European Journal of English Language Teaching
ISSN: 2501-7136
ISSN-L: 2501-7136
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/edu

DOI: 10.46827/ejel.v10i4.6412 Volume 10 | Issue 4 | 2025

TEACHER RECAST AND LEARNER NOTICEABILITY: DYNAMICS IN EFL INTERACTIVE CLASSROOMS

Talal M. Amara[i]
Department of English,
Sabratha University,
Libya

Abstract:
This study examines learner noticing of teacher recasts in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) interactive classrooms, with a specific focus on comparing the relative effectiveness of explicit and implicit recasts. The research was conducted at the Specific Training Center for Oil Industries in Zawia, Libya, and involved four intermediate-level classrooms comprising learners from diverse academic and professional backgrounds. Data were collected through 540 minutes of classroom observation, during which natural teacher–learner interactions were recorded. A total of 45 teacher recasts were identified, of which 28 were classified as explicit and 17 as implicit. Learner noticing was identified through immediate uptake and repair following each recast. To triangulate the findings, post-observation interviews were conducted with learners who had received recasts, providing further insight into their cognitive engagement with the teacher recasts. Findings revealed a high rate of learner noticing overall, with 96.8% of explicit recasts and 82.4% of implicit recasts being noticed by learners. Moreover, explicit recasts led to successful learner repair in over 90% of cases, compared to 76.5% for implicit recasts. These results suggest that both recast types are effective in promoting learner awareness and language accuracy, with explicit recasts showing a slightly stronger impact. The study highlights the pedagogical value of recasts, particularly in interactive EFL contexts where learners are actively engaged in communicative tasks. Limitations include the context-specific nature of the study and the reliance on observable uptake as the main indicator of noticing. Future research is recommended to explore long-term effects, learner perceptions, and broader classroom contexts.

Keywords: noticeability, recasts, explicit, implicit, repair

[i] Correspondence: email talal.amara@gmail.com

1. Introduction

In the field of second language acquisition (SLA), classroom interaction has long been recognized as a central context for language development. Through interactive exchanges, learners are exposed to meaningful input, opportunities for output, and feedback that collectively support the refinement of interlanguage (Long, 1996; Gass & Mackey, 2007). One key element of these exchanges, particularly in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, is oral corrective feedback (OCF), which means teachers' spoken responses to learners' incorrect utterances. In communicative language classrooms, where fluency and meaning-focused interaction are emphasized, OCF plays a crucial role in balancing communication with linguistic accuracy (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Ellis, 2009).

OCF can take a range of forms, from explicit corrections that overtly signal an error to implicit strategies such as recasts, clarification requests, and elicitation. The effectiveness of these strategies, however, depends largely on whether learners are able to recognize them as corrective. According to Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis, input must be consciously registered in order to be internalized; thus, for feedback to promote learning, it must be noticed as a signal of error. This highlights the importance of noticeability, which refers to a learner's ability to perceive a teacher's utterance as feedback rather than as repetition or progress of meaning. Some forms of feedback, such as explicit corrections, are generally more salient, while others, like recasts, may be overlooked, especially in fast-paced, meaning-oriented classroom interactions (Lyster, 1998; Mackey *et al.*, 2000).

Although a substantial body of research has explored the types, frequency, and uptake of OCF, relatively little attention has been paid to the noticeability of each type of OCF during interaction. This represents a significant gap in the current literature, particularly in EFL contexts where the classroom may be the primary, if not sole, source of English input. Understanding which types of feedback are more likely to be noticed, and whether or not this noticing leads to a potential repair. The noticeability impact on learner response is critical for both effective language teaching and informed teacher development. The current study addresses this gap by examining how EFL learners notice and respond to different types of oral corrective feedback during classroom interaction. The purpose is to identify the types of OCF that most learners notice during interaction flow. By focusing on learner noticeability within natural communicative settings, this research contributes to a clear understanding of feedback effectiveness and offers practical implications for the design of feedback strategies in EFL classrooms.

