



17th Annual Symposium | August 12-13, 2021 | Virtual

Oral corrective feedback with LESLLA students¹

Marilisa Birello

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

Maria Teresa Sans Bertran

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

Abstract

The role of corrective feedback has aroused much interest in English as a second or foreign language research. However, Catalan as an additional language is an emerging field of research. This paper focuses on the oral corrective feedback that the teacher provides to the students' errors in a context of Catalan as an additional language with LESLLA students of an educational center located in a penitentiary center. Five 45-to-50-minute lessons of classroom interactions were recorded, transcribed and coded for the analysis. The findings show that there is a high amount of lexical and pronunciation errors. Furthermore, related with oral corrective feedback, the most common strategy is recast. Differences between reformulations and prompts were noted in terms of frequency. Prompts are less common, even though clarification requests and elicitation stand out. Finally, in most cases, students notice the oral corrective feedback provided. With recast the amount of uptake is very high, although only a third of the cases conduct to repair. Prompts lead students to a correction of the error by the students more frequently.

Keywords: LESLLA students, oral corrective feedback, uptake, Catalan as an additional language, classroom interaction

¹ This paper draws on research previously published in Catalan in CLIL Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education

Introduction

The oral corrective feedback (OCF) that the student receives from an erroneous utterance during an interaction has been the focus of interest of many studies, which have shown its importance in additional language learning (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Ranta & Lyster, 2007; Ellis, 2009; Nassaji, 2009; Fu & Nassaji, 2016, among others). Most of these studies were carried out with students with high levels of literacy and, until now, few studies have investigated OCF with students with emergent literacy (Tarone, 2010, 2021). The aim of this paper is to study OCF and uptake in the context of teaching Catalan as an additional language and with LESLLA students.

Oral corrective feedback and students' uptake

In this study, we define OCF as a teacher reaction that clearly transforms, disapproves or demands improvement of learners' errors (Chaudron, 1977). Lyster and Ranta (1997) identified six types of OCF: reformulation, explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, request for clarification, elicitation and repetition. Later, Ranta and Lyster (2007) grouped the types of OCF into reformulations, those teacher's interventions in which the correct form would be offered, and prompts, those corrections in which the teacher intervenes with the intention of encouraging the learner to self-correct the erroneous utterance.

In Lyster and Ranta (1997), recast was the most frequently used type of OCF (55% of the cases), followed by elicitation (14%) and clarification request (11%). The other three cases of OCF were all below 10%. Panova and Lyster (2002) obtained similar results, where the most frequently used OCF was recast (also 55%), followed by the clarification request (11%). The rest of OCF were also below 10%. The main difference between the two studies was that in Panova and Lyster (2002) elicitation was only 4%, compared to 14% in Lyster and Ranta (1997). Lyster and Mori (2006) analysed OCF in Japanese and French immersion contexts. They noted differences in the relationship between types of OCF and uptake depending on the context. In the Japanese immersion course, uptake was more frequent after recasts, whereas in the context of French immersion classes, students' uptake was more frequent after prompts. Fu and Nassaji (2016) analysed classroom interaction during a Chinese as a foreign language course in a university context and showed that 56.7% were recasts, 10% consisted of metalinguistic feedback and in some cases both types were combined. When teachers offer OCF they expect uptake from students. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), in this study we define uptake as a student reaction that follows immediately the feedback given by the teacher to the student's erroneous utterance. It can include responses with repaired utterances as well as utterances that still contain errors. It is also possible that students do not take the OCF into account and continue with their discourse.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Panova and Lyster (2002) have shown that recasts lead to less students' uptake and repair than prompts. Other studies have shown that recasts can be effective and lead to a high percentage of uptake (71.6%), repaired in 76.3% of the cases (Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001). In Fu and Nassaji (2016), the high amount of recasts did not produce a high percentage of uptake (49.6%) by students, although it led to a 45.3% repair rate. In Shirani's study (2019) teachers used prompts more than recasts. Prompts provided more opportunities for students' uptake, although they only led to repair in half of the cases. Recasts, on the other hand, led to a high percentage of repair (74.5%), which were not self-generated repair but were repetitions of the teacher's OCF.

