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This study was a qualitatively-dominant investigation, combining both qualitative and quantitative procedures. The purpose of this study was to discover what types of feedback and error treatment better facilitates college students' oral foreign language learning. Subjects were students learning English in Taiwan. Through screening interviews, three professors responsible for teaching specific college oral English classes were purposefully selected from two different universities in Taiwan. Three different classes taught by the professors were observed on an ongoing basis during one semester of instruction.

Three different types of data were collected in this research, including: (a) transcribed interviews of professors, (b) statistical results regarding feedback types as well as college students' uptake and repair moves, and (c) multi-faceted data sources from classroom observations. The qualitative methodology of grounded theory was employed in the generation of a theory regarding professors' perceptions of instructional practices' effectiveness. Frequency distributions of feedback types and their comparative effectiveness were also analyzed.

The findings of this research revealed first that professors' perceptions of their instructional approaches matched closely the observed behaviors in their classrooms; consequently, professors are self-aware. Classroom observations revealed that these oral English professors tended to employ most often indirect and implicit types of feedback, believing these approaches better insofar as they prevented student frustration the professors had noted when using direct or explicit corrections. However, the results of this study concluded that direct and explicit feedback actually prompted a higher percentage of both uptake moves and repair moves from the learners. Therefore, language professors must become aware of the discrepancy between their perceptions of the effectiveness of instructional approaches and the actual effectiveness of their teaching methods. Thus, they should more often utilize methods with proven results.
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CHAPTER ONE

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Language enriches one's life and enlarges one's vision. This is exactly what English can do for its learners. Brown (2000), Borg (2001), and Lam (2002) all indicated the importance of English in today's world because of its recognition as the most powerful tool to communicate internationally. Learning English has become a significant priority for any individual who wants to be prepared to better survive in this highly competitive modern world. Language instructors and learners who have devoted themselves to serious teaching and learning want to learn the best curriculum and practices to achieve proficiency in English more efficiently and effectively.

In Taiwan, historically students began to learn English formally in junior high schools. But the situation changed dramatically when the government and society realized the importance of English. Thus, English started to be taught in elementary schools in 2001. Some families also send children to private language schools or bilingual schools to begin learning English earlier than the primary grades. The government has also developed and enforced a Standardized Test to assess English proficiency. This is intended to motivate learning and improve English ability.

However, both teachers and students often complain about the difficulties of teaching and learning English in Taiwan. Among the four skills of English (listening, reading, writing and speaking), speaking can be the most difficult and frustrating for Chinese students (Hill, 1999). Even after years of learning English, many Chinese students still struggle with speaking the language. Thus, it is important for language
instructors to determine what teaching methodologies and strategies can better improve Taiwanese students' oral English.

Many Mandarin-speaking students find it difficult to learn English because of the great differences between English and their native language (Hill, 1999; Huang, 1998; Cheng, 1999). For example, Chinese students can be frustrated when learning English due to the complicated tense distinction, a totally different structure of sentence patterns, and difficulty with pronunciation (Huang, 1998; Cheng, 1999). Therefore, it is essential that students be provided with several different teaching approaches to facilitate their learning (Duffy & Jones, 1995). As Lowman (1984) suggested, the quality of instruction depends upon the professors’ teaching style and on the classroom environment that is created. Thus, teachers should provide students with various teaching approaches as well as a non-threatening learning environment.

Since teachers’ instructional styles vary and have such great influences on students’ learning, it is important for instructors to establish and emphasize different levels of interpersonal rapport with the students (Lowman, 1984). Basically, Chinese students are traditionally more passive learners when compared to Western students. Chinese students tend to be more shy and quiet in the classroom, and seldom speak their minds in public (Huang, 1998; Cheng, 1999). Therefore, teaching styles must strive to address these cultural characteristics. Moreover, teachers should provide early and frequent feedback for the students and create an environment for active learning and cooperation (Westervelt, 1998; Dodge, 1996).

Having errors corrected can sometimes be frustrating for language learners, and such correction may reduce students’ willingness to communicate with their teachers or classmates. Teachers’ attitudes in providing positive feedback and effective treatment of
students' errors may greatly affect students' confidence and performance in the learning process (Panova & Lyster, 2002).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to discover what types of feedback and error treatment better facilitates Taiwanese college students' oral English learning. More specifically, this research was designed to understand English teachers' perceptions and their classroom practices regarding feedback and error correction. Through interviews and classroom observations, this study was to investigate if teachers' perceptions match observed behaviors in their classrooms.

Furthermore, the study was also conducted to determine what feedback types are used and how they are distributed. Different feedback types were observed, categorized, and analyzed in order to examine and compare their effectiveness. The term "effective" is defined by the amount of uptake to which learners respond after receiving feedback. In this way, this research aimed to discover which feedback types led to the greatest amount of uptake and repair of errors regarding Taiwanese college students' oral English learning.

Research Questions

The following research questions serve as a foundation for this investigation:

*Grand Tour Question:*

What kinds of feedback and error treatment will better facilitate Taiwanese college students' oral English learning?

*Sub-questions:*

1. What are the teachers' perceptions of feedback and error treatment in their teaching of college oral English?

2. Do teachers' perceptions match observed behaviors in their classrooms?
3. What kinds of corrective feedback are currently being used and how are they distributed in teaching and learning oral English in the college classrooms in Taiwan?

4. Are certain types of feedback more effective than others in leading learners to notice their errors? (The term “effective” is defined by the amount of uptake to which learners respond after receiving feedback).

5. Which feedback types (direct or indirect; explicit or implicit) lead to better repair of errors in Taiwanese college students’ oral English learning?

Limitations

This study has the following inherent limitations:

1. Some aspects of classroom processes are not actually observable in a very reliable or measurable way, such as anxiety. Consequently, the researcher is required to form opinions about the feelings of others as evinced through their behaviors.

2. Sometimes the corrective feedback and error treatments are not easily put into distinctive categories.

3. Since language learning and development can be an individual-based process, students’ English proficiency may vary even in the same level of language classroom.

Delimitations

The following are delimitations of this study:

1. This study is delimited to the classroom observations and interviews of English professors in Taiwan.
2. The analytic model, adapted from Lyster (2001), constitutes the coding format for interactional data and different types of feedback.

3. This study is delimited to a similar level of oral English instruction in order to minimize the differences of language proficiency.

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this research, the following terms are defined:

*Clarification Requests.* Feedback which indicates to the learner that their utterance was somehow misunderstood or erroneous, but without explicitly saying so (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

*Corrective Feedback.* “Any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance” (Chaudron, 1977, p. 31).

*Effective Treatment of Errors.* Teachers’ dealing with students’ errors in a positive way that promotes their learning (Allwright & Bailey, 1994).

*Elicitation.* Feedback which attempts to elicit a correct utterance from a learner, such as a leader where the learner would merely fill in the blank with the correct phrase, or a specific question to elicit a particular response (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

*Error.* An ill-formed linguistic production containing phonological, lexical, or grammatical problems (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

*Error Treatment.* The examination or decision-making processes that teachers go through when they react to learners’ errors (Allwright & Bailey, 1994).

*Explicit Feedback.* Direct feedback which blatantly tells the learner that an utterance contained an error (Carroll, Swain, & Roberge, 1992).
**Feedback.** How a speaker reacts to the errors of a language learner’s utterance (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

**Implicit Feedback.** Indirect feedback, including recasts and repetitions, requiring the learner to make inferences on their utterance (Carroll, Swain, & Roberge, 1992).

**Metalinguistic Feedback.** Feedback which contains information to indicate an error, but without explicitly telling the learner where or what the error is (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

**Oral Error.** The utterance which deviates from the correct version that normally is identified as the native speaker norm (Allwright & Bailey, 1994).

**Positive Feedback.** Teachers’ response toward students’ questions and performance in a constructive way that facilitates the students’ learning (Allwright & Bailey, 1994).

**Recast.** The restating of a learner’s utterance, but without the error, thus demonstrating the correct form. A form of implicit feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

**Repetition.** Feedback whereby the instructor emphatically repeats an utterance with an error, thus pointing out the error with a change in intonation with the voice (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

**Uptake.** Different types of student responses immediately following the feedback, including responses with repair of the nontarget items as well as utterances still in need of repair (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of this study is its contribution to the teaching and learning of oral English for Taiwanese college students. It was suggested that teachers should provide learners with appropriate cognitive feedback as well as affective support.
(Westervelt, 1998; Dodge, 1996). As Brown (1994) contended, “To prevent fossilization of erroneous forms, teachers should provide not only clear cognitive information about the problems in the learners’ output but also positive affective feedback” (p. 28). Most of all, teachers should offer learners the greatest possible variety of pedagogies based on a student’s individual language needs, proficiency level, and other individual differences. This is important because we know of no single way that always works and different people need to be treated differently (Brown, 1994). This individualized teaching is helpful for students with limited language proficiency (Allwright & Bailey, 1994). When teachers correct students’ errors, it can sometimes frustrate the students and may thwart their desire to try again (Allwright & Bailey, 1994). Therefore, teachers need to be careful when pointing out students’ misstatements and continue to encourage them by communicating and providing positive affective support (Panova & Lyster, 2002). The discovery and implementation of specific corrective feedback types which better facilitate Taiwanese students’ oral English learning would contribute to the effectiveness of English education in Taiwan.

In addition, this study would also help to enable academic administrators to hire better qualified potential language instructors and to more successfully evaluate the effectiveness of their instruction. As Rebore (2004) indicated, “the objective of the selection process is to hire individuals who will be successful on the job” (p. 117), and knowing the most efficient pedagogies to promote language learning could help the language instructors to be more successful. It is also beneficial for academic leaders to consider teachers’ teaching perceptions and instructional effectiveness when interviewing potential candidates for the faculty. Furthermore, Oliva (1989) suggested that academic administrators need to help teachers evaluate curriculum and instruction. This study
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which clarifies the understanding of feedback and error treatment would help academic administrators to more effectively evaluate instruction, especially teachers' giving feedback and correcting errors. The results of this study could also help facilitate a teacher's self evaluation of his or her instruction, as well as to better understand the students' learning progress.

Summary

How to learn English effectively and efficiently has become an important concern for both language instructors and learners in Taiwan because English is becoming the international language for the world economy. However, learning oral English can be quite difficult for Chinese students due to the very different language structure from their native language, as well as historically different learning styles when compared with Western students. In addition to the difficulties of learning English, teachers' feedback and error correction can sometimes frustrate students' learning and reduce their willingness to communicate using this foreign language.

Therefore, to better understand how teachers' instruction affects Taiwanese students' oral English learning, this study focused on teachers' perceptions of feedback and error treatment. The purpose of this research was to discover what kinds of feedback and error treatment would better facilitate Taiwanese college students' oral English learning. Furthermore, this research aimed to investigate which feedback types led to the greatest amount of uptake and repair of errors regarding Taiwanese college students' oral English learning.

In addition, the results of this study can also be useful for academic administrators to consider when hiring potential language professors, as well as to evaluate their instructional effectiveness. Findings from this research regarding specific corrective
feedback types designed to facilitate students’ oral English learning will contribute to the effectiveness of English education in Taiwan.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of literature consists of selected literature and related studies relevant to the teaching and learning of oral English from the aspects of giving feedback and correcting errors. The following areas of related literature will be reviewed: (a) Importance of Managing Interaction, (b) Teachers' Roles and Styles, (c) Tools Used for Classroom Research, (d) What Makes Speaking Difficult, (e) Providing Feedback and Strategies that Improve Oral English, (f) Problems in Defining Errors, (g) Teachers' Decision Making, (h) Fossilization, Difficulty and Complexity of Error Correction, (i) Significance of Error Correction, (j) Research on Recast, (k) Studies on Corrective Feedback, and (l) Role of Academic Administrators in Faculty Selection and Evaluation.

Importance of Managing Interaction

What is interaction? According to Brown (1994), interaction is “the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings, or ideas between two or more people resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other” (p. 159). Moreover, theories of communicative competence emphasize the importance of interaction as human beings use language in various contexts to negotiate meanings, or simply stated, to transfer an idea from one’s mind into the mind of another person.

Therefore, researchers as well as language instructors and learners believe that classrooms should be interactive from the very beginning of language study (Brown, 1994). Rivers (1987) also emphasized that through interaction, students can increase their language store. Even at an elementary stage, they learn in this way to develop the elasticity of language.
As Gaies has noted (1980), the language classroom is where teachers and learners come together to learn the language with different experiences and expectations, which is a result of the reactions among complicated elements. Thus, the success of the interaction in the classroom cannot be guaranteed or taken for granted. It has to be carefully planned in advance and it has to be managed appropriately.

The management of interaction in the classroom is a sort of “co-production” which takes everyone’s effort to succeed. As Allwright and Bailey (1994) stated, “We do not manage interaction purely for its own sake. We manage interaction in the language classroom for the sake of giving everyone the best possible opportunities for learning the language” (p. 21).

Teachers’ Roles and Styles

Teachers can play many roles in the course of teaching and there are several different styles of teaching as well. According to Brown (1994), teachers can be categorized into the following roles based on their different styles of teaching characteristics. These styles range from directive to nondirective, as indicated here: (a) the teacher as controller, (b) the teacher as director, (c) the teacher as manager, (d) the teacher as facilitator, and (e) the teacher as resource.

The Teacher as Controller

Teachers are often expected to be the “master” in many traditional educational institutions. That is, teachers are expected to be in charge of every moment in the classroom. They decide what the students do, when they should speak, and what language forms they should use. Teachers can predict most of the students’ responses, because everything is carefully planned ahead of time and the situation should, therefore, be better controlled.
**The Teacher as Director**

In some interactive classrooms, the teacher’s role is likened to that of a conductor of an orchestra or director of a play. As students engage in either rehearsed or spontaneous language performance, the teacher’s job is to keep the process flowing smoothly and efficiently. The ultimate goal of such direction is to enable students eventually to make progress in their language learning and engage in real-life communicative tasks.

**The Teacher as Manager**

In most successful corporations, managers retain control of certain larger objectives of the company, keep employees pointed toward goals, engage in ongoing evaluation and feedback but give freedom to each person to work in their own individual areas of expertise. That is the way teacher as manager does in a language classroom. The teacher is the one who plans lessons and structures the larger, longer segments of classroom time, but allows each student to be creative within those parameters.

**The Teacher as Facilitator**

The teacher as facilitator plays a less directive role in the classroom. The main job of the teacher here is to facilitate the process of learning, to make learning easier for students, to help them clear away roadblocks, to find shortcuts or to negotiate rough terrain. Such a facilitating role requires the teacher to step away from the managerial or directive role and allow students to find their own pathways to successful learning.

**The Teacher as Resource**

This is the least directive role of a teacher. In fact, the implication of the resource role is that the students take the initiative to come to the teacher. The teacher is there for advice and counsel when the students need it.
Brown (1994) indicated that an interactive teacher should be able to assume all five of the above roles on this continuum of directive to nondirective teaching. But the key to interactive teaching is to move toward the nondirective end of the continuum, gradually enabling students to change their roles of total dependence to relative independence. However, the proficiency level of the students will determine to some extent which roles will dominate.

Tools Used for Classroom Research

According to Allwright and Bailey (1994), classroom research concentrates on the inputs to the classroom or on the outputs from the classroom. There are several basic tools used for classroom research. The starting point for many people was Flanders’ (1970) pioneering work on “Interaction Analysis.” Flanders (1970) used this term for his ten-category observation schedule. He designed it for general educational purposes, to be relevant to a variety of lessons. The powerful idea was that teaching was more or less effective depending on how “directly” or “indirectly” teachers influenced learner behavior.

Later on, Moskowitz (1976) produced the best known and most widely-used modification for language pedagogy FLINT (Foreign Language Interaction). Moskowitz (1976) expanded and refined Flanders’ (1970) categories and then used FLINT both as a research tool—to pursue the issue of what constitutes “good” language teaching—and as a feedback tool in teacher training.

The FLINT model is helpful in developing interactive language teaching and has several practical uses (Brown, 1994). First, it gives teachers a taxonomy for observing other teachers. Moskowitz (1976) recommended using a chart or grid to note instances of each category. The observer can also calculate how much time a teacher spends on each
category. Looking at the overall distribution of time can help a teacher evaluate the appropriateness of such a distribution.

Second, the FLINT model gives teachers a framework for evaluating and improving their own teaching. Although this model includes seven categories for teacher talk and only two for student talk, it does not suggest that teachers should dominate in the classroom. The proportions of talking should vary, depending on the objectives of the lesson, the level of the students and other contextual factors.

Third, the FLINT model helps to set a learning climate for interactive teaching. As Brown (1994) indicated, “Teachers can establish a climate of cooperation by recognizing and openly accepting students’ ups and downs, by recognizing each individual student in the class as special in his or her own way, by soliciting their ideas, and by careful framing of questions” (p. 164).

Moreover, Fanselow (1977) created “FOCUS” (Foci for Observing Communications Used in Settings). FOCUS was an observation schedule developed with language teacher training in mind, but as a descriptive system applicable to research on any example of human interaction. Therefore, in Fanselow’s system, there are no separate categories for teachers and learners, but instead there are general categories that can be used regardless of who the participants are or what role they play in the interaction.