2. Literature Review

An increasing body of SLA research demonstrates that oral corrective feedback OCF supports learners in noticing, acquiring, and retaining language forms (Mackey & Philp, 1998; Philp, 2003). OCF helps learners recognize gaps in their output and adjust accordingly (McDonough, 2005). However, in mixed classrooms, the impact of OCF often

depends on the feedback type. Some forms of feedback that effectively promote output modification, such as prompts and elicitation, are underused (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Recasts, a commonly used feedback type, involve teachers reformulating learners' erroneous utterances without overtly marking the error. Their aim is to direct learner attention to the correct form while maintaining communicative flow (Sheen, 2004). Recasts can be divided into:

- Explicit recasts, where cues like "Do you mean...?" signal correction. These are generally more noticeable and effective in EFL contexts.
- Implicit recasts, which subtly reformulate errors without signaling correction, requiring learners to infer the change.

2.1 The Noticeability of Teacher's OCF

The extent to which learners notice recasts is central to their effectiveness. According to Schmidt's (1990, 2001) noticing hypothesis, conscious attention to linguistic input is essential for learning. In EFL settings with limited exposure, the ability to notice feedback becomes especially important (Ellis, 2009).

Evidence on recast noticeability is mixed. Some studies argue that recasts often go unnoticed (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002), while others show they can be salient (Ellis *et al.*, 2001; Sheen, 2006). Mackey *et al.* (2000) found that learners often overlook recasts, especially when embedded implicitly. Researchers have used two main methods to study noticing: (1) recall protocols and (2) immediate learner responses (Mackey *et al.*, 2002; Philp, 2003; Ammar & Sato, 2010). Mackey (2006) found that learners who noticed recasts during classroom interaction demonstrated improved L2 development. Ammar and Sato (2010) reported that explicit recasts were more frequently noticed and led to higher rates of successful repair. Taddarth (2010) also found explicit recasts to be more effective, with variations depending on linguistic features. However, Mackey *et al.* (2000) warned that learners might mimic recasts without fully processing them, echoing Gass's (2003) concern that repetition might be superficial. Philp (2003) and Mackey & Philp (1998) highlighted that repetition of a recast is not a reliable indicator of understanding. Panova and Lyster (2002) noted that since recasts are both initiated and completed by the teacher, they limit learner involvement in correction.

Furthermore, uptake may not always signal noticing. Long (1996) emphasized that uptake might reflect known forms rather than new learning. Leeman (2007) argued that the lack of learner response does not necessarily indicate a failure to notice. Cultural, cognitive, and contextual factors such as personality or readiness may inhibit immediate responses. Lyster (1998) added that recasts, due to their similarity to simple repetition, may be misinterpreted as mere reinforcement rather than correction.

In conclusion, while some learners notice and respond to recasts, their effectiveness varies greatly. Many studies, particularly those focused on interactive activities (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002), excluded grammar instruction. In contrast, the present study addresses a broader context of EFL classrooms in Libya, where grammar and speaking are both emphasized. This context affects the frequency and success of uptake.

2.2 Uptake as an Indicator of Noticing

Uptake, learners' immediate responses to OCF, is frequently used to assess whether feedback has been noticed (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). It can take the form of acknowledgment, reformulation, or repetition of the correction. While uptake provides visible evidence of attention, it doesn't necessarily indicate acquisition (Loewen, 2004). Uptake is considered the most immediate and observable sign of noticing. For example, when a learner repeats a corrected form, it suggests the correction has been attended to. Yet, uptake is not always cognitively deep; it might represent a surface-level adjustment or a conversational strategy (Long, 1996).

Lyster and Ranta (1997) distinguished between correct uptake (accurate incorporation of feedback) and incorrect uptake (misunderstanding or partial awareness). These distinctions help assess feedback effectiveness. However, researchers caution against viewing uptake as definitive evidence of noticing. Mackey & Philp (1998) and Ellis (2009) noted that learners may respond for conversational continuity rather than linguistic attention. Given these limitations, uptake should be considered alongside repair, delayed uptake, and metalinguistic awareness to form a more accurate picture of noticing. In summary, while uptake is a useful behavioral indicator, it is not conclusive. It provides insight into learners' immediate processing of feedback, but must be contextualized within broader interaction patterns and goals.

