

**PRE-SERVICE EFL TEACHERS' BELIEFS
and BEHAVIOURS on ORAL CORRECTIVE
FEEDBACK STRATEGIES**

**İngilizce Öğretmen Adaylarının Sözlü Geri Bildirim Hakkındaki
İnançları ve Uygulamaları**

Zübeyde Sinem GENÇ¹

Özlem CENGİZ²

Abstract

Although there have been studies conducted separately on the amount of oral corrective feedback (OCF) strategies language teachers provided, one relevant important issue that needs thorough investigation is the teachers' beliefs about OCF, the sources of teachers' beliefs, and whether teachers' beliefs and behaviours on OCF match. This study, descriptive in nature and part of a larger project, aimed to examine the beliefs and behaviours of 44 pre-service Turkish teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL) on the use of OCF strategies, to what extent their beliefs and behaviours matched, and to explore the sources of teachers' beliefs about OCF. Data were collected through a classroom simulation survey, adapted from Özmen & Aydın (2015), and a semi-structured interview with 8 of the participants. The results revealed that the pre-service EFL teachers had a positive attitude towards OCF and favoured selective correction as well as certain OCF strategies; however, the majority of their beliefs were observed to contradict with their stated behaviours. The research also demonstrated that their beliefs about OCF strategies are derived from various sources. Despite several limitations of the study, it contributes to enlighten the issue of teachers' beliefs and behaviours about OCF, which is one of the crucial topics in foreign language teaching and language teacher education.

Key Words: oral corrective feedback strategies, pre-service teachers EFL teachers, sources of teachers' beliefs

Öz

Öğretmenlerin kullandığı sözlü geri bildirim stratejileri üzerine pek çok çalışma yapılmasına rağmen sözlü geri bildirim stratejileri hakkındaki inançları, öğretmenlerin bu stratejiler hakkında inandıklarının ve uygulamalarının birbiriyle tutarlı olup olmadığı ve sözlü geri bildirim stratejileri hakkındaki inançlarının kaynakları etraflıca araştırma gerektiren önemli konulardan biridir. Daha geniş bir proje kapsamında betimleyici bir yapıda olan bu araştırma, 44 İngilizce öğretmen adayının kullandıkları sözlü geri bildirim stratejilerini, inançları ile uygulamalarının hangi ölçüde uyum sağladığını ve sözlü geri bildirim stratejileri

¹ Prof. Dr., Department of English Language Education, Faculty of Education, Bursa Uludağ University, z.sinem.genc@gmail.com

² English Language Instructor, School of Foreign Languages, Bursa Technical University, Bursa, cengizozlem1@gmail.com

hakkındaki inançlarının kaynaklarını incelemeyi hedeflemektedir. Veri toplama araçları olarak Özmen & Aydın'dan (2015) uyarlanan bir Sözlü Hata Düzeltme Simülasyonu ve 8 gönüllü öğretmen adayıyla yarı yapılandırılmış mülakat kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın sonuçları İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının sözlü geri bildirim stratejilerine yönelik olumlu bir tutum sergilediğini ve belirli sözlü geri bildirim stratejileri kullanmakla birlikte sözlü hataları düzeltmede seçici davrandıklarını ortaya koymuştur. Ancak sözlü geri bildirim stratejilerine dair pek çok inanın uygulamayla çeliştiği gözlenmiştir. Ayrıca bu çalışma öğretmen adaylarının sözlü geri bildirim stratejileri hakkındaki inançlarının farklı kaynaklara dayandığını göstermektedir. Bu çalışma, birtakım sınırlılıklarına rağmen, yabancı dil öğrenimi ve yabancı dil öğretmen eğitimindeki en önemli konulardan biri olan öğretmenlerin sözlü geri bildirim stratejileri hakkındaki inançlarını ve uygulamalarını ortaya koyması bağlamında alana katkıda bulunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: sözlü geri bildirim stratejileri, İngilizce öğretmen adayları, öğretmen inançlarının kaynakları

Introduction

Compared to incidental decisions, planned aspects of teaching are relatively easier for teachers to be able to foresee what might happen before and after an activity and how they could deal with the expected challenges without disrupting the flow of the lesson. Given that feedback sessions in a lesson cannot be planned beforehand, the issues regarding the provision of oral corrective feedback (hereafter OCF) are among teachers' decisions that have to be made instantly during teaching. Therefore, teachers must have developed their skills on how to provide corrective feedback (hereafter CF) since it has been proved by research that CF has a facilitative role in language acquisition (Özmen & Aydın, 2015; Kamiya, 2016, 2018; Lyster & Mori, 2006; Roothoof, 2014; Li, 2010; Oladejo, 1993; Russell & Spada, 2006; Schulz, 2001; Brandt, 2008; Ellis, 2010; Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013). However, the provision of CF is "a complex phenomenon" (Ellis, 2009; Junqueira & Payant, 2015; Mendez & Cruz, 2012; Hendrickson, 1978) and rather controversial because the answers to most of the questions raised so far have still not been agreed upon due to the inconclusive research findings (Agudo, 2013; Hendrickson, 1978). Moreover, many studies have demonstrated that there is a mismatch between teachers' beliefs on OCF strategies and their actual classroom practices (Basturkmen et al., 2004; Kamiya, 2016; Roothoof, 2014; Dilans, 2016; Yoshida, 2008; Kirgoz & Agcam, 2005). Furthermore, as some studies (Vasquez & Harvey, 2010; Kamiya, 2016; Szesztay, 2004) clearly showed, even experienced teachers have been observed to have inadequate knowledge and awareness about OCF strategies.

The previous studies generally investigated in-service teachers' OCF strategies. As explained above, it is of utmost importance to raise awareness about the issue and help teachers acquire effective feedback strategies at pre-service stage. In this sense, there is a great need to investigate the issue for pre-service teachers. However, only a recent study (Özmen & Aydın, 2015) investigated pre-service EFL teachers' stated beliefs and stated behaviours about OCF. The results proved that the pre-service EFL teachers were aware of the difference between an error and a mistake and preferred to use different strategies according to the type of the task, accuracy- or fluency-oriented. Even though the study presented detailed information regarding OCF strategies, it did not further analyse the sources of the participants' beliefs or whether the beliefs matched their stated practices. There is a significant number of studies examining the sources of teachers' beliefs (Kagan, 1992; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Vasquez & Harvey, 2010; Schulz, 2001; Nguyen, 2017; Borg, 2003; Florez & Basto, 2017; Richardson, 1996; Mattheoudakis, 2017). However, the sources of teachers' beliefs on OCF strategies have not particularly been investigated as much except for a recent study (Florez & Basto, 2017) demonstrating that the pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about OCF strategies came from their learning experiences.

