Chapter 1

Negotiation in immersion teacher–student interaction

Roy Lyster*

Department of Integrated Studies in Education, McGill University, 3700 McTavish Street, Montreal, Que., Canada H3A 1Y2

Abstract

This paper explores the role of negotiation in teacher–student interaction and argues that the negotiation of meaning, defined as a set of conversational moves which work toward mutual comprehension, is too narrow a construct to fulfil its pedagogical potential in teacher–student interaction in communicative and content-based second language (L2) classrooms. Drawing on examples from immersion classrooms, where the overriding focus is on delivery of subject matter in the L2, an argument is presented in support of a more comprehensive view of negotiation that accounts for corrective feedback and distinguishes between meaning-focused and form-focused negotiation.
© 2003 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Interaction; Negotiation; Immersion

Over the last two decades, research has shown that second language (L2) learners in language immersion classrooms develop high levels of comprehension skills as well as considerable fluency and confidence in L2 production, but experience long-lasting difficulties in grammatical development (e.g., Harley, Cummins, Swain, & Allen, 1990). As a result, studies in these and other communicatively oriented and content-based L2 classrooms have increasingly aimed to shed light on the effectiveness of different types of form-focused instruction, operationalized as either *reactive* or *proactive* (or *pre-emptive*; see Long & Robinson, 1998). A reactive approach to L2 instruction is defined as ''teachers' use of corrective feedback during communicative interaction in addition to other attempts to draw learners' attention to language features as opportunities arise during content-based lessons'' (Doughty

*Tel.: +1-514-398-5942; fax: +1-514-398-4529.

E-mail address: roy.lyster@mcgill.ca (R. Lyster).

& Williams, 1998; Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Lyster, 1998a, c, p. 67). This line of research suggests that it may be precisely at the moment when students have something to say that focus on form can be most effectively provided (e.g., Lightbown, 1991, 1998; Long, 1996), rather than postponing the focus on form until, for example, a subsequent language lesson.

A reactive approach to L2 instruction includes what is often referred to as the *negotiation of meaning*. Negotiation of meaning serves a conversational function which aims "to work toward mutual comprehension" (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989, p. 65) "until an acceptable level of understanding is achieved" (Long, 1996, p. 418). In this paper, I will argue that negotiation of meaning, defined as such, is too narrow a construct to fulfil its pedagogical potential in communicative and content-based L2 classrooms. Drawing on examples from immersion classrooms,[1] where the overriding focus is on delivery of subject matter in the L2, I will argue for a broader view of negotiation that accounts for corrective feedback and distinguishes between form-focused negotiation and meaning-focused negotiation in teacher–student interaction. Throughout this paper, I will interchangeably use the terms *form-focused negotiation* and *negotiation of form* (cf. Lyster, 1998a–c, 2002; Lyster & Ranta, 1997); the terms *meaning-focused negotiation* and *negotiation of meaning* (cf. Long, 1996; Pica, 1994) are also used interchangeably.

1. Recasts and meaning-focused negotiation

In addition to ensuring the psychological development of the children in their charge, one of the primary goals of immersion teachers is to ensure the comprehension of subject matter. Met (1994) describes a variety of negotiation of meaning strategies used by immersion teachers to enable their students to comprehend content presented through the L2:

- use of body language, realia, visuals, manipulatives, and other contextual clues;
- use of predictability in classroom routines and redundancy in repetitions, paraphrases, examples, definitions, and synonyms;
- use of input modifications such as a slower rate of speech, emphasis of key words, simple vocabulary, and simple grammatical structures (especially in the beginning grades).

In terms of student output, immersion teachers help students get their meaning across by encouraging them initially to use both verbal and non-verbal means of communicating. They make rich interpretations of immersion students' attempts to communicate by responding with various reformulations and expansions that also

---

[1] The examples are extracted from a corpus of classroom interaction described in detail in Lyster and Ranta (1997, pp. 42–43). The corpus includes just over 18 h of transcribed interaction composed of 27 lessons taught by four French immersion teachers at the grade 4/5 level (with students between the ages of 9 and 11). Quantitative analyses of this corpus are presented in detail in Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Lyster (1998a, b).

serve as confirmations and confirmation checks. As students expand their productive repertoire, teachers are seen to increase their students' opportunities to use the L2 and to refine their productive skills. However, once immersion students have acquired a language repertoire that sufficiently meets their communicative needs in the classroom, a tendency for L2 development to level off has been observed (e.g., Swain, 1985). At this point, meaning-focused negotiation becomes limited as a strategy for developing target language accuracy and may even contribute to the observed leveling-off effect.

In second language acquisition (SLA) research, where the goal is to account for the development of L2 knowledge and skills, negotiation of meaning has been operationalized more specifically as a set of conversational moves used in dyadic interaction. According to Long (1996), negotiation of meaning comprises the following types of interactional features:

- input modifications (e.g., stress on key words, decomposition, partial self-repetition);
- semantically contingent responses (e.g., recasts, repetition, expansions);
- conversational modifications (e.g., confirmations, confirmation checks, comprehension checks, clarification requests).

