Research Timeline

Research Timeline: Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition

Hossein Nassaji University of Victoria, Canada
nassaji@uvic.ca

Introduction

This article provides a timeline of research on form-focused instruction (FFI). Over the past 40 years, research on the role of instruction has undergone many changes. Much of the early research concentrated on determining whether formal instruction makes any difference in the development of learner language. This question was motivated in part by a theoretical discussion in the field of cognitive psychology over the role of explicit versus implicit learning, on the one hand, and a debate in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) over the role of naturalistic exposure versus formal instruction, on the other. In the early 1980s, for example, based on the notion that the processes involved in second language (L2) learning are similar to those in first language (L1) learning, Krashen (e.g., Krashen 1981, 1982, 1985) made a distinction between learning and acquisition and claimed that an L2 should be acquired through natural exposure not learned through formal instruction. Thus, he claimed that FFI has little beneficial effect on language acquisition. This position, which has also been known as a 'zero position' on instruction, was also taken by a number of other researchers who argued that L1 and L2 learning follow similar processes and that what L2 learners need in order to acquire a second language is naturalistic exposure to meaning-focused communication rather than formal instruction (Dulay & Burt 1974; Felix 1981; Prabhu 1987; Schwartz 1993; Zobl 1995).

Later research in SLA, however, led to a reassessment of the role of FFI. Many researchers began to make a strong case for L2 instruction, arguing that FFI can be potentially effective if it is provided appropriately. There were a number of reasons for this argument. First, the assumption that language can be learned without some degree of consciousness was found to be problematic (e.g., Sharwood Smith 1981; Schmidt & Frota 1986; Schmidt 1990 (see timeline); Sharwood Smith 1991(see timeline); Schmidt 1993, 1995). For example, Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt 1990, 2001) challenged non-interventionist perspectives, which claimed that the only way of acquiring a language is through naturalistic exposure. Instead, it considered that noticing or drawing learners' attention to the target form is an essential condition for L2 learning. Second, studies began to produce evidence that pointed to the inadequacies of the teaching approaches whose primary focus is on meaning and

communication with no focus on grammatical forms. For example, extensive research in French immersion programs or content-based classrooms (e.g., Harley & Swain 1984; Swain 1985; Lapkin, Hart & Swain 1991) demonstrated that learners in such programs may develop a high degree of comprehension skills or fluency. However, they do not achieve a high level of accuracy in certain grammatical and morphological features of the L2. Furthermore, evidence began to accumulate from a large number of studies and several important reviews (e.g., Long 1983 (see timeline); Ellis 1985; Lightbown & Spada 1990 (see timeline); Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991; Ellis 1994; Spada 1997 (see timeline); Norris & Ortega 2000; Ellis 2001; Norris & Ortega 2001) that demonstrated that FFI has positive effects on both L2 accuracy and ultimate level of acquisition. Given these developments, research shifted its focus from whether FFI has an effect to what type of FFI is most beneficial. Research also began to investigate more closely how FFI contributes to language acquisition and what factors or mechanisms may mediate its effectiveness.

With regard to types of instruction, a classification that has been very influential in the literature is the distinction that Long (1991) (see timeline) and Long & Robinson (1998) (see timeline) made between FOCUS ON FORM (*FonF*) and FOCUS ON FORMS (*FonFs*) instruction. Long (1991) defined FonFs as the traditional structural and synthetic approaches to language teaching, in which language is presented to learners in an isolated and de-contextualized manner. FonF was defined as instruction that involves drawing learners' attention to linguistic forms that arise spontaneously in the context of meaning-focused communication. Long's distinction and in particular the notion of FonF has become the impetus for many recent studies that have attempted to explore the best way of drawing learners' attention to form in the context of meaning-focused communication and its effects on language learning.

Long (1991) originally characterized FonF mainly as a reaction to linguistic problems occurring incidentally during communicative activities. Other researchers, however, expanded the concept to include both incidental and preplanned FonF and noted that FonF can take place on a broader scale depending on how and when it is implemented (Spada 1997 (see timeline); Doughty & Williams 1998 (see timeline); Lightbown 1998 (see timeline); Nassaji 1999 (see timeline); Ellis 2001; Williams 2005 (see timeline); Nassaji & Fotos 2010 (see timeline)). Spada (1997) and Ellis (2001), for example, used the term FFI to refer to any instructional strategies that attempt to draw learners' attention to form. Such strategies can occur in a variety of forms, which can differ from one another in a number of important ways. For example, they can occur both implicitly and explicitly, reactively (such as through various forms of interactional and corrective feedback in response to learner errors) or proactively in a predetermined manner, deductively or inductively, integratively or separately and also through various forms of input, output, and consciousness raising tasks designed to draw learner attention to specific target features (Nassaji & Fotos 2010). The notion of FORM was also expanded to include not only grammatical or syntactic forms but also vocabulary, pronunciation, and pragmatics. Furthermore, the theoretical perspectives underlying instructional studies shifted from a purely cognitive to those that incorporated more social, cultural, and sociocultural perspectives.

To reflect the scope of FFI research and how it has grown and changed over the years, the aim of this article is to provide a timeline of studies that have addressed the issue of FFI in its various manifestations. To this end, the timeline begins with early studies that examined

whether FFI plays a role in language acquisition and then moves on to later studies that examined the various forms of FFI in different contexts and with different learners as well as the different factors that affect their use and effectiveness. Due to the sheer number of theoretical and empirical studies that have addressed these issues, it is not possible, and also not intended, to provide a comprehensive account of all individual studies in this area. Thus, the timeline presents a chronology of a representative sample of key studies, with a focus on how they have evolved over time. The timeline has categorized the studies according to the following themes.

A. Theoretical and background issues
B. Definition of constructs
C. FFI versus no instruction
D. Types of instruction
    1. Explicit versus implicit
    2. Isolated versus integrated
    3. Deductive versus inductive
    4. Input enhancement
    5. Processing instruction (PI)
    6. Interactional or corrective feedback
    7. Consciousness raising tasks
    8. Incidental FonF
E. Factors affecting the use and/or effectiveness of instructional strategies
    1. Learner characteristics/individual learner differences
    2. Feedback characteristics
    3. Types of task
    4. Linguistic target
    5. Linguistic/developmental level
F. Learners' perception/noticing
G. Learners' and/or teachers' belief
H. Context of instruction/interaction
    1. Second language
    2. Foreign language
I. Context of research
    1. Classroom
    2. Laboratory
    3. Computer-assisted
J. Narrative reviews and/or meta-analysis of research

Acknowledgements

References

Dulay, H. & M. Burt (1974). Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 24, 37–53.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Felix, S. (1981). The effect of formal instruction on second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 31, 87–112.

Harley, B. & M. Swain (1984). The interlanguage of immersion students and its implications for second language teaching. In A. Davies, C. Criper & A. P. R. Howatt (eds.), *Interlanguage*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press, 291–311.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Lapkin, S., D. Hart & M. Swain (1991). Early and middle French immersion programs – French-language outcomes. *Canadian Modern Language Review–Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes* 48, 11–40.

Larsen-Freeman, D. & M. H. Long (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.

Norris, J. M. & L. Ortega (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 50, 417–528.

Norris, J. M. & L. Ortega (2001). Does type of instruction make a difference? Substantive findings from a meta-analytic review. *Language Learning* 51, 157–213.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 13, 206–226.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in language learning. In R. Schmidt (ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 1–63.

Schmidt, R. & S. Frota (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: Conversation in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 237–326.

Schwartz, B. (1993). On explicit and negative data effecting and affecting competence and linguistic behavior. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15, 147–163.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1981). Consciousness-raising and second language acquisition theory. *Applied Linguistics* 2, 159–168.

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

Zobl, H. (1995). Converging evidence for the 'acquisition-learning' distinction. *Applied Linguistics* 16, 35–56.