Oral corrective feedback with LESLLA students

In recent years a growing body of research has investigated OCF with LESLLA learners. Bigelow, Delmas, Hansen and Tarone (2006) and Tarone and Bigelow (2007) showed that, unlike high-literate learners, LESLLA learners process language in terms of meaning rather than linguistic form. Subsequently, Tarone, Bigelow and Hansen (2009) indicated that the level of literacy was

related to better cognitive processing of the formal linguistic features in the spoken language required to perceive and incorporate the recasts provided by teachers. Bigelow, Delmas, Hansen and Tarone (2006) partially replicated Philp's (2003) study on uptake by university-level students when they received CF focused on question formation. Philp (2003) concluded that recasts were more effective when the students' competence in question formation corresponded to the level of the forms provided in the recasts. Bigelow, Delmas, Hansen and Tarone (2006), in their replication, compared the results of two groups of students, one with a slightly higher level of literacy than the other, and showed that the more literate group remembered recasts significantly better than the less literate group. Furthermore, Tarone and Bigelow (2007) noted that LESLLA students used more semantic strategies to process recasts and had problems noticing and repeating recasts related to grammatical aspects (e.g., inversion of the order of the sentence), as these changes in the order of the words did not cause any change in the meaning of the original utterance. According to Tarone (2021), the absence or limited knowledge of written language hinders students' ability to learn form-focused OCF and to assimilate it.

In a classroom context of Dutch as an additional language, Strube (2006) analysed recasts, and showed that with LESLLA students, recasts were more effective and led students to repair the error in activities in which the focus was very clear (e.g., activities with a linguistic focus). On the other hand, recasts were less likely to generate repair in communicative activities in which the teacher's recast would focus both on aspects of language use and linguistic form.

The aim of this study is to extend research on OCF to a context of learning Catalan as an additional language with LESLLA learners in prison, a context in which exposure to Catalan is limited (Bretxa & Torner, 2005). The research questions guiding this study are:

- What is the type and frequency of errors made by students?
- What kind of OCF does the teacher provide and how often?
- What effects do the different types of OCF have on students' uptake?

Methodology

Context

The context of this study is Catalonia (Spain), where a multilingual curriculum is implemented with Catalan as the main means of instruction, along with Spanish and English (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2019; Vila et al., 2016). Following the current legislation, the majority of the primary, secondary school and adult education subjects are taught in Catalan (Law of language policy, Generalitat de Catalunya, 1998; Law of Education of Catalonia, Generalitat de Catalunya, 2009). In this context, adult education leads adult students to primary and secondary school graduation.

The study was carried out with a group of 13 students, all men from Morocco and aged from 19 to 23, who were attending the second year of an adult school² located in prison to obtain their primary school certificate. Morocco lives in a situation of diglossia, in which a cultured language used in formal situations coexists with a dialectal variant, with a clearly delimited distribution of functions between the two. Classical Arabic, taught in schools, is the language of the media, administration and literature, and it is used as medium of interdialectal communication. The dialects have notable differences from one region to another but are mutually intelligible. They constitute the mother tongue of the Moroccan speaker and the means of communication in everyday family situations (Benyaya, 2007). Their linguistic repertoire included Dàrija (Moroccan Arabic) as their first language and some knowledge of French and Spanish (co-official language in Catalonia), as Sans Bertran (2018) also reports in her study. The teacher's L1 is Catalan and she also knows Spanish and English. She has been teaching at the same adult school for three years.

² Primary school for adult lasts three years.

The Catalan language course followed a communicative approach and the research did not require any changes in the teacher's lesson plan. The sessions observed and analysed were organized always in the same way. First, the teacher introduced a new topic aimed at providing the students with the linguistic contents needed to talk about jobs and trade. Each session began with a semi-structured conversation in which the teacher asked questions and the students answered freely, without having to use a specific linguistic form, which served to introduce the topic of the session and motivate students. Next, the students carried out activities with a linguistic focus on pronunciation, vocabulary or grammar. In some cases, activities were carried out to recognise the vocabulary or to create short dialogues based on a model.

Data collection

Before starting the data collection, consent was requested from the prison, the adult school management and all the students who participated in the study. The data were collected from 11th to 15th January 2021 for five 45-to-50-minute sessions. For reasons of participant privacy, we were not allowed to video-record the sessions, so they were audio-recorded. The recordings were transcribed following van Lier (1988) conventions and generated a total of 1,336 turns, of which 764 were from the teacher and 572 from the students.

Both researchers coded the data independently and compared their results of the coding, which coincided in 90%, and discussed jointly the differences in order to reach an agreement for the remaining 10%. In this study, reliability was estimated using the formula "Agreement/Agreement+Disagreement" (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and the level of agreement reached between the researchers was high: $187/187+19=0.91$.

