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Abstract

This paper examines the distribution of corrective feedback in the Swedish EFL classroom, and the relationship between the context of teacher-student exchanges and the provision of feedback. Corrective feedback was categorized in six types as being ‘recasts’, ‘explicit feedback’, ‘repetition’, ‘elicitation’, ‘metalinguistic feedback’, and ‘clarification requests’. In parts of this study, the latter four types were classed together as ‘prompts’ because they aim at pushing the students to say the correct forms of language. Student exchanges were defined in four ways: content, communication, management, and explicit language-focused exchanges. The results show the number of moves per category of corrective feedback type used by each of the teachers, the overall number of feedback moves per context, and even the overall number of feedback moves provided by each teacher in each context. The findings indicated that recasts yielded the highest number of feedback moves. Recasts were also the favored feedback type provided by the teachers. However, when recasts were compared to prompts, prompts were used often by teachers, and thus suggesting that at least two of the teachers usually pushed their students to say the correct form. The findings also indicated that explicit language-focused exchanges yielded the highest number of feedback moves, whereas management exchanges had the fewest. In conclusion, this study suggests that context plays a role in the provision of corrective feedback, and teachers appear to favor recasts over any other single feedback type. The findings also confirmed that similar results which have been found in other cultural and educational contexts can be yielded in the Swedish EFL classroom.

Keywords: form-focused negotiation, meaning-focused negotiation, corrective feedback.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction

In English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms in Sweden, conversations between teachers and students give rise to opportunities for language development in the areas of grammaticality and communicative meaning. In these cases the participants, usually the teachers, provide cues to indicate that either a misunderstanding in communication has occurred or an erroneous word or phrase has been used by the learner. Some of these linguistic cues or strategies are referred to as negative evidence or corrective feedback in SLA discourse, and they are claimed to be facilitative of L2 development (Long 1996), and usually occur during a process called negotiation. Negotiation serves either as a means to elucidate a failure of comprehension or as a means to draw attention to and clarify grammatical forms (Gass 1997: 107). Thus, the presence of corrective feedback during interaction in the classroom may play a significant role for L2 acquisition and should be a significant area of interest for EFL teachers. Because of my background as a teacher and teacher-student, the provision of corrective feedback in the classroom setting is of particular interest.

The primary aim of this study is to investigate the provision of corrective feedback in the Swedish EFL classroom. The contexts in which feedback is provided will also be analyzed. Given the differences in the contexts of language learning and school culture between Sweden and the environments in which most research has been carried out, the question whether the Swedish EFL classroom will yield similar results as previous studies deserves investigation. This study also explored similarities and differences pertaining to the provision of feedback between the teachers.

The next section briefly describes the terms corrective feedback, negotiation, meaning-focused negotiation and form-focused negotiation.

1.2. Corrective Feedback and the Foci of Negotiation

Corrective feedback can be explained by the term negative evidence, which Susan Gass (2003) roughly defines as implicit or explicit information afforded learners regarding their erroneous utterances. The information provided, in other words, is either directly or indirectly stating that something is wrong with the learner’s utterance. These indications of
incorrectness can be classified according to six different types of corrective feedback: ‘explicit feedback’, ‘recasts’, ‘clarification requests’, ‘repetition’, ‘elicitation’, and ‘metalinguistic feedback’, of which the latter five types are implicit in nature (Lyster & Ranta 1997). These six approaches, which are explained in detail in section 3.3.2 and are referred to as moves when employed, occur during interaction or negotiation.

Negotiation refers to an oral exchange in which the flow of communication has been interrupted by a misunderstanding which the speakers involved attempt to resolve (Gass 1997: 107). These attempts to correct the flow of communication can entail a focus on linguistic form and/or a focus on meaning. These will be referred to as form-focused negotiation and meaning-focused negotiation, respectively.

Meaning-focused negotiation, which occurs in naturalistic and instructional settings, is the process in which second language learners and competent speakers impart information during conversation about their respective levels of comprehension, and therefore giving rise to adjustments in speech that lead to an acceptable level of comprehension (Long 1996: 418). A linguistic adjustment, i.e. a clarification request, in a meaning-based conversation is illustrated in the following example:

(1) NNS: Here’s your check, mam.

NS: Pardon me? (Clarification request)

NNS: Here’s your check, mam.

Example one illustrates that the native speaker (NS) elicits the repetition of the initial response by employing a clarification request, and therefore receives the answer from the non-native speaker (NNS). This example shows that there was a breakdown in communication, and then the repair was initiated by a clarification request by the NS in an attempt to negotiate meaning than form. The above exchange is meant to resemble an interaction in a naturalistic environment, but meaning-focused negotiation can also take place in an instructional setting. Meaning-focused negotiation that takes place in the instructional setting may simultaneously involve form-focused negotiation or corrective feedback.

Form-focused negotiation directs attention to the linguistic forms of a learner’s utterance. It is believed that the learner needs to be aware of the targeted linguistic feature in order for
acquisition to take place, but this is done most effectively when attention is directed to both form and meaning (Long 1996: 429). In the instructional setting, form-focused negotiation, according to Long (1996), incidentally occurs during meaning-focused contexts. When form-focused negotiation occurs the competent speaker draws attention to linguistic forms by employing different types of corrective feedback. These corrective feedback types draw attention to the linguistic forms by using either one of the six approaches mentioned above (Lyster & Ranta 1997).

However, the extent to which these different types of feedback target form may differ, and thus not all perspectives within the SLA field classify all of them as negotiation of form. Lyster and Ranta (ctd. in Lyster 2002: 243) classified only clarification requests, repetition, elicitation, and metalinguistic feedback as negotiation of form because these specific types of feedback aim at eliciting the correct form from the student. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), these feedback types push students to notice and attempt to say the targeted form, and therefore students may be more likely to repair their erroneous utterances. Because of this unique feature, Lyster and Ranta (ctd. in Lyster 2002) classified these feedback types as ‘prompts’. Furthermore, Lyster and Ranta discovered that prompts were used although the teachers understood, i.e. they pretended not to understand in order to draw attention to the incorrect forms used. On the other hand, recasts and explicit feedback, which provide the student with the correct form, do not press a learner to self-correct and were therefore classified differently (Lyster 2002: 247). Firstly, although others may see explicit feedback as a type of form-focused negotiation (Lyster 2002, reference to other studies: Doughty 1999; Ellis 2001), it does not fall in the category of negotiation of form because it does not require the student to self-repair, according to Lyster (2002). Secondly, Lyster points out that recasts are initially used during meaning-focused negotiation, in the respect that recasts help prevent breakdowns in communication which allow the flow of the communication to continue. According to Lyster, the problem is that the implicit nature of recasts usually makes them non-salient, i.e. the targeted linguistic form goes unnoticed, and therefore uptake is not likely. However, Long (2007) asserts that recasts work differently when applied to certain types of linguistic forms, that is better in some cases and worse in others. For the better cases, salience is higher, and therefore Long (1996) classifies recasts as having a focus on form. Additionally, according to Long, recasts give vital information regarding the form of an utterance during conversation, especially when the learner attends to the information, and
when the learner understands the contextual meaning to some extent. Such a process facilitates what Long calls form-function mapping\(^1\). The next paragraph explains this facilitative process applied to implicit feedback in general.