HOSSEIN NASSAJI is Professor of Applied Linguistics in the Linguistics Department at the University of Victoria, Canada. His teaching and research interests include form-focused instruction, interactional feedback, and second language reading and vocabulary learning. His recent books are *Interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning*, 2015, Bloomsbury Publishing; *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*, 2010, Routledge (with Sandra Fotos); and *Form-focused instruction and teacher education: Studies in honour of Rod Ellis*, 2007, Oxford University Press (with Sandra Fotos). He is co-editor of *Language Teaching Research* and editor of the Grammar Teaching volume of *The TESOL encyclopaedia of English language teaching* to be published by Wiley. He is the winner of the Twenty-First Annual Kenneth W. Mildenberger Prize of the Modern Language Association of America and the recipient of the 2012 Faculty of Humanities Award for Research Excellence, University of Victoria.

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
1983	Long, M. (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of the Research. *TESOL Quarterly* 17, 359–382.	**Long** conducted the first study that addressed the question of whether instruction makes a difference by reviewing 12 studies that compared instructed versus naturalistic language learning. Overall the instruction was found to have positive effects on L2 learning as compared to no instruction. The review was in response to earlier claims that instruction has no effect on L2 acquisition.	**C** **J**
1984	Ellis, R. (1984). Can syntax be taught? A study of the effects of formal instruction on the acquisition of WH questions by children. *Applied Linguistics* 5,138–155.	In this early study, **Ellis** investigated the effect of formal instruction on learning a specific language structure (WH questions). The results did not show a significant change in learning the new rule.	**C** **I1**
1984	Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 6, 186–214.	**Pienemann** was one of the first to explore the relationship between formal instruction and learner developmental sequences. It was found that a structure can only be learned if the learner's interlanguage has reached a point where it is one step below the target structure (see also PIENEMANN[1] 1988).	**E5** **H1** **I1**
1986	Pavesi, M. (1986). Markedness, discoursal modes and relative clause formation in a formal and informal context. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 8, 38–55.	**Pavesi** is an early study that examined the relationship between informal and formal learners of English and their acquisition of relative clauses. Results showed that both groups followed the pattern of learning from marked structures to unmarked structures.	**C** **H1** **H2**
1988	Pienemann, M. (1988). Determining the influence of instruction on L2 speech processing. *AILA Review* 5, 40–72.	**Pienemann** explored further the notion of developmental sequences and its relationship with FFI. Reviewing a number of his previous studies in this area, he concluded that there are a series of processing constraints that mediate the role of formal instruction.	**A** **E5** **H1** **J**
1989	Harley, B. (1989). Functional grammar in French immersion: A classroom experiment. *Applied Linguistics* 19, 331–359.	In this early study, **Harley** explored the effect of FFI in French immersion classes. The experimental groups outperformed the control groups in two of three measures: the cloze test and oral interview, but not on the composition test (see subsequent studies: SCOTT 1989; DAY & SHAPSON 1991; LYSTER 1994).	**D1** **I1**
1989	Scott, V. (1989). An empirical study of explicit and implicit teaching strategies in French. *The Modern Language Journal* 72, 14–22.	**Scott** examined the effect of implicit and explicit teaching on French relative pronouns and the subjunctive. The group that received explicit instruction outperformed the group that received implicit instruction on the written test but not on the oral test (see HARLEY 1989; DAY & SHAPSON 1991; LYSTER 1994).	**D1** **I1**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
1989	Shaffer, C. (1989). A comparison of inductive deductive approaches to teaching foreign languages. *The Modern Language Journal* 73, 395–403.	This study by **Shaffer** is among the first studies that examined the effectiveness of inductive versus deductive instruction. No significant difference was found between the two (see subsequent studies by ERLAM 2000; TAKIMOTO 2008).	**D3** **H2** **I1**
1990	Lightbown, P. M. & N. Spada (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12, 429–448.	**Lightbown & Spada** was one of the first studies to examine the role of FFI in intensive English as a second language (ESL) communicative classrooms. The classes that were more form-focused were more accurate at using certain grammatical features such as English *-ing* than those that were less form-focused (see subsequent studies: WHITE ET AL. 1991; SPADA & LIGHTBOWN 1999).	**D6** **C** **H1** **I1**
1990	Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11, 129–158.	This is one of the first papers in which **Schmidt** discussed the importance of attention in SLA and also introduced the notion of the *Noticing Hypothesis,* which argued that noticing is necessary for language learning. The noticing hypothesis, which was further discussed in a number of subsequent articles (e.g. SCHMIDT 1993, 1995, 2001), has been used as a strong theoretical rationale to support research on FFI in language acquisition.	**A**
1991	Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. DeBot, R. Ginsberge & C. Kramsch (eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 39–52.	In this influential article, **Long** introduced the notion of FonF by making a distinction between language teaching that teaches discrete linguistic items, what he called FonFs, and instruction that draws learners' attention to form in the context of communication, what he called FonF. This paper became the impetus of many subsequent theoretical and empirical studies of FonF (see also DOUGHTY & WILLIAMS 1998; DOUGHTY 2001; ELLIS 2001; WILLIAMS 2005 for further discussion and development).	**A** **B**
1991	White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research* 7, 133–161.	Within a Universal Grammar perspective, this early study by **White** provided evidence for the need for FFI in assisting L2 learners of English who may incorrectly assume, based on their L1 knowledge, that certain target structures are allowed in English (see also WHITE ET AL. 1991; SPADA & LIGHTBOWN 1999). The group that received instruction outperformed the group that did not. This study is in response to the claim that negative feedback and instruction is of limited effect.	**D6** **C** **H1** **I1**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
1991	Day, E. & S. Shapson (1991). Integrating formal and functional approaches to language teaching in French immersion: An experimental study. *Language Learning* 41, 25–58.	**Day & Shapson** was another early study to explore the role of FFI in French immersion classes. The study compared a control group with an experimental group that received formal instruction combined with functional and communicative activities. The experimental group significantly outperformed the control group in writing, but not in speaking. However, an examination of the individual class data showed that the experimental classes achieved consistent gains in speaking. The findings support the beneficial effects of integrating formal and functional approaches in French immersion classes (see HARLEY 1989; SCOTT 1989 for similar studies and findings in this context).	**C** **H1** **I1**
1991	Fotos, S. & R. Ellis (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly* 25, 605–628.	**Fotos & Ellis** compared the effectiveness of communicative grammar tasks in an English as a foreign language (EFL) (Japan) setting and a traditional grammar lesson. No significant difference was found between the two in the first posttest but the grammar lesson group had a significantly lower test score on the delayed posttest than the communicative task group (see NASSAJI 1999 and NASSAJI & FOTOS 2010 for a discussion of grammar tasks).	**D7** **E3** **H2** **I1**
1991	Sharwood Smith, M. (1991). Speaking to many minds: On the relevance of different types of language information for the L2 learner. *Second Language Research* 72, 118–132.	In this paper, **Sharwood Smith** introduced the notion of input enhancement as a way of drawing learners' attention to form. Defining the notion as 'the process by which language input becomes salient to the learner' the article examined how input can become salient and how this salience can affect language learning. This paper became the motivation for a number of subsequent studies of input enhancement (e.g., WHITE ET AL. 1991; ALANEN 1995; JOURDENAIS ET AL. 1995; WHITE 1998).	**A** **D4**
1991	White, L., N. Spada, P. Lightbown & L. Ranta (1991). Input enhancement and L2 question formation. *Applied Linguistics* 12, 416–432.	**White et al.** examined the effect of FFI and input enhancement on English question formation. The experimental groups outperformed the control group by a significant margin, even in the oral production task. The findings suggested that FonF through input enhancement can facilitate learners' interlanguage development.	**D4** **H1** **I1**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
1992	Carroll, S., Y. Roberge & M. Swain (1992). The role of feedback in adult second language acquisition: Error correction and morphological generalization. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 13, 173–189.	**Carroll et al.** examined the effect of corrective feedback (reactive FonF) on the acquisition of the French forms: -*age*, and -*ment*. The experimental groups significantly outperformed the control groups (see CARROLL & SWAIN 1993 for a follow-up study).	**D6** **C**
1993	Carroll, S. & M. Swain (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15, 357–386.	Following CARROLL ET AL. (1992), this study by **Carroll & Swain** examined the effects of explicit and implicit feedback. The group that received explicit metalinguistic feedback performed significantly better than other feedback groups. This finding was replicated in several subsequent studies (see also LI 2010 for a meta-analysis that confirmed the finding).	**D6** **D1** **E2** **I2**
1993	Nobuyoshi, J. & R. Ellis (1993). Focused communication tasks and second language acquisition. *ELT Journal* 47, 203–210.	**Nobuyoshi & Ellis** investigated whether feedback in the context of focused communication tasks promoted more accurate production of learner output following feedback. Two of the three learners who received clarification requests were able to modify their output 44% and 64% of the time in response to the feedback.	**D6** **H2** **I2**
1993	Spada, N. & P. Lightbown (1993). Instruction and the development of questions in L2 classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15, 205–224.	Following LIGHTBOWN & SPADA (1990), this quasi-experimental study by **Spada & Lightbown** explored the effect of FFI and corrective feedback on the development of ESL questions. Two experimental classes of preteens received nine hours of FFI in a two-week period. The groups that received corrective feedback outperformed the control group.	**C** **D6** **E5** **H1** **I1**
1993	VanPatten, B. & T. Cadierno (1993). Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15, 225–244.	**VanPatten & Cadierno** is the first study that compared PI as an FonF strategy with traditional output-based instruction. Learners receiving PI showed significant improvement in comprehension and production whereas those receiving output-based instruction revealed significant gains only in production. Several subsequent studies examined the role of PI in other contexts (e.g., CADIERNO 1995; VANPATTEN & OIKKENON 1996; ERLAM 2003; BENATI 2005).	**D5** **I1**