2.3 Repair as an Indicator of Noticing

Repair refers to a learner's successful correction of an error following feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Unlike simple uptake, repair implies deeper engagement and understanding. In SLA research, self-repair, where the learner corrects the error without further prompting, is considered strong evidence of noticing (Mackey, 2006). Repair can be immediate, occurring directly after the recast, or delayed, surfacing later in the interaction or lesson (Ellis, 2009). Immediate repair is typically linked to noticing, while delayed repair may reflect more sustained processing. The nature and timing of repair give insight into whether the learner has internalized the feedback. However, not all repairs reflect true noticing. Some may be prompted by conversational cues or pressure to respond (Mackey & Philp, 1998). For this reason, researchers emphasize analyzing repair in conjunction with context and learner engagement. In sum, repair, especially when initiated by the learner, serves as a robust indicator of noticing. It reflects learners' attempts to integrate feedback into their language and promotes language development through modification of output.

2.4 The Effectiveness of Teacher Recasts

Recasts are the most frequently used form of OCF in communicative EFL classrooms due to their unobtrusive nature. However, their effectiveness depends on several factors: type of recast, frequency, learner readiness, and classroom context (Yin, 2022). Explicit recasts tend to be more effective than implicit ones because they are more noticeable (Yin, 2022). This aligns with Schmidt's (2001) noticing hypothesis, which posits that conscious awareness of linguistic input is essential for acquisition. Wang and Loewen (2023)

showed that multiple recasts resulted in greater improvement than single ones, suggesting that repetition enhances saliency and retention. Learner-related factors also play a role. Addisa *et al.* (2024) found that while learners preferred recasts over direct correction, many failed to recognize their corrective function, particularly when recasts lacked saliency or were not repeated. Practical constraints such as large class sizes and time pressures also reduce the consistent use of effective recasts.

The nature of the linguistic error affects learner recognition. Mackey *et al.* (2000) reported that learners more easily identified corrections related to lexical (83.3%) and phonological (60%) errors than morphosyntactic errors (13%). Similar findings were observed among Italian learners. Trofimovich, Ammar, and Gatbonton (2007) investigated individual differences such as proficiency, memory, and analytical ability but found no strong link between these traits and noticing. The high frequency of recasts may have made them predictable, reducing the role of cognitive variables. Philp (2003) argued that recall may not always capture what is noticed, but if a recast is recalled, some level of noticing has occurred. She also found that shorter recasts were more likely to be recalled than longer ones. Additionally, recasts that deviated significantly from the original utterance (e.g., three or more changes) were less frequently noticed, regardless of proficiency.

Despite their widespread use, recasts are often misinterpreted as confirmation rather than correction. Learners may perceive them as paraphrasing or repetition rather than feedback. The implicit nature of recasts can obscure their instructional purpose, particularly in fast-paced interactions. Much of the existing research is limited by short-term, experimental designs, offering limited insight into how learners notice and respond to recasts over time. Few studies have examined these processes in authentic, longitudinal classroom settings. As a result, key areas such as affective responses, long-term retention, and real-time cognitive engagement remain underexplored.

In conclusion, while recasts are popular in EFL instruction, their effectiveness is inconsistent. Factors such as feedback explicitness, learner awareness, instructional context, and feedback frequency all influence whether learners notice and benefit from recasts. There is a clear need for more longitudinal, classroom-based studies that investigate how OCF unfolds over time and under real teaching conditions.

3. Material and Methods

3.1 Context

The empirical data utilized in this research were obtained from four English as a Foreign Language EFL classrooms at the Specific Training Center for Oil Industries, located in Zawia, Libya. This institution is well known for delivering high-quality EFL instruction, which aligns with the nature of the current research study. Instructional sessions are scheduled based on student affiliation: morning sessions are designated exclusively for individuals affiliated with the center, including current students and employees, while afternoon sessions are open to the general public, encompassing learners from a variety of academic and professional backgrounds. Each class comprised approximately fifteen

learners on average, which is consistent with findings suggesting that smaller class sizes tend to foster more effective language acquisition through increased interaction and individualized feedback (Ur, 2012). The data collection process was facilitated through the collaboration of four EFL instructors (three male and one female), all of whom possess substantial professional and pedagogical experience. The role of teacher expertise is well-documented in the literature as a critical factor in second language instruction effectiveness (Farrell, 2016). These instructors employed a uniform instructional material (i.e. *Laser B1 and B2*, published by Macmillan Education) which served as the core textbook for all participating classes.

3.2 Participants

The study participants were drawn from four intermediate-level EFL classrooms characterized by diversity in both gender and age. The intermediate proficiency level was purposefully selected by the researcher, as learners at this stage are typically expected to function predominantly in English during classroom interactions, thereby facilitating more communicative and immersive language learning experiences. This level is also associated with a higher potential for student engagement and interaction, which are central to effective language acquisition.