However, refinements of these basic tools (the observation instruments) seem not to have occurred. According to Allwright and Bailey (1994), one possibility is that some researchers can not bear to use anyone else’s observational schedules. Therefore, they observed, “the proliferation of instruments is an almost automatic result of refinement and progress in doing the research of classroom interaction” (p. 12).
What Makes Speaking Difficult

Many teachers and students often complain about the difficulties of teaching and learning English as a second language. Among the four skills (listening, reading, writing and speaking) of English, speaking can be the most difficult and frustrating for Chinese students (Hill, 1999).

Brown (1994) pointed out that several factors made speaking difficult for students: clustering, redundancy, performance variables, colloquial language, rate of delivery, pronunciation (stress, rhythm and intonation), and interaction. In order to better assist students’ learning of the language, it is important for language teachers to be aware of each of those difficulties.

The major difficulties of spoken English include problematic pronunciation, grammatical accuracy, speaking fluency, affective factors and interaction effect (Brown, 1994). Pronunciation can be difficult for adult learners of English because according to Brown (1994), the overwhelming majority of adult learners will never acquire an “accent free” command of a foreign language.

As for the aspects of accuracy and fluency, many teachers and learners find it hard to balance improvement and achieve the goals of both accurate and fluent language. Moreover, one of the major obstacles learners have to overcome in learning to speak is “the anxiety generated over the risks of blurting things out that are wrong, stupid, or incomprehensible” (Brown, 1994, p. 255).

Finally, the greatest difficulty that learners have in learning to speak is not in the multiplicity of sounds, words, phrases, and discourse forms that characterize any language, but rather in the interactive nature of most communication. David Nunan (1991) elaborated the idea called the “interlocutor effect.” The difficulty of a speaking task is
often gauged by the skills of one’s interlocutor. In other words, someone’s speaking performance is always influenced or colored by that of the person (interlocutor) he or she is talking with.

Providing Feedback and Strategies that Improve Oral English

Boud (1985) provided the following guidelines to teachers giving feedback to students during classroom discussions or presentations: (a) be realistic, (b) be specific, (c) be prompt, (d) be direct, and (e) be consciously non-judgemental.

According to Brown (1994), there are several guidelines for teaching speaking techniques:

1. Techniques should cover the spectrum of learner needs, from language-based focus on accuracy to message-based focus on interaction, meaning and fluency.
2. Techniques should be intrinsically motivating.
3. Techniques should encourage the use of authentic language in meaningful contexts.
4. Appropriate feedback and correction should be provided.
5. Students should be given opportunities to initiate oral communication. (p.268-269)

Problems in Defining Errors

According to Allwright and Bailey (1994), some of the early observational research in second language classrooms examined teachers’ responses to learners’ errors. The focus shifted in emphasis from contrastive analysis to error analysis in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Contrastive analysis generated predictions based on comparisons of the mother tongue and the foreign language while error analysis studied the errors actually made by learners (Allwright & Bailey, 1994). Researchers and teachers found that language learners inevitably made errors, but they were more concerned about the following questions: What caused people to make errors? Are errors really a problem or
are they an important part of the learning itself? How do teachers react to learners’ errors? Do teachers’ responses make any difference to the learners’ progress?

In order to better clarify these questions, we first must analyze the concept of error itself. According to Allwright and Bailey (1994), typical definitions of errors refer to the production of a linguistic form which deviates from the correct form. These researchers defined the “correct” version as the way native speakers typically produce the form, which is called the “native speaker norm.” They also noted that language learners’ speech usually deviated from the model they were trying to master, and these deviations or discrepancies are in forms that have typically been viewed as errors. But teachers who adopt the communicative approach are often more concerned with such second language learners’ abilities as to convey their ideas and get information than with their abilities to produce grammatically-accurate sentences (Allwright & Bailey, 1994). Some feel that it is more important for learners to accomplish their communicative goals than it is for their sentences to be perfectly well formed.

Therefore, in formal classroom instruction of second or foreign languages, the teacher’s response to students’ utterances may be the most important criterion for judging error. George (1972) even stated that an error is an utterance by a student in a form unwanted by the teacher, since learners’ responses are sometimes rejected by teachers—not because they are wrong but because they are unexpected. Fanselow (1977) observed lessons in which the teacher’s apparent goal was for the student to respond to questions in a way the teacher had planned with no variation allowed.

Chaudron (1986) also discussed various ways of defining error. He defined errors as: (a) linguistic forms or content that differed from native speaker norms or facts, and (b) any other behavior signaled by the teacher as needing improvement. Chaudron also used
the concept of "corrective reactions," defined as "any reaction by the teacher which transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of, a student's behavior or utterance" (1986b, p. 66).

Another important consideration for language teachers is to recognize that there is a distinction between "mistake" and "error." Corder (1967) uses the term "error" to refer to regular patterns in the learner's speech which consistently differ from the target language model. However, he uses the term "mistake" to refer to memory lapses, slips of the tongue, and other instances of performance errors. Second language learners can often correct their own mistakes, but the errors they make, from this perspective, are part of their current system of interlanguage rules, and hence are not recognizable as "wrong" (Corder, 1967). Thus, their errors are not amenable to self-repair, but their mistakes may well be.

Teachers' Decision Making

Allwright and Bailey (1994) emphasized the difference between "treatment" and "cure". As they noted:

Just because the teacher treats an error in some way, or just because the learner, in response to the treatment, manages immediately to get something right that was previously wrong, does not mean that a permanent cure has been effected. Many teachers have had the uncomfortable experience of getting learners who made repeated errors to use the correct form in the class, only to hear the incorrect form re-emerge in the corridors outside the classroom during the break. No matter how hard a teacher tries to correct errors, in the long run, only the learner can do the learning necessary to improve performance, regardless of how much treatment is provided. (p. 99)
Many studies on teachers' treatment of learners' errors show that teachers do not treat all the errors that occur (Allwright, 1975; Chaudron, 1977, 1986, 1987; Fanselow, 1977; Long, 1977; Nystrom, 1983). The findings also indicated that teachers have a wide variety of techniques available for the treatment of errors, but they do not typically make the full use of the repertoire of behaviors from which they might choose in providing feedback. According to these aforementioned studies, what is remarkable about the finding is the complexity of the decisions teachers must make in order to treat learners' errors appropriately.

Long (1977) also believed that the question of when to treat an error has no simple answer. He stated:

Having noticed an error, the first decision the teacher makes is whether or not to treat it at all. In order to make that decision, the teacher may have recourse to factors with immediate, temporary bearing, such as the importance of the error to the current pedagogical focus on the lesson, the teacher’s perception of the chance of eliciting correct performance from the student if negative feedback is given, and so on. Consideration of these ephemeral factors may be preempted, however, by the teacher’s beliefs (conscious or unconscious) as to what a language is and how a new one is learned. These beliefs may have been formed years before the lesson in question. (p. 288)

In fact, Long (1977) proposed a model of decision-making processes that a language teacher goes through when an oral error occurs. The model depicts the choices the teacher must make between the moment when an oral error occurs and the actual behavioral manifestation of feedback that follows.
Hendrickson’s (1978) study of error treatment was the foundation for Chaudron’s (1987) research that adopted the following questions as the framework for his study on teachers’ giving feedback and treatment of students’ errors: (a) Should learner errors be corrected? (b) If so, when should learner errors be corrected? (c) Which learner errors should be corrected? (d) How should learner errors be corrected? and (e) Who should correct learner errors?

In deciding whether to treat students’ oral errors, Chaudron (1987) noted several factors that teachers should consider. First of all, teachers should consider if the learners have been exposed to the form or function involving the error previously. That is, if the error comes from a certain unfamiliar form which the learners have not been taught, it may not seem fair to most teachers to criticize their students by reacting with negative cognitive feedback. In addition, there is a difference between native and non-native teachers. Although non-native teachers cannot be expected to treat errors if they cannot detect them, research has shown that they are relatively more severe correctors than most native speaking teachers (Ludwig, 1982).

Another question which teachers may consider in deciding whether to treat an error or to ignore it is to determine whether the error is within the learner’s current stage of acquisition in terms of his or her place on the interlanguage continuum (Allwright & Bailey, 1994). In other words, many teachers decide whether they should treat students’ errors or not depending on the assumption of their readiness to learn.

Brown (2000) also discussed the question of whether foreign language instructors should treat or ignore students’ errors. He indicated that the learner’s proficiency level or linguistic stage is the major factor that this decision depends on.
By treating errors, teachers are trying to help students move ahead in their language acquisition. However, mistimed error treatment may not be helpful, and may even be harmful if it is aimed at structures which are beyond the second language learners in terms of their stage of interlanguage development (Allwright & Bailey, 1994). Therefore, language instructors need to carefully consider when and how to treat oral errors.

Moreover, cultural expectations can also be an important consideration for teachers' decision making. Brown (1994) proposed that in order to play roles and develop styles effectively, teachers have to consider the culture in which they are teaching, as well as the culture of their students. Brown (1994) indicated that “western cultures emphasize non-directive, non-authoritarian roles and teaching styles” (p. 420). Similarly, Hofstede (1986) listed a number of cultural expectations of roles and styles regarding teachers and students in different cultures:

1. Eastern students expect the teacher to show them the way while western teachers expect students to find their own way.
2. Western students are encouraged to speak out their thoughts while eastern students are expected to speak in class only when called on by the teacher.
3. In the eastern culture, teachers are expected to provide all the answers; while in the western culture, teachers are not expected to know “everything.”
4. Western teachers and students tend to express their emotions; while in the eastern culture, teachers and students are not expected to show much of their emotions.
5. In the western culture, teachers reward students for their innovations; but in the eastern culture, students are rewarded for accuracy in problem solving.
Kasper (1985) found that self-initiated and self-completed repair is preferred by both learners and teachers. This research found that in language-centered phases, trouble sources were identified by the teacher and repaired by the teacher or another learner, rather than the original speaker. One characteristic of language classes that marks them somehow different from “real life” is the preponderance of other-initiated other-repair. That is, teachers often tell learners that they have made errors and then tell them what to say instead (Kasper, 1985). However, as Allwright and Bailey (1994) suggested, one of the issues language teachers must consider, when faced with learners’ errors, is deciding whether or not the learners themselves can employ self-initiated self-repair, or other-initiated self-repair.

Fossilization, Difficulty and Complexity of Error Correction

The concept of “fossilization” is often discussed regarding second language learners’ errors. As Allwright and Bailey (1994) stated, “Some learners seem not to make much use of the feedback they receive in terms of altering their output” (p. 93). In other words, fossilization is the “consistent use of recognizably erroneous forms” (p. 93).

Although we do not know exactly why fossilization occurs, some researchers (Brown, 1987; Vigil and Oller, 1976) believe that fossilization has to do with the type of feedback second language learners have received. For example, Vigil and Oller (1976) indicated that there are at least two kinds of feedback which second language learners get from their interlocutors: cognitive feedback and affective feedback. Cognitive feedback refers to the information about the language they use while affective feedback deals with emotional reactions in response to their desire or willingness to continue communicating. As Brown (1994) illustrated:
Teachers should be reminded of an important distinction between affective and positive feedback. The former is the extent to which we value or encourage a student's attempt to communicate; the latter is the extent to which we indicate an understanding of the 'message' itself. Teachers are engaged in a never-ending process of making sure that they provide sufficient positive affective feedback to students and at the same time give appropriate feedback to students about whether or not their actual language is clear and unambiguous. (p.28)

Vigil and Oller (1976) suggested that both cognitive and affective feedback are required to be provided for second language learners in order to prevent fossilization of erroneous form and to facilitate their language acquisition. That is, to ensure continued communication, clear cognitive information about the problems in the learners' output must be accompanied by positive affective feedback. However, affective feedback does not mean to be 100% positive. As Allwright and Bailey (1994) noted, "positive affective feedback must not be so encouraging that the learners see no reason to change their erroneous output" (P. 94).

Truscott (1999) strongly doubted the necessity of correcting learners' grammatical errors. In his way of thinking, to provide effective correction for a student's error, the teacher must first decide exactly what that error is. Even when teachers fully understand an error, they are still faced with the difficulty of clearly presenting the correction, along with any necessary explanation.

Truscott (1999) purported the correction often has to be designed to fit the reason for its occurrence. In providing corrections to deal with students' errors, teachers must also be concerned with what the student can and cannot understand. Students have a limited knowledge of grammar, so even when the teacher fully understands an error and
presents what would seem to be a clear correction, the correction may fail because the student does not understand it. In addition, Truscott (1999) argued that if teachers are inconsistent in their corrections, these corrections are as likely to be harmful as they are to be helpful.

According to Truscott (1999), to make correction effective and avoid harmful side effects, the teacher must see each student as unique and consider how that student will respond to correction in its many possible forms, varying the type of error corrected, the frequency and explicitness of the correction, the amount and type of accompanying explanation, and the forcefulness of the correction.

Furthermore, considering the possibility of peer correction, Porter (1986) found that learners rarely corrected one another's mistakes and when they did so, they were wrong one-sixth of the time. While some studies did not show positive benefits for error correction, instead of concluding that feedback is not effective, it would be helpful to examine the variables of individual studies to understand and determine the actual effectiveness of feedback and error treatment (Lyster, Lightbown, & Spada, 1999).

Significance of Error Correction

In contrast to Truscott's (1999) claim, Doughty and Varela (1998), Lyster and Ranta (1997), and Spada and Lightbown (1993) found that teachers provided feedback as they interacted with students, who, in turn, appeared neither traumatized nor frustrated; instead, they appeared to expect such interventions as an intrinsic part of the classroom process.

Some of the earliest studies of error correction in L2 (second language) classrooms revealed considerable ambiguity and inconsistency (Allwright, 1975; Fanselow, 1977; Hendrickson, 1978), but none of the researchers argued for the complete abandonment of
corrective feedback. Instead, these early classroom studies led researchers to recommend that teachers should draw on a wider range of feedback types (Corder, 1967; Vigil & Oller, 1976).

Observational studies suggest that students positively do respond to some corrective feedback. For example, in the Lyster and Ranta (1997) study, learner uptake followed over half of all the corrective feedback moves. While not an indication of learning per se, learner uptake is nonetheless an indication that the learner is responding in some way to the corrective feedback (Doughty, 1994).

There are other relevant studies that have investigated the effects of feedback provided during one-on-one interaction (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Mackey & Philp, 1998). These studies showed positive results for certain types of feedback provided consistently in response to specific errors. However, the results of such studies, in which the researcher provides feedback in a controlled one-on-one situation, may not be readily applicable to classroom settings.

The Lightbown and Spada (1990) study is based on post-hoc analyses of classroom transcripts. In the classrooms observed in that study, the pedagogical focus was almost always on communicative interaction, and teachers rarely provided any focus on form or corrective feedback. However, there was some evidence that when teachers did provide some form-focused instruction and corrective feedback, there was a positive effect on some aspects of learners' interlanguage development. Lightbown and Spada (1990) emphasized, however, that this descriptive study could only generate hypotheses for future research. In several experimental studies since that time, they have found some confirmation that, within communicative language teaching, school-age learners can benefit from focus on form and corrective feedback (Spada & Lightbown, 1993; White,
1991; White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta, 1991). However, research has revealed a variety of feedback types in communicative classrooms (Chaudron, 1977; Lyster & Ranta, 1997), some of which are more explicit than others and some of which provide unobtrusive opportunities for negotiation. Swain (1985) has argued that, to enhance the interlanguage development of classroom learners, negotiation strategies should be implemented in ways that “push” learners to produce language that is not only comprehensible but also accurate. In classrooms where this occurs, then, we can expect some overlap between negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form. For example, Lyster and Ranta (1997) found that immersion teachers often used clarification requests as a type of corrective feedback, not because they did not understand, but rather to draw attention to non-target forms. Pica, Holliday, Lewis, and Morgenthaler (1989) found that clarification requests were effective at getting language learners to modify their non-target output. Similarly, Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993) found that some learners progressed in their acquisition of past tense forms after receiving feedback in the form of clarification requests.

Therefore, while there are many challenges and complexities involved in providing effective feedback for L2 learners, there is increasing evidence that feedback on errors can be effective. What is needed is continued systematic and rigorous research to investigate whether different types of feedback are more effective than others and to what extent this may be dependent on the instructional contexts and the characteristics of learners within them.

Research on Recast

According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), recast referred to a corrective feedback type that teacher reformulates all or part of the learner’s utterance in an implicit way.
Some researchers suggested that recasts are effective in showing learners how their current interlanguage differs from the target (Long & Robinson, 1998). According to Nicholas, Lightbown, and Spada (2001), recasts appear to be most effective in contexts where it is clear to the learner that the recast is a reaction to the accuracy of the form, not the content of the original utterance.

Explanations of why recasts might be expected to affect language learning positively are derived from several theoretical frameworks. In L2 research, the most often cited explanations of the benefits of recasts are based on Schmidt's (1990) "noticing hypothesis," which suggests that in order to acquire new linguistic features, learners must first notice these features in the input. Recasts, because they represent an immediate reaction to a learner utterance, may allow learners to compare new linguistic forms to the linguistic forms that encode the same meaning that they had attempted to convey in their interlanguage utterance. Doughty (1999) discussed cognitive explanations for the effectiveness of recasts as examples of focus on form (Long, 1991) in L2 learning.