Long (1996) posits that implicit corrective feedback (recasts and prompts) that occurs immediately following a learner’s erroneous utterance is an effective tool because the learner may be assessing if the message was understood, and thus await the more competent speaker’s reaction. Furthermore, since the meaning of the conversational exchange may be understood by the learner during the provision of feedback, this might free attentional space for the learner to focus on the linguistic features of the newly provided utterance, and therefore the learner would realize that a correction has occurred (Long, 1996: 429).

Similarly, and as a potential positive consequence of the aforementioned hypothesis, Gass (2003) postulates that negotiation may make learners aware of their ill-formed utterances and this may thus encourage them to modify their output in an attempt to self-repair, so that the process of negotiation enhances L2 knowledge.

However, Gass also adds that the long term effects of language modifications, as in the provision of feedback, are ambiguous. Similarly, Braidi (ctd. in Mitchell & and Myles 1998: 133) argues that researchers who advocate an interactionalist perspective may be neglecting the role of Universal Grammar\(^2\) which independently affects the development of a second language grammatical system. Nonetheless, the assumption that negotiation, and the corrective feedback that may be provided during negotiation, may be facilitative of L2 linguistic forms and meaning is a crucial part of Long's (1996) Interactional Hypothesis:

 Negative feedback obtained during negotiation work or elsewhere may be facilitative of L2 development, at least for vocabulary, morphology, and language-specific syntax, and essential for learning certain specifiable L1-L2 contrasts (Long 1996: 414).

This notion has been a catalyst to numerous studies some of which the next section will review.

\(^1\) An approach that posits that “Grammaticalization is driven by communicative need and use and is related to the development of more efficient cognitive processing (e.g. via automatization) as part of language learning (Saville-Troike 2007: 58).

\(^2\) “Innate linguistic knowledge which, it is hypothesized, consists of a set of principles common to all languages. This approach is associated with Chomsky’s theory of language acquisition” (Lightbown & Spada 2006: 205).
1.3. Previous Studies

The following is a review of three relevant studies that have investigated the occurrence of corrective feedback in the L2 classroom or the role of context during the provision of feedback.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) investigated the distribution of six types of interactional corrective feedback and learner uptake in four French immersion classrooms instructed by four different teachers in a Montreal primary school (grades 4-5). Uptake, here, refers to a learner’s response to feedback, usually resulting in a reformulated version of his/her incorrect utterance, which this study will not examine. Their findings revealed that recasts had the highest incidence of all feedback types, whereas the other types did not occur as frequently. This suggested that the teachers had a tendency to employ recasts.

Regarding the role of feedback in student uptake the findings revealed that recasts were not effective. Similarly, however somewhat more successful, explicit feedback generated uptake only 50% of the time. However, elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback and repetition produced substantial frequencies. More interestingly, the findings revealed the latter types resulted in student-generated repair. Since recasts did not push learners to self-correct, and generally seemed nonsalient, they were deemed ineffective.

Similarly, Lyster and Mori (2006) investigated, among other things, the distribution of feedback in two different classroom settings: Japanese immersion and French immersion. The former immersion classes (grades 4-5) were from an elementary school in the United States, where instruction was 50% in English and 50% in Japanese. The latter classes were from French immersion classes in a Montreal elementary school. The findings revealed again that recasts were the favored type of feedback.

Oliver and Mackay (2003) investigated the relationship between classroom context, the provision of feedback, and modified output, which is similar to uptake, in Australian ESL classes. The instructional contexts were operationalized in four different categories, which are used later in this study: content exchanges, management exchanges, communicative exchanges, and explicit language-focused exchanges. Oliver and Mackay showed that there may be a link between instructional context, frequency of feedback moves, and modified output. The findings showed that the teachers in question had a predisposition to employ
feedback moves most often during explicit language-focused contexts, and least often during management contexts. Content contexts yielded the second highest number of feedback moves.

2. The Aims, Research Questions, and Hypotheses.

In reference to the previous studies done in the area, it does not appear that studies similar to them have been done in the Swedish EFL environment. Since the linguistic, cultural, and educational environments in Sweden, generally speaking, are unlike other countries, it would be interesting to find out if the findings of the current study correspond to or contradict previous studies’ findings in this area.

This qualitative study aims to investigate the provision of corrective feedback employed by three EFL teachers, and the relationship between the instructional context and the provision of feedback. Accordingly, the objective of this study is to identify corrective feedback, coded as explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, repetition, elicitation and metalinguistic feedback (see below), in some Swedish EFL classrooms. In parts of this study, the latter four feedback types will also be classified as prompts since they share the common feature of drawing out the targeted linguistic feature during form-focused negotiation. Additionally, an exploratory focus has been added regarding similarities and differences between the teachers in the provision of feedback. It is important to note that three-case studies do not have any basis for generalization with reference to teacher behavior.

Based on the hypothesis that corrective feedback facilitates L2 development, I therefore put forth the following research questions and hypotheses:

1. What is the distribution among types of the total amount of corrective feedback moves provided by the participants in this study?
   Hypothesis: The total number of recasts will be higher than any other feedback type, as in previous studies.

2. In which classroom-discourse contexts do these instances of corrective feedback occur?
   Hypothesis: Corrective feedback will predominantly occur during explicit language-focused contexts.
3. Are teachers uniform in terms of type and number of corrective feedback?

   **Hypothesis:** The native speaking teacher will have the greatest number of feedback moves and will utilize the six feedback types during instruction.

The following sections will present the methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. In the discussion, all three research questions and hypotheses will be addressed in regard to previous findings where suitable. Also, the implications of the results for teaching EFL will be drawn.

