Australian Journal of Teacher Education

Volume 40 | Issue 12 Article 10

2015

Examining Student Teachers' Beliefs about Oral Corrective Feedback: Insights from a Teacher Education Program in Turkey

Kemal Sinan Ozmen
Gazi University Ankara, sinanozmen@hotmail.com

Hale Ülkü Aydın
Türk Hava Kurumu Üniversitesi, haleaydin.elt@hotmail.com

Recommended Citation
Ozmen, K. S., & Aydın, 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).
http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2015v40n12.10

Examining Student Teachers' Beliefs about Oral Corrective Feedback: Insights from a Teacher Education Program in Turkey

Kemal Sinan Özmen
Gazi University, Turkey
Hale Ülkü Aydın
University of Turkish Aeronautical Association, Turkey

Abstract: *Teachers' beliefs about language learning and teaching are largely shaped during pre-service teacher education. Although many empirical studies have analyzed various dimensions of how student teachers' beliefs and practices are formed, the literature is scarce with the research on student teacher's beliefs about oral corrective feedback. For the field of English language teaching, student teachers' beliefs about correcting erroneous utterances count for their future instructional choices. Thus, as an uncharted territory of inquiry, this issue merits a scholarly attention. To this end, the present study investigated the stated beliefs and behaviors of 98 nonnative student teachers via various qualitative tools; an interview and a simulation offering 20 classroom situations. The results showed that although most student teachers held a constructivist belief in defining teaching, their oral corrective feedback strategies varied in terms of correcting errors that relate to language proficiency, language components and task type.*

Introduction

Error, as a linguistic and a pedagogic construct within applied linguistics, has been involved in all of the developmental periods of foreign language teaching and teacher education, defined and refined multiple times. Throughout this long process, learners' errors have been there in English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms, and the teachers have kept correcting errors in various ways although the pedagogic value of error correction is still under discussion (see Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013). This transformation period witnessed how the field evolved in the 1970s up to the present with interlanguage theory (Selinker, 1972), cognitive (Krashen, 1981) and social (Long, 1991) accounts of second language acquisition (SLA) on error correction and its influence on second language teacher education (SLTE).

Since Hendrickson's (1978) fundamental Wh- questions about error correction, SLTE has paid considerable attention to views and ways of oral corrective feedback (OCF) (e.g. Richards, 2008; Sheen, 2004) and to equipping student teachers (STs) with the competencies of corrective feedback (e.g. Scrivener, 1994; Tanner & Green, 1998) during their pre-service teacher education. However, providing STs with input in various forms, whether declarative, procedural or a mixture of both in different weights (Schön, 1987; Wallace, 1991), does not necessarily secure the teacher's expected classroom behavior (Richardson, 2003). The fact is that an effective pre-service education may not always result in effective realizations of the academic competencies, such as the strategies of OCF performed in an EFL classroom. Instead, specific

social, cognitive and affective mechanisms are known to shape how STs conceptualize language, learning and teaching as well as how STs build up their instructional pedagogies. Those mechanisms of teacher cognition are called 'teacher beliefs' (Borg, 2003, 2006).

We might reasonably assume that how teachers teach a foreign language also depends on where, whom and why they teach it. In this respect, despite being strong indicators of teacher's instructional choices, teacher's beliefs about language learning and teaching, whether academically grounded or not, cannot account for all of the methodology teachers put into practice. However, for STs who presumably have little or no teaching experience, an investigation of a specific aspect of instructional choices, beliefs about OCF within the present study, might show the influence of their current pre-service teacher education (Cabaroğlu & Roberts, 2000; Flores, 2002; Mattheouidakis, 2007) as well as their previous educational experiences as a learner (Kagan, 1992; Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 2003; Xing, 2009).

The case for nonnative EFL teachers and learners is way troublesome, as there are so limited opportunities to experience and be exposed to the actual use of the target language. Within those contexts, learning a foreign language is mostly dependent upon the language course, materials and the teacher, who is mostly the only proficient speaker of the target language around. Because of the limited opportunities to *notice and hypothesize* about the target language in real interactional situations, it is largely the teacher and the peers who can offer mediation, chance for interaction and corrective feedback for the learners. OCF, from this point of view, is highly valuable for the learners who learn English beyond the English-speaking circles, and how STs learn and perform it is of great importance.

The present study investigates nonnative STs' stated beliefs and instructional behaviors about OCF, as quite an uncharted territory, in a monolingual context where English is used purely as a foreign language. In addition to assessing the impact of the academic program and the effect of STs' previous learning experiences, it is important to shed light on how STs conceptualize and respond to classroom situations where OCF might be necessary or not. First, an investigation of STs' beliefs about OCF may show what exactly they know, or don't know, about giving oral feedback. Second, such an investigation may reveal whether there are differences and incongruities between what STs know about OCF, believe to be true and do in practice. Third, the insights gained from this study may offer alternative ways of teaching OCF for teacher educators and other stakeholders. Lastly, as teachers begin to construct their beliefs in pre-service years (Borg, 2006) even earlier (Richardson, 2003), analyzing how STs hypothesize about teaching and learning may assist SLTE programs in seeking ways to strengthen the overall content and methodology of pre-service teacher education.

Theory and Practice of Oral Corrective Feedback

OCF is an important research area in the field of SLA and generally refers to various sorts of teacher responses to learners' incorrect use of the target language. SLA researchers and teacher educators are interested in oral error correction because it is one of the ways in which teachers can help learners monitor, reflect on and self-correct their utterances (Walsh, 2006). Over the last decades, a plethora of interdisciplinary research has examined the nature of learner errors and the dynamics behind errors and error correction, such as negative evidence in linguistics (e.g., White, 1989), as repair in discourse analysis (e.g., Kasper, 1985), as negative feedback in psychology (e.g., Annett, 1969), as corrective feedback in second language teaching

(e.g. Fanselow, 1977), and as focus-on-form in particular studies in SLA (e.g., Doughty & Williams, 1998; Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Long, 1991).

After the role of corrective feedback was demonstrated theoretically, empirical research increased, and the issue has been investigated by researchers from various aspects. Although most studies are conducted in ESL contexts, there are also important studies from foreign language contexts (Sheen, 2004). The studies concentrate on the overall effect of feedback on interlanguage development (McDonough, 2005; Oliver & Mackey, 2003), the occurrence of different types of feedback (Lyster, 2001; Lyster & Ranta, 1997), learners' perception of feedback (Doughty, 1994; Mackey, Gass & McDonough, 2000) as well as on various effects of different feedback types (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006; Lyster, 2004).