Participants represented a range of educational backgrounds, including secondary school students, undergraduate students from various academic disciplines, as well as individuals who had already completed their undergraduate studies. Such heterogeneity in learner profiles can enhance the dynamics of classroom communication and foster collaborative learning through diverse perspectives (Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003). All participants were enrolled in this course with the primary goal of improving their overall English proficiency. General English programs are commonly designed to build foundational skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing, and are particularly beneficial for learners with varied academic and professional goals. This instructional context supports the development of communicative competence, which is widely recognized as a fundamental objective in EFL education (Canale & Swain, 1980).

3.3 Data Collection Tools

A qualitative research design was adopted to investigate the classroom interaction between the teacher and learners, with a specific focus on capturing learners' noticeability of teacher recasts that contribute to language development. This approach was selected to facilitate an in-depth understanding of learners' responses to these recasts. Data were collected through 540 minutes of non-participant classroom observation, during which audio recordings were made to ensure accurate documentation of verbal exchanges. Immediately following each observation session, semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected participants to enrich the observational data and elicit learner awareness of the recasts. The use of non-participant observation allowed the researcher to capture naturalistic teacher-student interactions without interfering in the instructional process (Mackey & Gass, 2016). The primary purpose of the observation phase was to identify whether learners were able to notice teacher-initiated recasts as a

form of corrective feedback. Recasts are reformulations of learners' erroneous utterances and are widely regarded as a common yet subtle technique in EFL classrooms (Ellis, 2009). To confirm whether these recasts were noticed by the learners and to determine whether such feedback led to repair (i.e., the correct reformulation of the target language), follow-up interviews were conducted. These interviews were semi-structured in format, allowing for guided but flexible discussion, and served as a form of stimulated recall.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

Besides the recording, the researcher created an observation sheet to be used during the observation. This sheet helped the researcher to jot down the required information when recasts occurred. It was also used as a reference for the researcher when conducting the immediate interview. Before the start of each lesson, the researcher held preparatory meetings with the classroom instructors to provide detailed guidance on the two specific forms of recasts (i.e. explicit and implicit) that they were expected to employ during the interactive session. To ensure consistency and clarity, examples of each recast type were demonstrated. Following this orientation, the instructors were instructed to incorporate both types of recasts naturally during class interactions. During each observation session, the researcher entered the classroom equipped with a structured observation sheet. To preserve participant confidentiality while maintaining the ability to track individual responses, a coding system based on students' seating arrangement was implemented. This allowed the researcher to refer to specific learners during data collection and post-class interviews without disclosing their real identities, thus ensuring ethical standards of confidentiality (BERA, 2018).

At the beginning of the session, the teacher formally introduced the researcher to the class and briefly explained the purpose of his presence in order to reduce potential anxiety and to foster a comfortable environment for observation. Once the session commenced, the researcher systematically monitored each student's verbal contributions, paying particular attention to interactions involving teacher feedback. When a recast was delivered either explicit or implicit, the researcher documented the learner's original utterance, the type of recast provided, and the student's immediate verbal or non-verbal reaction, which served as an indicator of whether the feedback was noticed and processed (Mackey *et al.*, 2000).

Upon conclusion of the lesson, the researcher invited each student who had received a recast to participate in a brief, individual interview conducted immediately after class. This timing was critical to ensure the accuracy of student recall, as immediate post-task interviews are shown to enhance data reliability in stimulated recall methodologies (Gass & Mackey, 2000). Through this approach, the researcher was able to triangulate the observational data with learners' reflective insights, thereby gaining a more accurate understanding of their awareness of corrective feedback and its potential role in promoting language repair.

4. Results and Discussion

This study investigated learner noticeability and uptake of teacher recasts in four intermediate-level EFL classrooms, focusing on two types of recasts: explicit and implicit. A total of 45 recasts were observed, including 28 explicit and 17 implicit recasts. The analysis focused on learners' immediate noticing and successful repair (i.e. correct learner response). The following sections present detailed findings for each recast type, integrating examples from the data and situating them within broader theoretical and pedagogical contexts. The error types found in the present data include: grammatical, lexical, and phonological errors.