3. **Methods and Material**

3.1. Participants

Four classes in a public Swedish junior high school and three classes in a public bilingual junior high school were selected for data collection. The former classes, comprised two seventh grade classes and two eighth grade classes, were instructed by their respective qualified EFL teachers, who both have Swedish as their L1. Teacher 1 (T1) has been teaching eight years and Teacher 2 (T2), two and a half years actively. Their classes each contain between 25-30 Swedish L1 students, whose proficiency levels range from high novice to high intermediate EFL learners according to the teachers. Furthermore, the student body is essentially native Swedish.

The latter classes, comprised two eighth grade classes and one ninth grade class, are both instructed by a native English speaker from England, who will be referred to as Teacher 3 (T3), and who is both a qualified geography teacher of 12 years (issued in England) and a qualified TEFL (Teaching English as a foreign language) teacher of 10 years. Two of the three classes contain approximately 27 students each, whereas the third class has approximately 16. The students’ national origins are diverse, and therefore they may have an additional language, other than Swedish, as their home language. Students’ proficiency levels range from higher beginner to advanced, according to the teacher. Moreover, the majority of instruction in the school is in English. The instructional setting is similar to immersion settings, and therefore T3's classes will be referred to as EFL/EAL in examples of transcribed conversation. EAL is an acronym for English as an additional language.
3.2. Procedure and Data

The data comprised 6.5 hours (390 minutes) of tape-recorded classroom talk from 9 EFL lessons, 3 lessons per teacher. The data was distributed as follows: T1 = 145 min., T2 = 105 min., and T3 = 140 min. Approximately 20 minutes were omitted from one of T2’s lessons accounting for the relatively short amount of lesson minutes in the data.

The methods used for data retrieval were observation accompanied by an observational scheme and audio-recording (a MP3-player donned as a necklace by the teachers). The moments of identifiable corrective feedback were transcribed and commented on by hand, thus facilitating the process of locating the recorded instances of corrective feedback. It is important to note that the instances of corrective feedback were not pre-planned.

The teachers in question were informed regarding the nature of the research for this study. This seemed not to affect the outcome since two of the three teachers expressed regret regarding the lack of substantial instances during their lessons; however, the results demonstrated the contrary: corrective feedback was present.

Prior to the data collecting, a pilot study involving observation and tape-recording during three lessons was carried out. The results revealed that (1) tape-recording is not fully reliable to retrieve audible episodes, and therefore (2) observation is a significant complementary method for a more accurate data collection. Conversely, observing was not completely reliable, in particular when the classroom environment was inundated by chatter and other noises. Due to these drawbacks some instances of feedback may have been accounted for, and therefore not revealing the true number of instances.

3.3. Data Coding and analysis

The following data analysis is based on the previous descriptive study done by Lyster and Ranta (1997). Some of the details in the defined categories have been altered to correlate to the data characteristics found during the collection of data in this study.
3.3.1. Error

All student-teacher exchanges were analyzed in order to detect erroneous utterances. Firstly, student-teacher exchanges were defined as exchanges with at least one word in each of the participants’ utterances. Secondly, an utterance was classified as erroneous if it contained at least one error. If more than one error was present in that particular error, each error was categorized as a single instance of feedback as long as the error was followed by corrective feedback. Lyster and Ranta classed these errors as multiple, however, their definition regarding this aspect was not explicit, and therefore it was modified. Example 2 shows two recasts provided to a double error of the word Turkey:

(2) (T1-EFL- March 5th)
T1: X, do you know any flag?
S1: /ˈtɜːrkəli/ (Phonological and grammatical error)
T1: Turkey, which one is that? (Recast 1)
S1: Eller de är Schweiz – jag vet inte! (L1 error)
T1: Is it a Turkish (2 sec.) Turkish flag or Swiss flag? (Recast 2)

Unlike Lyster and Ranta, instances of error not followed by corrective feedback were eliminated from data statistics since this study was not interested in the comparison of non-corrected to corrected utterances, but the presence and distribution of corrective feedback.

Errors were identified as grammatical, lexical, phonological, or L1. Any L1 use discouraged by the teacher and followed by a feedback move was admitted into this study as error. Example 2 contains L1 error and the following example illustrates a phonological error:

(3) (T1-EFL- March 5th)
S: On the /maʊf/. (Phonological error)
T: Yeah, on the mouth. (Recast)

---

3 International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). Used only for phonological errors in this study.
During the lessons, the teachers sometimes checked their students’ written assignments while walking around the classroom, and therefore the teachers were able to interact orally regarding their students’ errors. Certain exchanges were accompanied by a student’s ill-formed utterance and followed by corrective feedback and were thus included in the data; however, other exchanges were triggered solely by written errors, i.e. no student utterance, and followed by a provision of feedback. These were omitted as errors, and thus as instances of feedback.

3.3.2. Corrective feedback

The corrective feedback moves were classified in six separate categories in accordance to Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) data analysis. Adaptations have been made according to the characteristics of the data.

1. *Explicit correction* referred to the teacher’s direct indication that an utterance was incorrect, and then concurrently provided the correct form or explanation. For instance:

   (4) (T3-(EFL/EAL-March 10th))
   
   S: ‘A counter’ är att räkna, va? (L1/lexical error)
   
   T3: No, a counter is this, where, you know, where you buy your cheese or fish or meat. (Explicit Feedback)

2. *Recasts* involved the teacher following up a student’s utterance with a repetition which corrected the erroneous part of the utterance.

   (5) (T2-EFL-March 20th)
   
   S: Återberätta. (L1 error)
   
   T2: Retell it, yes. (Recast)

   (6) (T3-EFL/EAL-March 10th)
   
   T2: …what did you do yesterday? What did you do?
   