The studies on feedback types also vary significantly. Nevertheless, commonly accepted frameworks have been offered so far. For instance, Lyster and Ranta (1997) distinguished six different OCF types; explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition in their descriptive study of teacher-learner interaction in French immersion classrooms. In addition to these six main categories, Lyster and Ranta (1997) also included a category named multiple feedback and referred to it as a combination of more than one of the identified feedback types in a teacher turn. Later, they divided OCF into two broad groups, reformulations and prompts (Ranta & Lyster, 2007).

Drawing upon these identified OCF types, Sheen and Ellis (2011) suggested a taxonomy of OCF strategies for classroom pedagogy. They clarified not only the distinction between reformulations and prompts but also the distinction between implicit and explicit corrective feedback. Differently from the taxonomy of Lyster and Ranta (1997), Sheen and Ellis (2011) included paralinguistic signals that address the efforts to elicit the correct form from the learners non-verbally. Also, they separated recasts into two groups; conversational recasts that are reformulations of learners' utterances in order to resolve a communication breakdown and didactic recasts that are reformulations of learners' utterance in default of a communication problem (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). OCF types have also been differentiated by researchers in terms of explicitness and implicitness. However, it has been proven that making this kind of a categorization is problematic. For example, recasts are generally included in implicit category (Long, 1996), but the researches show that they can also be explicit depending on context, setting and characteristics such as linguistic target, the number and length of changes (Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Sheen, 2004).

Student Teachers' Beliefs about Teaching and Learning

Error correction process is largely conducted by the teacher, and how teachers evaluate and respond to errors cannot be excluded from the scope of SLTE. Teachers' beliefs are known to have a significant effect on the way they correct errors because their attitudes are largely shaped by their beliefs about what language, learning and teaching are (see Borg 2003, 2006). Then where, when and how are teacher beliefs shaped? As it is impossible to control and manipulate the primary and secondary educational years of the teachers, we can assume that teachers' field-related beliefs are mostly academically shaped in pre-service education and approximated to a scientifically strong level. Much of the research in teacher education has revealed the impact of teacher education on STs and the possible ways to bring about a positive chance in STs beliefs (Almarza, 1996; Cabaroğlu & Roberts, 2000; Flores, 2002; Mattheouidakis, 2007). Some other studies in SLTE report on problems in changing STs beliefs

effectively in pre-service years (see Wright, 2010). This is partly because STs hold some beliefs about teaching and learning before they start their profession (Woods, 1996; Flores, 2001) and many other contextual and institutional factors (e.g. Mattheouidakis, 2007; Özmen, 2012). Thus, it is not an easy task for SLTE programs to approximate those beliefs to an academic level (Borg, 2015).

Teachers' belief studies conducted with no respect to a specific curricular area in the field of foreign language teaching can be divided into three categories. In the first kind of studies, effects of prior language learning experiences on teachers' belief are examined (Golombek, 1998; Lortie, 1975; Nespor, 1987). The second category investigates effects of teacher education on teacher's beliefs (or changes in their beliefs) (Almarza, 1996; Cabaroğlu & Roberts, 2000). Last group of studies investigates the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices (Bailey, 1996; Richards, 1996). Within the last group, longitudinal studies were designed to focus on transformation in beliefs during the SLTE program (Özmen, 2012; Peacock, 2001) while other studies scrutinized the impacts of one specific course on STs' beliefs (MacDonald, Badger, & White, 2001; Richards, Ho, & Giblin, 1996).

The research shows that STs' beliefs come from mainly three different resources (Richardson, 1996); their own personal experiences as learners in the school, teacher education and their personal experiences in general and with teaching (Sanchez & Borg, 2014). Among these three sources, educational experiences as a learner are found to be more influential (Peacock, 2001; Richardson, 2003). Apprenticeship of observation, in Lortie's (1975) words, is a strong variable shaping STs beliefs. Roberts (1998) states that teacher training programs should give an opportunity to experience and observe good models of alternative instructional practices because STs are lack of procedural knowledge, and they do not have any idea about how classrooms work and learners behave. However, as Kagan (1992) states, STs' images of good and bad teachers are generally wrong because they suppose that their learners will have similar learning styles, interest and problems with them. The beliefs of non-native language teachers are even stronger than the other teachers on this point because they may hold that they have had similar experiences with their learners in the process of learning a second or foreign language (Kagan, 1992; Pajares, 1992).

In the present study, we assume that teacher beliefs are cognitive and socio-affective constructs, development of which is based on multiple academic and personal experiences. Although it is quite difficult to draw a line between belief and knowledge systems as separate constructs, we view that teacher beliefs and knowledge transform each other into an idiosyncratic cognitive filter, the effects of which play a partial role in teacher's instructional choices and overall classroom behaviors. Thus, considering that most of the academic tailoring work on teacher beliefs are carried out in pre-service teacher education (Kagan, 1992; Richardson, 2003), a study on nonnative STs stated beliefs about OCF and their approach toward oral errors in practice merits scholarly attention. A study by Adugo (2014) on nonnative STs' beliefs about OCF reveals the influence of past classroom language learning experiences of the STs and underlines the need for more training on corrective feedback pedagogy. The present study intends to elaborate on this specific point by investigating what beliefs STs hold about correcting oral errors and how they put those beliefs in practice. To this end, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are student teachers' stated beliefs about oral corrective feedback?
2. What are student teachers' stated behaviors about oral corrective feedback?

Methodology

Context and Participants

The present study was carried out in English Language Teaching (ELT) program at Gazi University in Ankara, the oldest and one of the most populated programs nationally. Each grade in the program includes around 150 undergraduate STs, and a total of 60 MA and 30 PhD students. It is a typical four-year bachelor SLTE degree program, designed in line with the requirements of Bologna Process (Council of Higher Education, 2015). The program offers academic English courses and general educational science courses in the first year. In the second year of the program, applied linguistics courses, some educational science courses, courses of techniques and principles in language teaching, a course of language acquisition and one practical course called 'Special Teaching Methods' are offered intensively. The third year of the program includes more practical courses such as teaching English to young learners, creative drama, special teaching methods, teaching language skills, in which STs are practice various aspects of ELT in micro teachings. In the last year, STs have to complete a one-year practicum.