Grammatical errors include ill-formulated sentences, phrases, or words, which can be regarded as not following or applying the 'native speaker norm'. These are often clear errors, and not slips of the tongue or performance errors. In the present study, all cases where the student did not either know a particular word, missed a word, misused a word, used the wrong word or phrase, were defined as lexical errors. The lexical errors, therefore, are concerned with the language user's knowledge of words, phrases and sentences. Phonological errors are, of course, errors in pronunciation, where the student clearly does not know the correct way of pronouncing a word or a phrase. The student cannot self-correct if a correct form is not first provided by the teacher. In other words, here, a distinction between a mistake and an error is crucial, because a student might be familiar with a word and mistakenly mispronounce it, or then she/he is new to a word and cannot pronounce it without assistance.

4.1 Explicit Recasts

Explicit recasts constituted the majority of corrective feedback, representing 28 out of 45 instances. These recasts were characterized by clear, overt correction in which teachers restated the learner's incorrect utterance using the correct form, often prefacing the correction with statements such as *"Do you mean…?", "I think you want to say…",* or *"I think you mean…"*. This explicit signaling maximized the salience of the corrected language structure, helping learners focus attention on form. Learners demonstrated remarkable responsiveness: 27 out of 28 explicit recasts (96.8%) were noticed immediately, and 25 (90.3%) led to successful repair.

The variety of errors targeted by explicit recasts reflects the breadth of linguistic challenges faced by intermediate EFL learners. Grammatical errors were frequent, especially in verb tense and subject-verb agreement. For instance, "*I should have go*" was explicitly corrected to "*I should have gone*," and "*When my friend go to bed*" to "*When my friend goes to bed*." Similar cases included "*I can't saved money*" recast as "*I can't save money*," and "*It show me where is to go*" corrected to "*It shows me where to go*." These examples show how explicit recasts help make syntactic forms more noticeable, especially those that are irregular or prone to fossilization (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006). Phrase structure and prepositional errors were also common targets. For example, the inaccurate phrase "*I need your help for arrangement my time*" was explicitly recast as "*I need your help for arranging my time*," correcting both noun phrase usage and gerund form.

Likewise, "*You use it take pictures*" was corrected to "*You use it to take pictures*," helping clarify verb complementation and infinitive usage. The phrase "*I listen podcast*" was recast as "*I listen to podcast*," reinforcing appropriate prepositional use.

Lexical and referential errors were addressed as well. In cases like "*Teacher is using him*," the recast "*Teacher is using it*" clarified pronominal reference, while "*She could have helped her*" was revised to "*She could have helped him*," highlighting pronoun accuracy. Corrections such as "*I would go out*" changed to "*I would go abroad*" improved lexical precision and contextual appropriateness. Phonological accuracy was another key domain of explicit recasts. Pronunciation issues were addressed directly, with words like "*Album*", "*Weapon*", and *"Exhibition"* being corrected. Although many of these were successfully repaired (e.g., "*Album*" and "*Weapon*"), not all were. For instance, the pronunciation correction of "*Exhibition*" was noticed but not repaired, indicating that even with explicit cues, some phonological forms may require repeated exposure and practice (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Goodwin, 2010). Isolated instances where explicit recasts were ineffective further underscore the complexity of second language acquisition. The word "*meself*" was corrected to "*myself*" but went unnoticed and unrepaired, possibly due to entrenched L1 interference or cognitive overload (Schmidt, 1990). Similarly, while "*It show me where is to go*" was noticed, it was not successfully repaired, suggesting that some complex syntactic structures may require more sustained instructional support. Overall, these findings corroborate earlier research on the effectiveness of explicit feedback. The high rate of uptake supports claims that explicit recasts are particularly effective when learners possess sufficient metalinguistic awareness to benefit from form-focused feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Ellis *et al.*, 2006). The intermediate proficiency level of learners likely contributed to their ability to process and apply explicit feedback effectively. Furthermore, the instructional context (e.g. small class sizes and experienced teachers) facilitated the success of this feedback type. Teachers could provide individualized feedback that was both immediate and contextually relevant, enhancing learner engagement (Farrell, 2016).