   S: Nothing. I watch TV (Grammatical error)
   
   T2: Okay, you watched TV. (Recast)
3. **Clarification requests** pointed out to the student that their utterance was either erroneous, in some matter or form, or incomplete and thus needed some sort of elaboration in order to be understood in the context. Inaudible utterances treated by this method, which were perceived as intentional mumbling and/or uncertainty, were included in the data (contra Lyster & Ranta). Clarification requests generally include the phrases ‘Pardon,’ ‘I don’t understand’ or ‘Excuse me.’ In this study, clarification requests, however, consisted only of the phase ‘Sorry’ and ‘I don’t understand.’ For instance:

(7) (T3- EFL- March 10th)

T3: X, what did you do yesterday?
S: Watching some movies (Grammatical error).
T3: Sorry? (Clarification request)

4. **Metalinguistic feedback** addresses the well-formedness of the student’s utterance by supplying comments, information or questions so as to elicit the correct form from the student. Metalinguistic comments indicate that there is an error present such as, ‘Do you see your error?’, ‘Do you know what’s wrong?’ or ‘No, it’s wrong.’ By doing so the teacher attempts to draw out the correct form from the student. The following illustrates metalinguistic feedback:

(8) (T1- ELF- March 5th)

T1: Vad heter ‘långfredag’ på engelska? (How do you say ‘långfredag’ in English?)
S1: Long Friday. (Lexical error)
T1: No. (Metalinguistic feedback)

5. **Elicitation** refers to the teacher directly questioning the student in order to get the correct form. For instance the teacher may ask questions such as ‘How do you say $x$ in English?’ Also, a teacher may ask for the completion of his/her own utterance as below:

(9) (T3-EFL/EAL- March 10th)

S: I were at the cinema. (Grammatical error)
T2: I... (Elicitation)
S: I was at the cinema.

Thirdly, teachers asked students to correctly rephrase their erroneous utterances. For example:

(10) (T1-EFL- March 6th)
   S: S-O-[inaudible]-L (Error)
   T1: Once again, please. I didn’t hear you. (Elicitation)

6. Repetition occurred when the teacher repeated the student’s erroneous utterance.
Generally, the teacher emphasized the error by adjusting his/her intonation. For instance:

(11) (T1- EFL- March 6th)
   S: Jag sa, who’s the tallest /twodl/? (Phonological error)
   T1: Who’s the tallest /wodl/? (Repetition omitting the t-phoneme)

Additionally, if an error was treated by more than one type of feedback during a teacher-student exchange, each instance was counted and included in the data. Lyster and Ranta’s category was more complex regarding this aspect of their coding system.

Naturally, this coding system had its problems. Firstly, teacher responses that involved multiple feedback types were easily overlooked, and thus closer scrutiny was needed. Secondly, some clarification requests were employed due to excessive noise. These were duly discarded since the problem was environmental in nature, as opposed to a misunderstanding or ill-formed utterance.

3.3.3. The Contexts

The following coding system is based on the Communicative Orientation to Language Teaching (COLT) used by Oliver and Mackay (2003). The following four contexts were defined in order to analyze various episodes of teacher-student exchanges. Some alterations were made due to definitional ambiguities.
1. **Content exchanges** were teacher-student interactions in which the teacher conveyed information or asked questions regarding the content of a particular subject or curriculum. In this study, content exchanges usually entailed questions or information related to the students’ textbook passages. This category did not appear in Mackay and Oliver’s description.

   (12) (T1- EFL- March 5)
   
   T1: Vad heter det (flintskalig) på engelska? (How do you say it (bald) in English?)
   S: /boold/. (Phonological error)
   
   T1: Vad heter det? (Elicitation)

2. **Management exchanges** comprised episodes of classroom management such as instructions during the opening of a lesson, at the start of a new phase, or during the closing of a lesson; furthermore, exchanges that addressed behavior, attendance, organization or movement were included in this category. For instance:

   (13) (T3- EFL- March 20th)
   
   S: If you already gone over, reading the [inaudible] kind of text, ah [inaudible].
   T3: Sorry, one more time. (Clarification)

3. **Communication exchanges** refer to exchanges in which the teacher engaged students in discussions regarding opinions, thoughts, beliefs, or topics of common interest, i.e., according to Oliver and Mackay (2003), in meaningful ways. In addition, discussions of writing assignments, in which students created their own stories, were included since student production can be interpreted as a way to engage students in the use of their L2 in a meaningful way. These exchanges were especially typified by the student discussing the topic and/or asking questions about their L2 usage (contra Oliver and Mackay). Example 3 above illustrates a communication exchange.

4. **Explicit language-focused exchanges** occurred when the focus was on explicit grammar usage and language structure. In this study, these contexts were typified by the teacher instructing grammar as the theme of the lesson. Example 9 above illustrates an explicit language-focused exchange.
It is important to note that the exchanges were classified according to my perceptions and intuition. Unlike Oliver and Mackay, I did not ask the teachers what their intentions were during the exchanges. Therefore, there was no form of validation applied which could have provided support, or lack thereof, for the analyses done in this study.

4. Results

4.1. Corrective Feedback

Figure 1 illustrates the total distribution of feedback types provided by all three teachers. It reflects both the number and percentage of distributed instances of feedback.

![Figure 1. Distribution of feedback types (n=66)](image)

Out of 66 feedback moves, recasts were the predominant type of feedback representing 48% (n=32) of the provided instances of feedback. As displayed, elicitation was the next most provided type of feedback encompassing 27% (n=18) of the moves. Thereafter, the remaining types each represented relatively small proportions, of which clarification requests were the least employed type with 3% = 2 instances.
Figure 2 reflects the percentage and number of feedback types after merging elicitation, clarification requests, repetition, metalinguistic feedback into the category ‘prompts’. Since these four types of feedback press students to self-repair, it was thought that the results would reflect a more accurate depiction of form-focused negotiation, according to Lyster and Ranta’s definition, by merging these types of feedback.

The distribution of feedback types therefore looked quite different. Of the total distribution of feedback types, prompts comprised 47% (n=31), illustrating the small differential (1%) between the provision of recasts and prompts. In addition, this figure shows the large degree of difference between the provision of explicit feedback, comprising only 5% of the feedback provided, and the corresponding categories.

Figure 2. Percentage distribution of feedback types (recasts, prompts, explicit feedback).
4.2. Corrective Feedback provided by the Teachers

Figure 3 illustrates the number of feedback moves employed by each of the three teachers and shows a clear difference between the provision of feedback moves by each respective teacher.

T1 provided more than half of all feedback moves: 36 moves (55%); whereas T2 supplied only 4 moves (6%) in total. The native English speaking teacher, T3, provided the next highest number of feedback moves: 26 moves (39%).
Figure 4 shows a breakdown of the number of feedback types provided by each teacher. Recasts were the most favored type of feedback provided by each teacher, whereas metalinguistic feedback and clarification requests, used by one of the three teachers (T1), were the least favored of all types.

![Figure 4](image.png)

Figure 4. Number of feedback moves provided by each teacher per category. First, the categories ‘recasts’, ‘explicit feedback’, and ‘prompts’ are shown, and then the category ‘prompts’ is represented as individual feedback types.