Year	References	Annotation	Theme
1994	Aljaafreh, A. & J. Lantolf (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal* 78, 465–483.	**Aljaafreh & Lantolf** investigated the role of corrective feedback in L2 learning using the Vygotskian sociocultural theory. They showed how the learner received scaffolded assistance during tutorial sessions and how the degree of scaffolding changed over time. This is one of the first studies that explored the implications of the sociocultural framework for L2 corrective feedback (see Nassaji & Swain 2000 for a subsequent study).	**D6** **H1** **I2**
1994	Lyster, R. (1994). The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion students' sociolinguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics* 15, 263–287.	Drawing on analytic-experiential curricular strategies (Stern 1990) and expanding on studies such as Harley (1989) and Day & Shapson (1991) in French classrooms, **Lyster** examined the effect of functional-analytic FFI on the sociolinguistic competence of grade 8 French immersion students. The study found that FFI improved important aspects of students' sociolinguistic competencies including the use of *vous* in oral and written formal situations.	**C** **I1**
1995	Alanen, R. (1995). Input enhancement and rule presentation in second language acquisition. In R. Schmidt (ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language acquisition*. University of Hawaii, Honolulu, 259–302.	Drawing on the notion of input enhancement (e.g., Sharwood Smith 1991), this study by **Alanen** was one of the first to examine the effects of textual enhancement as an FonF strategy by comparing textual enhancement with explicit instruction. The group who received explicit instruction outperformed the group who did not receive such instruction (see further studies: Jourdenais et al. 1995; White 1998; Lee 2007; Lee & Haung 2013; Winke 2013).	**D4** **D1** **I2**
1995	Cadierno, T. (1995). Formal instruction from a processing perspective: An investigation into the Spanish past tense. *The Modern Language Journal* 79, 179–193.	**Cadierno** conducted a study similar to Vanpatten & Cadierno (1993) using Spanish past tense verb morphology. The PI group outperformed the other groups on interpretation tasks and performed similar to the output group on the production task.	**D5** **I1**
1995	Jourdenais, R., M. Ota, S. Stauffer, B. Stauffer, S. Boyson & C. Doughty (1995). Does textual enhancement promote noticing? A think-aloud protocol analysis. In R. Schmidt (ed.), *Attention and awareness in second language learning*. Technical Report No. 9. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, 183–216.	**Jourdenais et al.** is another early study that investigated the role of input enhancement. Two groups of Spanish learners were assigned to an enhancement group and a comparison group respectively. Learners who received the enhanced text outperformed those who received the unenhanced text (e.g., Alanen 1995; White 1998).	**D4**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
1996	Robinson, P. (1996). Learning simple and complex second language rules under implicit, incidental, rule-search, and instructed conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18, 27–67.	This study by **Robinson** was one of the first to test the claim that the effects of implicit learning and explicit learning are different with respect to simple versus complex rules. The instructed group outperformed all other groups on simple rules. The implicit group did not outperform the others on complex rules (see subsequent studies: DE GRAAF 1997; SPADA & TOMITA 2010).	**D1** **E4** **I2**
1996	VanPatten, B. & S. Oikkenon (1996). Explanation vs. structured input in processing instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18, 495–510.	Following VANPATTEN & CADIERNO (1993) and CADIERNO (1995), **VanPatten & Oikkenon** examined which of the two components of PI (explicit instruction and structured input) are responsible for its advantageous effects. The advantage was found to be due to input processing activities, not explicit instruction.	**D5** **I1**
1997	Lyster, R. & L. Ranta (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19, 37–66.	This study by **Lyster & Ranta** was one of the first to examine the role of reactive FonF (corrective feedback) in content-based classrooms. Six types of feedback were identified among which recasts were the most frequently used type of feedback; however, they led to the lowest level of uptake. This study became the impetus for many subsequent studies on corrective feedback in classroom contexts (e.g., ELLIS, BASTURKMEN & LOEWEN 2001a, b; PANOVA & LYSTER 2002; SHEEN 2004). The corrective feedback framework used to code feedback type in this study has also been widely used in later observational studies of classroom feedback.	**D6** **D8** **I1**
1997	Spada, N. (1997). Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language Teaching* 30, 73–87,	Following LONG (1983), **Spada** is the first review that provided a state-of-the-art analysis of research on FFI in classroom contexts. Spada concluded that FFI is beneficial to SLA and that it may be most effective when integrated into a communicative context (see SPADA 2011).	**A** **J**
1997	de Graaf, R. (1997). The eXperanto experiment: Effects of explicit instruction on second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19, 249–276.	Following ROBINSON (1996), **de Graaf**'s laboratory-based study examined the effect of explicit instruction on learning morphologically and syntactically complex features of an artificial language. Explicit instruction assisted the acquisition of the simple morphological structure and the complex syntactic structure compared to implicit instruction (see subsequent meta-analysis of the same issue in SPADA & TOMITA 2010).	**D1** **E4** **I2**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
1997	Leow, R. P. (1997). Attention, awareness, and foreign language behavior. *Language Learning* 47, 467–506.	**Leow** examined the effect of awareness and noticing in SLA. The study found that the greater the awareness, the more accurately participants produced written production of noticed forms.	**D1** **I2**
1998	Doughty, C. & J. Williams (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.	This seminal edited volume by **Doughty & Williams** was the first book on classroom FonF and its role in L2 acquisition. It consists of a number of empirical and theoretical works that are often cited as key references in this area.	**A** **J**
1998	Long, M. & P. Robinson (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 15–41.	Following LONG (1991), this article by **Long & Robinson** was one of the first and seminal papers that provided a detailed overview of the notion of FonF and its theoretical underpinnings. They also provided an overview of research on attention to meaning and attention to form.	**A** **J** **B**
1998	Doughty, C. & E. Varela (1998). Communicative Focus on Form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 114–138.	Based on the notion of classroom FonF (e.g., DOUGHTY & WILLIAMS 1998; LONG & ROBINSON 1998), **Doughty & Varela** examined the role of corrective recasts as a type of FonF in a content-based ESL science class. Students who received recasts outperformed, in both accuracy and use of the target form in both written and oral production, those who did not receive corrective recasts, particularly on the immediate posttest.	**D6** **I1**
1998	Lightbown, P. (1998). The importance of timing in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 177–194.	**Lightbown** addressed the question of timing in FonF. She discussed that FonF should be included within communicative language teaching and that correction can also occur without disrupting the communicative flow in the classroom. Lightbown also argued that FonF can be presented either separately from language use or integrated into a communicative lesson (see SPADA & LIGHTBOWN 2008 for further elaboration).	**A** **J** **B**
1998	Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning* 48, 183–218.	As follow-up to LYSTER & RANTA'S (1997), this study by **Lyster** examined the relationship among types of feedback, error types, and learner repair. Learners tended to repair phonological errors following recast, and repair grammatical and lexical errors following a negotiated form of feedback.	**D6** **D8** **I1**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
1998	Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 20, 51–81.	This is another follow-up of LYSTER & RANTA's (1997) study, in which **Lyster** looked closely at the nature of recasts. Teachers used recasts and non-corrective repetition in similar ways, making recasts ambiguous and consequently less effective in leading to uptake in content-based classrooms.	**D6** **D8** **I1**
1998	Mackey, A., & J. Philp (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal* 82, 338–356.	**Mackey & Philp** investigated the effects of reactive FonF (recasts) on the development of ESL question formation. Learners who were developmentally ready benefited more from interaction that contained recasts than those who received interaction that did not contain recasts.	**D6** **E5** **H1** **I2**
1998	White, J. (1998). Getting the learners' attention: A typographical input enhancement study. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 85–113.	**White** examined the effects of input enhancement as a FonF strategy on learning third person singular possessives in English among French-speaking children. Textual enhancement promoted noticing of target forms but not learners' knowledge of target structures (cf. ALANEN 1995).	**D4** **I1**
1998	Williams, J. & J. Evans (1998). What kind of focus and on which forms? In C. Doughty & J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 139–155.	**Williams & Evans** examined the effects of input flood with two levels of explicitness: implicit and more explicit. The study showed that the effectiveness of textual enhancement varies depending on its degree of explicitness and type of the target form (see also WHITE 1998).	**D4** **I1**
1999	Nassaji, H. (1999). Towards integrating form-focused instruction and communicative interaction in the second language classroom: Some pedagogical possibilities. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 55, 385–402.	**Nassaji** discussed the need for incorporating FonF into communicative classrooms highlighted by previous research (e.g., SPADA 1997; DOUGHTY & WILLIAMS 1998). He suggested two main ways of doing so: 'by design' and 'by process'. FonF 'by design' involves identifying a target form and designing tasks to draw learners' attention to form. FonF 'by process' involves incidental attention to form in the course of meaning-focused activities (see NASSAJI & FOTOS 2010 for a further discussion).	**A** **B**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
