Learner Awareness of Recasts in Classroom Interaction:
Analysis of Empirical Research in L2 Classroom

Dr. Talal M. Amara

talal.amara@gmail.com

Ministry of Education, Tripoli, Libya

Abstract:

In the past two decades, there have been a number of research studies that found positive impacts of different types of recasts on learning a range of linguistic forms. This review analyzes the existing empirical research studies about the learners' awareness of teacher recasts in L2 classroom i¬nteraction. Furthermore, it focuses on the debate about the role of recast in learning a second language. While some researchers have criticized teacher recast as inefficient, unnoticeable, and ambiguous, others have described it as useful and effective in improving learners' accuracy. Some found that teacher recast may be perceived by learners as a confirmation of meaning rather than form (Lyster, 1998). This review helps pinpoint the factors (i.e. noticeability, learners' proficiency level, etc.) that contribute to the effec-tiveness of teacher recast. Researchers have yet clearly identified the differ-ential benefits that teacher recast may show in comparison to other forms of corrective feedback.

Keywords:
Corrective feedback, Recast, Saliency, noticeability.

Introduction:

With much of the empirical evidence of positive impact of interaction in second language (L2) development, many researchers have become more interested in investigating specific aspects of interaction including teacher recasts and its saliency. This research direction may likely influence the extent to which classroom interaction benefits L2 learning (Mackey, 2012; Gass & Mackey, 2015; Loewen & Sato, 2018). Teacher recasts have been at the center of most CF research with a view to understand the nature of recasts, their characteristics, and their relative efficacy. Teacher recasts in L2 learning contexts have been much investigated as an important contributing factor in L2 development. Long (2007) defined a recast as "a reformulation of all or part of a learner's immediately preceding utterance in which one or more non-target-like (lexical, grammatical, etc.) items is/are replaced by the corresponding target language form(s), and where, throughout the exchange, the focus of the interlocutors is on meaning, not language as object" (p. 77). To be more specific in a pedagogical sense, a recast is "the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 46). Teacher recasts may likely create favorable situations for L2 development because they immediately follow the learner's incorrect utterance

(e.g., Long, 2015; doughty, 2001). long (2007) states that "recasts convey needed information about the target language in context, when interlocutors share a joint attentional focus, and when the learner already has prior comprehension of at least part of the message, thereby facilitating form-function mapping" (p. 77).

Teacher recasts as one of the types of corrective feedback have been under the spotlight in recent research studies. Nicholas et al (2001) also defined teacher recasts as the restatement and reformation of learners' incorrect utterances. This type of corrective feedback is viewed as conductive to L2 acquisition (e.g., Nassaji, 2009; Sheen, 2006). However, there are a number of contrasting views on the effectiveness of teacher recasts. Ammar and Spada (2006), for instance, indicate that some researchers describe teacher recasts as an effective corrective feedback form because they are implicit and contingent on learners' intended meaning (Doughty, 2001; Leeman, 2003; Oliver, 1995); whereas other researchers (Truscott, 1999) view them as ineffective and useless. Braidi (2002) defines teacher recast as a response to an immediate incorrect utterance of a non-native speaker. Long (2007) also defines recast as a reformulation of all or part of a learner's utterance and replaced by the corresponding correct forms. Sheen (2006) believes that teacher recast consists of a reformulation of all or part of learner's incorrect utterance with at least

one error within the classroom interaction. Teacher recasts is considered as a type of implicit feedback and most commonly used in language classroom interaction (e.g. Havranek, 1999; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000). Researchers have concluded that teacher recast was favored because it saves time on correction and does not interrupt classroom interaction flow (Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Han, 2002; Leeman, 2003; Loewen & Philp, 2006).