Elicitation moves were the next most provided type followed by repetition. Both T1 and T2 had the same order of utilization in respect to recasts, elicitiation, and repetition. Furthermore, T1 was the only teacher to utilize all of the feedback types, whereas T3 utilized four during instruction.
Table 1. Number and percentage of moves per feedback type provided by each teacher. First, the categories ‘recasts’, ‘explicit feedback’, and ‘prompts’ are shown, and then the category ‘prompts’ is represented as individual feedback types.

When using recasts, explicit feedback and prompts as the only classifications, prompts represented the majority of T1’s overall feedback moves, and 42% of T3’s overall feedback moves, as seen in Table 1, which reflects the same data as figure 4 with the percentage of feedback moves per feedback type provided by each teacher included. Consequently, these findings indicated that these teachers attempted to draw out the correct responses from their students frequently.

The low number of feedback moves provided by T2 during 105 minutes of lesson time will be explained in section 4.4.

4.3. Corrective Feedback and Contexts

Figure 5 displays the percentage and number of feedback moves distributed over the four contexts: content, management, communication and explicit language-focused. As illustrated, the contexts all involved feedback moves. Explicit language-focused contexts accounted for the majority of provided feedback and thus covering for 38% of the total. Content and communication contained a similar quantity of feedback moves, 26% and 23% respectively; even though management generally took up a substantial amount of time, it was the least likely context in which teachers provided feedback.
Figure 5. Feedback moves in percent distributed over the four contexts (n=66=100%).

Figure 6 shows the quantity of feedback moves provided by each teacher in each of the four contexts: content, management, communication and explicit language-focused.

Figure 6. Number of feedback moves provided by each teacher per context.
Here, the chart shows that T1 and T3 employed feedback moves in all of their instructional contexts: there were no content exchanges present during T3’s lessons, explaining the absence of feedback in this category. In addition, Figure 6 displays that T3 provided the bulk of feedback moves during explicit language-focused exchanges, whereas the majority of T1’s moves were employed during content exchanges. Communication exchanges were the second favored context in which feedback was provided by T1 and T3.

Figure 7 displays the relationship between contexts and feedback types (recasts, prompts and explicit feedback). As it can be seen, all three categories of feedback types were represented in the explicit language-focused context.

![Figure 7. Total number of corrective feedback types per context](image-url)
Furthermore, Table 2 which reflects the same data as Figure 7, but in percentage form, shows that the explicit language-focused context generated the highest percentage of moves per feedback category: recasts and prompts produced 41% and 32%, respectively. Explicit feedback moves were not deemed relevant in this comparative analysis because of their low number of occurrence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recasts</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
<td>8 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>8 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Language-focus</td>
<td>13 (41%)</td>
<td>10 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32 (100%)</td>
<td>31 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Percentage and total number of corrective feedback types per context.

Prompts represented the largest number of moves both in the management and the communication contexts as illustrated in Figure 7; however, the difference was small between the respective feedback categories in the communication context. Prompts also represented almost half of the feedback moves provided in the content context.

4.4. Informal Interview with T2

During an informal talk with the teacher in question, T2 was informed of the provisional analysis. T2 was told firstly that feedback seemed rarely to be provided, and secondly, that Swedish had been used often during the recorded negotiation. Furthermore, it was emphasized that one lesson which had approximately 24 student-teacher exchanges was solely in Swedish. There was one exchange that commenced in English which switched shortly thereafter to Swedish.

T2 expressed the students’ proficiency levels regarding listening comprehension were poor, and so argued that L1 use was facilitative of overall comprehension in the classroom. Furthermore, T2 expressed that Swedish was essential for and facilitative of grammar development, i.e. information pertaining to grammar rules was communicated and discussed more easily in Swedish. Also, T2 sensed that the presence of the MP-3 tape-recorder and the
observer influenced the overall style of teaching and therefore altered classroom behavior. Lastly, T2 expressed the view that corrective feedback could be disruptive to the flow of communication and might possibly be discouraging for the students in question since many of the students were not normally inclined to speak English.

Due to the small number of moves employed by T2, no conclusions could be drawn from the data.

5. Discussion

The first question pertained to the distribution of the total number of feedback moves provided by the participants in the three different ESL environments. Quantitatively, the findings indicated that recasts were, as expected, the most common type of feedback followed by elicitation. This was case for all three teachers. Recasts comprised the majority of feedback provisions even in the tri-categorical comparison (recasts, explicit feedback, prompts); however, T1 provided 3 more instances of prompts than recasts, 19 and 16, respectively. Still, the predominance of the provision of recasts was noticeable.

These findings therefore lead to the confirmation of my first hypothesis that the number of recasts will be higher than any other feedback type. This particular finding confirms the studies carried out in Japanese and French immersion classes (Lyster & Ranta 1997), and hence suggests that teachers may generally have a predisposition to employ recasts in foreign language classrooms, even in the Swedish EFL setting. This suggestion then evokes thoughts as why this phenomenon might be the case.

This particular phenomenon may suggest that teachers may experience recasts as an effective type of feedback. This suggestion is supported by Saxton’s (cited in Long 2007: 78; Gass & Selinker 2001: 300-1) Direct Contrast Hypothesis which posits that recasts are more effective than modeling correct linguistic form since juxtaposing the student’s ungrammatical utterance with the teacher’s grammatical utterance creates an opportunity for the student to compare and contrast the two utterances, and thus enlightening the student of the ungrammaticality of their utterance. However, since this study did not investigate teachers’ perceptions of the functionality of recasts or, for that matter, corrective feedback, this notion remains mere conjecture, but plausible.

The second question addressed how the four types of contextual exchanges influenced the number of feedback moves. The findings suggested that explicit language-focused contexts
were favorable in the provision of corrective feedback, whereas management contexts were least favorable. This result confirms the findings of Oliver and Mackay's (2003) study mentioned above in which explicit language-focused and management exchanges landed up at the opposite ends of the provided feedback spectrum. However, in the comparison of each individual teacher’s provision of feedback in each of the four contexts (Figure 6), the results partially contradicted the former conclusion: whereas management exchanges did indeed generate the least amount of feedback instances among the teachers, it was only in T3’s lessons that explicit language-focused exchanges accounted for the bulk of feedback. This was most likely due to (1) a preference to provide planned focus on form by T3, (2) the overall lack of provision by T2, and (3) the uneven distribution of contexts and errors, i.e. a minimal amount of errors decreases the opportunity for feedback in each of the teacher’s environments, thus indicating a limitation of the generalizability or validity of this particular finding. Still, on the macro-level the contexts were represented more equally than the teacher-related data. Furthermore, this study does not take into account the time allocated each context. This is mentioned since some contexts might have been allocated more time during the observational period and thus this might have influenced the outcome of, for instance, the distribution of feedback types in context. Furthermore, one context was not present during the time spent in T3’s classroom. Nevertheless, the overall contexts were represented.