In the context of communicative and content-based approaches to language teaching, there has been considerable interest in the potential value of recasts for providing corrective feedback in L2 learning. This interest is partly based on the observation that L2 learning, although not identical to L1 (first language) acquisition, shares certain of its characteristics, as has been documented in numerous studies that have reported similar strategies, processes, error patterns, and developmental paths in L1 and L2 acquisition (Ellis, 1994; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Lightbown & Spada, 1999).

Recasts are distinguished from other kinds of focus-on-form procedures because they are not explicit, do not isolate the features of language forms that are the focus of the
feedback, and do not interrupt—even briefly—the flow of meaningful interaction. The
exception may be recasts that are accompanied by some sort of overt signal. For example,
Chaudron (1977) suggested that learners may better recognize “repetition with change
and emphasis” as feedback on form rather than feedback on meaning.

Mackey, Gass, and McDonough (2000) investigated the types of feedback that
occurred in response to different error types in dyadic situations, focusing on learners’
perceptions of that feedback. They found that recasts were most likely to follow morpho-
syntactic errors and that phonological errors were the least likely to receive corrective
feedback in the form of recasts.

Doughty (1994) observed teacher feedback in a beginner level class for university
students of French as a foreign language. The analyses were based on transcriptions of
six hours of audio- and videotapes of the interactional activities in the classroom.
Doughty observed various types of teacher feedback and analyzed learners’ responses to
that feedback. By far the most frequent feedback types were clarification request,
repetition, and recast, with recasts representing nearly 60% of the teacher’s feedback.
More than 40% of student utterances (correct and incorrect) received teacher feedback,
but there was a clear distinction between the kind of feedback the teacher provided to
different types of learner utterances. When feedback was given to correct utterances, it
was most likely to be a repetition. When there was a single error, the type of teacher
feedback was more likely to be a recast (68% of feedback to single-error utterances) or
clarification request (23%). Of the three most frequent feedback types, the one most
likely to lead to learner repetition was the recast.

Other classroom observation studies have yielded results that confirm that the
patterns observed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) are widespread and typical of a variety of
L2 classroom situations. Panova (1999) found a high frequency of recasts with little learner uptake in adult ESL classes. Lochtman (2000) observed the preference for recasts as feedback in German foreign language classes and also found little uptake. In Slimani's (1992) observational study of grammar lessons in an ESL setting, it was observed that the instances of error correction that went unnoticed by the students were typically those that did not contain any metalanguage or required no further involvement from the students. This included recasts.

Havranek's (1999) large-scale study of classroom interaction in English as a Foreign Language classes in Austria also showed a preference for recasts as feedback. The researcher analyzed the feedback patterns in eight secondary school and three university classes (Havranek's, 1999). Results of the study showed that recasts were less likely to be associated with accurate performance than feedback that was more explicitly focused on the form of the learner's utterance (Havranek's, 1999).

Seedhouse (1997) found that teachers in a wide variety of instructional settings tried to avoid telling learners directly that they had made an error. In a study of a large number of classroom transcripts and tapes from a variety of L2 classrooms, Seedhouse (1997) observed that teachers rarely tell learners explicitly that their utterances are incorrect. This unwillingness to be explicit may make it difficult for learners to recognize corrective feedback. Recasts are a good example of this "mitigated feedback," unless they are accompanied by additional devices that alert the learner to their feedback function and focus (1997).

In another classroom observation study with adult learners, Ellis, Loewen, and Basturkmen (1999) investigated a classroom in which 75% of the teacher's responses to learners' errors were recasts. Learners provided uptake to 75% of these. However,
Lochtman (2000) found little evidence of uptake of recasts in highly structure-focused foreign language classes in secondary schools in Belgium.

Furthermore, Lyster (1998) and Oliver (1995) indicated the potential ambiguity of recast for learners, due to its level of implicitness. Thus, Lyster explained that recast may be less effective than other kinds of corrective feedback in leading learners to uptake as well as repair moves.

Studies on Corrective Feedback

Although little experimental research has confirmed the effects of modified output, a study of the acquisition of past tense forms by six learners found at least short-term benefits for some learners receiving clarification requests (Nobuyoshi & Ellis, 1993).

Lyster and Ranta (1997) found that almost 15% of their teacher feedback turns involved multiple types of feedback. Similarly, Yao (2000) found that almost 20% of the teachers' corrective feedback turns involved multiple feedback types.

Yao (2000) observed six EFL teachers in Taiwan and found that they employed eight types of corrective feedback regarding their college students' language errors in class. However, these teachers exclusively applied only a few types, with “recast” the most frequently used type (34.2%), “elicitation” (30.7%) the second, and “explicit” (19.4%) the third. The rest of the five types were adopted only occasionally: “metalinguistic clue” (4.9%), “clarification” (4.7%), “interruption” (2.1%), “repetition” (2.5), and “body language” (0.8%).

Furthermore, Yao (2000) investigated Taiwanese college students' attitudes toward error correction in their EFL learning. In her study, fifteen out of eighteen students (83.3%) believed that error correction is necessary. The researcher also
examined these students’ willingness to be corrected and found that only five students out of eighteen participants stated that they did not want to be corrected for every single error. On the other hand, most of the students agreed that error correction is necessary and important for their language learning. This study revealed adult EFL learners’ positive attitudes toward error correction.

In Yao’s (1998) pilot study, she found that 91.6% of the students believed in the necessity of error correction in the foreign language classroom because of the following reasons: (a) fear of not being aware of one’s errors, (b) fear of fossilization, (c) fear of being unintelligible, (d) fear of being ridiculed, and (e) fear of misleading other students. Later in her further study of 2000, one additional reason was found to be “the fear of misunderstanding.”

Schulz (1996) also conducted research to investigate foreign language teachers’ and students’ attitudes toward error correction, particularly focusing on the use of explicit grammar. Results of this study indicated that students favored error correction with a focus on form. Of 824 foreign language students, 94% agreed that teachers should correct students when they make errors in class. However, of 92 foreign language instructors, only 30% agreed with the idea that when students make errors in speaking a target language, they should be corrected.

In another study conducted by Schulz (2001), findings also indicated that students believe strongly that they need explicit instruction as well as focus on form. A large majority of students in this study reported that they like being corrected, and they believe that it is the teacher’s responsibility to correct students’ errors.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) conducted research to investigate corrective feedback and learner uptake and repair in Canada. They observed four French immersion classes,
audio-taped, and transcribed 100 hours of classroom interaction. In this study, the researchers presented an analysis of classroom interaction that allowed the characterization of various types of corrective feedback used by teachers in response to learner errors. All learner errors were coded and categorized as phonological, lexical, or grammatical. They found that teachers adopted six different types of feedback: recast (55%), elicitation (14%), clarification requests (11%), metalinguistic clue (8%), explicit correction (7%), and repetition of error (5%). They examined and compared the effects of these six types of feedback. The corrective type of recast was found to be the most widely used feedback move.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) examined not only the distribution of different feedback types but also the ways in which learners reacted to the different types of feedback. These reactions were referred to as learner uptake and these utterances were coded as either repaired or still in need of repair. The notion of uptake was borrowed from Austin’s (1962) speech act theory which accounts for a variety of learner reactions in response to the teachers' corrective feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

The research revealed that the feedback type of recast was the least likely approach to lead to learners' uptake moves (31%), while clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition were more successful at prompting uptake (88%, 86%, 78% respectively). On the other hand, the feedback type of elicitation was the most successful approach, resulting in 100% of uptake moves. Explicit correction led to uptake 50% of the time.

As for corrective repairs, the feedback types of elicitation and metalinguistic clue appeared to be the most effective approaches. However, neither recasts nor explicit correction led to any peer-or self-repair because the correct forms are already provided to
the learners. On the contrary, the feedback types of elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests, and repetition of error were able to lead to higher rates of uptake as well as to elicit peer- and self-repair (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 2001).

Jang (2003) found that there are significant correlations between EFL learners’ proficiency levels and their anxiety levels, as well as strong correlations between their proficiency levels and their attitudes toward error correction. From her study, she concluded:

More anxious EFL learners tend to have negative attitudes toward error correction while most advanced learners, who are not anxious when speaking English, have very positive attitudes toward error correction. However, some beginner or intermediate EFL learners, who are anxious when speaking English, seem to have negative attitudes toward error correction. Therefore, EFL teachers may be allowed to use overt explicit error correction in advanced classes. In beginning or intermediate classes, however, EFL teachers should not use the method of explicit error correction because most of the learners suffer speaking anxiety. (p.197)

Carroll, Swain & Roberge (1992) examined implicit negative feedback and proposed that implicit feedback types might be more effective for more advanced learners who are learning vocabulary. Interestingly, Carroll and Swain (1993) later conducted research on adult ESL learners and found that all types of feedback produce a learning effect. The findings also indicated that the group receiving explicit feedback outperformed the group receiving various types of implicit feedback. Thus, they asserted that the explicit feedback type is more effective than implicit types of feedback.

White (1991) also conducted a study examining French-speaking Canadians learning English as a second language in grade school. The results of this study supported
the notion of effective error correction. The findings suggested that exposure to the correct forms of the target language is limited and that feedback helps to facilitate the acquisition of language.

Another study conducted by White, Spada, Lightbown, and Ranta (1991) also supported the effectiveness of corrective feedback. They found that explicit instruction had a positive effect on the accuracy of the language learners' formation of questions. Thus, they contended that corrective feedback has a significant influence on learners' interlanguage development.

Herron and Tomasello (1988) provided further support for oral corrective feedback. Their study of French-learning students at an American University found that corrective feedback actually produced a greater effect than modeling.

In addition, Chen (1996) conducted research examining the effect of corrective feedback on American students learning Chinese. The results of this study also supported the positive effect of corrective feedback.

Moreover, Bell-Corrales (2001) investigated college students studying Spanish and found that the feedback types of elicitation and recasts tend to be effective. While the above studies supported the immediate effectiveness of corrective feedback, positive results were not proven in the long term.

Lightbown and Spada (1990) observed several ESL classes and analyzed the amount of time spent on activities focusing on form and the teachers' reactions to students' errors. They found that the more the teacher focused on form in class, the more the students produced accurate language. Therefore, results of this study are also favorable toward the significance of feedback.
Although many studies show that feedback has a significant effect on language learning, at the same time several other studies reveal mixed results. Dekeyser (1993) researched Dutch-speaking high school students learning French in Belgium. The results of his study suggested that some language learners may respond better to feedback than others do. He also indicated that learners with lower anxiety tended to perform better with feedback provided in his study. However, learners with high extrinsic motivation performed better on the oral tests without corrective feedback.

Mackey and Philp (1998) investigated a group of 35 ESL learners in an intensive English class in Australia. They examined the effects of intensive recasts on the acquisition of English questions. According to their findings, in the utterances that occurred immediately after a recast, students rarely made changes that led to a correction of their errors. Learners who were at more advanced stages of question development, however, benefited more from interaction with recasts than they did from interaction without recasts.

The result of their study indicated that learners' language proficiency might play a role in the intake of corrective feedback such as recasts. In this study, participants with higher language levels tended to benefit more from the corrective feedback. However, the effect of feedback was not statistically significant for learners with lower language proficiency. Thus, the researchers proposed that feedback may only facilitate language learning for those who are developmentally ready to acquire the language.

Williams and Evans (1998) conducted a study investigating two English grammar forms: participial adjectives and passive voice. The participants of this study were college ESL students. Results of this study found that learners benefit more from corrective feedback when the target language form is already somewhat familiar to them.
Leow (2000) suggested that an explicit focus on grammar form facilitates faster language learning and higher performance levels. Norris and Ortega’s (2000) study also indicated a significant advantage for explicit feedback. In addition, Macheak (2002) supported this idea in his study of corrective feedback types by stating, “Both recast and elicitation are implicit types of feedback, and thus may not be as useful as explicit treatments in drawing learners’ attention to grammar difficulties (p. 132).”

Furthermore, Macheak (2002) conducted a qualitative study which concluded that language learners preferred explicit corrective feedback when speaking. Participants in this study reported that they expect to learn from more explicit instruction compared to implicit types of feedback.

DeBot (1996) claimed that second language learners are more likely to benefit from being pushed to find correct language forms (self-repair) than from simply hearing correct forms in input (teacher repair). Swain (1985) also purported that self production as well as self-modified output are necessary for language improvement.

Role of Academic Administrators in Faculty Selection and Evaluation

Academic administrators are key persons in the human resource planning for the institution. Rebore (2004) indicated that the building principal [academic administrator] is integral to the comprehensive process of human resource planning. He pointed out that “the front line contact with staff members, students, and parents” allows the chief administrator to have enough data and input needed to make decisions regarding evaluation and selection of personnel based upon specific criteria (p. 46).

Oliva (1989) suggested that because the evaluation of instruction requires a complex set of concepts and skills on the part of the teacher, supervisors should take the responsibility for providing teachers with training and skills needed to assure the
effectiveness of classroom pedagogies. Moreover, research on effective teaching concluded that student achievement is likely to be improved when teachers provide feedback about the students' performance (Oliva, 1989). Therefore, it is important for instructors as well as academic administrators to become aware of the necessity of providing effective feedback which promotes student learning.

Glickman and Gordon (1995) contended, "Effective supervision requires knowledge, interpersonal skills, and technical skills." This type of supervision is communicated when academic administrators provide assistance directly for "teachers, curriculum development, group development, and through action research" (p. 6). The role of the academic administrator is crucial in combining organizational goals, teacher needs, as well as providing for improved learning.

Oliva (1989) purported, "Evaluation seeks to provide answers on which decisions can be based for change and future action" (p. 304). It is important for both academic administrators and instructors to evaluate curriculum, programs, and instructional effectiveness. Thus, Oliva purposed that the supervisor must help teachers develop "an inquiring point of view," in order to examine and determine the effectiveness of a program or instruction (p. 306).

Mc Clenney (2003) indicated the importance of emphasizing student learning in the recruitment, orientation and evaluation of faculty and administrators. However, Newman, Couturier, and Scurry (2004) pointed out that faculties are skeptical about learner outcomes and any form of assessment except their own grading. They believe that what they are teaching is what the students need to know.

Learning (1998) suggested that academic leaders need to keep their hands in teaching because teaching helps to know students as well as to understand the concerns of
other faculty members. He further asserted that although evaluating teaching effectiveness is a complex process, by approaching the task thoughtfully and systematically, academic leaders can help improve the classroom instruction. Most of all, he emphasized the importance of “classroom visit” as well as “student and peer evaluation.” In his words, “We should use all the tools at our disposal to evaluate teaching effectiveness, including student evaluation, classroom visits by peers, and teaching portfolios” (p.42).

Summary

The process of giving feedback and error treatment can be difficult and complicated due to the concept of fossilization and problems in defining errors. Moreover, there can be huge differences among teachers’ teaching styles and students’ learning behaviors.

The significance of error correction is still emphasized because studies show that corrective feedback is an important part of managing interaction, which leads to more effective language learning. Researchers found that teachers provided feedback as they interacted with students, who, in turn, appeared to expect such interventions as an intrinsic part of the learning process (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Spada & Lightbown, 1993). Relevant studies that have investigated the effects of feedback also showed positive results for certain types of feedback provided consistently in response to specific errors (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Mackey & Philp, 1998).

Studies on recasts suggest that in order to acquire new linguistic features, learners need to first notice these features in the input. In addition, recasts appear to be most effective when learners recognize that the recast is a reaction to the accuracy of the form of the original utterance.
Lyster (2001) revealed that there is a certain degree of systematicity in the teachers' treatment of errors. Overall, the negotiation of form proved to be more effective at leading to immediate repair than recasts or explicit correction (Lyster, 2001).

Moreover, language learners are likely to benefit more from being pushed to retrieve target language forms than from merely hearing the forms in the input, because the retrieval and subsequent production stimulate the development of connections in memory (Swain, 1995). Therefore, modified output can be considered to represent the leading edge of a learner's inter-language development (Pica, 1988; Pica, Hollliday, Lewis, and Morgenthaler, 1989).

Lyster and Ranta (1997) presented an analysis of classroom interaction that characterizes various types of corrective feedback used by teachers in response to learner errors. They discerned six main feedback moves namely: (a) explicit correction, (b) recasts, (c) elicitation, (d) metalinguistic clues, (e) clarification requests, and (f) repetition. They examined the distribution of different feedback types and the ways in which learners reacted to the different kinds of feedback. These learners' reactions were regarded as "learner uptake" and these utterances were coded as either repaired or still in need of repair. They found that recasts resulted in the lowest rate of both uptake and repair moves. On the other hand, the corrective feedback types of elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests, and repetition of error not only led to higher rates of uptake but all were able to elicit peer- and self-repair (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

In addition, Yao's (2000) study found that EFL teachers exclusively applied only a few types of corrective feedback, with "recast" the most frequently used type, "elicitation" the second, and "explicit" the third. Furthermore, most of the students
agreed that error correction is necessary and important for their language learning. This study revealed adult EFL learners' positive attitudes toward error correction.

Academic administrators are key persons in the human resource planning for institutions. If these administrators have enough data and input they are able to make better decisions regarding hiring, selecting, and evaluating personnel. It is important for both academic administrators and instructors to evaluate curriculum, programs, and instructional effectiveness for the educational entity to offer the most beneficial language classes.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This research was about the feedback offered and the treatment given by teachers to Taiwanese college students when they made mistakes in speaking English. More specifically, this study investigated types of corrective feedback and their relationship to immediate learner uptake and repair of errors. It aimed to address the kinds of feedback and error treatment that would better facilitate Taiwanese college students' oral English learning.