Senior STs in 2013-2014 academic year took part in the study. The interview group, chosen among 98 participants of the study, consisted of 12 senior STs selected randomly. Three of them were males and 9 of them were females, quite a representative gender sample for teacher education programs in Turkey. The sample for simulation consisted of 98 senior STs, who participated in the study on a voluntary basis. This group of participants includes 77 female and 21 male STs. All of the participants were aged between 21 and 26 (SD= 0.94).

Data Collection and Procedures

Two data collection instruments were utilized. First one is a simulation questionnaire offering situations or scenarios in which OCF might be necessary. The second is interview collecting data about STs beliefs about corrective feedback pedagogy. Before data collection, a consent form was given to participants, and they were informed explicitly about their roles and rights.

Situations for Error Correction (SEC) Simulation is a data collection tool that aims to find out STs' stated behaviors of oral corrective feedback and developed by the authors (see Appendix B). It consists of 20 situations that English teachers may frequently encounter in English language classrooms. All the situations include an erroneous utterance in different proficiency levels and student profiles. The participants were asked to identify the type of the error (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation) and the focus of the activity (fluency, accuracy) and answer the question of how and why they would correct the error. The factors behind the scenarios are language components (grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation), proficiency level (from elementary to upper-intermediate) and age group (from young learners to adults) were distributed fairly and equally. To develop this tool, firstly, common errors of the learners of English were searched and most common errors included noted the studies (Brians, 2003; James, 1998; Swan & Smith, 2001; Tanner & Green, 1998) were identified. Then, these most common errors were included in the situations paying attention to the proficiency level of learners who made the errors (from elementary level to upper-intermediate level) and age of them (young learners, adolescents, adult learners). However, this paper reports merely on OCF for language components, proficiency levels and types of tasks (fluency vs. accuracy) due to the limits of the article.

The participants wrote their responses to the SEC Simulation in a 30-minute session conducted in the program. One of the authors monitored them during this data collection procedure. Before the session, a sample situation was discussed with the participants to show them the structure and contents of the SEC Simulation.

The interview questions (see Appendix A) were pre-planned and structured based on specific factors, such as beliefs about 1) teacher, 2) learner, 3) teaching and 4) language. Following the discussions on the factors and preparation of a representative 25 semi-structured interview items, one expert holding a PhD on teacher cognition reviewed the questions and gave feedback. The interview questions were then refined specifically to include different items aiming to measure same points with the SEC Simulation. The interviews were conducted once with each ST in a face-to-face session. The duration of interviews was between 25 to 45 minutes. The interviews were audio-taped and then transcribed verbatim.

A clarification is needed on why stated beliefs and behaviors of the STs were addressed in the present research study. Although the STs practice various micro and macro teaching attempts in the programs, they do perform those in front of their trainer and peers and based on rigid lesson plans. In addition, the practicum experience is not different; STs experience teaching under the observation of the peers, mentors and trainers. Such teaching attempts of STs are thus shaped by the influences of those artificial teaching contexts with little or no chance for improvisation and for genuine learner-teacher interaction. This makes hardly possible to observe how STs would truly put their beliefs into practice in a real teaching setting. Instead, STs who participated in this study willingly shared how they would behave in situations given in the SEC simulation.

Validity of the SEC Simulation

Although the SEC Simulation (see a sample in Figure 1) collects qualitative data through participants' written responses to the classroom situations offering an oral language error, it should be based on a psychological reality, structural validity, process validity as well as the predictive validity, which means the participants need to perceive it as realistic and comprehensive in terms of its structure, processes and its relevance to the real life situations (Snoek, 2003). To this end, we initially focused on the content validity of the simulation and included the critical real-life variables that are commonly taken into account when correcting (or not correcting) learners' errors. Those real-life variables address the typical characteristics of an English classroom, such as age and proficiency level of the learners as well as the type of the task/activity handled in the classroom. In addition, other variables that help secure the content validity are the type of the error; whether it might be a grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency or accuracy error. Here the fluency errors were expected to include socio-pragmatic errors, such as appropriateness and/or level of formality. The aim of giving those details was to provide enough descriptive accounts of the context and accurately specify methodological choices of the STs on correcting a specific oral error. Therefore, those variables shaping the major aspects of the reality of the simulation naturally exerted an impact on how and why STs might correct the given errors. The participants were expected to write down their response to the blank box provided below, and validate why (not) and how they would correct the error(s). Initially, we tried to address the psychological reality and different dimensions of the validity (structural, process and predictive validity) to develop a good simulation scenario, defined by Snoek (2003).

Read the situations below with the following questions in mind: 1. What kind of an error is that? (Circle the language component or activity type in the boxes given on the right. You can circle more than one item where applicable). 2. How and why would you correct the error(s). (Please write down your response to the space provided below each situation.)	**Grammar**	**Vocabulary**	**Pronunciation**	**Fluency**	**Accuracy**
Age: young learner **Level:** Elementary					
1. You are doing a warm-up activity with your class, asking them about their grandparents. One student tells the class **"My grandmother is seventeen and three".**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					

Figure 1: A Sample Simulation Item from SEC

Following the initial preparations of the SEC Simulation, a pilot study was conducted to secure the construct validity, which can largely be achieved via administering the instrument (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). In addition to the typical objectives of a pilot study (Dörnyei, 2007), the present pilot study was also expected to clarify 1) whether any language components, learner groups and proficiency levels were represented fairly and equally, 2) whether the situations in the simulation reflected the real-life situations that STs are likely to encounter in their future contexts, and 3) whether the terms and situations required any improvement or modification in terms of construct validity. Twenty STs representing the target participants took part in the piloting phase. Analysis of the data obtained from the pilot study led to modifications in three scenario simulations as well as to some minor wording revisions. Then, a professor of English language teaching from the same department was asked to review the SEC Simulation. This review process was completed in two phases. Initially, the professor reviewed the instrument independently and confirmed the effectiveness of SEC Simulation. Then we had a meeting with the professor during which we discussed various feedback given by him. This external review process resulted in minor linguistic modifications in expression of two more situations.