Oral corrective feedback

Oral corrective feedback has been defined in various aspects in language teaching and learning (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Ellis, 2006; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Mendez & del Rosario Reyes Cruz, 2012). The term 'corrective feedback' was first introduced by Chaudron (1977) to refer to "any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demand improvement of the learner utterance" (p. 31). This view raises the importance of classroom teachers in assisting learners in correcting their own errors or providing other types of feedback to learners on their language performance. This may include praising their correct linguistic and phonological performance. This corrective feedback to the learner's erroneous utterances can be implicit (e.g. recasts, repetition, etc.) or explicit (i.e. a grammatical explanation) (Carroll & Swain, 1993). Corrective feedback is viewed as a form of teacher corrections of students' erroneous oral production. Corrective feedback is considered as information given to learners regarding an error they make (Sheen, 2007). It indicates "an indication to a learner that his/her use of the target language is incorrect" (Lightbown & Spada, 2021, p. 172), or "responses to learner utterances containing an error" (Ellis, 2006, p. 28) but also as a "complex phenomenon with several functions" (Chaudron, 1977, p. 152) consisting of ,(a) an indication that an error has been committed, (b) provision of the correct target language form, or (c) metalinguistic information about the nature of the error, or any combination of theseʿ (Ellis et al., 2006, p. 340). Despite the fact that there are a number of conceptions of oral corrective feedback in language learning, oral CF is widely perceived as a useful teacher technique in classroom in correcting students' inaccurate utterances. In other words, oral corrective feedback refers to any correction technique teachers use in classroom to indicate or

respond to students' erroneous utterances. That can simply be by providing students with the correct form of their original form or giving them clues for the correct form.

Types of recast:

Although, teacher recast is generally one of the most studied types corrective feedback in the literature, it has been found to generate more ambiguity to its effectiveness for acquiring a second language. There are some slight differences in classifying teacher recasts that may have an influence in noticing and therefore, learners' uptake. Lyster (1998, p. 58-59) classified recasts into four types:

- Isolated declarative: It provides confirmation of a learner's message by correctly reformulating all or part of the student's ill-formed utterance. This type refers to the correction and reformation of learner's incorrect statement without adding any extra information.
  Ex: Student: the school bus arrive at 07:30 am.
  Teacher: Arrives…!
- Isolated interrogative: It refers to the confirmation of learner's message by either totally or partially reformulating the utterance with rising intonation and no additional meaning.
  Ex: student: the school bus always come on time.
  Teacher: the school bus always comes on time?
- Incorporated declarative: It refers to the reformulation of all or part of the ill-formed utterance into a longer statement with some additional information.
  Ex: Student: I always going to school by bus.
  Teacher: You always go to school by bus.
- Incorporated interrogative recast: It seeks additional information through the incorporation of the correct reformulation of all or part of a learner´s utterance into a question.

Fukuya and Zhang (2002) introduced pragmalinguistic recast as another kind of recast that contributes to pragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy of learner's utterance. They define it as the teacher's reformulation of:

1) An utterance that is grammatically inappropriate by changing the head act (and adding some hedges)
2) A pragmatically appropriate but grammatically incorrect utterance by changing the linguistic part of the head act (p. 7).

Based on these two features (i.e. pragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy), teacher recasts can be classified into four types:

1) If there is a correct usage and a correct form, recast is not needed; and therefore, learners are praised for their correct usage.
2) This occurs when there is a correct usage, but an incorrect form is produced. Therefore, teacher recast focuses only on their incorrect part of their utterance.
3) This is provided when there is an incorrect usage, but the correct form is used.
4) This occurs when there is an incorrect usage and incorrect form; and therefore, teachers reform the entire sentence or statement using their recast (Fukuya & Zhang, 2002)

As more attention has occurred about the impact of recast on L2 learners, more definitions and classifications have arisen to illustrate their role in learning a second language. For example, Farrokhi and Hassan (2012) clearly argue that recasts can be identified as either intensive or extensive recast. Intensive type of recast is normally directed at a single structure and suggests the treatment of recasts as an explicit feedback; whereas extensive type of recast is normally directed at different structures, and suggests the treatment of recasts as an implicit feedback. Sheen (2006, p. 365-366) proposes four criteria for determining what teacher recast is:

1) recasts are a discourse move that is identifiable at the level of one turn;
2) recasts can arise in either meaning or form focused interaction;
3) recasts can be more or less implicit/explicit, depending on their form;
4) recasts entail reformulations of one or more errors in a learner's utterance.

