Gist Education and Learning Research Journal. ISSN 1692-5777.
No.15. (July - December) 2017. pp. 125-148.

Exploring the Effects of Teachers' and Learners' Conflicting Beliefs on the Provision of Corrective Feedback During Undisturbed Classroom Interactions[1]

Explorando los Efectos de las Creencias Conflictivas de Maestros y Alumnos Sobre la Provisión de Retroalimentación Correctiva Durante las Interacciones de Clase sin Perturbaciones

Edgar Emmanuell Garcia-Ponce, Irasema Mora-Pablo[2]*
Universidad de Guanajuato, México

Abstract

Extensive research literature suggests that corrective feedback (CF), when effective, has a beneficial impact on the development of learners' interlanguage. This is because CF provides learners with language data concerning the correctness of their utterances and thus pushes their oral production towards greater clarity, accuracy and comprehensibility. However, CF has been found to be considerably scarce during classroom interactions. In an attempt to understand its scarcity, the present study investigates the interplay between the amount of CF provided by teachers and learner peers and the effects of their beliefs during uncontrolled classroom interactions at a Mexican university. By combining data collected from recorded classroom interactions, teacher interviews and learner focus groups, the findings show that there was a considerable number of errors which were avoided and not corrected by the teachers and learners during the classroom interactions. The findings also suggest that the scarcity of CF was in response to the teachers' and learners' conflicting beliefs about CF. This study provides a great opportunity to direct research towards the effects of

[1] Received: May 30th 2017/ Accepted: November 17th 2017

[2] ee.garcia@ugto.mx , imora@ugto.mx

teachers' and learners' beliefs on providing and receiving CF during classroom interactions, and find ways through which a socio-affective climate can be promoted in the language classroom in order to facilitate the provision of CF.

Keywords: accuracy, classroom interactions, corrective feedback, English as a foreign language, teacher and learner beliefs

Resumen

Un gran número de investigaciones han argumentado que la retroalimentación correctiva es de beneficio para el desarrollo del interlenguaje de los estudiantes. Esto se debe a que dicha retroalimentación facilita información sobre la precisión de sus estructuras lingüísticas y promueve que su producción oral sea más clara, precisa y comprensible. Sin embargo, estudios empíricos han encontrado que la retroalimentación correctiva es considerablemente escasa durante interacciones en el salón de clase. Con la intención de entender su escasez, el presente estudio indaga sobre la relación entre la cantidad de retroalimentación correctiva (facilitada por maestros y estudiantes) y sus creencias en salones de clase de una universidad mexicana. Al combinar datos recolectados de interacciones en salones de clase, entrevistas con maestros y grupos focales con alumnos, los resultados corroboran que hubo un número considerable de errores que no fueron atendidos y corregidos por los maestros y estudiantes durante las interacciones. Los hallazgos también sugieren que la escasez de la retroalimentación correctiva se debe a la influencia de sus creencias. Este estudio presenta una gran oportunidad de dirigir esfuerzos para investigar los efectos de las creencias de los maestros y estudiantes en la provisión de la retroalimentación correctiva y para encontrar alternativas que promuevan un ambiente socioafectivo en el salón de clase que permita la provisión efectiva de la retroalimentación correctiva.

Palabras clave: creencias de maestros y estudiantes, retroalimentación correctiva, inglés como lengua extranjera, precisión, interacciones de clase.

Resumo

Um grande número de pesquisas tem argumentado que a retroalimentação corretiva é de benefício para o desenvolvimento da inter-linguagem dos estudantes. Isto se deve a que mencionada retroalimentação facilita informação sobre a precisão de suas estruturas linguísticas e promove que a sua produção oral seja mais clara, precisa e compreensível. Porém, estudos empíricos encontraram que a retroalimentação corretiva á consideravelmente escassa durante interações na sala de aula. Com a intenção de entender a sua escassez, o presente estudo indaga sobre a relação entre a quantidade de retroalimentação corretiva (facilitada por professores y estudantes) e suas crenças em salas de aula de uma universidade mexicana. Ao combinar dados recolhidos de

interações em salas de aula, entrevistas com professores e grupos focais com alunos, os resultados corroboram que houve um número considerável de erros que não foram atendidos e corrigidos pelos professores e estudantes durante as interações. As descobertas também sugerem que a escassez da retroalimentação corretiva se deve à influência das suas crenças. Este estudo apresenta uma grande oportunidade de dirigir esforços para pesquisar os efeitos das crenças dos professores e estudantes nas provisões da retroalimentação corretiva e para encontrar alternativas que promovam um ambiente sócio afetivo na sala de aula que permita a provisão efetiva da retroalimentação corretiva.

Palavras chave: crenças de professores e estudantes, retroalimentação corretiva, inglês como língua estrangeira, precisão, interações de aula.

