The comparative effectiveness of recasts and prompts in second language classrooms

Ting DING*

Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB2 8PQ, UK
Email:td300@cam.ac.uk

Abstract:

Focusing on two types of corrective feedback strategies in second language classrooms, namely recasts and prompts, the current paper claims that the comparative effectiveness of recasts and prompts is an area of great research value, for the following reasons: (1) theoretically, studies in this area can inform the issues such as the roles of input and output in second language learning and the cognitive roles of recasts and prompts in language learning; (2) pedagogically, research findings in this area may provide second language teachers with useful advice concerning their classroom error correction. Based on a critical review of existing research findings, two distinct research gaps are discussed: (1) the effect of recasts and prompts in promoting the learning of new linguistic features has rarely been explored and awaits future research attention; (2) the effect of recasts and prompts has rarely been examined from learners' own perspectives and more studies in this direction are needed.

Key Words: Corrective feedback, Recasts, Prompts, L2 learning

* Ting Ding is a PhD candidate in Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge. This paper constitutes part of the author's research project 'The effects of recasts and prompts on the learning of new linguistic features in an English-as-a-foreign-language setting' in China. This project is funded jointly by Cambridge overseas trust and China Scholarship Council.

As corrective strategies that teachers use to deal with errors of language learners, recasts provide reformulations of all or part of a learner's erroneous utterance without changing its central meaning (Long, Inagaki & Ortega, 1998) while prompts withhold the reformulations and encourage learners to correct their errors themselves (Lyster, 2002). As two categories of corrective feedback strategies in second language (L2) classrooms, a discussion of recasts and prompts therefore shall start from an introduction of research on corrective feedback in general.

1 RESEARCH ON CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

Research on corrective feedback (CF) has been driven by a very practical issue—what should be done when students make errors in L2 classrooms? Ever since Hendrickson (1978) framed the question of 'how should errors be corrected?', many researchers have devoted their effort into this direction. Some started their enquiry from identifying the different types of CF strategies that teachers use in L2 classrooms. Some widely accepted feedback types are introduced below.

1.1 Types of corrective feedback strategies

Six types of CF, which were first reported by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and have been widely accepted by other studies, are listed below together with their definitions and examples[1]:

a. Explicit correction refers to the explicit provision of the correct form. As the teacher provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the student had said was incorrect (e.g., "Oh, you mean", "You should say").

(1) L(learner): and three pear (sounds like *beer*).
T(teacher): not beer. Pear.

b. Recasts involve the teacher's reformulation of all or part of the student's utterance, minus the error, as shown in example (2).

(2)T: When you were in school?
L: Yes. I stand in the first row.
T: You stood in the first row?
L: Yes, in the first row, and sit, ah, sat the first row.

c. Clarification requests indicate to students that the utterance is ill-formed in some way and that a repetition or a reformulation is required. A clarification request includes phrases such as

[1] Definitions of the six types of CF are cited from Lyster and Ranta (1997), with some revision. Example (1) is cited from Sheen (2004), example (2) is selected from Ellis and Sheen (2006) and all other examples are from Yang (2008).

"Pardon me." It may also include a repetition of the error as in "What do you mean by *X*?" An example is given in (3).

(3)L: Why does he fly to Korea last year?
T: Pardon?
L: Why did he fly to Korea last year?

d. Metalinguistic feedback contains either comments, information, or questions related to how well-formed the student's utterance is, without explicitly providing the correct form, as in example (4).

(4)L: I went to the train station and pick up my aunt.
T: Use past tense consistently.
L: I went to the train station and picked up my aunt.

e. Elicitation refers to techniques that teachers use to directly elicit the correct form from the student. Teachers can elicit completion of their own utterance by strategically pausing to allow students to "fill in the blank", or use questions such as "How do we say X in English?" to elicit correct forms, or directly ask students to reformulate their utterance.