Research Design

This study was a qualitatively dominant research combining both qualitative and quantitative procedures. As Creswell (2003) indicated, "With the development and perceived legitimacy of both qualitative and quantitative research in the social and human sciences, mixed methods research, employing the data collection associated with both forms of data, is expanding" (p. 208).

Allwright and Bailey (1994) endorsed the appropriateness of using both qualitative and quantitative approaches for data collection in classroom research. They suggested that qualitative and quantitative approaches to data analysis can be combined and that various combinations of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis are even more beneficial.

As Creswell (1994) indicated, researchers should make the most efficient use of both qualitative and quantitative paradigms in understanding social phenomena. This research was conducted by mixed methods of qualitative and quantitative procedures which aim to increase both the depth and breadth of the study.
This study was motivated by findings of observational research on feedback and error treatment in foreign language classrooms. Of particular relevance were Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study of corrective feedback and learner uptake and, specifically, their analytical model of error treatment, which this research applied to different instructional settings. Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study was conducted with young learners in French immersion classrooms using content-based L2 instruction. In contrast, this study involved Taiwanese college students in oral English classes where the instruction targeted the ESL (English as a Second Language) learning.

This study adopted the approach of grounded theory in qualitative research. Creswell (1998) identified grounded theory research as one of five traditions in the field of qualitative research. According to Creswell (1994), grounded theory is a research design used in human and social research. Researchers who employ this method hope to "discover a theory grounded in information from informants" (p. 93).

This study focused on developing a theory regarding teachers' perceptions of giving effective feedback and error treatment. Since little has been written on this subject, the purpose of this qualitatively dominant study was to generate a theory grounded in the rich data collected through the interviews and followed up with classroom observations. The purpose of the classroom observations was to determine if teachers' perceptions matched their behaviors regarding feedback and error treatment. Furthermore, the statistical results would also be reported from counting the frequencies of feedback moves and learners' repair moves, which served as strong evidence to probe the research question.
Data

Subjects

Subjects in this study were specifically chosen since the key of qualitative research is to purposefully select informants who can best answer the research question (Creswell, 1998). Moreover, Creswell (1998) emphasized the importance of articulating the rationale behind the sampling strategies employed. In this study, subjects were chosen because they were teaching equivalent college English conversation classes in Taiwan.

Three specific college teachers who taught English conversation classes were chosen. These three participants came from two different schools in Taiwan. Each of them taught a different English conversation class. Each class was taught by a teacher who had his or her own teaching style dealing with students' errors and giving feedback. There were fifty students in one class, forty-eight in another, and forty-five in the third.

Anonymity and Confidentiality

None of the participants was identified in this study. Complete confidentiality was maintained in the observation notes and research reports.

Triangulation

Eisner (1991) indicated that “the process of triangulation is a means through which multiple types of data are related to each other to support or contradict the interpretation and evaluation of a state of affairs” (p. 110). In this study, triangulation was employed through the collection of multiple types of data- interviews with screening questions, observations, tape-recordings, transcribed interaction and collected documents. Moreover, this study was a qualitatively dominant investigation which consisted of a mixed methodology. Different procedures of analysis including both qualitative and quantitative approaches were conducted to triangulate this research.
Data Collection Procedures

Prior to conducting this research, each gatekeeper was contacted in person as well as in writing. The gatekeepers were individuals responsible for providing access to interviewing these English teachers. In this study, the gatekeepers were the department chairpersons at the two selected schools. The purpose of this study was explained, the research process was described, and a description of the procedures that ensured confidentiality was also included.

Three different professors with specific college English oral classes were chosen from two different schools in Taiwan. Screening interviews were given to decide which teachers would participate in this research because they met all the specifications set a priori. The format of the screening interview can be found in Appendix A.

According to Creswell (1998), open-ended questions are recommended in order to explore the perceptions of the subjects. The main purpose of this study was to understand teachers' perceptions of giving effective feedback and error treatment. Thus, the investigator employed a semi-structured interview format, which was suggested by Bogdan and Biklen (1992). In addition, an interview protocol was utilized to assist the interviewer to stay on track, to organize thoughts, and to establish uniformity of the interview for different subjects (Creswell, 1998). This interview protocol is enumerated in Appendix B.

Three different classes taught by the three selected teachers were observed. Each class was taught by a different professor who has his or her own teaching style in dealing with students' errors and giving feedback. Each class was observed two hours a week, over a four-week time period. After scheduling the time and place for observations, the researcher observed each different class with notes taken, audio taped, and transcribed.
Class observation was conducted based upon the literature review of observing skills for effective classroom research (Glickman & Gordon, 1995).

Observation focused on how teachers gave feedback when students made errors. The researcher did not instruct teachers to use any particular kinds of feedback nor to focus on any particular type of error. Each teacher continued to use his or her usual way of teaching and these sessions were observed and tape-recorded. In addition, the researcher employed the use of an observational form which served as guidelines of observing the classroom activities and interaction. During observations, the researcher took field notes to capture specific contextual and paralinguistic features, such as gestures and the teacher’s writing on the board. The observational form is located in Appendix C.

Instrument Description

Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) analytical model of error treatment was applied in this research process because: (a) it provided a tool for identifying individual instructor styles regarding their oral error treatment in language classroom interaction, and (b) it helped to examine how learners react to feedback in various ways (Panova & Lyster, 2002).

According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), there were six main feedback moves in the observing categories:

1. Explicit correction: teacher provides the correct form and clearly indicates that what the student had said was incorrect;

2. Recast: teacher implicitly reformulates all or part of the student’s utterance;

3. Elicitation: teacher directly elicits a reformulation from students by asking questions such as “How do you say that in English?” or by
pausing to allow students to complete the teacher's utterance, or by asking students to reformulate their utterance;

4. Metalinguistic clues: teacher offers comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct answer such as "Oh, but that's in Chinese"; and

5. Clarification requests: teacher uses phrases such as "Pardon?" and "I don't understand";


Moreover, Panova and Lyster (2002) added translation as the seventh category in the feedback moves for that "there is nevertheless a relevant difference between a recast (a response to an ill-formed utterance in the L2) and a translation (a response to a well-formed utterance in the L1)" (p. 583).

**Data Analysis Procedures**

After the data collected from the interviews were transcribed, they were analyzed by the coding processes suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1998). These processes included open coding, axial coding, and selective coding and involved taking the data apart, analyzing relationships, and re-contextualizing the data. The narrative was finally written based on the results of these analyzing processes.

The data collected from classroom observations were also coded and categorized. Emerging themes were synthesized from the notes taken and the narrative was then interpreted and written using thick and rich description. Moreover, the statistical results
were reported from counting the frequencies of feedback moves and learners’ repair moves, which served as strong evidences to better answer the research question.

Spada and Frohlich’s (1995) Communicative Orientation to Language Teaching (COLT) coding scheme was adopted to transcribe the observation data. The categories used to code the data in this study were adapted from the error treatment sequence delineated in Panova and Lyster’s (2002) model in addition to Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) model.

The error treatment sequence was adopted as the main unit of analysis. This sequence contained instructor and student turns in the following order:

1. learner error
2. teacher feedback
3. learner uptake, with either repair of the error or needs-repair

According to Panova and Lyster (2002), this order reflected what actually happened when a teacher responded to a student’s error and when the student attempted to respond to the instructor’s feedback move. As they indicated, “Teacher-initiated or student-initiated topic continuation might follow learner error, teacher feedback, uptake with repair, or uptake with needs-repair” (p. 581).

Summary

This study was a mixed-methods style of research combining both qualitative and quantitative procedures because it was suggested that the combination of both approaches to data collection and analysis could be more beneficial in classroom research (Allwright & Bailey, 1994; Creswell, 1994). A grounded theory design was chosen because of the intent to understand and develop a theory regarding teachers’ perceptions of giving effective feedback and error treatment. The purpose of this qualitatively dominant study
was to generate a theory grounded in the rich data collected through the interviews and followed by classroom observations. Furthermore, the numeric information would also be reported from statistical results which facilitated the triangulation of this investigation.

Three different teachers with specific college English oral classes were chosen from two different schools in Taiwan. The screening interview was given to decide the appropriate participants. Three different classes taught by three different teachers were observed. Each class was observed two hours a week and over a period of four weeks time.

Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) analytical model of error treatment was applied as the instrument in this research. Spada and Frohlich’s (1995) Communicative Orientation to Language Teaching (COLT) coding scheme was adopted to transcribe the data. The categories used to code the data in this study were adapted from the error treatment sequence delineated in Panova and Lyster’s (2002) model in addition to Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) model.

The data collected were analyzed by the use of statistics after they were coded and categorized. Emerging themes were also synthesized from the observational notes and a richly descriptive narrative was written.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS

Introduction

This study was guided by the general research question: What kinds of feedback and error treatment will better facilitate Taiwanese college students' oral English learning? There are three types of data collected: information gathered from interviewing the specifically selected teachers of college English conversation classes in Taiwan; the statistical results showing the frequencies of different feedback moves and learners' repair moves; and the data collected, analyzed and described from observing the classes by the researcher.

The information in this chapter is divided into two sections. The first section is the descriptive data reported in narrative form from interviewing the three subjects, which includes the participants' statements taken from the interview notes as well as the reflections from the researcher. The second section of this chapter presents the data which was acquired and reported by the researcher from observing, analyzing and coding the classroom activities, and interactions between teachers and students giving feedback and having error corrections. The statistical results emerging from counting the frequencies of feedback moves and learners' repair moves are also reported. These serve as strong evidence to better answer the research question. The observation notes provide a descriptive picture of what is actually happening in the language classroom, illustrated further with examples from coding the classroom conversations.

Data Analysis and Interpretation from Interviews

To achieve the goal of rich description that tells a story, interview protocols were developed by the researcher. Although some of the interview questions may not directly
answer the research inquiry, they provide an important understanding of the essential information regarding the teachers' teaching styles and beliefs, their ideas and experiences dealing with students' errors, and their use of corrective methodology.

Fictitious names are purposely and consistently used for each of the three subjects to protect their identities. This use of fictitious names did not detract from any data collection or analyses. The data collected from interviewing the three participants was analyzed and interpreted following the guidelines suggested by Rossman and Rallis (1998) and Creswell (2003), who opined that analysis is “an ongoing process involving continual reflection about the data, asking analytic questions, and writing memos throughout the study and using open-ended data for the most parts” (Creswell, 2003, p. 190).

The analyses of the data gleaned from each subject in this study were aimed to determine relationships, processes and phenomena. In the analyses of data, one core category emerged. This was the “Teachers’ Perception of Feedback and Error Treatment,” along with three subcategories and several properties. The three subcategories that emerged from the data were: (a) teachers’ perceptions of teaching, (b) teachers’ treatment of errors, and (c) classroom methodology. The narrative of this study articulated the relationships between all categories and their properties.

The qualitative analyses of data for this study utilized the grounded theory format suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1998) with the processes of open coding, axial coding, and selective coding being employed. These processes included taking the data apart, analyzing relationships, and re-conceptualizing the data, and formed the basis for the narrative report (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).
Setting

This study was conducted in two universities. The first was a private vocational four-year institute of technology in Taiwan. The school was located in the suburb of Taipei County. The campus was actually on a hill surrounded by many trees. The buildings of the school were mostly new, constituting a sleek, white campus constructed with an architectural aesthetic of contemporary design.

The researcher had worked on this particular campus for five years and was familiar with the environment and the school system. Thus, observations and interviews conducted in this setting were less likely to be misunderstood. The English conversation courses offered here are popular and have heavy enrollment.

The second site was a four-year private university of science and technology, also located in the suburb of another large city in Taiwan. Their campus was not spacious, so the buildings sat quite close to one another. The school was recently upgraded to a four-year university, but prior to that, it was an institute of technology. This school was chosen for its offering of college English conversation classes consistent with the focal points of this investigation.

Participants

After the screening interviews, one assistant professor and two lecturers of English were selected to participate in this study. For the confidentiality of participants, pseudonyms were assigned to distinguish these three subjects. HuaLiu and DaiChao, the assistant professor, were from school A, and ChiKuo was from school B. They were chosen because their teaching experiences and expertise were well matched to the research. These teachers were non-native speakers who held master's degrees in language education or TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). They had...
similar educational backgrounds in terms of their language learning and teaching experiences, as well as common experience with professional development. The basic background information of the three participants is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Background Information of the Three Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of Teaching</th>
<th>Degrees Held</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Classes Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HuaLiu                  | Female | 7                 | BA in English (China)  
MS in TESOL (USA)  
Ed.D. in education (in progress in USA) | A     | English Conversation;  
Practical English;  
Freshman English |
| DaiChao                 | Female | 8                 | BA in Foreign Language and Literature (Taiwan)  
MS in TESOL (USA)  
Ph.D. in Bilingual Education (USA) | A     | English Conversation;  
Practical English |
| ChiKuo                  | Male   | 5                 | BA in Food Science and Nutrition (Taiwan)  
MBA (USA)  
Ed.D. in Education (in progress in USA) | B     | English Conversation;  
English Listening and Speaking |

Open Coding From Interviews

According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), open coding involves identifying concepts and their properties and dimensions. Using this methodology, data collected from the interviews were broken down into discrete parts and examined for relationships. Employing this process, three categories were identified: (a) teachers’ perceptions of
teaching, (b) teachers’ treatment of errors, and (c) classroom methodology. These three categories were then scrutinized for their properties and dimensional range (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), properties should be “the characteristics of a category that define and give meaning to the category” (p. 101). Consequently, when a category was identified, the properties of the category were also specified and analyzed to determine their dimensional range, which described how the concepts varied along those properties. The first of these categories to be examined was the Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching.

**Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching**

Table 2 presents the category of teachers’ perceptions of teaching, as well as the dimensional range of the properties related to this category.

**Table 2**

*Properties and Dimensional Range of Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensional Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teachers’ perceptions of teaching</td>
<td>teacher’s role</td>
<td>traditional → facilitator → motivator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher-student</td>
<td>very friendly → friendly → tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction</td>
<td>teaching beliefs</td>
<td>self-motivated learning → sharing experiences →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>culture emphasis → real use of the language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each property in Table 2 and each dimensional range of the category Teachers’ Perception of Teaching is supported in descriptive narratives. This stage of the open coding process begins with the property “Teacher’s Role” and refers to Table 2.
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Teacher's Role. Each subject interpreted how to play the role of English teacher differently. One subject, HuaLiu, said, “I see myself as an easygoing but rather traditional teacher.” Another subject, DaiChao, said, “I’m much more like a facilitator than a traditional teacher. My teaching philosophy is to facilitate students’ learning by opening the door and showing them the way of learning the language.” However, the third subject, ChiKuo, reported his role as an “easy-going and not a very demanding teacher.” He expressed that his ideal role of a teacher should be someone who can motivate students self learning.

Teacher-Student Interaction. When asked about teaching styles, none of the subjects responded with a particular documented style. Instead, they described themselves in terms of their teacher-student interaction. All three subjects viewed their interactions with students to be friendly. One subject, DaiChao, said, “My style is very friendly. I would rather my students treat me as their friend than a teacher with more hierarchy.” The other two subjects also emphasized their friendly teaching styles. ChiKuo stated, “I think students would learn better in a more tolerant and stress-free environment. Therefore, I try to be friendly and tolerant in my teaching of the language.” HuaLiu also reported, “I try to be friendly and helpful to my students when I teach. I hope they can learn something from my class, but I’m not a serious or strict teacher.”

Teaching Beliefs. Subjects provided a variety of responses regarding their teaching beliefs. One subject, HuaLiu, said, “I believe that my students are old enough for them to decide what they want to learn. So I don’t want to force them by giving lots of work or stress.” Another subject, DaiChao, said, “My ideal of teaching is to help students create their own thinking and self-motivated learning.” She also mentioned the importance of sharing her own learning and work experiences. In her words, “I like to do
this because it makes them feel that we have been through the same process of learning.”

Another subject, ChiKuo, also concurred. He said, “I try to bring lots of personal experiences into my teaching of the language.” In addition, he stressed his belief of the importance of culture in language teaching. In his words, “I believe that language should be culture-based, and it should be used for communication in daily lives.” Moreover, he stated, “Students should get involved in the real use of the language. They could benefit from learning the language, and that provides them with the real motivation as well as a positive reinforcement of their learning.”

*Teachers’ Treatment of Errors*

Table 3 depicts the category of teachers’ treatment of errors and the dimensional range of the properties related to this category.

Table 3

**Properties and Dimensional Range of Teachers’ Treatment of Errors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensional Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teachers’ treatment of errors</td>
<td>ideas about errors and correction</td>
<td>part of learning → students need more positive feedback → can be tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>types of errors corrected</td>
<td>pronunciation → listening and speaking → grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feelings and experiences of correction</td>
<td>annoyed and frustrated (consistent among subjects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The category Teachers’ Treatment of Errors consists of three properties. The properties are: (a) ideas about errors and correction, (b) types of errors corrected, and (c) feelings and experiences of correction. Properties and the dimensional range of each property of this category listed in Table 3 are described in the following narratives from the reports.
of each subject. The first property discussed in Table 3 is "ideas about errors and correction."