Long (1996) argues that these interactional features converge to provide L2 learners with a primary source of *negative evidence* (i.e., information about ungrammaticality) in ways that benefit L2 development.

Many SLA studies have demonstrated that the negotiation of meaning provides learners and their interlocutors with a useful set of communication strategies that facilitate comprehension. However, there is still little direct evidence that the negotiation of meaning affects L2 development (Braidi, 1995), as one can only deduce that negotiation promotes acquisition based on (a) the finding that negotiation promotes comprehension (e.g., Pica, Young, & Doughty, 1987) and (b) the speculation that comprehension promotes acquisition (e.g., Krashen; 1994; Long, 1985). Moreover, there is some debate concerning (a) the pedagogical value and feasibility of meaning-focused negotiation in student–student interaction (Aston, 1986; Foster, 1998) and (b) its effectiveness in drawing learners' attention to form in teacher–student interaction (Lyster, 1998a, 2002). As its name suggests, the negotiation of meaning aims primarily to achieve "comprehensibility of message meaning" (Pica, 1994, p. 494). Yet, according to Kleifgen and Saville-Troike (1992), teachers and students are able to negotiate meaning with little or no linguistic knowledge in common, by drawing on higher-order processes involving background and situational knowledge (see also Sato, 1986, regarding interaction between native speakers and non-native speakers in natural settings). As they do so, teachers and students display "the mutual satisfactoriness—notwithstanding difficulties—of the interaction" (Aston, 1986, p. 140). Similarly, Pica (1994, pp. 517–518) acknowledges that target language accuracy plays only a secondary role in negotiation, as it has been defined in SLA: "Negotiation, by definition, focuses on the *comprehensibility* of message meaning, and on the message's *form* only insofar as that can contribute to

its comprehensibility. Learners and their interlocutors find ways to communicate messages through negotiation, but not necessarily with target-like forms.''

One type of semantically contingent feedback that figures in the Long (1996) taxonomy of negotiation of meaning strategies, and that has received increasing attention in both first language and L2 contexts, is the recast—a well-formed reformulation of a learner utterance with the original meaning intact. Based on observation studies of immersion classrooms, I argued in previous work that recasting, as defined in the L1 literature and as observed in immersion classrooms (i.e., an implicit target-like reformulation of a learner's utterance), is not the most effective way of drawing young L2 learners' attention to form. In Lyster (1998a), I illustrated how teachers frequently use recasts to respond to ill-formed utterances but that, in the majority of cases, these moves do not draw attention to form, because they compete with a similar proportion of teacher repetitions of well-formed utterances. Recasts of ill-formed utterances and repetitions of well-formed utterances together appear to confirm or disconfirm the content or veracity of a learner's message, not its form. A closer look at interaction in a social studies lesson will illustrate the consequent ambiguity from the L2 learner's perspective.

The lesson is taught by Marie, who relies on meaning-focused negotiation to present content to her 9–10-year-old mid-immersion students in grade 4.[2] The lesson is about the Whippets Cookie Factory, which, for over a century, has manufactured chocolate-covered marshmallow cookies in Montreal. The exchange in Excerpt 1 is about the original manufacturer of this delicacy, Charles Théodore Viau:

Excerpt 1[3]

(1) Marie:	Et qu'est-ce qu'il avait fait de spécial, Charles Théodore Viau, dans sa vie? Qu'est-ce qu'il avait fait de spécial?	(1) Marie:	…And what did Charles Théodore Viau do that was special in his lifetime? What did he do that was special?
(2) St:	Il *a* une compagnie.	(2) St:	He has a company.
(3) Marie:	Oui, une compagnie de quoi?	(3) Marie:	Yes, a company of what?
(4) St:	Ah, *des* biscuits.	(4) St:	Ah, of the cookies.
(5) Marie:	De biscuits. En quelle année est-ce qu'il a ouvert sa compagnie de biscuits, Charles Théodore Viau?	(5) Marie:	Of cookies. In what year did he open his cookie company, Charles Théodore Viau?

---

[2] Marie, a francophone female, teaches grade 4 in a mid-immersion program, which begins in grade 4 (students are 9–10 years old). Her students' school day, prior to grade 4, was in English except for a 1-h French lesson, whereas in grade 4, her students' day is about 60% in French (including science, social studies, math, and French language arts) and 40% in English (physical education, moral education, music, and English language arts).

[3] The following conventions are used in the excerpts: St = student; Sts = more than one student; StD = a different student from the previous student turn. Errors are bracketed by asterisks.