(5) L: Once upon a time, there lives a poor girl named Cinderella.
T: Once upon a time, there…
L: there lived a girl.

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

(6) L: Mrs Jones travel a lot last year.
T: Mrs Jones travel a lot last year?
L: Mrs Jones traveled a lot last year.

Following the fundamental work of identifying different types of CF, the past two decades have witnessed a research trend of examining which one or several type(s) of CF is/are most effective in promoting L2 learning. This issue is of great value because it can lead researchers one step further to the question 'how should errors be corrected?' If evidence can be provided supporting that certain feedback types are more effective than others, advices can then be given to L2 teachers to facilitate better error correction treatment and better L2 learning. Previous research work done in this trend generally classified the above feedback types into antagonistic categories, attributing the effectiveness/ineffectiveness of a certain feedback type to the characteristics of the category it belonged to. In the following section, before we introduce how the above mentioned CF strategies are classified into the two categories of recasts and prompts, another influential classification of CF types into implicit/explicit feedback is also introduced.

1.2 Classification of corrective feedback types

1.2.1 explicit feedback vs. implicit feedback

A popular classification of CF types is to differentiate feedback in terms of how implicit or explicit it is. In the case of implicit feedback, there is no overt indicator that an error has been committed, whereas in explicit feedback types there is (Yang, 2008). Implicit feedback often takes the form of recasts (Long, 1996; Long & Robinson, 1998; Lyster, 1998a), while explicit feedback is often operationalized as explicit correction or metalinguistic feedback (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006). Researchers have argued that the implicitness/explicitness of feedback can impact learners' perception as to whether it functions as a correction, thus influencing its effectiveness. For example, the corrective intentions of recasts were reported to be easily unnoticed by learners due to their implicitness (Lyster, 1998b; Loewen & Philp, 2006), as shown in example (7) (Loewen & Philp, 2006):

(7) L: To her is good thing. To her is good thing.
T: Yeah for her it's a good thing.
L: Because she got a lot of money there.

In the above example, the teacher's recast seemed to have been taken as a confirmation of what had been said instead of a correction of the erroneous utterance, due to its implicitness. In contrast, the corrective intention of explicit feedback types are often made more salient by overtly rejecting the erroneous utterance of learners.

However, this dichotomous classification of feedback can be problematic (Egi, 2007). Recasts are not necessarily implicit. With different characteristics (such as prosodic emphasis, intonation, length and number of changes[2]) and provided in different instructional contexts (such as meaning-based or form-based instructional contexts), recasts can lie 'at various points on a continuum of linguistic implicitness-explicitness' (Ellis & Sheen, 2006, pp. 583). For example, a recast in the form of a single word and with prosodic emphasis to make the reformulation salient (e.g., by simply saying '**Got**[3]' in response to an erroneous utterance of 'I get really angry yesterday') can be as explicit as an explicit correction (e.g., 'You should say Got'). The same type of recast provided in a form-based context is also believed to be more explicit than that in a meaning-based context (Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada, 2001). Therefore it is no easy task ranking different feedback types (such as recasts, metalinguistic feedback and explicit correction) according to their implicitness/explicitness. This difficulty with evaluating the implicitness/explicitness of feedback types, as well as some other theoretical concerns, has led to the classification of corrective feedback strategies into recasts and prompts--the main focus of the current paper.

1.2.2 recasts vs. prompts

[2] Please see Loewen and Philp (2006) and Sheen (2006) for a detailed introduction of the different characteristics of recasts.

[3] The bold characters are used to show that some certain words are uttered with prosodic emphasis.

