



Managing language errors in real-time: A microanalysis of teacher practices



Drew S. Fagan*

University of Maryland, 2311 Benjamin Building, College Park, MD 20742, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 16 April 2014

Received in revised form 23 August 2015

Accepted 17 September 2015

Available online xxx

Keywords:

Conversation analysis

Classroom discourse

Teacher talk

Language errors

Corrective feedback

ESL

Second language acquisition

ABSTRACT

In addressing learners' language errors in classrooms, second language acquisition (SLA) scholars have formulated, examined, and categorized feedback types as having varied influences on language learning; not often accounted for in this line of inquiry, though, is the contingent nature of teachers' management of language errors in relation to the actions and activities within real-time classroom interactions. Rather than investigating such management vis-à-vis pre-conceived feedback types, the current paper utilizes the microanalytic lens of conversation analysis to document the emergence of teaching practices when learner errors arise and the reasons behind their usage as evidenced in the discourse itself. Based on 26 h of video-recorded data, two management practices surfaced: (1) foregrounding achievement and addressing correction, and (2) providing personal appreciation and addressing correction. The specific sequential environments in which they are found and their varied constructions are presented. As shown, teachers' management of language errors is multifaceted, performing simultaneous actions beyond solely doing error correction. The paper concludes with a discussion on the importance of using microanalytic lenses to provide fuller, more enriched understandings of how teachers' management of language errors surface in authentic classroom interactions, why such management is constructed as it is, and what it accomplishes.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Commonplace across language teacher education programs is learning the processes and theories of second language acquisition (SLA), where the intention of utilizing this research is to inform, if not altogether influence, teaching practices (Ellis, 2010). At odds, though, is the direct applicability of such research findings in authentic classroom interactions given that, moment-by-moment, teachers must maneuver through numerous and simultaneous factors not taken into account in this literature, e.g., curriculum mandates, local-, state-, and national-standards, number of learners in a classroom, their learning styles and educational backgrounds, and lesson progression (Allwright, 2005; Gass, Mackey, & Ross-Feldman, 2005; Han, 2007; Tarone & Allwright, 2005). Exemplifying this is work examining teachers' management of learners' language errors, long documented in SLA studies as being an integral component for promoting learning within classroom contexts (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013). Although there is consensus that such salient management enables learners to notice what language use needs correction and attempt modification of said language use (Gass & Mackey, 2006; Goo & Mackey,

* Tel.: +1 301 405 4416.

E-mail address: dfagan@umd.edu.

2013; Long, 2007; Russell & Spada, 2006), there remains minimal empirical research investigating these practices in ways that have “practical significance to teaching and ... is transparently relevant to teachers” (Lyster & Ranta, 2013, p. 181).

Central to this issue of transparent relevancy is reconciling the superimposition of findings from quasi-experimental studies on teaching practices with the dynamic, ever-emergent nature of authentic classroom interactions. In the case of managing learners' language errors, SLA scholars have formulated, examined, and categorized feedback types as having varied influences on language learning, albeit in relation to research questions and hypotheses addressing specific learner linguistic patterns (Mackey & Goo, 2013). Not accounted for in this line of inquiry is the contingent nature of teachers' management of language errors as they surface in real-time discourse. Thus, rather than investigating such teacher management vis-à-vis pre-conceived feedback types categorized by other empirical studies, the current paper sets out to encapsulate the actions and activities teachers orient to when making in-the-moment decisions regarding learners' language errors. Here, I examine one English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher's systematic management of language errors through the microanalytic lens of conversation analysis, documenting the organic emergence of authentic classroom practices when learner errors arise, the varied constructions and uses of those practices, and the reasons behind their usage as evidenced in the discourse itself.

2. Background

To position the current study within broader scholarly inquiry, I bridge two fields of research: SLA studies examining management of learner errors in relation to corrective feedback types and classroom discourse studies examining teacher feedback turn construction.

2.1. Corrective feedback in SLA research

The notion of corrective feedback centers largely on work supporting and supported by the interaction hypothesis, which places primacy on the importance for learners to notice target features in the language (Gass & Mackey, 2006). Key to this hypothesis is “negotiation work that triggers interactional adjustments by the [native speaker] or more competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, and output” (Long, 1996, pp. 451–452). The teacher, as a more competent interlocutor, can therefore be in part a catalyst to the acquisition process by triggering language adjustment for the learners through corrective feedback.

Varied feedback types found in this work include those that are input-providing such as recasts and explicit corrections, as well as those that are output-prompting like clarification requests, confirmation checks, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition of errors (Ellis, 2006; Lyster, 2004; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Ranta & Lyster, 2007). Of these, recasts are the most commonly used in language classroom interaction (Lyster et al., 2013; Miller & Pan, 2012; Révész, 2012). Scholars have long examined the effectiveness of recasts on language learning, with contradictory results being found. While they are seen as an effective form of correction in the language classroom environment to minimize communication disruption (Chaudron, 1977, 1988), learners can also find them ambiguous if teachers do not make explicit their purpose (Lyster, 1998; Russell & Spada, 2006). Barring ambiguity, it remains unclear whether recasts affect long-term learning (e.g., Loewen & Philp, 2006) or whether this depends on factors such as the linguistic target, the characteristics of the recast, and individual learner differences (e.g., Ellis, 2007; Long, 2007; Mackey, Adams, Stafford, & Winke, 2010; Sheen, 2011). In contrast, output-prompting feedback has continually been shown to have positive longitudinal effects on language development (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Lyster, 2004), though as with the findings on recast use, research is now only beginning to show that it is not necessarily the type of corrective feedback that affects learning but rather which type is used in relation to, among other factors, the language focus (e.g., vocabulary, grammatical form, pronunciation) and the needs of the learners in the immediate context (Lyster & Saito, 2010; Yoshida, 2010).