(6) St:	Mille neuf cent soixante-sept.	(6) St:	Nineteen sixty-seven.
(7) Marie:	Non, pas mille neuf cent soixante-sept.[…] J'étais née moi, en mille neuf cent soixante-sept. […] C'était quand?	(7) Marie:	No, not nineteen sixty-seven. [...] I was born in ninety sixty-seven. […] When was it?
(8) St:	Mille huit cent soixante-sept.	(8) St:	Eighteen sixty-seven.
(9) Marie:	Mille huit cent soixante-sept. Il a ouvert une biscuiterie qui s'appelait la biscuiterie Viau. Où ça? Oui?	(9) Marie:	Eighteen sixty-seven. He opened his cookie factory called Viau Cookie Factory. Where? Yes?
(10) St:	*Dans euh... dans* l'Ontario.	(10) St:	Inside euh… inside Ontario.
(11) Marie:	En Ontario, non. Oui?	(11) Marie:	In Ontario, no. Yes?
(12) St:	À Montréal.	(12) St:	In Montreal.
(13) Marie:	À Montréal. Sur quelle rue?	(13) Marie:	In Montreal. On what street?
(14) St:	Oh, oh, je sais.	(14) St:	Oh, oh, I know.
(15) Marie:	Oui?	(15) Marie:	Yes.
(16) St:	Sur la rue Viau.	(16) St:	On Viau Street.
(17) Marie:	Sur la rue Viau. […] Quel âge il avait Théophile Viau lorsqu'il a inventé, en mille neuf cent un, le premier biscuit à la guimauve enrobé de chocolat? Andrea?	(17) Marie:	On Viau Street. […] How old was Théophile Viau when he invented, in nineteen hundred and one, his first chocolated-covered marshmallow cookie? Andrea?
(18) St:	*Onze*.	(18) St:	Eleven
(19) Marie:	Il avait onze ans. Mmm, non, pas vraiment. Oui?	(19) Marie:	He was eleven years old. Mmm, no, not really. Yes?

Marie first asks what special feat Viau had accomplished in his lifetime. At line 2 a student replies, *Il a une compagnie*, which is understandable in terms of content but formally incorrect because the past tense is obligatory in this context. At line 3, Marie responds affirmatively with *Oui*, ignores the error in tense, and requests additional information about what kind of company it was. In response to the non-target *des biscuits*, Marie's recast at line 5 confirms the message and modifies its form (*de biscuits*) before she moves on to ask more information about when the company began. At line 7, she repeats the student's well-formed but incorrect answer (*1967*) in order to disconfirm it and move on to elicit the correct response, which a student provides at line 8 (*1867*) and which Marie confirms at line 9 by repeating it, before asking where the factory was located. In response to the student's non-idiomatic

utterance, *dans l'Ontario*, Marie provides a recast at line 11 (*En Ontario*), then rejects the content of this wrong answer (*non*). Marie repeats the students' responses at lines 13 (*À Montréal*) and 17 (*Sur la rue Viau*) to confirm both the form and veracity of these statements. In her recast at line 19 (*Il avait onze ans*), Marie reformulates the student's non-idiomatic utterance (*Onze*) before disconfirming its content (*non, pas vraiment*).

Meaning is negotiated in Excerpt 1 through various recasts and repetitions serving as confirmations and confirmation checks. These confirmations and confirmation checks serve a variety of functions:

(1) Recasts such as "*De biscuits*" confirm the veracity of student responses but disconfirm their form.
(2) Recasts such as "*En Ontario*" and "*Il avait onze ans*" disconfirm both the form and veracity of student responses.
(3) Repetitions such as "*pas mille neuf cent soixante-sept*" confirm the form of the student's response but disconfirm its veracity.
(4) Repetitions such as "*Mille huit cent soixante-sept,*" "*À Montréal,*" and "*Sur la rue Viau*" confirm both the form and veracity of student responses.

Long (1996) suggests that recasts, because they preserve the learners' intended meaning and thereby free up other cognitive resources required for learners to focus on form, provide ideal opportunities for learners to notice errors in their interlanguage production. However, in the case of content-based L2 classroom discourse, I would argue that, when students' attention is focused on meaning in this way, they remain focused on meaning, not form, because they expect the teacher's immediate response to confirm or disconfirm the veracity of their answers.

Recasts, repetition, expansions, confirmations, and confirmation checks thus converge in meaning-focused negotiation to create contexts of *pragmatic ambivalence.* Pragmatic ambivalence occurs when a speaker's intentions are left unclear, perhaps deliberately to circumvent a face-threatening act or to encourage further communication (Thomas, 1995). In the case of teacher–student interaction, L2 learners are left to their own devices to figure out the teachers' intentions and to determine (a) which teacher responses confirm or disconfirm a statement's form as opposed to its veracity and also (b) which teacher responses are *corrections* of form as opposed to possible *variations* in form (i.e., a different, but not better, way of saying the same thing; see Chaudron, 1988).[4] The pragmatic ambivalence is exacerbated by the teachers' frequent use of signs of approval as positive feedback: These include affirmations such as "Oui," "C'est ça" and "O.K." and praise markers such as "Très bien," "Bravo" and "Excellent." In immersion classrooms, teachers use these to respond to the content or veracity of a student's message rather

---

[4] Added to the pragmatic ambivalence of recasts is an overlap in the Long (1996) taxonomy of negotiation of meaning strategies. Recasts and repetition appear independently of confirmations and confirmation checks, even though recasts and repetitions are actually the forms that encode confirmations and confirmation checks. The latter are conversational moves that remain indiscriminately constant across recasts and repetition, irrespective of formal accuracy.

than (and in spite of) its form. Consequently, signs of approval are equally likely to occur with recasts and non-corrective repetition (Lyster, 1998a), making it difficult for learners in these cases to detect any negative evidence in recasts.