Noticing that it is the self-correcting force of certain feedback strategies (such as "elicitation" and "metalinguistic feedback") rather than their explicitness that contribute to L2 development, Lyster (2002) questioned the reliability of comparing the effects of different feedback techniques according to their implicitness/explicitness. Instead, he differentiated two categories of feedback—those that withhold correct forms and encourage learners to self-correct (including clarification requests, metalinguistic clues, repetition and elicitation of the correct form, generally referred to as prompts) and the one that provides learners with correct reformulation and therefore obviates the necessity to self-correct (referred to as recasts). Because recasts provide language learners with target-like reformulations and exemplars, they account for a significant part of language input in L2 classrooms, while prompts encourage learners to produce their own target-like output. This classification of feedback has aroused great research interest in those who are concerned about theoretical issues such as the role of input and output in L2 learning, as well as the cognitive roles that recasts and prompts play. In the next section, theoretical and pedagogical concerns that have boosted the research on recasts and prompts are addressed in detail.

2 THEORETICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL VALUES WITH STUDYING THE RELATIVE EFFECTS OF RECASTS AND PROMPTS

2.1 The role of input and output in L2 learning

There has been a deep-rooted interest among researchers as to what kind of roles input and output play in L2 learning. The crucial role that input plays, as Erlam, Loewen and Philp (2009) stated, is widely acknowledged. VanPatten (2004), for example, claimed that input is sufficient to cause a change in learner competence; when input is processed by language learners, form-meaning connections (FMC) are made and parsing takes place, which is crucial for language learning. Krashen (1989) and Schwartz (1993) were also proponents of the idea that input alone can directly affect language learning.

However, there are conflicting views of the role that output plays in the language acquisition process. VanPatten (2004) claimed that output does not lead to new form-meaning connections (FMC) in learners' interlanguage, but only has a subsidiary role in strengthening existing FMC. Swain (1985), however, suggested that output has a greater role in the language acquisition process. Output practice can facilitate acquisition because it allows for cognitive processes, such as noticing, hypothesis testing, syntactic processing and metalinguistic reflection.

In L2 classrooms, recasts provide learners with correct reformulations and exemplars of the target features and thus constitute part of the input in class. Prompts on the other hand, stimulate learners to make more accurate and target-like output, and thus are good opportunities for doing output practices. Elucidating the manner in which recasts and prompts contribute to the learning process of L2 may add to the evidence that will inform the debate over the relative roles of input versus output in L2 learning.

2.2 The cognitive roles that recasts and prompts play in L2 learning

As Lyster (2004) stated, various researchers have used an information-processing model to describe the cognitive mechanism of L2 learning. The notion of information-processing modal is a concept in cognitive psychology, which describes skill acquisition as a gradual change in knowledge from declarative to procedural mental representations (Anderson, 1983). In this model, acquisition of a L2 is viewed as acquisition of a complex cognitive skill. Declarative knowledge refers to knowledge of the language system, such as word definitions and rule-based representations, whereas procedural knowledge refers to knowledge about how to perform language capacity, including language comprehension and production.

Ellis (1997) has distinguished between two types of language acquisition: (1) acquisition as the internalisation of new forms, and (2) acquisition as an increase in control over forms that have already been internalised. Linked with the information-processing model introduced above, the first type of language acquisition would be acquisition of new declarative knowledge and the second type would be the transition from declarative knowledge to procedural knowledge (Lyster, 2004). Lyster further argued that recasts, because they provide target-like exemplars, can facilitate the encoding of new declarative knowledge, while prompts, because of their aim to elicit target-like output, can help to increase learners' control over the already-internalised declarative knowledge, promoting the transition from declarative knowledge to procedural knowledge.

As suggested by Lyster, recasts and prompts may play different roles in the cognitive process of L2 learning, with the former facilitating the internalisation of new knowledge and the latter enhancing the control over already-acquired knowledge. This notion, however, still needs support from empirical studies which examine the relative effects of recasts and prompts on facilitating the acquisition of new linguistic features.