Error codification

To code the errors, we adopted the grammatical criteria of Vázquez (1992) and, following Ferreira (2006) and Bao (2019), we classified them into four categories: pronunciation, lexical, grammatical and multiple errors. Regarding to pronunciation errors, inappropriate accentuation and mispronunciation of vocabulary in Catalan during conversation activities were documented (Example 1):

Example 1

1. S: la pintora pinta ['parets] ['parets] (*the painter paints [cei'ling] [cei'ling]*)
2. T: molt bé! la pintora pinta [pa're::ts] (*very good! the painter paints ['ceiling]*)

In the case of lexical errors, we took into account the inappropriate and inaccurate use of vocabulary (Example 2):

Example 2

1. S: vetenario vetenario de: ("vetenary" instead of "veterinary") (*vetenary vetenary of ("vetenary" instead of "veterinary")*)
2. T: veterinari aquest els que cuiden els que curen els animals (*veterinary this the person who takes care of animals*)

For grammatical errors, we considered errors such as sentence structure, verb conjugation, subject/verb, noun/adjective and article/noun agreement (Example 3):

Example 3

S: quin imatge corresponde al ofici de co- de coci- de cu- cuina **cocina** (student confused the gender of the noun "image" -feminine in Catalan- and did not make the required question word agreement) (*which image corresponds to the trade kit- kitch- kitchen kitchen*)

Regarding multiple errors, all cases that included more than one type of error in the student's production were examined (Example 4):

Example 4

S: [ta' ʎer][ta' ʎer][ta' ʎer] no? **exacto**? (inadequate use of the word “taller” -workshop- instead of “tallar”-to cut- and mispronunciation)

Coding OCF types

The coding of the OCF types was based on Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Fu and Nassaji (2016) taxonomy. Table 1 provides a definition of each OCF type with an example drawn from the data collected. It should be noted that the following OCF types were excluded from our classification: re-ask, asking another student and using L1, as no cases were documented in our data.

Table 1. Coding OCF types (adapted from Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Fu & Nassaji, 2016)

OCF types	Definition	Example
<i>Immediate recast</i>	The teacher provides the correct form by reformulating the learner's utterance.	1. S: vividor vindidor (<i>soldier selder</i>) 2. T: venedor (<i>seller</i>) 3. S: venedor (<i>seller</i>)
<i>Delayed recast</i>	The teacher reformulates the learner's erroneous utterance with some delay.	1. S: quinze a policia (.) qué imatge corresponde a l'oficina yo he post al = (<i>fifteen police (.) which image corresponds to the office I put to =</i>) 2. T: no: (<i>no:</i>) 3. S: = imatge (= <i>image</i>) 4. T: no:: quina imatge correspon a l'ofici de:: (<i>no:: which image corresponds to the trade of:</i>) 5. S: la policia! (<i>the police!</i>)
<i>Clarification request</i>	The teacher asks questions to better understand the student's erroneous utterance, without providing the correct form.	1. S: jaima las mantas : XXX (<i>tent the blankets: XXX</i>) 2. T: ah:: com has dit? (<i>ah:: what did you say?</i>)
<i>Metalinguistic feedback</i>	The teacher provides comments or brief analyses of a student's erroneous utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form.	1. T: què vol dir ven? (<i>what does it mean he sells?</i>) 2. S: ven? (<i>he sells?</i>) 3. T: ven (<i>he sells</i>) 4. S: que trabaja: en: de camarero (<i>that he works: in: like waiter</i>) 5. T: no:: (<i>no::</i>) 6. S: XXX (XXX) 7. T: no:: ven ve del verb vendre: (<i>no:: he sells comes from the verb to sell</i>)
<i>Elicitation</i>	The teacher does not provide the corrected form but intended to give the students a chance to self-correct the error without asking a direct question.	1. T: com es diu? (<i>how do you say it?</i>) 2. S: soldadura (<i>welding</i>)
<i>Explicit correction</i>	The teacher explicitly provides the correction of the student's erroneous utterance and clearly signals that the students made an error.	1. S: quin imatge corresponde a la oficina (<i>which image correspond to the office</i>) 2. T: l'ofici per què dius oficina si no hi ha un- (<i>the job why do you say office if there is not a-</i>) 3. S: ofici ofici metge metge (<i>job job doctor doctor</i>)
<i>Repetition</i>	The teacher repeats the student's erroneous utterance with a raising intonation to highlight the error.	1. S: no! chapista (<i>no! panel beater</i>) 2. T: és chapista ? (<i>is panel beater?</i>)

Coding uptake

To code the students' uptake, we followed Fu and Nassaji (2016) study, distinguishing between successful, unsuccessful uptake and no uptake. Table 2 gives a definition and an example for each type.