Analyzing the data

Specific parts of SEC simulation were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively depending on the nature of the data and requirements of the research questions. The qualitative data collected through SEC Simulation, as well as from interviews, were analyzed by using constant-comparative method derived from grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). However, those data were analyzed separately by using different coding procedures. In the SEC Simulation, the STs' answers to the question 'how and why to correct' were categorized according to the taxonomy of Lyster and Ranta (1997). There were seven types of oral corrective feedback in the study, namely, (1) explicit, (2) recasts, (3) clarification request, (4) meta-linguistic feedback, (5) elicitation, (6) repetition and (7) multiple feedback. For the responses to

the question of 'why' in the SEC Simulation, the themes were not different from the ones used for the question of 'how'. The answers to the question of 'why' were re-read cyclically to reach a saturation, and the ones related to these themes were categorized under them. In terms of feedback type, the categorized data were analyzed on the basis of calculating the frequency and percentage of OCF for each simulation item. As for the feedback time, a similar quantification was applied.

In the analysis of the interviews, some pre-determined themes were used to categorize the STs' stated beliefs in general. These were (1) teacher, (2) learner, (3) teaching, (4) language. Those pre-determined themes helped narrow down contents of the categorization via utilizing major themes of an ELT context. Also, these themes were categorized under main educational views on teaching a foreign language. These were traditional view, constructivist view and the mixed view (Özmen, 2012), which enabled us to offer a broad portrait of what beliefs STs hold about being a teacher or a learner as well as what teaching is or what language is. The views of some of the participants were incomprehensible, including some vague expressions, so they were categorized as 'Other'. In addition, specific themes on STs' beliefs about OCF emerged from the SEC Simulation data. Those themes were: (1) selecting errors to correct, (2) time of OCF, (3) frequent type of oral errors, and (4) effective OCF.

Results

This section provides the results of the study in 2 subsections. The first subsection reports the STs beliefs about oral corrective feedback. The second subsection includes the results of SEC Simulation.

STs Stated Beliefs about OCF

As an indicator of the overall approach of the STs toward OCF, the participating STs unanimously stated that they would not correct all of the errors, and that they would choose to correct the repetitive errors: "- *If I hear the same error for a few times on the same subject or if I have notice that she learns it in a wrong way, I'll correct it* (Int11)". The second reason to treat errors (3 of the STs) was the number of students making the same or similar errors. If the number was high, they would correct the errors. Another reason stated by 2 participants was whether an error causes ambiguity in interaction or not. If it caused ambiguity or unintelligibility, they would choose to correct it. An example of ignoring an error was repeated by 3 of the participants: "- …. *While one of the students is reading the text aloud, she makes a pronunciation mistake. I'll ignore it because at that point our focus should be on comprehending the text and answering the questions correctly* (Int1)".

The STs were asked to elaborate on when they preferred delayed or immediate correction, which is a critical point for STs' classroom pedagogy, and 11 of them reported to use a delayed correction. They expressed that they did not want to demotivate their learners, so they would benefit from delayed correction. Nine out of 12 participants stated that they would use a delayed correction if the focus of the activity was on fluency: "- …*think that one of the students is talking about a thing in an excited way and he's making some mistakes while speaks*[ing]*, I'll not interrupt him. If I do it, it'll not be correction but sabotage* (Int3)".

The second most repeated answer (5 out of 12 STs) was whether the error was pragmatically on correct use of language. They explained that when learners made a pragmatic

error, they will not correct the error if the communication flows without any misunderstanding. Another reason reported by 3 of the participants in using delayed correction was crowded classes: "- *I can use delayed correction in crowded classes because the duration of classes won't be enough if I correct mistakes of each student. Instead, I can take some notes and later I can talk about these mistakes with them* (Int2)". Also, 3 of the STs told that they would correct the error after some time if they thought that it was a minor one. It is evident that STs are able to differentiate between an error and a mistake, and use different techniques to error correction in terms of task type, fluency and accuracy: "- *…our aim in our classes is always communicating in English, but in some situations being accurate is more important. At that time, I can give feedback immediately* (Int6)".

Seven out of 12 participants spotted pronunciation mistakes as the most frequent error type. Grammar errors took the first place in the answers of 3 participants. One of them stated that: "- *…the most frequent errors are on grammar. This is tragicomic. In fact, we, as the country, give the most importance to grammar, but most of the mistakes are on grammar* (Int7)". Two of them referred to vocabulary errors as the most frequent one. When it comes to the second most frequent errors, there is an equal distribution of answers. Four out of 12 referred vocabulary errors, 4 of them showed pronunciation errors and the rest 4 participants indicated grammar errors as the second most frequent error type made by the learners.

The STs were asked to reflect on the factors having an impact on efficiency of OCF. Among the answers, classroom atmosphere and manner of the teacher were repeatedly articulated by the participants (stated by 5 of 12 STs). By stating classroom atmosphere, the participants mostly referred to the roles of students, roles of the teacher and their attitudes toward each other: "- *…classroom affects it a lot. If other students in the class make fun of him when he makes an error, I don't believe that error correction can be possible in this classroom* (Int2)". Most of the participants expressed that the teacher should be motivating not criticizing while correcting the errors. They underlined that the one who would create a positive classroom atmosphere was the teacher: "- *When one of the students makes a mistake, the attitudes of the other students are also important. At that point, I'll try to adjust the classroom atmosphere.* (Int12)".

STs' Responses to SEC Simulation

OCF for Language Components

The SEC Simulation includes 8 items on various aspects of grammar, 6 on vocabulary and 6 on pronunciation, either fluency or accuracy. Data analysis was performed on the basis of calculating the frequencies and percentages of OCF for each of the simulation factors. The overall findings suggest that the STs preferred to use different feedback types to correct the errors on different language components: grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. The details of OCF choices are provided in Table 1.

	Language Components					
	Grammar *8 Situations*		Vocabulary *6 Situations*		Pronunciation *6 Situations*	
	f	%	f	%	F	%
Explicit	11.8	12	13.7	14	27.7	28.3
Recast	21.1	21.5	12	12.2	18.8	19.2
Clarification request	0.8	0.8	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Meta-linguistic feedback	11.8	12	18.2	18.6	6.2	6.3
Elicitation	16.9	17.2	12.7	13	10.5	10.7
Repetition	1.8	1.8	0.3	0.3	1.5	1.5
Multiple feedback	2	2	2.8	2.9	1.8	1.8
No correction	17.1	17.4	21.3	21.7	11.8	12
Irrelevant response	5.6	5.7	6.3	6.4	6.3	6.4
Missing data	9.2	9.4	9.5	9.7	12.2	12.4

Table 1: Language Component and Feedback Types

Most of the STs preferred to use implicit ways of correction for grammar errors, namely recast ranking first (f= 21.1, 21.5%) and elicitation ranking third (f=16.9, 17.2%). The second most frequent response given to the situations including grammar error was no correction. They reported that grammar was something that could be learned through time and even native speakers of a language made grammar mistakes while speaking: "- …*especially in daily language grammar mistakes aren't cared much. This is true also for native speakers of English*" (Int8).