In further explanation of this reformulation, Sheen (ibid) divides these reformulations into three kinds of repetitions of the learner's utterance:

a) Complete.
   Ex: Student: My father has car.
      Teacher: My father has a big car.
b) Partial.
   Ex: Student: Where did you wen last weekend?
      Teacher: go last weekend.
c) Expanded.
   Ex: Student: Mary loves.
      Teacher: Mary loves watching action movies.

Loewen & Philp (2006) suggest that teacher recasts can be segmented so the error is highlighted and separated from the rest of the ill-formed utterance.
   Ex: Student: I went to supermarket.
      Teacher: to the supermarket.

Asari (2012) adds the speaker's emphasis (i.e. stressed and unstressed) as another category to differentiate two types of recasts. This type of recast may focus on phonetic errors (example.1), vocabulary errors (example.2), or grammar errors (example.3).

   Ex. 1: Student: She read three books last month.
      Teacher: She READ three books last month.
   Ex. 2: Student: David did only one mistake.
      Teacher: David MADE only one mistake.
   Ex. 3: Student: Emily is looking to the window.
      Teacher: Emily is looking AT the window.

Another category of teacher recast can be the number of errors the recast targets. In some cases, teacher recast targets only a single error.
   Ex. I visit Italy the last month.
   Ex. I visited Italy.

In other cases, teacher recasts target two or more errors in student's utterance.
Ex. She don't go to school in Fridays.
   Ex. She doesn't go to school on Fridays.

Noticeability of recasts:
   Noticeability of teacher recasts in language learning normally occurs when learners focus on the form and meaning of language structures in input,

and contribute to the internalization of the rule (Batstone, 1996). Swain and Lapkin (1998) identified three types of noticeability of teacher recasts. Teacher recasts can be either related to the form of input, noticing learner's own interlanguage deficiencies, or noticing the gap between the interlanguage and target language. A significant number of researchers have investigated the noticeability of corrective feedback and its effectiveness in general; however, they did not empirically examine the relationship between the noticing of the corrective feedback and L2 development Alavi, et al. (2015). They draw some conclusions about the noticeability without any empirical evidence.

On other hand, some researchers (i.e. Nabei and Swain, 2002) conducted a case study on a female Japanese university student to test the potential relationship between noticing and L2 development. They examined the student's language learning in relation meaning, language, feedback. Teacher recast was provided to errors on various linguistic structures including grammatical, lexical, phonological, and incomplete sentences. They found out that the amount of noticing and learning depended on the engagement the participant felt with the assigned task. Mackey (2006) conducted a larger scale study to investigate the relationship between the noticing of L2 form during classroom interactions and the effects of feedback. She found out that the learners were able to notice corrective feedback and that there was a positive relationship between the noticeability of feedback and L2 learning. That is, the learners' reports of noticing were mediated by error type in that they reported more noticing for questions than the other two targets and their development on the questions target was superior and the past tense forms. Ellis and Sheen (2006) argue that teacher recasts used in recent research studies contain other elements such as special stress and repetition making the recast quite explicit. In this sense, Ellis and Sheen (2006) argue that the implicitness of teacher recasts relies on the linguistic signals encoding the recasts and, therefore, a recast could be partially implicit or explicit. Similarly, Ammar and Sato (2010) who investigated the relationship between the noticing of explicit and implicit recasts on errors with questions, the past tense, and the third person possessive. The results revealed that the explicit recasts were noticed more than their implicit counterparts overall and that the explicit recasts led to more L2 knowledge gains than the implicit recasts. Finally, Taddarth (2010) looked at the relationship between the noticeability of implicit and explicit recasts and learner uptake. The results revealed that explicit recasts were more effective than implicit recasts in leading to uptake and language gains for both targets and that there was also a positive relationship between uptake and the learning of questions.