This study aimed to contribute to the literature by investigating what Turkish pre-service EFL teachers think and know about OCF strategies. It, additionally, aimed to shed light on the sources of their beliefs since there is no particular study, to the researchers' knowledge, examining pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about OCF strategies originate. In order to find answers to those issues, four research questions have been addressed:

1. What are Turkish pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs on OCF strategies?
2. What are Turkish pre-service EFL teachers' behaviours on OCF strategies?
3. To what extent do Turkish pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs match their behaviours on OCF strategies?
4. What are the sources of Turkish pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs on OCF strategies?

Theoretical Framework

Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies

CF has attracted a great deal of attention as it has been an issue of concern for both researchers and teachers (Ellis, 2010). It is obviously an important part of teachers' job because the previous studies showed that teachers spend almost 10% of their lesson time on the provision of corrective feedback (Davies, 2011; Simard & Jean, 2011; Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013; Atai & Shafiee, 2017). Another reason why CF attracts attention is that CF is "very researchable" (Ellis, 2010, p.336), which means it is relatively easier than other aspects of classroom to observe and identify as well as analyse CF moves. Furthermore, inconclusive research findings still draw researchers' attention on OCF strategies in order to contribute to the literature, and suggest more practical solutions for teachers to use in the classroom.

Although there is not a single definition for CF, basically it is "any feedback provided to a learner, from any source, that contains evidence of learner error of language form" (Russell & Spada, 2006, p.14). It is also referred to as negative feedback since it gives learners clues about what is incorrect in their utterances. Therefore, CF is "corrective in intent" (Ellis, 2009, p.3). Among the controversial aspects of CF are whether and which learner errors should be corrected, the time, the way and the agent of correction (Hendrickson, 1978).

Should Learner Errors Be Corrected?

Although errors are natural and inevitable in language learning (Corder, 1967), the value attached to them has varied depending on different approaches over the decades. Back in 1950s and 1960s, behaviourist teaching models advised teachers to avoid correcting learner errors and to focus on the repetition of correct uses of language. In 1980s, Krashen (1982) was strongly against error correction claiming that it was harmful for learners more than beneficial since language development followed a natural order and error correction would just make learners more nervous impeding acquisition. In contrast to this view, humanistic models considered error correction beneficial as long as it was positive and non-judgmental. During 1980s, Communicative Language Teaching became a popular teaching method, which viewed error correction necessary for the errors primarily hindering meaning. According to Skills Acquisition Theory, a learner needed "feedback on how well he or she is doing" (Ur, 1996, p.243). In the post-method era, the research showed that CF could promote second language acquisition (Russell, 2009; Ellis, 2009).

Today, it has been clear that learners want their oral errors to be corrected as evident in the studies across different learning contexts on learners' preferences for OCF (Oladejo, 1993; Schulz, 2001; Simard & Jean, 2011; Agudo, 2013; Genç, 2014; Kartchava, 2016; Lee, 2016; Roothoof & Breeze, 2016; Azad, 2016; Ananda et al., 2017).

When Should Learners' Errors Be Corrected?

Previous studies showed that teachers could either provide immediate OCF or delayed OCF. That distinction was also called as online CF (immediate CF) and offline CF (delayed CF) by Li (2013). Ölmezer-Öztürk & Öztürk (2016) described it in further detail and explained that immediate feedback referred to the one interrupting the learner speech, delayed feedback was provided right after the learner's speech finished and post-delayed feedback was provided at a later time after recording learners' errors. There are different opinions about the timing of OCF, which makes the issue controversial. Research shows that the majority of learners prefer delayed correction (Genç, 2014; Ölmezer-Öztürk & Öztürk, 2016) as they find it useful and delayed feedback decreases their anxiety. However, Agudo (2013) found that immediate correction led half of the learners to think about the reasons why they made errors whereas Ölmezer-Öztürk & Öztürk (2016) reported that the learners found it anxiety-provoking and discouraging.

Which Learner Errors Should Be Corrected?

This is another controversial issue where various opinions have been proposed. While some studies reported that learners want all the errors to be corrected (Ananda et al., 2017; Katayama, 2007), some demonstrated learners expect selective correction (Kartchava, 2016; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Chenoweth et al., 1983). Researchers have come up with various suggestions for practitioners. Corder (1967) made a distinction between an error and a mistake with the former referring to a problem in competence while the latter is related to ill performance. Nevertheless, it is not easy for teachers to differentiate between an error and a mistake in all cases. Burt (1975) came up with another categorization consisting of local and global errors. When learners make local errors, their message is clear but the utterance is not target-like whereas global errors lead to the hindrance of the meaning. Harmer (1983) and Basturkmen et al. (2002) focused on accuracy-fluency issue suggesting that teachers should provide learners with CF if the focus of the activity is accuracy. When an error is made in fluency-oriented activities, it could be addressed if the error leads to the communication breakdown or if the learner is asking for assistance (Harmer, 1983). Krashen (1982) suggested dealing with simple and portable errors; and similarly Ferris (1999) recommended that treatable errors should be addressed. Ellis (2010) preferred to correct errors that learners persistently make while Vann et al. (1984) found that some teachers considered all errors equally important and corrected them all. As for the types of errors, learners view grammatical and organization errors as serious errors and want those errors to be corrected (Oladejo, 1993; Katayama, 2007; Azad, 2016).

How Should Learner Errors Be Corrected?

The taxonomy of Lyster & Ranta (1997) is preliminary due to its systematicity in the field illustrating how CF could be delivered although some suggestions about dealing with errors had already been made before (Hendrickson, 1978; Oladejo, 1993; Fanselow, 1977; Brown, 1994; Harmer, 1983; Ur, 1992). Lyster & Ranta (1997) proposed 6 CF types with one additional type named multiple feedback which refers to more than one CF type to address an error. Sheen & Ellis (2011) categorized those CF types as implicit and explicit,

which, indeed, depends on the context the error is made, and input-providing and output-prompting as could be viewed below:

Figure 1. A taxonomy of CF strategies (Ellis, 2009, p.8)

	<i>Implicit</i>	<i>Explicit</i>
Input-providing	Recast	Explicit correction
Output-prompting	Repetition Clarification request	Metalinguistic explanation Elicitation Paralinguistic signal

type consists of clarification request, repetition, paralinguistic signal, metalinguistic feedback and elicitation. He observed that teachers used negotiation of form to draw learners' attention to focus on form and make a self-correction in the first place because it was found that although recasts were used more often by teachers, it did not lead to much uptake whereas negotiation of form strategies led to more uptake as they enabled students to produce output. Lyster (1998b) argues that negotiation of form should be particularly used for grammatical errors because they are the ones not easily noticed by learners, so those strategies will enable them to notice and give a chance to self-correct.

Another widely-known and accepted taxonomy is that of Llinares & Lyster (2014) who proposed three broad CF types that are recasts, prompts and explicit correction.

