EXPLORING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BELIEFS AND PRACTICES OF INSTRUCTORS ABOUT ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN EFL CLASSES: A CASE STUDY FROM TURKEY

Case Study

Pınar Kır

Kocaeli University

pnrkartal@gmail.com

Pınar Kır is an M.A. student in English Language Teaching and also an English Instructor at FSM Vakıf University. Her research interests include corrective feedback and teacher education.

EXPLORING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BELIEFS AND PRACTICES OF INSTRUCTORS ABOUT ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN EFL CLASSES: A CASE STUDY FROM TURKEY

Pınar Kır

pnrkartal@gmail.com

Abstract

Although many studies were conducted on stated beliefs and observed practices of oral corrective feedback (OCF) in language classes, relatively little is known about the actual relationship between them. Therefore, this study focused on the relationship between the teachers' stated beliefs and observed practices of oral corrective feedback (OCF) to explore how beliefs and practices interact. The participants of the study were four Turkish EFL instructors coming from English Language Teaching (ELT) and Translation and Interpreting Studies. The data were collected through a questionnaire, classroom observations, and interviews. The results showed that the participants' stated beliefs and observed practices held some inconsistencies. These inconsistencies were explained by different factors stated by the participants during the stimulated recall sessions. The content knowledge of OCF and the proceduralization of this knowledge have been found to be the indicators of this inconsistency. In addition to highlighting these different factors on the study of OCF, this study presents the insights for the integration of OCF in EFL classes.

Keywords: teacher cognition, oral corrective feedback, EFL

1. Introduction

Oral corrective feedback has become one of the most disputable topics of current teaching methodologies. The type of feedback, the mode of feedback, proficiency level of students, teachers' educational background, feedback setting, attitudes towards feedback, the timing of feedback and length of feedback are the most investigated sub-topics of OCF. Nearly most of the scholars elaborate on the effectiveness of OCF (e.g. Mackey & Goo, 2007; Russell & Spada, 2006). Some scholars have conducted much research on the subject to offer positive evidence for OCF. In their research, Ammar and Spada (2006) reported that the learners who were provided OCF performed better than those who did not. Along with these proponents, some researchers (e.g. Carroll, 1997) accept L2 learning as the same process with L1 acquisition while others (Russell & Spada, 2006) highly recommend OCF in language classes and claim that it has considerable amount of contribution to the interlanguage development.

With the publication of six corrective feedback types (explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition) by Lyster and Ranta (1997), the foci of OCF studies have moved to the types of OCF. All features of OCF such as feedback type (Kamiya, 2014; Mori, 2002), timing of feedback (Basturkmen et al., 2004), length of treatment and interlocutor type (Dong, 2012) have been examined in studies. In one of these studies, Li's (2010) meta-analysis grouped interlocutors into three broad types: a teacher, a native speaker, and a computer. In most research, literature has focused on teachers as the most prevalent feedback provider since they are the most common interlocutors. Several attempts have been made to clarify what type of feedback they use and their beliefs of OCF are.

The global economy requires more people in the expanding circle of English to learn English, hence the need for more English teachers. With the increasing demand of English teachers, the profile of English teachers has changed and broadened. Native speaker (NEST) or non-native speaker (NNEST), experienced or novice, and ELT graduate or non-ELT graduate teachers have become primary concerns in teacher profiles. In a considerable amount of studies, the dichotomy of NEST vs. NNEST and novice vs. experienced teacher has become a central issue in OCF analysis. However, the effect of different educational backgrounds (ELT vs. non-ELT) has been ignored. To fill this gap, this study investigates the relationship between teachers' knowledge of OCF and their use of OCF observing their use of OCF in pre-intermediate preparatory classes at a foundation university context in Turkey.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Definition and Types of OCF

Lightbown and Spada (2006) define corrective feedback as any feedback indicating to learners that their output is incorrect. Along with this definition Ellis (2009) describes OCF as any kind of response to student's wrong utterances. In their study, Su and Tian (2016) identify four different constructs of OCF: the provider of feedback (teacher, classmate and a competent person in the target language), the receiver of feedback (learner), the purpose of feedback (to reinforce language teaching) and the type of corrective feedback (depends upon teachers' perception and needs of the learner) (Su & Tian, 2016).

Lyster and Ranta (1997) claim that only comprehensible input is not adequate in language classes and students should be provided with negative evidence based on their observations in French immersion programs in Canada. Therefore, they grouped six different oral corrective feedback types for SLA classes: explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition.

2.1.1. Explicit Correction

It states the learner's mistake explicitly and provides the correct utterance. For instance,

Learner: In Tuesday.

Teacher: Not in Tuesday, on Tuesday. We should say "I will come on Tuesday."

