Teachers' Beliefs and Corrective Feedback

Reiko Mori
Kagoshima Prefectural College

Recent corrective feedback research has usually examined the effect of corrective feedback on students' linguistic outcomes. The present study proposes to expand the scope of this inquiry to include teachers as well as students. Using qualitative data, this paper examines the beliefs that appeared to be at work in two ESL teachers' corrective feedback behavior. By investigating how their beliefs are related to their corrective feedback behavior, this author contends that a more careful look at teacher corrective feedback that takes into consideration teachers' perspectives on how they utilize corrective feedback in their overall instructional scheme and what they hope to accomplish by it is warranted.

　最近の間違いの直し方に関する研究では、その直し方が学習者の言語学習にどのような影響を及ぼすかについて調査したものが多い。本稿は学習者だけではなく、教師もその研究に含めることを提案する。質的データ（授業観察、面接、手紙、ビデオテープなど）に基づいて、二人のESL教師の信念が、間違いの直し方にどのように関係しているかを考察し、信念がどのように間違いの直し方に結びついているかを明らかにすることにより、間違いの直し方を教え方全体に対してはどのように位置づけるか、あるいはそのような行為で何を成し遂げたいのかという教師の視点を研究に盛り込むことの重要性を説く。そのようにして初めて間違い直しの過程をより正確に理解できるようになるであろう。

Research in general education has substantiated the fact that what teachers bring into the classroom in the form of beliefs, principles, and assumptions is central to the comprehension of what happens in the classroom (e.g., Calderhead, 1988; Clandinin, 1985; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Elbaz, 1981). In recent years, this line of inquiry has also emerged in the field of TESOL, where researchers have investigated ESL teachers' beliefs regarding their practice in general (e.g., Almarza,

1996; Golombek, 1998; Johnson, 1994, 1999; Woods, 1996) and specific aspects of teaching such as grammar teaching (Borg, 1998; Johnston & Goettsch, 2000), literacy instruction (Johnson, 1992), and decision-making processes (Johnson, 1992; Smith, 1996). By exploring the teachers' side of the stories from the inside out, this line of inquiry has added richness and depth to the already existing research, in which teachers have tended to be left out as a variable.

Among many areas that have not yet been addressed in this growing research domain is the effect that teachers' beliefs exert on corrective feedback. This is an important area especially since the provision of corrective feedback is often considered to be "the primary role of language teachers" (Chaudron, 1988, p. 132). An examination of the cognitive foundations that inform teachers' practices may contribute to a more complete understanding of corrective feedback processes.

Corrective feedback research as initially conducted two decades ago primarily described how teachers provide feedback to students and what options are available to teachers when correcting errors (e.g., Allwright, 1975; Chaudron, 1977, 1986; Day, Chenoweth, Chun, & Luppescu, 1984; Fanselow, 1977; Gaskill, 1980; Long, 1977; Nystrom, 1983). The focus of exploration has shifted since then, and recent corrective feedback studies have usually examined the relationship between teachers' corrective feedback behavior and its effects on students' linguistic outcomes (e.g., Carroll & Swain, 1993; Carroll, Swain, & Roberge, 1992; Doughty & Varela, 1998; Lyster, 1998, 2001; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Spada & Lightbown, 1993; Tomasello & Herron, 1988, 1989).

Among the subsets of inquiry developed two decades ago was teachers' reasoning behind their corrective feedback behavior. Some of the above researchers suggested investigations into teachers' "reasons" (Chaudron, 1986) and "rationale" (Fanselow, 1977) for the priorities they have for corrective feedback, their "attitude" (Nystrom, 1983) towards corrective feedback, and their "awareness," "beliefs," and "perception" (Long, 1977) with regard to various factors involved in corrective feedback, such as the objectives of a lesson and program requirements and the likely outcome of corrective feedback. Especially notable were Chaudon's (1986) and Nystrom's (1983) efforts to gain insight into teachers' reasoning as to why they provide corrective feedback the way they do. These studies were carried out with the hope of enhancing student L2 development in immersion programs (Chaudron, 1986) and to illustrate the interplay among variables that teachers introduce into the classroom when they provide corrective feedback (Nystrom, 1983). Thus, earlier researchers anticipated teachers' beliefs to be a worthy area of inquiry in order to better understand teacher corrective feed-

back behavior and ultimately apply findings to teaching and learning. Unfortunately, however, this line of research has not been pursued.