Previous studies have been conducted to investigate which CF type is most effective for language development; however, the findings are inconclusive and show variance depending on the setting. As the majority of the studies demonstrate, recasts are widely-used by teachers (Russell, 2009; Ge, 2017; Brown, 2016; Dilans, 2016; Al-Faki & Siddiek, 2013, Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Yoshida, 2008) due to affective concerns such as not to discourage learners and break the communication flow. Nevertheless, it has also been proved that recasts are not usually noticed by learners and do not lead to correction due to their communicative nature as learners might think it is just another way of saying the same thing (Lyster & Mori, 2006; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Lyster, 1998a; Mackey et al., 2000). Although prompts lead to more repair (Choi & Li, 2012; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Samar & Shayestefar, 2009; Esmaeili & Behnam, 2014; Alsolami & Elyas, 2016), they do not prove to be more effective due to the limited number of teacher use. Cognitive research attempts to find out one best CF strategy that works for all learners and all situations, while sociocultural theory claims each student needs fine-tuned assistance in their own ZPDs (Ellis, 2009), which has also been proved in the studies focusing on learner preferences and contextual differences (Lyster & Llinares, 2014; Sakurai, 2014; Lyster & Mori, 2006). Thus, further research needs to be carried out to clarify these findings.

Who Should Correct Learner Errors?

There are three different CF providers: teacher, peers or learners themselves. Although the research shows that the majority of learners prefer teacher correction (Kartchava,

2016; Oladejo, 1993; Russell & Spada, 2006; Schulz, 2001) as they consider merely teachers as a reliable source of knowledge, many researchers suggest the use of self-correction and peer correction due to various benefits (Ellis, 2009; Hendrickson, 1978; Mendez & Cruz, 2012; Sheen & Ellis, 2011; Corder, 1967; Yoshida, 2008; Nassaji, 2007).

The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback

The effectiveness of providing CF has been measured by the rate of uptake, immediate and delayed post-tests, and stimulated-recall interviews. Uptake has been defined by Lyster & Ranta (1997) as “a student’s utterance that immediately follows the teacher’s feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher’s intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student’s initial utterance” (p.49). Uptake might involve a simple ‘yes’ by a student as well as the repetition or the repair of the incorrect utterance. Stimulated-recall interviews have demonstrated that students might not be aware of the correct form of an utterance although they responded positively with a ‘yes’ or even repeated the correct form of the utterance after the teacher. Therefore, self-correction seems to be the best clue showing the effectiveness of CF (Sheen & Ellis, 2011; Corder 1967; Nassaji, 2007) due to the time and effort devoted to repair. Immediate and delayed post-tests are also a good sign to measure the effectiveness of CF as long as the nature of tasks does not cause suspicion whether the errors refer to a competence problem or a performance problem.

Teachers’ Beliefs

In contrast to the passive role of the teacher as information transmitter, teachers are currently viewed as “active, thinking decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex, practically-oriented, personalised, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts and beliefs” (Borg, 2003, p.81). Teacher beliefs in decision-making before and during teaching with this role of the teacher even becomes more important as the underlying beliefs are assumed to have an impact on practice (Kamiya, 2016; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Roothoof, 2014; Pang, 2017; Richardson, 1996).

Teachers’ beliefs have been investigated for a long time in the field of education. However, due to the assumption that teachers unconsciously hold some beliefs or they might hesitate to express some of their beliefs due to social reasons, and it is practically not possible to find them, actual beliefs might differ from the stated beliefs (Kamiya, 2016). In other words, it is only possible to examine teachers’ stated beliefs by research and compare them to their practices. Stated beliefs, therefore, have been defined by Basturkmen et al. (2004) as “statements teachers make about their ideas, thoughts, and knowledge that are expressed as evaluations of what should be done, should be the case and is preferable” (p.244). Teachers’ beliefs are important because they have a strong impact on behavior (Özmen & Aydın, 2015; Kamiya, 2016; Basturkmen et al., 2004; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Roothoof, 2014; Pang, 2017; Irie et al., 2018; Richardson, 1996) and what a pre-service teacher will gain from a teacher education program and how they will interpret it depend on the already formed beliefs (Kagan, 1992; Richardson, 1996; Borg, 2011).

Teachers’ Beliefs and Their Actual Classroom Practices

There are two differing views about the correlation between teachers’ stated beliefs and their actual classroom practices. While some researchers think that teachers’ beliefs and practices have a strong relationship (Kamiya, 2016; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Roothoof,

2014; Pang, 2017), the others believe that actual practice does not necessarily reflect teachers' beliefs (Borg, 2003; Basturkmen, 2012). What seems to be common in those two differing opinions is the teaching experience. As Rahimi & Zhang (2015) demonstrated, novice teachers count on their previous learning experiences since they do not have sufficient teaching experience, while experienced teachers' practices depend on their teaching experience. In other words, as teachers gain experience, their beliefs are more experientially informed than novice teachers (Basturkmen, 2012).

The majority of research studies inform that a mismatch is generally found between teachers' stated beliefs about OCF strategies and their actual classroom practices (Kamiya, 2016; Roothoof, 2014; Dilans, 2016; Basturkmen et al., 2004; Yoshida, 2008) although a small proportion of their stated beliefs are in line with their practices. Most of those studies have been conducted with in-service teachers. Kamiya (2016), Roothoof (2014), Dilans (2016), Basturkmen et al. (2004), Yoshida (2008) and Junqueira & Kim (2013) revealed that teachers' classroom practices did not match their beliefs as they used different CF types than they believed were useful and they addressed all the errors although they stated they would correct only the ones hindering meaning. While it is not easy to explain the mismatch between the stated beliefs and practices, since it depends on many factors (Borg, 2003), the reasons for the mismatch involve teachers' wish to improve their students' both linguistic competence and self-confidence (Mori, 2011), situational constraints (Basturkmen, 2012) and teachers' use of technical knowledge at the planning stage but practical knowledge in the classroom (Basturkmen et al., 2004). Kamiya (2016) suggests that the mismatch between teachers' stated beliefs and classroom practices should be considered as an opportunity rather than a shortcoming and teachers should be encouraged to be aware of the gap and reflect on it.

As pre-service teachers' practices are not observable except for practicum, there are not any studies focusing on the match or mismatch between pre-service teachers' stated beliefs and practices. Regarding pre-service teachers' beliefs, there are two types of studies. First group of studies investigate the change of pre-service teachers' beliefs over time and education (Demirbulak, 2012; Florez & Basto, 2017; Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000; Mattheaoudakis, 2007; Albaba, 2017). The second set of studies examine the change of practice through experience (Polio et al., 2006; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015, Junqueira & Kim, 2013).

Sources of Teachers' Beliefs

Three factors are known to shape teachers' beliefs: their previous learning experiences, pre-service teacher education programs and teaching experiences (Özmen & Aydın, 2015; Schulz, 2001; Borg, 2003; Richardson, 1996). Teachers' previous learning experiences involve the images of good and bad teachers (Kagan, 1992; Richardson, 1996; Nguyen, 2017) and significant moments in their school lives (Nguyen, 2017). Those experiences have a powerful impact on their beliefs as Kennedy (1997) points out,

"Teachers learn their practice through an extended apprenticeship of observation. Unlike practitioners in virtually other professions, teachers observe practitioners for 13 years before they even begin their formal preparation for their work. Many of their deepest beliefs about teaching and learning derive from this apprenticeship of observation" (p.9).