Table 2. Coding uptake (adapted from Fu & Nassaji, 2016)

Uptake types	Definition	Example
<i>Successful uptake</i>	Student's successful correction of the error after the feedback of the teacher.	1. S: ['metye] ['metye] (['doctor] ['doctor]) 2. T: metge vale : (doctor ok :) 3. S: metge (doctor)
<i>Unsuccessful uptake</i>	Student's partial or off-target correction of an error after receiving teacher feedback.	1. S: quin és el ['payes] (who is the ['farmer]) 2. T: pagès (farmer) 3.S: se ((sí afirmatiu)) (ya ((yes affirmative)))
<i>No uptake</i>	Student did not produce any verbal response to the teacher's feedback.	1. S: quin (which ((masculine form in Catalan))) 2. T: quina (which ((femenine form in Catalan))) 3. S: [ma'txe] ([image]) 4. T: imatge (image) 5. S: imatge imatge (image image)

Results

A total of 163 errors were detected in the data. Most of the errors (Table 3) were related to pronunciation errors accounted for 42.4%, followed by lexical errors (30.7%), grammatical errors (15.3%) and multiple errors 11.6%.

Table 3. Frequency of each error types

Types of error	Frequency n	Frequency %
Pronunciation errors	69	42.4%
Lexical errors	50	30.7%
Grammatical errors	25	15.3%
Multiple errors	19	11.6%
Total	163	100%

Languages other than the target language also appeared during the lessons: Spanish, French and Arabic (Table 4). Students used them in n=125 occasions: they used Spanish in 95.2% of the cases, then French in 4% of the cases and Arabic in 0.8% of the cases. They used Spanish even when dealing with linguistic content that has already been covered in class. The students also use in five occasion French and in one occasion Arabic.

Table 4. Use of other languages of students' linguistic repertoire

Language used	Frequency n	Frequency %
Spanish	119	95.2%
French	5	4%
Arabic	1	0.8%
Total	125	100%

In the cases where students used Spanish, the teacher intervened consistently offering a translation into Catalan in order to provide them an extra input in the target language. Since the teacher did not know French and Arabic, she did not intervene in those cases.

Table 5 shows that in the 32.5% of the cases students did not receive any type of OCF. For instance, although not reflected in this table, the teacher decided not to provide all the OCF when the utterance included more than one error. In other cases, the teacher focused her attention on the functioning of the activity and prioritised the students' understanding of the meaning. The most frequent OCF types were recasts. Specifically, 33.5% of the cases of OCF were immediate recasts and delayed recasts accounted for 11.2%. The teacher, through the OCF, provided the correct answers to the students and only 22.8% were OCF that encouraged the student to correct their own errors: clarification request, elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic feedback. In this second group, the clarification request was the most frequent OCF type (8.1%), followed by elicitation (7.1%). Each of the other OCF types accounted for less than 5% of the total.

Table 5. Frequency of OCF provided by the teacher.

OCF types	Frequency n	Frequency %
No OCF	64	32.5
Immediate recast	66	33.5
Delayed recast	22	11.2
Clarification request	16	8.1
Elicitation	14	7.1
Explicit correction	8	4.1
Repetition	4	2.0
Metalinguistic feedback	3	1.5
Total	197	100

Table 6 presents the frequencies and relationships between the type of error in the students' utterances and the OCF types provided by the teacher. In total, the teacher did not provide any OCF in the 39,5% of the cases. Students' utterances that include pronunciation errors did not receive any OCF in the 36.2% of the cases. The 39.1% were immediate recast and the 10.1% of cases, the pronunciation errors were corrected with delayed recast. All the other cases of OCF were below 10%: clarification request (5.8%), elicitation (4.3%), explicit correction (1.5%), repetition (1.5%), metalinguistic feedback (1.5%). Regarding the lexical errors, the teacher did not provide any OCF in the 42% of the cases. When she provided, she preferred immediate recast (24%), followed by elicitation (12%), clarification request and explicit correction (both 8%), delayed recast (4%). In the 68% of the cases, the teacher did not intervene with grammatical errors. When she decided to give OCF they were mainly immediate recast. In the 8% of the cases, the teacher used elicitation, 4%

delayed recast, clarification request and repetition. With the multiple errors, the teacher's moves were mainly immediate recast (12%) and delayed recast (10.5%). All the other cases (clarification request, explicit correction and no OCF) were below 10% (all of them 5.2%).