**Ideas about Errors and Correction.** All of the three subjects agreed that making errors is part of the learning process. One subject, DaiChao, said, “Making mistakes is so common that is inevitable in the learning process.” Therefore, she does not worry about students’ mistakes and tries to give them more positive feedback to encourage their learning. She added a similar idea about error corrections saying, “I don’t want to frustrate their courage to try to create their own language by giving them lots of strict error corrections.” Moreover, she reflected on her students’ ability to learn and use self-correction, stating:

> Students can always go to look up the dictionary or any references for help if they need the structure of the language. If I noticed that my students need my help with the grammatical parts, I’d be more than happy to offer them the guidelines. However, many times I found my students could actually correct their own errors or compare the difference of the language output by my repetition of the same words or sentences. So, I’m not too worried about students’ temporary errors.

Another subject, ChiKuo, argued. “Making mistakes should be part of the learning process, so I’d rather have my students learn in a less stressful environment,” he said. He further explained, “Each student has a great potential to create different language through errors. So, I’d rather be tolerant to assist their learning than give them too many corrections.”

**Types of Errors Corrected.** When the subjects were asked about what kinds of errors they tended to correct, they all reported the tendency of correcting pronunciation. One subject, HuaLiu, responded, “I’m not too strict about students’ grammatical errors,
but I focus much on pronunciation problems. I think the pronunciation problem is the most difficult one to deal with.” Another subject, DaiChao, echoed those words, stating, “I tend to be more critical working on students’ pronunciation. I’m more concerned about how students can pronounce accurately, so I tend to spend much more time correcting their pronunciation.” The third subject, ChiKuo, emphasized that he was more tolerant with students’ errors, even though he also worked much more on listening and speaking. He said:

I put much emphasis on listening and speaking but tend to be more tolerant with students’ errors. I emphasize more students’ participation and performance inside and outside of the classroom activities. I think the real use of the language signifies more than the correctness of the written tests.

*Feelings and Experiences of Correction.* Subjects reported several examples of their experiences dealing with students’ errors. The feelings that they described tended to be more negative. HuaLiu reported, “What I found most frustrating about giving feedback was that students kept quiet when being asked questions. This made me very annoyed. Moreover, that students keep making the same mistakes can also be a big headache for me.”

Another subject, DaiChao, stated:

Once, when I asked a student to practice a correction, I kept asking her for several times but she just totally ignored me, not even looking at me, which made me really frustrated. I was wondering if it’s her problem or mine.

*Classroom Methodology*

Table 4 presents the category of teachers’ perceptions of classroom methodology regarding feedback and error treatment.
Table 4

Properties and Dimensional Range of Classroom Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensional Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classroom methodology</td>
<td>ideas about methodology</td>
<td>not useful → no one best way → analyzing many methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>application of specific methods</td>
<td>work on vocabulary and pronunciation → individually → use mirror → quiz → team project → do not over-correct → introduce culture → use more practice &amp; real use of the language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this study, the category “classroom methodology” consists of two properties: (a) ideas about methodology, and (b) application of specific methods. Each property is described in the following narratives, which also include the dimensional range as reported by the subjects. The first property to be discussed in Table 4 is Ideas about Methodology.

**Ideas about Methodology.** Each subject responded with a variety of ways in which he or she perceived methodology. One subject, HuaLiu, said:

Many teaching methodologies I learned in my TESOL program don’t really work in my teaching. I tried some of them in the beginning but later on my students told me they don’t like them. Maybe the large size of the class also makes it hard to apply those teaching methodologies.

Another subject, ChiKuo, reported his ideas about methodology and asserted, “There shouldn’t be one best way of learning, but it is the teacher’s responsibility to let his students find out the best learning method on their own.” The third subject, DaiChao, stated, “I think the worst teaching method would be just following the textbooks without
any change adapted to students' needs or interests. This may prevent students from developing independent thinking and creative learning."

Application of Specific Methods. In describing the specific methods dealing with students' errors, each subject gave suggestions according to his or her own teaching experiences. One subject, HuaLiu, said:

I usually review the grammar and make sure my students understand the context, but I would ask them to work on vocabulary and especially to practice the pronunciation of each word individually. I suggested my students practice their pronunciation in front of a mirror, which I found very helpful. Moreover, I sometimes asked students to memorize vocabularies and gave them a quiz right before the end of the class. I asked them to pronounce the new words in front of me individually. It takes time, but it really works.

Another subject, DaiChou, also used a similar approach, commenting:

Students could learn better pronunciation only through person to person, and that's why I have to help them a lot in the class or even work with them individually. In addition, I especially like to use the team project in my class, which students can work and learn from each other, and the supportive feedback from the same group also contributes a lot to their learning.

However, she also emphasized not overly-correcting students' errors when applying the classroom methodology. She noted, "I tend to avoid overly-correcting students' errors, especially in front of the whole class, which might embarrass my students or sometimes even hurt their self-esteem."
The third subject, ChiKuo, reported:

I try to spend much time introducing the cultural background of the language, besides the content of the textbooks. Also, I tend to give students more opportunities to practice, such as to imitate the situation they may encounter in an English speaking environment. Most of all, I encourage my students to get involved in the real use of the language in their daily lives, such as listening to the English radio program.

**Axial Coding**

Through the previous process of open coding, data were examined and identified as three categories. Employing the process of axial coding, the data were de-contextualized into segments, and those segments were analyzed and then re-contextualized in new ways. According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), the process of re-contextualization of the data identified properties for each category. The properties were then reported with their dimensional range.

The analysis of the re-contextualized data revealed phenomena that directly relate to the causal condition and the properties of that phenomenon. As a result of the axial coding process, the relationships and properties that emerged from the data were referred to as: "Causal Condition," "Phenomenon," "Context," "Intervening Condition," "Action/Interaction," and "Consequence." These terms, derived from Strauss and Corbin (1998), are briefly explained below.

**Causal Condition**

Causal conditions refer to events that result in the occurrence or development of a phenomenon (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The causal condition for each category in this study is the commitment and involvement of language teaching of each subject. It is the
teachers' commitment and involvement of language teaching that led to the development of each phenomenon.

Phenomenon

A phenomenon is a repeated pattern of events or actions that reflect what people say or do in response to their problems or situations. The phenomena that emerged during this study are the three categories of data resulting from the process of open coding. Thus, three specific phenomena are: (a) teachers' perception of teaching, (b) teachers' treatment of errors, and (c) classroom methodology.

Context

According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), context refers to a specific group of properties pertaining to a phenomenon along a dimensional range. As the data were de-contextualized into different segments and then re-contextualized, the context of each phenomenon was directly and closely related to the phenomenon that had emerged. For the purposes of this study, each context has an intervening condition.

Intervening Condition

Intervening conditions refer to structural conditions that pertain to a phenomenon and form the basis of circumstances in which the phenomena are grounded (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Intervening conditions are influenced by actions and/or interactions.

Action/Interaction

According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), action/interaction refers to strategies employed to resolve a problem and to shape the phenomenon.
Consequence

Consequences are what happen as the outcomes or results of actions/interactions (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). For the purposes of this study, the consequences are listed directly below the action/interaction statements.

Table 5 displays the components of the axial coding process and the analytic flow between each component.

Table 5
Axial Coding Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>causal condition</th>
<th>phenomenon</th>
<th>context</th>
<th>intervening condition</th>
<th>action/interaction</th>
<th>consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the process of axial coding, the first procedure is to identify the causal condition and the phenomena of that causal condition. Table 6 displays the causal condition and the phenomena identified during the axial coding process.

Table 6
Causal Condition and Phenomena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Condition</th>
<th>Phenomena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teachers' commitment to and involvement in language</td>
<td>-teachers' perceptions of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>-teachers' treatment of errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-classroom methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phenomena listed in Table 6 emerged from synthesizing contexts and features of the contexts. For the purposes of this study, the components of each context have been labeled: intervening condition, action/interaction, and consequence.
To better understand the analysis of the axial coding process, each phenomenon and its context are presented in table format. Following the table for each phenomenon, the context and the features of each context ("Intervening Condition," "Action/Interaction," and "Consequence") are described. The first phenomenon to be identified is Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching.

**The Phenomenon: Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching**

The phenomenon, Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching, emerged from the synthesis of three contexts. Table 7 lists the phenomenon of “teachers’ perceptions of teaching” as well as the three contexts from which the phenomenon emerged.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teachers’ perceptions</td>
<td>Subjects viewed themselves as “friendly” teachers, but regarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of teaching</td>
<td>their roles differently: traditional teacher, facilitator and motivator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjects reported the importance of sharing personal experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and introducing culture into their teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjects tried to be more tolerant of students’ behaviors and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>believed that students can learn better in less stressful environments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussed below are the three contexts for the phenomenon of teachers’ perceptions of teaching, as well as the features of each context. This phenomenon and its related features emerged in the process of axial coding.
Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching Context #1

Subjects viewed themselves as “friendly” teachers, but regarded their roles differently: traditional teacher, facilitator and motivator.

Intervening Condition
- Subjects viewed their teaching styles as friendly and easy-going.

Action/Interaction
- Subjects tried to be friends with their students.
- Subjects encouraged students liberally in their learning of the language.
- Subjects tried different ways to facilitate and motivate students’ learning.

Consequence
- The language classes are not demanding.
- Subjects think their friendly teaching styles help students’ learning.

Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching Context #2

Subjects reported the importance of sharing personal experiences and introducing culture in their teaching.

Intervening Condition
- Subjects liked to share their personal learning experiences and bring culture issues into their teaching of the language.

Action/Interaction
- Subjects liked to talk about their personal learning experiences.
- Subjects liked to introduce the cultural background of the language.

Consequence
- Students can benefit from teachers’ learning experiences.
Students seem motivated when professors providing them with examples of cultural experiences.

**Teachers' Perceptions of Teaching Context #3**

Subjects tried to be more tolerant of students' behaviors and believed that students can learn better in less stressful environments.

**Intervening Condition**

- Subjects hoped to provide students with a relaxed learning environment.

**Action/Interaction**

- Subjects were aware of student embarrassment due to correction or negative feedback.
- Subjects tried to encourage students' practice with copious praise.

**Consequence**

- Subjects tried to provide students with more positive feedback.
- Subjects tried to avoid being too strict or critical of students' behaviors.
- Subjects tried to avoid embarrassing students in front of their classmates.

**The Phenomenon: Teachers' Treatment of Errors**

The phenomenon, Teachers' Treatment of Students' Errors, emerged from the syntheses of three contexts. Table 8 lists the phenomenon of "teachers' treatment of errors" as well as the three contexts from which the phenomenon emerged.
Table 8

The Phenomenon: Teachers' Treatment of Errors in Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teachers' treatment of errors</td>
<td>Subjects viewed errors as part of the learning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The types of errors corrected by subjects varied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjects reported their negative feelings and experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dealing with errors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listed below are the three contexts for the phenomenon of teachers' treatment of errors and the features of each context. The phenomenon and its features are a direct result of the axial coding process.

Teachers' Treatment of Errors Context #1

Subjects viewed errors as part of the learning process.

Intervening Condition

- Subjects acknowledged that errors are inevitable.

Action/Interaction

- Subjects do not worry much about students making errors.
- Subjects tried to ignore minor problems.
- Subjects believe in students’ ability to engage in self-learning and self-correction.

Consequence

- Subjects tried to be more tolerant with students’ errors.
- Subjects viewed errors as a positive part of learning.
Teachers’ Treatment of Errors Context #2

The types of errors corrected by subjects varied.

Intervening Condition

- Subjects emphasized more pronunciation problems.

Action/Interaction

- Subjects provided guidelines for structures.
- Subjects regarded pronunciation as the most difficult part and thus spent much time working with it.
- Subjects worked individually with students’ pronunciation problems.

Consequence

- Students received a great deal of feedback and treatments dealing with their pronunciation problems.

Teachers’ Treatment of Errors Context #3

Subjects reported their negative feelings and experiences dealing with errors.

Intervening Condition

- Subjects’ feelings and experiences about error correction tend to be more negative than positive.

Action/Interaction

- Subjects’ awareness of fossilization is frustrating.
- Students’ silence creates a big headache for professors.

Consequence

- Subjects recognized the difficulty of correcting students’ errors.
Phenomenon of Classroom Methodology

The phenomenon of classroom methodology has emerged from the syntheses of two contexts. Table 9 lists the phenomenon of classroom methodology as well as the two contexts from which the phenomenon emerged.

Table 9

The Phenomenon: Classroom Methodology in Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classroom methodology</td>
<td>Subjects viewed methodology differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjects believed to be no single method that always works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listed below are the two contexts for the phenomenon of classroom methodology.

The phenomenon and its features emerged from the axial coding process.

Classroom Methodology Context #1

Subjects viewed methodology differently.

Intervening Condition

- Subjects’ experiences using different methods of teaching.

Action/Interaction

- Subjects used mirrors for correcting pronunciation.
- Subjects worked on pronunciation individually.
- Subjects gave tests on vocabulary.
- Subjects believed team projects beneficial in students’ learning.

Consequence

- Subjects used different teaching methods, depending on the situations.
- Subjects gave students as much practice as possible.
Classroom Methodology Context #2

Subjects believed to be no single method that always works.

Intervening Condition

- Subjects attempted to improve their teaching by trying different methods.

Action/Interaction

- Subjects tried not to merely follow the textbooks.
- Subjects attempted to motivate students' learning and to encourage peer correction.
- Subjects assigned students a variety of materials, activities and practices to achieve instructional goals.

Consequence

- Subjects employed a variety of instructional and curricular strategies to promote the teaching and learning of language.

This completes the process of axial coding. The last stage of the coding process is selective coding, in which the major categories are integrated to form a larger theoretical theme or theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Selective Coding

It is during the process of selective coding that an attempt is made to gain a more holistic picture of the data by pulling away from the micro view to a more macro one.

The selective coding process identifies the interrelationships between the core category and its three phenomena. These interrelationships are presented through a story line developed from the findings of the data analyzed during the axial coding process.

The story line contains the context of each phenomenon, along with the concepts related to that phenomenon. These concepts are identified in bold typeface to assist in the
analyses of the story line. The narrative that follows presents the interrelationships of the phenomena and is entitled “Teachers’ Perceptions of Feedback and Error Treatment.”

*Teachers’ Perceptions of Feedback and Error Treatment*

Teachers’ perceptions of feedback and error treatment can be influenced by several different factors, including their teaching beliefs, teacher-student interaction, and teachers’ roles. These perceptions are based mostly upon teachers’ self-learning and teaching experiences, which are further reflected in their teaching in the language classroom.

Although the subjects view their teachers’ roles differently (traditional teacher, facilitator, or motivator), they all try to have friendly interaction with students. They believe that easy-going attitudes help them get along with college students and provide students with a more stress-free learning environment. Some of them prefer to be tolerant with students’ errors, because they are aware of the frustration and embarrassment students feel due to negative feedback or correction. Still, some of the teachers believe that students are able to conduct peer-corrections or self-corrections and thus, avoid being too critical about correcting their errors. Teachers agree that errors are part of the learning process, so it is more important to motivate students’ self-learning than to overly correct their errors.

Teachers share with their students their own learning and teaching experiences and introduce them to the culture of the language. In this way, teachers believe that students are better motivated and classroom learning is also reinforced.

Although the professors report that they are not worried much about students’ errors, their feelings and experiences of dealing with errors tend to be more negative.
Teachers feel frustrated dealing with errors, especially when students repeat the same mistakes or do not respond to the teachers.

In teaching English Conversation Classes, teachers intend to put much more emphasis on the treatment of pronunciation problems rather than on others. They think that students need more help with pronunciation because pronunciation is the most difficult part, and it is also important for them to be able to pronounce words more accurately in order to communicate effectively.

Teachers use different methods in their teaching of language and believe that there is not a single method that always works. They assign different materials, activities and practices and avoid just following the textbooks without making adjustments to adapt to the needs of the students. They all believe that “practice makes perfect” and thus try to give students as much practice as possible. Teachers are also convinced that a variety of teaching methods are required in order to facilitate the teaching and learning of the language.

During the selective coding process, a core category emerged and is labeled “Teachers’ Perception of Feedback and Error Treatment.” The core category is closely related to the three phenomena that were examined during the axial coding process. As a result of the core category that emerged, the phenomena are now referred to as subcategories.

Core Category

The core category, Teachers’ Perceptions of Feedback and Error Treatment, is related to the following three subcategories: (a) teachers’ perceptions of teaching, (b) teachers’ treatment of errors, and (c) classroom methodology. These three subcategories are also related to each other.
Sub-categories

The interrelationships between the sub-categories are briefly discussed under the heading of each subcategory. The first subcategory to be discussed is "Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching."

*Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching.* Subjects in this study reported their perceptions of teaching, including their teaching styles, teaching beliefs and recognition of their roles. Teachers’ perceptions of teaching are closely related to and directly reflected by the feedback they give and how they deal with students’ errors. Therefore, it is obvious that there is a direct connection between the subcategory “Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching” and the subcategory “Teachers’ Treatment of Errors.” Moreover, teachers’ perceptions of teaching also shape and strongly influence their teaching in the language classroom. Therefore, there is also a direct connection between the subcategory “Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching” and the other subcategory, “Classroom Methodology.”