4.2 Implicit Recasts

Implicit recasts, accounting for 17 of the total instances, were subtler, integrated seamlessly into teacher discourse without overt signaling of correction. Despite the absence of explicit cues, 14 of 17 implicit recasts (82.4%) were noticed, and 13 (76.5%) resulted in successful learner repair, suggesting that even understated feedback can be pedagogically effective. Implicit recasts were particularly effective in addressing grammatical and syntactic errors. For example, "*If he still treat her badly*" was recast as "*If he still treats her badly*," subtly correcting subject-verb agreement. Similarly, "*I suggest for you*" was recast as "*I suggest that you*," guiding the learner toward appropriate clause structure without interrupting the conversational flow. Other grammatical adjustments included "*I wish I have a great job*," corrected to "*I wish I had a great job*," and "*He use his phone*," which became "*He uses his phone.*" These examples demonstrate how implicit recasts can support learner development through contextually meaningful input, even without direct attention to form. Pronunciation errors were also addressed through

implicit means. Learners responded successfully to subtle pronunciation corrections of words such as *"Definition," "Elbow,", "stage,"* and *"preparing"*. These corrections illustrate that learners are capable of detecting phonological adjustments, particularly when embedded in meaningful communicative exchanges. Additionally, lexical and collocational errors were subtly corrected. For instance, "*Don't be married*" was recast as "*Don't get married*," and "*I will bring meat dried*" was corrected to "*I will bring dried meat.*" These corrections highlight the potential of implicit recasts to refine learner output by modeling natural phrasing and lexical accuracy.

However, the data also reveal limitations. In cases such as "*Different*" recast to "*Difference*," the correction was noticed but not repaired, suggesting that learners may struggle with morphosyntactic shifts even when they recognize the correction. More problematic were instances like "*To take picture*," which was neither noticed nor repaired. Similarly, the utterance "*If I wake up early*, *I will done a lot of work*" went unrepaired despite its syntactic complexity. These examples point to a key drawback of implicit recasts: their reduced salience may hinder their effectiveness, particularly for learners with lower processing capacity or insufficient attention to form (Lyster, 2004). This variability aligns with Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis, which posits that conscious attention to language forms is a prerequisite for acquisition. When learners fail to notice implicit feedback, repair is unlikely. Nonetheless, implicit recasts offer unique pedagogical advantages. They preserve the natural flow of interaction, support learner autonomy, and promote hypothesis testing by providing subtle input enhancement without overt correction (Long, 1996). Thus, both implicit and explicit recasts serve complementary roles in the language classroom. While explicit recasts offer clarity and immediate salience, which is ideal for tackling persistent or complex errors, implicit recasts foster communicative fluency and learner independence. Skilled teachers can balance these strategies, adjusting their feedback style according to learner proficiency, classroom dynamics, and instructional goals. Such variability in effectiveness may be influenced by multiple factors, including learner attention, motivation, and the communicative demands of the task. Schmidt's (1990) Noticing Hypothesis posits that attention is critical for language acquisition, which may explain why some implicit recasts went unnoticed or unrepaired. Despite these limitations, implicit recasts play an important role in preserving the natural flow of classroom interaction and fostering learner autonomy by encouraging self-monitoring and hypothesis testing (Long, 1996). This balance between explicit and implicit feedback allows teachers to tailor recasts based on the classroom context and learner needs, promoting both accuracy and fluency.

4.3 Methodological Considerations and Limitations

While this study provides valuable insights into learner responses to recasts, some methodological limitations must be acknowledged. The sample size of 45 recasts, though sufficient for detailed qualitative analysis, limits generalizability across diverse EFL contexts (Mackey & Gass, 2016). Moreover, the focus on intermediate learners at the research context restricts applicability to other proficiency levels or educational environments (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). The categorization of recasts into explicit and

implicit, though grounded in established literature (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), may oversimplify the ways teachers deliver corrective feedback. Future research might consider a continuum or gradation of explicitness, capturing more subtle variations in teacher feedback (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006). Additionally, the operationalization of noticing through immediate uptake and repair, while practical, may not capture longer-term learning outcomes (Schmidt, 1990). Longitudinal studies incorporating follow-up assessments could better elucidate the impact of recasts on durable language development (Mackey, 2006). The presence of experienced teachers and small class sizes, while strengths in delivering feedback, may not reflect typical EFL classrooms elsewhere, where larger classes and less experienced teachers might affect recast effectiveness (Farrell, 2016).