Learner uptake and saliency of recast:

Since corrective feedback is intended to help learners reform their errors, their reactions towards any given CF is worth studying. These reactions are described as 'uptake'. Lyster and Ranta (1997) define learner uptake 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. 49). Therefore, learner uptake is 'a discourse move' (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013). This view denotes the teacher's reformulation of students' erroneous utterances and their attempts to respond immediately following the teacher's corrective feedback.

Teacher recasts have been viewed in the literature as implicit feedback; however, Ellis and Sheen (2006) discuss that in detail. They conclude that teacher recasts cannot purely be seen as implicit but also as explicit. Sato (2011) explains that saliency of teacher recasts will influence whether learners notice the recasts and hence its effectiveness. Philp (2003) indicates that learners can be taught to develop their ability to notice recasts. More discussion has been done about the saliency of recasts, and how they relate to learners' uptake. Saliency of teacher recasts have been related to the length of the utterance (Eggi, 2007). Sheen (2006) also states that the length of recasts as well as the linguistic focus (i.e., pronunciation, grammar), types of change (i.e., substitution, addition), mode (i.e., declarative, interrogative), the use of reduction (i.e., complete or partial recasts), and the number of changes (one or multiple) influence the saliency of recasts. A number of research studies have investigated learners' uptake of teacher recasts. Mackey et al. (2000) defined uptake of recasts as "the learners' modification of their original utterance following the NS's provision of feedback through recasts or negotiation" (p. 492). Their results pointed to the

learners' awareness of the intent of corrective feedback targeting lexical, semantic and phonological errors, but not the morphosyntactic issues. That is, only 52% of corrective feedback resulted in learners' modification of their original utterance; while 66% of it was viewed as phonological errors, and only 19% on lexical errors. Therefore, uptake in this sense is a sign of noticing with 66% chance. Many research studies on the noticeability of recasts have relied on verbal signs, and the significance of nonverbal signs has yet to be determined. Schmidt (1995) claims that noticing requires awareness and that SLA cannot occur without noticing. Schmidt further argued that only recasts targeting linguistic items that learners notice could result in intake. This hypothesis raises a question among some researchers (e.g., Gass, 1997; Tomlin & Villa, 1994) on whether learning truly requires awareness. Truscott (1999) for instance argues that noticing only helps the development of metalinguistic knowledge and has no impact on communicative competence. Today, there is a consensus that noticing and awareness are helpful for L2 learning (e.g., Godfroid, Boers, & Housen, 2013; Leow, 2000; Mackey, 2006; Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000). Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen (2001) redefined 'Learner uptake' to refer to the learner's utterance in which it is optional, and could occur not only after teacher recast, but also after any utterance made by anyone that provide information about a target feature. They added that successful uptake is equal to an explicit indication on the part of the learner that the linguistic feature has been understood. Successful uptake, in turn, is demonstrated by the learner's use of the corrected form after receiving feedback. These results align with Loewen's (2004) results, who in an attempt to demonstrate the types of feedback that would be more successful in leading to more uptake. Ohta (2000) concluded that learners were more likely to notice teacher recasts when they were directed either toward another student or to the whole class, and not when the recasts were directed to the learners' own errors. That is, teacher recasts are noticed by students in a class, even if they do not lead to uptake from the actual student who has originally made the error. Mackey and Philp (1998) also examined the effects of teacher recasts that repeatedly focus on a particular linguistic form in a communicative classroom exchange with adult learners of English where learners' uptake to recasts

were viewed in the type of 'continue', 'repeat', 'modify', and other. In the 'continue' type of uptake, the learners could either acknowledge their teacher recasts with a sound (e.g., "hmm") or simply continue with the task. In the 'repeat' uptake, the learners simply repeat the recast partially or in its entirety, while the 'modify' type called for some kind of modification (not repetition) of the recast. Finally, the "other" type indicated that in some cases an uptake is not possible for some reason such as change of topic. The results showed that the learners rarely modified their utterances immediately after their teacher recast. This led the to an assumption that teacher recast is more likely to be perceived and learned from by more developmentally ready learners and that simple repetition of a recast does not constitute L2 learning.