1999	Spada, N. & P. M. Lightbown (1999). Instruction, L1 influence and developmental 'readiness' in second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal* 83, 1–22.	**Spada & Lightbown** explored the relationship among learners' developmental readiness (e.g., PIENEMANN 1984), FFI, and learners' L1. One hundred and fifty French speaking children, aged between 11 and 12, were used in the study. Using a pretest, posttest and delayed posttest design, the study showed an important interaction between developmental sequences and L1 influence, and that explicit instruction which involved constructive information on L1 and L2 assisted L2 acquisition.	**E5** **E1** **H1** **I1**
1999	Williams, J. (1999). Learner-generated attention to form. *Language Learning* 49, 583–625.	**Williams** examined the use of learner-generated FonF. The study found that students did generate attention to form but not very often. The type and degree of attention to form were found to be dependent on both proficiency level and task type (e.g., DOUGHTY & WILLIAMS 1998. For other subsequent studies, see ELLIS 2001; ELLIS ET AL. 2001a).	**D8** **E3** **E4** **H1** **I1**
2000	Erlam, R. (2000). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the acquisition of direct object pronouns in French as a second language. *The Modern Language Journal* 87, 242–260.	**Erlam** investigated the effect of deductive versus inductive instruction on learners' comprehension and production skills. Learners who received deductive instruction significantly outperformed those receiving inductive instruction on both comprehension and production tasks (see SHAFFER 1989; TAKIMOTO 2008).	**D3** **H1** **I1**
2000	Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on form through interaction enhancement: Integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classrooms. *Language Learning* 50, 617–673.	**Muranoi** investigated the effect of interaction enhancement (IE) on learning English articles by Japanese EFL learners. Two types of IE were examined: IE plus formal debriefing and IE plus meaning-focused debriefing. IE with formal debriefing was more effective than IE with a meaning-focused debriefing.	**D4** **D6** **H2** **I1**
2000	Nassaji, H. & M. Swain (2000). Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness* 9, 34–51.	Taking a sociocultural perspective and expanding on ALJAAFREH & LANTOLF (1994), this study by **Nassaji & Swain** examined the beneficial effect of feedback when provided within the learner's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). The study showed that help provided within learners' ZPD is more effective than help provided randomly.	**D6** **H1** **I2**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2000	Norris, J. M. & L. Ortega (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 50, 417–528.	**Norris & Ortega** conducted one of the first large-scale meta-analyses of research on FFI, examining 49 studies published between 1980 and 1998. FFI resulted in substantial gains over instruction without a FonF and the gains had lasting effects. This study was the impetus for a number of subsequent meta-analysis studies of feedback and FonF (e.g., RUSSELL & SPADA 2006; LI 2010; LYSTER & SAITO 2010; SPADA & TOMITA 2010).	**J** **H1** **H2**
2000	Allen, L. (2000). Form–meaning connections and the French causative: An experiment in input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 22, 69–84.	Following the line of research on PI initiated by CADIERNO 1995 and VANPATTEN & OIKKENON 1996, **Allen** is one of the several further studies that compared the effectiveness of PI and traditional instruction in learning L2 French. PI and traditional instruction had similar effects on the interpreting task. For the production task, the traditional instruction group outperformed the PI group.	**D5** **H1**
2001	Doughty, C. (2001) Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 206–257.	**Doughty** examined FonF in relation to cognitive processing abilities. Drawing on studies in psycholinguistics, she provided a rationale for FonF instruction by correlating elements of cognitive processing including working memory (WM) with elements of FonF instruction. Doughty concluded that the capacity of WM relates with how learners process FonF.	**A**
2001	Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning* 51 (Supplement 1), 1–46.	**Ellis** provided a comprehensive and historical review of FFI for the decade beginning in 1991. Drawing on the distinction between FonF and FonFs (LONG 1991; LONG & ROBINSON 1998), Ellis classified form-focused instruction into three types: FonFs, planned FonF, and incidental FonF. This was one of the first articles that discussed the distinction between reactive and preemptive incidental FonF.	**A** **J** **B**
2001	Ellis, R., H. Basturkmen & S. Loewen (2001a). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning* 51, 281–318.	Drawing on LONG's (1991) notion of FonF, and following LYSTER & RANTA's (1997) study of feedback and uptake in French immersion classrooms with young learners and the distinction between reactive and preemptive FonF (ELLIS 2001), **Ellis et al.** investigated incidental FonF in two adult ESL classrooms in New Zealand. Reactive and preemptive student-initiated FonF led to more successful uptake than preemptive teacher-initiated FonF. This study was followed by several other studies in this context (ELLIS ET AL. 2001b; ELLIS, BASTURKMEN & LOEWEN 2002; LOEWEN 2003, 2005).	**D6** **D8** **H1** **I1**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2001	Ellis, R., H. Basturkmen & S. Loewen (2001b). Preemptive focus on form in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 35, 407–432.	Using the same database in ELLIS ET AL. (2001a), **Ellis et al. (b)** examined the amount of preemptive FonF occurring in the classrooms. Preemptive FonF occurred as frequently as reactive FonF and there were more instances of student-initiated FonF than teacher-initiated FonF (see ELLIS ET AL. 2002; LOEWEN 2003, 2005).	**D6** **D8** **H1** **I1**
2001	Nicholas, H., P. Lightbown & N. Spada (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning* 51, 719–758.	This seminal paper by **Nicholas et al.** is one of the first that provided a comprehensive review of the historical and contemporary research on recasts (a type of reactive FonF). Drawing on the literature in L1 and L2 acquisition, they discussed a variety of issues that can affect the use and effectiveness of recasts including, how recasts are defined, the type of linguistic feature, and the context of research (see ELLIS & SHEEN 2006 for a subsequent review).	**D6** **A** **J**
2001	Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3–32.	**Schmidt** further elaborates on, and discusses the relevance of, attention in SLA. The chapter takes a psychological stance in its explanation of the pivotal role of attention in SLA, and the argument that attention is necessary for L2 learning.	**A**
2001	Williams, J. (2001). The effectiveness of spontaneous attention to form. *System* 29, 325–340.	As a follow up to WILLIAMS (1999), in this study, **Williams** examined the role of unplanned attention to form on learners' ability to subsequently use the target forms. Proficiency level, the initiator of the form, and the provider of new input played a large role in the retention of the form and connection between form and meaning. This finding was further confirmed in NASSAJI (2010, 2013).	**D6** **D8** **E1** **H1** **I1**
2002	Ellis, R. (2002). Does form-focused instruction affect the acquisition of implicit knowledge? A review of the research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24, 223–236.	**Ellis** reviewed research that investigated the effects of FFI on implicit knowledge. Using data from 11 studies on FFI, Ellis found that FFI can significantly affect the accurate use of grammatical items and aids the acquisition of implicit knowledge for beginner level learners (cf. LONG 1983; SPADA 1997; ELLIS 2001).	**A** **J**
2002	Ellis, R., H. Basturkmen & S. Loewen (2002). Doing focus-on-form. *System* 30, 419–432.	**Ellis et al.** presented a rationale for using FonF versus FonFs in the classroom. They discussed reactive and preemptive FonF and advantages and disadvantages of using both. A summary of options and descriptions of each option for use in the classroom are included (see ELLIS ET AL. 2001a, b).	**D8** **A** **B**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2002	Havranek, G. (2002). When is corrective feedback most likely to succeed? *International Journal of Educational Research* 37, 255–270.	Following previous studies of incidental feedback and FonF in ESL and immersion contexts (e.g., LYSTER & RANTA 1997; ELLIS ET AL. 2001a), **Havranek** studied oral corrective feedback across 207 EFL classroom learners. The effect of feedback varied according to factors such as learners' contribution to the correction sequence, the communicative focus of the deviant utterance, and the type of error corrected.	**D6** **D8** **E1** **H2** **I1**
2002	Lochtman, K. (2002). Oral corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom: How it affects interaction in analytic foreign language teaching. *Interactional Journal of Educational Research* 37, 271–283.	**Lochtman** is another study exploring the role of different types of oral corrective feedback in an EFL context. A higher rate of feedback was found for elicitation strategies than recasts. However, the amount of successful uptake for both types of feedback was very similar (cf. LYSTER & RANTA 1997).	**D6** **D8** **I1**
2002	Nabei, T. & M. Swain (2002). Learner awareness of recasts in classroom interaction: A case study of an adult EFL student's second language learning. *Language Awareness* 11, 43–63.	**Nabei & Swain** conducted a case study examining one student's awareness of recasts and how that awareness related to her learning. Confirming the results of a number of previous studies (LYSTER & RANTA 1997; ELLIS ET AL. 2001a), the study found that the majority of recasts did not provide an opportunity for repair. However, recasts had an effect on the student's learning when it included an opportunity for repair (see LOEWEN 2005; NASSAJI 2007a, 2011 for similar findings).	**D6** **D8** **H2** **I1**
2002	Panova, I. & R. Lyster (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 36, 573–595.	Using LYSTER & RANTA's (1997) feedback framework, **Panova & Lyster** examined feedback types, learner uptake, and repair occurring in an ESL communicative context. The results replicated those of LYSTER & RANTA.	**D6** **D8** **H1** **I1**
2003	Erlam, R. (2003). Evaluating the relative effectiveness of structured-input and output-based instruction in foreign language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 25, 559–582.	**Erlam** is one of the further studies that compared input PI with output-based instruction (e.g., CADIERNO 1995; VANPATTEN & OIKKENON 1996; BENATI 2005). Using measures of listening/reading comprehension and written/oral production, the study found greater effects for output-based instruction than input-based instruction.	**D5**