However, those experiences are usually incorrect as pre-service teachers lack information about the student profile since their students will have different learning styles, abilities, strengths, weaknesses and interests from their own (Kagan, 1992). Borg (2003) also highlights the importance of previous learning experiences as they determine what and to

what extent pre-service teachers are going to gain from their teacher education programs. Although they are not many in number, studies with pre-service and novice teachers show that their beliefs depend mainly on their previous learning experiences. For instance, Florez & Basto (2017) found that the pre-service teacher participants believed learner errors should always be corrected. The researchers thought this belief might come from previous learning experiences as in one of the journal entries it was written that the participant herself had mispronounced a word for a few years because she had not been corrected by her teacher. Similarly, Rahimi & Zhang (2015) revealed that both novice and experienced teachers considered CF as part of their responsibility; however, the reasons they provided for this belief differed. Novice teachers referred to their previous learning experiences and previous teachers while experienced teachers mentioned their previous teaching experiences. The researchers explained that as teachers gained experience, they found the provision of CF more important. Similar results were found in Basturkmen (2012), Polio et al. (2006) and Junqueira & Kim (2013) that experienced teachers focused more on student learning, learner interaction and output. Unfortunately, it seems that pre-service teacher education has the least impact on teachers' beliefs (Richardson, 1996; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015) and reading articles alone has not been observed to lead to a change in teachers' beliefs (Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Kagan, 1992; Vasquez & Harvey, 2010) although Mattheoudakis (2007) demonstrated that the pre-service teachers' beliefs changed completely during the pre-service education program.

Methodology

A mixed-method research design where quantitative and qualitative data were collected was used to investigate the pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs, stated behaviours, the sources of their beliefs and the match between their beliefs and stated behaviours.

Setting and Participants

44 pre-service EFL teachers studying at a well-known state university in Turkey volunteered to participate in the study. 16 of them were male and 28 of them were female.

Table 1. Demographic Information about the Participants

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Male	16	36,4
Female	28	63,6
<u>Teaching Experience</u>		
Yes	9	20,5
No	35	79,5
<u>OCF Background</u>		
Yes	17	38,6
No	20	45,5
Left Blank	7	15,9
Total	44	100

9 of the participants stated to have some kind of teaching experience varying between three months and one year while the rest declared to have no previous teaching experience at all. 17 participants stated they had some background knowledge about OCF

strategies due to the courses they were taking whereas 20 participants claimed to have no background about OCF strategies. 7 participants did not mention any information about it.

Data Collection Instruments

A survey and an interview were used to gather data about pre-service teachers' stated beliefs and behaviours about OCF Strategies.

A Situations for Oral Error Correction (SOEC) Simulation was adapted from Özmen & Aydın (2015) and used to find the stated behaviours of the participants. This tool consists of 20 different classroom situations a teacher might encounter in real context. Each classroom situation involves a part of the teaching (such as warm-up or practice) including one erroneous utterance of students. The participants are asked to read each situation, identify the type of error (grammar, vocabulary or pronunciation), and write down why and how they would correct it. With regards to the validity, three expert opinions were received on the type of errors, whether the classroom situations sounded natural and whether the errors were the typical ones Turkish L2 students would make. The original instrument consisted of 8 items with grammatical errors, 6 items with lexical errors and 6 items with pronunciation errors. The numbers remain the same; however, after the expert opinions, seven items were edited or rewritten due to the ambiguity and as the wording was leading. Moreover, the age of the participants was omitted in the demography section while teaching experience background and background on OCF strategies were added.

A semi structured interview was used to investigate the participants' stated beliefs about OCF strategies. Eight of the participants volunteered to take part in the interview. Interview questions were adapted from two different sources: Özmen & Aydın (2015) and Roothoof (2014). In total 19 questions were prepared, one of which was written by the researchers of this study. The wording in some questions was edited as they were either ambiguous or leading. Also, one more question to find where their beliefs came from was added and discussed with the interviewees. All the questions were translated into Turkish and the interviews were conducted in Turkish for the participants to be able to express their opinions freely.

Data Collection Procedure and Analysis

The SOEC simulation was administered to all of the participants. After the aim of the study was explained and the importance of the participants' contribution to the research was pointed out, the instructions for the simulation were clarified. The time allotted for the completion of the simulation was 30 minutes. However, it took for some participants up to 45 minutes to complete the survey. In the following two weeks after the simulation, semi-structured interviews were conducted individually with eight volunteers. Each interview lasted 18 to 25 minutes. The interviews were recorded and transcribed for further analysis. While the quantitative data, which were only descriptive in that study, were analysed through SPSS 17, the analysis of qualitative data was conducted through content analysis. In the current study the taxonomy of Lyster & Ranta (1997) was taken as a basis for OCF types. However, during the analysis of the data other types previously put forward by different researchers were also observed and thus coded. Those are Paralinguistic Feedback (Ellis, 2009), Re-ask (Yoshida, 2008) and Recast with Emphasis (Asari, 2012). An additional category of OCF, providing students with two different

options, one of which is the correct utterance, was used by a considerable number of participants, so it was also included in the study and called as “Providing Options”. It is used this way since it has not been mentioned in any of the studies, to the researchers’ knowledge. As for the timing of OCF the terminology “online” and “offline” were used since some open-ended answers in the survey did not refer to a specific time whether it was immediately after the student error or after the student’s sentence finished; thus, online OCF was used both for immediate OCF right after the student’s error and after student’s sentence whereas offline OCF referred to the one provided after the activity or at the end of the lesson. In the data analysis all the responses as well as nonresponses were counted to show the big picture; therefore, in the results there are three different codes for the cases where no responses were provided. No Correction refers to the participants’ preference of not correcting that particular error. Missing Data means the participants did not provide a response to a particular subcategory like OCF type but, for instance, provided who should correct the error and when. Finally, Left Blank refers to a completely blank space left unwritten by the participants.

In order to find the sources of beliefs, the interviewees were explicitly asked why they thought what they had written in the survey and how they answered the questions addressed to them. The conclusions were made by the analysis of both their explicit answers to those two questions and inferences from the answers given to all the other questions. Some examples to the latter is as follows:

“When I was at high school, ...” (Participant 5)

“I, also, did not want to be corrected when I was a student.” (Participant 6)

Results

Pre-Service Teachers’ Beliefs about OCF Strategies

The first research question aimed to investigate the teachers’ stated beliefs about OCF strategies. The results revealed that all the interviewees believed L2 teachers should provide OCF in the classroom as it contributes to students’ language acquisition by developing their accuracy in the target language, providing exposure, habit formation and increasing students’ self-confidence. Although all the participants believed OCF was important in language acquisition, they preferred to provide selective OCF by addressing the most obvious errors rather than correct every single error. They stated that mistakes and unimportant errors could be ignored not to discourage the students from communicating. As for the type of errors to be corrected, six of the interviewees considered the errors hindering meaning as the most immediate and significant ones to correct and that was followed by grammar errors. One of the interviewees stated that common errors that most students made should primarily be corrected while another participant revealed that all errors were equally important as language was learnt as a whole system. The interviews also demonstrated that task type, whether it was accuracy-oriented or fluency-oriented, was important for all the interviewees as they preferred to use less correction in fluency-oriented tasks since they focused on the message and they preferred to provide OCF at the end of the lesson whereas they provided more OCF, yet still selective, in accuracy-oriented tasks and they provided it right after the student’s speech.