Table 6. Frequency and relationship between error types and OCF types.

OCF types	Types of error								Total	
	Pronunciation error		Lexical error		Grammatical error		Multiple errors			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
No OCF	25	36.2	21	42.0	17	68.0	1	5.6	64	39.5
Immediate recast	27	39.1	12	24.0	3	12.0	12	66.6	54	33.3
Delayed recast	7	10.1	2	4.0	1	4.0	2	11.0	12	7.4
Clarification request	4	5.8	4	8.0	1	4.0	1	5.6	10	6.2
Elicitation	3	4.3	6	12.0	2	8.0	0	0	11	6.8
Explicit correction	1	1.5	4	8.0	0	0	1	5.6	6	3.7
Repetition	1	1.5	1	2.0	1	4.0	0	0	3	1.8
Metalinguistic feedback	1	1.5	0	0	0	0	1	5.6	2	1.3
Total	69	100.0	50	100.0	25	100.0	18	100.0	162	100.0

Regarding the effects of the different OCF types on the students' uptake after the teacher's move, 33.8% of the cases led learners to successful uptake and repair the error. In 34.6% of cases, the students were able to take the turn, but were unable to repair the error or only partially repaired it. In the remaining cases (31.6%), there was no attempt of learners' uptake. Table 7 shows the relationships between the different OCF types and the students' uptake.

Table 7. Relationship between OCF types and learner uptake

OCF types	Types of uptake								Total	
	Successful uptake		Unsuccessful uptake		Total uptake		No uptake			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Immediate recast	25	37.9	20	30.3	45	68.2	21	31.8	66	100
Delayed recast	4	18.2	5	22.7	9	40.9	13	59.1	22	100
Clarification request	3	18.8	10	62.5	13	81.3	3	18.8	16	100
Elicitation	7	50.0	5	35.7	12	85.7	2	14.3	14	100
Explicit correction	4	50.0	2	25.0	6	75.0	2	25.0	8	100
Repetition	0	0	4	100.0	4	100.0	0	0	4	100
Metalinguistic feedback	2	66.7	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100
Total	45	33.8	46	34.6	91	68.4	42	31.6	133	100

In order to see the different students' behaviour in relation to the two types of recasts, this study comments them together. The high amount of immediate recast (n=66) and delayed recast (n=22) meant that most of the students' uptake was related to these two OCF types. Immediate

recasts led to 37.9% of repairs, while only 18.2% of delayed recasts led to learner uptake. Delayed recasts were the OCF type with the highest percentage of no learner uptake (59.1%).

Although they were not the most frequent OCF types, elicitation and explicit correction were the OCF that proportionally led students to repair the error in 50% of cases. The clarification request, although the third most frequently used OCF type, was not a very effective, as in the 18.8% of the cases did not produce any move by the student and in 62.5% of cases the students' uptake it did not lead students to repair or they repair partially their utterance. The other types of OCF (explicit correction, repetition and metalinguistic feedback) appeared on very limited occasions and are therefore not very informative. However, the use of explicit correction and the metalinguistic feedback point to a tendency towards students' repair. On the other hand, repetition could be perceived as discursive rather than corrective strategy and, therefore, did not attract the students' attention.

Discussion

The analysis of the data showed a strong presence of other languages in the Catalan lesson, mainly Spanish (95.2% of the cases), the other official language coexisting in Catalonia (Spain), and a language that students share with the teacher. Students also use other languages in their language repertoire, French and Arabic, but in a much smaller quantity. This result is striking because as Branchadell (2015) pointed out, the first immigration plan of a new left-wing and nationalist party coalition in government was to turn Catalan into the vehicular language of immigrants. This turning point coincided in time with a shift in the language ideologies underpinning the overall Catalan language policy. In terms of Woolard's celebrated distinction (2008), an ideology of authenticity gave way to an ideology of anonymity: the goal was to move from a conception that locates the value of a language in its relationship to an historically specific social group to the supposedly neutral hegemonic language associated with the public sphere of nineteenth and twentieth century nation-states. According to this framework, Catalan was supposed to become the common language of Catalonia. In the process of turning immigrants into citizens (the key idea of this plan), the Catalan language teaching and learning was a necessary condition. For this reason, appeared a new approach to the teaching of the Catalan language to foreigners, the linguistic welcome (*acollida lingüística*) that was included in a comprehensive welcome program (Branchadell, 2015).