Year	References	Annotation	Theme
2003	Loewen, S. (2003). Variation in the frequency and characteristics of incidental focus on form. *Language Teaching Research* 7, 315–345.	Building on ELLIS ET AL. (2001a, b), and the importance attributed to the notion of incidental FonF (LONG 1991; LONG & ROBINSON 1998), **Loewen** studied the frequency and occurrence variability of incidental FonF in L2 adult meaning-focused classrooms. Incidental FonF occurred in every classroom observed; however, the frequency of occurrence varied widely.	**D8** **D6** **E2** **H2** **I1**
2003	Oliver, R. & A. Mackey (2003). Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal* 87, 519–533.	**Oliver & Mackey** examined the role of interactional context in exchanges between teachers and learners in ESL classrooms. Learners were most likely to benefit from feedback provided in explicit language-focused contexts (see other studies of the role of context in influencing FonF e.g., SHEEN 2004; LYSTER & MORI 2006; NASSAJI 2013).	**D8** **D6** **E3** **H1** **I1**
2004	Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 26, 399–432.	This study by **Lyster** is the first that examined the effects of FFI instruction plus either recasts or prompts on developing accuracy of gender assignment in French. FFI was more effective when combined with prompts than recasts, particularly on the written tests.	**D6** **I1**
2004	Mackey, A., C. Polio & K. McDonough (2004). The relationship between experience, education and teachers' use of incidental focus-on-form techniques. *Language Teaching Research* 8, 301–327.	**Mackey et al.** studied the use of FonF in meaning-based classrooms by experienced and less experienced instructors. The level of teacher experience had an effect on the amount of FonF. Less experienced teachers did not use FonF as much as experienced teachers.	**D6** **D8** **E1** **H1** **I1**
2004	Nassaji, H. & S. Fotos (2004). Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24, 126–145.	**Nassaji & Fotos** provided a state-of-the-art review of grammar and FonF research. Arguments that support and discount the use of FFI in L2 classrooms were presented and current approaches to FonF were discussed (see also LONG 1991; SPADA 1997; DOUGHTY & WILLIAMS 1998; ELLIS 2001).	**A** **J** **B**
2004	Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research* 8, 263–300.	This study by **Sheen** examined corrective feedback (reactive FonF) and learners' uptake across four communicative classroom settings: French immersion, Canada ESL, New Zealand ESL, and Korean EFL. Recasts led to learner uptake most often when students were prepared for attending to linguistic form rather than meaning (cf. LYSTER & RANTA 1997; ELLIS ET AL. 2001a; PANOVA & LYSTER 2002).	**D8** **D6** **E3** **H1** **H2** **I1**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2004	Sanz, C. & K. Morgan Short (2004). Positive evidence versus explicit rule presentation and explicit negative feedback: A computer assisted study. *Language Learning* 54, 35–78.	**Sanz & Morgan Short** examined the effects of computer-delivered explicit information on learning the Spanish word-order for object pronouns. No additional effects were found for explicit feedback and explanation when learners performed structured input tasks (see CADIERNO 1995; VANPATTEN & OIKKENON 1996).	**D1** **D5** **H2** **I3**
2005	Benati, A. (2005). The effects of processing instruction, traditional instruction and meaning-output instruction on the acquisition of the English past simple tense. *Language Teaching Research* 9, 67–93.	**Benati** examined the effects of FonF through PI by comparing it to traditional instruction and meaning-based instruction. The group that received PI outperformed other groups in the processing and acquisition of the target structure (English simple past), but the three groups performed equally with the production task.	**D5** **H2** **I1**
2005	Housen, A. & M. Pierrard (2005), *Investigations in instructed second language acquisition*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.	This edited volume by **Housen & Pierrard** presents a collection of theoretical and empirical studies on instructed SLA. The chapters demonstrate the broad scope of the field of instructed SLA and the wide range of issues current research is examining in this area. (see also DOUGHTY & WILLIAMS 1998; ELLIS 2001; NASSAJI & FOTOS 2007).	**A** **D** **E**
2005	Loewen, S. (2005). Incidental focus on form and second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 27, 361–386.	Building on previous studies of incidental FonF (e.g., ELLIS ET AL. 2001a, b; LOEWEN 2003), **Loewen** was one of the first studies to examine the effect of incidental FonF on L2 learning. Learners successfully recalled incidents of FonF in both the immediate and short term at a rate of close to 50%. Learners who produced successful uptake scored higher on the individual tests (see also NASSAJI 2010).	**D8** **D6** **H1** **I1**
2005	Williams, J. (2005). Form-focused instruction. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook on research in second language teaching and learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 671–691.	**Williams** examined the current understanding of the notion of FonF and its various features. She reviewed and compared the definitions of FonF provided earlier (LONG 1991; LONG & ROBINSON 1998) as well as FFI (SPADA 1997; ELLIS 2001) in terms of their characteristics and also discussed a number of other issues including the concept of noticing, negotiation of meaning, and the role of output in L2 development.	**A** **J** **B**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2006	Ammar, A. & N. Spada (2006). One size fits all?: Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28, 543–574.	Building on LYSTER (2004), **Ammar & Spada** investigated the role of recasts and prompts in three intensive ESL classrooms. The prompt group outperformed the recast group on both the immediate and the delayed posttests. Recasts and prompts were equally effective for learners with high pretest scores whereas learners with low pretest scores benefited only from prompts.	**D6** **I1**
2006	Davies, M. (2006). Paralinguistic focus on form. *TESOL Quarterly* 40, 841–855.	This is a rare, if not singular, study on how the use of paralinguistic cues, in conjunction with recasts, affected learner uptake. Through classroom observations, **Davies** found a lower frequency rate of recasts than had been previously found in other studies but 100% of the recast episodes combined with paralinguistic cues resulted in uptake.	**D8** **D6** **H2** **I1**
2006	Ellis, R. & Y. Sheen (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in L2 acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28, 575–600.	Following an earlier examination of the role of recasts (NICHOLAS ET AL. 2001), this article by **Ellis & Sheen** looked critically at the role of recasts as an implicit type of FonF. Reviewing theory and research on recasts, the authors identified a number of issues that need to be considered when examining recasts.	**D6** **E2** **A** **B** **J**
2006	Ellis, R., S. Loewen & R. Erlam (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28, 339–369.	**Ellis et al.** examined the effects of explicit (metalinguistic) and implicit (recasts) FonF on learning a specific target form (past tense -*ed*). Learners' implicit knowledge was more positively affected by explicit corrective feedback than was their explicit knowledge.	**D6** **H1** **I1**
2006	Loewen, S. & R. Erlam (2006). Corrective feedback in the chatroom: An experimental study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 19, 1–14.	**Loewen & Erlam** replicated ELLIS ET AL. (2006) in a chartroom and with elementary level learners. No effects were found for any of the feedback types on learners' ability to acquire the target form (past tense -*ed*). This is one of the several studies that have recently examined the role of feedback in computer-mediated environment (see SAURO 2009).	**D6** **I3**
2006	Loewen, S. & J. Philp (2006). Recasts in adult English L2 classrooms: Characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *The Modern Language Journal* 90, 536–556.	**Loewen & Philp** examined the effectiveness recasts in L2 classrooms. Recasts were found to be as effective as other forms of feedback (metalinguistic feedback and elicitations). Several characteristics of recasts (i.e., intonation, interrogative, stress emphasis) were identified as more likely to predict successful learner uptake (see also SHEEN 2006; NASSAJI 2007a).	**D8** **D6** **E2** **H1** **I1**