2.1.2. Recast

It refers to reformulate the wrong utterance of the learner indicating that learner's utterance was incorrect without explaining it. For instance,

T: I didn't see you yesterday. Why didn't you come?

L: sick.

T: Ohh, you were sick yesterday.

2.1.3. Clarification Request

It tries to clarify the utterance of the learner with a question or a phrase. For instance,

L: I came go.

T: What?

2.1.4. Metalinguistic Feedback

It proposes a short metalinguistic explanation for learner's wrong utterance. For instance,

L: I eated chicken yesterday.

T: Eat is an irregular verb.

2.1.5. Elicitation

It leads the learner to correct their own mistake by prompting them. For instance,

L: I will come, if I will finish my homework.

T: I will come, if I……………?

2.1.6. Repetition

It repeats the wrong form of the learner with intonation. For instance,

L: She drink milk every day.

T: She DRINK milk every day.

2.2. Research on Teacher Beliefs of OCF

Over the past two decades, a lot of research has been conducted to identify the effects of OCF in EFL (Olmezer-Ozturk, 2016; Roothooft, 2014) and ESL (Kamiya, 2014; Mori, 2002) context. In the light of these studies, many researchers (Russel & Spada, 2006; Li, 2010; Lyster &Saito, 2010) indicated the benefit of correcting a wrong utterance or implying a mistake in language classes. They assert that using six OCF types in the classroom develops speaking abilities of learners. Also, Lyster et al. (2013) propose oral OCF as a facilitator reinforcing oral skills for the target linguistic form in the input. According to the study of Mendez and Cruz (2012), conducted on 45 university instructors, 80 % of instructors advocate the positive effect of oral OCF in the classroom, and Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2018) claim that not all OCF types facilitate student learning in the short run, but they are helpful in the long run.

To have an in-depth investigation of the types of OCF used in the classroom, some studies have been carried out (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013; Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004; Dong, 2012). Regarding these studies, it was concluded that most of the teachers prefer using various corrective feedback types in their classes. As regards a considerable amount of research, recast was found to be the most common OCF among the other types and it was assumed to help improve L2 use (Lyster & Mori, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). To observe its long-lasting effects Long, Inagaki and Ortega (1998); and Mackey and Philp (1998) conducted research both in laboratory and classroom contexts. As a consequence of these studies, not all results supported the positive impact of recast in classes although recast was found to be the most commonly used OCF by teachers. Some of the findings maintained the benefits of recast referring to its practical application in the classroom as it saves time. However, others (Lyster, 2002; Li, 2014) rejected recast claiming that it is not obvious in lower levels and students do not prefer it since it does not integrate them into the learning process as much as elicitation and clarification request do. Yoshida (2010) emphasizes that teachers are aware of recast's ineffectiveness, but they use it because it prevents fear among students.

Whilst many of the studies have been carried out types of OCF, only few studies have investigated other types of OCF apart from recast. With regard to this limited literature, some studies approved the positive beliefs of teachers towards elicitation. They claimed that elicitation increases participation of students, especially in lower levels. However, Ammar and Spada (2006) stated that elicitation is not helpful for beginners, but it is more beneficial for advanced learners. Also, Lochtman's study (2002), conducted in the classroom context, found out that metalinguistic feedback and elicitation have 98% of success rate in language classes.

2.3. Background to the Study

A number of studies have examined teachers' belief of OCF and found out different beliefs of OCF. With the recent trend of classroom research, the classroom practices of teachers started to be observed. The findings of the classroom research have reported a dichotomy of a consistency between beliefs and practices (Kamiya, 2014) and an inconsistency between stated beliefs and observed practices of teachers on OCF (Karavas-Doukas, 1996; Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004; Farrell & Lim, 2005). Based on preliminary research exploring the inconsistency, various perspectives have been addressed: native or non-native status, novice or experienced teacher dichotomy and educational backgrounds of teachers.

Native and non-native status is a highly disputed topic regarding OCF. However, this difference was not analyzed in Turkish EFL setting commonly. Demir and Ozmen (2017) observed seven native and non-native English teachers in Turkey and concluded that these teachers have salient differences regarding their tolerance of feedback, timing and amount of feedback and type of feedback.

Another dichotomy mentioned in studies is experienced vs. novice teachers' OCF use. The results of a great amount of research indicated that novice teachers have more inconsistencies between their OCF beliefs and practices (Basturkmen, Loewen & Ellis, 2004). Oakeshott (1962) attributes that lack of inconsistency to the proceduralization of knowledge developing with the experience. Another research by Kamiya (2014) supports the claim with her findings that inconsistency between teachers' stated beliefs and classroom practices decreases while teaching experience increases. On the other hand, Pouriran and Mukundan (2012) refuted those findings with their research on the frequency of oral OCF among experienced and novice teachers in EFL setting. According to their results, the use of oral corrective feedback among experienced teachers was more frequent compared to novice teachers.