Research studies have shown that teacher recasts lead to uptake in Korean EFL classrooms as well as in ESL classrooms in New Zealand (Ellis et al., 2001& Sheen, 2004), The lack of uptake following teacher recasts in content-based classrooms stems out of their ambiguity. Teacher recasts may be perceived by learners as another way to say the same thing or as positive reinforcements of meaning and not as reactions to a problem in the original utterance (Long, 1996). As mentioned above, Lyster and Ranta (1997) found that learners did not immediately respond to teacher recasts as often as they did to other corrective techniques, rendering the resulting limited uptake as a sign that learners did not notice the recasts' corrective intent. However, Sheen (2004) found out that teacher recasts lead to more uptake in the more structured foreign language classrooms and that reduced recasts have a higher chance to be noticed by learners in communicative contexts. Lyster (1998) concluded that isolated declarative recasts were repaired (23%) in comparison to incorporated recasts (0%).

Teacher recast and language anxiety:

Language anxiety may also have a role in the way learners notice and/or respond to teacher recasts. Language anxiety is defined as a type of situation-specific anxiety and aroused by situations in which some learners listen, speak, read, and write in the L2 (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986; MacIntyre, 1999). In an experimental classroom research, Sheen (2008) investigated whether the influence of language anxiety differs according to

CF types. She concluded that recasts significantly helped the low-anxiety recast group to outperform the high-anxiety recast group and the low-anxiety control group, and the performance of the high-anxiety recast group showed no significant difference from the control group. These results indicate that language anxiety significantly affects the learners' repair and learning following recasts. However, Rassaei's (2015) study yielded the results that low-anxiety learners benefited from both recasts and direct metalinguistic feedback, but the high-anxiety learners benefited from recasts significantly more than they did from metalinguistic feedback. That is, anxiety plays a significant role on the way learners perceive teacher recasts. In other words, learners with no or low anxiety are more likely to benefit from teacher recast comparing to those who have high level of anxiety. Mifka-Profozic (2013) investigated the effects of recasts and clarification requests on the students' acquisition of two complex forms and found out that teacher recasts are the only useful feedback type for learners. In further analyses, she, however, did not find any significant correlation between language anxiety and CF effectiveness. This raises a significant question, and argues many claims that anxiety has a high impact on how learners react to teacher recasts.

The effectiveness of recasts:

To date, it is evident that teacher recasts can be manipulated to improve efficacy; this effect stems from learners' different levels of awareness of target structures. In general, researchers have found short recasts with one or two corrections are more effective than long ones. The effectiveness of teacher recasts has been argued to depend on a number of factors (i.e. intonation, length, and number of changes), which may impact the noticeability of the recasts and, therefore on the learning outcome (e.g., Egi, 2007; Loewen & Philp, 2006; Nassaji, 2009; Philp, 2003; Sheen, 2006). Researchers (e.g. Dörnyei, 2009; Ellis, 2004; Goo, 2012; Mackey, 2012; R; Sawyer & Ranta, 2001; Skehan, 2002; Trofi movich et al., 2007) have also argued whether the recasts may be affected by individual differences related to motivation, learners' personality, learning styles, learning strategies, and language aptitude. Other factors (e.g. age and gender) have been examined to find out their impact on the effectiveness of teacher recasts (Oliver, 2000). Researchers agree that it is difficult