Introduction

The role of corrective feedback (henceforth CF) has been acknowledged in most second language theories and language pedagogy since it is viewed as language data that fosters linguistic accuracy and language learning (Ellis, 2009). Over the past three decades, extensive research has corroborated the beneficial effects of CF on learners' language development (see Nicholas, Lightbown & Spada, 2001; Russel, 2009; Sheen, 2001). Based on this evidence, we can thus assume that there is no reason why teachers and learners should avoid providing CF in the language classroom. However, recent empirical studies suggest that the provision of CF is scarce during classroom interactions, despite teachers' and learners' stated value of it. It may seem possible that there is an interrelated set of instructional, interactional, practical and perceptual factors that compel teachers and learners to avoid providing and receiving this language data concerning the accuracy of their utterances.

By combining interactional (from recorded classroom interactions) and perceptual (from teacher interviews and learner focus groups) data, the present study aims to develop an understanding of the interplay between the amount of CF that is provided during classroom interactions led by teachers (teacher-led interactions) and learners (peer interactions) and the effects of teachers' and learners' beliefs. Due to practical constraints, the study is unable to encompass all the classroom factors that have effects on providing or avoiding CF. Rather, it intends to determine the impact of teachers' and learners' beliefs on the provision of CF, and thus provide new insights into how these perceptual factors can be oriented towards enhancing its provision during classroom interactions. The study is guided by three research questions (RQs):

RQ1: What is the amount of corrective feedback during uncontrolled classroom interactions led by the teachers and learner peers?

RQ2: To what extent do teachers' and learners' beliefs influence the provision of corrective feedback during these interactions?

RQ3: What can be learned from RQs 1 and 2 in order to enhance the provision of corrective feedback?

Literature review

In the classroom, there can be two types of feedback: positive and negative feedback. Positive feedback signals the veracity of the content of a learner's response or the correctness of an utterance (Ellis, 2009). Negative feedback, on the other hand, is language information provided by teachers or learner peers for learners to signal that their utterance lacks veracity or linguistic correctness (Ellis, 2009; Walsh, 2011). In other words, this latter feedback is other-initiated repair and corrective in nature. CF consists of:

- an indication that an error has been committed,
- provision of the correct target language form, and
- metalinguistic information about the nature of the error, or any combination of these (Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006; cited in Ellis, 2009).

Due to the asymmetrical roles in classroom interactions, the provision of CF is a ritual that is mostly initiated by teachers (Walsh, 2006, 2011, 2013). Both language teachers and researchers have paid careful attention to CF because CF promotes language learning (see Ellis, 2009; Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006; García Mayo & Pica, 2000; McDonough, 2004; Walsh, 2006, 2011, 2013; to name just a few). In particular, CF is claimed to provide learners with opportunities to metalinguistically reflect on the clarity, accuracy, and comprehensibility of their output (Martínez-Flor, 1999; McDonough, 2004), as well as opportunities to correct wrong language hypotheses and prevent errors from being fossilised (Swain, 2005). It has been also argued that CF can be beneficial – when its initiation and moves to provide it are embedded in a collaborative interaction during which teachers and learners provide jointly owned affordances to solve linguistic problems (Rassaei, 2014; Swain & Susuki, 2008).

Despite arguments that there is no reason why erroneous utterances should not be corrected in L2 classrooms, language teachers and researchers frequently disagree on the following conflicting actions regarding the provision of CF:

1. What errors to correct.
2. How and when to correct errors.
3. Whether to correct errors, interrupt the interaction and avoid interlanguage fossilization.
4. Whether to omit the error, continue with the interaction and maintain learners' face.

It has been found that the fourth action is motivated when learners perceive CF as face-threatening (Yoshida, 2013a), evaluative (Allwright & Bailey, 1991), or a communication failure (Tsui, 1995). Learners' perceptions of CF as face-threatening information, in influencing emotions, have significant effects on their self-concepts and perceived self-efficacy (e.g., learners' self-perceptions of limited linguistic competence, poor pronunciation, limited vocabulary, etc.), which in some cases may deter them from fully participating and thus developing the target language (Tsui, 1995; Wesely, 2012). In light of the possibility that CF during classroom interactions may be perceived by learners as face-threatening and thus limit their oral production, research literature has suggested alternative techniques for providing learners with CF or information concerning their accuracy. For example, Hendrickson (1978) suggests that teachers should only correct those errors that 1) hinder communication significantly; 2) have highly stigmatising effects; and 3) occur frequently in learners' speech. Tsui (1995) warns that teachers should not correct every error since it may discourage learners from answering questions and participating in future interactions. However, the immediate issue that emerges from an avoidance approach to providing CF is that learners' opportunities to develop metalinguistic knowledge and push their utterances towards greater accuracy would be limited. In particular, this approach would also limit negotiations for meaning during which (implicit or explicit) CF is facilitated.

It seems possible that the provision of CF in the language classroom is enhanced if research efforts are oriented towards understanding the perceptual factors that motivate learners' perceptions of CF as face-threatening and thus limitations in its provision. Therefore, the present study attempts to gain insights into the interplay between the amount of CF in uncontrolled classroom interactions and teachers' and learners' beliefs about CF with a view to enhancing the opportunities to provide learners with more effective CF in the language classroom.