The effect of teacher education on OCF has been investigated in few studies (Kagan, 1992; Richardson, 1996; Freeman & Richards, 1996). Their educational background was examined under the title of individual differences (Mackey, Polio & McDonough, 2004).

As summarized in the literature review part, there is an inconsistency between what teachers believe and do in the class regarding oral corrective feedback. As the reasons for this inconsistency, native vs. non-native status, novice- experienced teacher dichotomy and educational background of teachers were emphasized. However, the relationship between teachers' knowledge of OCF and how they provide corrective feedback has not been studied in the Turkish EFL context. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct further research to understand the reasons for the preference of different OCF types by EFL teachers from different educational background in Turkey. To address this gap in previous research, the relationship between teachers' perception of oral OCF and their educational backgrounds was searched observing their use of corrective feedback in Turkish EFL setting.

The following research questions were examined in the present study:

1. What are the corrective feedback beliefs of the participant EFL instructors?

2. What kind of corrective feedback do the participant EFL instructors integrate into their classes?

3. Is there an inconsistency between their stated beliefs and observed practices in terms of OCF?

4. What are the factors that lead to inconsistency between participants' stated beliefs and observed practices?

3.Method

This study uses qualitative approach including an observation, the following questionnaire, and a stimulated recall session to gain insights to OCF beliefs and practices of teachers.

3.1. Participants

Four non-native English instructors with L1 Turkish from a foundation university volunteered to participate in this research. Based on their educational backgrounds, the teachers were divided into two categories: (a) instructors who are both BA graduates and MA students currently in Translation and Interpreting Studies Department of a public university in Turkey (b) instructors who are both BA graduates and MA students currently in English Language Teaching Department of a public university in Turkey. One of the Group A teachers did not attend any English language teaching courses at institutes or university, and one of them took a course for language teaching while group B teachers completed all of English Language Teaching Must Courses during their university education. . Teachers from translation studies department were one male and one female having three years of teaching experience. Teachers from the English Language Teaching Department were females having teaching experience from 1 to 2 years. The average of ages in Group A ranges from 28 to 30. The average of ages in Group B ranges from 22 to 24. Criteria for selecting subjects were to determine whether there is an effect of the departmental difference on the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish preparatory class setting. There were 19 students in each class and all students were aged between 17 and 20. Pre-intermediate classes were chosen to observe for their need to be corrected because of their lack of vocabulary and grammar knowledge at this level.

Table 1. *The categories of participants*

	B.A.	M.A	Certificates	Experience
Ali	Trans.and Interp. Studies	Trans.and Interp. Studies	Yes	3 years
Ebru	Trans.and Interp. Studies	Trans.and Interp. Studies	No	3 years
Öykü	English Lang. Teach.	English Lang. Teach.	Yes	2 years
Pelin	English Lang. Teach.	English Lang. Teach.	Yes	1 year

3.2. Instrumentation

For the observation part, the class was in its natural setting. New Success Pre-intermediate student book was the course book, and grammatical forms and vocabulary covered in the lessons were coherent with the book. The lessons were voice-recorded with a tape-recorder to capture teacher and student voices.

The questionnaire was an adapted version of Yuksel (2018, unpublished). (See Appendix). It aimed to define instructors' stated beliefs about oral corrective feedback and the type of oral corrective feedback they use in the class. The questionnaire included items in figuring out what type of OCF the participants would use to correct student mistakes in the classroom. In stimulated recall part, the oral corrective feedback types that instructors used in the natural classroom setting were used to gain insights to reasons of the selection.

3.3. Procedures

The current study includes three main parts: an observation, a questionnaire, and an interview. The data was collected from four instructors from the Foreign Languages School of a private university in one of the major cities of Turkey. Before the study, the required permissions from the institution and the participants were obtained. Foreign Language Schools provide one year of English education in English-medium universities. In this university, there are four levels: elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate and upper-intermediate and students are categorized by their English level tested by Proficiency Exam at the end of each module. Majors of the students are not taken into consideration in class formation. Four skills are integrated into the classrooms and students are responsible for each of these skills in Proficiency exam. The classes are divided into two: main course classes including speaking, listening and reading skills, and writing classes. Each level is taught 19 hours of main course and 6 hours writing classes. To have consistency, instructors were observed during the main course classes. Teachers were not told that the aim of the study was to observe OCF, because this would change teachers' OCF preference. As each level followed the same pacing schedule, the topics, vocabulary and grammar points were the same in all classes. In order to carry out the study, each instructor was observed for 1 slot (45 minutes) during the same week. Immediate after the observation teachers were provided with a questionnaire to identify their corrective feedback beliefs. To prevent the biases of research and priming, the questionnaire was given after observation. Participant did not get any information about the research before observation. At the end of each day, teachers were interviewed by the researcher in stimulated recall session to investigate them why they had applied such correction strategies in their classes. To reduce common pitfalls of time the Stimulated Recall interviews were carried out immediately after the observation (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