to draw a concrete conclusion on the effectiveness of teacher recasts on learning outcome as most of the researchers argue different attributes to recasts. Nicholas et al (2001, p. 752) suggested that "recasts can be effective if the learner has already begun to use a particular linguistic feature and is in a position to choose between linguistic alternatives". Anmar (2008) however found that learners with low proficiency level tended to benefit more from prompts than from recasts. Therefore, other researchers have included learners' proficiency as a variable in the study of recasts effectiveness in the classroom (e.g., Ammar & Spada, 2006). Ayoun (2004) and Lyster (2004) investigated the effectiveness of recasts as opposed to other instructional strategies on acquisition. They identified four aspects that may impact the effectiveness of recasts. First, teacher recasts are beneficial when learners have a higher level of proficiency (e.g., Ammar & Spada, 2006; Li, 2013; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada, 2001; Philp & Mackey, 2010). Second, teacher recasts are more noticeable when they focus on form (e.g., Lyster & Mori, 2006; Sheen, 2004). Third, lexical and phonological targets are more likely to be noticed (e.g., Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013; Mackey et al., 2000), but the correct noticeability of grammatical targets varies (e.g., Lyster et al., 2013). Lastly, various features of recasts affect the saliency of recasts and therefore the noticeability of recasts (e.g., Kamiya, 2015; Loewen & Philp, 2006; Sheen, 2006). Doughty and Varela (1998) found out that prior repetition of the error reduces the ambiguity of the recast as corrective feedback and draws the learner's attention to the problematic form. Their findings suggest a beneficial effect in the combination of drawing learners' attention to the error and then recasting. All the researchers (e.g. Lyster, 1998; Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Panova and Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004) have concluded that recast is the least effective in comparison with other types of feedback. However, the results from other studies show that teacher recast can be as effective if learners' attention is drawn to the error using some techniques (e.g. Lowen and Philp, 2006; Nassaji, 2007; Panova and Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2006; etc). Finally, Loewen and Philp (2006) found that researchers view teacher recasts as "productive for learners" (p. 551)., and that teacher recast is time saving, less threatening to student confidence, and

less intrusive to the flow of interaction than other factors such as elicitation of self-repair. Han (2008) on the other hand argue that in order for teacher recasts to be effective in the classroom setting, their corrective target has to be made salient. Therefore, teachers need to determine the meaning the learner is trying to convey and then provide recasts based on that and focus on one grammatical feature. This was agreed by Doughty and Varela's (1998) investigation on the effectiveness of 'corrective recasts' versus no feedback on the acquisition of the past tense. The results reveal that on the immediate post-test, the group that received teacher recast gained significantly on both the oral and written tasks, whereas the control group showed no progress.

Conclusion:

Overall, it seems that there is a special need for further studies to investigate the facilitative factors and the effect of features of recasts and personal and cognitive characteristics that may affect the level of uptake as a result of recast. Lyster and Izquierdo (2009) came to the conclusion that recasts can be as effective as prompts if learners are exposed to more and more positive exemplars and "have the opportunity to infer negative evidence" (p. 453).

While there is evidence that recast noticeability depends to some extent on the target feature, it is not clear what error types benefit the most from. It is difficult to draw conclusions about the link between recast noticeability and learning from the studies that examined noticeability as a function of learner recall (Egi, 2007; Mackey, 2006; Nabei & Swain, 2002; Ammar & Sato, 2010) and/or uptake (Mackey, 2006; Taddarth, 2010) alone. Therefore, what is needed is an investigation that would systematically compare the noticeability of several teacher recasts across different targets, using various tools to measure recast noticeability. Furthermore, it would be interesting to determine whether this noticeability is mediated by the differences in the learners' beliefs about corrective feedback. The research studies that have examined the noticeability of recasts as a function of uptake show conflicting results. Moreover, some other studies demonstrate that teacher recasts generally go unnoticed by learners (Mackey et al., 2000) and their noticeability does not depend on the uptake (Mackey & Philp, 1998). To date, the recast noticeability research has primarily focused on only

the noticeability of recasts, and rarely comparing it to the other corrective feedback types. Before considering how the recast noticeability may affect L2 development, it is necessary to examine the research that has looked at the effectiveness of these recasts. Research studies on the noticeability of recasts as a function of uptake show conflicting results. Some descriptive studies suggest that recasts lead to the least amount of uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002) because they are not always noticed by learners; whereas other studies support the noticeability of recasts (Ellis et al., 2001; Ohta, 2000; Sheen, 2006). Another argument was made by Philp (2003) who found no relation between noticing of feedback and L2 production. Panova and Lyster (2002) justifies this lack of L2 development to the fact that teacher recasts are both initiated and completed by the teacher and not worked-out by the learners themselves.