The results also provide strong support for the pedagogical effectiveness of teacher recasts in interactive EFL classrooms. Explicit recasts, due to their clarity and salience, appear particularly effective in promoting immediate learner noticing and accurate repair (Lyster, 2004; Ellis *et al.*, 2006). Meanwhile, implicit recasts also serve a valuable function by fostering learner autonomy and preserving the natural flow of communication (Long, 1996). The integration of both feedback types, tailored to learner proficiency and classroom context, can optimize language acquisition outcomes (Sheen, 2006). Furthermore, the learners' intermediate proficiency likely enabled them to benefit maximally from form-focused corrective feedback (DeKeyser, 2003). While most recasts led to noticing and repair, occasional failures highlight that feedback is not universally effective, pointing to the complex interplay of learner, teacher, and contextual factors in second language acquisition (Philp, 2003). Future research should further investigate these variables, as well as explore the long-term effects of recasts on language development.

5. Conclusion

This study explored learner noticeability of teacher recasts in intermediate-level EFL interactive classrooms, focusing on the differential effects of explicit and implicit recasts on learner uptake and repair. The findings clearly demonstrate that both recast types serve as effective forms of corrective feedback, facilitating learner awareness of errors and encouraging immediate attempts at self-correction (Lyster & Saito, 2010). Notably, explicit recasts yielded higher rates of noticing and successful repair compared to implicit recasts, underscoring their greater salience and directness in drawing learner attention to target forms (Ellis, 2009).

The results affirm the critical role of teacher recasts in enhancing communicative language teaching by balancing the dual goals of fluency and accuracy (Long, 1996). Explicit recasts provide learners with clear, unambiguous feedback that supports error detection and immediate modification, which is particularly beneficial for learners developing metalinguistic sensitivity (Schmidt, 2001). Conversely, implicit recasts offer a subtler approach that maintains natural interactional flow, encouraging learner autonomy and self-monitoring without interrupting communication (Lyster, 2004).

Practically, these findings suggest that EFL instructors need to consider employing a flexible feedback strategy that integrates both explicit and implicit recasts based on learner proficiency, classroom context, and the nature of the error (Sheen, 2006). For learners at intermediate levels, explicit recasts may be more effective in promoting immediate noticing and correction, while implicit recasts can be valuable for maintaining interactional continuity and fostering learner confidence. Moreover, the study highlights the importance of skilled teacher mediation and small class sizes in optimizing feedback effectiveness. Teachers' ability to deliver timely, contextually appropriate recasts, combined with learner readiness and engagement, are essential factors in maximizing language acquisition outcomes (Farrell, 2016). While this research contributes valuable empirical evidence to the field, future studies should expand on these findings by examining long-term impacts of recasts on language development, exploring learner perceptions of different feedback types, and investigating feedback effectiveness across diverse EFL contexts and proficiency levels.

In conclusion, teacher recasts, especially explicit ones, play a pivotal role in facilitating real-time language learning in communicative classrooms. By harnessing the complementary strengths of explicit and implicit recasts, educators can better support learners' journey toward communicative competence and linguistic accuracy.

Conflict of Interest Statement
The author declares that there are no financial, personal, or professional conflicts of interest that could have influenced the work reported in this research paper.

About the Author(s)
Talal M. Amara is an Associate Professor in the College of Education & Arts at Sabratha University, Libya. He holds a PhD in Language, Literacy and Education (specializing in English / TESOL / Teacher Education), earned in 2014 from Washington State University. He also had an MA in TESOL from University of Sunderland in 2004.

References

Ammar, A. & Sato, M. (2010). *Corrective feedback, noticing, and individual differences: Exploration into their relationship with second language acquisition*. Paper presented at the annual conference of Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Addisa, K., Yigzaw, A., & Tefera, E. (2024). Using recasts to enhance students' English question production: Ethiopian secondary school students in focus. *Cogent Education, 11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2396170

BERA. (2018). Ethical guidelines for educational research (4th ed.). British Educational Research Association. Retrieved from: https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1-47. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1

DeKeyser, R. M. (2003). *Implicit and explicit learning*. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 313–348). Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492.ch11

Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667138

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal, 1*(1), 1-18. Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2504d6w 3.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language learning*, *51*(2), 281-318. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00156

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(2), 339–368. Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/studies-in-second-language-acquisition/article/implicit-and-explicit-corrective-feedback-and-the-acquisition-of-l2-grammar/CDE67D4A4E286921DA4BE9C40BAD9FE6