3.3.1. Research Setting

English Language Teaching has two different settings: EFL (English as a Foreign Language) and ESL (English as a Second Language). In the EFL setting, students do not learn the language as a way of communication in their linguistic community (e.g., an L1Turkish speaker learning English in Turkey). In the ESL setting, students learn the language as the way communication in their linguistic community (e.g., an L1 Turkish speaker learning English in England). According to Li (2010), the research setting determines the type of feedback used in the classroom. Loewen et al. supported this idea with the research conducted among SL and FL learners, and he concluded that FL context is more appropriate for language correction and corrective feedback (Loewen et al., 2009). In the present study, students learn English in the EFL setting. They are all Turkish students who live in Turkey where English is taught as a foreign language.

3.3.2. Research Context

Research in the area of feedback has been conducted both in laboratories and classrooms. Li (2010) states that laboratory context is freer from distracters and does not leave a space for corrective feedback. On the other side, classroom context is a better place for natural observation of the use of corrective feedback types. In the current study, pre-intermediate classroom context was used to be able to observe the classroom interventions.

3.3.3. Educational Background

ELT graduates are teachers who got their degrees from the English Language Teaching Departments of Education Faculties of universities in Turkey. They all successfully completed L1 and L2 Acquisition in Adults and Young Learners, Current Teaching

Methodologies in SLA and Micro-Macro Teaching Courses. Non-ELT graduates are teachers who got their degrees from Translation and Interpreting Studies, Linguistics, English Language and Literature, American Language and Literature Departments of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. They do not get any formal teaching education courses.

3.4. Data Analysis

The analysis of data includes the analysis of questionnaire results, coding observation results (transcription of observation data and determining OCF types), coding stimulated recall memos and theorizing (interpreting data and drawing conclusions). The data were analyzed regarding the taxonomy of OCF (explained below) and cross-checked by a colleague with M.A. degree in ELT and suggested in the current literature part on OCF (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). Questionnaire items were coded according to Lyster and Ranta(1997) taxonomy. (An example of item analysis criterion was provided below.) The results of the questionnaire were given in numbers and percentage. For the stimulated recall and observed data results, thematic analysis was used. Braun and Clarke (2006) define thematic analysis as the method that analyses and describes the elements inside the data in qualitative studies.

Example 1:

Teacher: What did you do at home last night?

Student: I goed home late so I couldn't do much.

A) Teacher: No, not goed, went. (Explicit Correction)

B) Teacher: You went home late? Why? What did you do? (Recast)

C) Teacher: I am sorry? (Clarification Request)

D) Teacher: You need to use the past form of the verb (Metalinguistic Feedback)

E) Teacher: You… (pausing)? (rising intonation) (Elicitation)

F) Teacher: I GOED home late. (stressing the mistake, with rising intonation)(Repetition)

4. Results

4.1. Pelin

Table 2. *Amount and types of oral corrective feedback stated in the questionnaire and observed in the lesson*

	Stated Belief		Observed Practice	
	Nr of OCF	% of OCF	Nr of OCF	% of OCF
Repetition	2	20%	0	0%
Metalinguistic Feedback	3	30%	1	3%
Recast	3	30%	14	45%
Elicitation	2	20%	8	26%
Clarification Request	0	0%	2	7%
Explicit Correction	0	0%	6	19%

According to questionnaire results, she mostly prefers metalinguistic feedback (30%) and recast (30%). Repetition (20%) and elicitation (20%) are the second most used OCF though their numbers are less than previously mentioned ones. She does not favor clarification request and explicit correction. When her observed practice is examined, recast (45%) and elicitation (26%) are the mostly used OCF in her class which does not contradict with her stated belief. However, metalinguistic feedback (3%) is the least used OCF in her observed class although it is the most preferred one in the questionnaire. What is more, she chooses repetition more than one time in her stated belief; still, there is no place for repetition in her observed practice. Furthermore, she uses explicit correction and clarification request although she does not prefer them in her stated belief.

When Pelin was asked about her corrective feedback decisions for grammar mistakes during stimulated recall session, she stated that they are generally quick decisions and she was unable to notice why she used that specific OCF type. Although she explained that she generally prefers explicit OCF for grammar mistakes due to students' expectations and needs, this statement was not consistent with her observed data results.