Moreover, no distinction was made between teacher recasts intended for meaning and others intended for form. There is a need for studies that investigate the specific features of recasts, as Ellis and Sheen (2006) also noted. They claim that it is difficult to distinguish between implicit and explicit recasts, explicit or didactic recasts. The results of some other studies (Lyster and Ranta, 1998b; Mackey et al., 2000) concluded teacher recasts on phonological and lexical rather than morphosyntactic errors were found to be more beneficial and much more likely to lead to uptake.

Recommendation:

The findings of the recent research reviewed in this paper indicate that classroom teachers relatively use recasts with their students. Although their use of recasts seems to be random and does not follow a certain type, a rigorous research study can be conducted in the Libyan context to find out the most common types of recasts and their impact on students' achievement across the language skills. Based on the results of the reviewed research studies, the effectiveness of recasts on students' performance in classroom varies from one type to another; therefore, a profound research study on the most common type used in the Libyan context should be conducted. Another strong point that any future research should examine is the existence of the relationship between teacher recasts and students' uptake. That is, any potential research should examine students' awareness of their teacher

recasts in classroom interaction, as some research studies concluded that some teacher recasts may go unnoticed by students. This may lead all teachers to the most appropriate recast type they should use with their students. One more point is that researchers should not only measure students' uptake. Instead, they should measure the impact of teacher repetition of recasts on students' accuracy. To conclude, further research would be valuable to explore how the different types of feedback vary across other factors including different levels of language proficiency, gender, age, and language skills.

References:

- Alavi, S. S., Foo, T. C. V., & Amini, M. (2015). L2 learners' proficiency development through noticing feedback. International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding, 2(5), 25-41.
- Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28(4), 543–574.
- Ammar, A. & Sato, M. (2010). The importance of noticing in meaning-oriented second language classrooms. Paper presented at the 10th International Conference of the Association for Language Awareness, University of Kassel, Germany.
- Asari, Y. O. K. O. (2012). Types of recasts and learners' uptake. Dialogue, 10, 1-20.
- Ayoun, D., (2004) The effectiveness of written recasts in the second language acquisition of aspectual distinctions in French: A follow-up study. Modern Language Journal, 88, 31-55.
- Batstone, R. (1996). Key concepts in ELT. ELT Journal, 50(3), 273.
- Braidi, S. M. (2002). Reexamining the role of recasts in native-speaker/ nonnative-speaker interactions. Language Learning, 52, 1-42.
- Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15, 357–386.
- Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. Language learning, 27(1), 29-46.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). Psychology of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Doughty, C. J., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. J. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition (pp. 114–138). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), Cognition and second language instruction (pp. 206–257). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.

- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. TESOL quarterly, 40(1), 83-107.
- Ellis, R. (2004). Individual differences in second language learning. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), The handbook of applied linguistics (pp. 525–551). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Re-examining the role of recasts in L2 acquisition. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28, 576–600.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28, 339-368.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. Language learning, 51(2), 281-318.
- Farrokhi, F., & Chehrazad, M. H. (2012). The Effects of Planned Focus on Form on Iranian EFL Learners' Oral Accuracy. World Journal of education, 2(1), 70-81.
- Fukuya, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2002). Effects of recasts on EFL learners' acquisition of pragmalinguistic conventions of request. Second language studies, 21(1), 1-47.
- Gass, S. (1997). Input, interaction, and the language learner. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2015). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten, & J. Williams (Eds.), Theories in second language acquisition (pp. 180–206). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Goo, J. (2012). Corrective feedback and working memory capacity in interaction-driven L2 learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 34, 445–474.
- Godfroid, A., Boers, F., & Housen, A. (2013). An eye for words: Gauging the role of attention in incidental L2 vocabulary acquisition by means of eye-tracking. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 35(3), 483-517.
- Han, Z. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on tense consistency in L2 output. TESOL Quarterly, 36, 542–572.
- Havranek, G. (1999). The effectiveness of corrective feedback: Preliminary results of an empirical study. Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Étrangère, 2, 189–206.
- Hernández Méndez, E., & Reyes Cruz, M. D. R. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms.

Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development, 14(2), 63-75.

- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. The Modern language journal, 70(2), 125-132.

- Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and second language development: Beyond negative evidence. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25 (1), 37–63.

- Li, S. (2013). The interactions between the effects of implicit and explicit feedback and individual differences in language analytic ability and working memory. The Modern Language Journal, 97(3), 634–654.

- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2021). How Languages Are Learned 5th Edition. Oxford. Oxford university press.

- Loewen, S. (2004). Uptake in incidental focus on form in meaning-focused ESL lessons. Language learning, 54(1), 153-188.

- Leow, R. P. (2000). A study of the role of awareness in foreign language behavior: Aware versus unaware learners. Studies in second language acquisition, 22(4), 557-584.

- Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult L2 classroom: characteristics, explicitness and effectiveness. Modern Language Journal, 90, 536-556.

- Loewen, S., & Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and instructed second language acquisition. Language Teaching, 51(3), 285–329.

- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. Handbook of second language acquisition.

- Long, M. H. (2007). Problems in SLA. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Long, M. H. (2015). Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Lyster, R (1998). Recasts, repetition and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20 (1), 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(1), 37–66.

- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28, 321–341.

- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms.

- Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 27 (3), 405-430.

- Mackey, A. (2012). Input, interaction, and corrective feedback in L2 learning. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? The modern language journal, 82(3), 338-356.

- Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive implicit negative feedback? Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22, 471–497.

- Mifka-Profozic, N. (2013). The effectiveness of corrective feedback and the role of individual differences in language learning.

- Nabei, T., & 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), 43-63.

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

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

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

- Ohta, A. (2000). Rethinking recasts: A learner-centered examination of corrective feedback in the Japanese classroom in JK Hall and L. Verplaetse (Eds.): The construction of second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction.

- Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversation. Annotations Theme Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17(4), 459–481.

- Oliver, R. (2000). Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pairwork. Language Learning, 50, 119–151.

- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL Classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 36(4), 573–595.

- Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on 'Noticing the gap': Nonnative speakers' noticing of recasts in NS-NNS interaction. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25(1), 99–126.

- Philp, J., & Mackey, A. (2010). Interaction research: What can socially informed approaches offer to cognitivists (and vice versa)? In R. Batstone (Ed.), Sociocognitive perspectives on language use and language learning (pp. 210–224). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rassaei, E. (2014). Scaffolded feedback, recasts, and L2 development: A sociocultural perspective. The modern language journal, 98(1), 417-431.

- Sato, M. (2011). Constitution of form-orientation: Contributions of context and explicit knowledge to learning from recasts. The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 14(1), 1–28.

- Sawyer, M., & Ranta, L. (2001). Aptitude, individual differences, and instructional design. In P. Robinson (Ed.), Cognition and second language instruction (pp. 319–353). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), Attention and awareness in foreign language learning (pp. 1–66). Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa.

- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. Language teaching research, 8(3), 263-300.

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

- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. TESOL quarterly, 41(2), 255-283.

- Skehan, P. (2002). Theorising and updating aptitude. In P. Robinson (Ed.), Individual differences and instructed language learning (pp. 69–93). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. The modern language journal, 82(3), 320-337.

- Taddarth, A. (2010). Recasts, uptake and learning: Effects and relationships. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Montreal.

- Tomlin, R. S., & Villa, V. (1994). Attention in cognitive science and second language acquisition. Studies in second language acquisition, 16(2), 183-203.

- Truscott, J. (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction. Canadian Modern Language Review, 55, 437-456.