When it came to the learner variables, the interviewees thought the age of learners was an important factor in the provision of OCF and the way they would provide it would be different with young learners from adults due to three aspects: the cognitive development,

affective concerns and linguistic competence. They stated that they would provide adults with more explicit feedback as they were cognitively in formal operational stage. The opinions regarding the affective concerns differed since some preferred to provide more implicit feedback to young learners as they thought children would be offended more with the provision of OCF while the others believed that this was the case for adults. Similarly, the participants believed that students' proficiency level was another important factor in OCF provision. The interviewees expressed that they would tolerate more errors in the beginning levels as students just started learning a language and were expected to make many errors, yet students with upper proficiency levels would make fewer errors and could be given more detailed feedback. Fossilization was a concern for student-teachers in lower levels. They feared that student errors could be fossilized if they were not corrected in the beginning. Besides, all the participants believed that individual differences such as learners' personality, awareness, different backgrounds and linguistic competence would affect how they would provide OCF. They mainly stated that they would not correct the shy students as frequently as the others and would provide OCF on one-on-one basis. They would also change their intonation and the explicitness-implicitness degree of the OCF they would provide.

As for the ways to provide OCF, all the participants preferred to provide implicit types of OCF such as recast, elicitation and re-ask which would encourage students to correct their own errors. However, they highlighted that students would not always notice their own errors if teachers did not provide some kind of signal such as intonation or emphasis. The majority of the participants (seven out of eight) believed that self-correction was the most useful technique followed by teacher correction. Half of the participants favoured peer-correction following self-correction; however, all of them stated to find it a little risky to use in the classroom due to affective concerns and the differences in the students' linguistic competences. None of the participants preferred to correct learner errors right after the error was made as they thought this would be demotivating for students and might discourage them from speaking. The majority preferred providing OCF after student speech; however, if it was a fluency-oriented task or group work, they preferred to provide it at the end of the activity or lesson not to negatively impact the communication flow. All the participants expressed that they would monitor their students to understand if the OCF provided was effective or not. Moreover, the majority of the interviewees thought that students would have negative feelings such as embarrassment after receiving OCF and particularly shy and fragile students would not wish to be corrected. Although there were differing opinions about how the participants felt about the provision of OCF, as half of them found it easy and the other half difficult, all the participants thought providing OCF was far more difficult than written CF as written feedback was concrete and visual as well as easier to notice and elaborate on.

Pre-Service Teachers' Behaviours on OCF Strategies

The second research question was about pre-service teachers' stated behaviours on OCF strategies. The results are provided below.

Table 2. Amount of OCF Based on Task Types

	<u>Accuracy</u> (6 Situations)		<u>Fluency</u> (14 Situations)	
	n	%	n	%
Recast	40	15,6	128	21,2
Recast w/ Emphasis	14	5,4	53	8,8
Explicit Correction	49	19,1	161	26,7

Metalinguistic Feedback	18	7	17	2,8
Elicitation	3	1,2	6	1
Repetition	6	2,3	9	1,5
Clarification Request	0	0	4	0,7
Paralinguistic Feedback	5	1,9	2	0,3
Re-ask	18	7	35	5,8
Providing Options	4	1,6	8	1,3
No Correction	36	14	75	12,4
Missing Data	33	12,8	64	10,6
Left Blank	31	12,1	41	6,8
Total	257	100	603	100

Table 2 shows that 6 classroom situations were accuracy-oriented while 14 situations were fluency-oriented. The most preferred OCF strategies in accuracy-based situations were Explicit Correction ranking the first with 19.1% followed by Recast (15.6%) and No Correction (14%). In fluency-oriented situations, similarly, Explicit Correction was the most frequently used OCF strategy (26.7%) followed by Recast (21.2%) and No Correction (12.4%). None of the participants used Clarification Request in accuracy-oriented situations. As demonstrated in Table 3, Recasts, Explicit Correction and Recasts with Emphasis were used most frequently in handling grammatical errors (consecutively 19.2%, 13.1% and 12.2%). Explicit Correction, Recasts and No Correction were preferred to address vocabulary-related errors (38%, 12% and 10.9% consecutively). As for the pronunciation errors, Recasts, Explicit Correction and No Correction were provided (27.5%, 26% and 17.8% consecutively).

Table 3. Amount of OCF Based on Language Components

	<u>Grammar</u> (8 Situations)		<u>Vocabulary</u> (6 Situations)		<u>Pronunciation</u> (6 Situations)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Recast	66	19,2	31	12	71	27,5
Recast w/ Emphasis	42	12,2	12	4,7	13	5
Explicit Correction	45	13,1	98	38	67	26
Metalinguistic Feedback	24	7	5	1,9	6	2,3
Elicitation	9	2,6	0	0	0	0
Repetition	11	3,2	4	1,6	0	0
Clarification Request	0	0	3	1,2	1	0,4
Paralinguistic Feedback	1	0,3	6	2,3	0	0
Re-ask	29	8,4	16	6,2	8	3,1
Providing Options	3	0,9	8	3,1	1	0,4
No Correction	37	10,8	28	10,9	46	17,8
Missing Data	46	13,4	28	10,9	23	8,9
Left Blank	31	9	19	7,4	22	8,5
Total	344	100	258	100	258	100

Tables 4 and 5 present the timing of OCF provided according to task types and language components.

Table 4. Timing of OCF Based on Task Types

	<u>Accuracy</u> (6 Situations)		<u>Fluency</u> (14 Situations)	
	n	%	n	%
Online	162	62,8	410	68,1
Offline	34	13,2	82	13,6
No Correction	19	7,4	54	9

Missing Data	11	4,3	14	2,3
Left Blank	32	12,4	42	7
Total	258	100	602	100

Table 5. Timing of OCF Based on Language Components

	<u>Grammar</u>		<u>Vocabulary</u>		<u>Pronunciation</u>	
	(8 Situations)		(6 Situations)		(6 Situations)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Online	255	74,1	172	66,7	145	56,2
Offline	23	6,7	39	15,1	54	20,9
No Correction	24	7	22	8,5	27	10,5
Missing Data	9	2,6	5	1,9	11	4,3
Left Blank	33	9,6	20	7,8	21	8,1
Total	344	100	258	100	258	100

As shown in both Table 4 and Table 5, Online OCF was used considerably more than Offline OCF. That finding is followed by No Correction in all cases except for grammatical errors which were not preferred to be corrected, which is a more preferred strategy than providing offline OCF. Finally, in Tables 6 and 7 the agents providing OCF according to the task types and language components are shown.

