

Beliefs about oral corrective feedback in an Argentinean EFL university classroom: Their impact on a teacher's classroom actions

Adelina Sánchez Centeno, Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto
Silvana Yanina Ponce, Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto

Beliefs about oral corrective feedback (OCF) are essential components in the EFL classroom, especially when learning the speaking skill since teachers have to strike a delicate balance between the provision of OCF without negatively affecting students' emotions. During the last years, many scholars have devoted great attention to the influence of affective factors in the learning of foreign languages. Among these factors, beliefs held by teachers and students have proved to impact significantly on the processes of teaching and learning a foreign language. The aims of this paper are: to describe the beliefs held by an Argentinian EFL teacher about OCF and to describe how her beliefs might shape this teacher's classroom practices regarding the provision of OCF at a specific context. A qualitative approach was adopted, and data was collected by means of videotaped classroom observations, teacher stimulated recall interviews and a semi-structured teacher interview. The results showed that the teacher's beliefs and her classroom actions were not always congruent, especially when she was faced with an ambiguous situation. In the end, the beliefs that had stronger connections to emotions were the ones enacted in her classroom practices.

Keywords: beliefs about language teaching, oral corrective feedback, EFL, university students

1 Introduction

In any English foreign language classroom, oral corrective feedback (OCF) is always present, since, it has been acknowledged to play an important role in the language acquisition process (Ellis, 2009, 2017; Li, 2014; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Russell & Spada, 2006, among others). Ideally, EFL teachers should motivate their students to develop their speaking ability through varied activities in a relaxing and tension-free atmosphere in order to avoid students' feelings of embarrassment or frustration when being orally corrected (Martínez Agudo, 2012; Wass, Timmermans, Harland, & McLean, 2018). As speaking has been reported as a challenge for students (Aragão, 2011; Pawlak, 2018) this type of classroom context, in which students feel more comfortable to speak, would allow EFL teachers to listen to students' oral productions and give feedback on

Corresponding author's email: adelinasc.unrc@gmail.com

ISSN: 1457-9863

Publisher: Centre for Applied Language Studies

University of Jyväskylä

© 2019: The authors

<http://apples.jyu.fi>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201907063591>

their errors (error and mistake are used interchangeably in this paper). However, despite the importance attributed to OCF, some EFL teachers might be reluctant to provide it to their students (Ayedh & Khaled, 2011; Cohen & Fass, 2001) and when they do it, they tend to overuse a specific type of feedback strategy, namely recast (Ayedh & Khaled, 2011; Gutierrez Oduber & Miquilena Matos, 2009; Lyster & Mori, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002). This excessive usage has been attributed to teachers' need of guidance and instruction on this topic (Noor, Aman, Mustaffa, & Seong, 2010) or to a set of teachers' beliefs in support of a more traditional approach to language instruction (Cohen & Fass, 2001).

At present, the tendency is leading researchers to focus on the social interactionist perspective of OCF (Althobaiti, 2014; Ayedh & Khaled, 2011; Ellis, 2009; Martinez Agudo, 2012; Roothoof, 2014; Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2016; Wass et al., 2018) in order to fulfil the need of taking into consideration the affective component of the EFL teaching and learning processes. Thus, this research goes in line with Ellis's (2009) assertion that corrective feedback is a highly complex instructional and interactive phenomenon that manifests cognitive, social and psychological dimensions. This claim opens the discussion to the consideration of the role that beliefs, and in turn emotions, have in EFL classrooms. It should be stated that in many cases, when we make reference to classroom actions in this study, we mean the provision of OCF, which is understood as "one type of negative feedback and can consist of (1) an indication that an error has been committed, (2) provision of the correct target language form, (3) metalinguistic information about the nature of the error, or any combination of these" (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006, p. 340).

While many scholars have devoted to the study of teachers' beliefs in relation to several aspects of the processes of teaching and learning a foreign language (Valsecchi & Ponce, 2015) and from many different perspectives (Barcelos, 2015), not so many have concentrated on the role of emotions on these processes. What is more, it has been noted that the affective dimension of learning has been largely neglected in the field of SLA (Dewaele, 2015). In this paper, beliefs and emotions are approached from a contextual perspective, from which beliefs are defined as "a form of thought, constructions of reality, ways of seeing and perceiving the world and its phenomena which are co-constructed with our experiences and which result from an interactive process of interpretation and (re)signification, and of being in the world and doing things with others" (Barcelos, 2014, as cited in Kalaja, Barcelos, Ruohotie-Lyhty & Aro, 2015, p. 10). Therefore, we understand beliefs to be personal, socially constructed, experiential, dynamic, and only understood if they are considered within the context in which they are embedded (Barcelos, 2015). As regards emotions, MacIntyre (2002) defines them as "the primary human motive" which function as an "amplifier, providing the intensity, urgency, and energy to propel our behaviour in everything we do" (p. 61). In the EFL classroom context, emotions, as well as beliefs, impact on teachers' and students' behaviour and decision-making (Barcelos, 2015; Dewaele, 2015).

Moreover, classrooms have been described as emotional places, where teachers and students bring their beliefs and emotions from the outside world, and which influence the teaching and learning processes that take place there (Pekrun, 2014). However, the relationship between beliefs and emotions is not a linear one, on the contrary, it has been characterized as "dynamic, interactive and reciprocal" (Barcelos, 2015, p. 314) as research has shown that emotions "can awaken, intrude into and shape beliefs, by creating, altering, amplifying (...) them" (Frijda,

Manstead & Bem, 2000, p. 5) and that beliefs and emotions regulate student's and teachers' classroom actions. Therefore, understanding this relationship is of great importance for interpreting classroom actions (Aragão, 2011).

This article reports and discusses the results of a case study in which the relationship between an EFL university teacher's beliefs and her classroom actions are explored. The research questions that this study intends to answer are:

- 1) What are the beliefs held by an EFL university teacher about OCF?
- 2) What are the different OCF strategies used by an EFL teacher in her classes?
- 3) To what extent is there correspondence between the EFL teacher's classroom actions and her beliefs about OCF?

In this way, by casting light on the affective aspect of OCF, we hope to increase our understanding of teachers' beliefs to learn more about the ways in which they can influence classroom actions and in turn, the language teaching and learning processes.

In the last few years, several studies have explored the relation between beliefs and their impact on classroom actions. In the following paragraphs, the most salient studies on these topics will be discussed.

2 Research on the relation between teachers' beliefs and classroom actions

According to Pajares (1992), teachers' beliefs influence their perceptions and judgments, which, in turn, affect their classroom behaviour. Although some scholars have recently devoted to the study of EFL/ESL teachers' beliefs about OCF and their relationship to classroom actions (Carazzai & Santin, 2007; Farrokhi, 2007; Junqueira & Kim, 2013; Kamiya, 2014; Mori, 2002, 2011; Roothoof, 2014) results have been diverse. Some researchers concluded that teachers' beliefs about OCF and classroom actions are congruent (Carazzai & Santin, 2007, Kamiya, 2014; Mori, 2002, 2011; Junqueira & Kim, 2013), while others have shown that beliefs and actions are not always in agreement (Farrokhi, 2007; Roothoof, 2014). The great majority of these studies based their classroom analysis on Lyster and Ranta's (1997) feedback strategies typology (Kamiya, 2014, adhered to Sheen's [2004] taxonomy). Using a vast variety of data collection instruments such as: open-ended questionnaires, audio or videotaped classroom observations, field notes, 5-point Likert scales and stimulated recall interviews, among others, researchers sought to better understand the relationship between teachers' beliefs about OCF and classroom practices. Therefore, in the following paragraphs a review of the latest studies on EFL teachers' beliefs about OCF and their relationship to classroom practices will be discussed.