While most of the corrective feedback literature has focused on the influence of these practices on learning, some researchers have investigated teachers' and learners' preferences for using different feedback types, albeit not necessarily what is actually used in the classroom. For some teachers, the decision on what corrective feedback type to use is based on learners' perceived anxiety when doing explicit correction, leaving many to opt for implicit forms of correction (e.g., recasts) or only doing correction with language errors that impede communication (e.g., Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004; Jean & Simard, 2011; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005). In one of the few studies utilizing authentic classroom interaction, Yoshida (2008) noted that, in addition to taking into consideration learners' anxieties, teachers also chose to do recasts for practical purposes, allowing them to more smoothly continue with an activity without disruption. Conversely, learners have stated that they prefer explicit correction. Brown (2009) described how more advanced language learners wanted explicit forms of correction in order to notice their errors and be guided on how to correct them, while those in Yoshida's (2008) study requested opportunities for self-correction vis-à-vis elicitation or clarification requests as opposed to being given the correct answer. Schulz (2001) found that a learner's culture and language learning ideologies could influence their perceptions of corrective feedback use, with Colombian learners favoring explicit correction in grammar activities over American learners.

In sum, the corrective feedback literature can be categorized as either examining the direct effects of corrective feedback on language learning or examining teachers' and learners' perceptions of feedback use. The majority of this work, however, does not account for the emergence of feedback practices in naturally occurring classroom interactions;

those that do have not included a fine-grained analysis encapsulating the entirety of those teacher practices or the reasoning behind their uses as evidenced in the interaction itself, thus glossing over the nuanced multitasking that teachers accomplish. The current study, therefore, contributes to making this research more transparently relevant for pedagogical purposes by exemplifying the moment-by-moment unfolding of one ESL teacher's management of learner errors as it occurs in real-time.

2.2. Feedback turns in classroom discourse research

While SLA researchers tend to focus their investigations on how different forms of corrective feedback affect learning, classroom discourse analysts examine the construction of teacher feedback turns and their influences on *opportunities* for learning. At the crux of this research are investigations into the third turn of the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequence (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; cf. IRE in Mehan, 1979), a sequence commonly found across classroom discourse (Cazden, 2001; van Lier, 1996). In its most rudimentary form, the sequence has been criticized for its hindrance of language learning opportunities due to the restrictive interactive role given to learners, particularly when the feedback turn is used for evaluation without elaboration (Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Nystrand, 1997; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Wells, 1993). Waring (2008) and Wong and Waring (2009) illustrated this occurrence through the teacher's use of explicit positive assessment (e.g., "very good") without elaboration, which when used signaled to the learners the completion of the sequence regardless of whether there were other questions or comments on the topic. As found in Waring's (2008) study, many lines after an explicit positive assessment had been given and the topic closed, one learner had a question regarding the correctness of the response provided, leading to a series of questions from other learners. Lin (1999) further discussed how teachers' use of evaluation without elaboration in the feedback turn not only restricted learners' interaction with the language but also pushed their interest away from learning the language.

Instead of utilizing evaluation in the third turn of the IRF sequence, teachers are encouraged to foster a "dialogic interaction" with learners regardless of response correctness (Hall & Walsh, 2002, p. 190). In this regard, the feedback turn can be constructed to promote such dialogic interaction either between teacher and learner or among learners. In the case of the former, teacher feedback can allow learners to actively engage with the language when the third turn (1) incorporates prior learner discourse as a way to build upon what learners are saying and learning (e.g., Hall, 2002), (2) acknowledges learners' responses regardless of correctness and builds upon those ideas subsequently in the activity (e.g., Cullen, 2002), and (3) encourages learners to elaborate on their responses (e.g., Wells, 1993). In the case of the latter, the feedback turn can promote learner–learner interaction when used to delegate other learners to assist their struggling peers or to set up activities where learners are expected to collaborate in working through language issues (e.g., Antón, 1999; Gutiérrez, 2008).

While much discourse analytic work has looked at general construction of teacher feedback turns and its effects on learning opportunities, the field of conversation analysis (CA) has sought to do a more microanalytic examination of the construction of and orientation to feedback turns in order to understand the context-sensitive nature of classroom interaction (Sert & Seedhouse, 2011). Through this, CA has been influential in investigating how learners orient to the intricate verbal and nonverbal cues utilized in teachers' feedback turns in order to determine the purpose of the feedback being given. This is particularly evident in cases where teachers use the same lexicon or response techniques to signal different feedback functions (Walsh, 2002). In the case of Fagan's (2012a) examination of the teacher's use of *okay* in the third turn of the IRF sequence, speed, increases and decreases in intonation, and elongation of sound were cues learners oriented to in determining whether *okay* was used as positive or negative feedback. Similarly, Hellermann (2003) found that pitch, combined with repeating the learner's response, was one of the "primary linguistic resources employed by ... teachers[s] to accomplish ... interactive work" (p. 83), namely lower pitch signaling positive feedback and higher pitch prompting correction.

Additionally, CA examinations have shed light on systematic patterns in the interaction influencing how feedback is given. Lee (2007), for example, illustrated how teachers' third turns both acted on the second turn response and moved the second turn forward in the interaction. In her investigation of third turn repeats in the IRF sequence, Park (2014) found that the pedagogical focus of the class, the nature of the activity, and the type of initiation given by the teacher determined the function of repetition in the feedback turn. Finally, Fagan (2012b) uncovered the systematic discursive patterns of one novice teacher's classroom talk demonstrating her struggles in addressing learner silence and incorrect responses within the IRF sequence.

It is evident in the classroom discourse literature that teacher feedback, specifically in the third turn of the IRF sequence, plays a large role in how learners can interact with language. Furthermore, the microanalyses of CA research illustrate (1) the intricacy with which teacher feedback turns are constructed and oriented to by learners as doing specific actions, and (2) the numerous factors found in the discourse that affect teachers' real-time feedback decisions. One observation, though, is worthy of mention. While much of this work focuses on individual aspects of teacher feedback (e.g., use of prosody, patterns in uses of repetition), it does not account for the emergence of varied types of teacher management practices used when addressing learners' language errors. Utilizing the framework of CA, the current study sets out to do a microanalysis of one teacher's systematic use of the third turn of the IRF sequence when addressing such errors.

Table 1
ESL learners' demographic profiles.