*Teachers’ Treatment of Errors.* Teachers’ treatment of errors is based upon their own learning and teaching experiences, which also strongly influence their teaching styles, teaching beliefs and recognition of their roles. The teachers’ ideas about errors are also reflected on their practice of giving feedback and doing error treatments. Therefore, there is a direct connection among the three subcategories “Teachers’ Treatment of Errors,” “Teachers’ Perceptions of Teaching,” and “Classroom Methodology.”

*Classroom Methodology.* All subjects reported “Classroom Methodology” include a variety of materials, activities and practices. However, the subcategory “Classroom Methodology” is related to the other two subcategories for the reasons mentioned above.
Linkage to Research Question

The data collected in the interview were subjected to the qualitative procedures of open coding, axial coding and selective coding. Findings from the interviews directly answer the first research question of this study, "What are teachers' perceptions of feedback and error treatment in their teaching of college oral English?"

In the next section, findings are reported from classroom observations with descriptions of settings and individuals, followed by illustrative examples. The statistical results of counting the frequencies of feedback moves and learners' repair moves provide a more direct answer to the research question.

Data Analysis and Interpretation from Observation

According to Creswell (2003), there are several steps involving data analysis from observations. These procedures include the following stages: (a) detailed description of the setting or individuals, (b) analyses with a coding process in which themes or categories emerge, (c) narratives of themes or categories which display multiple perspectives from individuals and are supported by diverse quotations and evidence, and (d) an interpretation of the data. These procedures served as the guidelines as well as the framework for the following report of data analyses and interpretation from observations.

Furthermore, Creswell (2003) also indicated that a mixed method approach is one in which the investigator "employs different strategies of inquiry that involve collecting data either simultaneously or sequentially to best understand research problems" (p. 18). The data collection was also suggested to involve gathering both "text information" as well as "numeric information" (p. 20). For the purposes of this study, the following section presents the findings of both text and numeric information from classroom observations.
Description of Settings and Subjects

Subject 1: HuaLiu’s Class

HuaLiu’s class was an English Conversation class with fifty students. Students who take this class are primarily majoring in Management of Information Science. The class was taught in the evening for two hours a week over the course for eighteen weeks. It was a basic level course for learners of English and was required for students in their second year in the college. The teacher used *Express Way 3* as the textbook, which integrated life-skill topics with grammatical structures for language learners. The requirements of this class included attendance, participation, homework, quizzes, midterm and final exams.

The climate of this class was relaxing. The teacher seemed to be tolerant of her students’ behaviors in the classroom. For instance, many students came in late and the teacher did not seem to be critical about the lateness of her students. She seemed to understand that most of the students in her evening classes worked in the daytime and might have difficulty being on time for the first class at six thirty.

Some of the students were in the process of eating a light meal (such as bread) when the class started, because they did not have enough time for dinner before hand. In addition, some of the students did not turn their cell phones off during the class and incoming calls sometimes interrupted the teacher’s lecture. However, the teacher seemed to be tolerant and made no comments about these circumstances.

Most students who sat in the front rows appeared to be more attentive than those who sat in the back. Some of the students who sat in the back talked a lot during the class. For instance, when the teacher asked questions, students who answered voluntarily were always those who sat in the front rows. When the teacher asked specific questions to
those students in the back, they seemed to be more confused and could not get the right answers most of the time.

After explaining the content of the text, the teacher went through the exercise questions and checked the answers with her students. But it turned out that many of the students had difficulty answering the questions correctly. The teacher seemed to be a bit frustrated, but she still tried to be humorous, saying things like, “Well, my dear students, you could be killed if you can’t get this right!”

The teacher would go through the content of the textbook, check the answers with students, and then explain the ideas or grammatical structures in the exercise questions. The teacher often assigned students to practice different parts of the dialogues. Sometimes an individual student would be assigned to answer the question or to practice the conversation with the teacher in front of the whole class. Most of the time, the teacher would have her students work in pairs to practice the dialogues. Sometimes, the students would be asked to have an oral test after their pair practice. This meant that they would act out the conversation in front of the teacher and that grade would be part of their total classroom scores.

The teacher tended to give students many opportunities to practice and also provided them with different phrases and ways to express the same ideas. For instance, she asked several groups of students to practice the similar content and structure of dialogues. But she would ask them to use different phrases to express the same idea, such as “I’m not sure”; “I don’t know for sure” or “I’m not positive.” In this way, students seem to become more familiar and more confident with their learning materials.
Subject 2: DaiChao’s Class

DaiChao’s class was an English Conversation class required for junior students majoring in business. There were forty-eight students in this class. The students were very focused on the teacher’s speaking but the classroom atmosphere was more relaxing than serious. The students were very quiet and concentrated on the teacher’s lecturing. It was surprising to find that not a single student was chatting or doing other activities during the teacher’s presentation or lecture, even in such a big class.

The teacher primarily used English in her class, speaking in Chinese occasionally when she felt the need to explain something in their native language. She tended to draw examples to explain the new words or phrases. She also repeated these, using them to make sentences. In this way, she was able to better help her students memorize and apply the new words and phrases.

Moreover, she tried to reconfirm and remind her students what they had learned whenever they came across these words or phrases. She would check their understanding and memorization by asking them what words they could use. Alternatively, she asked them to tell her the meaning of the words again.

The teacher would give her students a chance to think and guess before giving them the right answer directly. For example, she once asked her students if they knew the word “customer.” They did not give her the right answer. Then she started to explain the word by giving situations about the differences between a good customer and a bad customer. After that, the students could figure out the meaning of the word right away without a problem.

Furthermore, the teacher tried to praise and encourage her students frequently during the class. For instance, once she asked her students to repeat a very long sentence
after her. When they followed her without making mistakes, she told them how surprised she was that they could follow so well, even after such a long sentence. She even told them they might be the smartest students she ever had.

The teacher always gave lots of praise to her students when they did a good job answering her questions or reading the sentences. She emphasized in the beginning of the session that no one in her class should feel shy to speak or make errors. She told them that making mistakes was just a natural part of learning, so no one there would laugh at their errors. She explained that it would be helpful if they could learn from each other’s errors, and therefore urged them not to be shy about speaking in class.

In this way, the teacher created a very positive learning atmosphere. She always asked her students to speak loudly when answering questions or practicing sentences. She would then praise their good pronunciation and tell them she was proud of their good performance. In fact, she told them that they should feel proud of themselves that they did a good job answering questions in English in front of the teacher and so many classmates, which was not an easy task for beginning learners.

The teacher often asked students to come to the front to act out the conversation with role plays and gave students lots of encouragement after their presentations. She continued encouraging them not to be afraid to make mistakes and not to be afraid to speak loudly. She emphasized this to her students, saying, “Only if you speak loudly enough can I hear you and correct your mistakes!”

Moreover, the teacher tried to interact with the students by utilizing in her teaching information and experiences from the students’ daily lives. For example, when learning about “zip code,” the teacher asked if the students knew the zip code of their university’s area. She also tried to explain the difference between zip code and area code,
which seemed to be rather confusing to some students. She then mentioned country code and gave examples, which also served as extra information to her students.

When some of the students were asked to act out their conversations on stage, their classmates initially try to help translate in their first language. After that, the teacher commented that even she could hear the numbers from other students who sat in the back. She advised that they should really understand and try to apply what they had learned in English. She said that trying to translate everything into Chinese might not be a good way for them to increase their learning.

She devised an example for telling time and showed the difference between English and Chinese. The teacher tried to explain different ways of expressing ideas, and at the same time, she encouraged her students to engage in more practice so that they would get more familiar with different usages. In her words:

It’s normal that you feel awkward using different ways to express your ideas in the beginning, since you’re so used to your native language pattern. It’s kind of abnormal if you don’t feel so, actually. But you know practice makes perfect, that’s the only way we learn the language.

Subject 3: ChiKuo’s Class

This English Listening and Speaking class was required for college freshmen. There were forty-five students in the class, and most of them were male. They were predominantly from the department of Mechanical Engineering. The textbook ChiKuo used in this class was Tactics for Listening, which contained different topics of everyday activities.

The students were quiet, and they concentrated on the teacher’s lectures. The teacher played tapes for listening to the conversation first, and then explained the content
of the text and also checked the answers of the exercises. Students seemed to be very interested in his lectures, because he gave them lots of interesting examples from his own experiences. The topics were also practical and related to their daily lives.

ChiKuo encouraged the students to listen to some English radio programs such as ICRT (International Community Radio Taipei) and Studio Classroom. He tried to help his students develop their listening skills by emphasizing and repeating the key words or phrases, showing different stress or intonation.

At the same time, he encouraged students by showing them different strategies of learning the language. He even mentioned his two-year old babies, saying they could recognize more than two hundred vocabulary words in English. He kept motivating and giving them opportunities to reinforce their language learning in their daily lives, consistent with his stated belief that his students could learn effectively and efficiently in this manner.

He encouraged his students by stating that it was not a problem if they could not understand each word or could not remember everything in the conversation, because they were not like computers. He emphasized that it was more important to get the key points from the listening practice. That was why he tried to give them clues to getting the key words and phrases from the context or even from different intonations.

When talking about the topic of car rentals in the United States, he gave students information about his experiences renting cars in America, including telling them where they can rent cars, what identification they will need, where they can pick up and drop off the car, car insurance, and rental prices in the market. He tried to give his students as much information as possible from the content they learned, providing details about the
culture they might not be familiar with. In this way, students were learning not only the English language, but also about the culture of the language.

Similarly, ChiKuo used simple examples to explain his idea about how to learn the language in daily life. For instance, when someone sneezed in the class, he showed them the way a sneeze is responded to by saying, “Bless you.” The one who was blessed, he pointed out, should say “Thank you” in return. Here he stated students could go on and say things like, “You’re welcome.” The situation may be continued a couple of times, and therefore, there was no need to repeat the same sentences. They could simply use “Bless you again” or “Again” to respond to such situations. He mentioned that it was the way he trained his two-year-old babies to speak English and to enable them to learn more about cultural courtesy.

After reviewing the content of the textbook and finishing the listening practice, the students were then asked to conduct the role play and act out the conversation in front of the class. After their demonstration, the teacher corrected some pronunciation problems. However, he tended not to interrupt their conversation during their talk but instead provided his corrections all together after the presentation was finished.

Data Analysis Procedures

Spada and Frohlich’s (1995) Communicative Orientation to Language Teaching (COLT) coding scheme was used to transcribe the data. The categories employed to code the data in this study were adapted from the error treatment sequence delineated in Panova and Lyster’s (2002) model, in addition to Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) model.
The error treatment sequence was adopted as the main unit of analysis which contained instructor and student turns in the following order:

1. learner error
2. teacher feedback
3. learner uptake, with either repair of the error or needs-repair

This order reflected what actually happened when a teacher responded to a student’s error and when the student attempted to respond to the instructor’s feedback move. All student utterances were included, and errors were counted and categorized in the analysis (Panova & Lyster, 2002).

After detailed analysis with the coding process, the transcriptions were examined carefully. Similar ideas were clustered together and grouped into major topics. The data were thus assembled into new categories referring to the emerging themes. Emerging themes were synthesized from the notes taken and the narratives were written by rich description (Creswell, 2003).

**Description and Interpretation of Themes from Observation**

Three major themes emerged from the observations in this study: (a) teachers’ expectations and practice reflect their teaching perceptions, (b) feedback types and strategies, and (c) learner responses to feedback (uptake and repair). Each of the emerging themes would be described and interpreted with a display of multiple perspectives from individuals, supported by diverse quotations as well as numeric evidence.

*Teachers’ Expectations and Practice Reflect their Teaching Perceptions*

During the interviews, all three subjects had mentioned that their teacher-student interactions were “friendly.” These teacher-student friendly interactions were also noticed...
during the classroom observations. The teachers appeared to be tolerant with students’ less-than-ideal behaviors such as talking or being late to class. They also seemed to avoid being too demanding or too critical about students’ behaviors in the classroom. For instance, they seldom gave negative feedback to students regarding either their learning or classroom behavior. Moreover, the participant teachers gave feedback with senses of humor as a strategy to deal with students in their classes. One subject, DaiChao, once greeted a student who came in late to the class by saying, “Congratulations! So you did find the classroom.” In this way, she made the classroom atmosphere much more relaxing. Another subject, ChiKuo, once also joked with a student who was very late to the class. He asked this late student if he came to tell his classmates that it was about time for class to be dismissed. The student seemed to be a little embarrassed hearing that, but the rest of the class was amused and at the same time, realized that the teacher did pay attention to their attendance and punctuality. There was another time when a student’s cell phone rang during the class. ChiKuo joked with the students, asking if it was about time to end the class or just a reminder of time to watch their favorite soap opera because the ring tone was actually the melody of a popular TV program.

However, also corresponding to their previous perceptions about teaching, the participants in this study tended to motivate students’ learning by sharing their self learning and work experiences, as well as by introducing the culture of the language. For example, DaiChao, when trying to explain the word “customer,” talked about her part-time job as a waitress in a restaurant when she studied in the United States. In this way, the students became intently interested in knowing about her experiences living and studying abroad while learning the language and the culture at the same time. Similarly, another subject, ChiKuo, gave his students many examples from daily life as well as his
experiences while living and studying in the United States. For instance, when talking about the topic of car rentals, he mentioned the differences between the used car markets in Taiwan and the United States. He talked about his experiences renting cars in the United States and how convenient and cheap the price was compared to that in Taiwan. He also gave students ideas and pictures of different kinds of vehicles when teaching the vocabulary of different types of cars, including “limo,” “station wagon,” “sports car,” and “minivan.”

In addition, subjects were observed assigning a variety of materials, activities and practices for students in their classrooms. They adopted many different methods and tried to give students much practice. For example, students were given numerous opportunities to conduct pair conversation practice or even individual presentations during classroom observations.

Moreover, it was also observed that teachers put more emphasis on correcting students’ pronunciation errors, which also corresponded well with their stated perceptions of their first priority being to deal with phonological problems in teaching oral English. This study found that teachers’ perceptions of teaching strongly influence their expectations and how they practice their teaching in the language classroom.

Feedback Types and Strategies

During observations, the frequencies of feedback moves were calculated and categorized into different types of feedback. There are seven types of feedback observed for the classes: (a) explicit, (b) recast, (c) elicitation, (d) metalinguistic clue, (e) clarification, (f) repetition, and (g) translation. The analyzed discussions started from each subject and then moved to the more holistic view of data with cross-analysis.
Table 10 enumerates the distribution of feedback moves in HuaLiu’s class, the first to be observed.

Table 10

*Distribution of Corrective Feedback Moves: HuaLiu’s Class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic Clue</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=58

It was found that the teacher tended to use recast frequently as the corrective feedback to deal with students’ pronunciation problems. These interactions are shown in the following examples:

1. T: Social security number.
   S: Social se____ number. (try to repeat but with pronunciation problem.)
   T: Social security number. Do you have a social security number? What’s your social security number? [recast and repetition]
   S: No, I don’t have a social security number.
   T: Very good.

2. S1: What’s new with you?
   S2: Well, actu_____ (have problem pronouncing the word “actually”)
   T: Actually. [recast]
   S2: Actually, I have some good news.
      I just got a pro____ (have problem pronouncing the word “promotion”)
   T: Promotion. [recast]
   S2: Promotion. (repeat)
S1: (silence)
T: So, how to read this? (in L1) [elicitation]
S1: Congra____. (have problem pronouncing the word “congratulations”)
T: Congratulations! [recast]
S1: Congratulations! (repeat)
T: Good!

3. S1: What are you going to do this weekend?
S2: My husband and I are going to repaint our kitchen this weekend.
S1: Repaint your kitchen? You’re certain…
T: Certainly. [recast]
S1: You’re certainly going to be busy.
S2: I suppose so. How about you? What’s your plan for the weekend?
S1: I’m not sure. I will proba____ (have problem pronouncing the word “probably”)
T: Probably, which means maybe. [recast; metalinguistic clue]
S1: I will probably visit my grandchildren.
S2: Well, have a good weekend!

The teacher often used metalinguistic clues to deal with students’ grammatical problems. The following examples depict this technique:

1. T: What do you think of this question? What’s the answer?
S: (Quiet. Don’t know the answer to the question.)
T: You answer the time “yesterday”. So, which one do you use to ask?
[metalinguistic clue]
S: When
T: Good.

2. T: What do you think of this question? What’s the answer?
S: (Quiet. Don’t know the answer to the question.)
T: You answer “our whole family.”
Which one is better to ask? [metalinguistic clue]
S: Where?
T: If you use where, you need to answer the place… not the people. “where” doesn’t make good sense here. [metalinguistic clue]
So, which one is better?
S: Who.
T: Good. (with more explanation in Chinese..)

3. S: Where “do” he come from?
T: Where “does” he come from? [recast]
Because of “he”, the third person singular, you should use “does.”
[metalinguistic clue]
However, the teacher also used explicit feedback moves to deal with grammatical errors. The following are examples of this explicit feedback:

1. S: He didn’t wake up on time. He wake up an hour late.
   T: You should use the past tense of wake, which is ‘woke’. [explicit]
   S: He woke up an hour late.