As regards studies that found similarities between teachers' beliefs about OCF and classroom actions, Carazzai and Santin (2007) focused on beliefs about error correction, influence of former teachers, language used when giving feedback and type of feedback strategies used by an EFL teacher. They identified that the participant teacher frequently provided OCF to her students' ungrammatical oral productions and used a great variety of OCF strategies. Furthermore, these researchers determined that the participant teacher had a positive attitude towards errors since she considered them to be part of the learning process. Carazzai and Santin (2007) inferred that this positive attitude had its origin in the teacher's previous experiences as an EFL student.

Similarly, Junqueira and Kim (2013) investigated how teaching experience along with teachers' previous education and beliefs might influence a novice and an experienced teachers' awareness of their OCF provision in their classroom situations. They concluded that even though the experienced teacher generated more teacher-learner interactions and provided more types of OCF, teaching experience and teacher training did not seem to impact on the teachers' beliefs regarding the provision of OCF, while their previous experiences as ESL students appeared to have a greater influence on both, teachers' beliefs about error correction and their classroom practices.

In the same vein, Mori's study was carried out in 2002 and later replicated in 2011. The aim of the studies was to examine the relationship between teacher beliefs and OCF practices. Mori (2002, 2011) determined that teachers' thoughts, beliefs and prior experiences as EFL learners and professionals exerted a powerful influence on their classroom behaviour and that, in general, teachers' provision of OCF was attuned with their beliefs. In addition, she identified the factors that also determined why the participant teachers provided or opted not to provide OCF; to name a few: instructional focus, time constraints, frequency of occurrence of errors, students' personality and students' level of communication ability, etc. Mori (2011) highlighted that the teachers in both studies had similar agendas: firstly, to teach the target language and secondly, to encourage values such as confidence, independence, and reasonable ability to communicate. Therefore, when providing OCF they considered students' feelings, personalities, linguistic knowledge, and socio-cultural development. Likewise, Kamiya (2014) reached to similar conclusions: the participant teachers believed that creating a comfortable environment for students was crucial, and therefore, they avoided the use of explicit correction, which could potentially humiliate learners, and instead opted for a more implicit type of OCF, such as recasts.

However, other researchers concluded that beliefs about OCF and classroom actions are not always in harmony. Farrokhi (2007) concentrated on teachers' beliefs about the effectiveness and appropriateness of OCF types and concluded that teachers' stated beliefs did not always match what they did in their lessons, due to several factors that might have been at play when teachers had to take on-the-spot decisions to tackle their students' non-target-like oral productions. Among these factors, Farrokhi mentioned situational demands, contextual constraints, practical considerations and affective variables.

Similarly, Roothoof's investigation (2014) was aimed at finding if teacher beliefs matched their feedback practices. She concluded that the participant EFL teachers believed OCF to be important and recognized that their students wanted to be corrected. However, they shared an interest in promoting fluency and confidence in their students, which they tended to see as incompatible with "too much" corrective feedback. In addition, the teachers' stated beliefs about the best method of correcting did not always match their practices. Roothoof hypothesized that a possible reason for such a discrepancy was that feedback is usually an unplanned aspect of teaching, for which teachers tend to rely on instinctive and spontaneous behaviours. Indeed, the results indicated that teachers' beliefs and their classroom practices were not always congruent.

The studies previously described analysed the connections between teachers' beliefs regarding OCF and classroom actions. Although some studies concluded that beliefs and actions were congruent, and others found the opposite, research

results have been consistent in relation to the multitude of factors that play a role and influence EFL/ ESL teachers' beliefs about OCF and their classroom practices.

This disparity of results suggests that further research is required in order to understand this relationship in a more complete fashion. What is more, none of these studies has focused on the impact that teachers' beliefs about OCF and teachers' beliefs about students' emotions have on her classroom actions. Although, beliefs are fundamental components in the processes of EFL teaching and learning, their impact has not been exhaustively explored in the field of applied linguistics. This research intends to contribute to a better understanding of this relationship.

3 Methodology

Data comes from a master thesis study that documented OCF beliefs of a teacher and seven students through diverse qualitative data collection instruments. In this article, the teacher case study is presented and discussed. Besides, data from two of the instruments employed are analysed.

3.1 Context of the study and participant

The study was framed within the context of an Argentinian university, Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto (hereafter UNRC), where a three-year programme called *Tecnicatura en Lenguas* is offered by the Language Department. The aim of this programme is to prepare competent students in communicating in English and French as foreign languages. English is taught during the three years and students are expected to reach a B2 level, according to the Common European Framework of References for Languages (Council of Europe, 2001).

The participant teacher in this study was Raquel (pseudonym is used throughout this paper). She was in charge of the English Language III course which is a 26-week-long course taught eight hours per week during the whole academic year in the third and last year of the programme. Raquel was 38 years old and a full-time adjunct professor. She has been teaching at the programme since 2001, which gives her vast experience in the field of EFL teaching. She graduated as a Teacher of English in 1999 and has recently obtained her master's degree in English orientated to Applied Linguistics.

3.2 Data collection procedures

In order to address the research questions proposed in this investigation, a qualitative case study methodology was adopted. Patton (2015) explains that "qualitative research often inquiries into the stories of individuals to capture and understand their perspectives" (p. 15). To answer research questions 1 and 3 (What are the beliefs held by an EFL university teacher about OCF? and To what extent is there correspondence between the EFL teacher's classroom actions and her beliefs about OCF?) two types of interviews were designed and implemented to gather data: a semi-structured teacher interview (SSTI, see Appendix A) and a stimulated recall interview, (SRI, see Appendix B). Both instruments were designed and administered in the English language. The semi-structured teacher interview consisted of four demographic questions and ten guiding questions that

inquired about the teacher's beliefs about OCF. The stimulated recall interview had as its aim to access the participant teacher's "retrospective verbal accounts [in order] to examine their interactive thinking" (Borg, 2006, p. 210) during a post-lesson observation. Two stimulated teacher interviews were administered after the third and fourth classroom observations. The following questions were included in the SRI: What were you thinking about at that moment?, What was your aim in this activity/ behaviour/ answer/ etc.?, Was your aim achieved?, Why did you decide to do or not to do that? (See Appendix B). Besides, four lessons were videotaped in order to answer research questions 2 and 3 (What are the different OCF strategies used by an EFL teacher in her classes? and To what extent is there correspondence between the EFL teacher's classroom actions and her beliefs about OCF?). The aims of the videotaped classroom observations were to identify the types of OCF strategies employed by the participant teacher, her classroom actions, as well as teacher-student rapport and the classroom atmosphere. These data sources were selected to obtain qualitative data which could be triangulated to address to issues of credibility, trustworthiness and authenticity.

Before the data collection phase took place, a pilot study was conducted in order to ensure the clarity and effectiveness of the instruments. First, the way the video camera should be positioned was piloted by means of the video recording of an English Language I lesson taught at the first year of the same programme. Second, a first version of the interviews (SSTI and SRI) were piloted with the EFL teacher in charge of the English Language I. As a result, few changes were made in the wording of two of the questions of the semi-structured teacher interview.

In order to avoid any possible behavioural changes in Raquel's teaching practice, and therefore skewing of the data, the purpose of this study was not completely disclosed to the participant teacher; instead, she was informed that the research goal was to examine general teaching techniques as it was done by Junqueira and Kim (2011) and Mori (2002, 2011). For this reason, the data collection phase started with the videotaped classroom observations. Four lessons were observed and videotaped during the months of May and June 2015, summing a total of 12 hours approximately with the aim of capturing teacher-student interactions, types of OCF strategies employed by the teacher, body language, tone of teacher's voice, teacher-student rapport and classroom environment.