The study reported here resumes the above research and examines the beliefs that appear to be at work behind two ESL teachers' corrective feedback. Specifically, it aims to examine what beliefs the teachers possess regarding classroom interaction and how they are reflected in their provision of corrective feedback. Thus, it examines not the effects of corrective feedback on students' linguistic outcomes, but the relationship between the teachers' beliefs and the corrective feedback that they provide. By investigating how teacher beliefs are related to corrective feedback, the author contends that a more careful look at teacher corrective feedback behavior is warranted, one that takes into consideration teachers' perspectives on how they utilize corrective feedback in their overall instructional scheme and what they hope to accomplish by it. The author will first delineate the method used in the data collection and analysis and then analyze the participating teachers' beliefs, their corrective feedback behavior, and the relationship between the two. Finally, I will discuss conclusions and future directions for corrective feedback and teacher belief research.

Method

The data come from a larger qualitative study conducted in the United States in which two ESL teachers' beliefs regarding classroom interaction were examined for two semesters. The present study is a secondary analysis of the above data. One lesson for each teacher was selected for detailed analysis. The selection was based on how well the lesson appeared to represent the teacher's beliefs (identified over the entire academic year) and how discernable the influence of these beliefs on corrective feedback seemed.

Participants

Jean (pseudonym) had been teaching ESL for almost 40 years, and Charles (pseudonym) had been teaching for about 10 years. The data collection was conducted at a two-year college with Jean and at a large university with Charles.

Procedures

The sources of data include: (a) nonparticipant observations of classroom instruction and field notes; (b) interviews; (c) letters from the researcher addressed to the teachers and follow-up interviews about

the letters; (d) a videotape of a lesson and a follow-up interview about it; and (e) documents such as handouts and ESL newspapers.

Observations and Field Notes

The author observed classes three times a week for Jean (43 observations over 17 weeks) and twice a week for Charles (27 observations over 16 weeks). During the observations, written notes were taken. Immediately upon completing each observation, more detailed field notes were constructed.

Interviews

Loosely structured interviews were conducted as soon as the teachers had free time for them. In order to gather as much information as possible concerning their beliefs about classroom interaction, all of the interviews were audiotaped and an "interview log" recommended by Merriam (1988) was constructed from the interviews. In the log, the propositional content of each interview was coded, and the corresponding tape positions were recorded.

Letter Interviews

At the end of each semester, the researcher sent an informal letter to each teacher with tentative interpretations of their beliefs about classroom interaction and of their teaching practice in general. After they had been given sufficient time to formulate their reactions to the letter, an open-ended interview was conducted in which each teacher's and my own interpretations about their teaching practice and beliefs about classroom interaction were discussed. This step was performed as a "member check" recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985), in order to determine whether my interpretations actually reflected the two teachers' perspectives. This data collection procedure was adapted from Clandinin (1985). The entire interview was audiotaped and transcribed.

Videotape Interviews

Three lessons were videotaped for each teacher, once toward the end of the first semester and twice in the middle of the second semester with two-to-three-week intervals between videotapings. After each taping, an interview was conducted in which the teachers were asked to point out any segments in the videotape that they thought illustrated the beliefs that they had been discussing. The interviews were audiotaped

and a log was kept. The purpose of this procedure was to watch the interaction from the teachers' perspectives and to gain more access to what they considered to be good interaction.

Documents

Class handouts and an ESL newspaper were collected to complement other data.

The Lessons

For Jean, a lesson from a high-elementary reading and speaking class is examined in this paper, since the influence of her beliefs on her corrective feedback behavior seemed to be clearly manifested there. In this lesson, Jean gave a whole-class oral competence and reading comprehension test, which, in effect, was a discussion about the readings that the students had done. She took the following steps to prepare and administer the discussion/test. Prior to the discussion/test, Jean assigned the students to read three articles she had chosen from a four-page ESL newspaper. On the day of the discussion/test, 18 students attended the class. Jean first distributed question sheets, and the students formed groups and brainstormed answers to the questions with one another. The students then sat around a table on which a tape recorder was placed. The basic format of the discussion/test involved the following: Jean read the questions and the students raised their hands or simply spoke up. Jean called out the names of those who indicated their willingness to answer the questions so that their names would be recorded onto the audiotape. Then she nominated a student who then answered. When the discussion/test was completed, Jean graded the students based on the number of times their names were recorded.

For Charles, a lesson from an elementary class will be examined in detail here since his beliefs about corrective feedback seemed to be more clearly delineated in this lesson. While Charles had his 14 students carry out several tasks in this lesson, two tasks are particularly relevant for the current study in that they reflected some of his beliefs, and most of the corrective feedback occurred during these tasks. One is a whole-class corrective feedback based on sentences the students had previously produced. The other was a question formation review exercise. In this exercise, Charles had prepared a transparency on which answers were printed and the question portions were left blank. He formed groups of three or four students and gave a transparency to each group. He then explained that it was an interview, and that the students needed to provide the missing direct questions. During this activity, the

students were left alone with Charles occasionally making procedural announcements. At the end of the activity, he explicitly corrected errors as he showed each transparency to the class.