Year	References	Annotation	Theme
2006	Lyster, R. & H. Mori (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28, 269–300.	Building on LYSTER & RANTA's (1997) study and studies that have examined the role of instructional settings (e.g. SHEEN 2004), **Lyster & Mori** compared the effect of interactional feedback (reactive FonF) in two different immersion contexts: Japanese immersion and French immersion. Prompts resulted in higher levels of repair in the French setting and recasts produced the most repair in the Japanese setting.	**D6** **D8** **E3** **I1**
2006	Russell, J. & N. Spada (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research. In J. Norris & L. Ortega (eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 133–164.	**Russell & Spada** provided one of the first meta-analyses of research investigating the effects of corrective feedback. Fifteen studies provided data. Corrective feedback was found to be beneficial in both oral and written formats. Russell & Spada concluded that there might be many factors affecting the usefulness of feedback (see more recent meta-analyses such as LI 2010; LYSTER & SAITO 2010).	**D6** **J**
2006	Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research* 10, 361–392.	**Sheen** investigated connections between recast characteristics and learner uptake. Linguistic focus, length, and type of change were found to be the recast characteristics more closely connected to uptake (see LOEWEN & PHILP 2006; NASSAJI 2007a).	**D8** **D6** **E2** **H1** **H2** **I1**
2006	Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and second language development: An empirical study of L2 classroom interaction. *Applied Linguistics* 27, 405–430.	**Mackey** examined the relationship between interactional feedback, ESL learners' noticing, and their subsequent L2 development. A positive link was found between feedback, the learners' reports about noticing, and the acquisition of L2 question forms.	**D6** **E4** **F** **H1** **I1**
2007	Fotos, S. & H. Nassaji (eds.) (2007). *Form focused instruction and teacher education: Studies in honour of Rod Ellis* Oxford: Oxford University Press.	This book is one of the first volumes that has addressed the relationship between FFI and teacher education. With chapters by leading researchers, the book combined theory and research in the area and addressed questions asked by teachers about how to integrate FFI in communicative classroom contexts.	**A** **B** **J**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2007	Lee, S. K. (2007). Effects of textual enhancement and topic familiarity on Korean EFL students' reading comprehension and learning of passive form. *Language Learning* 57, 87–118.	**Lee** investigated the effect of textual enhancement among a group of young adults studying English in Korea. Textual enhancement facilitated learning the targeted form (English passive forms), but had a negative effect on learner's comprehension (see a subsequent replication of this study by WINKE 2013).	**D4**
2007	Nassaji, H. (2007a). Elicitation and reformulation and their relationship with learner repair in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning* 57, 511–548.	**Nassaji** examined the effectiveness of two FonF feedback types (elicitation and recast/reformulation) and how feedback types and learner repair were related. Increased rates of successful repair were found when feedback was combined with explicit prompts (intonation or prompts) (see LOEWEN & PHILP 2006).	**D6** **E2** **H1** **I2**
2007	Nassaji, H. (2007b). Focus on from through recasts in dyadic student–teacher interaction: A case for recast enhancement. In C. Gascoigne (ed.), *Assessing the impact of input enhancement in second Language Education.* Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press, 53–69.	This is a follow up study of NASSAJI (2007a) in which **Nassaji** examined the relationship between different implicit and explicit forms of recasts with learner uptake and repair. Explicit forms of recasts (i.e., when recasts were combined with either intonational or verbal prompts) were more effective than implicit forms of recasts. These results confirmed those of LOEWEN & PHILP (2006) and NASSAJI (2007a).	**D6** **D4** **E2** **H1** **I2**
2007	Nassaji, H. & S. Fotos (2007). Issues in form focused instruction and teacher education. In S. Fotos & H. Nassaji (eds.), *Form focused instruction and teacher education: Studies in honour of Rod Ellis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 7–16.	**Nassaji & Fotos** examined a number of the theoretical and empirical issues related to FonF including the different taxonomies used in previous research and their rationale. They also reviewed the gap between SLA research and L2 instruction and also acknowledged that what is proposed in the research is not necessarily what happens in the classroom (see ELLIS 2001; NASSAJI & FOTOS 2004; NASSAJI & FOTOS 2010).	**A** **B**
2007	Zhao, S. Y. & J. Bitchener (2007). Incidental focus on form in teacher–learner and learner–learner interactions. *System* 35, 431–447.	**Zhao & Bitchener** was one of the first studies that examined how patterns of interaction between teachers and learners and between learners affected types of FonF and uptake. The teacher–learner and learner–learner interaction did not produce differences in feedback types provided; however, uptake responses differed between the two interaction groups.	**D8** **D6** **H1** **I1**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2008	Laufer, B. & N. Girsai (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning: A case for contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied Linguistics* 29, 694–716.	**Laufer & Girsai** investigated the effect of FFI on the acquisition of L2 vocabulary. Learners who received explicit contrastive instruction performed significantly better than those who received meaning-focused or less explicit non-contrastive FFI (see CARROLL & SWAIN 1993; DE GRAAF 1997).	**D1** **D7**
2008	Lee, S. K. & H.-T. Huang (2008). Visual input enhancement and grammar learning: A meta-analytic review. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 30, 307–331.	**Lee & Huang** provided a meta-analysis of research on the role of input enhancement. Reviewing 16 primary studies in this area, they found that learners exposed to enhanced texts outperformed those exposed to unenhanced text but the effect size was very small ($d = 0.22$).	**D4** **J**
2008	Shak, J. & S. Gardner (2008). Young learner perspectives on four focus-on-form tasks. *Language Teaching Research* 12, 387–408.	**Shak & Gardner** investigated the often-overlooked area of how younger learners perceive FonF tasks. Overall, the young learners expressed positive attitudes towards the tasks. Learners showed greater preference for tasks that were stimulating but not too cognitively demanding.	**D7** **E3** **E1** **H2** **I1**
2008	Sheen, Y. (2008). Recasts, language anxiety, modified output, and L2 learning. *Language Learning* 58, 835–874.	This study by **Sheen** was one of the first to look at the effects of language anxiety on the effectiveness of recasts. The low-anxiety recast group outperformed the high-anxiety recast group in the speeded dictation and writing immediate posttests.	**D6** **E1** **H1** **I1**
2008	Spada, N. & P. Lightbown (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated? *TESOL Quarterly* 42, 181–207.	Extending beyond an earlier discussion of the timing of FonF (LIGHTBOWN 1998), **Spada & Lightbown** drew a distinction between, and also discussed the effectiveness of, two types of FFI: isolated and integrated. Through reviewing the research and theoretical frameworks in SLA and cognitive psychology, both types of instruction were discussed to be effective in different ways (see NASSAJI 1999; ELLIS 2001).	**D8** **D2** **E2** **A** **J** **B**
2008	Takimoto, M. (2008). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the development of language learners' pragmatic competence. *The Modern Language Journal* 92, 369–386.	**Takimoto** examined the effects of deductive and inductive instruction on learning pragmatics among EFL learners. Using pretests and posttests involving both production and comprehension tasks, the study showed that both the deductive and inductive groups outperformed the control group on both measures (see SHAFFER 1989; ERLAM 2000).	**D3** **H2**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2008	Zyzik, E. & C. Polio (2008). Incidental focus on form in university Spanish literature courses. *The Modern Language Journal* 92, 53–70.	**Zyzik & Polio** observed three Spanish literature classes for the occurrence of incidental FonF and found that the most common type of feedback provided by the instructors was the recast (LYSTER & RANTA 1997; ELLIS ET AL. 2001; SHEEN 2004). During stimulated recall, instructors reported that they did not use explicit forms of feedback because they believed it was 'socially harmful' (p. 64).	**D8** **D6** **I1**
2009	Loewen, S., S. Li, F. Fei, A. Thompson, K. Nakatsukasa, S. Ahn & X. Chen (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal* 93, 91–104.	**Loewen et al.** examined learner beliefs about the role of grammar instruction and error correction. The results showed important variations among learners about the efficacy and attitudes towards grammar instruction and feedback.	**G** **D6**
2009	Lyster, R. & J. Izquierdo (2009). Prompts versus recasts in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning* 59, 453–498.	Extending earlier studies of the role of prompts versus recasts (LYSTER 2004; AMMAR & SPADA 2006), **Lyster & Izquierdo** examined the difference in effectiveness between recasts and prompts by using a combined classroom and laboratory study with intermediate level learners of French. Both feedback types resulted in improvement in immediate and delayed posttests, thus not replicating LYSTER's (2004) findings but providing evidence for the role of context (e.g., NICHOLAS ET AL. 2000; SHEEN 2004; LYSTER & MORI 2006).	**D6** **I2** **H1** **I1**
2009	Nassaji, H. (2009). Effects of recasts and elicitations in dyadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. *Language Learning* 59, 411–452.	**Nassaji** investigated the effectiveness of recasts and elicitation in dyadic interaction. The feedback types were further categorized with respect to implicitness and explicitness. The explicit forms of both feedback types resulted in higher rates of correction than their implicit forms (see LOEWEN & PHILP 2006).	**D6** **E2** **H1** **I2**
2009	Sauro, S. (2009). Computer-mediated corrective feedback and the development of L2 grammar. *Language Learning and Technology* 13, 96–120.	**Sauro** analyzed the effects of two types of computer-mediated corrective feedback (recasts and metalinguistic feedback) on the development of L2 knowledge. Pretests, posttests and delayed posttests showed that neither feedback type group showed immediate or sustained gains of the target form. However, the group that received metalinguistic information showed significant immediate gains in comparison to the control condition (see LOEWEN & ERLAM 2006).	**D6** **H2** **I3**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2010	File, K. A. & R. Adams (2010) Should vocabulary instruction be integrated or isolated? *TESOL Quarterly* 44, 222–249.	This study by **File & Adams** is one of the first studies that investigated the difference between integrated and isolated FFI (see SPADA & LIGHTBOWN 2008). The study found that both instructional methods resulted in similar improvements in vocabulary learning compared to incidental learning.	**D2** **H1** **I1**