After the third-class observation, the stimulated recall interview was administered. In order to avoid memory decay, each interview was conducted within the 24 hours the classroom observation took place (Gass & Mackey, 2000). Raquel was explained that she would watch seven short extracts from the previous day lesson and that she should try to remember what she was thinking at that moment. Among the extracts there were 3 distracters and 3 OCF episodes. The same procedure was carried out once the fourth classroom observation was finished. The two interviews took approximately 20 minutes each. During the videotaped classroom observation phase and the stimulated recall interview the concept of OCF was not mentioned. Once the second and last stimulated recall interview was over, and before the semi-structured teacher interview was administered, the concept of OCF was introduced to Raquel for the first time and an operationalization of the concept was provided. All the questions in the guide were asked even if the topic of the question had already been addressed in previous answers (see Appendix A). She was relaxed and outspoken during the 30 minutes that the semi-structured teacher interview lasted. All the interviews (SRI and SSTI) were audio recorded.

3.3 Data coding and analysis

Given the characteristics of this study, two qualitative strategies were selected for analysing the data obtained: “content analysis” Patton (2015) and “interaction analysis” (McKay, 2006). The data obtained from the semi-structured teacher interview and the stimulated recall interview were analysed using content analysis, whereas the data obtained from the videotaped classroom observations were analysed using interaction analysis. Regarding content analysis, Patton (2015) explains that it “refers to any qualitative data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meanings” (p. 1178). The purpose of the content analysis was to identify the teacher’s beliefs and emotions towards the provision of OCF. In order to help the reader to follow our data analysis, the themes identified in the data analysis will be highlighted in bold and italics.

In relation to interaction analysis, McKay (2006) considers that this method can be used to study classroom oral discourse. She defines interaction analysis as the use of “some type of coding system to investigate the communication patterns that occur in a classroom” (McKay, 2006, p. 90). The purpose of this analysis was to identify all the instances of teacher-student interactions in which OCF was provided; the instances which contained errors and were not corrected by the teacher were not included in the analysis, neither were the ones corrected by a classmate, since they were not the focus of this study. More specifically, the coding system used was *limited coding scheme* which deals “only with the moves that are used in a particular type of classroom interaction” (ibid., p. 91) and the categories of analysis are “developed in reference to a specific classroom activity” (ibid., p. 96). It is important to mention that two types of classroom interactions were considered: spontaneous teacher-student interactions and reading-aloud activities. In this study, only the moves which involved OCF provided by the participant teacher were transcribed, analysed and categorized according to the six types of OCF strategies identified by Lyster and Ranta (1997): 1) recasts, 2) metalinguistic cues, 3) elicitation requests, 4) clarification requests, 5) explicit corrections, 6) repetitions. However, as this classification lacked a non-linguistic OCF strategy, a seventh strategy called 7) paralinguistic signals proposed by Ellis (2009) was also included (see Lyster & Ranta, 1997, for OCF strategies’ definitions and Ellis, 2006, for their recategorization). Table 1 below provides a brief description of the OCF taxonomies, their definitions and examples. In addition to the aforementioned taxonomy, OCF types can also be distinguished in terms of whether they are input-providing or output-prompting (Ellis, 2009). The former “provides learners with input demonstrating target language forms” (Ellis, 2008, p. 227); the latter “indicates that an error has been made but does not supply the correct forms” (Lyster, 2004, p. 266). Instead, output-prompting types of OCF encourage students to try to self-correct. Ellis (2008) highlights that this distinction is of theoretical importance because “it is related to the nature of the data that learners obtain” (p. 227).

After having identified all the instances of teacher-student interactions in which OCF was provided, the analysis of the type of OCF strategy and type of error corrected started. A table was completed with the extract where the student’s mistakes and the teacher’s feedback were identified. Then, in other two columns, the type of strategy used by the teacher and the type of mistake produced by the student were specified. After having classified all the instances

by the two authors of this article, an external EFL researcher was asked to code the OCF strategies identified and the types of errors targeted by the participant teacher. The presence of an inter-rater helped reduce the potential bias that comes from a single researcher analysing the data and gives credibility to the findings of the study (Patton, 2015).

Table 1. Types of OCF, definitions and examples.

Types of Corrective Feedback	Definition	Examples
<p>Recast (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)</p> <p>(Recategorized as Input-providing by Ellis, 2009, p. 8)</p>	<p>An utterance that involves the teacher’s reformulation of all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 46), usually contrasting the utterance with the learner’s erroneous utterance through prosodic emphasis on the problematic form (Ellis, 2009, p. 8). Recasts occur immediately after the erroneous or inappropriate utterance. (Yoshida, 2010, p. 302)</p>	<p>L: I went there two times. T: You’ve been. You’ve been there twice as a group? (Ellis, 2009, p. 9)</p>
<p>Metalinguistic Cues/ Explanations/Feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)</p> <p>(Recategorized as Output-prompting by Ellis, 2009, p. 8)</p>	<p>An utterance that provides metalinguistic comments, feedback, or questions without providing a reformulation. (Yoshida, 2010, p. 302)</p>	<p>T: Can you find your error L: Mmm T: It is feminine (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 47)</p>
<p>Elicitation (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)</p> <p>(Recategorized as Output-prompting by Ellis, 2009, p. 8)</p>	<p>An utterance that strategically pauses in the middle of the utterance to elicit a learner’s completion. The teacher uses a partial repetition of the learner’s erroneous or inappropriate utterance or asks the learner questions (excluding the use of yes/no questions) to elicit the learner’s reformulation. (Yoshida, 2010, p. 302)</p>	<p>L: I’ll come if it will not rain. T: I’ll come if it? (Ellis, 2009, p. 9)</p>
<p>Repetition (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)</p> <p>(Recategorized as Output-prompting by Ellis, 2009, p. 8)</p>	<p>An utterance by either a teacher or a classmate that repeats a learner’s erroneous or inappropriate utterance highlighting the error by means of emphatic stress. (Yoshida, 2010, p. 302)</p>	<p>L: I will showed you. T: I will SHOWED you. L: I’ll show you (Ellis, 2009, p. 9)</p>
<p>Clarification Request (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)</p> <p>(Recategorized as Output-prompting by Ellis, 2009, p. 8)</p>	<p>An utterance that asks a question for clarification. (Yoshida, 2010, p. 302)</p>	<p>L: What do you spend with your wife? T: What? (Ellis, 2009, p. 9)</p>

<p>Explicit Correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)</p> <p>(Recategorized as Input-providing by Ellis, 2009, p. 8)</p>	<p>An utterance that clearly indicates that a learner's utterance is incorrect or inappropriate and provides the correct form. (Yoshida, 2010, p. 302)</p>	<p>L: On May. T: Not on May, In May. We say, "It will start in May." (Ellis, 2009, p. 9)</p>
<p>Paralinguistic Signals (Ellis, 2009)</p> <p>(Recategorized as Output-prompting by Ellis, 2009, p. 8)</p>	<p>The corrector uses a gesture or facial expression to indicate that the learner has made an error. (Ellis, 2009, p. 302)</p>	<p>L: Yesterday I go cinema. T: (gestures with right forefinger over left shoulder to indicate past). (Ellis, 2009, p. 9)</p>

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 RQ1: What are the beliefs about OCF held by an EFL university teacher?