Table 6. Agents of OCF Based on Task Types

	<u>Accuracy</u>		<u>Fluency</u>	
	(6 Situations)		(14 Situations)	
	n	%	n	%
Teacher	161	62,4	417	69,3
Peer	10	3,9	33	5,5
Self	25	9,7	41	6,6
All Agents	6	2,3	8	1,3
No Correction	17	6,6	50	8,3
Missing Data	7	2,7	13	2,2
Left Blank	32	12,4	40	6,6
Total	258	100	602	100

As evident in both Table 6 and Table 7, teacher correction was the most frequently used OCF type by the participants followed by self-correction in all the cases but one which includes pronunciation errors. Peer-correction was a more preferred strategy than self-correction in handling pronunciation errors.

Table 7. Agents of OCF Based on Language Components

	<u>Grammar</u>		<u>Vocabulary</u>		<u>Pronunciation</u>	
	(8 Situations)		(6 Situations)		(6 Situations)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Teacher	216	62,8	173	67,1	189	73,3
Peer	24	7	10	3,9	9	3,5
Self	34	9,9	25	9,7	7	2,7
All Agents	7	2	4	1,6	3	1,2
No Correction	23	6,7	20	7,8	24	9,3
Missing Data	9	2,6	6	2,3	5	1,9
Left Blank	31	9	20	7,8	21	8,1
Total	344	100	258	100	258	100

Pre-Service Teachers' Beliefs and Behaviours on OCF Strategies

The third research question investigated to what extent the participants' stated beliefs and behaviours matched. The survey and interview results revealed that although some beliefs and behaviours were found to match, the majority was observed to mismatch.

The current research shows that the positive attitude towards selective correction is reflected in pre-service teachers' behaviours as they did not correct every single error, which can be examined in the Tables from 2 to 7 (please check the percentages of No Correction). In addition to that, the majority of the participants (74.1%) provided online OCF after grammatical errors as they stated. However, in contrast to the stated beliefs, the majority of the participants used Explicit Correction to correct vocabulary errors although they thought it was the last option to prefer in the interviews just as Participant 8 stated, "Under no circumstances do I correct students' errors explicitly" (Interview 8). Moreover, another mismatch found between stated beliefs and behaviours was that the majority (68.1%) provided online OCF in fluency-oriented activities even though they stated they preferred offline OCF in order not to break the communication flow. Furthermore, the research revealed that the participants used teacher-correction most frequently in both accuracy- and fluency-oriented activities and addressing all language components whereas they stated that they would prefer to correct only on the cases where the students could not self-correct their errors.

Sources of Pre-Service EFL Teachers' Beliefs on OCF Strategies

The last research question aimed to find out the sources of pre-service teachers' stated beliefs. As shown in Table 8, the courses they were taking in their undergraduate program were effective in all the participants' stated beliefs. This was followed by their previous learning experiences, model teachers and their own teaching experiences. Although two of the participants mentioned both their previous learning experiences and model teachers as the sources of their beliefs, Participant 7 did not mention her previous learning experiences but only her model teachers. Two participants (Participant 1 and Participant 4) stated that their personal interests, which were psychology and research on CF, influenced their answers. Participant 7 expressed that her mum was also a teacher and she learnt from her a lot; therefore, this was counted as a source of belief as well. Participant 8 considered language as a communication tool, so that belief influenced most of her answers. Finally, Participant 3 conveyed that she learned a lot from her classmates who were of different opinions from her own and that was also counted as a source of belief.

Table 8. Sources of Pre-Service Teachers' Beliefs

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Undergraduate Courses	8	100
Previous Learning Experiences	4	50
Model Teachers	3	37,5
Teaching Experiences	3	37,5
Personal Interests	2	25
Family Members	1	12,5
Beliefs About L2	1	12,5
Classmates	1	12,5
Total	8	100

Discussion

The results of the current study revealed that the pre-service EFL teachers had a positive attitude towards the use of OCF strategies, which is in congruence with learner expectations as many studies have shown (Simard & Jean, 2011; Oladejo, 1993; Schulz, 2001; Agudo, 2013; Genç, 2014; Kartchava, 2016; Lee, 2016; Roothoof & Breeze, 2016; Azad, 2016; Ananda et al., 2017). It was also found that they preferred selective correction rather than correcting every single error, which contributes to Özmen & Aydın (2015) and Mattheoudakis (2007) although it contradicts to the findings of Florez & Basto (2017) who demonstrated the participants preferred to correct all of the errors. The current research showed that the participants were well aware of the differences between mistakes and errors (Corder, 1967; Özmen & Aydın, 2015). Moreover, the participants made a distinction between accuracy- and fluency-oriented activities and preferred to use different strategies for both task types (Harmer, 1983; Basturkmen et al., 2002). As the findings further demonstrated, the participants preferred to handle serious and important errors primarily, by which some of them meant global errors (Burt, 1975) and some referred to the ones students persistently made (Ellis, 2010).

As for the timing of OCF, the participants preferred to provide online OCF in accuracy-oriented activities and offline OCF in fluency-oriented activities. This contributes to what Özmen & Aydın (2015) recently found. In addition, the survey results showed that the participants used mostly online OCF just as previous research demonstrated that students find it more effective (Ölmezer-Öztürk & Öztürk, 2016; Genç, 2014).

Regarding the provision of OCF types the current study proved that Recast was used mostly by the participants in both accuracy- and fluency-oriented activities just as the previous research shows (Russell, 2009; Ge, 2017; Brown, 2016; Dilans, 2016; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Yoshida, 2008; Özmen & Aydın, 2015). Besides, the participants preferred Recast both for grammatical and pronunciation errors whereas they used Explicit Correction to deal with vocabulary errors, which differs from Özmen & Aydın (2015) who revealed the pre-service teachers used Explicit Correction for pronunciation errors and preferred not to correct vocabulary errors.

The survey results evidenced that the pre-service teachers preferred teacher correction more than self-correction and peer-correction. This is what learners in general prefer as has been proved by many research studies (Kartchava, 2016; Oladejo, 1993; Russell & Spada, 2006; Schulz, 2001). Nevertheless, this finding contradicts to what many researchers suggest who believe self-correction and peer-correction are more effective for learning (Ellis, 2009; Hendrickson, 1978; Mendez & Cruz, 2012; Sheen & Ellis, 2011; Corder, 1967; Yoshida, 2008; Nassaji, 2007).

Further analysis through the interview demonstrated that the participants took individual differences such as the age and proficiency level of the learners into consideration in the decision of providing OCF. They provided lower levels with less OCF whereas upper levels received more detailed feedback due to the affective concerns. Also, they preferred more implicit types for the beginning levels while they provided more explicit types for upper levels. These findings contribute to Özmen & Aydın (2015); however, the frequency of OCF in different levels is just the opposite in the current study. The results also show that pre-service teachers consider student uptake as a sign for the effectiveness of the OCF provided (Kamiya, 2016; Lyster & Mori, 2006) and they find written CF less difficult than OCF as it is visual, more concrete and easier to elaborate on the errors (Sheen, 2010).