2. Prompts and form-focused negotiation

As we saw in Marie's lesson about the Whippets Cookie Factory, mutual comprehension can easily be achieved in classroom interaction, despite the students' use of non-target forms. For this reason, Swain (1985) argued that teachers, in order to benefit their students' interlanguage development, need to incorporate ways of "pushing" students to produce language that is not only comprehensible, but also accurate. In Lyster and Ranta (1997), we identified four interactional moves that teachers use to push learners to improve the accuracy of their non-target output:

- *Clarification request*: the teacher indicates to the student, by using phrases such as "*Pardon me*" and "*I don't understand*," that the message has not been understood or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way, and that a repetition or a reformulation is required.
- *Repetition*: the teacher repeats the student's erroneous utterance, adjusting the intonation to highlight the error.
- *Metalinguistic clues*: the teacher provides comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form (e.g., "*Do we say 'goed' in English?*" "*Ça se dit pas en français,*" "*Non, pas ça,*" "*Is it masculine?*").
- *Elicitation*: the teacher directly elicits correct forms from students by asking questions such as "*Comment ça s'appelle?*" or "*How do we say that in French?*"; or by pausing to allow students to complete the teacher's utterance (e.g., "*C'est un…*"); or by asking students to reformulate their utterance (e.g., "*Try again*").

In order to differentiate these interactional moves from the negotiation of meaning and its primarily conversational function, we initially classified these four moves as *negotiation of form*, because they serve a pedagogical function that draws attention to form and aims for both accuracy and mutual comprehension. Clarification requests and repetition of error also appear in taxonomies listing strategies for negotiating meaning yet can be distinguished from meaning-focused negotiation in two ways. First, they are unique in actually pushing learners to modify their non-target output, a finding summarized by Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, and Linnell (1996) as follows: L2 learners respond to open-ended signals (i.e., prompts such as clarification requests and repetition of error) with modified versions of their prior utterances, but respond to native-speaker models (i.e., recasts in confirmation checks) with *yes* or *no*, but seldom with a modification of their own. Second, in Lyster and Ranta (1997), we found that teachers often used clarification requests and repetition of error, not because they did not understand, but rather to feign incomprehension and thus intentionally draw attention to non-target forms. We

therefore regrouped these moves, along with elicitation and metalinguistic clues, as negotiation of form. In subsequent ongoing collaboration (Ranta & Lyster, 2003), we refer to these moves as "prompts" rather than negotiation of form, in order to distinguish them more categorically from negotiation strategies that focus on message comprehensibility.

To illustrate the use of prompts, we will examine exchanges in a grade 4 science lesson, taught by Rachelle to her 9–10-year-old students, on how various mammals defend themselves against their enemies.[5] Throughout this lesson, Rachelle draws attention to her students' non-target output in ways that encourage them to peer- or self-repair. Rachelle is able to do this more frequently than Marie, because her early immersion students have had more exposure to French than Marie's mid-immersion students. The first exchange is about hares and appears in Excerpt 2.

Excerpt 2

(1) Rachelle:	Le lièvre. Joseph pour-rais-tu nous dire quels sont les moyens que tu vois, toi, d'après l'illus-tration là?	*(1) Rachelle:*	*The hare. Joesph could you tell us what are the means of defense that you, you see from this picture?*
(2) St:	Il court vite, puis il saute.	*(2) St:*	*It runs fast and it hops.*
(3) Rachelle:	Il court vite.	*(3) Rachelle:*	*It runs fast.*
(4) StD:	*Il bond*.	*(4) StD:*	*It jump.*
(5) Rachelle:	Il bond?	*(5) Rachelle:*	*It jump?*
(6) Sts:	Il bondit.	*(6) Sts:*	*It jumps.*
(7) Rachelle:	Il bondit, c'est le ver-be…?	*(7) Rachelle:*	*It jumps, from the ver-b…?*
(8) Sts:	Bondir.	*(8) Sts:*	*To jump.*
(9) Rachelle:	Bondir. Il fait des bonds. Hein, il bondit. Ensuite, Joseph?	*(9) Rachelle:*	*To jump. It jumps about. Right, it jumps. Next, Joseph?*

Rachelle begins at line 3 by repeating *Il court vite* to confirm one of Joseph's contributions from line 2. Then at line 5 she repeats the student's ill-formed utterance to draw attention to the non-target form, *Il bond*. Other students immediately provide the target form, *Il bondit*, which Rachelle confirms by repeating at line 7, then asks for its infinitive form. At line 8, several students propose *bondir* which Rachelle confirms by repeating at line 9, then provides a synonymous expression (*Il fait des bonds*) along with a final repetition of *Il bondit* before calling on Joseph to continue. It is important to stress here that the lesson continues,

---

[5] Rachelle is a francophone female teaching 9–10-year olds in a grade 4 early total immersion program. Since grade 1, when these students were 6–7 years old, their school day has been entirely in French except for about 1 h of English.

uninterrupted by the form-focused negotiation, which is composed of a prompt followed by peer-repair at lines 5 and 6, respectively.