Name	Age band	Country of origin	First language	Occupation/Field	Days in attendance
Arata	25–30	Japan	Japanese	Politics	15
Bae	30–35	South Korea	Korean	Doctoral student	20
Clara	25–30	Brazil	Portuguese	Musician	6
Hiro	25–30	Japan	Japanese	Business	12
Ichiro	30–35	Japan	Japanese	Accountant	19
Inoue	25–30	Japan	Japanese	Banker	3
Eun Mi	18–25	South Korea	Korean	Exchange student	2
Maria	18–25	Brazil	Portuguese	Au pair	14
Miki	40–45	Japan	Japanese	Business assistant	19
Olga	18–25	Germany	German	Au pair	18
Tetsuyuki	30–35	Japan	Japanese	Business	19

3. Data and method

Data for this study come from an adult ESL course in a community language program in the United States. The teacher participant, Ann,¹ a master teacher in the program, was chosen based on her 35 years of teaching English and Spanish across the United States and Europe, her experiences working specifically with adult language learners in community programs, and her current work as a doctoral student in an applied linguistics program, thus keeping her abreast of theoretical and methodological knowledge in the field. The course she taught was the most advanced in the program with learners of varied ages, educational backgrounds, English learning experiences, careers, and days in attendance (see Table 1). In total, 26 h of classroom interactions were video-recorded using three flip cameras, one placed in the back of the room facing the front so as to get any interaction occurring near that portion of the classroom, and the other two positioned at both front corners of the room facing back, thus encompassing all interactions.

The analysis was conducted using a CA framework, which places primacy on the importance for examining naturally-occurring interaction data from an *emic* perspective (i.e., how participants themselves construct the interaction) as opposed to an *etic* one (i.e., researcher's external interpretation of interaction construction or expectations of how interaction should occur) (ten Have, 2007). To do this, an intricately detailed transcription key first conceived by Jefferson (2004) is used documenting participants' communicative cues. Strict adherence is paid to the transcription itself, where turn-by-turn analyses are done to uncover the construction of the discourse based on how participants orient to one another's prior turns-at-talk. In so doing, a CA examination answers why a specific action is being done a specific way at a specific point in time, i.e., "why that now" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 299). Such analysis allows for more validity in understanding how interaction is constructed by participants in real-time as opposed to imposing pre-conceived categories or expectations of interaction "at the *outset* which can systematically distract from, even blind [researchers] to, the details of those domains (*italics added*)" (Schegloff, 1991, p. 62).

Following the CA framework, the 26 h of video-recordings were transcribed using a modified version of Jefferson's system, allowing for details into the verbal and non-verbal cues employed by the participants (see Appendix) (Waring, 2011). After the transcription was completed, reiterative line-by-line analyses were done, from which specific classroom practices emerged, including those showing Ann's management of language errors as they surfaced within IRF sequences. With the importance CA examinations place on adhering strictly to the transcription itself, learners' turns were marked as having errors only if Ann treated them as having errors. Further line-by-line analyses were then performed on this management data set from which distinct practices began to emerge and were subsequently separated from one another. One final stage of discursive analysis was done to distinguish the different constructions with which the management practices were formulated and the specific sequential environments in which they occurred.

Given the methodological nature of this study, it is important to address the notion of generalizability, which in CA relates to the concept of *possibility*. While CA examinations are specific to a particular site and particular participants, as is the case here with Ann and her learners, the microanalytic nature of the findings illustrate how interactional practices "are made possible through the very details of the participants' actions" (Peräkylä, 2004, p. 297). The minute cues utilized in Ann's management turns, for instance, pinpoint what she orients to in the learners' prior turns-at-talk. Concurrently, the cues used by the learners in subsequent turns-at-talk illustrate their orientation to the details of Ann's management turns. The findings here are not presented as representative of what all teachers do in this situation or what should be done but rather as in-depth examinations of what *can* be done based on the detailed nature of this particular discourse analysis. By doing so, CA studies achieve the goal of "promot[ing] an overall sensitivity to the intricacies of classroom talk and to generate critical reflection on classroom policies and instructional design" (Mori, 2004, p. 536). What follows is an illustration of the practices systematically used by Ann when managing learners' language errors as they emerge from the interaction, the various manifestations of these practices, and the factors found in the discourse to influence their uses in real-time.

¹ All names are pseudonyms.

4. Findings

In managing learners' language errors, Ann is shown to systematically use two practices: *foregrounding achievement and addressing correction* and *providing personal appreciation and addressing correction*. For each excerpt, Ann's initiation turns are marked with →, the learners' error-embedded turns with →, and Ann's management turns with ⇒.

4.1. Foregrounding achievement and addressing correction

The practice of *foregrounding achievement and addressing correction* is utilized in the sequential environment of addressing what Ann orients to as learners' partial language errors. In such cases, she first highlights some form of achievement with the learner's response before addressing correction. Excerpt 1 is a prototypical example of this practice being done in a cloze activity; here, the learners are reviewing their answers to a daily fill-in-the-blank prepositions/particles worksheet,² where they are to choose a word from the word bank. After one learner, Bae, has finished sharing his answer for the first sentence correctly, Ann nominates him to continue with the second one, "Mr. Johnson is now __ charge __ office supplies":

(1) Change the First One				
01	Ann:	→		((looks to Bae))- next one.
02				(1.8)- Ann continues looking at paper; Bae picks up paper))
03	Bae:	→		mr. johnson is no:w (0.6) <u>at</u> charge of office supplies.
04	Ann:	⇒		((looks up and points paper to Bae))- <u>of</u> (.) is <u>perfect</u> .
05				(0.6)- ((Ann gazes towards other LL))
06		⇒		{{(to all LL))- but i <u>think</u> we're going to cha:nge, (0.4)}}((looks
07				back to Bae)) [the first one.}}
08	LL:			[<u>in</u> charge.]
09	Bae:			<u>in</u> [charge]
10	Ann:			[(((to Bae))- < <u>in</u> char]ge of.>)(((to all LL)) if that's the o:ne,
11				(1.2) you cho:se, (1.0) good.)