Classifying Corrective Feedback

In order to gain a general picture of their corrective feedback in the lessons, the participating teachers' feedback turns following the students' errors were classified into five types. Corrective feedback was defined as instances in which the teachers explicitly or implicitly provided pedagogical feedback as to the well-formedness of the students' utterances. In other words, corrective feedback was considered a "didactic" teaching strategy (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 41) rather than a communication strategy. Therefore, the teachers' feedback turns immediately after communication breakdowns were not counted as corrective feedback. This was because the teachers' focus appeared to be on the message the students were trying to convey, and the communicative function of these turns seemed to override the corrective function.

The five corrective feedback types were explicit correction, recasts, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and translation. All the teacher turns containing corrective feedback were classified according to their corrective functions defined in Table 1. When multiple corrective feedback types were identified in one turn, all the types were counted. The distribution of the corrective feedback types for each teacher is displayed in Table 2.

Table 1: Definitions of the Feedback Types

Feedback Types	Definitions
Explicit Correction	The teacher supplies the correct linguistic form.
Recast	The teacher implicitly reformulates all or part
of a	student's utterance, minus the error.
Metalinguistic Feedback	The teacher indicates that there is an error made in
the	student's utterance and provides
directions as to how to	repair it using
metalinguistic language such as "Take	one
word off."	
Elicitation	The teacher attempts to have the student
provide the	correct answer by

where everything such as the curriculum, the teacher's decision making, the instruction, and the student learning converge, as Ellis (1994) points out. Classroom interaction, thus, touches many different issues to which the two teachers could easily digress.

It seemed, therefore, that discarding those parts of the data that were only indirectly related to classroom interaction would result in an incomplete way of representing the two teachers' beliefs and how these beliefs exist in their inner worlds. Thus, the decision was made to retain and analyze both types of data.

Jean's Beliefs and Her Feedback Behavior

Jean's Beliefs

Of all the topics Jean raised regarding her beliefs about classroom interaction, Aesthetic Realism, a philosophy that she had been studying for 35 years, was probably the most influential for her. It touched upon many of the issues Jean discussed in the interviews, as it gave coherence and a deep philosophical meaning to her existence. Some of the principles of Aesthetic Realism mentioned included "to like the world," "seeing the world as well-structured," "seeing the world in terms of opposites," and "good will, tolerance, and respect among people."

Among all the principles of Aesthetic Realism, "to like the world" was the most fundamental for Jean. It is epitomized in a key sentence derived from the originator of Aesthetic Realism, which she mentioned in her course description each semester: The purpose of education is to like the world through knowing it. Jean stated in the interviews that a way to like the world is to see the world as well-structured. She believed that the students would eventually become autonomous learners when they saw a structure in the English language. This was because English would seem more "friendly" if perceived as well-structured, and when it seems "friendly," the students would be more likely to embrace English as their own language (Interview #12).

One way to see the world as well-structured, according to Jean, was to see it in terms of opposites. When two opposites are in a dynamic relationship, it is most "pleasing" and ideal (Interview #30). In the interviews, Jean discussed how the world is structured in terms of opposites with examples from English grammar and phonology. She talked about tense and lax vowels, past and nonpast, and singular and plural. For Jean, singular and plural, for instance, were not "just grammar abstractions" but what the world is, because the world is one and many. Jean believed, as far as her writing classes were concerned, that every lesson should be carefully planned to teach that English grammar represents

what the world is. When that goal is achieved, the students will see that the outside world makes sense and looks friendlier.

Other Aesthetic Realism principles Jean referred to were good will, tolerance, and respect among students. These seemed to be related to the liking of the world in that they can contribute to the development of a congenial atmosphere among the students. Jean mentioned that the supportive relationship among the students made it easier for her to give more control to the students over their own learning, creating a more student-centered class.

In short, Jean's interpretation of these principles all pointed to one major educational belief she professed: student autonomy. Jean believed that every lesson should be student-centered, and that she was there to facilitate their learning as a resource person. Therefore, she welcomed it when the students took the initiative and asked her questions or voiced their opinions. In the following segment, reflecting on the part of the day's lesson where she had one student (Milton) write his short composition on the board, Jean observed:

Excerpt 1

I was happy, because I saw the students taking over more. People were busily correcting Milton, dictating to him, telling him how to spell. I thought that was good communication among them. I said, "This is where I want to be. This is what makes me happy." I'm leaning on the door, and they're communicating among themselves. That's where the class should be (Interview #4).