In the next exchange about the giraffe (Excerpt 3), Rachelle again simply repeats the student's non-target *le girafe*, which prompts him to self-repair at line 4 before Rachelle proceeds to ask for more information about giraffes.

Excerpt 3

(1) Rachelle:	Plus grand que toi ça serait qui?	*(1) Rachelle:*	*Bigger than you would be what?*
(2) St:	*Le… le girafe*?	*(2) St:*	*The giraffe? [masc. gender]*
(3) Rachelle:	Le girafe?	*(3) Rachelle:*	*The giraffe? [masc. gender]*
(4) St:	La girafe.	*(4) St:*	*The giraffe. [fem. gender]*
(5) Rachelle:	La girafe. Mais la girafe est-ce que c'est un animal du Canada?	*(5) Rachelle:*	*The giraffe[fem. gender]. But is the giraffe an animal from Canada?*

In Excerpt 4, the topic is porcupines and the negotiation is about the precise word for quills:

Excerpt 4

(1) Rachelle:	…Le porc-épic? Sara?	*(1) Rachelle:*	*…The porcupine? Sara?*
(2) St:	C'est *les piques* sur le dos, c'est…	*(2) St:*	*It's the pines on its back, it's…*
(3) Rachelle:	Les piques. Est-ce qu'on dit "les piques"?	*(3) Rachelle:*	*The pines. Do we say "pines"?*
(4) StD:	*Les épiques*.	*(4) StD:*	*The upines.*
(5) Rachelle:	Les…?	*(5) Rachelle:*	*The…?*
(6) StD:	Les piquants.	*(6) StD:*	*The quills*
(7) Rachelle:	Les piquants. Très bien. Les piquants.	*(7) Rachelle:*	*The quills. Very good. The quills.*

In response to Sara's suggestion at line 2 (*les piques*), Rachelle provides her with a prompt at line 3 by repeating the error and giving a metalinguistic clue as she asks, *Est-ce qu'on dit "les piques"?* Another student proposes an equally erroneous term at line 4 (*les épiques*), which incites Rachelle to use a prompt at line 5 (*Les…?*) that not only aims to elicit the target form but also serves as a rejection of the non-target form and thus as negative evidence. This simple move succeeds in eliciting *Les piquants* at line 6, the correct term approved and repeated by Rachelle at line 7.

As we can see from these examples, form-focused negotiation is less likely to create pragmatic ambivalence than recasts embedded in meaning-focused negotiation, because prompts do not co-occur with signs of approval and cannot be perceived as confirmation of message content or as another way of saying the same thing. When the form-focused negotiation is removed from the preceding excerpts, we are left with only recasts and the resulting exchanges lack pedagogical richness and become

less noticeable from the students' perspective. For example, if we remove lines 3 and 4 from Excerpt 3, we are left with:

(1) Rachelle:	Plus grand que toi ça serait qui?	(1) Rachelle:	Bigger than you would be what?
(2) St:	*Le... le girafe*?	(2) St:	The giraffe? [masc. gender]
(5) Rachelle:	La girafe. Mais la girafe est-ce que c'est un animal du Canada?	(3) Rachelle:	The giraffe[fem. gender]. But is the giraffe an animal from Canada?

The examples of prompting in these excerpts do not support claims made by Krashen (1994) and Truscott (1999) that oral feedback on accuracy causes anxiety, breaks the communicative flow, and remains difficult for teachers to provide and for students to notice. That teachers are able to intervene in this way, without inhibiting students from continuing and without interrupting conversational coherence, suggests that prompts, at least in the context of children learning subject matter through their L2, are an expected part of classroom discourse.

3. Differentiating form-focused and meaning-focused negotiation

Gass (1997) rightly argues that negotiation of form and meaning are not easily separable in dyadic interaction with native and non-native speakers. As a result, many researchers conflate form-focused and meaning-focused negotiation and refer only to "negotiation" or "negotiated interaction" without clearly distinguishing focus on form from focus on meaning, yet generally implying that the negotiation is meaning-focused.

My research in immersion classrooms over the last 15 years, however, has convinced me, first, that the distinction between form-focused and meaning-focused negotiation is a crucial one and, second, that important negotiation work in classroom interaction is not necessarily meaning-focused. Experienced teachers with daily exposure to their students' shared interlanguage become experts at under-standing the interlanguage code. For example, if a learner uses the wrong grammatical gender and utters "Le piscine est fermé aujourd'hui," the meaning remains unequivocally clear to teachers. More important for these teachers than negotiating the meaning of such utterances are ways of drawing attention to interlanguage forms while maintaining a central focus on communication. Yet a typical recast in this context, "La piscine est fermée?" is indeed likely to draw attention to the veracity of the statement, not its form, because, as a confirmation check, it appears to ask, "Is this what you *mean*?" For learners to make a cognitive comparison of interlanguage forms and target forms and to "notice the gap" (Schmidt & Frota, 1986), they need to hold their ill-formed utterance in working memory long enough to make the comparison (Ellis, 1994). However, they need first to notice that their utterance was indeed ill-formed. Yet there is nothing disapproving in a response like "La piscine est fermée?" that points out that "Le

piscine'' is not allowable in French, and so recasts do not necessarily provide negative evidence. Conversely, feedback involving form-focused negotiation, such as ''Pas le piscine,'' serve not only as prompts for self-repair but also as a rejection of the non-target form and thus as negative evidence—without breaking the communicative flow as teachers are able to continue interacting with students about content after briefly drawing attention to form in this way.