In response to Ann's initiation in line 1, Bae gives the answers "at" and "of" respectively (line 3). As the given response has a partial error, Ann in line 4 first acknowledges Bae's achievement in getting "of" correct with an emphatic use of *explicit positive assessment* (Waring, 2008), i.e., "perfect". Note that as Ann foregrounds achievement, her gaze is on Bae the entire time. When beginning to address correction, though, she switches her eye gaze from Bae to the other learners (lines 5 & 6), an action commonly used to mark the end of the sequence with the current interlocutor (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992); this removes Bae from being put on the spot during correction. In proceeding to address correction, Ann does not do so with an overt negative assessment; rather, she mitigates the feedback by making clear her own epistemic stance on the matter via "I think" before eliciting others to do the correction, which numerous learners do in overlap in line 8. Note that as Ann prompts learners to do the correction (lines 6–7), she does so slowly, incorporating the use of sound elongation and pausing. The use of slow verbal cues continues with her pausing in lines 10–11 to *maintain grammatical control* (Schegloff, 1996), done to keep interlocutors' attention for what is to come next; in this case, keeping learners' attention as she slowly confirms the correctness of "in" (line 11).

Foregrounding achievement and addressing correction is also done when the learner's response is treated as relatively close to being accurate, as exemplified in excerpt 2. This excerpt takes place during a warm-up to a main activity on word families. Prior to starting the activity, Ann is first having the learners correctly pronounce the list of words that will be used:

(2) Pretty Close				
01	Ann:	→		>how do you say the first one.<= anyone feeling brave?
02				(0.8)- ((Ann looks from sheet to LL))
03				this first word?
04	Ichiro:	→		<cooperative.>
05	Ann:	⇒		{{(nodding and smiling to Ichiro))- pretty close. pretty
06				close.)(((to all LL))- cooperative. cooperative.)
07	Olga:			coop[er] ative.]
08	Ann:	⇒		[it's like] operative? with a co in front of it.
09				coop[er]ative.
10	LL:			°coop[er]ative.°
11	Ann:			okay.=next.

² For her advanced classes, Ann provides daily preposition/particle activities since she views these grammar points as some of the most difficult in English.

Responding to Ann's initiation in line 3, Ichiro pronounces the word “cooperative” with incorrect stress placement on cooPERative. In line 5, she foregrounds achievement by providing nonverbal positive affirmation in the form of nodding and smiling and by noting verbally the degree to which the pronunciation is correct (i.e., “pretty close”). As with excerpt 1, Ann's eye gaze remains on Ichiro the entire time she foregrounds achievement and switches her gaze to the other learners when preparing to address correction. What changes at this point is how correction is done: rather than elicit other learners to attempt correction, as was done in excerpt 1, here Ann does it herself and also provides clues to help the learners remember the word's pronunciation (lines 6 & 8). This explicit correction aligns with Ann's use of other verbal cues highlighting the speed with which she wants to get through the sequence, i.e., fast-paced speech at the start the sequence in line 1, overlap in line 8 to regain speakership and provide clues for doing pronunciation of this word, quick shift to the next sequence in line 11. Keeping with this fast-paced momentum is the use of explicit correction, used here to simultaneously ensure that learners receive the correct information while quickly moving the interaction along.

Thus far, the first two excerpts saw *foregrounding achievement and addressing correction* done in accuracy-based activities. This practice also surfaces in non-accuracy-based activities, or those more conversational in nature, as shown in excerpt 3. Taking place during the first hour of the first day of the course, the class is preparing to discuss cultural stereotypes. First, Ann models the activity by asking learners to tell her American stereotypes they have heard back home. One example has already been given, and Ann is now eliciting others:

(3) Obesity

01	Ann:	→	↑ other (.) {{(to Maria))- stereotypes.}}
02			(0.8)- ((Ann smiles at Maria))
03	Maria:	→	uh, (0.4) in brazil they tal->like we< (.) always hear so
04			much about (0.4.) <obizity,> (.) [here.]
05	Ann:	⇒	[[((nods))- ↑ah.] obesity.]
06	Maria:		<cause when i was coming i thought that i was
07			coming i was able to find just fat people.
08	Ann:	⇒	{{(to Maria))- obesity. {{(looks up))- <.hh> [not in a-]}}=
09	Maria:		[[((to Ann))- obesity.]
10	Ann:		={{(to Maria))- not in um? new york is kind of (.) differ- >i
11			mean there are heavy people< everywhere. but ↑we (.) new
12			york doesn't seem to- i mean. tell me what you think. but
13			{{(looks up))- new york (.) to me} {{(looks at Maria))- doesn't
14			see- >it seems to have a lot of thinner people.

In response to Ann's nomination, Maria, after a 0.8-s gap, states that in Brazil they hear about Americans with “obizity”. Note that the word “obizity” is given after a 0.4-s pause and with slow speech, two cues indicating the importance the participant wants to place on what is being said at that moment in the turn (Psathas, 1995). While the content of Maria's response correctly addresses the activity, the pronunciation of the emphasized word “obizity” is not accurate. Ann uses line 5 to foreground achievement of the content vis-à-vis the nonverbal cue of nodding and the use of the acknowledgment discourse marker “ah” (Schiffrin, 1987) followed immediately by using a recast with emphasis on the corrected sound; these actions are done all the while maintaining eye gaze with Maria throughout the turn. Maria quickly takes up the next turn (lines 6–7) to continue her response as opposed to addressing Ann's recast, to which Ann repeats herself with the same emphasis on the corrected sound (line 8). It is to this repetition that Maria, in overlap in line 9, repeats the word “obesity” with correct pronunciation, illustrating that she has oriented to Ann's repetition in line 8 as correction.

While the general structure of *foregrounding achievement and addressing correction* is found in this excerpt, observe two variations in its construction compared with the previous two excerpts. First is a lack of overt foregrounding and explicit addressing. Here, *foregrounding achievement* is done with a simple acknowledgment marker (“ah”) without embellishing the correctness of the content. *Addressing correction* is also done more implicitly vis-à-vis recasting as opposed to elicitation or explicit correction. Second, Ann maintains eye gaze with the learner as opposed to changing her focus to the others in the class. Such an action indicates that the turn was intended for that specifically chosen interlocutor (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992); in other words, Ann's action are intended for Maria to note and act upon alone.