Her common OCF was for pronunciation mistakes and recast was the mostly used OCF type for these mistakes. When she was asked about that, she stated she knows recast is not useful in the classroom and explicit feedback is more effective than implicit, yet she still uses it without realizing. She described recast as her pitfall likening recast to spoon-feeding, but she defended her action stating there are many problematic sounds like –th in English for Turkish students. As she teaches in EFL context, she feels that she needs to correct pronunciation mistakes arising from these problematic sounds that will lead to vocabulary misunderstanding as she was the only source for her students. Her students are not prone to check their correct pronunciations, so she is trying to raise awareness of these different sounds without losing time and uses recast. Also, as she had a professor at the university who was sensitive about phonetics and phonology she feels responsible for correcting her students' pronunciation mistakes since this is the way she was taught. When she was asked other forms of OCF, she does not change her feedback choice.

She explains her OCF was affected by her English Language Teaching Education. With the help of the lessons that she took during her education, she knows the specific names of OCF types emphasizing the studies about the effectiveness of them. When she was asked the substitutive types, she could easily find other OCF, yet she chose to keep the ones that she provided in the class as they were more convenient at that time.

Example 1:

S: Do you know this object?

T: Television. (Wrong pronunciation, they are very similar in L1 and L2)

T: So?

S: Television. (Correct Pronunciation)

The teacher's recall:

"They are cognates, and they sometimes create big problems, I try to make them aware of these cognates with elicitation."

4.2. Öykü

Table 3. *Amount and types of oral corrective feedback stated in the questionnaire and observed in the lesson*

| | Stated Belief | | Observed Practice | |
	Nr of OCF	% of OCF	Nr of OCF	% of OCF
Repetition	3	30%	3	20%
Metalinguistic Feedback	4	40%	0	0%
Recast	2	20%	6	40%
Elicitation	0	0%	2	13%
Clarification Request	0	0%	1	7%
Explicit Correction	1	10%	3	20%

In her questionnaire results, metalinguistic feedback (40%), repetition (30%), recast (20%) and explicit correction (10%) are the chosen OCF types. She did not prefer elicitation and clarification request in her stated belief. However, recast (40%) was the mostly used OCF in her observed practice, and she never mentioned metalinguistic feedback. Repetition (20%), explicit correction (20%), elicitation (13%) and clarification request (13%) were observed in the classroom. Although metalinguistic feedback was the most preferred OCF in her stated belief, she never used it in her observed practice. Furthermore, she used clarification request and elicitation which were not selected in the questionnaire.

She did not correct every mistake in the classroom environment. As the reason for it, she stated that she corrects the oral communication mistakes that will lead to a huge communication problem. During her lesson, she gave OCF to the whole class instead of giving to every student one by one during pair work. She believes giving whole class feedback is more effective than giving one by one feedback while monitoring their frequent mistakes.

She used recast to correct all of the pronunciation mistakes. When she was asked about she affirmed that she does it by purpose. With high intonation, she indicates that there is something wrong in student's utterance without losing time. Also, she used clarification request in one of the pronunciation, and she explained that she does not want to offend students with the direct answer and tries to do it more funnily. However, she indicated that she does not use recast for grammar mistakes instead she emphasizes explicit feedback types like metalinguistic feedback which is inconsistent with her observed practice but consisted with her stated belief. When she was showed the example of a recast for grammar mistake from her teaching, she explained that she was not teaching grammar in that point and the topic was not grammar, so it was not necessary to use explicit correction.

She was familiar with the OCF types from the courses she took during her English Language Teaching Education. In grammar teaching lessons, the type of feedback and their effectiveness on mistake types were taught to her, so she was confident while explaining her OCF choices based on the theories that she learned during these courses. Also, she explained that she knows which OCF will lead to more uptake rate, so she tries to use these OCF types in her class.

Example 1:

S: Frozen.

T: Frozen! (rising intonation)

S: Freezer.

The teacher's recall:

"The mistake was very obvious and easy to notice for the student, and I used implicit feedback type here."

Example 2:

S: They are keep on eating vegetables.

T: They keep on vegetables. (Recast for a grammar mistake)

The teacher's recall:

"Because we were focusing on speaking here and the topic was not related to grammar. We were talking about our different diets. I mean it wasn't necessary to use it."

4.3. Ebru

Table 4. *Amount and types of oral corrective feedback stated in the questionnaire and observed in the lesson*

| | Stated Belief | | Observed Practice | |
	Nr of OCF	% of OCF	Nr of OCF	% of OCF
Repetition	3	30%	3	27%
Metalinguistic Feedback	0	0%	0	0%
Recast	2	20%	1	9%
Elicitation	5	50%	5	46%
Clarification Request	0	0%	0	0%
Explicit Correction	0	0%	2	18%

She was the most consistent teacher with her OCF choices both in her stated beliefs and observed practices despite her lack of language teaching education. Elicitation (50%) has the greatest per cent and respectively repetition (30%) and recast (20%). She did not select metalinguistic feedback, clarification request and explicit correction in the questionnaire. In line with the occurrence frequency of her stated beliefs, elicitation (46%) is the first mostly used OCF type and repetition (27%) is the second most used in her observed practice. Only contrast between her stated belief and observed practice is the use of explicit correction. Although she never preferred explicit correction in her stated belief, she used it in her observed practice.