Conclusion

This study contributes to the literature by displaying the mismatch between the pre-service teachers' stated beliefs and stated behaviours as has been evidenced with in-service teachers before (Kamiya, 2016; Roothoof, 2014; Dilans, 2016; Basturkmen et al., 2004; Yoshida, 2008; Junqueira & Kim, 2013). This is an important finding as, to the researchers' knowledge, there is no research study examining the relationship between the pre-service teachers' stated beliefs and stated behaviours, which reveals that pre-service teachers do not have a complete understanding of what they know and believe about OCF strategies due to either lack of knowledge or teaching experience since they contradicted with their own beliefs many times.

Furthermore, the current research revealed that the participants' beliefs about OCF strategies derived from many different sources such as previous learning experiences, model teachers, teaching experiences (Kagan, 1992; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Vasquez & Harvey, 2010; Schulz, 2001; Nguyen, 2017; Borg, 1999, 2003; Florez & Basto, 2017; Richardson, 1996; Mattheoudakis, 2017) although they all considered their courses in the pre-service teacher education program useful, which Rahimi & Zhang (2015) and Richardson (1996) claimed to be the least effective; however, the point that most participants in the current study do not have any teaching experience should be taken into account while making inferences out of this finding.

The current study was conducted to investigate 44 junior pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs and behaviours on OCF strategies. The study presented detailed findings regarding the pre-service EFL teachers' OCF preferences and behaviours. The research also depicted mismatches between pre-service teachers' stated beliefs and behaviours in terms of OCF types, agents of OCF as well as timing and it was found that the pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs on OCF strategies came from various sources as previous studies have also shown. While this study adds on the findings in Özmen & Aydın (2015) making them more generalizable for Turkish context, it also contributes to the literature by presenting the mismatches between stated beliefs and behaviours on pre-service teacher basis. Besides, the findings that one participant was influenced by her mum, whose profession is also teaching, and that one participant argued about her classmates' opinions differing from hers were new, which have not been discussed in the literature before.

This study is descriptive in its nature attempting to gain insights into pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs on OCF strategies. However, like all other studies, it comes with its limitations. First, it is a cross-sectional study and just sheds light on one developmental stage of the participant pre-service teachers. Second, the particular pre-service teachers' beliefs studying their third year at the faculty are examined; therefore, the findings cannot be generalized for all pre-service EFL teachers in that particular institution or other institutions in Turkey except for the existing results of a similar recent Turkish study (Özmen & Aydın, 2015). The final limitation of the study is that individual differences of the participants have not been taken into account.

The findings of the research suggest that pre-service teacher education programs need to put more emphasis on the OCF strategies through implementing different techniques because many of the pre-service teachers investigated in the study were not aware about the effective use of OCF strategies.

References

- Agudo, J. D. (2013). An investigation into how EFL learners emotionally respond to teachers' oral corrective feedback. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 15(2), 265-278.
- Albaba, M. B. (2017). Teacher Learning during Transition from Pre-Service to Novice EFL Teacher: A Longitudinal Case Study. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 11(2), 142-154.
- Al-Faki, I. M., & Siddiek, A. G. (2013). Techniques Used by Teachers in Correcting Students' Oral Errors in an Omani Boys School. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(10), 1770-1783. doi:10.4304/tpls.3.10.1770-1783
- Alsolami, H. M. & Elyas, T. (2016). Investigating Teachers' Corrective Feedback and Learners' Uptake in the EFL Classrooms. *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, 3(1), 115-132.
- Ananda, D. R., Febriyanti, E. R., Yamin, M., & Mu'In, F. (2017). Students' Preferences toward Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class at English Department of Lambung Mangkurat University Academic Year 2015/2016. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(3), 176-186. doi:10.17507/tpls.0703.03
- Asari, Y. (2012). Types of recasts and learners' uptake. *Dialogue*, 10, 1-20.
- Atai, M. R., & Shafiee, Z. (2017). Pedagogical knowledge base underlying EFL teachers' provision of oral corrective feedback in grammar instruction. *Teacher Development*, 21(4), 580-596. doi: 10.1080/13664530.2016.1277257
- Azad, A. K. (2016). Bangladeshi EFL Learners' Perceptions and Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback. *ASA University Review*, 10(2), 75-84.
- Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *System*, 40(2), 282-295.
- Başturkmen, H., Loewen, S. & Ellis, R. (2002). Metalanguage in focus on form in the communicative classroom. *Language Awareness*, 11(1), 1-13. doi:10.1080/09658410208667042
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers Stated Beliefs about Incidental Focus on Form and their Classroom Practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 243-272. doi:10.1093/applin/25.2.243
- Borg, S. (1999). Studying teacher cognition in second language grammar teaching. *System*, 27(1), 19-31. doi:10.1016/s0346-251x(98)00047-5
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36 (2). pp. 81-109. ISSN 1475-3049. doi: 10.1017/S0261444803001903
- Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, 39(3), 370-380. doi:10.1016/j.system.2011.07.009
- Brandt, C. (2008). Integrating feedback and reflection in teacher preparation. *ELT Journal*, 62(1), 37-46. doi:10.1093/elt/ccm076
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 436-458. Doi: 10.1177/1362168814563200
- Burt, M. (1975). Error analysis in the adult EFL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 53-63.
- Cabaroğlu, N., & Roberts, J. (2000). Development in student teachers' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-year PGCE programme. *System*, 28, 387-402. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346251X\(00\)00019-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346251X(00)00019-1)

- Chenoweth, N. A., Day, R. R., Chun, A. E., & Luppescu, S. (1983). Attitudes and preferences of ESL students to error correction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6(1), 79-87.
- Choi, S. & Li, S. (2012). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in a Child ESOL Classroom. *RELC Journal*, 43(3), 331-351. doi:10.1177/0033688212463274
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 161-169.
- Davies, M. J. (2011). Increasing students' L2 usage: An analysis of teacher talk time and student talk time. Birmingham, UK: University of Birmingham.
- Demirbulak, D. (2012). Fostering propensities for reflective practice at undergraduate methodology and practicum courses. *Euroasian Journal of Educational Research*, 48, 39-58.
- Dilāns, G. (2016). Corrective feedback in L2 Latvian classrooms: Teacher perceptions versus the observed actualities of practice. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 479-497. doi:10.1177/1362168815584454
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, 1, 3-18.
- Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 335-349.
- Esmaeili, F. & Behnam, B. (2014). A study of corrective feedback and learner's uptake in classroom interactions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(4), 204-212. doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.4p.204
- Fanselow, J. (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. *Foreign Language Annals*, 10, 583- 593. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1977.tb03035.x>
- Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 1-10.
- Flórez, S. A., & Basto, E. A. (2017). Identifying pre-service teachers' beliefs about teaching EFL and their potential changes. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 19(2), 167-184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15446/profile.v19n2.59675>.
- Ge, X. (2017). Restudying Oral Corrective Feedbacks in EFL Classes of Jinan University— A Statistical Analysis of Discrepancies via SAS Software. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(6), 473-482. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0706.10>
- Genç, Z. S. (2014). Correcting spoken errors in English language teaching: Preferences of Turkish EFL learners at different proficiency levels. *Education & Science*, 39(174), 259-271. doi:10.15390/EB.2014.1438
- Harmer, J. (1983). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching: Recent Theory, Research, and Practice*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 62(8), 387-398. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1978.tb02409.x
- Irie, K., Ryan, S., & Mercer, S. (2018). Using Q Methodology to Investigate Pre-Service EFL Teachers' Mindsets about Teaching Competences. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(3), 575-598.
- Junqueira, L., & Kim, Y. (2013). Exploring the relationship between training, beliefs, and teachers' corrective feedback practices: A case study of a novice and an experienced ESL teacher. *Canadian modern language review*, 69(2), 181-206.
- Junqueira, L., & Payant, C. (2015). "I just want to do it right, but it's so hard": A novice teacher's written feedback beliefs and practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 19-36.
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional Growth among Pre-service and Beginning Teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(2), 129-169.