As seen across excerpts 1–3, Ann manages partial language errors by first foregrounding the achievement of the learner's response. Rather than doing this perfunctorily (i.e., “Good, but ...”), she incorporates the learner's language in her feedback by acknowledging the correct portion or stressing the closeness of the language to its correct use. These actions may also surface as nonverbal cues such as smiling and nodding. When doing this foregrounding, Ann maintains eye gaze with the learner, ensuring that they are the interlocutor recipient of the noted achievement. This is followed by addressing correction, i.e., prompting other learners or doing correction herself. How the latter is constructed depends on the nature of the activity. During accuracy-based activities, Ann takes focus away from the learner who provided the incorrect language use by changing eye gaze towards other learners. In cases where this partial language error occurs within the main activity of the lesson, Ann prompts other learners to do correction, thus extending the time the class spends on the sequence. When such errors occur outside of main activities, Ann does explicit correction herself, ensuring that the correct language use is given while simultaneously moving the talk forward. During more conversationally-based

activities, however, these actions are done more implicitly, with Ann affirming the content of the response before recasting the incorrect language use, all the while maintaining eye gaze on the original responders to ensure that they are the intended recipients of the correction.

4.2. Providing personal appreciation and addressing correction

This next section shows how Ann provides feedback to what she orients to as complete language errors, i.e., those that have no definitively correct portions or are not relatively close to the correct language use. She does so by *providing personal appreciation and addressing correction*. In reviewing the data set, this particular practice only surfaced in sequences-of-talk focusing on language use accuracy. Excerpt 4 is a prototypical case. Taking place during another prepositions/particles fill-in-the-blank activity, the learners are now reviewing the sentence “We’ve been in Barcelona for over a month; let’s go ___ this weekend”:

(4) Very Creative Answer				
01	Ann:	→		{{(looks at paper))- okay.} {{(looks up and extends arm to Miki))-
02				moving on to: miki.}
03				(0.6)- ((Ann looks down))
04				try number four.
05	Miki:	→		we’ve been in barcelona for over a month. let’s go <u>on</u> this
06				weekend.
07	Ann:			((perks ears towards Miki))- let’s go.;
08	Miki:			<u>on</u> .
09				(0.4)- ((Ann smiles at Miki))
10	Ann:	⇒		<u>on</u> . {{(points finger up)) - it’s a very (0.2) creative (0.2)
11				[answer.]
12	Miki:			[hehehe] hehe[hehehe.]
13	Ann:	⇒		[very cre]ative.
14				(0.8)- ((Ann looks up at ceiling))
15		⇒		((looks at Miki))- but i <u>have</u> to think of another one. }
16				(0.4)- ((Ann gazes towards other LL))
17				((to other LL))- any other ideas?

In response to Ann’s initiation (line 4), Miki provides the answer “on” (lines 5–6). Following her repetition in line 8, there is a 0.4-s pause during which Ann smiles at the learner before providing personal appreciation of the response, framing it as a “very creative answer” (lines 10–11). Miki reacts to this statement with laughter, possibly realizing that this implies an error has been given. Indeed, Ann does mark the response as incorrect by proceeding to address it in line 15. To Miki, Ann states that she, Ann, “has to think of another” response, almost apologetically. This is followed by Ann switching her attention from Miki to the class, thus no longer keeping Miki on the spot as she addresses the incorrect response and, similar to the previous practice, prompts other learners to do the correction (lines 16 & 17).

The next excerpt differs from the previous one in that *providing personal appreciation and addressing correction* does not occur in a planned activity; instead, this practice is used in an on-the-spot, unplanned teachable moment not connected with what had occurred prior or what would occur subsequently. In excerpt 5, the learners are settling into their chairs during the first few minutes of class. Ichiro informs Ann that another learner, Hiro, is supposed to come to class that day even though he has been absent for two days:

(5) Missing in Alaska				
01	Ichiro:			and (0.2) h↑ iro (1.2) is supposed to come [↓ here.]
02	Ann:			[hiro]
03		→		(0.4) is what we call M (.) I (.) A: {{(to all LL))- do
04				you know what that is?}
05	Bae:			<mia.
06	Ichiro:			missing?
07	Tetsu:			m. (.) i. (.) a.
08	Ann:	→		{{(to Ichiro))- m↑issing (0.2) i:n,}
09				(1.2)- ((Ann looks all around the room; LL look at Ann))
10				no ideas. >oh we’re gonna< learn something new
11				today.}
12	Maria:			what is it.
13	Ann:	→		<m. (.) i. (.) a.>
14	Tetsu:	→		missing (.) in (0.2) alaska.
15				(0.4)- ((Ann looks towards Tetsu))
16	Ann:	⇒		((to Tetsu))- \$mis[sing in alaska.\$]
17	LL:			[hehehehehehe]hehe.

18	Ann:	⇒	that's really- that's really cute.
19			(2.0)- ((Ann smiles and shakes her head))
20	Ann:	⇒	{{(to Tetsu)}- \$we <u>could</u> say that.\$} {{{(to all LL)}- that
21			could be the <u>new</u> mia.}
22	Tetsu:		<yeah.
23	Ann:		<mia. {{{(puts arms up)}- missing in alaska?} \$it
24			could be.\$
25			(0.8)- ((Ann smiles at all LL))
26		⇒	{{(to Tetsu)}- that's very creative. i ↑like that.
27			(0.4)- ((Ann looks towards all LL))
28		⇒	but it's missing in <u>action</u> .
29			(1.0)- ((LL write it down))
30		⇒	missing in action. and usually they use it during a
31			<u>war</u> .

After Ann introduces the acronym MIA, Ichiro correctly guesses that the first letter is “missing” (line 6). This is followed by Ann providing the second word, “in” (line 8), in the form of a *designedly incomplete utterance* (Koshik, 2002) to invite other learners to finish the acronym. That there is no uptake to this designedly incomplete utterance in line 9 is the first indicator that the learners do not have access to this language use. After Ann informs the learners that they will “learn something new today” (lines 10–11), i.e., the acronym MIA, there is further evidence in the excerpt that the learners do not know the acronym (line 12).

It is in line 14 that Tetsuyuki responds to Ann's original initiation from line 8 with the incorrect “missing in Alaska”. From this point forward, two distinct characteristics of how Ann *provides personal appreciation and addresses the incorrect* distinguish this excerpt from most others. First, while prototypical excerpt 4 shows Ann's personal appreciation occurring over the course of two turns, here it is done over the course of four (lines 16, 18, 20–21, 26). In them, Ann shows deep appreciation of the creativity of Tetsuyuki's response to the point that she states it could be the new MIA, done while maintaining eye gaze with him. Second, when addressing correction, Ann, in her typical fashion, changes her eye gaze to the others in the class, but rather than prompt them to provide the correction she does so herself. (lines 28, 30–31).