Jean's notion of student-centeredness appeared to refer to moments when the students transcended whatever structure she herself had superimposed on a task and started spontaneous interaction on their own. Therefore, she was always looking for ways to induce those situations. Inviting visitors or taking the students outside and letting them hold real conversations were some of the ways she chose to maintain student-centeredness. The whole-class oral competence and reading comprehension discussion/test, selected for a detailed analysis in the present study and described below, was another way. She believed that when the challenge was linguistically at the right level for the students, and especially when they could get intrinsically interesting information from native speakers, the interaction that was generated could be quite good.

In the interview about the discussion/test, Jean mentioned that the assessment of the students in this task did not depend on their language ability or recall of facts, but on how many times they volunteered to

speak. Therefore, how fluent, accurate, or elaborate their English was did not matter as far as this discussion/test was concerned.[2] Generally speaking, Jean's beliefs about a speaking class, of which the present class was an example, was that the focus of each lesson should not be on the form, but on the content of what the students say. In other words, although linguistic accuracy was valued in her overall classroom practice, the quality of the students' English did not matter as much as the message they conveyed and their willingness to participate in oral activities. Therefore, her criterion for issuing a grade for the discussion/test was consistent with her beliefs about a speaking class in general.

Jean stated in the interview that the lesson sounded "more like a conversation" as opposed to a lesson or a test. Watching a videotape of the discussion/test, she said:

Excerpt 2

The people are sitting around, talking, thinking, sometimes calling out. I'm not saying an American classroom is the ideal. No. On the contrary. But...there are many people in this class who want to be fully integrated into American classrooms. So if they feel this way in an American classroom, they're better off, where they can raise their hands, where they can call out, where they can say, "But, Jean, what do you think about...." I think that's great. And someone did ask me my opinion... But it is nice that they are treating me as a participant rather than the manager (Interview #31; italics added).

Here, Jean acknowledged that she wanted to be treated by the students as "a participant rather than the manager" of the discussion/test. She wanted to create real communication in her classroom by playing the role of a participant. The reason for that, Jean explained, was that she wanted the students to learn American classroom interaction strategies (i.e., rais[ing] their hands, call[ing]out, and ask[ing the teacher her] opinion) instead of waiting to be called upon by the teacher. Thus, playing the role of a participant appeared to be related to Jean's belief that students needed to learn American classroom behavior such as "volunteering" and "expressing opinions" if they wanted to be fully integrated into a mainstream classroom.

The way Jean structured the discussion/test is also indicative of some of her beliefs about classroom interaction. Her emphasis on the importance of student-initiated interaction is reflected in the way she structured the discussion as a test. She installed a mechanism in the discussion by which to train the students to move towards more autonomy with the hope that they would eventually volunteer to participate with-

out the pressure of a test. Jean also fostered a supportive atmosphere among the students instead of pitting them against each other. She not only structured the discussion/test in such a way that the students could assist one another, but she also articulated the importance of helping one another during the discussion/test.

Thus, some of Jean's beliefs were put into practice through the conceptualization and implementation of the discussion/test. She believed in student autonomy, student-centered and student-initiated classroom interaction and learning, emotionally charged interaction among the students, the focus placed on the students' messages in a speaking class, supportive relationships among the students, and the acquisition of American classroom behavior to an extent the students felt comfortable with.

Jean's Corrective Feedback Behavior

Table 2 demonstrates the overall corrective feedback pattern that she exhibited during the discussion/test. Although she occasionally gave fairly overt corrective feedback (i.e., elicitation) on grammatical, phonological, and lexical errors (17% of the feedback Jean gave in the lesson), the feedback she usually gave was recasts (71%). That is, the correction was covertly done without explicitly drawing the students' attention to the errors committed.

As for the purpose of recasts, it was often difficult to determine whether Jean was genuinely reacting to the students' utterances as a participant in the discussion, or whether she had pedagogical purposes beneath her friendly reactions. Therefore, it was decided to analyze recasts from both viewpoints. Excerpt 3 below demonstrates how the functions of recasts seemed to vary. Here, Beth was talking about her grandfather, who started smoking at a young age. Turns with corrective feedback are indicated with an asterisk.

	Excerpt 3		
	1	Beth:	He::s ((pause)) the he:: ((pause))
	2	Jean:	((pretends to smoke))
	3	Ss:	Hhh ((smile))
	4	Beth:	=he:: smoke=
*	5	Jean:	He smokes?
	6	Beth:	=from: you young.
*	7	Jean:	He smokes from from when he was young?
	8	Beth:	No, no, no, not young. A:: what is the

((pause))   maybe:: eighteen.