2010	Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 60, 309–365.	**Li** provided a meta-analysis of research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback. The analysis found corrective feedback to be effective with explicit feedback resulting in more immediate benefits while implicit feedback showed more lasting effects on L2 learning (see RUSSELL & SPADA 2006; LI 2010; LYSTER & SAITO 2010).	**D6** **H1** **H2** **J**
2010	Lyster, R. & K. Saito (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 32, 265–302.	Following previous meta-analyses of feedback and focus on from (NORRIS & ORTEGA 2000; RUSSELL & SPADA 2006; LI 2010), **Lyster & Saito** conducted a meta-analysis of 15 classroom-based feedback studies. Corrective feedback was effective and had a lasting effect on learning. Prompts, recasts, and explicit correction all had significant effects, with medium effects for recasts and large effects for prompts.	**D6** **E1** **E2** **H1** **H2** **J**
2010	Nassaji, H. (2010). The occurrence and effectiveness of spontaneous focus on form in adult ESL classrooms. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 66, 907–933.	Building on previous studies of incidental FonF (e.g., ELLIS ET AL. 2001a, b; LOEWEN 2003, 2005), **Nassaji** examined the effects of incidental FonF in communicative classrooms. Both reactive and preemptive FonF occurred frequently in communicative classrooms and preemptive FonF produced better results in posttests than did reactive FonF. The study also found a link between language proficiency level and FonF effectiveness (see WILLIAMS 1999, 2001).	**D8** **D6** **H1** **I1**
2010	Nassaji, H. & S. Fotos (2010). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.	**Nassaji & Fotos** discussed theory and research behind various input, output, and interaction-based approaches to FFI and how they can be implemented in L2 communicative classrooms. A variety of classroom tasks and examples are provided (see also DOUGHTY & WILLIAMS 1998; ELLIS 2001; WILLIAMS 2005).	**I1** **A** **B**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2010	Nassaji, H. & D. Simard (2010). Current developments in form-focused interaction and second language development. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 66, 773–977.	This special issue contributed to the body of research on FFI by publishing a number of studies that examined the contribution of focused interaction and feedback on L2 development (see DOUGHTY & WILLIAMS 1998; ELLIS 2001; WILLIAMS 2005).	**A** **D** **E**
2010	Spada, N. & Y. Tomita (2010). Interaction between type of instruction and type of language feature: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 60, 263–308.	Following previous studies of the effects of FFI on learning simple vs. complex rules (ROBINSON 1996; DE GRAAF 1997), **Spada & Tomita** conducted a meta-analysis of research on how different instruction (implicit or explicit) influences the acquisition of complex or simple English grammatical forms. Overall, explicit instruction was found to be more beneficial than implicit instruction for both simple and complex grammatical forms, even in spontaneous ways.	**D1** **E4** **E2** **J**
2010	Yang, Y. & R. Lyster (2010). Effects of form-focused practice and feedback on Chinese EFL learners' acquisition of regular and irregular past tense forms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 32, 235–263.	Extending LYSTER (2004) and AMMAR & SPADA (2006), **Yang & Lyster** compared two different types of feedback (prompts and recasts) and their influence on the acquisition of a target form (English past tense – regular and irregular). They found that prompts were more effective than recasts, but only on the use of regular past tense.	**D6** **H2** **I1**
2011	Nassaji. H. (2011). Immediate learner repair and its relationship with learning targeted forms. *System* 39, 17–29.	**Nassaji** examined the relationship between learner-generated repair following elicitation and teacher-generated repair following recasts. While both types of repair resulted in similar levels of correction following interaction, student self-repair was shown to have a more sustained effect versus teacher-generated repair.	**D6** **H1** **I2**
2011	Simard, D. & G. Jean (2011). An exploration of L2 teachers' use of pedagogical interventions devised to draw L2 learners' attention to form. *Language Learning* 61, 759–785.	**Simard & Jean** examined how, and how much, instructors use FFI during ESL and L2 French high school classrooms. They found a higher frequency of grammar-related FFI events in both English and French classes and that, while FFI interventions were more frequently observed in ESL classes, the instructors in the L2 French classes spent more time on FFI interventions.	**E3** **H1** **I1**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2011	Spada, N. (2011). Beyond form-focused instruction: Reflections on past, present and future research. *Language Teaching* 44, 225–236.	**Spada** revisited the questions she addressed in SPADA (1997). She concluded that while progress has been made in answering most of those questions, questions have still remained regarding the role of linguistic forms, timing of FonF, and individual learner differences.	**A** **J**
2012	Bell, N. (2012). Comparing playful and non-playful incidental attention to form. *Language Learning* 62, 236–265.	**Bell** investigated the effects of spontaneous metalinguistic feedback provided in a playful or non-playful manner in an ESL classroom. Bell found that students had significantly better recall of items that were associated with playful feedback interactions than with non-playful feedback interactions.	**D8** **D6** **H1** **I1**
2012	Nassaji, H. (2012). Correcting students' written grammatical errors: The effects of negotiated versus non-negotiated feedback. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 1, 315–334.	**Nassaji** explored the effects of oral feedback on written errors. Three feedback types were investigated (direct reformulation, prompt plus reformulation, and negotiated feedback). Negotiated feedback showed the greatest advantage overall; however, the effect was mediated by the type of error. Nassaji concluded that negotiated feedback can be beneficial to improving written accuracy (see NASSAJI & SWAIN 2000).	**D6** **H1** **I1**
2012	Saito, K. & R. Lyster (2012). Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of /ɹ/ by Japanese learners of English. *Language Learning* 62, 595–633.	**Saito & Lyster** was one of the first studies that investigated the effect of instruction and feedback on pronunciation (English /ɹ/). Following the methodology used in LYSTER (2004), the study used feedback in conjunction with FFI and found a significant effect of FFI plus feedback on learning the target sound (see SAITO 2013a, b).	**D6** **H1** **I2**
2012	Sato, M. & R. Lyster (2012). Peer interaction and corrective feedback for accuracy and fluency development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 34, 591–626.	**Sato & Lyster** explored the effects of corrective feedback in peer interaction. University-level EFL learners who were trained to provide corrective feedback to their peers showed improvement both in accuracy and fluency, while those who engaged in peer interaction without such training improved only in fluency.	**D6** **H2** **I1**
2013	Goo, J. & A. Mackey (2013). The case against the case against recasts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 35, 127–165.	In light of the claim that recasts are not an effective type of feedback strategy compared to other types of feedback (LYSTER & RANTA 1997; PANOVA & LYSTER 2002), **Goo & Mackey** reviewed empirical studies on the effectiveness of recasts and argued against those that supported the relative ineffectiveness of recasts. They also discussed a number of methodological issues in previous research that should be considered when interpreting their results.	**D6** **A** **J**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2013	Lee, J. F. & A. Benati (eds.) (2013). *Individual differences and processing instruction*. Equinox: London.	This volume provided a collection of studies that addressed the role of individual differences in the effectiveness of PI (see CADIERNO 1995; VANPATTEN & OIKKENON 1996; BENATI 2005).	**D5** **E1**
2013	Lyster, R. & L. Ranta (2013). Counterpoint piece: The case for variety in corrective feedback research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 35, 167–184.	**Lyster & Ranta** replied to GOO & MACKEY (2013), rebutting their main claims. They argued that (a) the effects of recasts have not been settled; (b) Goo & Mackey misinterpreted Lyster & Ranta's perspectives on uptake; (c) Goo & Mackey's argument on single-versus-multiple comparisons is invalid; and (d) classroom research should be encouraged.	**D6** **A**
2013	Saito, K. (2013a). Reexamining effects of form-focused instruction on L2 pronunciation development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 35, 1–29.	This research examined the role of explicit phonetic information (EI) during FFI. **Saito** found that although the FFI-only group demonstrated moderate improvement in familiar contexts, the FFI + EI showed significant improvement with large effects in unfamiliar lexical contexts.	**D6** **E4** **H2** **I2**
2013	Saito, K. (2013b). The acquisitional value of recasts in instructed second language speech learning: Teaching the perception and production of English /ɹ/ to adult Japanese learners. *Language Learning* 63, 499–529.	This is a follow up study to SAITO & LYSTER (2012), which investigated the effectiveness of FFI plus recasts on the acquisition of English pronunciation /ɹ/ in an EFL context. The results confirmed that FFI had positive effects by showing these effects on both perception and production.	**D6** **H2** **I2**
2013	Sato, M. (2013). Beliefs about peer interaction and peer corrective feedback: Efficacy of classroom intervention. *The Modern Language Journal* 97, 611–633.	**Sato** examined beliefs of Japanese EFL learners on peer interaction and peer corrective feedback. Learners showed positive beliefs about peer interaction and peer feedback. Feedback training also increased their willingness and confidence in providing feedback.	**D6** **H2** **I1**
2013	Shintani, N. (2013). The effect of focus on form and focus on forms instruction on the acquisition of productive knowledge of L2 vocabulary by young beginning-level learners. *TESOL Quarterly* 47, 36–62.	**Shintani** examined the difference between FonF and FonFs. Both treatment groups showed improvement in vocabulary acquisition, but the FonF group was better at acquiring adjectives.	**D1** **H2** **I2**