Thus far, the previous two excerpts illustrate Ann managing complete language errors by providing appreciation of the learners' attempts at language use before addressing correction vis-à-vis elicitation or explicit correction. As found in the next excerpt, there is a limit to how often Ann uses this practice when confronted with numerous language errors to the same initiation. In this activity, Ann has noted certain mistakes she has heard the learners say over the past week that correspond with common errors she has heard throughout her career. The learners are now reviewing the sentence “We must judge him for his acts, not his expectations,” with the words “for” and “expectations” marked as incorrect word choices. They are now determining the correct preposition to use in place of “for”:

(6) Nope

01	Ann:		{{(looks at sheet)}- oo:.} {{{(looks at LL)}- number
02			three. ouch?}
03			(0.4)- ((looks at sheet))
04			one preposition?
05			(0.4)- ((looks at sheet))
06			and one kind of ambiguous who knows <u>what</u> that
07			is. = what about the preposition?
08			(3.0)- ((looks at sheet and at all LL))
09	Maria:		°abo ut.° }
10	Ann:		[be br]ave.
11			(0.2)
12	Bae:		[by.]
13	Ann:		[beca]use after we do this we are going to do
14			prepos[itions.]
15	Bae:		[judge]him <by?>
16	Ann:		{{(looks at sheet)}} {{{(to Bae)}- judge him <u>by</u> his acts?= you could say by?} {{{(looks at sheet)}- that's i think what}{{{(to Bae)}- i would say?}
17			(0.4)- ((looks towards other groups))
18			and you could <u>also</u> sa:y?
19			(0.2)- ((Ann continues looking))
20			<maybe maybe:??>
21			about?
22	Tetsu:		(0.4)- ((Ann and Tetsuyuki look at each other))
23			.hh ↑eh: i don't know if {{{(looks to group of three)}- that
24	Ann:		one works.}
25			fr[om?]
26	Miki:		
27	Ann:		[how]does that one sound?
28			

29	Miki:		<from?
30			(0.4)- ((Ann looks to Miki))
31	Ann:	→	{{(points at Miki)}- that's a} good idea. {{{to all LL}}-
32			no. these are good creati- <u>very</u> creative ideas. =
33			but i think i would use something else. i'm <u>thinking</u>
34			about another one.
35			(0.8)- ((Ann looks around room))
36	Bae:	→	to?
37	Ann:	⇒	{{looks from Bae to other LL}}- °nope.°
38	Maria:	→	with? he[hehehehehehehehehehehehehehehehe.]
39	Ann:	⇒	{{(to Maria)}- °nope.° hehehe. that's] when we say
40			judge him} {{{to all LL}}- <u>on</u> his acts.}
41			(0.2)- ((Ann smiles))
42			there. i said it.

After asking the learners about the incorrect preposition used in the sentence (lines 4, 6–7), Ann is met with a 3.0-s gap before Maria quietly gives the answer “about” (line 9). Appearing not to have heard Maria, Ann continues to elicit other responders by stating they should “be brave” (line 10). Once Bae repeats his given answer of “by” in line 15, Ann agrees that she would say it this way and that it is correct; however, she continues to elicit other responses (lines 16–22).

From line 23 forward, four other responses are provided, none of them correct. After “about” and “from” are given as possible answers (lines 23, 27, 29), Ann proceeds to first provide appreciation before eliciting the learners to explore other possibilities (lines 31–34). It is to this initiation vis-à-vis eliciting in lines 33–34 that Bae responds with another incorrect response: “to” (line 36). For the first time in this interaction, Ann does not *provide personal appreciation* but rather directly *addresses correction* with an overt, albeit quiet, negative assessment: “nope” (line 37). Notice that Ann accomplishes two feats in this turn: succinctly marks Bae’s response as incorrect and prompts other learners for a different response with the change in gaze. Maria, apparently in jest as indicated by the laughter tokens in line 38, takes up this elicitation and provides yet another error. Ann addresses it with another quiet “nope” before providing the correct language use herself (lines 39–40).

As demonstrated in these last three excerpts, the practice of *providing personal appreciation and addressing correction* is used when managing learners’ complete language errors in accuracy-focused sequences-of-talk. This includes acknowledging in some form the learner’s attempt at responding to the teacher’s initiation, usually by focusing on the “creativity” of the answer. When it comes time to address correction, Ann utilizes the same characteristics as when *foregrounding achievement and addressing correction*: refocusing her attention away from the responder to the other learners and either prompting them to do the correction or doing explicit correction herself. What distinguishes the manner in which she addresses correction is how readily learners appear to have access to the correct language use. Eliciting correction is used when there is evidence that learners readily have access to the correct language use, such as the prepositions/particles fill-in-the-blank activity with word bank in excerpt 4; in cases where there is evidence to the contrary, such as introducing spontaneous language without context as done in excerpt 5, Ann does explicit correction. As found in excerpt 6, though, there is a limit to how often this practice is used when addressing numerous language errors to the same initiation; in these cases, Ann reverts to using overt negative assessments before providing the answer herself.

5. Discussion and conclusion

In addressing the need for SLA research to be practically significant and transparently relevant for language teachers (cf. Lyster & Ranta, 2013), the current paper utilized the microanalytic lens of conversation analysis to examine one ESL teacher’s, Ann’s, real-time management of learners’ language errors as they surfaced in the Initiation-Response-Feedback sequence, and the reasoning behind her management practices as evidenced in the interaction itself. Through this analysis, two practices emerged from the data: (1) *foregrounding achievement and addressing correction* when managing partial language errors, and (2) *providing personal appreciation and addressing correction* when managing complete language errors. Both practices were constructed in similar ways. First, Ann provided positive commentary by highlighting what portions of the language use were accurate, the close proximity of the learner’s language use to what was correct, or the “creativity” of learner’s language choice. In these cases, the positive commentary referenced the exact language used by the learner, marking the feedback as personal rather than generic and perfunctory. Second, Ann addressed correction by either eliciting other learners to do the correction or doing it herself. When addressing partial language errors, the manner in which she addressed correction was based on the nature of the activities. For those more accuracy-based, Ann changed her eye gaze from the learner who made the error towards others in the class, in turn removing the learner from being put on the spot when dealing with the language error. Other learners were elicited to do the correction if the error occurred in a main activity of the lesson, where it was evident in the talk that Ann wanted to take time to review the language. When such errors occurred outside of main activities, Ann did explicit correction herself, ensuring that correct language use was noted while also moving the talk forward. During more conversationally-based activities, recasting was utilized, all the while maintaining eye gaze with the individual learner marking her as the intended recipient of the correction. In managing complete language errors, Ann addressed correction

based on how readily learners had access to the correct language use. When there was evidence the learners would have access, such as an activity with a limited number of possible choices to choose from, Ann would default to eliciting other learners to do correction. When there was evidence that learners did not have access to the language use, such as new language being spontaneously introduced without schema, Ann did explicit correction herself. Finally, there is a limit to how often this practice was used, namely when addressing numerous language errors to the same initiation; in these instances, Ann reverted to using overt negative assessments before providing the correct language use herself.