Yet, looking closer at the findings the results revealed that the highest proportion of both recasts and prompts occurred in explicit-language focused exchanges (Table 2). This confirmed that explicit language-focused exchanges might give rise to a greater frequency of feedback provision.

In other words, the second hypothesis stating that corrective feedback will predominantly occur during explicit language-focused (ELF) exchanges was corroborated. Consequently, and once again, the question of why this is the fact in some studies was raised. One obvious reason is that ELF exchanges intend to lift linguistic form to the explicit level, i.e. the focus is on the form of language, and in turn, this aspect creates a forum where students may tacitly accept that feedback is inherent to the context, and thus they await and expect feedback. Similarly, teachers may be more conscious of their role as providers of feedback in these contexts and believe feedback to be an inherent feature of grammar instruction, and also expect students to await or perhaps be more tolerant as the recipients of feedback. However, again, this study did not investigate perceptions.
Furthermore, when the relationship between corrective feedback and context was analyzed (displayed in Figure 7) the findings revealed that prompts were the preferred type of feedback in both the communication exchanges and the management exchanges, and represented close to half of the feedback moves in the content exchanges. This perhaps suggests that prompts are used when the focus of communication is on meaning. Prompts appear to elicit clarifications and reformulations of utterances by drawing out learner responses by the means of phrases as “Sorry,” “Pardon” “Can you say that again” which are normal in all types of conversation; thus, the relevant contexts might comprise more conversation that was slightly more naturalistic in content. For instance, during management episodes the teacher needs to organize the class, and consequently, these episodes might have given rise to moments of miscommunication, as in examples 14 and 22 (app. A). This idea appears to be directly connected to the theory that form-focused negotiation incidentally occurs during meaning-focused negotiation (Long 1996). It seems that ungrammatical utterances can obstruct the meaning(s) of conversation, and therefore focus on form must occur for teachers to make an association between the two, i.e. to make a connection between the meanings of words and their forms in order for comprehension to occur. This notion would perhaps require more information and a theoretical framework based on the psychology of SLA.

The third question addressed similarities between the teachers in terms of type and number of corrective feedback. The findings revealed that T1 and T3 had more in common than T2 who provided a total of only four feedback moves. T1 and T3 were similar regarding their total numbers of moves in the distribution of recasts, elicitation, and repetition. However, they differed regarding (1) the overall number of feedback moves and (2) utilization, i.e. T1 utilized all six types whereas T3 did not. In conclusion, NS T3 provided fewer feedback moves and types than the NNS T1. Herein lies the answer to the third hypothesis. The NS T3 provided neither the greatest number of feedback moves nor the broadest utilization of the feedback types, therefore contradicting my hypothesis.

The question here is why this hypothesis was put forth. Mainly, since I observed a number of EFL classes in public schools around Stockholm, I discovered that NNS teachers frequently switched languages when communicative breakdowns had occurred, and also that teachers usually explained the constraints and parameters of the English language in Swedish, thus minimizing exposure to the target language. Lin and Luk (2007), in reference to NS and NNS teachers, substantiate the aforementioned by claiming that NNS users (teachers) may be more likely to resort to their L1 during negotiation, and therefore the students may not be
exposed to as much L2 use as during NS-NNS negotiation. However, this was not the case here for the NNS T1. The findings only suggest that other characteristics, than native speaker background, are at play regarding the teachers in this study. Perhaps, teaching styles, experience, and NNS teachers with native speaker linguistic behavior/attributes should be contemplated when assessing what may and may not be facilitative of L2 development (cf. Lin & Luk 2007: 186). In the light of the aforementioned ideas, the behavior of T2 can be addressed.

Briefly stated, T2 provided little feedback because there was little interaction in English, and this is probably an ineffective teaching approach (Lin & Luk 2007: 25, 186; Ellis, 1991: 117), even though it may be necessary to convey meaning and maintain social relations in the classroom as T2 suggested.

The study has some limitations not already mentioned. Firstly, the relationship between errors not treated by corrective feedback and errors treated by corrective feedback moves was not addressed. This might have shed a different light on the results, since it would have been statistically possible to calculate the probability of feedback types being used by each teacher. A more accurate picture would possibly have been conveyed. Secondly, three-case studies cannot reflect how teachers and students interact on a general level in the Swedish EFL environment.

In practice, Oliver and Mackay's (2003) coding system used for the analysis of the exchanges caused some difficulty during the labeling process, and it was therefore altered as mentioned. The descriptions were not explicit, and it was felt that interpretation was somewhat subjective. For instance, the notion of meaningful ways of communication can be applied to many more areas than the definition put forth by Oliver and Mackay. Instead of the coding system applied, a coding system based on the nature of tasks, i.e. creative writing, oral, grammar exercises etc., probably would have produced data of better validity.

6. Conclusion

This study set out to examine the provision of corrective feedback in different contexts in an endeavor to find out how the results would differ to other foreign language environments unlike the Swedish one. This study also explored similarities and differences pertaining to the provision of feedback between the teachers.
The findings corroborated the results of previous studies in respect to recasts and explicit language-focused exchanges, therefore indicating that studies which have other cultural, social and linguistic environments can yield similar findings.

The findings also suggested that the three teachers essentially behaved differently in their provision of corrective feedback. The NNS or NS status of the teachers did not appear to be a characteristic that affected the provision of feedback. Other factors beyond the scope of this study, such as teaching style(s), experience, communicative competence, and student behavior may possibly influence the behavior of teachers regarding the provision of feedback.