Most STs preferred not to correct vocabulary errors (f=21.3, 21.7%). The second most frequently preferred correction type to correct vocabulary errors was meta-linguistic feedback (f=18.2, 18.6%). Most of the STs preferred to define the meaning of the word or ask some yes-no questions to lead the students to the incorrect use of the vocabulary item. The third most frequent type of correction choice was explicit correction (f=13.7, 14%). The participants who stated to correct vocabulary errors held that this type of correction would be beneficial for students to learn the vocabulary item because it is direct and clear. One of the participants stated: "- … *especially wrong word use should be corrected directly. If we tell the correct word directly, we can improve the learners' vocabulary knowledge* (Int3)".

The majority of the STs would choose an explicit correction provided that the error was on pronunciation (f=27.7, 28.3%). They stated that correcting pronunciation errors was highly important because it "- …*plays a key role in being able to communicate with people whose mother tongue is different from yours* (ST19)". They unanimously expressed the importance of explicit correction: "- *I would directly give the correct pronunciation of the words because I don't want the students to learn the pronunciation wrong* (ST27)". Recast was the second most common correction type preferred by the STs (f=18.8, 19.2%). As for the reason why they would use recasts, STs stated that just repeating the correct pronunciation of a word would be enough for the learners to notice the correct pronunciation.

OCF for Language Proficiency and Task Objectives

There are two remarkable points related to the preferred correction type in terms of level of the students. Firstly, as is given in Table 2, the STs preferred to correct low proficiency learners more frequently than high proficiency ones. The reason why they would focus on errors of low proficiency learners was reported as the threat of mislearning: "- *The teacher should*

correct the student's mistake as soon as possible because he/she is an elementary level student. If the teacher doesn't correct the error, the student may learn it in a wrong way (ST58)".

	Proficiency Level							
	Elementary		Pre-intermediate		Intermediate		Upper-intermediate	
	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%
Explicit	13.5	13.8	8.75	8.9	20.2	20.6	19.7	20.1
Recast	25	25.5	26.25	26.8	16.2	16.5	11.5	11.7
Clarification request	2	2	1	1.0	0.5	0.5	1.3	1.3
Meta-linguistic feedback	10.5	10.7	12.75	13	9.4	9.6	15.5	15.8
Elicitation	11	11.2	22.25	22.7	13.8	14	8.8	9
Repetition	3	3	2.5	2.5	1	1.0	0.17	0.17
Multiple feedback	4	4	1.25	1.3	2.4	2.4	2	2
No correction	15	15.3	10	10.2	19.4	19.8	18.5	18.9
Irrelevant response	2,.5	2.5	5	5.1	5.5	5.6	8.7	8.9
Missing data	11.5	11.7	8.25	8.4	9.6	9.8	11.8	12

Table 2: Proficiency Level and Feedback Types

The second most significant finding concerns the type of OCF techniques preferred by the participants for low and high proficiency learners. The STs preferred to use more implicit ways of OCF for low proficiency learners, namely recast (elementary: f=25, 25.5% and pre-intermediate: f=26.25, 26.8%) and elicitation (elementary: f=11, 11.2% and pre-intermediate: f=22.25, 22.7%) although they preferred explicit OCF for both intermediate and upper-intermediate level learners (respectively f=20.2, 20.6% and f=19.7, 20.1%).

The SEC Simulation includes 15 items on fluency and 5 items on accuracy. For both fluency and accuracy based activities, recast was found to be the most frequently exploited feedback type (fluency: f=18.2, 18.5% and accuracy: f=16.2, 16.5%). The second most frequent feedback type was explicit correction (f=17.5, 17.8%) for fluency based activities while it was explicit correction (f=16, 16.3%) and elicitation (f=16, 16.3%) for activities focusing on accuracy. Lastly, the findings indicated that the STs would correct the errors in accuracy based activities more frequently than in fluency based activities.

Discussion and Conclusions

RQ1: Student Teachers' Beliefs about OCF

In the interviews, all of the participants stated that they had a positive attitude toward using oral corrective feedback, and that they held a constructivist view of foreign language teaching and learning. Also, they referred OCF as an important part of foreign language learning. Unanimously, the participants viewed that the OCF techniques should be utilized carefully to secure the effective flow of communication in the classroom. Whether the error jeopardizes the flow of communication and whether it causes ambiguity in meaning were previously stated in some important studies (e.g. Lyster et al., 2013; Roothooft, 2014). The STs' beliefs about time of OCF generally depend on the type/focus of the activity (accuracy or fluency), which indicates a sound rationale for strengthening flow of communication in the classrooms. If the focus of the activity was on fluency, STs reported to use a delayed correction, but if the focus of the activity

was on accuracy, they would use immediate correction. This result is in congruence with the findings of Méndez and Cruz (2012) and Roothooft (2014). Especially for delayed correction, before the participants stated when they would prefer it, they mentioned why they would prefer such an approach. The core reason was not to demotivate learners and not to hurt their feelings. In fact, the participants in Méndez and Cruz's study (2012) expressed the same concerns with the participants in the present study. Another point stated by the participants was the class size. If the class was a crowded one, they would prefer delayed correction.

The matter of effectiveness of OCF is a much discussed issue in OCF inquiry. There are a number of studies focusing on effectiveness or differential effects of particular types of correction type on a particular language component (Büyükbay, 2007; Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009; Mutlu, 2006; Nassaji, 2009). Getting to know the learners, their characters, their attitudes toward the lesson are accentuated as important factors affecting the efficiency of OCF. These findings are in line with the findings of Méndez and Cruz (2012) and with those of Roothooft (2014). The participants highlighted the importance of the learners' reactions toward feedback that would change according to the stated factors, mentioned in those studies. One of the most expressed factors that identify the use of OCF was the classroom atmosphere. With classroom atmosphere, the participants meant the roles of the learners and teachers in a class, their relations, and classroom rules.