Throughout the findings is the complexity of managing learners' language errors vis-à-vis practices that perform multiple and simultaneous actions. Ann's management turns accounted for the individual learner's language error, the nature of the sequence-of-talk or activity in which the error occurred, peers' perceived levels of competency in addressing the errors, and the maintenance of interactional flow. The documented details of the verbal and nonverbal communicative cues used in Ann's management turns further illuminated her own systematic approach to managing learners' language errors; as opposed to the corrective feedback literature which focuses on what learners *cannot* accomplish (Gass & Mackey, 2006), Ann's management highlighted what learners *could* accomplish and de-emphasized what they could not. An argument could therefore be made that these management actions addressed learning opportunities in the immediate context and set up such opportunities for future interactions, where learners would be more apt to participate in an atmosphere promoting language exploration as opposed to solely doing error correction.

Theoretically, as exemplified in this study, the management of learner errors in real-time is a union of teacher multi-tasking. Indeed, corrective feedback types as categorized in the SLA literature (cf. Lyster et al., 2013) play a role in teacher's management but alone do not encompass the entirety of the teacher's actions. Rather, those actions take into consideration the individual learner who made the error *and* other learners in the classroom, the needs of the immediate interaction *and*, potentially, the ramification of current practices on future interactions and learning opportunities. How the teacher reconciles these factors also connects to the classroom discourse literature, which until now has emphasized the importance for teacher feedback to promote learner interaction in the immediate talk (cf. van Lier, 2008). Depending on the nature of the talk, or evidence indicating that the learners do not have access to certain language components, it may be more beneficial for the purposes of language use clarity and lesson progression to keep learner interaction at a minimum rather than forcing interaction to occur. With future research, it would be lucrative to investigate the effects of teacher practices on learning opportunities by considering the multiple factors teachers attend to in real-time, for without this information such research would not only diminish what teachers do accomplish but also potentially overlook learning opportunities set up elsewhere in the interaction.

Methodologically, the use of CA addresses the conundrum that teachers face in attempting to fit decontextualized research findings into their specific instructional contexts (Ellis, 2010; Lyster & Ranta, 2013). As a framework, CA allows for greater detail into (1) what teachers orient to in the discourse, (2) how their management turns are intricately constructed vis-à-vis verbal and nonverbal communicative cues, and (3) how learners orient to those cues and respond accordingly. Such an examination enables teachers' actual practices to emerge from naturally-occurring classroom interaction data with a level of intricacy that uncovers the moment-by-moment decisions made, the reasons behind those decisions, and the potential for promoting language learning opportunities within specific instructional contexts.

Pedagogically, the current study illustrates the importance for language teachers and teacher educators to be cognizant of a few points. First, managing learners' language errors goes beyond directly applying research findings into teaching practices; instead, teacher management takes into consideration the needs and perceived competencies of the learners in the classroom and the ramifications of such practices on immediate and future interactions. Second, there are intricacies associated with the construction of teacher management turns needed to achieve multiple and simultaneous actions. Varied communicative cues utilized in such turns enable learners to orient to the teachers' intended actions and proceed accordingly. Third, extrapolating from the previous two points are the potential discrepancies between teachers' perceptions of how they manage language errors and their actual management. CA can therefore be used as an observational or self-analytic tool to uncover how real-time classroom interactions are formed and what factors in the discourse influence those in-the-moment decisions, thus enabling teachers to compare what is found with what they perceive their classroom practices to be.

Finally, two interconnected limitations are worth noting. Given how often the IRF sequence surfaces in classroom discourse (Cazden, 2001; van Lier, 1996), the data set used in this study only consisted of errors within this particular sequence. Those outside of the IRF sequence, particularly in cases where learners initiated talk, were not accounted for in this study. Similarly, prior research has shown cases where learners' language errors were not addressed by teachers for varied reasons (e.g., Basturkmen et al., 2004; Jean & Simard, 2011; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Yoshida, 2008). In following a CA framework, learners' errors in the interaction data were marked and further analyzed only if there was evidence of Ann orienting to and addressing them as errors; this does not preclude other errors from being present in the classroom interaction data. It could therefore be argued that non-addressing of such errors are, in-and-of itself, a management practice worthy of future examination.

In conclusion, the aim of this study was to provide an avenue for which to make pedagogically salient teachers' management of learners' language errors in real-time. This study alerts scholars to the importance of doing research that utilizes varied methodological tools not often used in one's discipline. Doing so allows for a fuller, more enriched understanding of how teacher practices surface in authentic classroom interactions, why those practices are constructed as they are, and what they accomplish, thus further illuminating the crucial role teachers play in the language learning process.

Acknowledgments

I'd like to thank "Ann" and her students for inviting me into their classroom each day with my cameras. This project would not have been possible without the guidance and support of Hansun Zhang Waring, as well as the helpful suggestions from Tara Tarpey and Christine Jacknick on earlier versions of this paper. Finally, I'd like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their insights on revising this manuscript. Any remaining errors are my own.