The results of the content analysis of the data obtained from the semi-structured teacher interview and the stimulated recall interviews will be presented in order to answer the first research question.

As regards the beliefs about OCF, Raquel was asked about the following aspects: the role of error correction (EC) in language learning, OCF effectiveness, ways of providing OCF and its emotional impact on students. When Raquel was explicitly asked about her beliefs regarding the role of EC in her students' language learning, she replied that she believed that EC was a stage in the language learning process. She expressed this idea as follows:

1. *I think that [...] you need to be corrected. I think that correction is part of learning. (SSTI)*

In relation to her provision of OCF to her students' erroneous oral productions and the reason why she did so, Raquel answered that she had never considered the issue before, and that she had provided OCF in an intuitive way because it depended greatly on her perceptions about students' emotional states and classroom atmosphere of each specific class. She acknowledged that she was not completely conscious of her behaviour regarding the provision of OCF, but she stressed that she knew she had to do it. Raquel considered that if she did not correct her students' erroneous oral productions they would not progress in their learning.

2. *I never thought about this before, I know that I need to correct because if you don't correct, they won't advance in their learning. (SSTI)*
3. *I don't know if I always do it [correct] because sometimes I know that I have to do it, but sometimes when they are speaking and I notice that there's a difficulty in speaking and they try and try and I can see effort on the part of the students and if they can't get their meanings through I sometimes don't correct. But if I see that students [...] make mistakes but not doing a great effort so I correct. That depends on what I see. What I'm sure is that if I can see that they cannot get their meanings through I need to correct [...] sometimes this is very subjective as I see. (SSTI)*

Raquel admits that she is not fully aware of her OCF practices in her classes and that it is a subjective practice when she affirms that "I never thought about this before"

and that “sometimes this is very subjective as I see”. In addition, Raquel firmly believes that the provision of OCF to students’ erroneous oral productions is inherent in the teacher role when she repeatedly affirms: “I know I have to do it”, “I need to correct” so that students can improve their language learning. However, she acknowledges that her provision of OCF sometimes depends on her perceptions of students’ effort and ability to get their meanings through: “That depends on what I see” “but if I see that students [...] make mistakes but not doing a great effort so I correct”. Raquel’s beliefs and sometimes intuitive classroom actions go in line with Basturkmen’s (2012) assertion that feedback is an unplanned aspect of teaching, for which teachers tend to rely on “automatic and generally unexamined behaviours” (p. 291).

When Raquel was confronted to her actual classroom OCF practices, in the stimulated recall interview, she realised that her perception about her student’s emotional states and that of the classroom affected her decision making regarding the provision of OCF, and in this particular occasion, this led her to abandon the OCF provision.

4. *...then I wanted to guide her to use a quantity expression because she hadn’t been using it and she couldn’t do it either, so I think I quit, I don’t know what I did but I didn’t try any longer, well... I don’t know why, because sometimes I look at the faces of the rest of the people and they start becoming nervous and sometimes that’s... I don’t know. (Raquel describing her classroom actions in the SRI)*

When trying to explain this classroom action, she admits that her perception of the students’ nervousness or apprehension when the classmate could not get her meanings through might have been determining: “I look at the faces of the rest of the people and they start to become nervous”. Raquel is undoubtedly aware that class-fronted speaking abilities triggers negative emotions such as anxiety (Nilsson, 2019), therefore, she tactfully renounces the OCF provision probably to reestablish the tension-free and supportive classroom atmosphere.

As regards the effectiveness of OCF, Raquel believed that one of the most effective ways of providing OCF was to give students the opportunity to self-correct.

5. *They should correct themselves and [I should] guide them to achieve that aim of correcting themselves. [...] I want them to realize by themselves. (SSTI)*
6. *I don’t know if that [provision of OCF] will favour them or inhibit them; but anyway, they are in Language III so they should start correcting themselves. (Raquel reflecting on her actions in the SRI)*
7. *I couldn’t understand what she was saying [...] So I had to spend a while trying to understand and trying to guide her to say it in the right way, but it was quite difficult. (Raquel reflecting on her actions in the SRI)*

In her verbalizations during the semi-structured interview and the stimulated recall interview, Raquel discloses that she promotes self-correction in her classes, even though she admits that sometimes it is very difficult to achieve. Besides, she affirms that she is not quite aware of the consequences of her OCF provision “I don’t know if that [provision of OCF] will favour them or inhibit them”, but she believes that as this group of students is in the last year of the programme, they should be able to self-correct and she should guide them to achieve it: “They are in Language III so they should start correcting themselves”.

Raquel believes that students' self-correction would shift the responsibility for correction and performance onto students, thus promoting their discovery learning¹. This belief goes in line with Hattie, Biggs and Purdie (1996, as cited in Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p. 87) who claim that "teachers can create a learning environment in which students develop self-regulation and error detection skills". Among the authors who have obtained similar results was Yoshida (2008), who stated that the teachers and students in her study also considered self-correction to be more effective for learning than the provision of correct forms. In addition, Basturkmen, Loewen and Ellis (2004) also found that the three teachers participating in their study believed that students' self-correction should be promoted. Furthermore, Garcia-Ponce and Irasema-Mora (2017) also discovered that the participant teachers perceived self-correction to be beneficial for their students' language learning.

However, Raquel firmly stated that if her students were unable to self-correct, she would provide the right answer, but only as her last resource. Raquel expresses this conscious classroom actions when answering the questions from the semi-structured teacher interview:

8. *I try they discover by themselves, the first try is to give them the opportunity to discover or to change something, if they can't, the last resource would be to tell them. (SSTI)*

In addition, during the stimulated recall interview, Raquel reaffirms her belief of guiding her students to achieve self-correction before providing the right answer:

9. *Well, at least I tried to make her realize which the mistake was. It seems to me that I always try to guide them before telling them explicitly. (Raquel reflecting on her actions in the SRI)*

Raquel also believed that she should provide OCF especially when there was a risk of communication breakdown, and that she should avoid the provision when students were struggling to communicate. She believes she should not add more pressure by providing OCF to students who are making a great effort to get their meanings through. She expressed this belief as follows:

10. *[When] I notice that there's a difficulty in speaking and they try and try, and I can see effort on the part of the students and if they can't get their meanings through, I sometimes don't correct. (SSTI)*

Raquel explained that on some occasions she intentionally overlooked some students' mistakes to assure a comfortable and secure classroom atmosphere. In this regard, Ellis (2017) suggests that teachers should avoid OCF if it is a source of students' anxiety.

Even though Raquel expressed that some of her decisions regarding OCF were subjective and intuitive, as we went deeper into conversation, she disclosed that she took into consideration students' maintenance of positive emotions and self-confidence² when providing OCF. She believed that the development of the speaking skill was closely connected to students' self-confidence. She believed that if students' self-confidence was low or even lowered by the teacher's provision of OCF, this could deter them from participating in speaking activities in the EFL classroom and consequently their speaking ability would not be developed. In Raquel's own words when answering the semi-structured teacher interview questions:

11. Speaking relies a lot on **confidence**, on being **confident to speak**; so, **if you correct too much**, I think that **they won't speak**. **If you want to develop fluency**, I let some mistakes pass, (sic.) I would say. But not all errors, I think that speaking is one of these skills in that you need confidence. (SSTI)
12. I strongly believe it (correction) may have an **impact on (students') feelings** [...] I think that **if I corrected too much**, if I was very demanding on their productions, **they would quit**. (SSTI)
13. I think that **if I over correct it might have a negative effect** [...] **it can affect their confidence**. (SSTI)

In her verbalizations, Raquel's disclosed her beliefs about the impact that EC could have on her students' negative emotions and in turn, on her provision of OCF. What is more, she expressed her concern about not being too demanding so as not to trigger students' frustration and not to undermine their self-confidence which could lead to deter their class participation.