     9   Jean: That's young.

     10 S?:   Very young.

*   11 Jean: He smokes from: he he he started smoking when
                      he was young.

     12 Beth: He never stopped.

Three sentences (lines 5, 7, and 11) were identified as recasts. On the one hand, they appeared to be corrective feedback, especially if the gradual development of the sentences is taken into account. The third sentence (line 11) especially had a characteristic of corrective feedback. The prolongation of the final consonant of the word "from" indicated that Jean was possibly thinking about correcting the sentence. Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) call this a repair "initiator" (p. 367), because it signals that a possible correction may follow immediately afterwards. Immediately after the repair "initiator," Jean reformulated the sentence and produced another sentence "he he he started smoking when he was young" (line 11), which was similar to the previous one but sounded more idiomatic to native speakers of English. Jean, therefore, appeared to provide Beth with grammatical sentences through recasts.

At the same time, these reactions looked very much like genuine responses, especially when the nonverbal cues were considered. By directing her posture and eye gaze exclusively towards Beth and providing ample nonverbal cues such as smiles, nods, eye movements, and a gesture mimicking smoking, Jean succeeded in portraying herself as an interlocutor who was genuinely interested in what Beth had to say.

To summarize, Jean seemed to play two roles in utilizing recasts. On the one hand, she provided the students with grammatical sentences through recasts in the discussion. On the other, these recasts looked very much like genuine responses, especially when the non-verbal cues that she often utilized were taken into account. She focused simultaneously on the form and the content of the students' utterances by playing the dual role of teacher and participant. She achieved this through recasts.

Jean's Purposes for Corrective Feedback

In the discussion/test, Jean wished to reinforce what she always taught: that students should take the initiative, volunteer, and express themselves. This was based on her overarching beliefs in student-centered lessons and students' proactive (as opposed to reactive or passive) learning and communication styles. Thus, Jean's primary purposes for

this particular activity were philosophical, and she assessed the outcome accordingly. Recasts as a form of corrective feedback enabled her to encourage and scaffold the students' willingness to participate in the discussion/test and voice their opinions, while concurrently correcting their errors.

Charles' Beliefs and His Feedback Behavior

Charles' Beliefs

Like Jean, Charles possessed various beliefs directly and indirectly connected to classroom interaction. One of the topics that Charles mentioned throughout the data collection process was the culture of his workplace. He frequently expressed reservations about certain practices within the program such as teaching from a theme-based syllabus. He agreed with the principles of theme-based teaching and with the program view that there should be a thematic flow between activities, and that in these activities, a lesson should move from "lower" to "higher-order" thinking. However, he was concerned about the fact that the teaching of grammar tended to be less valued in a theme-based syllabus.

Another work-related issue that Charles occasionally discussed was communicating with the students in a variety of ways. Since various ways of communication were encouraged at his workplace, and since this was discussed in postobservation conferences held as a part of staff development, Charles incorporated different ways of givingcorrective feedback and of conducting lessons involving teacher-fronted as well as student-centered lessons and individual seatwork as well as pair/group work. He also issued class newsletters, trying different ways of communicating procedural information. Furthermore, Charles had learned at graduate school to explore different ways of communicating and see what differences small changes make. This training also had an influence on his teaching practice.

Among various beliefs Charles discussed, one major issue emerged as particularly crucial to his teaching practice. On the one hand, it was important for him that the students use whatever grammar, vocabulary, or idiomatic expressions they learned as they interacted in class. On the other hand, what he aimed for in his class, and what gave him considerable satisfaction when it occurred, was to have an activity where the interaction was concurrently "structured" and "unstructured."

First, Charles' key word, "structuredness," should be explained in more detail. Early on in the interview process, Charles began using the word "structured." Since its meaning was not apparent, he was asked to define it.

Excerpt 4

Charles: Part of structured for me is giving them a lot of free-
              dom, but if they don't know where the boundaries
              are, I think I do.... It sometimes...gets too chatty for
              what I want it to be like, but they may be picking up
              these cards and looking at the pictures, saying "What
              is it used for?" "It's used for screwing screws." A lot of
              laughing. "Doesn't screwing also mean something
              else?" And I am like "Yeah."... It's still a structured
              activity. I am listening for gerunds and infinitives and
              passive voice...we are still doing vocabulary. There are
              also other things happening at the same time. That for
              me is still structured because I see an anchor in the
              activity.

RM: What do you mean by anchor?

Charles: Technically what the focus is even if just ( ) gerunds
              and infinitives, these pictures, the vocabulary, passive
              voice. So there are a few things I'm watching for, a few
              things they should be watching for (Interview #3).