2. S1: The bus drivers plan to go on strike at midnight.
   S2: Where did you hear that?
   S1: I hear…. 
   T: Heard, you should use past tense here. [explicit]
   S1: I heard it in the bus station this morning.
   T: Good.

When there was a new word or phrase introduced, the teacher would ask her students if they knew the meaning or the pronunciation, or if they could guess or try to pronounce it first. She tended to use the approach of “elicitation” to deal with this kind of situation.

Here are two examples:

1. T: Do you know this word: r-e-s-e-r-v-a-t-i-o-n?
   How do you pronounce it? [elicitation]
   S: (They are trying in different ways…) 
   T: Reservation. (show them the right pronunciation) Repeat after me. [explicit]
   S: Reservation.
   T: Good, what does that mean? [elicitation]
   S: (No response)
   T: For example, I have a reservation for the hotel room. You need to make reservation for that restaurant. [metalinguistic clue]
   S: (try to give answers in Chinese)

2. S: Ca____ is…..(The student can’t pronounce “Canada”)
   T: How do you pronounce “Canada”? (In Chinese) [elicitation; clarification]
   S: I can’t read. I don’t know.
   S: Canada. (repeat after the teacher)

   It was also noticed that the teacher would use Chinese to elicit students’ responses or give feedback in their native language. The following example illustrated the idea of using their first language:
1. T: Where are you from?
   S: Taiwan.
T: Can you use a complete sentence? (in Chinese) \[elicitation; translation\]
   S: I'm from Taiwan.
T: Good.

Moreover, it was observed that the teacher used several hints when giving feedback
and making error corrections. She would say, “Are you sure? Is it right? Do you still
insist on using this word?” Also, she often asked someone else to do the same practice,
which served as a good peer correction at the same time. It can be shown in the following
eexample:

1. S: I just gave a promotion last week.
   T: If you’re the boss, you can say you give someone a promotion. But if you’re
      not,... (explain in L1) \[metalinguistic clue\]
   S: I just give....
T: Do you still insist on using give? \[metalinguistic clue; clarification\]
   S: (silence)
T: We use the word “get” saying that you have a promotion. \[explicit\]
   S: I just get a promotion last week.
T: past tense? \[metalinguistic clues\]
   S: I just got a promotion last week.
T: That’s right.
Table 11 displays the distribution of feedback moves in DaiChao’s class.

Table 11

_Distribution of Corrective Feedback Moves: DaiChao’s Class_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic Clue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=28

During the observation, it was noticed that the teacher focused her corrections mostly on pronunciation, and she tended to use much more implicit and indirect feedback moves such as metalinguistic clues and repetitions than explicit and direct feedback moves. This is shown in the following examples:

1. T: I tell them the reason for my call.
   S: (repeat)
   T: Call. [Repeat] (emphasize the sound of “I”)
   S: Call.
   T: How do you pronounce “L”? [elicitation]
   S: L...
   T: Again. “L” [repeat]
   S: Try to look at the mirror next time and you’ll see the difference. (Explain the pronunciation parts...and check each one’s pronunciation) [metalinguistic clue]

2. T: If it is a phone call, I greet the customer and identify myself.
   S: (Repeat)
   T: Identify. [repeat]
   S: Identify (repeat)
S: (start to discuss)
T: (some more explanation about how to distinguish the stress and syllables by using more examples such as the word “con-ver-sa-tion”) [metalinguistic clue]

3. T: “Politely”
S: Politely.
T: Politely. How many syllables and where’s the stress? [metalinguistic clue]
S: (start to discuss)
T: Let’s try different stresses.
(ask students for demonstrations)
T: Communicate. Com-mu-ni-cate. How many syllables are there?
Where does the stress fall? [metalinguistic clue]
S: (Start to discuss).
T: Listen again, Com-mu-ni-cate. [repeat]
How do you pronounce if the stress falls in the first syllable? How about the second? [metalinguistic clue]

When correcting students’ pronunciation problems, DaiChao would emphasize the pronunciation by separating the word into different syllables. The students were always asked to practice and correct their pronunciation several times, working together as a group or sometimes even individually. For instance, the teacher asked them to practice the pronunciation of the word “politely” several times in order to distinguish the difference between r and l. She emphasized there should not be the r sound but the l and she had everyone practice that pronunciation. The teacher herself even asked each student to pronounce the word for her and then checked each one of them individually. Sometimes, in order to help the students with the syllables, intonation, and stress, the teacher would ask students to demonstrate and distinguish the pronunciation with different inflection and intonation.

In addition, DaiChao tended to use more WH- questions such as why, who, and when, which made her students think more deeply. She always asked her students what
the meaning or pronunciation of the words should be before telling them the correct answer.

Table 12 shows the distribution of feedback moves in ChiKuo’s class.

Table 12

*Distribution of Corrective Feedback Moves: ChiKuo’s Class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic Clue</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=35

It was observed that this teacher used implicit and indirect feedback moves freely such as metalinguistic clues and recast. The following examples explain this:

1. S: How to feel about the movie?
   T: How “do you” feel about the movie? [recast]
   Don’t forget to use ‘do’. [metalinguistic clue]
   S: Oh, I see.

2. S: Would you mind do me help?
   T: “Would you mind helping me” or “would you mind doing me a favor?”
   [recast]
   S: Can I say give me a hand? I learned that before.
   T: Yes, would you mind giving me a hand? [recast]

3. SI: How do you come to school?
   S2: By motorcycle, because I house is far.
   T: Because I live far from here. [recast]
Don't just translate directly from Chinese. That's Chinese structure. 

[metalinguistic clue]

It was further observed that both the professor and students often used Chinese to help explain their ideas when giving feedback and treating errors. This can be shown in the following examples:

1. S: I don’t more than money.
   T: Sorry, I don’t understand. [clarification]
   S: (explain in L1)
   T: Oh, you should say, “I don’t have extra money”. You do have money for meals but not enough for eating in the restaurant. [explicit; metalinguistic clue]
   Or, you can also say, “I don’t have more money”.

2. S: I will at ten o’clock in the morning.
   T: I don’t understand this sentence. [clarification]
   S: (Explain and translate into L1)
   T: You should say “I will leave at ten o’clock in the morning. “Leave” is the verb you should use here. [explicit; metalinguistic clue]
   S: I will leave at ten o’clock in the morning.

3. S: Can you ride autobike carry me go home?
   T: What does that mean? I don’t really get it. [clarification]
   S: (Explain and translate into L1)
   T: Oh, you mean “give a ride”.
   Can you give me a ride? [recast]
   S: Can you give me a ride? (repeat)

ChiKuo also corrected students' errors due to their direct translation from their first language. He commented that some students acquired the words from the dictionary and translated them into English directly, which might not be a good way of learning English due to the different patterns of Chinese and English. That would make their translation from their first language look awkward in English, because of the different language structure. That was the problem of why much of their English sounded like Chinese English, because they used basically the Chinese structure. The following examples show this point:
1. S: How long do you come to school?
   T: How long will it take for you to come to school? [recast]
   (Explain in Chinese that they tend to use the Chinese structure, which is not a good way of saying correct English sentence. The meaning can be confusing too.) [metalinguistic clue]

2. S: I will wear special clothes for the party.
   T: I will dress up for the party. [recast]
   Dress up is the phrase we used to use for the situation, which means to wear something special or formal. Don’t just translate from Chinese, which may sound weird in English. [metalinguistic clue]
   S: Oh, I see.

The teacher did not assign individual students to answer the questions. He usually asked the class as a group or looked for volunteers who would like to answer his questions. Sometimes he offered to give students extra points in order to motivate them to try to work out the questions. If no one could come up with the right answer, he would then give them the answers himself. Doing so, he would again confirm with the students whether they agreed with the answer. For example, once he even joked with his students, saying that they would lose some points if they did not respond to show their agreement.

When asking questions, the teacher did not tend to give his students answers directly, but instead provided them with some hints from the context. He showed them how to listen to the points related to the questions and find clues from the key words.

When teaching vocabulary, he would give them many examples to illustrate the ideas. He often offered his own experiences to explain how they could use the words in different situations. He tended to provide his students with sufficient cultural background information. For instance, when talking about food and restaurants, he mentioned all different kinds of fast food restaurants in the United States, such as Kentucky Fried Chicken and Taco Bell. The students might be familiar with some of them, but not all. The teacher even joked with the initials “KFC” as “Kill and Fry Chicken” in order to help
with the students’ memorization skills. His sense of humor helped to create a more relaxing learning atmosphere.

The teacher also tended to use his sense of humor to deal with students’ errors. For instance, once he asked why his students brought running water and bread back from the restroom break. Then he checked to see if they understood what running water was. Some students guessed that was sports drink since he used the word “running.” He said that was a very smart guess and also a very creative one, and he would like to keep it as a good example of a “mistake” to share with others later in his teaching. Of course, later on he corrected the meaning of “running water” actually referring to tap water. In these ways, students seemed to be impressed with their growing vocabularies.

The teacher gave feedback not only to deal with students’ errors but also to improve their skills of presentation. For example, once when two students finished their dialogues, the teacher commented that the content was good, but that they needed to improve their attitudes, too. The teacher indicated that they seemed to memorize the content instead of really speaking in English. The teacher encouraged the students not only to memorize the conversation, but also to actually use the language in conversation in a more natural way.

In another instance, the teacher came up with a logistic problem. Because the situation of students’ conversation happened on their way to the same class together, the teacher pointed out that it was inappropriate to end the dialogue by saying “Nice to meet you.” In addition, there are some grammatical problems which the teacher corrected. For example, the students were corrected from saying “I just go there now” where the present progressive tense “I’m going there now” would be more correct.

Once the teacher commented that because the content of the students’ conversations was too easy, it was hard for him to find errors to correct. This teacher was suggesting
that the students should be using more difficult English if they were going to improve their skills.

Table 13

_Distribution of Corrective Feedback Moves: Total_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic Clue</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=121

In Table 13, “Metalinguistic Clue” and “Recast” were the most often used corrective feedback approaches by the participants in this study. The feedback types of “Explicit” and “Repetition” were moderately adopted by the subjects. However, these teachers seldom used the feedback types of “Elicitation,” “Clarification,” and “Translation” during the classroom observations.
Figure 1

*Distribution of Corrective Feedback Moves*

Figure 1 shows a clear distribution of the teachers’ corrective feedback moves. Among the seven categories, “metalinguistic clue” was most frequently used by the participants in their treatment of students’ errors. The next category would be “recast,” then followed by “explicit” and “repetition.” “Translation” was the least adopted feedback move, actually observed only once in the classroom.

*Learner Responses to Feedback (Uptake and Repair)*

To investigate whether certain feedback types were more effective than others, the frequencies of uptake and repair moves were calculated, with the results shown in the following four tables. Again, the analyses and discussion started from each subject and then moved to the whole picture via cross-analyses.
Table 14 shows the uptake and repair moves following different types of feedback in HuaLiu's class.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Uptake Moves</th>
<th></th>
<th>Repair Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit (n=11)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast (n=16)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation (n=6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic Clue (n=17)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification (n=4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition (n=3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation (n=1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=58

The subject used the feedback types “recast” and “explicit” as the most effective approaches. These two feedback types received good responses from students’ uptake moves as well as repair moves. However, the use of “metalinguistic clue” appeared to receive good uptake moves but not repairs. The feedback types of “elicitation” and “clarification” received the least uptake moves as well as repair moves.
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Table 15

*Uptake and Repair Moves Following Different Types of Feedback: DaiChao’s Class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Uptake</th>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>Repair</th>
<th>Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit (n=1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast (n=0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation (n=1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic Clue (n=13)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification (n=0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition (n=13)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation (n=0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=28

The subject used mainly two feedback types in her treatment of students’ errors: “metalinguistic clues” and “repetition.” However, the repair moves following these two feedback types do not appear to be as effective as the “explicit” approach. The results showed that these two feedback types received good uptake moves but not repair moves.
Table 16

*Uptake and Repair Moves Following Different Types of Feedback: ChiKuo’s Class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Uptake Moves</th>
<th>Repair Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit (n=7)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast (n=10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation (n=1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic Clue (n=12)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification (n=4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition (n=1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation (n=0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=35

This subject used the feedback types of “metalinguistic clue” heavily in his treatment of errors. However, this approach did not appear to be effective regarding both uptake moves and repair moves. In fact, results showed that only “elicitation” and “repetition” received better uptake moves; other feedback types did not appear to be very effective dealing with errors, according to the response from repair moves.
Table 17

**Uptake and Repair Moves Following Different Types of Feedback: Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Uptake Moves</th>
<th>Repair Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit(n=19)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast(n=26)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation(n=8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic Clue(n=42)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification(n=8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition(n=17)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation(n=1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=121

Table 17 showed the total uptake and repair moves following different types of feedback provided by all three subjects. The feedback types of "translation" and "repetition" received the highest percentage of uptake moves; while the feedback type of "elicitation" received the lowest percentage of uptake moves. For the repair moves, the use of "translation" and "explicit" approach appeared to be more effective than other types of feedback.
Figure 2

Distribution of Uptake and Repair Moves Following Different Types of Feedback

Note: Uptake N=number of uptake moves; Uptake %=percentage of uptake moves; Repair N=number of repair moves; Repair %= percentage of repair moves

The use of “metalinguistic clue” was the most adopted feedback type. However, its subsequent uptake moves and repair moves were less than most of the other feedback types. The feedback types of “translation,” “repetition,” “explicit,” and “recast” received better uptake moves as well as repair moves. The use of the feedback types of “elicitation” and “clarification” were less frequent, and their effectiveness was also limited. These two feedback types received average responses from students’ uptake moves, but the repair moves were much lower when compared with the other feedback types.

To investigate which feedback types lead to better repair of errors, the data were again categorized into different segments as direct or indirect, and explicit or implicit. The tables that follow show the distribution of uptake and repair moves following direct and explicit, or indirect and implicit types of feedback.
### Table 18

**Uptake and Repair Moves Following Direct/Explicit and Indirect/Implicit Types of Feedback: HuaLiu’s Class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Uptake</th>
<th>Repair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explicit &amp; Direct (n=11)</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implicit &amp; Indirect (n=47)</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=58

The use of explicit and direct feedback types better treat students’ errors, resulting in much higher uptakes and repair moves than the indirect and implicit types of feedback.

During observations of the class, the teacher tended to give feedback more indirectly in response to her students’ errors. She used rising intonations to imply a problematic area or asked if it was right in order to make her students think more about the answers.

This teacher-student exchange can be illustrated by the following examples:

1. T: What is your favorite city?
   S: Japan.
   T: Is it right? Japan? [repetition; metalinguistic clue]
   S: Kyoto.
   T: Yes, Japan is a country, not a city. [metalinguistic clue]
   T: What is your favorite Japanese food?
   S: Sushi.
   T: Very good!

2. S: “Where” bank do you go?
   T: Is it O.K. to use “Where”?
   In Chinese, “Where” bank do you go? Sounds O.K. but…. Explain…”M” bank… [metalinguistic clue]
   So, what do you think? [elicitation]
   S: Which.
   T: Good! “Which” bank do you go to?
The teacher tended to provide her students with more direct answers when they stopped their sentences or asked for the teacher’s help.

The following is an example:

T: Can you read the sentence?
S: What is your _____? (stop) I can’t pronounce this word.
T: Favorite. [explicit]
S: Favorite.
T: Good, say the sentence again. [clarification]
S: What’s your favorite city in Korea?
T: Very good!

Table 19

_Uptake and Repair Moves Following Direct/Explicit and Indirect/Implicit Types of Feedback: DaiChao’s Class_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Uptake Moves</th>
<th>Repair Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit &amp; Direct (n=1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit &amp; Indirect (n=27)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=28

The teacher’s use of explicit and direct feedback types also received better uptake and repair moves than the indirect and implicit types of feedback. However, she provided mostly indirect and implicit feedback to deal with students’ errors.
Table 20

*Uptake and Repair Moves Following Direct/Explicit and Indirect/Implicit Types of Feedback: ChiKuo’s Class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Uptake Moves</th>
<th>Repair Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit &amp; Direct (n=7)</td>
<td>N: 5, %: 71</td>
<td>N: 4, %: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit &amp; Indirect (n=28)</td>
<td>N: 17, %: 61</td>
<td>N: 8, %: 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=35

Here the use of explicit and direct feedback types received better effectiveness when dealing with students’ errors than through the use of indirect/implicit types of feedback. In addition, the particular subject’s uptake moves and repair moves appeared to be markedly fewer in number than the other two teachers.

Table 21

*Uptake and Repair Moves Following Direct/Explicit and Indirect/Implicit Types of Feedback: Total*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Uptake Moves</th>
<th>Repair Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit &amp; Direct (n=19)</td>
<td>N: 16, %: 84</td>
<td>N: 15, %: 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit &amp; Indirect (n=102)</td>
<td>N: 81, %: 79</td>
<td>N: 58, %: 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=121
Table 21 showed the total uptake and repair moves following direct/ explicit and indirect/ implicit types of feedback used by all the subjects. The explicit and direct feedback type received 84% of uptake moves and 79% of repair moves; while implicit and indirect feedback type received 79% of uptake moves and only 57% of repair moves.