An example from the video-taped classes could better support this claim. In the following interaction between Raquel and one of her students, it can be observed that, even though the student was not able to get her meanings through, Raquel did not force her to achieve self-correction. On the contrary, Raquel tried to guide the student to achieve effective communication. Despite of the fact that the student could not achieve an effective message, Raquel deliberately overlooked many mistakes, probably not to expose the student in front of her classmates. (The overlooked mistakes will be underlined and the missed elements that Raquel also overlooked will be marked with this symbol ◡. In addition, the OCF strategies identified in the excerpts are included in capital letters at the end of each utterance).

14. *Raquel:* ((addressing to the whole class)) Tell me about art in our city... Mariana do you want to start?
- Student:* I think, for example, ◡cinema is important the quantity and quality /kaliti/
- Raquel:* quality /'kwɒlɪti/ RECAST
- Student:* quality /'kwɒlɪti/ of the film because ◡is the sometimes in the Buenos Aires, for example; the film in Rio Cuarto are ◡ in the same time with Buenos Aires or the other /odəʀ/ city of the world
- Raquel:* ok
- Student:* the... the... demos?
- Raquel:* the quality? The release?
- Student:* the release ...
- Raquel:* so they are of the same quality as... ELICITATION
- Student:* as the ◡ Buenos Aires or the other /odəʀ/ cities
- Raquel:* other /'ʌðəʀ/ cities. RECAST. What about in relation to quantity? What can you say?
- Student:* the... place, the specific place is a few quantity, but the quality
- Raquel:* It's good, you were talking about quality, so it is good...
- Student:* yes
- Raquel:* Can you tell me how many theatres there are in Río Cuarto? ((she is addressing to the whole class))

In this short extract, it can be seen that Raquel did not force the student to self-correct and tried to guide her to get her meanings through. However, Raquel failed in her attempts so she called the whole class attention to finish the student's oral intervention.

When Raquel was asked to describe what was her aim in this classroom interaction during the SRI she replied:

15. *I tried to guide her to change or to correct herself but with questions, not explicitly [...] I tried to model something or to start a phrase, so she could continue; but most of the time she was focusing on meaning that's why she couldn't do it on form, but the message was impossible to understand. (Raquel reflecting on her actions in the SRI)*

In her reflections about her classroom practices, Raquel admitted that she tried to guide the student to get her meanings through. She confirmed that the student could not achieve an effective communication, even though she tried to guide her. This classroom interaction is an example of Raquel's intentions in guiding her students and not being too demanding with students' oral productions. She could have insisted on trying to elicit the right student's utterances, but instead, she overlooked many mistakes and focused mainly on phonological errors. This could have also been done to maintain the class participation and sustain a supportive atmosphere so as not to frustrate her students and in this way deter their class participation. Roothoof (2014) obtained similar results in that being too demanding as to elicit the right utterance in class fronted situations would diminish students' self-confidence. Seemingly, Raquel is well aware of the fact that speaking in full classes ignites students' negative emotions such as anxiety. This finding echoes the ones obtained by Nilsson (2019) who concluded that the speaking ability is the most frequent trigger of students' anxiety.

In the interviews, Raquel claimed to provide OCF in a tactful and cautious way, avoiding students' exposure and taking care of not lowering their self-confidence. She firmly believed that it was also part of her role as a teacher not to weaken her students' self-confidence in order to foster their speaking ability. In this regard, Raquel believed that teachers should be sensitive when providing OCF to the students' erroneous oral productions because their self-confidence could be affected in a negative way. In fact, Raquel considered herself a sensitive teacher who cared about not triggering students' negative emotions and their effort to communicate in a foreign language. She expressed this in the semi-structured teacher interview as follows:

16. *I am very sensitive to the way I should correct because I know that there are some ways which can be negative. [...] So, you should be very sensitive whether you affect confidence or not and whether that can help or not. (SSTI)*
17. *I want students to achieve communication and I tend to avoid correcting every mistake when I see that the [communication] problem is not really important. [...] they are in a course of studies in which they have to communicate, and I know that we all make mistakes! Especially when speaking, I don't want perfection. They are making a great effort and they need time. (SSTI)*

Some of the classroom decisions and behaviours that Raquel resorts to self-portrait as a sensitive teacher when providing OCF are: the avoidance of correcting every students' mistake: "I sometimes don't correct" (ex. 10); "I let some mistakes pass, (sic.) I would say" (ex. 11); "I think that if I corrected too much, if I was very demanding on their productions, they would quit". (ex. 12); the programme language learning objectives and the fact that the course "English Language III" is the last course taught in English in the programme: "they are in Language III so they should start correcting themselves" (ex. 6); "they are in a course of studies in which they have to communicate" (ex. 17); the belief that her students need time to learn a foreign language: "they need time" (ex. 17). At this point, the impact that her OCF provision could have on students' emotions and self-confidence were an openly disclosed topic. Raquel was aware of the negative

emotions that students might experience during EC and of their possible consequent rejection of OCF and avoidance to participate in speaking activities. As some authors have explained, emotions towards EC are dependent upon how OCF is handled in the classroom (Cohen & Fass, 2001; Méndez, Cruz & Loyo, 2010; Mori, 2011; Yoshida, 2010). As Ellis (2017) asserts OCF “needs to be undertaken with care and tact to avoid a negative affective response in students” (p. 13). In addition, Smith (2010) claims that a teacher who is cognizant of the impact that negative emotions can have on students’ ability to process and concentrate on their language learning will be able to provide appropriate OCF types so that students can benefit from EC. This idea was also expanded by Breen (2001, as cited in Yoshida, 2010) who explained that:

language classes are social situations as well as places of learning, noting that teachers usually correct errors based on the learner’s language ability, flexibility, and emotional state and that a learner’s self-esteem can be affected by the teacher’s response (Yoshida, 2010, p. 297).

Martinez Agudo (2012) and Elsaghayer (2014) acknowledge that teachers should know when and how to correct errors and, especially, should consider students’ sensitiveness and personality. Echoing Pollari’s (2017) assertion: “undoubtedly, every teacher giving feedback hopes that the feedback is beneficial and that their students make good use of it” (p. 22).

As many authors claim, language teachers should avoid students’ arousal of negative emotions, such as embarrassment, frustration and/or anxiety when being orally corrected in class-fronted situations (Ellis, 2017; Kamiya, 2014; Martinez Agudo, 2012; Nilsson, 2019; Yoshida, 2010). One way of assuring the generation of students’ positive emotion, is the kind and careful provision of OCF.

In sum, even though Raquel expressed that she had never thought about the way she provided OCF before, it was evident that she held many entrenched beliefs about how to handle OCF in her classes. In first place, she believes that EC has a very important role in her students’ language learning, and that her role as a teacher is to provide OCF so that her students can improve their language leaning. In addition, Raquel believes that teachers should be very sensitive when providing OCF to avoid students’ arousal of negative emotions that might cause anxiety to speak and consequently, lower their self-confidence. Furthermore, she believes that she should guide her students to achieve self-correction so that their discovery learning is promoted.