Charles appeared to be using the term "structured" in two different senses. One meaning referred to the language that the students needed to learn. Language, in this sense, could be grammar, vocabulary, idiomatic expressions, or the sociolinguistic aspects of the language. This suggests that Charles had a concept of language form similar to that advocated by Celce-Murcia, Dornyei, and Thurrell (1997), which included not only sentence-bound rules, but also "higher level organizational principles or rules and normative patterns or conventions governing language use beyond the sentence level" (p. 147). The other meaning of "structured" referred to a framework that Charles himself gave to a language-learning task when he set it up. "Unstructured," on the other hand, was always used in only one sense. It meant completely spontaneous conversation that went beyond the framework set up by the task at hand. In other words, the teacher did not tell the students to conduct an unstructured conversation. It was unplanned, genuine interaction.

In the card activity that Charles briefly discussed in Excerpt 4, the interaction was structured because Charles, the teacher, had set up the whole activity. Besides, there were certain grammar structures or vocabulary items he wanted the students to practice. However, it was also unstructured because it provided opportunities for spontaneous interaction to take place.

Charles felt less successful when the students did not use the grammar

or vocabulary that he wanted them to use in the activities he had set up. For example, on April 2, he asked the students to provide possible reasons for not buying computers, which was a warm-up activity for a passage they were going to read later on. Reflecting on that part of the lesson, he observed:

Excerpt 5

Charles: My impression was that it was a lot lighter than I wanted it to be. Originally I was intending it to be more structured. "He doesn't want to buy a computer because," and do a lot of "because" type of clauses. And that didn't happen at all, because they started offering their own answers. There weren't any "because" in it. It was "He wanted to do this."

RM: What do you mean, "lighter"?

Charles: Perhaps less structured on language, and getting them to be aware of getting it grammatical.

RM: What was the kind of language you were expecting?

Charles: On the surface level, I thought there were going to be "because" kind of reasons, causes.... In order to put some structure in there, I said, "Use the word 'by'." And I said, "Use the word 'help' in the sentence." Put those two together and they formed another sentence, using those two words. That is the kind of thing I would have liked to have continued to sort of play with multiple versions of the same answer and make it more of a language lesson (Interview #3).

Charles felt that the interaction was "less structured" than he expected it to be, because the students did not use the language he wanted them to practice. He wanted them to be aware of the grammar when they were doing the activity.

Charles believed that "unstructured" interaction was indispensable, because the students ultimately needed to achieve "real communication," and they needed to learn to draw on their own resources in order to communicate. However, he also thought that explicit focus on the language was essential, because the students might not know what they were practicing unless they consciously paid attention to language, and as a consequence, their second language acquisition might not be enhanced as much. Thus, Charles seemed to share with some SLA researchers the position that form-focused instruction within communicative contexts facilitates second language learning (e.g., Celce-Murcia et

al., 1997; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Spada & Lightbown, 1993). Charles' way of balancing these two contradicting elements was to create tasks which were fairly clearly defined in terms of the language he wanted the students to produce, but which provided some opportunities for disciplined but spontaneous interaction to occur.

Some of Charles' beliefs were thus put into practice in the tasks examined in this study. He believed in communication between the teacher and the students in various different modes and a focus on both communication and language.

Charles' Corrective Feedback Behavior

As for Charles' corrective feedback behavior, Table 2 demonstrates the overall corrective feedback pattern that he exhibited during the lesson. He performed explicit correction 25% of the time. He also provided metalinguistic feedback half of the time (53%) and showed elicitation moves 22% of the time. That is to say, in every feedback turn, Charles demonstrated a clear preference for overtly indicating that an error had been made.

As was mentioned above, Charles incorporated different ways of giving corrective feedback in deference to the program policy. This was observed in the current lesson also. The following are some of the examples of metalinguistic feedback Charles provided the most during the lesson. They are selected from the whole-class corrective feedback task. Each student had previously written a dialogue of an interview between a prospective employer looking for a nanny and a job candidate. Some of the erroneous sentences extracted from the interviews were printed on an OHP, and the class corrected them as Charles read them out loud.

Excerpt 6
	1	Charles:	((reads from the OHP)) Why do you find a job as a nanny?
*	2		A difficulty might be this word. ((points at "find"))

Excerpt 7
	1	Charles:	((reads a sentence on the OHP)) Number Four. How many times
*	2		does it take from your home to mine? I want something about time.
	3	S?:	How long does it take?

Excerpt 8
1   Charles: Now Eight. ((reads from the OHP))
What kind   of household
2   education do you use for your chil-
dren?
*   3   There's, I think there's an important
verb   missing.

Excerpt 9
1   Charles: ((reads from the OHP)) If I took care
of your   children, what would
2   you want me to do something special?
There   are several ways to do
*   3   it. Take one word off.