2.3 Pedagogical value in L2 classrooms

Recasts and prompts have both been considered as "pedagogically useful strategies in communicative language classrooms" (Nassaji, 2009). However, the two strategies function differently in classrooms. As for recasts, Doughty and Varela (1998) claimed that they are "potentially effective, since the aim is to add attention to form to a primarily communicative task rather than to depart from an already communicative goal in order to discuss a linguistic feature" (p. 114). Because recasts can keep the learners' focus on meaning but at the same time allow the teacher to maintain control over the linguistic form, they are described by Loewen and Philp (2006, p.537) as "pedagogically expeditious" and "time-saving." As for prompts, they draw learners' attention from the ongoing communicative task to the well-formedness of the linguistic form, providing learners with opportunities to correct their errors through various forms of requests for clarification and self-correction. Therefore, the pedagogical function of such feedback moves is to develop linguistic accuracy.

Many L2 teachers correct learners' erroneous utterances instinctively, using a combination of recasts and prompts. Though there is pedagogical justification that both corrective strategies should be used[4] (e.g., Ammar & Spada, 2006; Lyster, 2002), it remains a question to language teachers as to when to use more recasts and when to use more prompts. If research on corrective feedback could understand the specific effects of recasts and prompts on L2 learning, pedagogical suggestions can thus be provided to L2 teachers, helping them to find a balance between promoting L2 development and improving classroom efficiency.

3 PREVIOUS STUDIES ON THE EFFECTS OF RECASTS AND PROMPTS

Driven by the theoretical and pedagogical concerns discussed above, the relative effectiveness of recasts and prompts has become the subject of intensive inquiry. Among the many previous studies addressing this issue, different measures have been adopted to determine the effects of recasts and prompts. While the majority of these studies examined their effects by measuring learners' learning outcomes, other studies attempted to do so by examining learners' uptake/repair in response to as well as learners' perceptions of these two feedback techniques.

3.1 Learners' learning outcomes and the effects of recasts and prompts

The majority of previous studies on recasts and prompts have been conducted within an experimental or quasi-experimental framework, by providing recasts and prompts as different experimental treatments to different research groups, comparing the learning outcomes of these groups on a pretest-posttest basis and attributing greater effectiveness to either recasts or prompts that lead to better learning outcomes. According to many researchers, the advantage of this experimental research design lies in the great accuracy it can bring about when examining the effects of CF (Ammar & Spada, 2006).

For studies falling into this category, those conducted in classroom settings systematically differ in results from those operationalized in laboratory settings. Classroom studies which compared recasts with prompts have generally reported the advantage of prompts over recasts in helping learners to achieve better learning outcomes on selected target linguistic features (Lyster, 2004; Yang & Lyster, 2010; Ellis et al., 2006; Ellis, 2007; Ammar & Spada, 2006). For example, the study of Yang and Lyster (2010), one of the few that examined the effects of recasts and prompts in a Chinese EFL setting, reported that prompts had larger effects than recasts for increasing learners' accuracy in the use of regular past tense forms.

[4] For example, Ammar and Spada (2006) found that high-proficiency learners benefited equally from both prompts and recasts, whereas low-proficiency learners benefited significantly more from prompts than recasts. Considering that a second language class usually constitutes both high-proficiency learners and low-proficiency learners, it will be for the benefit of the whole class if teachers use both recasts and prompts. Recognizing the different pedagogical functions of recasts and prompts, Lyster (2002, p.251) also suggested teachers to use both of them "in accordance with their students' language abilities and content knowledge …without abandoning one at the expense of the other."

Most of the laboratory studies (Carroll & Swain, 1993; McDonough, 2007; Leeman, 2003; Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009), however, have found that there was no significant difference between prompt groups and recast groups and learners benefited as much from recasts as from prompts when acquiring target features through experimental interventions.

The reason for the different findings reported in the two different settings might lie in that, as noted by Lyster & Izquierdo (2009, p.458), "laboratory settings allow feedback to be delivered intensively in consistent ways on specific linguistic targets," while classroom settings do not. In laboratory studies, feedback can be designed to focus on specific linguistic features and be offered to learners consistently and repeatedly, which may magnify the effects of CF (especially that of recasts). Whereas the classroom instructional environment usually consists of multiple communications between teachers and learners as well as between learners themselves, which makes it hard for teachers to provide consistent feedback to specific target features.