4.2 RQ 2: What are the different OCF strategies used by the EFL teacher in her classes?

The results obtained from the analysis of the data from the four videotaped classroom observations allow us to describe Raquel’s classroom atmosphere as relaxed and tension-free. Her tone of voice and way of delivering her messages were calm but active. We could perceive that she was the main feedback provider in the four videotaped classes. Furthermore, from the interaction analysis we could conclude that Raquel provided OCF to most of their students’ erroneous oral productions. As regards the OCF strategy analysis, 41 teacher-student interactions were identified. In these 41 interactions, the participant teacher provided 73 instances of OCF strategies to 57 students’ errors. This interesting finding indicates that, on some occasions, Raquel provided more than one OCF

strategy in response to a single mistake, as it can be seen in the examples below. (The OCF strategies identified in the excerpts are included in capital letters at the end of each utterance)

18. *Lucía:* [...] they are in charge of taking care of them, taking ancient?
Raquel: ancient people? CLARIFICATION REQUEST
Lucía: ancient people... Instead of taking them to...
Raquel: old people, RECAST you say old not ancient, ancient is not for people
 EXPLICIT CORRECTION (1st class, videotaped classroom observation)
19. *Mariana:* but is an ecological
Raquel: but is... REPETITION you are missing something there... METALINGUISTIC CUE, but... ELICITATION
Mariana: but it (emphasis added) is an ecological product, renewable energy and adding more benefits to the university (2nd class videotaped classroom observation)

However, it was not possible to identify a pattern in the data that could have allowed us to conclude that Raquel used a specific combination of OCF strategies when she provided more than one OCF strategy to one particular student's mistake. The chain of OCF strategies varied randomly.

Data also revealed that Raquel used the seven types of OCF strategies identified by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Ellis (2006, as cited in Ellis, 2009) with different degrees of frequency. Recast was found to be the most frequent with 43 instances, representing 59% of the total number of instances. It was followed far behind by 10 instances of metalinguistic cues (14%); and eight instances of elicitation (11%). In addition, three instances of clarification requests, three of explicit correction, three of repetition and three of paralinguistic signals were identified, each one representing 4 % of the total number of incidents. (See table 2 below).

Table 2. Types and frequency of use of Raquel's OCF strategies.

Input-providing Strategies 63%		Output-prompting Strategies 37%				
Recast	Explicit Correction	Metaling. Cues	Elicitation	Clarification Request	Repetition	Paralinguistic signals
59%	4%	14%	11%	4%	4%	4%

Raquel used input-providing types of OCF strategies 63% of the times, distributed unevenly between recasts and explicit corrections. On the other hand, the remaining 37% of the output-prompting types of OCF strategies used were provided in a more uniform way. These findings are in line with previous classroom-based CF studies' results which have also reported that recasts comprised the largest proportion of feedback (Fu & Nassaji, 2016; Gutierrez Oduber & Miquilena Matos, 2009; Lyster & Mori, 2006; Sheen, 2004).

When examining the results in search of patterns between the types of mistakes and OCF provision, it was evident that phonological errors were mostly treated

by Raquel with recasts. Therefore, out of 43 instances of recasts, Raquel provided them 64% of the times to correct phonological errors, 19% to treat grammatical errors and 17% to correct lexical errors. Put in other words, most of the times that Raquel used recast as a strategy, it was to provide OCF to phonological mistakes. Table 3 shows how frequently Raquel provided recast to three different types of students' errors.

Table 3. Frequency of Recast strategy used by Raquel to address different students' errors.

Frequency of use of recast targeted to different types of errors		
Grammar errors	Lexical errors	Phonological errors
19%	17%	64%

The fact that Raquel used recast as the most frequent type of OCF strategy could imply an apparent contradiction between her beliefs and her classroom actions. One of Raquel's most entrenched beliefs was that she should guide students to discover their mistakes in order to promote meaningful learning. Likewise, she believed that her students would achieve self-correction if they were given the opportunity to reflect on their mistakes rather than if they were provided with the right answer immediately. Following this line of thought, it was expected to observe an ample use of output-prompting types of OCF (i.e. metalinguistic cues, elicitation, repetition, clarification requests, paralinguistic signals), since they would be the most appropriate ones to shift the responsibility for correction and performance onto students. However, Raquel provided higher frequencies of recasts (59%) than any other OCF types. As recasts are classified as input-providing type of OCF strategies, their use would not allow students to think about their mistakes and to self-correct. This incongruent relation between Raquel's beliefs and her classrooms actions will be further explored in the following section.

4.3 RQ 3: *To what extent is there correspondence between the EFL teacher's classroom actions and her beliefs about OCF?*

As regards Raquel's beliefs about OCF and her classroom practices, it can be affirmed that there is correspondence. As table 4 shows, Raquel believed that OCF contributes to language learning; in her classroom practices it was possible to identify that she enacted this belief by addressing the majority of her students' mistakes employing the 7 types of OCF strategies. Therefore, it can be said that Raquel's classroom actions mirrored her belief about the role of OCF in language learning. In addition, Raquel held the belief that one of her roles as a teacher was to provide OCF. This belief was apparently enacted in her actions as we could perceive that in the classroom, she was the main feedback provider. Furthermore, Raquel believed that she should be sensitive in the way she provided OCF to avoid the arousal of students' negative emotions and that her students should have high self-confidence in order to develop their speaking ability. It appears that Raquel acted in accordance with her beliefs by creating a relaxing and tension-free atmosphere. One way she might have done so was by using mostly recast. This OCF strategy has been described as a non-disturbing and non-intimidating strategy because it helps to secure a comfortable classroom environment since

students are not interrupted by the teacher to explicitly point out their errors (Farrokhi, 2007; Junqueira & Kim, 2013; Kamiya, 2014; Yoshida, 2008, 2010). Furthermore, as students are not “humiliated” (Kamiya, 2014) in front of their peers, their self-confidence is not lowered.

However, there was not always a direct correspondence between Raquel’s beliefs and actions. An incongruent relation was detected between her belief about giving the students the possibility to self-correct and promote discovery learning and her classroom practices. It was observed that in very few occasions Raquel provided students with opportunities for self-correction; only 37% of the OCF instances Raquel used output-prompting strategies.

Table 4. Correspondence between Raquel’s beliefs and her classroom actions.

Raquel’s beliefs	Raquel’s classroom actions	Correspondence
OCF contributes to language learning	She addressed most of students’ errors employed 7 different OCF strategies	Yes
Her role is to provide OCF	She was the main feedback provider	Yes
Teachers should be sensitive in the way she provides OCF to avoid the arousal of students’ negative emotions	She created a comfortable and tension-free classroom atmosphere 59% recast - input-providing strategy	Yes
students should have high self-confidence in order to develop their speaking ability	She created a comfortable and tension-free classroom atmosphere 59% recast - input-providing strategy	Yes
students should achieve self- correction	Her students were not given the opportunity to self- correct 59% recast- input-providing strategy	No

In addition, Raquel held the belief that she should guide her students to discover their own mistakes in order to encourage students to develop self-regulation and error detection skills. In the same way, she believed that self-correction could be achieved if students were allowed to reflect on their mistakes rather than if they were provided the right answer straight away. Accordingly, output-prompting OCF strategies would be the most suitable for guiding the students to self-correct. Notwithstanding, Raquel used recasts (59%) to treat her students’ mistakes; in this way, students were provided with the right answer, instead of being given the opportunity to detect their mistakes and achieve self-correction. A possible explanation for this lack of correspondence might be related to another of Raquel’s entrenched beliefs. She repeatedly manifested that for students to develop the speaking ability, they needed to have high self-confidence and that teachers should avoid classroom situation that would provoke students’ negative emotions. Hence, Raquel believed that teachers should be sensitive in the way they provided OCF. In addition, Raquel would avoid distressing her students by not providing OCF strategies that would expose them in front of their classmates, such as output-prompting ones. Presumably, the source of conflict between Raquel’s beliefs and her classroom actions could have been her beliefs regarding the negative impact her provision of OCF could cause on her students’ emotions and self-confidence. Raquel’s frequent use of recasts during her classes might

mean that her aim was not to lower her students' self-confidence. She might have provided recasts because they are the least intimidating type of OCF strategies since students are not forced to self-correct in front of the whole class (Yoshida, 2008). Therefore, it is at this point, that the complex nature of the relationship between beliefs and actions is manifested.