Methodology

The present study resided in an exploratory and naturalistic inquiry which adopts a multiple data-gathering approach with a view to developing an understanding of the participants' classroom practices and meanings (Lillis, 2008). The data collection instruments were:

For interactional data: 1) recorded classroom interactions

For perceptual data: 2) teacher interviews and 3) learner focus groups

The rationale behind the use of the above instruments is that interactional and perceptual data provide insights into the interplay between classroom interactional behaviour and beliefs (Wesely, 2012). Moreover, these research instruments not only allow a thick description of what may prove to be potentially significant, but also help researchers maintain an openness to what may be important to the participants (Lillis, 2008).

Research context and participants

The present study took place at a university located in the centre of Mexico. In this teaching and learning context, learners take subjects which train them to become language teachers or translators after a five-year BA programme. However, it is common in this context that most learners opt to major in EFL teaching. Learners are also expected to learn English throughout the programme.

Specifically, the study was conducted in three classrooms at basic, intermediate, and advanced levels. Learners in courses at basic and intermediate levels practise English during six hours per week. At advanced levels, learners study English during five hours per week. The reason why this university decided to reduce the number of hours at advanced levels was to encourage learner autonomy outside the classroom. The total number of learners who voluntarily accepted to participate in the study was 63 (17 at the basic level; 26 at the intermediate level; and 20 at the advanced level). All the learners were Mexican, their age ranged from 18 to 24 years, and their L1 was Spanish. Most of the learners had studied English before starting their university studies. Some of them came from state schools, where language exposure ranges from four to five hours per week. A low number of learners had studied English in private schools, where the language is practiced from 15 to 20 hours per week. The teachers were also invited to participate in the study and accepted under no obligation. The three teachers were women, born and raised in Mexico, and their mother tongue was Spanish. They all stated that they had been learning English for 18 or more years, and teaching it for 11 or more years.

Data collection instruments

Classroom interactions at the three proficiency levels are claimed to provide a detailed and comprehensive description of teachers' and learners' interactional behaviour in a naturally-occurring way (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). Following this claim, the interactions were

recorded in two sessions of 100 minutes approximately at each proficiency level. In total, 600 minutes of classroom interactions were recorded, 200 minutes approximately from each proficiency level. After having recorded the interactions, the data were then transcribed completely, and segmented into teacher-led interactions (TLIs) and peer interactions (PIs).

Teacher interviews were included in this study in order to understand how the teacher participants make sense of the provision of CF in relation to the context which they inhabit (Snape & Spencer, 2003). The teacher interviews were conducted by one of the researchers, after the recorded classroom interactions. In order to guide the interviews, a list of ten questions was used to understand the teachers' beliefs and practices regarding CF. In the case of the learner focus groups, Gibbs (1997) maintains that they allow insights into people's beliefs, attitudes and values from individual as well as group perspectives. This was of particular relevance for the study which seeks to investigate the extent to which learners' beliefs influence the provision of CF. Thus, three focus groups were carried out with five learners from each proficiency level. They were selected randomly from the teachers' attendance list, and invited to participate free of obligation. They all agreed to participate in the focus groups which were arranged at their convenience. A list of 10 questions was used to facilitate and guide the oral interactions between the researcher and learners. The teacher interviews and learner focus groups lasted around 20 minutes. They both were conducted in Spanish so as to avoid the learners' anxiety about the correctness of their utterances in the L2. For analysis purposes, the oral interactions during the interviews and focus groups were recorded and transcribed in their entirety.

All participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any time, and provided consent to participate. Complying with their right to be protected from identification, the learners' names and identities were carefully anonymised in the data. Instead, abbreviations and pseudonyms are used. The word 'Learner' (or letter 'L') and an identification number, e.g., Learner 5 are used to refer to learners in the extracts. In the case of teachers, pseudonyms are also used to refer to the teachers: *María* for the teacher at the basic level, *Tanya* for the teacher at the intermediate level, and *Aranza* for the teacher at the advanced level.

Data analysis and interpretation

According to Ellis (2006, 2009) and Lyster (2004), moves to provide CF can be classified in the following way:

Table 1. Taxonomy of CF moves

Input-providing	Recast
Output-prompting	Repetition
	Clarification request

Therefore, the study investigates the incidence of recasts, repetitions and clarification requests that were initiated during the TLIs and PIs at the three proficiency levels. In order to identify these moves in the uncontrolled TLIs and PIs, it was necessary to find the CF episodes which involve a trigger, feedback and (optionally) uptake (see Ellis, 2009), as shown in the following example:

Trigger	L11: //The woman … call a taxi//
Feedback	T: the woman?
Potential Uptake	L11: //Calls a taxi//

Once identified, we classified each feedback move following the specifications summarised in Table 2.