- Kamiya, N. (2016). The relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(3), 206-219. doi: 10.1080/17501229.2014.939656
- Kamiya, N. (2018). An Analysis of the Meaning of "Natural" Concerning Oral Corrective Feedback. *TESL-EJ*, 22(1), 1-12.
- Kartchava, E. (2016). Learners' beliefs about corrective feedback in the language classroom: Perspectives from two international contexts. *TESL Canada Journal*, 33(2), 19-45. doi:10.18806/tesl.v33i2.1235
- Katayama, A. (2007). Students' perceptions of oral error correction. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 41(1), 61-92.
- Kennedy, M. (1997). The connection between research and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 26, 4-12.
- Kırkgöz, Y. & Ağcam, R. (2015). Teachers' perceptions on corrective feedback in Turkish primary schools. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 574-581. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.096
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.
- Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J. M., (2005). Error correction: Students' versus teachers' perceptions. *Language Awareness*, 14(2-3), 112-127, DOI: 10.1080/09658410508668828
- Lee, E. J. (2016). Advanced ESL Students' Prior EFL Education and Their Perceptions of Oral Corrective Feedback. *Journal of International Students*, 6(3), 798-816.
- Li, S. (2010). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309-365. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x
- Li, L. (2013). The complexity of language teachers' beliefs and practice: one EFL teacher's theories. *The Language Learning Journal*, 41(2), 175-191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2013.790132>
- Llinares, A. & Lyster, R. (2014). The influence of context on patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake: A comparison of CLIL and immersion classrooms. *The Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 181-194. doi:10.1080/09571736.2014.889509
- Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies In Second Language Acquisition*, 20(1), 51-81. doi:10.1017/S027226319800103X
- Lyster, R. (1998a). Form in immersion classroom discourse: In or out of focus?. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée*, 1(1-2), 53-82.
- Lyster, R. (1998b). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language learning*, 48(2), 183-218.
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional Feedback and Instructional Counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(02), 269-300. doi:10.017/s0272263106060128
- Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(01), 37-66. doi:10.1017/s0272263197001034
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language teaching*, 46(1), 1-40. Doi: 10.1017/S0261444812000365
- Mackey, A., Gass, S. & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback?. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22(4), 471-497. doi:10.1017/S0272263100004022
- Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language

- development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings?. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 338-356.
- Mattheoudakis, M. (2007). Tracking changes in pre-service EFL teacher beliefs in Greece: A longitudinal study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(8), 1272-1288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.06.001>
- Mendez, E. H., & Cruz, M. R. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *PROFILE*, 14(2), 63-75.
- Mori, R. (2011). Teacher cognition in corrective feedback in Japan. *System*, 39(4), 451-467.
- Nassaji, H. (2007). Elicitation and reformulation and their relationship with learner repair in dyadic interaction. *Language learning*, 57(4), 511-548.
- Nguyen, C. D. (2017). Connections between learning and teaching: EFL teachers' reflective practice. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 12(3), 237-255. doi: 10.1080/1554480X.2017.1356725
- Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error correction in ESL: Learners' preferences. *TESL Canada Journal*, 10(2), 71. doi:10.18806/tesl.v10i2.619
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, E. & Öztürk G. (2016). Types and timing of oral corrective feedback in EFL classrooms: Voices from Students. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 10(2), 113-133.
- Özmen, K. S. & Aydin, H. Ü. (2015). Examining student teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: Insights from a teacher education program in Turkey. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(12), 141-164.
- Pang, A. (2017). Reflective teaching and practice: Interview with Thomas Farrell. *RELC Journal*, 48(2), 174-179.
- Panova, I. & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573-595. doi:10.2307/3588241
- Polio, C., Gass, S., & Chapin, L. (2006). Using stimulated recall to investigate native speaker perceptions in native-non-native speaker interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 237-267
- Rahimi, M. & Zhang, L. J. (2015). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers cognitions about corrective feedback in teaching English oral communication. *System*, 55, 111-122. doi:10.1016/j.system.2015.09.006
- Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. *Handbook of research on teacher education*, 2, 102-119.
- Roothoof, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System*, 46, 65-79.
- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, 25(4), 318-335. DOI: 10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580
- Russell, V. (2009). Corrective feedback, over a decade of research since Lyster and Ranta (1997): Where do we stand today?. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 6(1), 21-31.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research. In Norris, J. & Ortega, L. (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133-164). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sakurai, S. (2014). Corrective Feedback and Student Uptakes in English Immersion Classrooms in Japan: Is the Counter-Balance Hypothesis Valid?. *TESL-EJ*, 18(1).
- Samar, R. G. & Shayestefar, P. (2009). Corrective Feedback in EFL Classrooms: Learner Negotiation Strategies and Uptake. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(212), 107-134.

- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85 (2), 244-258. doi:10.1111/0026-7902.00107
- Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 203-234.
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 593-610). New York: Routledge.
- Simard, D., & Jean, G. (2011). An Exploration of L2 Teachers' Use of Pedagogical Interventions Devised to Draw L2 Learners' Attention to Form. *Language Learning*, 61(3), 759-785. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00656.x
- Szesztay, M. (2004). Teachers' ways of knowing. *ELT Journal*, 58(2), 129-136.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Vann, R., Meyer, D., & Lorenz, F. (1984). Error gravity: A study of faculty opinion of ESL errors. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 427-440.
- Vasquez, C., & Harvey, J. (2010). Raising teachers' awareness about corrective feedback through research replication. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 421-443. doi: 10.1177/1362168810375365
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Perceptions of learners' private speech by teachers and the learners in Japanese language classrooms. *Innovation in Language Learning & Teaching*, 2(3), 268-288. doi:10.1080/17501220802209934