Farrell, T. S. C. (2016). *The practices of language teaching.* TESOL Press. Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/studies-in-second-language-acquisition/article/implicit-and-explicit-corrective-feedback-and-the-acquisition-of-l2-grammar/CDE67D4A4E286921DA4BE9C40BAD9FE6

Gass, S. (2003). *Input and interaction*. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224–255). Malden, MA: Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492.ch9

Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410606006

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching (4th ed.).* Pearson Education. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410606006

Leeman, J. (2007). *Feedback in L2 learning: Responding to errors during practice. Practice in second language learning: perspectives from linguistics and pedagogy.* Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313084598_Feedback_in_L2_learning_Responding_to_errors_during_practice

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://www.library.brawnblog.com/How%20Languages%20are%20Learned.pdf

Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult English L2 classroom: Characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *The modern language journal*, *90*(4), 536-556. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2006.00465.x

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. *Handbook of research on language acquisition*, *2*. Retrieved from https://www.library.brawnblog.com/Long1996-Ling%20Env%20L2%20Acq.pdf

Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 51-81. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/44486383

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(3), 399–432. Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/studies-in-second-language-acquisition/article/abs/differential-effects-of-prompts-and-recasts-in-formfocused-instruction/2C69A2DBB417D64B57EC2A7E3FA682BA

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., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *32*(2), 265-302. Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/studies-in-second-language-acquisition/article/abs/oral-feedback-in-classroom-sla/4999EE1C8379B2BF026B148EAF373CA1

Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied linguistics*, *27*(3), 405-430. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami051

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2016). *Second language research: Methodology and design* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315750606

Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal, 82*(3), 338-356. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb01211.x

Mackey, A., Gass, S. M., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *22*(4), 471-497. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100004022

Mackey, A., Philp, J., Egi, T., Fujii, A., & Tatsumi, T. (2002). *Individual differences inworking memory, noticing of international feedback in L2 development*. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Individual differences and instructed language learning*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.2.12mac?locatt=mode:legacy

McDonough, K. (2005). Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners' responses on ESL development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27*(1), 79-103. Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/studies-in-second-language-acquisition/article/abs/identifying-the-impact-of-negative-feedback-and-learners-responses-on-esl-question-development/E50A60C44843C2AFFF8AF436A513630F

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 of recasts in NS–NNS interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*(1), 99–126. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/44486658

Robinson, P. (1995). Attention, memory, and the "noticing" hypothesis. *Language Learning, 45*, 283-331. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00441.x

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 129–158. Retrieved from https://nflrc.hawaii.edu/PDFs/SCHMIDT%20The%20role%20of%20consciousness%20in%20second%20language%20learning.pdf

Schmidt, R. (2001). *Attention*. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/cognition-and-second-language-instruction/attention/DB6276BCF85FDAC4C66D0E1DFE0AA3D8

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research, 8*(3), 263-300. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168804lr146oa

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research, 10*(4), 361-392. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168806lr203oa

Swain, M. (1995). *Three functions of output in second language learning. Principles and Practice in Applied Linguistics.* Studies in Honour of HG Widdowson/Oxford UP.

Taddarth, A. (2010). *Recasts, uptake and learning: Effects and relationships. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Montreal*. Université de Montréal, Canada – Papyrus repository. Retrieved from https://dam-oclc.bac-lac.gc.ca/download?id=db162f00-a1d0-484f-872c-d9eba68e26d0&fileName=Assma_Taddarth_2010_memoire.pdf

Trofimovich, P., Ammar, A., & Gatbonton, E. (2007). *How effective are recasts? The role of attention, memory, and analytical ability*, In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 171-195). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://www.paveltrofimovich.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Trofimovich-et-al-2007-chptr.pdf

Ur, P. (2012). *A course in English language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024518

Wang, W., & Loewen, S. (2016). Nonverbal behavior and corrective feedback in nine ESL university-level classrooms. *Language Teaching Research, 20*, 459–478. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815577239

Wang, Y., & Loewen, S. (2023). A quasi-experimental study of the impact of single versus multiple recasts on the acquisition of English unreal conditional forms. *Heliyon, 9*(6). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16595

Yin, X. (2021). How effective are recasts in providing corrective feedback? *An analysis of recent perspectives.International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 10*(1), 33-41. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.10n.1p.33