In Excerpt 6 (line 2), Charles pointed at the word posing a problem, but he did not locate problematic words in the other excerpts. In Excerpt 8 (line 3), he mentioned a missing part of speech, whereas he referred to the semantic nuance that the sentence should carry in Excerpt 7 (line 2). Moreover, he indicated that something should be added in Excerpt 8 (line 4), whereas he suggested that something should be discarded in Excerpt 9 (line 3). Charles thus seemed to consciously vary his approach to the provision of corrective feedback. He might have been able to do so with more ease, since he was dealing with written data as opposed to on-line oral communication.

Charles' Purposes for Corrective Feedback

Charles expressed the belief that a focus on both communication and language in the sense that Celce-Murcia, et al. (1997) used was central to second language learning. His reasoning for an explicit focus on language was that the students needed to be aware of what they were practicing. Such a belief was reflected in his overt corrective feedback.

Corrective Feedback with Different Purposes

The above two teachers' cases reveal that behind teaching behavior exist teachers' thoughts and beliefs, and that their teaching is influenced by these. Jean and Charles conducted their teaching, which included corrective feedback, taking into consideration their students'

linguistic, personal, and sociocultural development, the purposes of the class, and the program at large. Furthermore, the two teachers had their own firm beliefs with regard to second language acquisition and socialization. How they taught appeared to be determined through the interplay of all these factors.

Each teacher's corrective feedback was compatible with his or her beliefs. Charles' overt feedback was supported by his firm belief that the structure of the language plays a crucial role in second language acquisition. Thus, the purpose of his correction was largely linguistic. Conversely, Jean had philosophical objectives in mind; she did not seem to be always aiming at the enhancement of student linguistic outcome, as far as the lesson observed was concerned. Her covert corrective feedback (recasts) was supported by her beliefs, many of which were philosophical rather than linguistic. Instructional purposes may vary from linguistic to disciplinary to sociocultural, depending on students, classes, programs, and schools, to name just a few possible factors, and teachers' corrective feedback may well be influenced by such purposes. Each teacher's use of specific corrective feedback types seemed to be driven by instructional beliefs based on the interplay of all the above factors.

Conclusion

This investigation of two ESL teachers' beliefs and their influence on corrective feedback behavior suggests that a closer look at teacher corrective feedback behavior is called for, taking into consideration teachers' perspectives on how to best utilize corrective feedback in their overall instructional scheme and what they hope to accomplish by it. Furthermore, it implies that the definition of the effectiveness of corrective feedback should include attitudinal changes in students as well as linguistic changes. The outcome of corrective feedback should be judged based on the specific purposes that teachers have for their behavior; their corrective feedback and its success might be misinter-preted if researchers' preferred purposes and those of teachers are not identical.

SLA researchers have tended to provide teachers with research findings in the belief that teaching will be improved and learning en-hanced if teachers act on those findings. Thus, the research approach has been essentially top-down. In addition to this type of research, however, this study implies that researchers also need to take a bottom-up ap-proach, tapping into and codifying the epistemological and experiential reservoir that exists behind the teachers' teaching behavior (Freeman

& Johnson, 1998; Shulman, 1987). This reservoir, which contains their thoughts, ideals, and hopes about teaching, is not readily accessible from their surface teaching behavior. Therefore, researchers need to probe into the teachers' mental worlds without prematurely superimposing their own research agenda on it.

Corrective feedback is a perpetual and complex issue for many ESL/EFL teachers (Allwright, 1975; Long, 1977). The intricate decision-making processes that teachers go through when reacting to student errors have been delineated by various researchers (e.g., Allwright, 1975; Chaudron, 1977; Long, 1977). Preservice teachers would, therefore, particularly benefit from learning about experienced teachers' beliefs behind their corrective feedback behavior. Knowledge about corrective feedback thus acquired may be more holistic than quick-fix type corrective feedback techniques in that corrective feedback is embedded in the experienced teachers' uniquely amalgamated instructional base that informs practice. In this instructional base, which is similar to Freeman and Johnson's (1998) notion of "content" or Shulman's (1987) "pedagogical content knowledge," research findings, theories, teaching approaches, and the like are transformed through teachers' unique sensitivities, their particular educational backgrounds, teaching experience, and workplace culture, and assimilated into their practice as is evidenced in Jean and Charles' cases. Because theories and teaching approaches are already translated into practice to suit the urgent needs of daily classroom life, learning about corrective feedback within this instructional base may assist novice teachers to see how others make sense of theory and connect it to practice. Research into teachers' beliefs needs to be included in corrective feedback research, and efforts must be made to "map out" the reservoir that exists in the hinterland of teachers' mental worlds (Freeman & Johnson, 1998).