When she was asked about her OCF choices, she explained the reason for using elicitation by referring to her previous lessons. As students learned the correct utterance before, she makes them remember their previous knowledge. Recast was used only for new vocabulary.

She does not know specific names and differences of OCF types and she did not take a special education about them. Nonetheless, she benefits from her own earlier learning

experience. She selects her feedbacks regarding her previous expectations from her teachers about OCF. Also, she asserted that her teaching experience shaped her OCF strategies.

4.4. Ali

Table 5. *Amount and types of oral corrective feedback stated in the questionnaire and observed in the lesson*

| | Stated Belief | | Observed Practice | |
	Nr of OCF	% of OCF	Nr of OCF	% of OCF
Repetition	0	0%	1	8%
Metalinguistic Feedback	0	0%	0	0%
Recast	3	30%	9	69%
Elicitation	6	60%	0	0%
Clarification Request	0	0%	3	23%
Explicit Correction	1	10%	0	0%

Elicitation (60%), recast (30%) and explicit correction (10%) are the mostly selected OCF types in his questionnaire. He did not prefer repetition, metalinguistic feedback and clarification request. Still, when we look at his observed practice, his most common OCF is recast (69%). Clarification request (23%) and repetition (8%) follow recast. In contrast to his stated belief, he never used elicitation or explicit correction in his observed practice, and he used clarification request in his observed practice although he did not choose it in his stated belief.

If he is aware of that student knows the correct answer, he uses repetition to make them understand their mistake. Yet, if students do not know the answer he prefers recast not to waste time. In his lesson, clarification request was common. When it was asked, he explained that he used it by purpose because students were learning clarification request utterances at that time. Due to that, he wanted to emphasize them by using these questions in his OCF types.

For pronunciation mistakes, he uses recast over and over again as he believes that they will learn when he emphasizes the mistakes every time. However, he ignores some of the students' mistakes since students' will be embarrassed and start to think about making a mistake during their conversation which decreases their fluency.

Example 1:

S: I goes to seminar.

T: You went to a seminar.

Teacher's recall:

"Actually, I waited here, but she was not aware of her mistake. I just say it, then she was aware of her mistake."

4.5. The Teachers' Stated Beliefs and Observed Practices of OCF

Table 6. *Amount and types of oral corrective feedback stated in the questionnaire and observed in the lesson*

	Stated Beliefs						Observed Practice					
	Expl Cor	Rep	Metal Feedb	Recast	Clari Requ	Elici	Expl Cor	Rep	Metal Feedb	Recast	Clari Requ	Elici
Ali	1	0	0	3	0	6	0	1	0	9	3	0
Ebru	0	3	0	2	0	5	2	3	0	1	0	5
Öykü	1	3	4	2	0	0	3	3	0	6	1	2
Pelin	0	2	3	3	0	2	6	0	1	14	2	8

Regarding the current data, three teachers (Ali, Ebru, and Öykü) had the nearly same amount (11) of OCF in their classes while Pelin had two times more OCF. They all believe the effectiveness of feedback: Ali (70%), Pelin (75%), Ebru (90%) and Öykü (90%). All of them have inconsistent data regarding their stated beliefs and observed practices. In ELT group teachers, metalinguistic feedback is the commonly selected OCF in stated beliefs, while in practice they used recast and elicitation. For example, Pelin chose commonly recast and metalinguistic feedback in the questionnaire, but she did not use metalinguistic feedback in her class. Öykü preferred metalinguistic feedback in the questionnaire, yet she used recast mostly in the class. Between translation studies teachers, elicitation was the most elected OCF in their stated beliefs. However, they had different practices in their classrooms; Ali used recast while Ebru chose elicitation. Although Ebru had one inconsistent item in her data, against she is the teacher that had the most consistent stated belief and observed practice data concerning their number.

Regarding their stimulated recall data, all of them seemed to have formed their own beliefs of OCF and applied them into their classes. The only difference between translation and ELT graduates was the knowledge of OCF types. While ELT graduates knew the effectiveness of OCF types, the translation studies graduates were not aware of their functions. Nonetheless, when we look at their practices, in both groups there were inconsistencies in terms of their beliefs and practices.