Following Vila, Sorolla and Larrea (2013), it must also be considered that Moroccan people who arrive in Catalonia usually prioritise learning Spanish for two reasons: they have a migration history that leads them to follow their family, friends or work in different parts of Spain, and it is the language that predominates in the workplace where they are incorporated. Other authors have shown that Spanish is the most frequently used language in the prison context (Bretxa & Torner, 2005; Sans Bertran, 2018; Birello, Pérez Ventayol & Casadellà Matamoros, 2017). As Branchadell (2015) said, a Statistics Institute of Catalonia study indicates that there is ample evidence that foreigners tend to choose the dominant language, in the case of Catalonia, Spanish. In a 2006 survey focused on people of Moroccan, Ecuadorian, Romanian and Chinese origin, the following conclusion was reached:

“The predominant language in the family and with friends is that of the country of origin, although Spanish is also widely used with acquaintances. At work, the prevalence of Spanish is overwhelming, especially when compared to Catalan. The use of Catalan is very scant and few immigrants understand it.” (Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya, 2006).

In 2010, another survey gave similar results: Spanish is the main language of respondents in all areas, although most keep their language of origin, especially at home. The presence of Catalan in daily life is minimal (Branchadell, 2015).

The dominance of Spanish in penitentiary context also can be explained due to a deep-seated social norm according to which Spanish, not Catalan, is the language to be used with foreigners (even if they happen not to know it). This is part of the status quo that Catalan immigration policy and education is intended to challenge with specific policies and measures (i.e., awareness campaigns and workshops for teachers).

The first research question of this study focused on identifying the different types of errors and their frequency. Of the 163 cases of errors noted, the majority of them (42.4%) corresponded to the pronunciation errors. This high number of pronunciation errors can be explained with the fact that, as Benyaya (2007) suggests, a characteristic that makes Moroccan speaker more easily identifiable is the confusion of some vowels or the neutralisation of some consonants, which are adapted to Arabic pronunciation. In our data, sometimes the difficulties with the pronunciation of some Catalan words depends on Spanish because they confuse both languages. In the 30.7% of the cases were lexical errors, this may be because the lessons observed were very much focused on the introduction of new vocabulary and therefore the students were not familiar with it. The presence of grammatical errors (15.3%) and multiple errors (11.6%) was significantly lower.

The second question focused on the type and frequency of the OCF provided by the teacher. As in other studies, most of the OCF were immediate recasts (33.3%) (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 1998; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Lyster & Mori, 2006; Jimenez, 2006; Fu & Nassaji, 2016) or delayed recast (7.4% - see Table 6). This result points to a tendency for the teacher to provide a more implicit OCF, with the intention of providing more samples of the target language to a group that had little chance of listening and using it. It should be noted that grammatical errors, although an infrequent type of error (15.3%), did not receive OCF in 68% of the cases. This result can be explained by the fact that most of the classroom activities had a lexical focus and therefore the teacher prioritised the correction of this type of error.

Regarding OCF cases where the student has to look for a solution on his own from the teacher's questions or suggestions: clarification request (6.2%), elicitation (6.8%), explicit correction (3.7%), repetition, (1.8%) and metalinguistic feedback (1.3%) were used very sporadically (see Table 6). Most probably, the teacher preferred to use an OCF that seemed less invasive to her in order to avoid cases of adult inhibition (Fernández López, 1995). It should be noted that in a total of 39.5% of the cases of errors, no OCF was provided (Table 6). In some cases, the teacher decided to prioritise communication. In other cases, such as in those utterances that contained more than one error, the tendency was to correct the error found at the end of the student's utterance.

The third research question of the study aimed to find out what effects the different OCF had on the students' uptake. The students' reaction to the OCF was fairly evenly distributed between successful (33.8%), unsuccessful (34.6%) and no uptake (31.6%). In 68.4% of the cases, the students replied to the OCF provided, but in only 33.8% of the cases was there a repair. As in Strube (2006), the recasts were effective. In our study, the most effective recasts were the immediate ones, as students replied to them in 68.2% of the cases and in 37.9%, they led to repair. The case of delayed recasts was slightly different, as they seemed to be less effective in that only 18.2% of cases led to repair. It should be noted that delayed recasts were the OCF with the highest percentage of cases in which there was no learner uptake (59.1%). One reason for this result may be that when the delayed recast was provided, the students were concentrating on other tasks and did not notice the teacher's OCF or do not understand that it is as a correction of an error that had occurred previously.