3.2 Learners' uptake and the effects of recasts and prompts

Uptake is defined by Lyster and Ranta (1997) as "a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance" (p. 48). Uptake can take the form of (a) repair (i.e., the uptake move successfully corrects the initial error) or (b) needs repair (i.e., the uptake move does not correct the initial error) (Lyster & Ranta).

Some researchers (e.g., Chaudron, 1977) have viewed uptake as a main immediate measurement of the effectiveness of CF, believing that uptake with repair provides evidence that learners have noticed teachers' corrections and are able to deploy them while no uptake indicates learners' failure in noticing the corrective intention of the feedback. Research results from some studies that examined the uptake rate following recasts and prompts are presented below.

Lyster and Ranta (1997), for example, reported a high frequency of recasts (55% of all feedback moves examined) followed by a low uptake rate (only 31%) in French immersion classrooms in Canada. They, however, found that prompts that were less frequent led to higher uptake rates (about 90%). Panova and Lyster (2002) reported similar results in their study in Canadian adult English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) context, with prompts leading to higher uptake rates (about 93%) than recasts (only 40%). These studies seem to suggest that recasts are ineffective in eliciting learners' uptake. Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen (2001) and Sheen (2004), however, found that in adult ESL classrooms in New Zealand and adult EFL classrooms in South Korea, both recasts and prompts generally led to high uptake rates (approximately 80% uptake rate for recasts and approximately 100% for prompts), much higher than uptake rates reported in Canadian immersion and ESL classrooms. A possible explanation for the differential research results on uptake rates is the influence of different instructional contexts: while immersion classrooms and ESL classrooms in Canada focused more on

language content and speaking fluency, ESL classrooms in New Zealand and South Korea were more devoted to language forms and accuracy (Sheen, 2004).

However, caution should be taken before any conclusion on the effects of recasts and prompts can be drawn from the uptake frequencies reported above, since the use of immediate uptake as a valid measure of the effectiveness of CF has been widely questioned. Firstly, the absence of uptake does not necessarily means the lack of effect from CF (Braidi, 2002; Gass, 1997; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Oliver, 1995, 2000; Ammar & Spada, 2006), as it is possible that learners have processed and learned from the feedback in their inner thought, but did not overtly respond to it (Ohta, 2002; Nassaji, 2009). Secondly, some uptake following recasts may be a sign of 'mimicking' (Gass, 2003, p.236), with the learner repeating mechanically what the teacher had said without any learning happening.

Although the valid role of uptake in evaluating the effects of recasts and prompts has been denied, it should be noted that uptake is still an 'important and observable source for understanding the impact of the feedback' (Nabei & Swain, 2002, p. 45), for it demonstrates how learners react or respond to feedback moves.

3.3 Learners' perceptions of recasts/prompts

Another approach used by pervious researchers (e.g., Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000; Nabei & Swain, 2002; Egi, 2007) to evaluate the effects of CF is to elicit learners' perceptions of feedback moves at the time they receive them. Retrospective techniques such as stimulated-recall interviews have been used in such studies to examine whether a learner could recognise the corrective intention of a certain feedback move. The use of this approach is justified by the role of noticing in L2 learning: since noticing is argued to be the condition under which language learning could take place (Gass, 1997), learners' recognition of the corrective intention of CF demonstrates their noticing of the deficiency with their knowledge and thus constitutes potential opportunities for language learning, while learners' failure in perceiving CF as corrections may not contribute to language learning (Mackey et al.). In such cases, research on learners' perceptions of CF can help to understand how CF may arouse learners' noticing and further more lead to language learning.