Table 2. CF moves

Move	Specification
1.Clarification requests	These are mostly wh- or bipolar questions which are initiated to elicit clarification or new information of the interlocutor's preceding utterance(s) (Long, 1980; Ellis, 2009; Tedick & Gortari, 1998).
2. Repetitions	Language information which is provided to reshape another speaker's utterance (Ellis, 2009; Tedick & Gortari, 1998). These are the most common types of feedback moves which usually contain an additional feature, for example, stress or lengthening of a segment, questioning intonation, etc. (Chaudron, 1988).
3. Recasts	These are reformulations which are initiated to reshape or refine all or part of others' utterances (Walsh, 2006). Recasts need to 1) contain content words of a preceding incorrect utterance; 2) reshape utterances in a phonological, syntactic, morphological or lexical way (Braidi, 2002); and 3) focus on meaning rather than form (Long & Robinson, 1998).

Because the purpose of the study was not to test hypotheses but to explore the incidence of CF, the interactional data were calculated using simple totals and ratios. Firstly, the total numbers were obtained by counting the instances when CF was provided and the moves that triggered them. Secondly, ratios were calculated by dividing the total number of each move per the total minutes of each TLI or PI. In order to understand the amount of errors that were attended during the interactions, we also counted the total number of errors, and calculated ratios by dividing the total number of errors per the total minutes of each TLI and PI. Prior to this analysis, we needed to establish what constituted an error. The following criteria were then coded for identifying and counting errors:

- Errors in word selection
- Errors in morphology
- Errors in syntax
- Errors in pronunciation
- False starts, hesitations and self-corrections were excluded.

The perceptual data from the interviews and focus groups were analysed following a meaning categorisation which is believed to facilitate the identification of patterns, themes and meaning (Berg, 2009). This involved identifying extracts manually, and attributing them to theme categories and sub-categories which emerged from the data:

Perceptions about CF

- Positive attitudes towards CF
- Perceived benefits of CF
- Negative attitudes towards CF
- Teachers avoiding corrections

Perceived nature of CF

- Types of CF moves
- CF at word level
- No perceived need for CF
- CF moves not initiated by learners
- Face-threatening CF
- More CF episodes in PIs

Results

In order to address RQ1 (i.e., what is the amount of corrective feedback during uncontrolled classroom interactions led by the teachers and learner peers?) and RQ2 (i.e., to what extent do teachers' and learners' beliefs influence the provision of corrective feedback during these interactions?), this section firstly discusses the findings into the amount of CF at the three proficiency levels. It then explores the influence that the teachers' and learners' beliefs exerted on this amount. Overall, the interactional evidence shows a considerable proportion of errors which went unnoticed or omitted by the teachers and learner peers, and a low number of CF moves to address them during the interactions at the three proficiency levels. The perceptual data suggests that the teachers' and learners' beliefs about CF are conflicting and important perceptual factors that heavily influenced the provision of CF.

Results of interactional data

The findings of the interactional data are summarised in tables, and are presented by kind of interaction (TLI or PI) at each proficiency level. The first two tables show the number of errors per minute and ratios of CF moves at the basic level:

Table 3. Number of errors and CF moves during TLIs at basic level

		TLI 1	TLI 2	TLI 3	TLI 4	TLI 5
	Time of activity	1 min 24 s	5 min 20 s	7 min 20 s	5 min 13 s	2 min 45 s
Frequencies	**Clarification request**	1.3	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.3
	Repetition	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.3
	Recast	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3
	CF moves per minute	1.3	0.4	0.2	0.9	0.9
	Errors per minute	2.0	0.5	0.2	0.5	1.8

Table 3 shows that the number of CF moves per minute tends to be low compared to the number of errors per minute that the basic learners committed during the five TLIs. It can also be seen in this table that there is a trend towards clarification requests, ranging from 0.1 to 1.3 clarification requests per minute. However, in some TLIs, there is an absence of some moves. For example, in TLIs 1 and 3, there is a lack of repetitions. In the case of TLIs 1, 2 and 4, there is omission of recasts. It was only during TLIs 2-4 that the basic teacher and learners attended to all the errors. However, as we will see in the remainder of

this section, the interactional data indicate that there was a high number of errors which were unnoticed or omitted, but a considerable scarcity of CF moves during the TLIs and PIs at the intermediate and advanced levels. This was also the case of the basic PIs:

Table 4. Number of errors and CF moves during PIs at basic level

		PI 1	PI 2	PI 3	PI 4	PI 5	PI 6
	Time of activity	3 min 20 s	5 min 47 s	2 min 53 s	9 min 03 s	9 min 03 s	9 min 03 s
Frequencies	**Clarification request**	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.5	0.7	0.6
	Repetition	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Recast	0.0	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.1	0.0
	CF moves per minute	0.6	1.2	1.4	1.9	0.8	0.6
	Errors per minute	3.6	3.4	3.2	2.5	1.6	1.0

As in the TLIs, Table 4 shows that there is a high proportion of errors per minute to which a low amount of CF was provided, as indicated by the CF moves per minute during these interactions led by learner peers. For example, during PI 1, 3.6 errors per minute were committed, but only 0.6 clarification requests per minute were initiated to address them. Moreover, there is a tendency towards a greater number of clarification requests (a range of 0.6 to 1.5 clarification requests per minute) than repetitions and recasts. It can also be seen from this table that there is a scarcity of repetitions, and a tendency of recasts in some PIs (PIs 2-5).