Further investigation into how knowledge of negotiation, teacher behavior, and instructional settings affect the provision of corrective feedback may give us a clearer picture of the aspects of SLA pedagogy which can lead to L2 acquisition or facilitation.
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8. Appendices

Appendix A: Inventory of Student-teacher exchanges containing implicit and explicit negative feedback

I. Teacher 1

Seventh Grade EFL lesson (50 min.), March 5th

(1) (Communication context)
   T1: Would you kiss your partner on the forehead? På Pannan? (Translation).
   S: Nej, på munnen, kanske. (L1 error)
   T1: In English! (Elicitation)
   S: On the /maʊʃ/. (Phonological error)
   T: Yeah, on the mouth. (Recast)

(2) (Content context)
   T1: X, do you know any flag?
   S1: /'tʃr kei/. (Phonological and grammatical error)
   T1: Turkey, which one is that? (Recast)
   S1: Eller de är Schweiz – jag vet inte! (L1 error)
   T1: Is it a …Turkish (2 sec.)Turkish flag or Swiss flag? (Recast of Schweiz and Turkey)

(3) (Content)
   T1: …X (Eliciting a response regarding the adjectival form for flags)
   S1: /juˈkrai nə/ (L1 phonological error)
   T1: Ukraine, which one is that? (Recast)

(4) (Content)
   T1: Okay, what should it be then?
   S1: Sverige, igen. (Sweden, again) (L1/lexical error)
   T1: No! (Metalinguistic FB)
S2: The Sweden flag. (Grammatical error)
T1: No, it’s not the Swedish flag. (Metalinguistic feedback ⇒ Recast)

(5) (Content)
T1: X, you have one.
S: Jamaica. (Grammatical Error)
T1: Jamaica, which one is the Jamaican flag? (Recast)

(6) (Content – Teacher eliciting questions regarding a passage read in the book)
T1: Artig, vad heter det på engelska? (What the word for ’artig’ in English?)
S1: Affection.
S2: Belief
S3: /pou ˈlit/ (Phonological error)
T1: Polite, polite, polite (Recast)

(7) (Content)
S: All over the world adults /ˈpin ɪf/. (Phonological error)
T1: Pinch (Recast)
S: Pinch…

(8) (Content)
T1: The little couple beneath, or under, what do they do?
S1: Buga. (L1 error)
T1: Okay, in English. What do you do if you “buga” in English? (Elicitation)
S1(?): /boʊz/.
T1: Ahh, do you /boʊ/? (repetition minus the z phoneme)
S2: [inaudible utterance]
T1: What did you say? (Elicitation)
S2: /boʊs/ (Phonological error)
T1: Close, but almost. (Metalinguistic Feedback)

4 Refers to an adjustment in intonation.
S4: Bow.
T1: Bow, you bow.

(9) (Content)
T1: Vad heter det (flintskalig) på engelska? (How do you say it (bald) in English?)
S: /buold/. (Phonological error)
T1: Vad heter det? (Elicitation)
S: Bald
T1: Bald.

(10) (Management: Teacher informs students regarding their Easter break)
T1: Vad heter ’långfredag’ på engelska? (How do you say ’långfredag’ in English?)
S1: Long Friday. (Lexical error)
T1: No. (Metalinguistic feedback)
S2: Sadness Friday.
T1: The opposite, almost. I think it’s called Good Friday. (Explicit Feedback)

(11) (Content)
T1: X, can you choose one of the small texts please?
S1: In Kenya, /fiild/ / booo/, bow [inaudible utterance]. (Phonological error)
T1: Hmm, vad heter barn på engelska? (Elicitation)
Ss: /fiild/, /fildds/ (Phonological error)
T1: Child, child. (Recast)

Eighth Grade EFL lesson (50 min.), March 5th

(12) (Communication)
S: Man kommer inte till himmelen…
T: Sorry, I don’t understand, X. (Clarification request)

(13) (Communication)
S1: Previous [barely inaudible]. (Error)
T: Sorry. (Clarification request)
S1: Previous.
S2: /pre vi es li/ (Phonological error)
T1: Previous, previous (Recast)

Eighth Grade EFL lesson (45 min.), March 6th

(14) (Communication)
S: Vem är tallest [inaudible]? (L1 error)
T1: Ahh, what did you say? (Elicitation)
S: Jag sa, who’s the tallest /twod/?
T1: Who’s the tallest /wod/? (Repetition)
S: /twod/
T1: Twin! I don’t know. (Recast)

(15) (Communication)
S: Umm, Teacher 1, [inaudible] take them apart. (Lexical error)
T1: Tell them apart. (Recast)
S: Aha.
T1: Tell them apart.

(16) (Explicit language-focus)
T1: Blek? X!
S: Pale.
T1: Pale, how do you spell ‘pale’?
S: P-h-l-e (Phonological error)
T1: P-h[l]-e. (Repetition)
S: A, Ach (Phonological error)
T1: P-a[l]-e (Recast)

(17) (Explicit Language-focus)
T1: Själ? X!
S: Soul.
T1: Soul. How do you spell it?
S: S-O-[inaudible]-L (Error)
T1: Once again, please, I didn’t hear you. (Elicitation)
S: S-O-U-L.
T1: Thank you.

(18) (Explicit Language-focus: past tense)
T1: Number 5, X.
S1: We tell a ghost story. (Grammatical error)
T1: Ahh, did you say ‘tell’? (Elicitation)
S1: Teld. (Grammatical error)
T1: Told? (Recast)

(19) (Explicit language-focus)
T1: X.
S: We wait for the [inaudible]. (Error)
T1: We wait. (Repetition)
S2: We waited.
T1: Waited, thank you, Waited.

(20) (Management)
T1: X, you weren’t here. This is the plan, so, [inaudible].
S1: [inaudible Swedish utterance]
T1: Can you please take that in English, please? (Elicitation)
S1: Can you please go through the plan before I lost it because I’m worried because something will [inaudible].
T1: Okay.

(21) (Explicit language-focus)
S: /h/ said good to see you. (Phonological error/L1 error)
T: I said good to see you. Okay. (Recast)

II. Teacher 2
Eighth Grade EFL-lesson (45 min.), March 19th
-Five student-teacher exchanges detected with errors present, however no provision of feedback detected.

Seventh Grade EFL-lesson (35 min.), March 19th
-Twenty-four student-teacher exchanges in Swedish, in which one drifted from English to Swedish due to a communication breakdown.
-Lesson was predominately in Swedish.