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATION	THEME
2013	Tomita, Y. & N. Spada (2013). Form-focused instruction and learner investment in L2 communication. *The Modern Language Journal* 97, 591–610.	**Tomita & Spada** examined teenage Japanese learners' investment in L2 communication in the FFI environment. All participants engaged in both meaning-focused and form-focused activities. Turn, discursive, and statistical analyses reveal that FFI encouraged the learners to invest in L2 communication by helping them create learner identity.	**C** **H2** **I1**
2013	Valeo, A. (2013). The integration of language and content: Form-focused instruction in a content-based language program. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 16, 25–50.	**Valeo** compared one class receiving content-based instruction integrated with FFI to another class receiving the same content-based instruction with a focus on meaning only. There was an overall positive impact on language outcomes for both groups and significant benefit on the content knowledge of the group receiving FFI.	**C** **H1** **I1**
2013	Winke, P. (2013). The effects of input enhancement on grammar learning and comprehension: A modified replication of Lee (2007) with eye-movement data. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 35, 323–352.	**Winke** replicated LEE's (2007) study on input enhancement of English passive forms. The study used eye-tracking techniques to collect information on eye movement and, unlike Lee's study, input enhancement did not positively influence form learning, nor negatively affect reading comprehension.	**D4** **H1** **I2**
2014	Fordyce, K. (2014). The differential effects of explicit and implicit instruction on EFL learners' use of epistemic stance. *Applied Linguistics* 35, 6–28.	**Fordyce** investigated the effects of both explicit and implicit instruction on epistemic stance in English. Results showed that epistemic forms were more frequently used after the explicit intervention than the implicit intervention.	**A3** **H2** **I2**
2015	Loewen, S. (2015). *Introduction to instructed second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.	This book by **Loewen** presents a thorough overview of the current theoretical and empirical research on instructed SLA. The volume illustrates the broad scope and the diversity of issues this area of SLA addresses and how they can inform classroom practices (see DOUGHTY & WILLIAMS 1998; HOUSEN & PIERRARD 2005; NASSAJI & FOTOS 2010; NASSAJI 2015).	**A** **B** **C** **D**
2015	Nassaji, H. (2015). *The interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning: Linking theory, research, and practice*: London: Bloomsbury.	This is the first book that explicitly addresses interactional feedback as an important dimension of instructed second language learning. Drawing on recent theory and research in both classroom and laboratory contexts, the book explores a wide range of issues regarding interactional feedback and their relevance for both theory and practice, including how interactional feedback is used, processed, and contributes to L2 acquisition (see DOUGHTY & WILLIAMS 1998; NASSAJI & FOTOS 2010; LOEWEN 2015).	**A** **D** **E** **J**

[1]Authors' names are shown in small capitals when the study referred to appears in this timeline.