In the literature, different measures have been used to measure the effectiveness of OCF on learning or for learners. These are essentially some post-tests (immediate or delayed) (e.g. Doughty & Varela, 1998; Loewen & Philp, 2006), uptake and learner repair (e.g. Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002) and stimulated recalls (e.g. Roberts, 1998; Philp, 2003). Similarly, in the present study, the STs referred to some measures and students' responses in deciding the effectiveness of the OCF. However, the participants not only mentioned the verbal responses of the students but also pointed their facial expressions, gestures and behaviors just after the OCF as a hint to decide the effectiveness of teachers' feedback, which are also reported to be evident in other international studies (see Borg, 2015).

RQ2: Student Teachers' Stated Behaviors about OCF

The most frequently preferred feedback type in total was explicit correction, account for 18% of all responses. The reason of this high percentage is the result of the answers given to phonological errors, and this percentage is slightly higher than that of recasts (17.6%). Similar studies suggest that explicit ways of corrective feedback could be more useful than implicit ones (Ellis et al., 2006; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Lyster et al., 2013). However, there is no particular language component focused on in most of the studies. The foci of the classrooms observed might range from vocabulary, grammar to combination of speaking, listening, grammar or reading. Nevertheless, it is shown that grammar errors receive the highest proportion of correction made in classes (Brown, 2014; Havranek, 2002).

The most frequent OCF type exploited by the participants for grammatical errors was the recasts, accounting for 21.5% of all answers given to the questions including grammatical errors. This is concurrent with the findings of Brown (2014), Havranek (2002), Lyster and Ranta (1997), Panova and Lyster (2002), Roothoft (2014) and Sheen (2004).

As for the vocabulary errors, a considerable part of the participants preferred not to correct the errors (f= 21.3, 21.7%). In a similar vein, Méndez and Cruz (2012) found that teachers in an EFL context did not tend to provide corrective feedback for vocabulary errors. The

second most frequent feedback type was meta-linguistic feedback, accounting for 18.6% of the responses given to the situations including vocabulary errors. There is no study investigating the particular types of preferred OCF by the teachers or STs, but there are some studies analyzing different effects of various feedback types on learners' vocabulary knowledge. In one of these studies, Dilans (2010) studied on the effects of recasts and prompts (i.e. meta-linguistic feedback, classification request, elicitation, repetition), and it was revealed that both of those oral corrective feedback types improved vocabulary knowledge of the learners.

For pronunciation errors, the most frequently used feedback type was explicit correction, accounting for 28.3% of the situations containing pronunciation errors. The second most frequent one was recast, and it received 19.2% of the responses. This result coincided with that of Lyster and Saito (2010), in which they proved the effect of recasts on L2 pronunciation development.

Findings of the previous studies suggest that teachers' corrective feedback choices can be affected by learners' language proficiency levels. In the present study, it was an issue to discuss, and the results demonstrated that the participants' oral corrective feedback preferences differed according to the language proficiency level of the learners. The STs tended to use implicit techniques for lower proficiency learners and explicit correction techniques for higher proficiency groups. These findings are concurrent with the findings of Ahangari and Amirzadeh (2011). We do believe that this strategy is beneficial specifically in EFL contexts, as helping language students reach higher proficiency levels might be facilitated by strengthening language awareness and metacognitive thinking dispositions (e.g. Ellis et al., 2006). In the present study, for pre-intermediate level learners, the most frequent preference of the STs was again the recasts (f=26.25; 26.8%). From these findings, it can be inferred that the participants tended to supply the low proficiency learners with the correct forms. However, some studies in literature show that low proficiency learners benefit less from recasts than high proficiency learners (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Brown, 2014; Li, 2013; Lyster et al., 2013). When it comes to high proficiency learners, explicit correction received the highest proportion (f=20.2, 20.6%; f=19.7, 20.1%, respectively). Ammar and Spada (2006) concluded that prompts were more useful than recasts in general, and although high proficiency learners benefited from both of the feedback types equally, especially low proficiency learners benefited more from prompts than recasts. Therefore, the participants of the present study might be stated to use effective corrective feedback types for all the levels.

In the SLTE programs, mostly planned aspects of teaching are within the scope of the courses. However, chaotic aspects of teaching like error correction might be ignored largely. This point is also confirmed by Adugo (2014), accentuating the need for more training on OCF in SLTE programs. Furthermore, SLTE programs can provide STs with some chances to identify and examine their beliefs about both planned and chaotic aspects of teaching, which might be realized by more intense practicum teaching during pre-service education. Specifically, corrective feedback stands at a critical point for EFL contexts, in which learners have little or no opportunity to use language communicatively outside the class and to be exposed to the various forms and registers of English. Therefore, STLE programs in such contexts might provide STs with extra courses on corrective feedback as well as more opportunities for STs to practice strategies for OCF to build up their own pedagogy. This might also enable STs to examine their own beliefs and knowledge so as to intertwine their academic and personal experiences on foreign language teaching and learning.

One of the most important tasks for the further research is to conduct a similar study in different contexts. Firstly, the present study aimed to analyze the STs' beliefs about OCF in a specific context and the findings were mostly based on qualitative data driven from a limited

sampling. For this reason, it is not possible to make universal generalizations. Secondly, this group of STs' might be observed after graduation to investigate their approach toward oral errors in their classrooms. Thirdly, such a follow-up study might provide invaluable insights about the macro factors that shape how teacher's beliefs and behaviors evolve within the educational system.

References

Agudo, J. D. D. M. (2014). Beliefs in learning to teach: EFL student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. *Utrecht Studies in Language and Communication, 27*, 209.

Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011).Exploring the teachers' use of spoken corrective feedback in teaching Iranian EFL learners at different levels of proficiency. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29*, 1859-1868. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.435

Almarza, G. G. (1996). Student foreign language teacher's knowledge growth. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (50-78). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*, 543-574. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0272263106060268

Annett, J. (1969). *Feedback and human behaviour.* Harmondsworth. UK: Penguin.

Bailey, K. M. (1996). The best laid plans: Teachers' in-class decisions to depart from their lesson plans. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Ed.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education* (15-40). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: a review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe and do. *Language Teaching, 36*, 81-109. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice.* London: Continuum.

Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Brians, P. (2003). *Common errors in English usage.* William James & Company.

Brown, D. (2014). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168814563200

Büyükbay, S. (2007). The effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback. (Unpublished MA thesis), *Bilkent University, Ankara*.