Similar to the TLIs and PIs at the basic level, Tables 5 and 6 show that despite a high number of errors, there was a considerable scarcity of some CF moves across the intermediate interactions.

Table 5. Number of errors and CF moves during TLIs at intermediate level

		TLI 1	TLI 2	TLI 3	TLI 4
	Time of activity	6 min 16 s	7 min 20 s	12 min 55 s	5 min 21 s
Frequencies	**Clarification request**	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.7
	Repetition	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Recast	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0
	CF moves per minute	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.7
	Errors per minute	2.4	1.7	2.0	2.4

In Table 5, it is evident that the number of CF moves per minute is lower than the number of errors per minute, indicating again that there was a high number of errors which were omitted by the intermediate teacher and learners. This table also shows that there is a low proportion of CF moves across the intermediate TLIs, with a clear tendency towards clarification requests. In the case of the PIs, the data indicates a greater scarcity of CF moves than in the TLIs:

Table 6. Number of errors and CF moves during PIs at intermediate level

		PI 1	PI 2	PI 3	PI 4	PI 5	PI 6
	Time of activity	8 min 31 s	8 min 31 s	8 min 31 s	13 min 02 s	13 min 02 s	13 min 02 s
Frequencies	**Clarification Request**	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.07	0.1	0.3
	Repetition	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Recast	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.07	0.0
	CF moves per minute	0.6	0.1	0.0	0.07	0.2	0.3
	Errors per minute	5.1	3.0	4.5	2.6	1.0	2.2

As in previous interactions, Table 6 indicates that there is a low number of CF moves compared to the number of errors that were committed during these learner-led discussions. Due to the high number of errors during these and previous teacher- and learner-led interactions, it seems possible that there are more pressing factors that compel these teachers and learners to avoid providing CF during the interactions despite the high number of errors. It can also be seen in Table 6 that there was a low number of CF moves per minute across the six PIs. Again, clarification requests tended to be initiated more than repetitions and recasts.

The following table shows the absence of errors and therefore the initiation of CF moves at the advanced TLIs:

Table 7. Number of errors and CF moves during TLIs at advanced level

		TLI 1	TLI 2
	Time of activity	1 min 50 s	5 min 40 s
Frequencies	**Clarification Request**	0.0	0.0
	Repetition	0.0	0.0
	Recast	0.0	0.0
	CF moves per minute	0.0	0.0
	Errors per minute	0.0	0.0

In exploring these two TLIs, it was possible to observe the lack of learners' opportunities to contribute to the classroom discourse with freer and more elaborate utterances. It was the teacher who controlled these interactions; learners only had opportunities to respond to the teacher's elicitations centred on grammar practice. This lack of opportunities to contribute to the classroom discourse with more creative utterances may explain the absence of errors and thus CF moves. This suggestion is supported by the advanced PIs, during which learners were responsible of the discourse, and had more opportunities to experiment with the language, having perhaps an impact on the number of errors that they committed.

Table 8. Number of errors and CF moves during PIs at advanced level

		PI 1	PI 2	PI 3	PI 4	PI 5	PI 6
	Time of activity	11 min 42 s	11 min 42 s	11 min 42 s	6 min 20 s	6 min 20 s	6 min 20 s
Frequencies	**Clarification Request**	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.4
	Repetition	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Recast	0.0	0.2	0.08	0.0	0.0	0.0
	CF moves per minute	0.1	0.4	0.08	0.3	0.1	0.4
	Errors per minute	7.7	7.6	4.8	1.4	1.7	2.8

As shown in Table 8, there is a considerable amount of errors for which a limited number of CF moves was initiated. For example, 7.7 and 7.6 errors per minute were committed during PIs 1 and 2, respectively, but only 0.1 and 0.5 CF moves per minute were initiated to attend to these errors. As at previous proficiency levels, the advanced learners during these interactions opted to initiate clarification requests.

Overall, the above interactional data firstly showed a high proportion of errors which was not attended. In other words, there was a high number of errors which went unnoticed or avoided by the teachers and learner peers. The issue that emerges from this evidence is that the learners had fewer opportunities to notice erroneous utterances and thus push their oral production to be more accurate and comprehensible.

The data also indicated that there was a varied, but low number of CF moves initiated by the teachers and learner peers across the interactions at the three proficiency levels. Among the CF moves, it was clarification requests which tended to be initiated. It is possible that the teachers and learner peers relied more on clarification requests than repetitions and recasts because clarification requests were used as moves which provided CF but in an indirect way. That is, when an

error was committed, the teachers and learner peers tended to initiate elicitations to signal that there was the presence of an erroneous utterance, but without modifying or correcting the utterance as in the case of repetitions and recasts.

It seems possible that there are more pressing concerns or factors that compelled these teachers and learners not to initiate CF moves to attend to the high number of errors. Particularly, the teachers' and learners' beliefs as important perceptual factors may reveal the motivation behind this avoidance strategy, and possible ways through which the teachers and learners can be assisted in providing CF and thus benefitting from greater opportunities to develop the target language. The following section attempts to address this.

Teachers' and learners' beliefs about CF

During the teacher interviews and learner focus groups, various points concerning CF were suggested by the participant teachers and learners. In general, the three teachers claimed that they embrace the value of CF as a strategy for teaching and learning the target language, for example:

Extract 1 Quote by María (basic level)

"It [CF] may be significant for them, like having an alarm to correct. Then, they can produce the same sentence and if they make the same mistake, they will be able to correct it."

Extract 2 Quote by Tanya (intermediate level)

"It is a matter of giving you my [corrective] feedback so that you in the future see which one is the standard. Then, making for the whole class, you realise that the learners are aware and say: 'I can use this in this situation, and the other in another situation' and all the class benefits from this [feedback]."

Maria's and Tanya's statements clearly reveal their positive attitudes towards providing CF during classroom interactions. These statements also indicate perceived benefits for learners' self-corrections. Interestingly, they perceived that CF was beneficial not only for the learners to whom corrections are directed, but also to the whole class

(for a discussion about this, see Havranek, 2002; Muranoi, 2000). The 15 learners during the focus groups also suggested responses which reveal positive attitudes towards providing and receiving CF. For example, Learner 5 (basic level) said: "I think it is good that she corrects us."

However, the responses of the three teachers, one learner at the basic level and the five learners at the advanced level suggested that CF was scarce or absent during classroom interactions, as borne out by the interactional data. For example, in "we need that the teacher starts to correct us," Learner 1's (basic level) suggestion points to a perceived scarcity of CF during the classroom discussions. This perceived scarcity is corroborated by Aranza's statement: "I seldom correct while they are speaking, […] I rarely correct them during classroom discussions." The teachers' responses point to one main reason that motivated this avoidance:

Extract 3 Quote by Aranza (advanced level)

"Maybe they are fluent but with many mistakes. Thus, I have decided not to correct them so as not to affect"

Extract 4 Quote by Tanya (intermediate level)

"It is give them something positive, something not very positive and not tell them that their speaking was wrong, you may inhibit them and you could spoil the interactions."

Aranza's and Tanya's statements suggest the feeling that correcting learners' oral mistakes inhibited them from speaking, as indicated in "not tell them that their speaking was wrong, you may inhibit them, and you could spoil the interactions." The feeling that CF inhibited learners from interacting was shared by the learners during the focus groups, for example:

Extract 5 Quote by Learner 4 (advanced level)

"Some people may feel pressed while talking to the teacher for fear of being corrected or something like that."

Again, Learner 4's statement suggests a feeling that CF had a negative impact on learners. It thus appears that the teachers' and learners' beliefs about CF were conflicting. That is, the teachers' and learners' beliefs about the importance of CF appear to have conflicted with their beliefs about negative effects of it on learners' oral production, as suggested in Aranza's statement: "it is funny because everybody agrees to be corrected, but when you do correct them, they [learners] don't like it that much." As indicated in "I have decided not to correct them so as not to affect [speaking]" (Aranza, Extract 3), it seems that these conflicting beliefs influenced Aranza's teaching decisions not to correct learners' oral mistakes. The other two teachers' responses also suggest teaching decisions influenced by these conflicting beliefs:

Extract 6 Quote by Tanya (intermediate level)

"They perceive it negatively and take it personal, like exposing them. There are people who take it (corrections) personal […] you need to find like tactics, it is a delicate topic."

Tanya's explanation again points to a perception that CF had negative effects on learners, even at a personal level. As suggested in "you need to find like tactics, it is a delicate topic," we see a perception that the conflicting beliefs around CF influenced her teaching decisions. The following two extracts suggest how the teachers' and learners' conflicting beliefs around CF influenced the basic and intermediate teachers' teaching and interactional behaviour:

Extract 7 Quote by María (basic level)

"Depending on the intimacy for them to express, interact and tell them at the end [of the classroom discussion] where they were wrong."

Extract 8 Quote by Tanya (intermediate level)

"The provision of feedback is personalised and without other learners […] Then, you have the freedom to tell them their mistakes and advise them." "[…] I now do it in a personalised way so as to avoid peer criticisms."

As suggested in María's and Tanya's statements, we again see beliefs that CF was perceived as face-threatening (as implied in "depending on the intimacy for them to express"), and had a negative impact on learners (as indicated in "I now do it in a personalised way so as to avoid peer criticisms"). These beliefs appear to have influenced the teachers' teaching decisions to avoid providing CF during the classroom discussions, as indicated in "I now do it in a personalised way" and "tell them at the end [of the classroom discussions] where they were wrong."

Discussions

In exploring the interactional data, it was found that there was a high number of errors that were unnoticed or omitted by both the teachers and learner peers during the classroom interactions. The number of CF moves was considerable low during the discussions led by the teachers and learner peers across the three proficiency levels. Among the three CF moves explored in this study, it was clarification requests which the teachers and learners tended to initiate during the discussions. The study was unable to determine the extent to which these CF moves were effective in providing feedback which leads to uptake. However, we put forward the argument that the teachers and learners decided to initiate mostly clarification requests since they involve less face-threatening interactional work which, implicitly, encourage learners to reshape their own erroneous or unclear utterances. It is possible that the other two CF moves were perceived by the teachers and learner peers as face-threatening moves.

Based upon the evidence that CF moves were scarce during classroom discussions, the study found that the teachers' and learners' beliefs about CF were conflicting. That is, the teachers and learners valued the role of CF, but it was perceived by both teachers and learners to inhibit learners and thus limit their oral production. This thus implies that providing information concerning the correctness of learners' utterances and thus push them towards greater accuracy may have been perceived as face-threatening or as a sign of incompetence to speak the target language. This is in accord with Cathcart & Olsen (1976) and Allwright & Bailey (1991), who also found classroom perceptions of oral corrections as face-threatening, despite the fact that learners claimed to value them (Cathcart & Olsen, 1976). However, the findings of this study suggest that it was actually the teachers' and learners' conflicting beliefs about CF which influenced teachers' and learners' behaviour, resulting in an avoidance strategy to save the learners' face.

Based on the above interactional and perceptual data, and in addressing RQ3 (i.e., what can be learned from RQs 1 and 2 in order to enhance the provision of corrective feedback?), it thus seems that the frequency and effectiveness of CF and its moves reside not only in teachers' and learners' value of them as opportunities which promote language learning, but also in their willingness to provide and receive strategic and supportive language data concerning the correctness of their utterances and thus promote others' language development. Drawing on the evidence that the teachers and learners of the study were able to reflect on their teaching, learning and interactional behaviour during classroom discussions, it may seem possible that this reflection ability may be directed towards the socio-affective climate between teachers and learners and learner peers, and the ways through which they can be encouraged to develop a positive attitude and behaviour towards initiating and receiving CF. This suggestion is supported by Naughton (2006), who contends that the most relevant classroom discussions to interlanguage development is that in which teachers and learners share a need and desire to understand each other, and learn from them. As suggested by Naughton (2006), classroom discussions can be exploited through a classroom climate in which challenging or modifying others' utterances is not social taboo. Under these conflicting circumstances, Yang and Kim (2011) raise the need to align teachers' and learners' beliefs with interactional behaviour that is more effective for classroom practices. In line with this, Yoshida (2013) contends that teachers and learners can be assisted in breaking away from classroom behaviour influenced by their conflicting beliefs in order to promote the development and appropriation of new beliefs consistent with more effective teaching and learning practices. We might thus explore the possibility that opportunities to provide CF can be enhanced if teachers and learners are assisted in mediating their beliefs and other cognitive factors through awareness-raising processes (e.g., advice from tutors on more effective interactional behaviour, or reflective procedures) (see, for example, Navarro & Thornton, 2011; Yang & Kim, 2011; Yoshida, 2013). These processes can assist them in raising an awareness of the interplay between actions and beliefs, resulting in co-constructed beliefs which have a beneficial impact on the socio-affective climate of classrooms and teachers' and learners' interactional behaviour (Li & Lian, 2012; Yang & Kim, 2011; Yoshida, 2013), in this case, opportunities to provide and receive CF in both TLIs and PIs.

In the language classroom, teachers need not abandon the provision of CF; its use during classroom interactions maximises learners' opportunities to be exposed to information concerning the

accuracy of their utterances (Rassaei, 2014). Teachers should make a conscious use of feedback in relation to the pedagogic goal of the moment (Tsui, 1995; Walsh, 2013). That is, teachers need to be aware of the effects of these moves, and use them depending on the aim of the teaching practice. In order to avoid learners' loss of face, Rassaei (2014) suggests that the provision of CF needs to be performed collaboratively, in a way that encourages learners to produce language and assists them in negotiating and solving their erroneous utterances.

Conclusions and further research

The primary aim of the present study was to explore the interplay between the amount of CF and teacher and learner beliefs around this corrective language data. The study resided in a naturalistic as well as exploratory enquiry in order to understand better teaching and learning practices without controlling classroom variables.

The study firstly found that the amount of CF, indicated by clarification requests, repetitions and recasts, was scarce or absent during the classroom discussions led by the teachers and learner peers, despite the high number of errors that were identified in the interactional data. In an attempt to understand this avoidance, the study found that the teachers' and learners' beliefs concerning CF were conflicting, and influential on teaching behaviour by avoiding these moves perceived by the teachers and learners as face-threatening. Based on this evidence, the study puts forward the argument that in cases of low amount of CF, teachers' and researchers' attention should be directed towards the socio-affective climate in the language classroom where CF is seen not only as beneficial, but also as necessary to promote learners' interlanguage development.