Of the existing studies on learners' perceptions of CF, most of them (Nabei & Swain, 2002; Carpenter et al., 1006; Egi, 2007) focused on learners' perceptions of recasts only. These studies reported that learners' perceptions of recasts were closely related to the types of linguistic features that recasts targeted: recasts focusing on learners' lexical, phonological and semantic errors were more easily perceived as corrections than those targeting morphosyntactic errors. The study of Mackey et al. (2000) examined learners' perceptions of several feedback techniques (including recasts and some subtypes of prompts), and they reported that learners' perceptions of these feedback types were influenced by the linguistic focus of the feedback as well. Their study, however, made no comparison between the ways in which learners perceive

recasts and prompts. Therefore a research gap exists as to how learners perceive recasts and prompts.

4 EXISTING RESEARCH GAPS

4.1 The need to examine the effects of recasts and prompts on the acquisition of new linguistic features

One common characteristic with the previous experimental/quasi-experimental studies[5] on recasts and prompts (as introduced in section 3.1) is that the target linguistic features which they have explored are not new to learners. These target structures, including simple past tense in English (Ellis et al., 2006; Ellis, 2007; McDonough, 2007; Yang & Lyster, 2010), grammatical gender in French (Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009; Lyster, 2004), third-person possessive determiners in English (Ammar & Spada, 2006) and dative alternation in English (Carroll & Swain, 1993), were all claimed by researchers to have already appeared in learners' L2 systems. It would seem that feedback treatments taking the form of recasts or prompts only functioned as enhancement of existing features in these studies.

Nassaji (2009) examined the effects of recasts and prompts on a series of linguistic features. Despite the fact that these target features were not new to learners in his study either, he came to an inspiring point that the degree of learners' latent knowledge of the target forms may affect the efficacy of recasts and prompts, based on his finding that recasts generally worked better than prompts when they were provided towards target forms that learners did not know well. It might be that prompts rely more heavily on learners' latent knowledge of the target form than recasts. He further hypothesized that recasts could be "more beneficial for learning new forms" than prompts (2009, p.441).

Ellis and Sheen (2006) made a similar statement about the benefit of recasts on promoting learning of new language forms:

> …, it remains possible that recasts will prove more effective in promoting acquisition of new linguistic features, although this remains to be demonstrated empirically, as the majority of existing studies examined features of which learners already have partial knowledge.

Whether recasts are more effective than prompts in promoting learning of new language forms still needs the support from empirical evidence. However, to study the relative effectiveness of recasts and prompts on the learning of new forms does not seem to be a fair comparison: prompts, by definition, do not provide learners with target-like forms but instead push them to

[5] Studies that focused on learners' uptake in response to or learners' perceptions of recasts and prompts (as introduced in section 3.2 and 3.3) are excluded from the discussion in this section, since it is the characteristic of experimental/quasi-experimental studies that specific linguistic features are selected and are targeted on during the experimental intervention. Studies examining learners' uptake and perceptions are generally based on real-classroom observation and may consist of learning of both old and new linguistic features.

make target-like output. This leads to the question of how teachers can push learners to produce utterances on language forms of which they have no knowledge.

This problem can be solved by providing learners with form-focused instructions[6] on the new target features prior to the feedback treatment (in the form of recasts/prompts). In this kind of design, form-focused instruction can familiarize learners with new declarative knowledge of the target features, and recasts/prompts in the following feedback intervention may promote the internalisation of this new declarative knowledge as well as the transition from declarative knowledge to procedural knowledge. By adopting this research design, it is possible to examine the effects of recasts and prompts in facilitating the acquisition of new declarative knowledge and new procedural knowledge.