Overlaps will inevitably occur in attempts to classify negotiation moves as either form-focused or meaning-focused. This is particularly likely in the case of clarification requests and repetition of learner error, because the speaker's intentions underlying these moves can of course change according to context. They tend to be used to check comprehension of meaning in conversations, but to question formal accuracy (not meaning) in teacher–student interaction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Similarly, because recasts are embedded in confirmations and confirmation checks, the intention underlying a teacher's recast appears primarily to confirm or disconfirm the veracity of student responses in classroom interaction. However, when teachers shorten the learner's utterance to isolate the linguistic error and then add stress to emphasize the correct form (e.g., Chaudron, 1977; Lyster, 1998a), the intention to draw attention to form is likely to be much clearer.

Because of this potential for overlap, I would like to suggest that a less equivocal way of distinguishing form-focused and meaning-focused negotiation is to do so in terms of the extent to which the learner is prompted. Prompting is not a frequent feature of conversational repair, where self-initiated self-repair is preferred over other-initiated self-repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977), but appears to be an important component of classroom discourse, where other-initiated self-repair is preferred over other-initiated other-repair (McHoul, 1990). In this view, what distinguishes form-focused and meaning-focused negotiation most essentially is the way in which form-focused negotiation provides prompts for learners to self-repair, thereby engaging them in retrieval processes (i.e., the means of accessing and using stored information) that differ from those activated by meaning-focused negotiation.

4. Differentiating form-focused negotiation and explicit correction

Form-focused negotiation has sometimes been referred to categorically as ''explicit feedback'' (e.g., Doughty, 1999; Ellis, 2001), yet other studies (e.g., Lyster, 1998b; Lyster & Ranta, 1997) have considered form-focused negotiation and explicit correction as different types of discourse moves, distinguished most importantly by the types of learner repair they allow for. In form-focused negotiation, the teacher withholds correct forms and instead prompts students to retrieve correct forms from what they already know. Conversely, in explicit correction, the teacher supplies the correct form and clearly indicates that what the student had said was incorrect. Although explicit correction, defined in this way, draws attention to form, it does so in a way that does not allow for negotiation because it provides the form unilaterally and thus creates an opportunity for the learner to repeat the teacher's alternative form but not to self-repair. In Lyster and Ranta (1997), we found that other moves,

such as elicitation and metalinguistic clues, were more likely than explicit correction to prompt learners to respond (what we called ''uptake'') and that, in such cases, student responses involved peer- or self-repair. Thus, we found that self-repair results not necessarily from explicitness, but rather from the illocutionary force of prompts that are intended to engage students in the negotiation.

Feedback designed to encourage learners to self-repair includes a variety of optional moves ranging from implicit to explicit. For example, form-focused negotiation may appear relatively implicit when teachers feign incomprehension and provide simple prompts for uptake, without any metalinguistic information other than rising intonation used as a cue for students to reconsider their output, as Rachelle did in Excerpt 4: ''*Le girafe?*'' Perhaps more explicit are prompts composed of direct questions framed metalinguistically, such as the one used by Rachelle in Excerpt 5: ''*Est-ce qu'on dit 'les piques'?*''

More reliable, however, than comparing the effects of feedback with different degrees of explicitness (a vaguely defined notion in classroom SLA research), and perhaps more revealing from a research perspective, are comparisons of the effects of feedback with and without provision of the correct reformulation (i.e., recasts vs. prompts). This distinction allows us to compare the effects of different retrieval processes. Because different retrieval processes entail different cognitive processes, comparisons of feedback types that activate different retrieval processes have much to contribute to the study of feedback and its potential role in L2 development.

5. Support for self-repair

In their study of cognitive processes generated by output, Swain and Lapkin (1995) proposed that (a) feedback enables learners to notice problems in their output and pushes them to conduct an analysis leading to modified output, and (b) what occurs between the first and second output is part of the process of L2 learning. I would like to add that the extent to which cognitive processes are activated between the learner's first and second output depends on the type of feedback. That is, not all modified output results from similar degrees of ''pushing.'' In the case of recasts, on the small number of occasions when learners do modify their ill-formed utterances (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), the modification may be only a mechanical repetition of the alternative form. As positive evidence in classroom input, recasts may nonetheless help learners with encoding new information; accordingly, whether or not learners repeat a recast may even be inconsequential with respect to L2 development, as suggested by the Mackey and Philp (1998) study. In the case of form-focused negotiation, learners must attend to the retrieval of previously encoded information. This prompts them to reanalyze what they have already internalized at some level and may thus contribute to a destabilization of interlanguage forms. Such was the case in the Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993) small-scale study in which the learners who responded with self-repair following clarification requests improved more than the learner who did not modify his output following the feedback. In the case of form-focused negotiation, then, learners are prompted to retrieve the correct forms from

what they already know, thus engaging in a different type of retrieval process than repeating or simply hearing a recast embedded in meaning-focused negotiation.