We argue that Raquel's beliefs about the impact OCF could have on her students' emotions and self-confidence could have played a role at the time of deciding which belief to enact: to generate a tension-free classroom atmosphere, where students would be able to develop their speaking skill without social strains, or to prioritize students' development of self-regulation and error detection skills by giving them the opportunity to self-correct and consequently pointing out their mistakes in front of their peers. In practice, Raquel enacted her belief regarding the protection of students' self-confidence. This classroom action might have possibly been guided by her sensitivity and her beliefs about the impact OCF could have on students' emotions. Seemingly, Raquel's awareness of her students' emotions seemed to be more important than the promotion of discovery learning.

Previous research findings will help support interpretations of Raquel's complex relationship between her beliefs, her students' emotions and her classroom practices. Kamiya (2014) obtained similar results. He observed that the four ESL participant teachers had the commonly stated belief that creating a comfortable environment for students was a crucial component for successful language learning. Therefore, one of their shared beliefs about OCF was that it should not humiliate students. Consequently, when OCF was employed, they opted for implicit types, mainly recasts. The fact that implicit types of OCF were preferred by teachers to prevent students' arousal of negative emotions was also supported by Yoshida's (2008, 2010) findings. Yoshida (2010) explained that implicit OCF such as clarification requests, repetitions and recasts in particular, were frequently used by the teachers in order to provide corrections without disturbing the flow of interactions or intimidating students by not explicitly pointing out their errors. Another reason why the teachers used recasts was because they did not threaten students' face and consequently, the maintenance of a supportive classroom atmosphere was assured.

Raquel was aware of the conflict between her beliefs and her actions; she expressed this in her final comment in the stimulated recall interview:

20. *I sometimes try not to correct them so much; [...] I try to avoid that, especially because **I think that they won't continue speaking if I correct them too much.** But if I don't correct **that's contradictory** because if I don't correct, I know that they would continue making mistakes so **that's difficult sometimes to decide.** (SRI)*

This contradiction has been explained in the literature by Magilow (1999) who refers to it as the "pedagogical dilemma". He explains that "to facilitate successful language learning teachers must perform a complicated balancing act of two necessary but seemingly contradictory roles. They must establish positive affect among students yet also engage in the interactive confrontational activity of error correction" (Magilow, 1999, p. 125)

In essence, Raquel enacted her explicit belief regarding the fact that students' emotions and self-confidence should be preserved by creating a comfortable and tension-free classroom atmosphere, at the expense of enacting another of her entrenched beliefs.

5 Conclusion

This case study attempted to describe an Argentinian EFL teacher's beliefs regarding the provision of OCF and her beliefs correspondence or not with her classroom practices. It can be concluded that Raquel's classroom actions regarding the provision of OCF were mostly guided by her beliefs. Even though the relationship between Raquel's beliefs and classroom practices could be described as a congruent one, when discrepancies were noticed, it was because students' emotions were at play. When Raquel was faced with an ambiguous situation: either to use output-prompting OCF strategies to promote students' self-correction and in this way risk students' self-confidence, or to provide input-providing types of OCF to achieve a relaxed and comfortable classroom atmosphere, she prioritised the preservation of her students' integrity, self-confidence and avoidance of the arousal of negative emotions. In this respect, Kalaja et al. (2015) highlighted that emotions serve as background [...] since they permeate what we believe about the world".

This study has attempted to "unveil" (Barcelos, 2015) the impact that a teacher's beliefs could have on classroom actions. We consider that this is a step forward to the contribution to a deeper and more nuanced interpretations of teachers' beliefs regarding OCF practices in EFL classrooms. Furthermore, we consider that a reflective teacher should take into consideration the findings from this and other studies on teachers' beliefs about EC in order to reflect upon their own OCF practices and to make more conscious and informed decisions when dealing with their students' erroneous oral productions.

Although the findings in this study may contribute to improving the situation of EFL teachers in their classroom contexts, there are some limitations that should be considered. Some critics may argue that a qualitative case study is not generalizable as we have only studied a participant within a particular course and classroom context. However, other investigations in the field have arrived at similar conclusions (Farrokhi, 2007; Roothoof, 2014). In addition, Patton (2015) states that the creation of a "thick and rich description" (p. 1163) of the situation is the goal of a qualitative study, instead of generalizability. Another limitation of this study can be related to the number of class observations. Observing more classes would have provided a more comprehensive picture of the teacher's systematic provision of OCF and her enacted beliefs. However, the use of the video recorder intimidated not only the teacher but also the students because they did not get accustomed to it and never forgot about it. Despite the limitations, the findings carry pedagogical implications to EFL teachers OCF practices.

In the end, the beliefs that had stronger connections to Raquel's assumed students' emotions were the ones enacted in her classroom practices.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our deepest gratitude to Raquel, the participant teacher of this study for her time and willingness to contribute to this investigation. We are also immensely grateful to the two anonymous reviewers whose comments have greatly improved this manuscript.

Endnotes

¹ Discovery learning is a particular type of active learning that involves pupils discovering information or concepts through enquiry rather than being given it directly (Smith & Firth, 2018, p. 246).

² Self-confidence is defined as an individual's recognition of his own abilities, loving himself and being aware of his own emotions. Self-esteem, self-love, self-knowledge, stating concrete aims and positive thinking are the elements of intrinsic self-confidence. Extrinsic self-confidence is the behaviour and attitude towards others. (Gürler, 2015, p. 15).