Figure 3

**Distribution of Uptake and Repair Moves Following Direct/Explicit and Indirect/Implicit Types of Feedback in Total**

Note: Uptake N=number of uptake moves; Uptake %=percentage of uptake moves; Repair N=number of repair moves; Repair %=percentage of repair moves

The results of the study showed that explicit and direct feedback types were more effective than implicit and indirect types in receiving both better uptake and repair moves.

**Summary**

Data collection in this study came from two primary sources: interviews and classroom observations. Three different types of data were collected in this research: (a) information from interviewing the subjects, (b) statistical results from counting the frequencies of feedback types as well as learners' uptake and repair moves, and (c) the data collected, analyzed, described and interpreted by the researcher from classroom observations.
Data collected through the semi-structured interviews were subjected to the qualitative procedures of open, axial, and selective coding. Several themes that emerged from the open coding process, were later de-contextualized into segments in the axial coding process. During the process of selective coding, the data segments that emerged were re-contextualized. The results of the analysis were then presented in a narrative report, which provided answers to the first research question, “What are teachers’ perceptions of feedback and error treatment in their teaching of college oral English?”

Data collected in the observation part contained both qualitative and quantitative analyses. The qualitative analyzing procedures included: (a) detailed descriptions of the setting or individuals, (b) analyses with a coding process in which themes or categories emerged, and (c) narratives of themes or categories which display multiple perspectives from individuals that were supported by diverse quotations and evidence. In addition, the numeric information was also gathered as strong evidence to better answer the research question.

Findings from analyzing and interpreting the observation data provided a good understanding regarding the other research questions. Observations revealed that teachers’ perceptions did match observed behaviors in their classrooms. Statistical results from counting the frequencies of feedback types explained what kinds of feedback were adopted and how they were distributed. Moreover, the calculated frequencies of learners’ uptake moves proved that certain feedback types were more effective than others in leading learners to notice their errors. Finally, the counting frequencies of learners’ repair moves directly answered the question of which feedback types led to better repair of errors in Taiwanese college students’ oral English learning. In the following chapter,
these findings are summarized, along with postulation, implication for practitioners, and recommendations regarding future studies.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, POSTULATION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The essence and strength of the qualitative dominant research design is its interpretive nature which allows the researcher to interact with the participants in order to develop an understanding or theory of a phenomenon. Chapter Five contains three sections to conclude this study: (a) summary, (b) postulation, and (c) recommendations. It first summarizes the findings from Chapter Four and is followed by an exploration of the grand tour question, sub-questions, and what the data revealed in response to each. Furthermore, the explanation for the postulations and implications are also suggested at the end of this study.

Summary

This summary provides a holistic perspective to answer the research question of this study: “What kinds of feedback and error treatment will better facilitate Taiwanese college students’ oral English learning?” In order to examine the findings more thoroughly, there are five sub-questions that serve as the major categories of this study:

1. What are the teachers’ perceptions of feedback and error treatment in their teaching of college oral English?

2. Do teachers’ perceptions match observed behaviors in their classrooms?

3. What kinds of corrective feedback are currently used, and how are they distributed in teaching and learning oral English in the college classrooms in Taiwan?

4. Are certain types of feedback more effective than others in leading learners to notice their errors? The term “effective” is defined by the amount of uptake with which learners respond after they receive feedback.
5. Which feedback types (direct or indirect; explicit or implicit) lead to better repair of errors in Taiwanese college students' oral English learning?

Each sub-question was used to form a holistic perspective of answering the grand tour question and thus a more complete study was achieved. The first sub-question addressed the perception of teachers regarding the feedback and error treatment in their teaching of the college oral English.

*What are the teachers' perceptions of feedback and error treatment in their teaching of college oral English?*

From the interviews, all of the subjects agreed that it was important to deal with students' errors with cautions by using a combination of different strategies. According to the subjects' reports, their feelings and experiences of dealing with students' errors appeared to be more negative than positive. These college English professors were aware of students' frustration or embarrassment due to negative feedback or as a result of corrections; thus, they tended to be tolerant with students' errors in their teaching of the oral English classes. They emphasized the importance of providing students with a less stressful learning environment, which they perceived as more crucial and a higher priority to promote students' learning than dealing with students' errors. Subjects were also convinced that making errors was an inevitable part of the learning process; thus, they tried to avoid being too critical about students' errors. Moreover, these language professors shared their personal learning and working experiences with their students and introduced them to the culture of the language, which they believed could further motivate students' interests in learning. According to these teachers' perceptions, students need more guidance and treatment on their pronunciation problems, which is the area they focused upon when working with their students.
Do teachers' perceptions match observed behaviors in their classrooms?

The classroom observations revealed that teachers' expectations and practices did indeed reflect their earlier-stated perceptions of teaching. All subjects stated that they aimed to develop a friendly teacher-student interaction which they believed could facilitate students' learning of the language. When observed, they did not appear to be overly demanding about students' behaviors or too critical of students' errors. They seldom provided negative feedback, and they tried to correct students' errors with some humor to soften the blow. By doing so, they created a more relaxing learning atmosphere in their language classrooms. They also put increased emphasis on motivating students' learning by articulating a number of examples drawn from their own learning and work experiences. In addition, these professors shared with students many different perspectives of cultural backgrounds and created a context for using a foreign language. Subjects were also observed using a variety of different methods, attempting to provide a majority of time in the classroom for students to practice the language. Finally, the teachers' priorities to correct pronunciation problems also reflected their ideas and preferences in correcting different kinds of errors. These phenomena were observed in the classrooms and corresponded well to the subjects' stated beliefs about their teaching strategies. Therefore, teachers' perceptions matched the observed behaviors in the classroom.

What kinds of corrective feedback are currently used and how are they distributed in teaching and learning oral English in the college classrooms in Taiwan?

During the classroom observation, seven types of feedback moves were found: (a) explicit, (b) recast, (c) elicitation, (d) metalinguistic clue, (e) clarification, (f) repetition, and (g) translation. Although each subject used different types of feedback with degrees
of variance, it was obvious that during classroom observation certain feedback types appeared to be more dominant than others. “Metalinguistic clue” was found to be the most frequent feedback type adopted by these Taiwanese college teachers in their English conversation classes. The other feedback types of “recast” and “explicit” were also heavily disseminated in their dealing with students’ errors. On the other hand, the feedback types of “translation,” “elicitation,” and “clarification” had the lowest frequencies of use during the classroom observations.

Are certain types of feedback more effective than others in leading learners to notice their errors? (The term “effective” is defined by the amount of uptake which learners respond when receiving feedback).

From the classroom observations, certain types of feedback were found to be more effective than others in leading learners to notice their errors in terms of students’ uptake moves. Overall, the feedback types of “translation,” “repetition,” and “explicit” appeared to receive better uptake moves from the learners. However, these feedback types were not heavily used by the teachers in their treatment of students’ errors. In other words, teachers were observed to use more frequently feedback types with lower uptake moves.

Which feedback types (direct or indirect; explicit or implicit) lead to better repair of errors in Taiwanese college students’ oral English learning?

The direct and explicit feedback type was found to be more effective in terms of prompting learners’ repair moves. After observing the teachers, it was concluded that explicit and direct feedback type could lead to better repair of errors in Taiwanese college students’ oral English learning. However, this study also found that these
teachers used more indirect and implicit than direct and explicit feedback types to deal with students' errors.

Postulation

Analysis of the data relating to this study has produced one major postulation. This postulation has been labeled "The Relationship between Teachers' Perceptions and Their Instructional Effectiveness of Error Treatment in Oral English Learning."

The findings of this study conclude that teachers’ perceptions of teaching correspond well to their classroom practices. However, this study also reveals the discrepancy between professors’ perceptions of their own effectiveness and the actual instructional effectiveness with regard to giving feedback and error treatment to students. It is apparent that teachers tend to apply what they perceive to work for their students based on their self-learning and teaching experiences. They recognize the importance of providing more positive feedback which they believe helps create a less stressful learning environment. Thus they try to avoid being too critical toward students’ errors, as well as avoid providing negative feedback. Furthermore, their tolerant attitudes toward students’ errors also reflect on their limited frequencies of error correction. Most of all, these oral English professors tend to adopt more indirect and implicit types of feedback to prevent frustrating students with direct or explicit corrections. However, the findings of this study reveal that direct and explicit feedback actually prompts higher percentage of both uptake moves and repair moves from the learners. Therefore, it is important for language instructors to be aware of the gap between their perceptions of ideal teaching and the effectiveness of their instruction regarding giving feedback and error treatment.
Recommendations

Several recommendations have been generated from this study. These recommendations are divided into three sections: (a) Recommendations for Academic Administrators, (b) Recommendations for Professors, and (c) Recommendations for Future Studies. The first section describes recommendations for those who may like to utilize the findings from this study in their positions as academic administrators in Taiwan.

Recommendations for Academic Administrators

Effective feedback and error treatment facilitate students' language learning. Teachers give feedback and correct students' errors based upon their perceptions of teaching. However, teachers' use of feedback types and their correcting behaviors also reflect their teaching perceptions which include teaching styles, teacher-student interaction and the recognition of teachers' roles. In addition, teachers' giving feedback and dealing with students' errors are closely related to their personal learning and teaching experiences. Thus, understanding the ideas of feedback and error correction can benefit academic administrators in hiring better qualified potential language instructors as well as evaluating the effectiveness of their instruction.

Specific recommendations for academic administrators include:

1. When interviewing potential language instructors, it is helpful for academic administrators to understand professors' perceptions of feedback and error treatment.

2. Academic administrators should be aware of language instructors' negative feelings dealing with students' errors and had to provide professors with
resources to improve their teaching skills as well as teacher-student interaction.

3. Academic administrators can gain a better understanding of actual teaching and learning by observing the classes, specially focusing on teachers giving feedback and dealing with students’ errors.

4. The frequencies of uptake moves and repair moves can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction.

5. To prepare language instructors with better professional trainings, academic administrators may consider offering courses or workshops relating to effective feedback and error treatment.

Recommendations for Professors

The investigation revealed that although professors agree they need a wide variety of different methods to improve their teaching, their ideas and uses of feedback types are still limited. Subjects in this study recognized and adopted only a few types of feedback in order to deal with students’ errors. Furthermore, those feedback types which were most frequently adopted in teachers’ error treatment did not achieve the desired uptake moves and repair moves from the learners. Therefore, from the findings of this study, the following recommendations for language instructors emerge:

1. Language instructors should be aware of different types of corrective feedback and understand that certain types are more effective than others in dealing with students’ errors.

2. It is important for language instructors to deal with students’ errors in various ways instead of using only limited types of feedback.
3. Language professors are suggested to employ more direct and explicit feedback types to facilitate Taiwanese college students' oral English learning.

4. Language professors should be aware of the discrepancy between their perceived teaching effectiveness and the actual instructional effectiveness regarding feedback and error treatment.

5. Language instructors should avoid over-correcting students' errors or giving negative feedback which might hurt students' feelings.

6. It is important for language instructors to update their professional knowledge as well as to examine their application of different teaching methodologies.

7. Observing a variety of classrooms helps language instructors to increase their knowledge and understanding as well as to improve their teaching skills.

8. Professors are recommended to have friendly interaction with students and to provide them with a more stress-free learning environment.

9. Language instructors should motivate students' self-learning as well as provide them with more opportunities to do self-correction.

10. It is crucial for language teachers to motivate students' interests in learning by encouraging them with more positive feedback and then to reinforce the learning with more practical use of the target language.

Recommendations for Future Studies

Investigators who are interested in further understanding this research topic may consider the following areas for exploration:

1. students' perspectives of receiving feedback and error treatment

2. analyses of the relationships between different feedback types and error types
3. cultural influences discussed regarding teachers’ giving feedback and doing error correction

4. investigation of students’ self and peer correction and their effectiveness of each

More specifically, there are several questions which remain unanswered and require further research:

1. What are students’ perceptions regarding different types of corrective feedback used by their teachers?

2. Do students perceive the importance and effectiveness of error correction?

3. What are the relationships between different feedback types and error types?

4. Which kinds of errors should be corrected and how should they be corrected?

5. How does cultural influence affect teachers’ giving feedback and treating students’ errors in the language classroom?

6. Is corrective feedback effective for the long term or only for the short term?

7. Does the learner’s language proficiency level influence the effectiveness of error correction?

8. Is corrective feedback more effective when provided in English or the native language?

9. What teaching strategies help to motivate and facilitate the effectiveness of students’ self-correction and peer-correction?

Endnote

We all learn from mistakes. But some people learn more from their errors, while others keep on making the same ones. Making mistakes is absolutely an inevitable part of the language learning process. Many teachers have negative experiences dealing with
students' errors due to the frustration and embarrassment which students experience. Teachers then report that they feel their efforts at correcting student errors are fruitless. However, students definitely benefit from teachers' feedback and error treatment and, thus, learn language more effectively. It is the responsibility of foreign language teachers everywhere to provide students with better learning strategies. Chief among these are improvements to the methods of giving feedback and treating errors. The importance of this concept is illustrated in the following quotation from Brooks (1960):

Like sin, error is to be avoided and its influence overcome, but its presence is to be expected....the principal way of overcoming it (error) is to shorten the time lapse between the incorrect response and the presentation once more of the correct model (p. 56).
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Appendix A: Screening Interview
Screening Interview

Date: ______________, 2004  Time: ______________  Male:  _____  Female:  _____

Opening Statements:

Thank you for taking part in this initial interview for a research study. I would like to go over a few things before we start the initial interview.

1. The research study will look at teachers giving feedback and error correction to Taiwanese college students as they learn oral English.

2. All information from this interview will be confidential. You will not be identified by name in any report from this study.

3. This researcher and Dr. Roberta D. Evans, Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at The University of Montana, will be the only people who know you participated in this research. Dr. Evans is my Doctoral Dissertation Committee Chairman and oversees all aspects of this research.

4. The confidentiality of your name is also under the purview of the Institutional Review Board at The University of Montana.

I want to assure you that there are no correct answers to the questions. What is important, are your thoughts, feelings, and experiences. The intent of this interview is to find out if you are interested in participating in this research and if you currently have experiences in the field of giving feedback and error correction on Taiwanese college students oral English learning.

Questions

1. What courses are you currently teaching?

2. What is your students' English proficiency? Low-intermediate, intermediate or advanced?
3. Can you describe your styles of teaching?

4. Please tell me your experience of giving feedback and correcting students' oral English errors.

5. What is your understanding about error correction and giving feedback?

6. Is there any specific method which works best or worst according to your teaching experience?

7. Would you be interested in participating in this research?
Appendix B: Interview Protocol
Interview Protocol

1. What is your educational background?

**Planned prompt:** What professional trainings have you received from your education?

2. How long have you been teaching?

3. What teaching experiences do you have?

4. Do you have other experiences related to teaching?

**Planned prompt:** What work experiences do you have?

5. What courses are you currently teaching?

6. What is your students’ English proficiency? Low-intermediate, intermediate or advanced?

**Planned prompt:** Does students’ language proficiency level vary a lot? What is the influence of different proficiency?

7. What teaching materials are you using?

8. Do you sometimes give students handouts or extra learning materials?

**Planned prompt:** Is the material appropriate for students’ learning regarding their language proficiency level and understanding of the content?
9. What are your requirements for students who take your class?

**Planned prompt:** What is the teacher's expectation for students in the class?

10. How do you see your role as an English teacher?

11. Can you describe your styles of teaching?

**Planned prompt:** What are your characteristics of being an English teacher?

12. What are your beliefs about language learning and teaching?

**Planned prompt:** Is there any belief that influences your language teaching?

13. Is there any specific method which works best or worst according to your teaching experience?

14. What method or methods do you like? Why do you like it/them?

**Planned prompt:** What are your experiences using specific teaching methods and the reasons behind your methodology?

15. What is your understanding about error correction and giving feedback?

16. Please tell me your experience of giving feedback and correcting students' oral English errors.

**Planned prompt:** What is your idea and experience of giving feedback and dealing with students' oral errors?
17. Do you think it is important to correct students’ errors?

18. What kinds of errors do you usually correct?

**Planned prompt:** Are there specific types of errors that you emphasize and correct more than others?

19. Do you use different ways to deal with students’ errors?

**Planned prompt:** How do you usually deal with students’ errors? What strategy or strategies do you use?

20. How do you feel when giving feedback and doing error correction?

**Planned prompt:** Do you sometimes feel frustrated when giving feedback and doing error correction? Can you give me some examples?

This is the end of the interview question, is there anything else that you would like to tell me?

Is there any question you would like to ask?

I would like to thank you again for participating in this interview. Please remember that all information from this interview will be confidential and you will not be identified by name or in any report from this study. I really appreciate the opportunity to hear your ideas and experiences.
Appendix C: Observational Form
Classroom Observation Sheet

Identity of subject: ___________ Date: ________________

Observation #___________

Part I: Basic Information

1. Classroom environment

2. Handouts

3. Activities

4. Learning tasks

5. Other notes

Part II: Feedback and Error Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What I observe in class</th>
<th>My interpretation on the observation data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Checklist of Feedback Moves
Checklist of Feedback Moves

Identity of subject: ___________  Date: ________________  
Class: ________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Feedback Moves</th>
<th>Uptake Moves</th>
<th>Repair Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: This checklist was developed from the Error Treatment Sequence  
(Lyster & Ranta, 1997)