Regarding the numbers of OCF, Pelin who is less experienced than other teachers had twice more OCF. This situation may be attributed to the proceduralization of knowledge (Oakeshott, 1962). However, the experience could not be counted as the differentiating variable for the inconsistency of stated belief and observed practice as all teachers with different experiences have inconsistency between their beliefs and practices in the present study.

Recast was the most frequent OCF type their observed data. Ali, Öykü and Pelin indicated that they prefer recast to correct pronunciation mistakes. Also, Öykü and Pelin (ELT graduates) stated that they prefer explicit OCF for grammar mistakes, but this explanation was not coherent with their practice. Ali and Ebru (non-ELT graduates) matched recast to present new knowledge to save time.

5. Discussion

The current study indicates inconsistency related to the participants' stated beliefs and observed practices contrary to previous studies that pointed out consistencies between stated

beliefs and classroom practices of OCF among EFL teachers (e.g., Kamiya, 2014). 2 ELT graduates and 1 Translation Studies graduate with a pedagogical certificate had more significant inconsistencies, while 1 Translation studies graduate had relatively more consistent data. This situation implied one possibility regarding their educational backgrounds. Teachers who have knowledge about OCF were aware of the effectiveness of OCF types and knew how they should correct the specific student mistake, so they could monitor their knowledge and choose the most applicable feedback types since they had enough time to monitor their OCF knowledge during the questionnaire. Nonetheless, in the classroom practice as they do not have enough time they could not apply their knowledge to their teaching behaviors and use the most common OCF type(recast) in line with the findings of Lyster and Ranta, 1997. On the other hand, one participant from Translation Studies was not knowledgeable about the OCF taxonomy of Lyster and Ranta (1997) or the effect of OCF types, but her observed and stated beliefs were entirely consistent. The reason for it may be attributed to her lack of knowledge of different types of OCF. Therefore, she preferred the same OCF in the questionnaire as the one that she used in the class. The only input for her choice of OCF was her previous learning experiences. The result can be related to her own learning experience. This study supports the hypotheses that there cannot be a perfect match between teachers' stated beliefs and observed practices of OCF (Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004). Novice-experienced teacher differentiation was not found applicable in terms of stated belief and observed practice inconsistency. It was just logical the number of OCF provided by the less experienced teacher.

5.1. Limitations

The present research has some limitations regarding the methodologies and research design. The author could collect the data just for one lesson due to time restriction of school rules, but it would be more useful to collect longitudinal data as the relationship between stated beliefs and observed practices can change. The author needed to listen to the recorded tapes of each observed lesson before the stimulated recall sessions, so it was not possible to carry out the interviews immediately after class. Due to this, stimulated recall sessions had to be conducted the next day of the observation, which did not cause any retrieval problem and participants could remember what they had been thinking about during OCF episodes.

Regarding the data analysis, as all studies including self-reported data inevitably do, the analysis needed my assumptions. The research design of stimulated recall sessions, as well as the audio recording of the classes, resulted in a small number of voluntary participants and lessons. Although the objective of the present study is not to generalize the results, teachers' OCF beliefs and practices will definitely need to be further explored in more participant numbers with a longitudinal design with the immediate stimulated recall.

Despite the above limitations, the present study had significant findings concerning the inconsistency between teachers' OCF beliefs and practices. The data were collected with multiple methodologies: classroom observation, audio-recording of the classes, questionnaire and stimulated recall sessions with the teachers. The data of audio-recording and the teachers' retrievals in their stimulated recall sessions were carefully analyzed benefiting from the detailed notes of the classroom observation, referring to the contexts in which OCF occurred.

Interpretation of the data was repeatedly reviewed during the process of data analysis and changed when necessary. Consequently, the combination of audio recording the classes with the retrospective method and teacher questionnaires provided more useful data for more in-depth analysis of the inconsistency between teachers' stated OCF beliefs and observed practices and their reasons.

6.Conclusion

Stimulated Recall Sessions were fruitful and longer with English Language Teaching graduates as they have the knowledge of OCF to be able to discuss and explain. Their data were rich in terms of the contribution to the study results. They could name all OCF types and indicate what kind of OCF was helpful for the specific mistakes in the classroom. Nonetheless, their education was not indicative in their classroom practices. Although they have the knowledge of OCF stated in the questionnaire and stimulated recall sessions, they could not apply this knowledge into the classroom. This inconsistency can be explained with the proceduralization of knowledge of the teachers (Oakeshott, 1962). As they have the knowledge of OCF, they try to apply their knowledge into their practices, but they are still in the process of internalization of OCF knowledge. However, one participant from Translation and Interpreting Studies could not attach to the conversation during the stimulated recall session as she did not have a full command of OCF terminology. She could not explain the reasons of her OCF choices and attributed them to her previous learning experiences.