Since the present study is a secondary analysis of the data from a larger qualitative study in which the participating teachers' beliefs about classroom interaction in general were researched, it has examined how their overarching (as opposed to local) beliefs are related to their corrective feedback behavior. Future research should focus more on teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. Moreover, teachers with a wider range of teaching experience and educational background should be studied. Through examining different cases, similarities and differences among various teachers would become more evident, which might contribute towards more holistic theory building. Finally, since teachers' beliefs can have a strong influence on how they conceptualize their daily teaching practice, not only corrective feedback, but also all aspects of teaching should be reexamined from the standpoint of teachers' beliefs. Only then could a more complete understanding of teaching processes be achieved.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Carl Mantzel, Mary Maxey, and the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments.

Reiko Mori teaches EFL at Kagoshima Prefectural College. Her research interests include classroom interaction and teacher beliefs.

Notes

1. Pajares (1992) points out a similar phenomenon about beliefs.
2. Jean also graded her students in other, more traditional ways.

References

Allwright, R. L. (1975). Problems in the study of the language teacher's treatment of learner error. In M. K. Burt & H. C. Dulay (Eds.), On TESOL '75 (pp. 96-109). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Almarza, G. G. (1996). Student foreign language teachers' knowledge growth. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), Teacher learning in language teaching (pp. 50-78). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study. TESOL Quarterly, 32, 9-38.

Calderhead, J. (Ed.). (1988). Teachers' professional learning. London: Falmer.

Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15, 357-386.

Carroll, S., Swain, M., & Roberge, Y. (1992). The role of feedback in adult second language acquisition: Error correction and morphological generalizations. Applied Psycholinguistics, 13, 173-198.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1997). Direct approach in L2 instruction: A turning point in communicative language teaching? TESOL Quarterly, 31, 141-152.

Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. Language Learning, 27, 29-46.

Chaudron, C. (1986). Teachers' priorities in correcting learners' errors in French immersion classes. In R. R. Day (Ed.), Talking to learn (pp. 64-84). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

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

Clandinin, J. (1985). Personal practical knowledge: A study of teachers' classroom images. Curriculum Inquiry, 15, 361-385.

Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C.

Whittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillan.

Day, R. R., Chenoweth, N. A., Chun, A. E., & Luppescu, S. (1984). Corrective feedback in native-nonnative discourse. Language Learning, 34, 19-45.

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

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.) (1998). Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Elbaz, F. (1981). The teacher's "practical knowledge": Report of a case study. Curriculum Inquiry, 11, 43-71.

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

Fanselow, J. F. (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. Foreign Language Annals, 10, 583-593.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. TESOL Quarterly, 32, 397-417.

Gaskill, W. H. (1980). Correction in native speaker-nonnative speaker conversation. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), Discourse analysis in second language research (pp. 125-137). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Golombek, P. R. (1998). A study of language teachers' personal practical knowledge. TESOL Quarterly, 32, 447-464.

Johnson, K. E. (1992). Learning to teach: Instructional actions and decisions of preservice ESL teachers. TESOL Quarterly, 26, 507-534.

Johnson, K. E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers. Teaching & Teacher Education, 1, 439-452.

Johnson, K. E. (1999). Understanding language teaching: Reasoning in action. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Johnston, B., & Goettsch, K. (2000). In search of the knowledge base of language teaching: Explanations by experienced teachers. Canadian Modern Language Review, 56, 437-468.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Long, M. H. (1977). Teacher feedback on learner error: Mapping cognition. In D. H. Brown, C. A. Yorio, & R. T. Crymes (Eds.), On TESOL '77 (pp. 278-294). Washington, D C: TESOL.

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

Lyster, R. (2001). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. Language Learning, 51, 265-301.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19, 37-66.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Nystrom, N. J. (1983). Teacher-student interaction in bilingual classrooms: Four approaches to error correction. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition (pp. 169-189). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62, 307-332.

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

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 1-22.

Smith, D. B. (1996). Teacher decision making in the adult ESL classroom. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), Teacher learning in language teaching (pp. 197-216). New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Tomasello, M., & Herron, C. (1988). Down the garden path: Inducing and correcting overgeneralization errors in the foreign language classroom. Applied Psycholinguistics, 9, 237-246.

Tomasello, M., & Herron, C. (1989). Feedback for language transfer errors. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11, 385-395.

Woods, D. (1996). Teacher cognition in language teaching. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix

Transcript Conventions

[ ]	Overlapping utterances.
=	Used to link different parts of a single speaker's utterance.
a::	Extension of a sound.
((nods))	Non-verbal actions.
( )	Unintelligible utterances.