As in any exploratory study, further research should be conducted in order to generalise from the findings of this study. Research should explore the interplay between the nature of CF and the influence of teachers' and learners' beliefs in teaching practices with several aims. It would be interesting to know whether awareness-raising processes have a beneficial impact on the amount and quality of CF during classroom interactions. However, it is hoped that this study is useful for teachers and learners who endorse CF and its moved, but struggle to initiate them during classroom discourse.

References

Allwright, D. & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language learner.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braidi, S. M. (2002). Reexamining the role of recasts in native-speaker/nonnative-speaker interactions. *Language Learning,* 52, 1-42

Cathcart, R. L. & Olsen J. W. B. (1976). Teachers' and students' preferences for correction of classroom conversation errors. In J. F. Fanselow & R. H. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '76*, 41-45. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & Z. Dornyei (Eds.), *Themes in SLA Research.* AILA, 19, 18-41. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ellis, R. (2009). CF and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1, 3-18.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2005). Implicit and explicit CF and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 339-368.

García Mayo, M. P. & Pica, T. (2000). L2 learner interaction in a foreign language setting: Are learning needs addressed? IRAL: *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 38*(1), 35-58.

Gibbs, A. (1997). Focus Groups. *Social Research Update, 19*, Winter, Department of Sociology, University of Surrey. Retrieved January 12, 2016, from http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU19.html

Havranek, G. (2002). When is negative feedback likely to succeed? *International Journal of Educational Research, 37*(3–4), 255–270.

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern Language Journal, 62*, 387-398.

Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. H. (1991). *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research.* London: Pearson.

Li, S., & Liang, W. (2012). The dynamic nature of learner beliefs: the relationship between beliefs about EFL learning and proficiency in a Chinese context. *System, 14*(1), 177-211.

Lillis, T. M. (2008). Ethnography as Method, Methodology, and "Deep Theorizing": Closing the Gap between Text and Context in Academic Writing Research. Written Communication, 25(3), 353–388.

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

Long, M. H. (1980). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, UCLA, Department of Applied Linguistics and TESL.

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 26, 399-432.

Martínez-Flor, A. (1999). *Does Language Learners Benefit from Classroom Interaction?* Jornades de Foment de la Investigació, Universitat Jaume I.

McDonough, K. (2004). Learner-learner interaction during pair and small group activities in a Thai EFL context. *System, 32*(2), 207–224.

Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on form through interaction enhancement: Integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classrooms. *Language Learning, 50*(4): 617–673.

Naughton, D. (2006). Cooperative strategy training and oral interaction: Enhancing small group communication in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal,* 90, 169-184.

Navarro, D. & Thornton, K. (2011). Investigating the relationship between belief and action in self-directed language learning. *System, 39*(3), 290–301.

Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning 51*(4): 719.758.

Philp, J. & Tognini, R. (2009). Language acquisition in foreign language contexts and the differential benefits of interaction. *IRAL, 47*(3/4): 245–66.

Rassaei, E. (2014). Scaffolded feedback, recasts, and L2 development: A sociocultural perspective. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*, 417–431.

Russell, V. (2009). Corrective feedback, over a decade of research since Lyster and Ranta (1997): Where do we stand today? Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching 6(1): 21-31.

Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition 32*(2): 203-234.

Snape, D. & Spencer, L. (2003). The foundations of qualitative research. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice. A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 1–23). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Swain, M. & Suzuki, W. (2008). Interaction, output, and communicative language learning. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 557–568). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Tedick, D. & de Gortari, B. (1998). Research on error correction and implications for classroom teaching. *The ACIE Newsletter,* 1(3).

Tsui, A. B. M. (1995). *Introducing classroom interaction.* London: Penguin English.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse.* London: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: language in action.* London: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wesely, P. (2012). Learner attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs in language learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*(S1), 98-117.

Yang, J. S. & Kim, T.Y. (2011). Sociocultural analysis of second language learner beliefs: A qualitative case study of two study-abroad ESL learners. *System, 39*(3), 325–334.

Yoshida, R. (2013). Conflict between learners' beliefs and actions: Speaking in the classroom. *Language Awareness, 22*(4), 371-388.

Authors

***Edgar Emmanuell García** holds an MA in Applied Linguistics (UAEMex, Mexico), and a PhD in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (University of Birmingham, UK). His research interests are centred on the interplay between classroom interactions and teacher and learner beliefs. He currently teaches in BA in TESOL and MA in Applied Linguistics of English Language Teaching at the Departamento de Lenguas, Universidad de Guanajuato.

Irasema Mora Pablo holds an MA in Applied Linguistics (Universidad de las Américas-Puebla) and a PhD in Applied Linguistics (University of Kent, UK). She coordinates the the Master's in Applied Linguistics of English Language Teaching at the Universidad de Guanajuato. She is a member of the National System of Researchers (Sistema Nacional de Investigadores) and her research interests are bilingual studies, identity and nativespeakerism.