Support can be found in studies of educational contexts other than those dealing specifically with L2 learning. For example, Lepper, Aspinwall, Mumme, and Chabay (1990) found that expert tutors rarely give students correct answers (except as a last resort) and, instead, offer students hints, in the form of questions or remarks. This approach resembles the ''clueing'' procedure or ''withholding phenomenon'' identified by McHoul (1990) in his study of feedback in subject-matter classrooms. McHoul found that teachers tended to provide correct responses only as a last resort when the clueing failed to elicit self-repair. In addition, experimental studies of the *generation effect* have shown that participants remember items that they have generated in response to cues better than items merely provided to them (e.g., Clark, 1995). Finally, there is also some evidence from L2 classroom research (Slimani, 1992) that learners recall target features that they utter in response to teacher prompts more than features that are recast by the teacher (see Panova & Lyster, 2002).

According to de Bot (1996), L2 learners benefit more from being pushed to retrieve target language forms than from merely hearing the forms in the input, because the retrieval and subsequent production stimulate the development of connections in memory. Similarly, language production—particularly the production of modified output—benefits L2 development because it pushes learners to move from semantic to syntactic processing of language (Swain, 1995). In this sense, self-repair provides L2 learners with opportunities to proceduralize target language knowledge already internalized in declarative form and to thereby increase their control over these already-acquired forms (e.g., Nobuyoshi & Ellis, 1993).

6. Conclusion

A well-known argument against corrective feedback has often been presented as a paradox, summarized by Chaudron (1988, p. 134) as follows: ''teachers must either interrupt communication for the sake of formal correction or let errors pass 'untreated' in order to further the communicative goals of classroom interaction.'' However, this may be a false paradox. Nowhere in the Lyster and Ranta (1997) database were we able to locate instances of the communicative flow being truly broken by corrective feedback. Teachers provided feedback after roughly 50–70% of their students' errors and did so in various ways that allowed the communicative flow to continue. Teachers do not have to choose, therefore, between communication on the one hand and corrective feedback on the other, because they can integrate both during teacher–student interaction (see also Doughty & Varela, 1998; Spada & Lightbown, 1993).

Accordingly, corrective feedback can best be considered as part of negotiation rather than as separate from it. Yet, as Pica (1994) points out, SLA researchers investigating negotiation have shown considerably more interest in negotiation that places ''emphasis on achieving comprehensibility of message meaning'' and much

less interest in interaction that "can be interrupted by a correction" (Pica, 1994, pp. 494–495). I would argue that, for negotiation to be a useful notion in both SLA research and classroom pedagogy, it needs to account for corrective feedback and include both focus on form and meaning. As such, negotiation has considerable potential for being an important pedagogical strategy in language classrooms, because it allows learners to focus on form while maintaining a central focus on meaning (cf. Long, 1996), diffuses the dichotomy of language use vs. language instruction (cf. Lightbown, 1998), and provides opportunities for transfer-appropriate learning (cf. Segalowitz, 1997).

Braidi (1995) argued that, for interactional analyses to be more beneficial to the study of SLA, a more precise way of distinguishing between form-focused and meaning-focused interaction is needed. One way of generating more fine-tuned analysis of teacher–student interaction involves differentiating form-focused and meaning-focused negotiation in terms of (a) speaker intentions (i.e., focus on form vs. meaning), (b) retrieval processes (i.e., retrieval from external input vs. retrieval via internal processes), and (c) types of modified output (i.e., repetition of interlocutor's reformulation vs. self-repair following prompting).

On the one hand, meaning-focused negotiation provides teachers with a useful set of communication strategies that facilitate comprehension during classroom interaction. One such strategy is to recast learner utterances as a means of confirming the meaning and, at the same time, provide L2 exemplars that serve as positive evidence. Recasts embedded in meaning-focused negotiation are ideal for facilitating the delivery of complex subject matter, as we saw in Marie's social studies lesson about the Whippets Cookie Factory. Recasts delivered in this way provide supportive, scaffolded help, which serves to move the lesson ahead when the target forms in question are beyond the students' current production abilities. At the same time, as positive evidence, recasts may facilitate the internalization of these new forms. In addition, recasts that reduce the learner's initial utterance to isolate the error then add intonational stress for emphasis may serve as negative evidence by drawing attention to the mismatch between the interlanguage form and the target form. Recasts that are designed in this way and that target pre-selected L2 features, with consistency, may have particular benefits (Doughty, 2001). Recasts following phonological errors may also be particularly beneficial insofar as learners (at least the 9–10-year-old students observed in Lyster, 1998b) tend to accurately repeat recasts of phonological errors, unlike recasts of grammatical errors. This suggests that young learners are able to attend to the imitative quality of recasts of phonological errors and to interpret the speaker's intention as a cue for imitation.