References

- Althobaiti, N. (2014). Corrective feedback: A bridge between cognitive interactionist and social interactionist perspectives. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 2(10), 950–954.
- Aragão, R. (2011). Beliefs and emotions in foreign language learning. *System*, 39(3), 302–313.
- Ayedh, A., & Khaled, E. (2011). EFL teachers' feedback to oral errors in EFL classroom: Teachers' perspectives. *Arab World English Journal*, 2(1), 214–232.
- Barcelos, A. M. F. (2015). Unveiling the relationship between language learning beliefs, emotions, and identities. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 2, 301–325.
- Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *System*, 40(2), 282–295.
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 243–272.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language teaching*, 36(2), 81–109.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education. Research and practice*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Carazzai, M. R. P., & Santin, F. (2007). Correção de erros gramaticais orais na sala de aula de inglês-LE: Um estudo da prática e das crenças de uma professora [Oral corrective feedback on grammatical errors in the EFL classroom: Studying a teacher's practices and beliefs]. *Revista Letras*, 73, 109–130.
- Cohen, A. D., & Fass, L. (2001). Oral language instruction: Teacher and learner beliefs and the reality in EFL classes at a Colombian university. *IRLC*, 6, 44–62.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dewaele, J. M. (2015). On emotions in foreign language learning and use. *The language Teacher*, 39(3), 13–15.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3–18.
- Ellis, R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in L2 classroom. What we know so far. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 3–18). New York: Routledge.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 339–368.
- Elsaghayer, M. (2014). Affective damage to oral corrective feedback among students in Libyan secondary schools. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 4(6), 74–82.
- Farrokhi, F. (2007). Teachers' stated beliefs about corrective feedback in relation to their practices in EFL classes. *Research on Foreign Languages Journal of Faculty of Letters and Humanities*, 49(2), 91–131.
- Frijda, N. H., Manstead, A. S., & Bem, S. (2000). The influence of emotions on beliefs. In N. H. Frijda, A. S. Manstead, & S. Bem (Eds.), *Emotions and beliefs: How feelings influence thoughts* (pp. 1–44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Fu, T., & Nassaji, H. (2016). Corrective feedback, learner uptake, and feedback perception in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 159–181.
- García-Ponce, E. E., & Irasema-Mora, P. (2017). Exploring the effects of teachers' and learners' conflicting beliefs on the provision of corrective feedback during undisturbed classroom interactions. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 12(1), 125–148.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gürler, I. (2015). Correlation between self-confidence and speaking skill of English language teaching and English language and literature preparatory students. *Current Research in Social Sciences*, 1(2), 14–19.
- Gutiérrez Oduber, O. I., & Miquilena Matos, R. J. (2009). Retroalimentación oral correctiva en el aula de inglés como lengua extranjera (ILE) [Oral corrective feedback in the EFL classroom]. *Laurus*, 15(29), 339–367.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81–112.
- Junqueira, L., & Kim, Y. (2013). Exploring the relationship between training, beliefs, and teachers' corrective feedback practices: A case study of a novice and an experienced ESL teacher. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 69(2), 181–206.
- Kalaja, P., Barcelos, A. M. F., Aro, M., & Ruohotie-Lyhty, M. (2015). Key issues relevant to the studies to be reported: Beliefs, agency and identity. In P. Kalaja, A. M. F. Barcelos, M. Aro, & M. Ruohotie-Lyhty (Eds.), *Beliefs, agency and identity in foreign language learning and teaching* (pp. 8–24). New York: Springer.
- Kamiya, N. (2014). The relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(3), 206–219.
- Li, S. (2014). Oral corrective feedback. *ELT Journal Volume* 68(2), 196–198.
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(3), 399–432.
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 269–300.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66.
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265–302.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (2002). Motivation, anxiety, and emotion in second language acquisition. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Individual differences and instructed language learning* (pp. 45–68). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Magilow, D. (1999). Case study #2: Error correction and classroom affect. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/ Teaching German*, 32, 125–129.
- Martínez Agudo, J. D. (2012). Investigating Spanish EFL students' beliefs and preferences regarding the effectiveness of corrective feedback. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(19), 121–131.
- McKay, S. L. (2006). *Researching second language classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Méndez, E. H., Cruz, R. R., & Loyo, G. M. (2010). Oral corrective feedback by EFL teachers at Universidad de Quintana Roo. *International FEL Memo*, 1, 240–253. Retrieved from <http://fel.uqroo>
- Mori, R. (2002). Teachers' beliefs and corrective feedback. *AJAL Journal*, 24(1), 52–73.
- Mori, R. (2011). Teacher cognition in corrective feedback in Japan. *System*, 39(4), 451–467.
- Nilsson, N. (2019). Foreign language anxiety: The case of young learners of English in Swedish primary classrooms. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 13(2), 1–21.
- Noor, N. M., Aman, I., Mustaffa, R., & Seong, T. K. (2010). Teacher's verbal feedback on students' response: A Malaysian ESL classroom discourse analysis. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 7, 398–405.

- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573–595.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. California: SAGE.
- Pawlak, M. (2018). Investigating the use of speaking strategies in the performance of two communicative tasks: The importance of communicative goal. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(2), 269–291.
- Pekrun, R. (2014). *Emotions and learning (Educational Practices Series 24)*. Switzerland: UNESCO International Bureau of Education.
- Pollari, P. (2017). To feed back or to feed forward?: Students' experiences of and responses to feedback in a Finnish EFL classroom. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 11(4), 11–33.
- Roothoof, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System*, 46, 65–79.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar: A meta-analysis of the research. In J. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 131–164). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sepehrinia, S., & Mehdizadeh, M. (2016). Oral corrective feedback: teachers' concerns and researchers' orientation. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(4), 483–500.
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 263–300.
- Smith, H. (2010). *Correct me if I'm wrong: investigating the preferences in error correction among adult English language learners*. Doctoral dissertation, College of Arts and Humanities, University of Central Florida. Retrieved from purl.fcla.edu/fcla/etd/cfe0003062
- Smith, M., & Firth, J. (2018). *Psychology in the classroom: A teacher's guide to what works*. New York: Routledge.
- Valsecchi, M. I., & Ponce, S. Y. (2015). *Creencias de docentes de inglés de escuela secundaria: Su importancia e implicancia en la formación docente. VIII Jornadas Nacionales y 1° Congreso Internacional sobre formación del profesorado* [Secondary school teachers' beliefs: their relevance and implications in teacher training. VIII National Conference and I International Conference about Teacher Training]. Conference Proceedings. ISBN: 978-987-544-655-7. Mar del Plata, Argentina.
- Wass, R., Timmermans, J., Harland, T., & McLean, A. (2018). Annoyance and frustration: Emotional responses to being assessed in higher education. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 1–13. Available at <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1469787418762462>
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 78–93.
- Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 293–314.

Appendices

Appendix A. Semi-structured Teacher Interview.

1. Teacher's background

- a) Age:
- b) How many years of teaching experience do you have?
- c) What's your teaching and academic background?
- d) Why did you become an ESL teacher?

2. **Beliefs about OCF**: I would like to talk about your beliefs and classroom actions about the oral corrective feedback that you provide (or you do not provide) to your students in your lessons/ classes.

We operationalized OCF as the teacher's reaction to a student's erroneous oral production. They can consist of 1) an indication that an error has been committed, 2) provision of the correct target language form, 3) metalinguistic information about the nature of the error, or any combination of these (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006).

- 1) Do you provide OCF to your students? Why?
 - 2) How do you usually provide OCF to your students? What does it depend on?
 - 3) Do you believe that error correction enhances or hinders student's language learning process? Why?
 - 4) What aspects do you believe that you should focus on when providing OCF to your students? Why do you think so?
 - 5) In your opinion, which is the most effective way of providing OCF to your students? Why do you believe so?
 - 6) Are you satisfied with the way you handle OCF in your classes?
3. **Beliefs about students' preferences on the provision of OCF**
 - 7) Do you believe that your students want to receive OCF? Why do you believe that?
 - 8) Do you believe that your students prefer to receive OCF in a particular way? (Provide the examples if necessary: Every time they make a mistake? Once they have finished expressing their idea? Or they want to be interrupted?) Why do you think so?
 - 9) Do you believe that the way you provide OCF affects or has an impact on students' feelings? Why do you believe so?
 - 10) Do you talk to them about how they prefer to receive OCF? Why?

Appendix B. Stimulated Recall Teacher Interview.

- Researcher:
- Participant Teacher:
- Date, Time & Venue:

<p>Purpose of this stimulated Recall interview: The purpose of this stimulated recall interview is to complement the classroom observations with your own view and explanation of the pointed situations.</p>
--

- **Activity**

- ✓ The researcher will show you an excerpt from your lesson. After watching it, you are invited to answer the following questions in English or Spanish, as you feel more comfortable. Mind that these are suggested questions, it is not necessary that you answer all of them in every excerpt that the researcher will show you.
 - What were you thinking about at that moment?
 - What was your aim in this activity/ behaviour/ answer/ etc.?
 - Was your aim achieved?
 - Why did you decide to do or not to do that?
 - Comment on your behaviour

Received September 20, 2017
Revision received May 2, 2018
Accepted June 19, 2019