4.2 The need to examine the effects of recasts and prompts from learners' perspectives

As introduced in section 3, the research approach that dominates the study on the effects of recasts and prompts is based on the experimental design and the measurement of learners' learning outcomes, and has been argued to be more accurate than other approaches (e.g., using learners' immediate uptake) in determining the effects of feedback techniques (Ammar & Spada, 2006). This dominant approach, however, has researched the effects of these two feedback strategies in a similar way that scientists research the physical world: operating recasts and prompts as different experimental interventions to different groups of learners and seeking any possible difference between the learning outcomes of these groups. This application of a natural science research approach to CF research is not without problems, because it has ignored the influence imposed by recasts and prompts on human participants and the change of participants in behaviour and opinion accordingly. Because human behaviour under study in social research is not 'mechanistic' and is usually 'very context sensitive and multifaceted' (Esterberg, 2002, pp.11), a social phenomenon (such as the effects of recasts and prompts) can be better understood if the human participants' opinions, reactions, and perceptions etc. are taken into consideration.

Although some studies have explored learners' responses to recasts and prompts (by examining learners' immediate uptake, as introduced in section 3.2), controversial findings have been reported in different instructional settings, inviting more evidence from future research. At the meantime, some efforts have also been made to explore learners' perceptions of CF, yet little is known as to whether differences exist in the ways learners perceive recasts and prompts (please see section 3.3). Furthermore, little research has been done to elicit learners' opinions of the feedback they receive, leaving another research gap in this area. Generally speaking, the inquiry of the effects of recasts and prompts from learners' own perspectives is far from well-developed and further research in this direction is required.

[6] Form-focused instruction refers to 'any pedagogical effort which is used to draw the learners' attention to language form' (Spada, 1997, p.73).

5 CONCLUSIONS

From what has been discussed above, it is demonstrated that recasts and prompts constitute two important categories of corrective feedback. Comparing the effects of these two feedback forms may cast light on theoretical issues such as (a) the role of input and output in L2 learning, and (b) the cognitive roles that recasts and prompts play in L2 learning. It may also provide teachers in L2 classrooms with pedagogical advice to maximize the effect of error correction, all of which have made research on recasts and prompts an issue of intensive enquiry. While a lot of studies have been devoted to this topic, there are still some under-researched areas. First, most of the existing studies focused on linguistic features of which learners already have some knowledge, and the effects of recasts and prompts on promoting learning of new knowledge has remained untouched. Second, the majority of previous studies have evaluated the effects of recasts and prompts by measuring learners' learning outcomes, while the influence of these two feedback strategies on learners' responses, perceptions and opinions etc. is rarely explored. Future studies on the effect of recasts and prompts shall be directed to address these two research gaps.

REFERENCES

[1] Ammar, A., and Spada, N. 2006, One size fits all? Recasts, prompts and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(4), 543-574.

[2] Anderson, J., 1983, *The architecture of cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[3] Braidi, M., 2002, Reexamining the role of recasts in native-speaker/nonnative-speaker interactions. *LanguageLearning*, 52, 1–42.

[4] Carroll, S., and Swain, M. 1993, Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(3), 357-386.

[5] Chaudron, C. 1977, A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning*, 27(1), 29–46.

[6] Doughty, C. and Varela, E., 1998, Communicative focus on form. In *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*, eds., C. Doughty, & J.Williams. 114, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[7] Egi, T., 2007, Interpreting recasts as linguistic evidence: The roles of linguistic target, length, and degree of change. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 29(4),511-537.

[8] Ellis, R., 1997, *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[9] Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. 2001, Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51(2), 281–318.

[10] Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R., 2006, Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 339-368.

[11] Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y., 2006, Re-examining the role of recasts in L2 acquisition. *Studies in Second language Acquisition*, 28(4), 575-600.

[12] Ellis, R., 2007, The differential effects of corrective feedback on two grammaticalstructures. In *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies. ed.*, A. Mackey, 339-360,Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[13] Erlam, R., Loewen, S., & Philp, J., 2009, The roles of output-based and input-based instruction in the acquisition of L2 implicit and explicit knowledge. In *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching.* eds., R. Ellis, S. Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philp, & H. Reinders, 241-261, Bristol: Multilingual matters.

[14] Esterberg, K. 2002, *Qualitative methods in social research*. 11, Boston: McGraw-Hill Companies.