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/S0346-251X(00)00019-1

Cohen, L., Manion. L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge

Council of Higher Education. (2015). *Higher Education System in Turkey.* Retrieved from http://goo.gl/yN156p on 5 June 2015

Dilans, G. (2010). Corrective feedback and L2 vocabulary development: Prompts and recasts in the adult ESL classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 66,* 787–815. http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.66.6.787

Doughty, C. (1994). Fine tuning of feedback by competent speakers to language learners. In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Strategic Interaction and Language Acquisition: Theory, Practice and Research.* Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

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

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Issues and terminology. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Ed.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (1-12). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., Loewen S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28,* 339-368. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0272263106060141

Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28,* 575-600. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S027226310606027X

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

Flores, M. A. (2001). Person and context in becoming a new teacher. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 27*(2), 135-148. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02607470120067882

Flores, M. A. (2002). Learning, Development, Change in the Early Years of Teaching. A Two-year Empirical Study (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), *University of Nottingham, UK*.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. New York: Aldine.

Golombek, P. R. (1998). A study of language teachers' personal practical knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(3), 447-464. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588117

Harmer, J. (2006). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd Ed.). London: Longman.

Havranek, G. (2002). When is corrective feedback most likely to succeed? *International Journal of Educational Research, 37*(3), 255–270. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(03)00004-1

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

James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use.* London: Longman.

Kagan, D. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 62,* 129-169. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543062002129

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7,* 200–215. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100005374Krashen, S. (1981).*Second language acquisition and second language learning.* London: Pergamon.

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

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12,* 429–448. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100009517

Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult English L2 classroom: Characteristics, explicitness and effectiveness. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(4), 536-556. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2006.00465.x

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, D. Coste, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Ed.). *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (39–52). Amsterdam: Benjamins. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/sibil.2.07lon

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition, in W.C. Ritchie and T.K. Bhatia (Ed.). *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*, San Diego, CA: Academic Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/b978-012589042-7/50015-3

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *School teacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lyster, R. (2001). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning, 51*(1), 265–301. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.2001.tb00019.x

Lyster, R. (2004). Different effects of prompts and effects in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26,* 399-432. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263104263021

Lyster, R., & Izquierdo, J. (2009). Prompts versus recasts in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning, 59,* 453-498. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00512.x

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19,* 37-66. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0272263197001034Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32,* 265-302. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). State-of-the-art article: Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms, *Language Teaching, 46,* 1-40. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365

MacDonald, M., Badger, R., & White, G. (2001). Changing values: What use are theories of language learning and teaching? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 949-963. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00042-7

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*(4), 471-497. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100004022

Mackey, A. & Oliver, R. (2002). Interactional feedback and children's L2 development. *System, 30,* 459–477. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00049-0

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

McDonough, K. (2005). Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners‟ responses on ESL question development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27,* 79-103. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0272263105050047

Méndez, E. H., & Cruz, M. R. R. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile, 14*(2), 63-75.

Mutlu, M. (2006). The differential effects of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on foreign language development of young learners. *(*Unpublished MA thesis), *Abant Izzet Baysal University, Turkey*.

Nassaji, H. (2009). Effects of recasts and elicitations in syadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. *Language Learning, 59*, 411-452. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00511.x

Nespor, J. K. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19(*4), 317-328. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0022027870190403

Oliver, R. (2000). Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pair work. *Language Learning, 50*, 119-151. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00113

Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2003).Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms. *Modern Language Journal, 87,* 519-533. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00205

Özmen, K.S. (2012). Exploring student teachers' beliefs about language learning and teaching: A longitudinal study. *Current Issues in Education, 15*(1): 1-16.

Pajares, M. F. (1992).Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 307-332. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*, 573-595. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588241

Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning: A longitudinal study. *System, 29*, 177-195. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00010-0

Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on "noticing the gap": Non-native speakers' noticing of recasts in NS-NNS interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*, 99-126. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0272263103000044

Ranta, L., & Lyster, R. (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral language abilities: The Awareness-Practice-Feedback sequence. In R. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (141 – 160). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (1996). Teachers' maxims in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *30*(2), 281-296. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588144

Richards, J. C. (2008). Second language teacher education today. *RELC Journal*, *39*(2), 158–176. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033688208092182

Richards, J. C., Ho, B., & Giblin, K. (1996). Learning how to teach in the RSA Cert. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (p. 242-259). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Richardson, V. (2003). Preservice teachers' beliefs. In J. Raths & A. C. McAninch (Eds.), *Teacher beliefs and classroom performance: The impact of teacher education*, (1 -22). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Roberts, J. (1998). *Language Teacher Education.* Arnold: London.

Roothooft, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System, 46*, 65-79. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.012

Sanchez, H. S., & Borg, S. (2014). Insights into L2 teachers' pedagogical content knowledge: A cognitive perspective on their grammar explanations. *System*, *44*, 45-53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.02.005

Sato, K., & Kleinsasser, R. (1999). Communicative language teaching: Practical understandings. *The Modern Language Journal*, *83*(4), 494–517. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00037

Scrivener, J. (1994). *Learning teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Schön, D.A. (1991). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *10*(1-4), 209-232.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, *8*, 263-300. http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1362168804lr146oa

Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011).Corrective feedback in language teaching. In Hinkel, E. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, (593-610). New York: Routledge.

Snoek, M. (2003). The use and methodology of scenario making. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *26*(1), 9-19. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0261976032000065607

Swan, M. & Smith, B. (2001). *Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problems*. (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667121

Tanner, R., & Green, C. (1998). *Tasks for teacher education: A reflective approach*. Longman.

Wallace, M. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

White, L. (1989). *Universal Grammar and second language acquisition.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/lald.1

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

Wright, T. (2010). Second language teacher education: Review of recent research on practice. *Language Teaching*, *43*(3), 259-296. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000030

Xing, Q. (2009). An investigation of the relationship between the teaching beliefs and teaching behaviors of teachers of English as a second or foreign language. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), *The University of Utah, USA.*

Appendices

A. Interview Questions

1. What is your attitude toward L2 learners' errors?
2. Does error correction contribute to L2 learning?
3. Should learners' errors be corrected?
4. Do you always correct students' errors? If not, how do you select errors to correct?
5. Before the lesson, do you determine which kind of errors or forms you will correct?
6. When should learners' errors be corrected?
7. Does it depend on activity type: free – controlled?
8. Does it depend on focus of the activity: fluency – accuracy?