Appendix. CA Transcription Key (Waring, 2011)

.	(period) falling intonation.
?	(question mark) rising intonation.
,	(comma) continuing intonation.
-	(hyphen) abrupt cut-off.
::	(colon(s)) elongation of sound.
<u>word</u>	(underlining) stress.
<u>word</u>	The more underlining, the greater the stress.
WORD	(all caps) loud speech.
°word°	(degree symbols) quiet speech.
↑word	(upward arrow) raised pitch.
↓word	(downward arrow) lowered pitch.
>word<	(more than and less than) quicker speech.
<word>	(less than & more than) slowed speech.
<	(less than) jump start or rushed start.
hh	(series of h's) aspiration or laughter.
.hh	(h's preceded by dot) inhalation.
(hh)	(h's in parentheses) inside word boundaries.
[]	(brackets) simultaneous or overlapping speech.
=	(equal sign) latch or contiguous utterances of the same speaker.
(2.4)	(number in parentheses) length of a silence in 10ths of a second.
(.)	(period in parentheses) micro-pause, 0.2 second or less.
()	(empty parentheses) non-transcribable segment of talk.
((gazing toward the ceiling))	(double parentheses, italics) nonverbal activity.
{ }	Simultaneous verbal and nonverbal conduct
(try 1)/(try 2)	(two parentheses separated by a slash) alternative hearings.
\$word\$	(dollar or pound signs) smiley voice.
#word#	(number signs) squeaky voice.
LL	double Ls- more than one learner

References

- Allwright, D. (2005). From teaching points to learning opportunities and beyond. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 9–31.
- Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all?: recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 543–574.
- Antón, M. (1999). The discourse of a learner-centered classroom: sociocultural perspectives on teacher-learner interaction in the second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, 303–318.
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 25, 243–272.
- Brown, A. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: a comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93, 46–60.
- Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: the language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning*, 27, 29–46.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talk: the importance of the F-move. *ELT Journal*, 56, 117–127.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA Research*, 19, 18–41.
- Ellis, R. (2007). The differential effects of corrective feedback on two grammatical structures. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition* (pp. 339–360). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2010). Second language acquisition, teacher education, and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching*, 43, 182–201.
- Fagan, D. S. (2012a). 'Okay' as a multifunctional resource for giving feedback in classrooms. *Language & Information Society*, 16, 9–41.
- Fagan, D. S. (2012b). 'Dealing with' unexpected learner contributions in whole-group activities: an examination of novice language teacher discursive practices. *Classroom Discourse*, 3, 107–128.
- Gass, S., & Mackey, A. (2006). Input, interaction and output. *AILA Review*, 19, 3–17.
- Gass, S., Mackey, A., & Ross-Feldman, L. (2005). Task-based interactions in classroom and laboratory settings. *Language Learning*, 55, 575–611.
- Goo, J., & Mackey, A. (2013). The case against the case against recasts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 35, 127–165.
- Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1992). Context, activity, and participation. In P. Auer, & A. de Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language* (pp. 77–99). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gutiérrez, A. G. (2008). Microgenesis, method and object: a study of collaborative activity in a Spanish as a foreign language classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 29, 120–148.
- Hall, J. K. (2002). *Methods for teaching foreign languages: Creating a community of learners in the classroom*. Columbus, OH: Prentice-Hall.
- Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 186–203.
- Han, Z.-H. (2007). Pedagogical implications: genuine or pretentious? *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 387–393.
- Hellermann, J. (2003). The interactive work of prosody in the IRF exchange: teacher repetition in feedback moves. *Language in Society*, 32, 79–104.
- Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). Grammar teaching and learning in L2: necessary, but boring? *Foreign Language Annals*, 44, 467–494.

- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: a pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 35, 277–309.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2005). Error correction: students' vs. teachers' perceptions. *Language Awareness*, 14, 112–127.
- Lee, Y. A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 1204–1230.
- Lin, A. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 393–412.
- Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult English L2 classroom: characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 536–556.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie, & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic.
- Long, M. H. (2007). *Problems in SLA*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies 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., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37–66.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (2013). Counterpoint piece: the case for variety in corrective feedback research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 35, 167–184.
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: a meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 265–302.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46, 1–40.
- Mackey, A., Adams, R., Stafford, C., & Winke, P. (2010). Exploring the relationship between modified output and working memory capacity. *Language Learning*, 60, 501–533.
- Mackey, A., & Goo, J. (2013). Interaction approaches in second language acquisition. In C. A. Chappelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics: Vol: Cognitive second language acquisition*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Miller, P. C., & Pan, W. (2012). Recasts in the L2 classroom: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Educational Research*, 56, 48–59.
- Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: a case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 536–550.
- Nassaji, H., & Wells, G. (2000). What's the use of 'triadic dialogue'? an investigation of teacher-student interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 376–406.
- Nystrand, M. (1997). Dialogic instruction: when recitation becomes conversation. In M. Nystrand, A. Gamoran, R. Kachur, & C. Prendergast (Eds.), *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom* (pp. 1–29). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Park, Y. (2014). The roles of third-turn repeats in two L2 classroom interactional contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, 35, 145–167.
- Peräkylä, A. (2004). Reliability and validity in research based on naturally occurring social interaction. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method, and practice* (pp. 283–304). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: the study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ranta, L., & Lyster, R. (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral language abilities: The Awareness-Practice-Feedback sequence. In R. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspective from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (pp. 141–160). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Révész, A. (2012). Working memory and the observed effectiveness of recasts on different L2 outcome measures. *Language Learning*, 62, 93–132.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar: a meta-analysis of the research. In J. Norris, & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133–164). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden, & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 44–70). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52–133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8, 289–327.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schulz, R. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 244–258.
- Sert, O., & Seedhouse, P. (2011). Introduction: conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 5, 1–14.
- Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences, and second language learning*. New York: Springer.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tarone, E., & Allwright, D. (2005). Second language teacher learning and student second language learning: shaping the knowledge base. In D. J. Tedick (Ed.), *Second language teacher education: International perspectives* (pp. 5–23) (Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers).
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy, and authenticity*. London: Longman.
- van Lier, L. (2008). Agency in the classroom. In J. Lantolf, & M. E. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages* (pp. 163–186). London: Equinox.
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6, 3–23.
- Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, 577–594.
- Waring, H. Z. (2011). Learner initiatives and learning opportunities in the language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 2, 201–218.
- Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: a proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and the learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 5, 1–37.
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2009). 'Very good' as a teacher response. *ELT Journal*, 63, 195–203.
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective-feedback types. *Language Awareness*, 17, 78–93.
- Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 293–314.