Eighth Grade EFL-lesson (30min), March 20th

(22) (Management)
T2: Any questions. Yes.
S: If you already gone over, reading the [inaudible] kind of text, ahh, [inaudible].
(Error)
T2: Sorry, one more time. (Elicitation)
S: Jag har läst det 10 gånger. (I have read it 10 times)

(23) (Management)
T2: You can read it to each other or. Yes.
S: Återberätta. (L1 error)
T2: Retell it, yes. (Recast)

(24) (Explicit language-focus)
S: …does she knows it, or doesn’t her does she. (Grammatical error)
T2: Doesn’t she know it. (Recast)

(25) (Explicit Language-focus)
S: Kan man skriva, I let him join? (Grammatical/lexical error)
T2: I let him join me on my… (Recast)

III. Teacher 3
Ninth Grade EFL/EAL-lesson (40 min.), March 10th

(26) (Management)
   T3: X!
   S: What? (Lexical error- Sociolinguistic)
   T: What! What do you say in English? (Repetition⇒Elicitation)
   S: [inaudible] (Error)
   T3: Pardon. Coat, please! (Recast)

(27) (Management)
   S: Can I get a white paper? (Lexical error)
   T3: Can I please have a piece of white paper, yeah? (Recast)

Eighth Grade EFL/EAL-lesson (40 min.), March 10th

(28) (Communication)
   S: There are a few buffalos. Eller hur (Eng- Right)? (Gram. error-uncountable here)
   T3: Today, there are a few buffalo… (Recast)

(29) (Communication)
   S: What does /ənˈsiːsi/ means? (Phonological error)
   T3: /ənˈsiːsi/ it means, you said ‘unceasing’? As in ‘ceases’- it isn’t anymore, it stops. (Repetition; however followed by an elicitation)
   S: /ənˈsɪsənt/ (Phonological error)
   T: Ahh, incessant, continuous, the whole time. Incessant chatter… (Recast)

Eighth Grade EFL/EAL-lesson (60 min.), March 10th

(30) (Explicit Language-focus)
   T3: …what did you do yesterday? What did you do?
   S: Nothing. I watch TV. (Grammatical Error)
   T3: Okay, you watched TV. (Recast)
(31) (Explicit Language-focus)
T3: X.
S: I were at the cinema. (Grammatical error)
T3: I …? (Elicitation)
S: I was at the cinema.
T3: Okay, I was at the cinema.

(32) (Explicit Language-focus)
T3: X, what did you do yesterday?
S: Watching some movies. (Grammatical Error)
T: You watched some movies yesterday. Okay… (Recast)

(33) (Explicit Language-focus)
T3: X, what did you do?
S: Jag [inaudible] på Eriksdalsbadet. (L1 error)
T3: Okay, in English. I … (Elicitation)
S: I was.
T3: I was, yeah. So, you, I was at (delay) eriksdalsbadet or I was swimming.
(Recast)

(34) (Explicit Language-focus)
T3: What did you do, X, yesterday, on the weekend?
S: [inaudible L1 response]
T3: In English. (Elicitation)

(35) (Explicit Language-focus)
T3: (writing on WB): What did you do yesterday? (pointing) Which one is the main verb?
Ahh, okay, maybe this is not, what is the main verb in there?
S: Did. (Lexical/grammatical error)
T3: Did or do is the main verb? (Elicitation)
(36) (Explicit Language-focus)
   S: Umm, lost, losted. (Grammatical error)
   T3: Lost is in the past. It’s lose. (Explicit feedback)

(37) (Explicit Language-focus)
   S: Lose is, ahh, l-u-s-e. (L1 error)
   T3: L-o-s-e, yeah. (Recast)
   S: L-o-s-e.

(38) (Explicit Language-focus)
   T3: …is that correct?
   S: Well, only those who I was insecure [inaudible]. (Lexical error)
   T3: Okay, yeah, those you weren’t sure about. (Recast)

(39) (Explicit Language-focus w/o utterance)
   T3 (looking at the spelled word): There’s an ‘a’ in there, meant. M-e-a-n-t.
   (Explicit FB) (Discarded)

(40) (Explicit Language-focus)
   S: Is it like breaks? (Grammatical error)
   T3: Broke, I broke… (Recast)

(41) (Explicit Language-focus)
   S: Bite? (Grammatical error)
   T3: Bite? (Repitition)
   S: Bit.
   T3: You put bited…

(42) (Explicit Language-focus w/o utterance)
   T (Looking at S’s work): …bring, brought. B-r-o-u. (Explicit FB)
   S: Yeah, I know, I know, I know.
   T3: You have an ‘a’ and ‘o’ in there…
T3: Chose, one ‘o.’ (Explicit Feedback)
T3: … hid, not hided. (Explicit Feedback)
T3: …‘u’ with an ‘e.’ (Explicit Feedback) (Discarded)

T3: This one is wrong. So, you have to look this one up.
    That’s wrong. (2 Metalinguistic feedback)
S: Nej, det är inte alls wrong.
T3: If I just give you the answer, yeah, chose.
S: Yeah.
T3: Chose. That one’s wrong. That’s, this is ‘held,’ goes to ‘hold,’ I put the wrong
    [inaudible] in there… That’s wrong, that’s spelled wrong, that’s wrong, that’s
    spelled wrong. Spelling! (5 moves of Metalinguistic Feedback) (Discarded)
S: Read (meaning that the spelling is r-e-d). (Error)
T3: We say /red/ - read, read (red), but we spell it the same way.
    (Explicit feedback) (Discarded)
T3: This is teach-thought (Explicit) (Discarded)

(42a) S: Spended. (Grammatical error)
    T3: Spent. I spent lots of… (Recast)

(43) (Explicit Language-focus)
    S: Think, thank. (Grammatical error)
    T3: No, think, think…? (Elicitation)
    S: Thought. (Slight Phonological error of the vowel)
    T3: Thought, yeah. (Recast)

(44) (Communication)
    S: Ask him what ancient is, he doesn’t answer. (Lexical error)
    Ss: [inaudible chatter]
    T3: Do you mean: what does it mean? What does the word mean? (Elicitation)
    S: I know that, but I want ask his that.
    T3: Yes, what you are saying, what does ancient mean? (Recast)
(45) (Explicit language-focus)

S: ‘A counter’ är att räkna, va? (L1/lexical error)

T3: No, a counter is this, where, you know, where you buy your cheese or fish or meat. (Explicit Feedback)

Appendix B. Rough overview of the contexts present during each teacher’s lessons

T1: Lesson 1 Management + communication + content
    Lesson 2 Management + communication + content
    Lesson 3 Management + communication + explicit language-focus

T2: Lesson 1 management + content + explicit language-focus + communication
    Lesson 2 management + content + explicit “ “
    Lesson 3 management + content + explicit “ “

T3: Lesson 1 management + communication
    Lesson 2 Management + explicit language-focus
    Lesson 3 management + communication