-based computer mediated communication. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(1), 33-58.

Swain, M. (1985). 'Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensive input and comprehensive output in its development' In S. Gass and C. Madden (Eds), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp.235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language. In H.G. Widdowson, G.Cook & B. Seidlhofer (eds.), *Principles and Practice in applied linguistics*: studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson (pp.125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. and S. Lapkin (1995). Problems in output and cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*. 16(3), 371-391.

van den Branden, K. (2006). *Task-based language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

van Patten, B. (1990). 'Attending to form and content in the input'. *Studies in second language* acquisition. 12: 287-301.

Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.