On the other hand, form-focused negotiation enables learners to increase their control over already-acquired forms by prompting them to retrieve correct forms from what they already know, as we saw in Rachelle's science lesson about well-adapted mammals. Because her students were discussing mammals on which they had already conducted research, they were more in control of the content and this enabled Rachelle to engage more in form-focused negotiation, which prompted her students to reanalyze or "reprocess" (Swain, 1995) interlanguage forms. According to de Bot (1996), the attention required for reanalysis and retrieval may contribute to

a destabilization of interlanguage forms. He argues that retrieval via internal mechanisms (as opposed to hearing external representations in the input), which results in reanalysis and the production of modified output, draws attention to form in ways that stimulate the development of connections in memory.

Form-focused negotiation may be particularly beneficial in communicatively oriented and content-based classrooms where learners have many opportunities to communicate but have a tendency to do so with a classroom code easily understood by both teacher and peers. In these contexts, negotiating for comprehensibility and continued recasting of what students already know are unlikely effective strategies for ensuring continued development of target language accuracy. Similarly, continued prompting of learners to draw on what they have not yet acquired will be equally ineffective. Some of the most effective L2 teachers, therefore, may be those who are willing and able to orchestrate, in accordance with their students' language abilities and content knowledge, both form-focused and meaning-focused negotiation, without abandoning one at the expense of the other.

Acknowledgements

References

Aston, G. (1986). Trouble-shooting in interaction with learners: The more the merrier? *Applied Linguistics*, *7*, 128–143.

Braidi, S. (1995). Reconsidering the role of interaction and input in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, *45*, 141–175.

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*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, S. (1995). The generation effect and the modeling of associations in memory. *Memory & Cognition*, *23*, 442–455.

de Bot, K. (1996). The psycholinguistics of the output hypothesis. *Language Learning*, *46*, 529–555.

Doughty, C. (1999). Psycholinguistic evidence for recasting as focus on form. Paper presented at the *meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics*, Stamford, CT.

Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206–257). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 197–262.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1994). A theory of instructed second language acquisition. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit language learning* (pp. 79–114). London: Academic.

Ellis, R. (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, *51*(Suppl. 1), 1–46.

Foster, P. (1998). A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, *19*, 1–23.

Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Harley, B., Cummins, J., Swain, M., & Allen, P. (1990). The nature of language proficiency. In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins, & M. Swain (Eds.), *The development of second language proficiency* (pp. 7–25). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kleifgen, J., & Saville-Troike, M. (1992). Achieving coherence in multilingual interaction. *Discourse Processes*, *15*, 183–206.

Krashen, S. (1994). The input hypothesis and its rivals. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 45–77). London: Academic Press.

Lepper, M., Aspinwall, L., Mumme, D., & Chabay, R. (1990). Self-perception and social-perception processes in tutoring: Subtle social control strategies of expert tutors. In J. Olson, & M. Zanna (Eds.), *Self-inference processes: The Ontario symposium*, Vol. 6. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lightbown, P. M. (1991). What have we here? Some observations on the role of instruction in second language acquisition. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research: A commemorative volume for Claus Fŕrch* (pp. 197–212). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lightbown, P. M. (1998). The importance of timing in focus on form. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 177–196). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communication language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *12*, 429–448.

Long, M. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377–393). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie, & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition. Vol. 2: Second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.

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

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

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

Lyster, R. (1998c). Immersion pedagogy and implications for language teaching. In J. Cenoz, & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education* (pp. 64–95). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lyster, R. (2002a). The importance of differentiating negotiation of form and meaning in classroom interaction. In P. Burmeister, T. Piske, & A. Rohde (Eds.), *An integrated view of language development: Papers in honor of Henning Wode* (pp. 381–397). Trier, Germany: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.

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

Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Recasts, interaction and interlanguage development: Are responses red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, *82*, 338–356.

McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society*, *19*, 349–377.

Met, M. (1994). Teaching content through a second language. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children* (pp. 159–182). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nobuyoshi, J., & Ellis, R. (1993). Focused communication tasks and second language acquisition. *ELT Journal*, *47*, 203–210.

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

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning*, *44*, 493–527.

Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *11*, 63–90.

Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D., & Linnell, J. (1996). Language learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of language learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, *30*, 59–84.

Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly*, *21*, 737–758.

Ranta, L. & Lyster, R. (2003). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral production abilities: The awareness, practice, and feedback sequence, unpublished manuscript.

Sato, C. (1986). Conversation and interlanguage development. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn* (pp. 23–45). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53*, 361–382.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn* (pp. 237–326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Segalowitz, N. (1997). Individual differences in second language acquisition. In A. de Groot, & J. Kroll (Eds.), *Tutorials in bilingualism: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 85–112). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Slimani, A. (1992). Evaluation of classroom interaction. In C. Anderson, & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 197–221). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (1993). Instruction and the development of questions in L2 classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *15*, 205–224.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook, & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). New York: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *16*, 370–391.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

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

Roy Lyster is Associate Professor and Co-Director of Graduate Programs in the Department of Integrated Studies in Education at McGill University in Montreal, Canada.