[15] Gass, M. 1997, *Input, interaction and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

[16] Gass, M. 2003,Input and interaction. In *Handbook of second language acquisition*, eds., C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long, 224-255, Oxford: Blackwell.

[17]Hendrickson, J., 1978, Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. Modern Language Journal, 62(8), 387–398.

[18] Krashen, S., 1989, We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal*, 74(4), 440-464.

[19] Leeman, J. 2003, Recasts and L2 development: Beyond negative evidence. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25(1), 37–63.

[20] Loewen, S., and Philp, J., 2006, Recasts in adults English L2 classrooms:Characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), 536–556.

[21] Long, M., 1996, The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In *Handbook of second language acquisition*, eds., W. Ritchie, & T. Bhatia, 413-468, New York, CA: Academic Press.

[22] Long, M., and Robinson, P., 1998, Focus on form: Theory, research and practice. In *Focus on form in classroom language Acquisition*, eds., C. Doughty, & J. Williams, 15–41 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[23] Long, M., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. 1998, The role of implicit feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 357–371.

[24] Lyster, R., and Ranta, L., 1997, Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19(1), 37-66.

[25] Lyster, R., 1998a, Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48(2), 183–218.

[26] Lyster, R., 1998b, Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20(1), 51–81.

[27]Lyster, R., 2002, Negotiation in immersion teacher-student interaction. International Journal of Educational Research, 37(3-4), 237-253.

[28] Lyster, R., 2004, Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(3), 399-432.

[29] Lyster, R., and Izquierdo, J. 2009, Prompts versus recasts in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning*, 59(3), 458.

[30] Mackey, A., and Philp, J., 1998, Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 338–356.

[31] Mackey, A., Gass, S. & McDonough, K. 2000, How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22(4), 471-497.

[32] McDonough, K. 2007, Interactional feedback and the emergence of simple past activity verbs in L2 English. In *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies.* ed., A. Mackey, 323-338, Oxford: Oxford University Press.2007.

[33] Nabei, T. and Swain, M. 2002, Learner awareness of recasts in classroom interaction: a case study of an adult EFL student's second language learning. *Language awareness*, 11(1), 45.

[34] Nassaji, H., 2009, Effects of recasts and elicitations in dyadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. *Language Learning*, 59(2), 411-452.

[35] Nicholas, H., Lightbown, M. & Spada, N., 2001, Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning*, 51(4), 719–758.

[36] Ohta, A., 2000, Rethinking recasts: A learner-centered examination of corrective feedback in the Japanese classroom. In *The construction of second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. eds., J. K. Hall & L. Verplaeste , 47-71, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

[37] Oliver, R., 1995, Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*,17, 459–481.

[38] Oliver, R., 2000. Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pairwork. *Language Learning*, 50, 119–151.

[39] Panova, I., and Lyster, R. 2002, Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573-595.

[40] Schwartz, B., 1993, On explicit and negative data effecting and affecting competence and linguistic behavior. *Studies in Second language Acquisition*, 15(2), 147-163.

[41] Sheen, Y. 2004, Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 263–300.

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

[43] Spada , N. 1997, Form-focussed instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language Teaching*, *30*, 73 – 87.

[44] Swain, M., 1985, Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In *Input in Second Language Acquisition*,. eds., S. Gass, and C. Madden, 235-253, Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

[45] VanPatten, B., 2004, Input and output in establishing form-meaning connections In *Form -meaning Connections in Second Language Acquisition*. eds., B. VanPatten, J. Williams, S. Rott, & M. Overstreet Mahwah, 29-48, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

[46] Yang, Y., 2008, Corrective feedback and Chinese learners` acquisition of English past tense. PhD dissertation, McGill University.

[47] Yang, Y. and Lyster, R., 2010, Effects of form-focused practice and feedback on Chinese EFL learners' acquisition of regular and irregular past tense forms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 235-263.