9. Does it depend on levels of L2 learners: elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate, upper-intermediate, advanced?
10. Does it depend on age of L2 learners: young learners, adolescence, adults?
11. When do you prefer delayed correction?
12. When do you prefer immediate correction?
13. What kinds of errors do your students generally make in speaking activities? (Grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation)
14. Which kinds of L2 learners' errors should be corrected? (Grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation)
15. Should L2 learners' errors be followed or written down?
16. How should errors be corrected?
17. Do you use explicit error correction in your teaching? What are some advantages and disadvantages of explicit error correction?
18. Do you use implicit ways of error correction in your teaching? How do you implicitly correct student error? What are some advantages and disadvantages of implicit error correction?
19. Do you think students notice when you implicitly correct their errors?
20. Do you behave in the same way when a group of students or only a student makes an error? If not, how and why does your error correction technique change?
21. Who should do the correction? (Self-correction, peer correction, teacher correction)
22. Which kind of error correction is most effective for L2 learner's learning?)Self-correction, peer correction, teacher correction)
23. Which factors can affect a correction to be effective? (Classroom atmosphere, level of students, type and focus of the activity)
24. Do you think that teacher should take individual differences/learners' variables into account?
25. How can you tell whether your error treatment is effective for learners to acquire the correct information? (How to judge the effectiveness of your error correction?)

B. Situations for Error Correction (SEC) Simulation

Situations for Error Correction (SEC) Simulation

A. Introduction

The SEC Simulation aims to identify how and why language teachers correct L2 learners' errors Situations for Error Correction (SEC) Simulation consists of 20 situations that English language teachers may encounter in any language teaching context. Each of these situations involves an erroneous utterance or a written/oral text including an error.

B. Instructions

1. Erroneous utterances or sentences including an error in the situations are written in bold.

2. Above each situation, age and level variables of the classroom are provided.

3. Some options (the language components, focus of the activity) about the nature of the errors are given for each situation on the right. You are asked to identify those by circling the language component and activity type. You can circle more than one item where applicable.

4. There is a space provided below each situation. In this part, you are asked to explain how and why you correct the error(s).

C. Demography

- Age: 20-22 ( ), 23-25 ( ), 26- older ( )

- Gender: F ( ), M ( )

- GPA (Please provide the overall score): 2.00-2.50 ( )
  2.50-3.00 ( )
  3.00-3.50 ( )
  3.50-4.00 ( )

Read the situations below with the following questions in mind: 1. What kind of error is that? (Circle the language component or activity type in the boxes given on the right. You can circle more than one item where applicable). 2. How and why would you correct the mistake(s). (Please write down your response to the space provided below each situation.)	**Grammar**	**Vocabulary**	**Pronunciation**	**Fluency**	**Accuracy**
Age: young learner **Level:** Elementary **1.** You are doing a warm-up activity with your class, asking them about their grandparents. One student tells the class **"My grandmother is seventeen and three".**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: young learner **Level:** pre-intermediate **2.** You have just introduced "his" and "hers" for the first time. You have collected some items belonging to your class on your desk. You ask, picking up some keys "Whose pencils are these?" A student answers, pointing at the owner of the pencils **"They're him."**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adolescence **Level:** intermediate **3.** Your class is doing an information gap activity in pairs in your speaking class. As you walk around the class and listen to them, you hear that most students cannot pronounce the words **'really'** and **'grateful'** correctly.	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adults **Level:** intermediate **4.** Your class is working in pairs doing a speaking activity. One student is asking the other to go out for the evening. A student says **"I want go to a Chinese restaurant".**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adolescence **Level:** intermediate **5.** You are doing a speaking activity. You give them some pictures to make up a story. In one of the pictures, there is a thief. While one of your students tells his story, he always says **"There is a man who steals belongings of other"** instead of the word 'thief'.	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					

Age: young learner **Level:** elementary **6.** Your class is working in pairs. While you are walking around the class, you hear that one of your students use the word **'positive'** incorrectly.	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adolescence **Level:** intermediate **7.** Your class is working in groups, discussing magic events you've talked about. One of your students says **'angle'** intending 'angel'.	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adults **Level:** intermediate **8.** Your class is working in pairs. One of your students says to his partner **"Can I lend your pen?"** meaning "Can I borrow your pen?"	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: young learner **Level:** intermediate **9.** You want your students to ask questions about you in turn. One of the students says **"What age are you?"**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adolescence **Level:** pre-intermediate **10.** Your class is working in groups, creating a typical day at their ideal school. A learner says **"I liking Maths and English best".**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: young learner **Level:** pre-intermediate **11.** You have revised simple past tense. Then, you want them to work in pairs and ask questions to each other. One of the students asks her partner **"When did you went to the market?"**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adults **Level:** upper-intermediate **12.** Your students are doing a role-play activity in your drama class. One of your students always mispronounces the word **'occur'.**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC

How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adults **Level:** upper-intermediate **13.** You give some situations to your students and want them to say how they feel. One of your students says **"I feel excited"** meaning "I feel anxious".	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adolescence **Level:** pre-intermediate **14.** You are doing a warm-up activity. You ask your students how they feel today. One of them says **"I am tiring".**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adults **Level:** upper-intermediate **15.** You want your students to describe one of their classmates and the others to find out who she/he is. One of your students says **"Despite of he speaks seldom, he says meaningful words".**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adolescence **Level:** upper-intermediate **16.** You are doing a drama activity. You give your students some role-cards. On their role-cards, event, setting and features of characters of the activity are written but you don't write what they say. One of the students is a secretary and she puts through one of the partner of her manager. She wants the telephone to wait and says **"Hold on a minute, will you?"**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adolescence **Level:** intermediate **17.** You are doing a post-activity of a reading text. You ask your students whether they have a car accident. One of the students wants to tell his experience. He starts saying **"The road wasn't large enough for two cars."**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adults **Level:** upper-intermediate **18.** You have just focused on changes in meaning of a question tag depending on how you say it. Then, you give your students a dialogue and want them to read it aloud paying attention to its meaning and use rising/falling intonation correctly. One of the students use rising intonation while he is supposed to use falling intonation.	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC

How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adolescence **Level:** upper-intermediate **19.** You and your students have talked about General American Pronunciation and Received Pronunciation. You want them to prepare a short talk and be careful while they are talking. While they are talking, you realized that most of your students mispronounce initial and medial /r/ sound.	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					
Age: adolescence **Level:** intermediate **20.** You have focused on some vocabulary items. Then, you give a story to your students. In the story, there are some blank parts that the students fill in using the words they've just learned while they are telling the story. One of them cannot use the word 'mood' correctly and says **"The streets were very crowded and had a holiday mood".**	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
How and Why to Correct it?					