It should be noted that, although they are not very frequent OCF, clarification requests and elicitation led to students' uptake in 81.3% and 85.7% of cases, respectively. In this sense, a similar tendency is shown with LESLLA students to that detected by Fu and Nassaji (2016) with university

students. With regard to repair, LESLLA students behaved differently from highly-educated students in Canada in Fu and Nassaji (2016): half of the cases of elicitation led to repair, while the clarification request was not as effective, as in most cases (62.5%) it did not lead students to repair the error. Perhaps the students in the present study did not perceive clarification requests as corrective strategy but as discursive strategy. In this sense, more research is needed.

Finally, even though there are few cases, it seems that there was a tendency to repair when the teacher used a more explicit type of OCF, which guided the students more towards repair, such as, for example, explicit correction, elicitation and the metalinguistic feedback. Most probably this depended on the fact that with this OCF type the teacher clearly indicated where the problem was and this helped the students to identify and locate it. In this sense, more research is also needed.

Conclusions

The results of this study show that in the Catalan context, there is a very high use of Spanish during the Catalan lessons. This aspect encourages some dynamics in the classroom because the teacher tries to offer a translation into Catalan as an extra input for the students. The results show that most of the OCF are recasts which are effective in the sense that they produce a repair from the student.

It must be considered that the present study has some limitations, as it was carried out in a single school, with a small number of students and a limited number of recorded sessions. We did not have the opportunity on this occasion to make a more in-depth study about the use of other languages of the student's linguistic repertoire. For future research, the participants and groups with different levels of literacy should be increased. Moreover, the level of learners' awareness of the OCF received, especially of recasts and the OCF types, which are more precise when indicating the error and encourage the learner to self-correct, should be examined. Finally, a qualitative study from a translingual perspective is needed in order to fully understand the use of the entire students' linguistic repertoire to accomplish their communicative goals and the kind of classroom interaction it promotes.

References

- Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes: Teachers' beliefs versus their practices. *System*, 82, 140-150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.004>.
- Benyaya, Z. (2007). La enseñanza del español en la secundaria marroquí: aspectos fónicos, gramaticales y léxicos [The teaching of Spanish in Moroccan secondary schools: phonic, grammatical and lexical aspects]. *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de Lenguas*, 1(2), 1-61.
- Bigelow, M., Delmas, R., Hansen, K., & Tarone, E. (2006). Literacy and the processing of oral recasts in SLA. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(4), 665-689. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264303>
- Birello, M., Pérez Ventayol, M., & Casadellà Matamoros, M. (2017). Los repertorios lingüísticos en los centros penitenciarios en Cataluña. In A. Benucci & G. Grosso (Eds.), *Buone Pratiche e repertori linguistici in carcere* [Good practices and linguistic repertoires in prison] (pp. 147-160). Aracne.
- Bretxa, V., & Torner, R. (2005). El català ocult: el potencial d'ús de la llengua catalana a la presó model de Barcelona. [Hidden Catalan: the potential use of the Catalan language in the model prison of Barcelona]. *Llengua i ús: Revista tècnica de política lingüística*, 32, 58-69.
- Branchadell, A. (2015). Language education for adult migrants in Catalonia Nation-state ambitions without nation-state resources. In J. Simpson & A. Whiteside (Eds.), *Adult Language Education and Migration*, (pp.82-94). DOI: 10.4324/9781315718361-6
- Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning*, 27, 29-46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1977.tb00290.x>

- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1, 3-18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054>
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51, 281–318. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00156>
- Fernández López, S. (1995). Errores e interlengua el aprendizaje del español como lengua extranjera. [Errors and interlanguage learning of Spanish as a foreign language]. *Didáctica. Lengua y Literatura*, 7, 203. <https://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/DIDA/article/view/DIDA9595110203A>
- Ferreira, A. (2006). Estrategias efectivas de feedback positivo y correctivo en español como lengua extranjera. [Effective positive and corrective feedback strategies in Spanish as a foreign language]. *Revista Signos*, 39(62), 379-406. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-09342006000300003>
- Fu, T., & Nassaji, H. (2016). Corrective feedback, learner uptake, and feedback perception in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 159-181. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.1.8>
- Generalitat de Catalunya. (1998). Act on linguistic policy. <https://llengua.gencat.cat/permalink/78000b57-5382-11e4-8f3f-000c29cdf219>
- Generalitat de Catalunya. (2009). Llei d'Educació de Catalunya. [Law of Education of Catalonia]. <https://www.parlament.cat/document/cataleg/48041.pdf>
- Generalitat de Catalunya. (2019). The language model of the Catalan education system. Language learning and use in a multilingual and multicultural educational environment. Generalitat de Catalunya. <https://educacio.gencat.cat/web/.content/home/departament/publicacions/monografies/model-linguis-tic/model-linguistic-Catalunya-ENG.pdf>
- Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya (2006) Sondeig a la immigració. Estudi pilot sobre el perfil de la immigració marroquina, equatoriana, romanesa i xinesa installada a Catalunya. [Immigration survey. Pilot study on the profile of Moroccan, Ecuadorian, Romanian and Chinese immigration settled in Catalonia]. Generalitat de Catalunya.
- Jimenez, J. (2006). Corrective feedback in EFL university classrooms: A case study at an Italian university. *Linguistica e Filologia*, 23, 45-89. [https://aisberg.unibg.it/retrieve/handle/10446/121/1032/Lef23\(2006\)Jimenez.pdf](https://aisberg.unibg.it/retrieve/handle/10446/121/1032/Lef23(2006)Jimenez.pdf)
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 269–300. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060128>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48(2), 183-218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00039>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Nassaji, H. (2009) Effects of recasts and elicitations in dyadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. *Language Learning*, 59(2), 411-452. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-09342020000200468>
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573-595. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588241>
- Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on 'noticing the gap': Nonnative speakers' noticing in recasts in NS-NNS interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 99-126. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000044>
- Ranta, L., & Lyster, R. (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral language abilities: The Awareness–Practice–Feedback sequence. Dins R. DeKeyser. (Ed.),

Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology (pp. 141-160). Cambridge University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667275.009>

- Sans Bertran, M. T. (2018). Repertori i usos lingüístics d'un alumne intern d'origen marroquí d'un centre penitenciari de l'àrea metropolitana de Barcelona. [Repertoires and linguistic uses of Moroccan inmate in a prison in the metropolitan area of Barcelona]. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 11(3), 64-86.
<http://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.744>
- Shirani, R. (2019). Patterns of uptake and repair following recasts and prompts in an EFL context: Does feedback explicitness play a role?, *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 9(4), 607-631. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2019.9.4.3>
- Strube, S. (2006). Recasts and learner uptake: the non-literate adult L2 classroom during oral skills practices. In M. Young-Scholten (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Third Annual LESLLA Forum* (pp.61-75). Roundtuit Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005734>
- Tarone, E., & Bigelow, M. (2007). Impact of literacy on oral language processing: Implication for second language acquisition research. In A. Mackey (Ed.) *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies* (pp.101-121). Oxford University Press.
- Tarone, E., Bigelow, M., & Hansen, K. (2009). *Literacy and second language oracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Tarone, E. (2010). Second Language acquisition by low-literate learners: An under-studied population. *Language Teaching*, 43(1), 75-83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005734>
- Tarone, E. (2021). Alphabetic print literacy level and noticing oral corrective feedback in SLA. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 450-470). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789.022>
- van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. Longman.
- Vila, X.F., Sorolla, N., & Larrea, I. (2013). Les vies per als aprenentatges lingüístics del jovent d'origen marroquí establert a Catalunya. [Paths to language learning for young Moroccan people settled in Catalonia]. In F. X. Vila & E. Salvat (Eds.), *Noves immigracions i llengües* (pp. 147-197). Agrupació d'Editors & Autors Universitaris.
- Vila, F. X., Lasagabaster, D., & Ramallo, F. (2016). Bilingual education in the officially plurilingual autonomous communities of Spain. In O. García, A. Lin & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education. Encyclopedia of language* (pp. 1-13). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_28
- Woolard, K. A. (2008) Language and identity choice in Catalonia: the interplay of contrasting ideologies of linguistic authority. In K. Süselbeck, U. Mühlischlegel & P. Masson (Eds.), *Lengua, nación e identidad. La regulación del plurilingüismo en Espana y América Latina*. Vervuert/Madrid: Iberoamericana, 303-323.

Appendix 1

Transcription conventions

S, S1, S2: student

T: teacher

Emphasis with falling intonation: va!

Rising intonation, question: què és?

Lengthening of the preceding sound: no:::

Abrupt cut-off: co-

Turn continue below: =

Comments: ((laugh))

Use other languages: **Spanish**

Phonetic transcription: [ta'ʎer]

Brief pause: (.)

Reading: read