Finally, the present study showed the inconsistency between stated beliefs and observed practices of OCF regarding teachers' educational backgrounds. The researcher sincerely hopes that the current study contributes to the area.

References

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*, 543–574. doi:10.1017/S0272263106060268

Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *System, 40*(2), 282-295. Retrieved from https://www.journals.elsevier.com/system

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Carroll, S. (1997). On the irrelevance of verbal feedback to language learning. In L. Eubank, L. Selinker, & M. Sharwood-Smith (Eds.) *The Current State of Interlanguage* (pp.73-78). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Demir, Y., & Özmen, S. K. (2017). Exploring native and non-native EFL teachers' oral corrective feedback practices: An observational study. *Brock Education Journal, 26*(2), 111-129. Retrieved from https://secure3.ed.brocku.ca/brocked/vol-26-no-2-2016/

Dong, Z. (2012). Beliefs and practices: A case study on oral corrective feedback in teaching Chinese as a foreign language (TCFL) classroom. MA, thesis, Arizona State University, US.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, *1*, 3-18. doi: 10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054

Farrell, T. S., & Lim, P. C. P. (2005). Conceptions of grammar teaching: A case study of teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. *Tesl-Ej, 9*(2), 1–13. doi:10.1177/1362168814541722

Freeman, D., & Richards, J. (1996). A look at uncritical stories. In D. Freeman, J. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching* (pp. 1-6). CUP: Cambridge.

Kagan, D. (1992). Implications of research on teachers' beliefs. *Educational Psychologist, 27*, 65-90. doi: 10.1207/s15326985ep2701_6

Kamiya, N. (2014). The relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 10*(3), 206-219. doi: 10.1080/17501229.2014.939656

Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach. *ELT Journal, 50*, 187-198. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ529505

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, S. (2014). Oral corrective feedback. *ELT Journal Volume, 68*(2), 196-198. doi:10.1093/elt/cct076

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages Are Learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University.

Lochtman, K. (2002). Oral corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom: how it affects interaction in analytic foreign language teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37,* 271-283. doi: 10.1016/S0883-0355(03)00005-3

Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). L2 learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal, 93*, 91–104. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00830.x

Long, M., Inagaki, S. and Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal, 82*, 357-37. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb01213.x

Lyster, R. (2002). Negotiation in immersion teacher-student interaction. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37*, 237-253. doi: 10.1016/S0883-0355(03)00003-X

Lyster, R. & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*, 269–300. doi:10.1017/S0272263106060128

Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37–66. doi:10.1017/S0272263197001034

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 265-302. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520

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. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mackey, A. & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction Research in SLA: a meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction and second language acquisition (*pp. 407-453). New York: Oxford University Press.

Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *Modern Language Journal, 82*, 338-356. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb01211.x

Mackey, A., Polio, C. & McDonough, K. (2004). The Relationship between experience, education, and teachers' use of incidental focus-on-form techniques. *Language Teaching Research, 8*(3), 301-327. doi:10.1191/1362168804lr147oa

Mendez, E. H. & Cruz, M. R. R. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile, 14*(2)*,* 63-75. Retrieved from https://revistas.unal.edu.co/index.php/profile

Mori, R. (2002). Teachers' beliefs and corrective feedback. *JALT Journal, 24*(1), 48-70. Retrieved from http://jalt-publications.org/jj/

Oakeshott, M. (1962). *Rationalism in politics and other essays.* London: Methuen.

Olmezer-Ozturk, E. (2019). Beliefs and practices of Turkish EFL teacher regarding oral corrective feedback: A small scale classroom research study. *The Language Learning Journal, 47*(2)*,* 1-10. doi:10.1080/09571736.2016.1263360

Pouriran, Y. & Mukundan, J. (2012). A comparison between experienced and novice teachers in using incidental focus on form techniques in EFL classrooms. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 1*(6), 288-296. Retrieved from http://www.journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/IJALEL/article/view/850

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp.102-119). New York: MacMillan.

Roothooft, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System, 46*(1), 65–79. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2014.07.012

Russell, J. & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research. In J. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.). *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 131–164). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sepehrinia, S. & Mehdizadeh, M. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: teachers' concerns and researchers' orientation. *The Language Learning Journal, 46*(4), 483-500. doi:10.1080/09571736.2016.1172328

Su, T. & Tian, J. (2016). Research on corrective feedback in ESL/EFL classrooms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 6*(2), 439-444. Retrieved from http://www.academypublication.com/ojs/index.php/tpls/article/view/tpls0602439444

Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the

Japanese language classroom? *The Modern Language Learning, 94*(2), 293-314. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01022.x

Yuksel, D. (in press). The effects of instructors' individual differences on the (in)congruence between beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback.