KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY * THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

ELT AND NON-ELT PRE-SERVICE LANGUAGE TEACHERS' STANCE ON ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK PROVISION: A TURKISH CONTEXT

PhD DISSERTATION

Hayrettin KÖROĞLU

FEBRUARY – 2021

TRABZON

KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY * THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

ELT AND NON-ELT PRE-SERVICE LANGUAGE TEACHERS' STANCE ON ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK PROVISION: A TURKISH CONTEXT

PhD DISSERTATION

Hayrettin KÖROĞLU

Thesis Advisor: Prof. Dr. Mustafa Naci KAYAOĞLU

FEBRUARY - 2021

TRABZON

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, **Hayrettin KÖROĞLU**, hereby confirm and certify that;

- I am the sole author of this work and I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution,
- this work contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other university or institution,
- all data and findings in the work have not been falsified or embellished,
- this is a true copy of the work approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Karadeniz Technical University, including final revisions required by them.
- I understand that my work may be electronically checked for plagiarism by the use of plagiarism detection software and stored on a third party‟s server for eventual future comparison,
- I take full responsibility in case of non-compliance with the above statements in respect of this work.

Date 05.02.2021

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The study examined beliefs of pre-service teachers who were in their final term at Ataturk University – Kazım karabekir Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching (ELT) and from Faculty of Letters, Department of English Language and Literature (non-ELT), on oral corrective feedback (hereafter, OCF) provision and their actual practices on the students' errors in the classroom during their practicum classes.

During the data gathering process of this Study, both qualitative and quantitative methods were utilized for triangulation. Firstly, classes of 20 pre-service EFL teachers, who were equally selected from two departments, were observed and recorded during their teacher training classes. Secondly, follow up interviews, which are a qualitative way of data gathering, were held with the 20 pre-service EFL teachers whose classes had been observed. These interviews were conducted either English or Turkish as the participants preferred. Thirdly, the survey, which is a means of quantitative data gathering, was conducted with purposively selected 152 participants, 61 of which were from the Faculty of English Language Teaching Department and 91 of which were from the English Language and Literature Department, in order to examine their stance on OCF provision.

The aims of this Study were to explore pre-service teachers beliefs of the importance of OCF provision, to find out what errors they targeted and how often the participants employed OCF provision, what OCF strategies they preferred to treat students' errors, whether they preferred implicit or explicit OCF strategies. Another aim was to discover whether the participants preferred input providing strategies or output prompter strategies, which allow the learners to interact with teachers and their peers. And, the last aim was to find out whether ELT and non-ELT pre-service teachers differed in terms of their beliefs and practices of OCF provision.

Finally, I would like to thank Prof. Dr. M. Naci KAYAOĞLU, who has been my supervisor and who has assisted, directed, and encouraged me during my doctoral studies, and Assoc. Dr. Ali DİNÇER. This dissertation would not have been completed without their help which I appreciate sincerely.

February 2021 Hayrettin KÖROĞLU

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER THREE

CHAPTER FOUR

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, amaçlı örneklem yöntemiyle seçilen son sınıf İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının sözlü düzeltme geribildirimleri (SDG) hakkındaki görüş ve tutumları ile onların öğretmenlik uygulaması derslerindeki SDG vermeleri incelemiştir. Bu çalışmanın başlıca amacı İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının SDG kullanım sıklığı, öğretmen ile öğrenci ve öğrenci ile öğrenci arsında etkileşim kurmaya imkân tanıyan SDG tekniklerini kullanıp kullanmadıklarını ortaya çıkarmaktı. İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının ifade ettikleri inanç ve tutumları ve onların sınıf içi uygulamaları, hem anketin kullanıldığı nicel araştırma yöntemi hem de ders gözlemleri ve yüz yüze görüşmenin kullanıldığı nitel araştırma metotları sayesinde araştırılmıştır. Atatürk Üniversitesi – Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi, İngilizce Öğretmenliği ve aynı Üniversitenin Edebiyat Fakültesi - İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümlerinde son sınıf okuyan 152 öğrenci anket çalışmasına ve her iki bölümden de eşit sayıda olmak üzere 20 öğrenci sınıf gözlem ile yüz yüze görüşmelere katılmışlardır.

Bu çalışmada, İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının SDG uygulamasının önemi hakkındaki inançları, onların ders esnasında SDG uygulama sıklığı, hangi hata türünü daha çok tercih ettikleri, öğrenci hatalarını daha çok hangi SDG tekniği ile düzelttikleri, hataları dolaylı olarak mı yoksa direkt olarak düzelttikleri, öğrencilere bilgi veren mi yoksa öğrencilerin konuşmalarına imkan sağlayan teknikleri mi kullandıkları, hataları ne zaman düzelttikleri ve hataları kimin düzelttiği araştırılmıştır.

Bu Çalışmanın bulguları, her iki Fakülteden de katılımcı olan öğrencilerin SDG vermenin gerekli ve önemli olduğuna inandıklarını göstermektedir. Sınıf gözlemlerindeki uygulamalarda, İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının, dilbilgisi (%98) ve kelime (%82.8) ile ilgili hataları, telaffuz ve anlam ile ilgili hatalara göre daha çok düzeltme eğiliminde oldukları görülmüştür. Öğretmen adaylarının SDG teknikleri ile ilgili tercihlerine gelince, öğretmen ve öğrenci, ve öğrenci ile öğrenci arasında bir etkileşim kurmaya imkan sağlamayan teknik olan *doğrudan düzeltme* (%92.9) en çok tercih ettikleri teknik olmuştur.

Diğer yandan, İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının sözel düzeltme geribildirimin uygulanması hakkında ifade ettikleri görüş ve düşünceleri ile sınıf içi uygulamaları arasında farklılıklar olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Son olarak eğitim fakültesi öğretmen adayları ile edebiyat fakültesinden olan öğretmen adaylarının sözel düzeltme geribildirim konuları hakkında görüş ve tutumları açısından anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğretmen eğitimi, sözlü düzeltme geribildirim, düşünce, İngilizce öğretmen adayları, etkileşim

ABSTRACT

The study examined a purposively selected sample of pre-service ELT and non-ELT teachers' stance on oral corrective feedback (hereafter, OCF) and their actual practices in the classroom during their practicum classes. The objective of the study was explore the extent of student English teachers' use of OCF strategies and whether they would prefer the OCF types that promote interaction between language teachers and their students, and among their students or not. EFL student teachers' stated beliefs and classroom practices of OCF were explored by means of utilizing a survey and qualitative methods using classroom observations and face to face interviews. ELT and non-ELT pre-service EFL teachers studying in their final years at the Departments of English Language and Literature and English Language Teaching at Ataturk University participated in the survey and twenty of them took part in the both classroom observations and the interviews.

This study examined EFL pre-service teachers' beliefs of importance of OCF provision, amount of their OCF provision in the classroom, preferences for error types to be treated, preferences for OCF types to treat with, preferences between explicit or implicit OCF types, preference between input providing or output prompter OFF types preferences for the timing in order to treat the erroneous productions, and preferences for the sources of OCF provision in general. This study also investigated whether EFL pre-service teachers beliefs differ regarding their ELT or non-ELT status.

The main findings indicate that the participants with both ELT or non-ELT background regard OCF provision to be essential for language progress. As for their practices in the classroom, pre-service EFL teachers found errors related to grammar (98%) and vocabulary (82.8%) more important than those regarding pronunciation and semantic. With regard to their preference for OCF type, *explicit correction* (92.9%) was their most frequently used error OCF technique, which do not promote the interaction between the language teachers and their students, and among the students.

However, the analyses detected a discrepancy between their sated beliefs of OCF provision and their actual practices in the classroom. Finally the data revealed that there are significant differences between ELT and non-ELT pre-service EFL teachers regarding their beliefs on most of the belief topics.

Keywords: Teacher education, oral corrective feedback, belief, pre-service English teacher, interaction

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ALL : American Language and Literature
BOTO : The Board of Training and Order
BSQ : Belief Scale Questionnaire
CI : Classroom Interaction
EFL : English as A Second language
ELT : English Language Teaching
ELL : English Language and Literature
IL : Interlanguage
L1 : First Langauge
L2 : Second Language
MONE : Ministry of National Education
OCF : Oral Corrective Feedback
TL : Target Language
PBQ : The Participant Background Questionnaire
SDG : Sözlü Düzeltme Geribildirim
YÖK : Higher Education Council

INTRODUCTION

This topic has caught my interest through my personal experiences as a language lecturer at tertiary level for three equally important research issues in language learning domain: the relationship between the teachers' stated beliefs and their instructional practices, oral corrective feedback (hence, OCF) provision, and teacher education. English learners who are beginners continuously produce ill-formed utterances. Students' erroneous utterances mostly are regarded as something which must be minimized or eliminated (Han, 2008), since they are believed to hinder the communication and to be the sources of man problems in learning a language. In addition, learners' erroneous utterances are never easy to overcome and it is a controversial issue theoretically and methodologically. With regard to dealing learners' erroneous utterances, Han (2008) states that while correcting errors means an evident and direct correction, OCF refers to overall technique, which requires delivering the learners signs or hints leading self-correction along with correct forms in the target language when necessary. In the meantime, it is commonplace to see that a good deal of language teachers correct these errors in the classroom persistently. This has prompted my attention on how pre-service English teachers react to this pedagogical issue, since OCF is gaining importance in L2 and FL domains (Sheen 2004, Ellis 2006).

Regarding second language learning, a lot of researchers in the field of second language (here after, L2) acquisition focus primarily on the importance of oral corrective feedback (OCF) provision in learning a foreign or a second language. These studies still keep addressing the significance and the potential impacts of on L2 learning in detail. Nevertheless, the impact and of OCF on education differs according based on the methodologies and procedures implemented (Ellis, 2009). In general, how the language teacher perceives the process of the learning and teaching affects the effectiveness of OCF provision (Doughty & Williams, 1998).

While the supporters of the behavioristic approach (e.g., Brown, 2007; Krashen, 1985) assert that any form of error treatment is of no importance and not needed, some researchers (e.g., Long, 1996; Swain, 1985) assert that OCF provision promoting interaction between the teacher and the student and among the students plays an important role during learning a foreign language (hereafter, FL) or L2. In addition, Schmidt (2001) argues employing solely one kind of OCF strategy cannot be sufficient in order to enhance the language learning. Therefore, students need to be provided with as many types of OCF as possible as in order for them recognize the erroneous utterances they commit. In addition, the interactionist's opinion is that the learning of language is a process through interaction (Long, 1996; Schimidt, 1995). According to them, a desirable type of interaction refers negotiation of meaning, and this happens through modification of utterances when students'

interaction with the more expert counterpart in conversations and then words are rearranged. From this point of view, all these take place during the conversations and interactions as a result of the provision of feedback. Moreover, Gass and Mackey (2007) stated that the "interaction approach attempts to account for learning through the learner's exposure to language, production of language, and feedback on that production" (p. 176). According to Long (1996), implicit negative feedback is another way for a language learning to take place, and this negative feedback error correction that is reached by negotiations might be useful for L2 development. Besides, Mackey and Oliver (2002) argued that interaction along with negotiation and feedback have been found to be more effective than interaction with negotiation alone when development of advanced question form is being discussed.

Therefore, there are numerous main concerns in L2 learning which should be considered by the teacher and the language teacher related to OCF provision. The first refers to the type of error to be corrected. That is to say, do the language teachers target certain kinds of errors or all? Should the OCF provision be focused or unfocused? The second refers to the type of OCF strategies to employ in treating the learner erroneous utterances. According to Long (1996), the L2 learner is often provided with input: positive evidence and negative evidence. The positive evidence or positive feedback aids the learner notice the extent to which his or her produce is satisfactory, meaningful, linguistically appropriate, and target-like. Third, there have been some OCF taxonomies offered by researchers in the field (e.g., Harmer, 2001; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002). These classifications were adopted in different studies on many occasions. One the other hand, it is important to find out what types of OCF strategies are more beneficial than others. From an academic point of view, what types promote self-learning, and interaction between the teacher and the student, and among students, which types lead to more "student uptake" that is the learner's utterances upon the teacher's error treatment (Nassaji, 2007)? Another issue regarding OCF provision, what OCF strategies do the language teachers prefer for error treatment and why do they do so? Researchers have progressively started to look into different learning contexts, aiming at building models that would reflect the repertoire of the language teacher's OCF strategies. The fourth refers to whether the feedback is immediate or delayed. Researchers have not come to an agreement yet pertaining to timing of the OCF provision (Hedge, 2000). It seems that language teachers are free to treat the learners' errors as they like. Both immediate and delayed OCF provision come with their advantageous. In addition, as Ellis (2009) suggested, there are some techniques that language teachers can employ when treating at a later time. Last but not least, the fifth important issue refers to what the teachers' beliefs are regarding OCF provision. As learners and language teachers are the real performers of the teaching and learning process, their beliefs related to important issues have been investigated with great effort to find out what they believe and what they do in the classroom. Researchers have had designed surveys and questionnaires in order to detect teachers' and learners' beliefs regarding OCF provision. As Ellis (2010) posits, overt or covert OCF provision has been one of the main issues of the research and has been examined along with teacher perceptions.

Therefore, research has made a lot of effort to detect beneficial or the best way for error treatment and made a lot of progress in theory and practice ending up with inconsistent findings to some extent. This case would not be a surprise as there are many different aspects in every setting, such as the teachers' educational backgrounds, beliefs, the learning experience of the both learners and teachers, the extent of the teachers' teaching experience, learners ages, EFL versus ESL setting, learner proficiency levels and so on. These uncontrollable variables are all interconnected and play an important role on the results. Therefore, this study intends to continue and extend the efforts started by some investigators (e.g., Lyster and Ranta, 1997, and Panova and Lyster, 2002), targeting not only the interactional alterations (i.e., belief, the OCF type, timing, source), but the ELT teachers' beliefs, practices and their relationship with the learners regarding classroom interaction through OCF provision.

Now, the issues about OCF ranges from benefits of OCF provision for foreign language teaching and learning, techniques of OCF, best time for feedback provision, and types of errors requiring amendment (Ellis, 2009; Kim, 2004; Ma & Zhang, 2010). These issues have produced significant number of experimental research about the possible influence of OCF on FL and L2 learning and its functions in real language classroom (Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004; Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Ellis, 2009; Ellis, Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima, 2008; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Sheen, 2007a).

Besides certain experimental works (Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Mackey & Goo, 2007) suggesting that OCF can enhance learning a FL or L2, yet more research studies are needed to be able to find out how pre-service English teachers perceive, use and select the types of OCF in order to enhance learning a foreign or second language (Li, 2010). Basically, it is necessary to determine before their graduation whether pre-service language teachers are aware of different types of OCF that would better facilitate language learning, or not how and when pre-service English teachers would provide feedback. Or, do they learn about these strategies through experience on the job? Regarding when and how to treat students' erroneous utterances, collecting more information about what the pre-service English teachers state they believe and do in the classroom regarding OCF provision is necessary, if it is proposed FL and L2 research influence on teacher education and ultimately language education. One important question must be answered: Are pre-service EFL teachers aware of the recent research or do they shape their beliefs about language teaching and learning through teaching experience after graduation? The present study of 152 pre-service ELT and non-ELT teachers in Turkey will add to the limited number of studies dealing with this matter as there are no studies done on this issue in Turkey to the knowledge of the researcher of this study.

The current research reviews studies on OCF, the efficacy of OCF, teachers' beliefs and OCF provision. Motivated by the related research, the current study might have potential to make contribution to the standing body of knowledge, providing further evidence in relation to the pre-

service English teachers' actual provision of OCF during practicum classes, with a view to understanding the reasons why they do as they do through follow up interviews. As a result of this effort, the present study is likely to provide some pedagogical implications of OCF provision on enhancing teaching and learning EFL in Turkey.

CHAPTER ONE

1. FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

1.1. Significance of the Study

This study has been inspired by examining some EFL ELT and non-ELT pre-service teachers' practicum classes in fullcontext in Turkey. EFL studies have been mainly focusing on ELT pre-service or in-service teachers and we have sporadic attention to EFL teachers' classrooms in terms of ELT and non-ELT status. To the best knowledge of the researcher, this will be one of the the first studies in the field which entirely addresses and compares OCF beliefs and preferences of Turkish pre-service ELT and non-ELT English language teachers, and their reactions while teaching English at certain sate secondary schools in Esatern region province of Turkey.

As Atay (2006) argues, it is essential for teachers to be trained well enough in their own subjects and need to be knowledgeable regarding teaching their subjects in order for them to provide better education. There are two main sources from which train English teachers in Turkey, English Language Teaching (hereafter ELT) department of Faulty of Education and English Language and Literature (hereafter ELL or non-ELT interchangeably) department of Faculty of Literature. The students of former one are subjected to essential academic and practical matters relating to teaching and learning a second or foreign language. ELT programs offer all basic skill and methodological classes to their students during four academic years in order to train them as competent and skilled English teachers.

On the other hand, main target of the other source, ELL department of Faculty of Literature, is to provide the students with courses regarding mainly literature and linguistics along with skill courses such as reading, writing, speaking, and listening. The students of these departments seem to takee limited number of methodological courses in the ELT department of faculty of education under the name of 'certificate program' beside their own courses during or after their final year in order to become English teachers. Thus, it is a reality that while there are ELT graduates on one side, there are non-ELT graduates on the other who are the like heads and tails in maintaining the sources of training English teachers in Turkey. In addition, there is a continuous debate in relation to effectiveness of both sides, but, to the knowledge of the researcher of this study, there is not experimental research on this issue. In order to fill this important gap, this study also intended to explore whether there is a significant difference between ELT and non-ELT student teachers' beliefs and practices regarding to oral CF provision. On the other hand, this study aimed at comparing two

programs, their training of language teachers, and potential attitudes of pre-service English teachers from both sources towards OCF provision. Therefore, this study can contribute to the EFL field by providing information on OCF at Turkish EFL context. The results can be compared to those that are conducted in other EFL and ESL domains.

Another significance of the study lies in its focus on the novice teachers' beliefs of the issues regaring to OCF provision such as frequencies, types, targets, and providers of OCF. Many former studies investigated and compared the teachers' and the students' perceptions of OCF targets, whether phonological, morphological, or syntactical in nature. This study started out to compare perceptions about the general frequency of OCF provided by pre-service teacher feedback from both ELT and ELL, and the frequencies of specific types of feedback. This is important if we want to know what the student English teachers from ELL and ELT do, believe, and do about OCF in the classroom and whether there are any differences in their beliefs and practices since there may be discrepancy between what teachers state they believe and what they do while teaching for some teachers (Kumaravadivelu, 1993; J. Richards, Ho, & Giblin, 1996). On the other hand, most of the studies are limited to finding out their beliefs only. Likewise, it is highly probable that pre-service student teachers' practices may also differ from what they have learned in the ELT courses (Almarza, 1996). In addition, Pajares (1992) claimed that teachers' reported beliefs are not reliable to reflect the nature of the classroom performances of the teachers. In the same way, certain research findings demonstrated that the teachers' reports on their beliefs and their actual performances are not compatible in the classroom (Basturkmen et al., 2004; M. Borg, 2005; S. Borg, 2009b; Phipps & S. Borg, 2007). There seem to be certain reasons of this disparity. First, even if their beliefs and their performances in the classroom are inconsistent, what they believe and that they state they believe might be different. In other words, their practices conform to their beliefs, but their stated beliefs might have differed from their actual beliefs. Second, as S. Borg (2003a: 94) maintains that transformations regarding the beliefs of teachers cannot alter their actions accordingly due to several reasons like "the social, psychological and environmental realities of the school and classroom". In addition, as S. Borg (2003a: 94) states, an adjustment in their beliefs may "hinder language teachers' ability to adopt practices which reflect their beliefs". Finally, without a shift in the teacher's belief, changes may occur in their practices in the classroom too (Phipps & S. Borg, 2007).

In addition to investigating pre-service ELT and non-ELT teachers beliefs, this study also aims to examine the classroom interaction (here after, CI) between the teacher and the student and among the students that provides students with better conditions to learn. It can be said that it is mainly up to the teachers to make it easier for the students to learn better as the teachers are expected to provide their students with as a suitable, authentic, and safe learning area as possible. Therefore, teacher OCF can be the most important element which affects CI. According to through OCF, not only provides the learner with information but also obtain information from the learner (Tusi, 1995). Nevertheless, according to Nassaji and Wells (2000), the teacher should make sure that he or she prolongs the

dialog creating more occasions for the learners to participate in. In addition, the teacher should request the students' views and allow the students to provide their peers with OCF as soon as possible (Smith & Higgins, 2006).

As a result, this study can contribute to the EFL field in several ways by providing information on EFL pre-service teachers' beliefs of OCF provision, their actual classroom practices, the nature of the interaction in the classroom, and whether there is a difference between participants' beliefs and practices regarding OCF provision according to their ELT or non-ELT status at Turkish EFL context. The results can be compared to those that are conducted in other EFL and ESL domains. Moreover, this research could give FL teachers interesting perceptions and understandings of OCF provision regarding what, when and how to treat students' errors, enhancing classroom interaction and ultimately language learning. In addition, the results of this study may help the officials at minstry of education to design educational curriculum by incorporating those issues in order to enhance the pre-service and in-service language istructors' training and their practices within actual classroom settings. Moreover, this research could give FL teachers interesting perceptions and understandings of OCF provision regarding what, when and how to treat students' errors, enhancing classroom interaction and ultimately language learning.

1.2. Background of the Study

This study is viewed within the theoretical framework of the Interaction Approach from an interactionist perspective. Since the learners are able to improve linguistic hypotheses from the evidence provided through input, according to many significant second language theories, it is seen as an indispensable factor for L2 learning (Ellis, 2007; Gass & Mackey, 2007; White, 2007). Since being exposed to a second language is not adequate for language learning, the input should be as comprehensible as possible. As basic steps must not be sufficient for L2 to occur, the language learning must be logical and coherent. In fact, Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1982, 1985) asserts that intelligible input together with the learner's enthusiasm is not only an indispensable situation for language acquisition to happen, this is the appropriate circumstance.

The vital foundation of the Interaction Approach is that students are supposed to get chances to learn second language in negative and positive form through interaction with interlocutors, and students have the opportunity to compare their own grammatical structure to that of their partners whom they are talking with (Gass & Mackey, 2006; Long, 2006). Both corrective feedback and interactions push learners to adjust their own output as they modify linguistic input students receive, and are identified as the gap between the student's production and target language (Gass & Mackey, 2006).

Interaction Hypothesis was defined by Gass and Mackey (2007) as an amalgam of the "Input Hypothesis" (Krashen, 1982) and the "Output Hypothesis" (Swain 2005). They both urge that the "Interaction Hypothesis" has been identified under different labels, such as "the input, interaction, and output model" (Block, 2003), and the "Interaction Theory" (Carroll, 1999). First element of this Hypothesis is "input" and it is the linguistic forms that the students are subjected to. Most theories of second language learning acknowledge it as a key factor in the learning process. Input's main function is to make it easier for learners to form of linguistic output in the second language.

Many studies have been conducted on comparison of the relative effectiveness of input simplification and interactional modified input on second language comprehension and learning, (Ellis & He, 1999; Ellis, Gass & Varonis, 1994; Mackey, 1999; Pica, 1992). The results of these studies indicated that modified input through interaction may be more useful than simplified input for language development. Advocates of the interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996) claim that this is because students get a chance of negotiating during interactional modifications about the kind of input that best fits to their particular developmental stage. However, according to Mackey and Abbuhl, (2005), simplified input solely does not meet the learners' communicative needs, and is not suitable for their weaknesses in relation to the target language.

From the time when Input Hypothesis was put forward, the claim that comprehensible input solely is sufficient has been questioned by many researchers. For example, the results of studies of Swain (1981, 1985, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1998, 2005), who is considered as an expert on this issue, found that learners, in French language programs, gained native-like reading and listening skills abilities, however it was not the case for speaking and writing skills. She made logical conclusion that the focus of class activities were on reading and listening tasks and they needed to depend on lexical and contextual clues in order to comprehend the topic. Since students were not expected to produce oral or written output in French at a high level, there was not much progress in students' proficiency level morphology and syntax. Therefore, Swain (2005) posited that the learners had not been given enough opportunities for output and that lack of opportunities had played great role on poor language development on productive skills.

Upon these observations, Swain came up with the Output Hypothesis (1985) which stresses that profound relationship exists between language production and language learning. Therefore, Swain (1995) asserts that output plays an essential role in the development of sentence structure and morphology and that is why learners need to employ syntactic structures in order to get their massages across in logical manner. Verbal output in the form of conversational interaction has vital role in second language improvement. The benefit of foreign language students' participating in interactions is valuable information from the expert side of the discussion pertaining accuracy, or incorrectness of their utterance. Through the process of negotiating for a meaning in order for this mutual understanding to occur, interlocutor and the L2 student try to manipulate the language and

this happens though unsuccessful trial of attempt to convey massage. In times where the foreign language students are having difficulty in conveying the message that is intended to carry on, the language construction might be the best way to enhance consciousness of ill-forms in learners' TL understanding and competence.

The logic behind this Hypothesis can be explained as that the students learn language via a series of interactions while they are engaged in a conversation and are exposed to comprehensible input. And through the negotiations in conversation, students are pushed to produce output and this makes up the second component of the Interaction Hypothesis. "Output" implies to productions by the target language learners either as written or oral. According to some researchers there is a distinction between comprehensible input and modified output (McDonough & Mackey, 2008; Muranoi, 2000; Swain, 1985, 1995, 2005). Modified output refers to utterances that are amended to be more target-like in response to an interlocutor's signal of communicative breakdown. According to them, due to the fact that output drives the student to reflect his/her own original production and urges them to see the gaps between it and the language being learnt, this kind of output is attributed to its facilitative role in language learning. The negative evidence and corrective feedback, which is the third component of this hypothesis, push FL students to exploit their interlanguage to turn the intended message more understandable and ultimately might enhance TL learning (Long, 1996). In addition, some researchers have stated that output creates opportunities to hear their own feedback, and this results in a more accurate, more comprehensible forms (2005; Swain & Lapkin, 1995; Gass, 1988; Long, 1996). Though, it must be stated that this opinion is shared by all not all investigators.

In addition, the interactionist's opinion is that the learning of language is a process through interaction (Long, 1996; Schimidt 1990). According to them, a desirable type of interaction refers negotiation of meaning, and this happens through modification of utterances when students' interaction with the more expert counterpart in conversations and then words are rearranged. From this point of view, all these take place during the conversations and interactions as a result of the providing OCF. Moreover, Gass and Mackey (2007) stated that the "interaction approach attempts to account for learning through the learner's exposure to language, production of language, and feedback on that production" (p. 176). According to Long (1996), implicit negative feedback is another way for a language learning to take place, and this negative feedback error correction that is reached by negotiations might be useful for L2 development. Besides, Mackey and Philip (1998) argued that interaction along with negotiation and feedback have been found to be more effective than interaction with negotiation alone when development of advanced question form is being discussed.

As of Long (1991) directed the attention to the importance of focusing on form in the language teaching, a lot of studies have been conducted in order to determine the methods that enhance language learning. The L2 or FL teacher has choices to highlight where and how a certain linguistic

system needs to be stressed under any circumstances. When treating learner errors, the teachers have many opportunities related to what error to treat, what technique to employ, when to employ, how to employ the strategy, who to correct the errors without interrupting flow of the communication. In a way, treating errors might be resembled to accomplishment of complicated cognitive operations. On the other hand, many researchers agree that the teachers need to treat the students' erroneous utterances in a way that do not hinder communication but promotes it. If not, it should not any differ from the one that takes place in a natural setting.

Therefore, several important issues arise in L2 learning that the researchers and L2 or FL instructors should consider related to OCF provision. The first refers to the type of error to be corrected. That is to say, do the language teachers target certain kinds of errors or all? Should the OCF provision be focused or unfocused? According to Ellis (2009), while the first is dealing with specific learner erroneous utterances, the latter is aiming at any type of erroneous ones. Much research stresses that focused specific or focused error treatment is much more beneficial and helpful for teachers in identifying the kinds of erroneous utterances to target beforehand and saving time. In the same way, certain number of studies (e.g., Bitchener et al., 2005; Ellis, 2010; Ellis et al., 2006; Ellis et al., 2008; Lyster, 2004) favor the specific OCF provision or error treatment since it turned out to be more beneficial than unspecific error treatment. In addition, Ellis et al. (2008) posit that specific OCF provision could uphold the students' noticing better than unspecific OCF provision.

The second refers to the type of OCF strategies to employ in treating the learner erroneous utterances. According to Long (1996), the L2 learner is often provided with input: positive evidence and negative evidence. The former aids the learner notice the extent to which his or her produce is satisfactory, meaningful, linguistically appropriate, and target-like. As Ellis (2009) posits, positive feedback should be seen of great importance, helping the learner with both self-learning and motivation. On the other hand, negative evidence or negative feedback informs the learner that his or her produce is ill-formed or linguistically inappropriate in the target language (Ellis, 2009). Whether negative OCF is preventive or responsive, it means the teachers' straight amendment of the students' erroneous utterances. In addition, according to Ellis (2007), both with negative feedback and corrective feedback, the information from the teacher is conveyed to the learner regardless the learners' opinions or qualities for the most part.

In addition, there have been some OCF taxonomies offered by researchers in the field (e.g., Harmer, 2001; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002). These classifications have been adopted in different studies so far. One the other hand, it is important to find out what types of OCF strategies are more beneficial than others. From an academic point of view, what types promote self-learning, and interaction between the teacher and the student, and among students, which types lead to more "student uptake" that is the learner's utterances upon the teacher's error treatment (Nassaji, 2007)? Another issue regarding OCF provision, what OCF

strategies do the language teachers prefer for error treatment and why do they do so? Researchers have progressively started to look into different learning contexts, aiming at building models that would reflect the repertoire of the language teacher's OCF strategies.

The fourth refers to whether the feedback is immediate or delayed. Researchers have not come to an agreement yet pertaining to timing of the OCF provision (Hedge, 2000). It seems that language teachers are free to treat the learners' errors as they like. In other words, it is up to them when to deal with erroneous utterances, with being either immediately or delayed. On the other hand, if the activities require written feedback, then the teachers had better exploit delayed written feedback. If it is not the case for written feedback, the teachers have the choice immediate or delayed OCF provision, completely left to them to decide. Both immediate and delayed OCF provision come with their advantageous. In addition, as Ellis (2009) suggested, there are some techniques that language teachers can employ when treating at a later time. For example, the teachers may record the activities and request the learners to detect their own ill-formed utterances and self-correct.

Last but not least, the fifth important issue refers to what the teachers' beliefs are regarding OCF provision. As learners and language teachers are the real performers of the teaching and learning process, their beliefs related to important issues have been investigated with great effort to find out what they believe and what they do in the classroom. Researchers have had designed surveys and questionnaires in order to detect teachers' and learners' beliefs regarding OCF provision. As Ellis (2010) posits, overt or covert OCF provision has been one of the main issues of the research and has been examined along with teacher perceptions.

To some up, research has made a lot of effort to detect beneficial or the best way for error treatment and made a lot of progress in theory and practice ending up with inconsistent findings to some extent. This case would not be a surprise as there are many different aspects in every setting, such as the teachers' educational backgrounds, beliefs, the learning experience of the both learners and teachers, the extent of the teachers' teaching experience, learners ages, EFL versus ESL setting, learner proficiency levels and so on. These uncontrollable variables are all interconnected and play an important role on the results. Therefore, this study intends to continue and extend the efforts started by researchers (e.g., Lyster and Ranta, 1997, and Panova and Lyster, 2002), targeting not only the interactional alterations (i.e., belief, the OCF type, timing, source), but the ELT teachers' beliefs, practices and their relationship with the learners regarding classroom interaction through OCF provision.

1.3. Statement of the Problem and Research Questions

This study aimed at finding answers to the questions about classroom practices of OCF provision and investigate the pre-service ELT and non-ELT EFL teachers' beliefs of OCF provision.

By observing twenty secondary school English lessons and interviewing the participants of the classroom observations, the study examined the most OCF strategies that pre-service EFL teachers prefer while correcting their students' errors as well as errors commonly targeted during interaction. Using a survey, the study also investigated the pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs of OCF (e.g., their beliefs of OCF types, its timing, its providers, input providing vs. output prompter feedback, and explicit vs. implicit feedback). To achieve this goal, this study aimed at finding the answers to the following questions:

1. What is the general frequency of OCF provision in EFL classrooms in Turkish context?
2. What are the Turkish ELT and non-ELT pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs of OCF provision?
3. Do ELT and non-ELT pre-service teachers differ in their beliefs of OCF prvision?

1.4. Definitions of Terms

Beliefs: "They are expressed as evaluations of what should be done, what should be the case, and what is preferable." (Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004, p. 244).

***ELT* pre-service English teacher:** It is an operational definition referring to pre-service English teachers studying English Language Teaching at the Faculty of Education rather than "established concept" used widely in the literature. They take all the methodology courses during four years in the program.

***Explicit feedback*:** "It refers to corrective feedback that provides the learner with the correct form while simultaneously indicating that an error occurred" (Ellis, 2008).

***Implicit Feedback*:** It points to feedback moves that inform a learner indirectly that his or her oral production is somewhat not correct and it might not be meaningful in the target language (Ortega, 2009).

***Interlocutor*:** It refers to a person who engages in conversations, oral tasks, or dialogues where the focus, for the most part, is on oral production.

***In-service*:** It refers to graduates of teacher training programs who are fully employed and started teaching independently in their own classes.

***Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF)*:** In the current dissertation, OCF implies to the information, clues, elicitation besides providing correct forms with which learners are given following an erroneous utterance. Negative evidence and implicit or explicit OCF are interchangeably employed in various areas, indicating that the learners uttered something off-target statements and it was

defined as “the reactive information that learners receive regarding the linguistic and communicative failure of their utterances.” (Mackey, 2007, p. 14). In addition, Gass and Selinker (2008) defined it as “the learner-oriented provision of information about the success (or, more likely, lack of success) of their utterances that give additional opportunities to focus on production and comprehension.” (p. 329-330).

Practice: The term “practice” refers to actions (real teaching) during the practicum classes in this study.

***Follow up interviews*:** It is a reflective procedure in order to detect what participants think, believe of an issue and do, and why they do so. The participants are asked to elaborate on the issue and to remember what they were thinking and doing when an earlier interaction event took place, presenting them with a stimulus such as a video-recording or voice recording of the original event (Gass & Mackey, 2000).

EFL: It is an acronym for English that is being learned in foreign countries where learners of it lack the opportunity to be expoesed to native speakers of English.

***Error/Mistake*:** The previous one implies to lack of knowledge whereas the latter implies ill use of knowledge. That is to say, errors relate to learners’ lack of knowledge, while mistakes are an indication that learners have correct knowledge but can not use properly yet.

***ESL*:** It is an abbreviation for English which is taught or learned in the country of the target langugae where the learners have ample opportunities to have converstaion with the native speakers of English.

***Input/Output*:** While the previous one points to linguistic features that a learner is subjected to and able to hear in order to enhance his or her interlanguage system, output means language production which can be either speaking or writing.

***Interlanguage*:** It impleis to the language the learners of which can produce when learning FL or SL. It is often somewehere between the learners’ mother language and the target language.

***Non-ELT*:** It is an operational definition referring to pre-service English teachers studying English Language and Literature at Faculty of Letter rather than “established concept” used widely in the literature. Those students attend a certificate program which offers only some of the methodology courses.

***Preferences*:** They refer to someone's assertiveness or eveluations towards a particular set of objects mirrored by means of an overt decision-making process as to liking or disliking or choosing them (Lichtenstein & Slovic, 2006; Scherer, 2005).

***Pre-service*:** It refers to a period of time prior to obtaining their teaching licences and active teaching at state or private schools. In this study it refers to students in a teacher education programs who are preparing to become teacher, but have not yet taught self-sufficiently in their own classrooms.

***Uptake*:** It was defined as "-a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance (this overall intention is clear to the student although the teacher's specific linguistic focus may not be)" (Lyster and Ranta, 1997, p. 49).

CHAPTER TWO

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This part of the thesis reviews related literature on six main areas; 1) theoretical background, 2) error and mistake – types of errors to be treated, 3) oral corrective feedback types – research on oral corrective feedback, studies comparing effectiveness of feedback types, 4) teacher and learner beliefs on OCF provision, 5) the history of teacher education in Turkey – the history of teacher education programs in Turkey. Since this study inspired by interactionist approach, it is therefore important to review the theoretical background of related SLA theory and hypothesis including interaction and L2 acquisition, interaction hypothesis, input hypothesis, and output hypothesis. Part 2.2. briefly introduces definitions of errors and mistakes and types of errors. Following the review of errors, part 2.3. looks at OCF types and it introduces previous research studies which are similar to this study. Then, part 2.4. introduces teachers and learners beliefs of oral corrective feedback and the rationale of studying pre-service EFL teachers beliefs of oral corrective feedback. Finally, 2.5. and 2.6. are dedicated to presenting the history of teacher education and the history of foreign language teacher education programs in Turkey.

2.1. Theorethical Background

It can be stated that interactional OCF provision is seen by many researchers as crucial for a second or foreign language learning especially inside a classroom where there is insufficient time, input and occasions in terms of communication the learner needs to have with the target language (Philp & Tognini, 2009). Certain prospective merits of interactional OCF can be raised in many second language theories including aspects of the Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985), the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 2005), the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996), along with the interlanguage theory. Since this study observes natural interaction inside communicative the EFL classroom, the interactional method is the main approach that is going to be debated for the purpose of this research study.

2.1.1. Interaction and Second Language Acquisition

A complex and contentious question appears on how children should learn an L2 or FL. Many scholars and theorists have studied and examined it, but there are a variety of general metaphysical methods that aim to understand the language learning process. Each strategy has a clear conceptual foundation and relies on a specific deciding factor. The sociocultural method wherein social contact

and conversation play a major role is among the most prominent approach of language learning in modern times. “The sociocultural attitude towards acquiring languages is different from other theoretical approaches because it is not in agreement with the idea that information originally comes and evolves through biological processes and internal processes solely within the humans self.” (Gutierrez, 2006: 232). The core argument here seems to be that factors related to the people around the learners or linguistics should involve precedence over human cognition, and that the latter may be influenced or decided by the former (Vygotsky 1978). Vygotsky, whose thoughts have made a contribution to the present interpretation of classroom interaction, initially formulated such a socio-cultural theory. Wertsch (1990:112) described this by means of “an approach which focuses not on universals, but on the organizational, historical and cultural specifics of the function of the human mind”. As Wells and Chang-Wells (1992) clarifies, the core problem for such a strain of thought is to understand the individual and society’s inter-dependence, as each one produces and is produced by one and another.

Vygotsky (1978) mainly focused on social interaction in his socio-cultural theory, stressing the function of the language, interaction and guidance in the growth of information and comprehension. He interpreted speech as the core and main means of the learning process as it encourages the learner to demonstrate what he learns, believes and can do to himself and others. According to Britton (1970), speech is used as a significant childhood learning tool that children communicate by listening and that they learn to talk by speaking. Olyer (1996) concluded that giving opportunities to communicate is crucial, because children should be motivated to become creators and not only information users. Vygotsky emphasized the role of conversation in the social growth of infants. As Vygotsky (1978: 53) states language is a conceptual cultural instrument just the way “work tools are a way to master nature’s labor”.

Vygotsky (1978) stressed the significance of the child’s relations with the individuals around them, including peers and family or educators, and also claimed that children could do and learn far better than they already do on their own with the aid of more experienced people. General assumption is that the degree of cognitive maturity of the children is limited solely to the extent of which infants are able to solve the problem individually and without support. What was not acknowledged, on the other hand, was the extent of growth of the potential of the infant if the issue was solved with the aid of more experienced people. It has been called ‘scaffolding’ to aid a child in undertaking a mission (Bruner, 1983), wherein the job of the tutor is to drive the learner one piece at a time beyond where he is now; that is, to give the requisite help to children before they can begin to accomplish the task on their own. As Walsh (2006: 35) states, “Scaffolds are withdrawn when a mission has been mastered and the student is alone to think and report on the mission”.

This research study is influenced by Second Language Acquisition’s interactionist approach (SLA). It is commonly understood that communicative discourse plays a vital role in SLA when

context is negotiated (e.g., Gass, 1997; Pica, 1994). According to Pica (1994) negotiation in which learners request clarity, affirmation and repetition of L2 where they do not comprehend provides a convenient opportunities for language acquisition by supplying understandable feedback to learners. And so far as Krashen (1985) is interested, learners with whatever feedback they happen to be subjected to are fundamentally very passive processors. In addition, Krashen (1985) assumes that to guarantee acquisition, exposure to any form of input is adequate. In comparison, Long (1983, 1985) indicated that while it is undoubtedly important to be subjected to understandable input, it is not adequate by itself to guarantee acquisition without sufficient output practices.

The interactionist approach suggests that L2 learning is strengthened as learners have chances such as modification and negotiation to address contact problems. When the learner and his or her counterparts are engaged in negotiations, they react in such a way that it enhances their comprehension of the linguistic input (Krashen, 1985) and aids their 'sense of negotiation' (Long, 1996). Thus, this negotiation facilitates the SLA process. Negotiation of context often activates input that preserves the desired meaning of the learner. As Swain (1983) states, this guidance helps the learner to consentrate on inconsistencies in input and the vocabulary of the learner; thus, the learner can understand the discrepancy between he or she would like to say and what he or she can say. This recognition of the disparity has come to be recognized as the theory of "realizing the difference" (Schmidt & Frota, 1986). Therefore, the learners can find certain inconsistencies on the grounds of their interlanguage between what they have learned through the negotiation and what they usually generate themselves. As White (1991: 16) states: "This can trigger the sorts of ways to be identified for which a pure diet of understandable input will not be sufficient". This argument does not necessarily mean that negotiation leads to learning. Yet, it suggests that mediated contact has an essential function in L2 learning (Long, 1996), fostering the two major awareness and development processes. It would be particularly useful for L2 and/or FL students to acquire a productive instrument to promote these two procedures.

The present study will help to reveal the Turkish pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs of and their preferences for OCF provision in Turkish context. In fact, OCF related aspect of the interactional practices will further explain the link that certain researchers have claimed between negotiations and L2 or FL learning. OCF provision might be an important way of improving interaction in classroom, encourage students enough chanses to concentrate on the structure and the type of response or output they provide in class. Positive OOCF can create a beneficial environment for input and output processing. It is thus essential that EFL teachers know of OCF types that are promoting negotiation, interaction, and output in EFL classroom.

2.1.2. Krashen's Comprehensible Input Hypothesis

According to Krashen (1985), comprehensible input hypothesis suggests that acquiring a language occurs provided that learners understand the input which is just over their present level. That is to say, Krashen meant that the input needs to be both intelligible and carry philological information which is a little above the learners' level of competence. It is what is needed most so that the learners' language acquiring progresses successfully. The teachers should expose their students to linguistic material, which is a form of input, by having them read and listen so that they can acquire the language. That is how Krashen (1985) established this hypothesis. Krashen asserted that there is no proof that a learner begins learning a language immediately unless they are provided with comprehensible input. Numerous investigators (e.g., Pica & Doughty, 1985; Allright & Bailey, 1991) who agree upon the importance of the input hypothesis emphasized the function that interaction has so that comprehensible input happens. SLA literature has shown that controversy exists about the function of comprehensible input.

2.1.3. Swain's Comprehensible Output Hypothesis

It seems that input solely might be insufficient for a successful L2 or FL learning. Therefore, learners need to be aloowed to produce in the TL so that language learning can occur. In other words, they should be involved in the output process. In this respect, Swain's (1985, 1995, 2000) many studies show that have 'comprehensible input' alone does not guaranty for learners to achieve expertise in L2 or FL they are learning. Initially, Swain (1985) related her hypothesis to Krashen's (1985) 'comprehensible input theory'. Swain called her theory as "comprehensible output" since Krashen's theory was named as "comprehensible input theory". Nevertheless, Swain gave prominent importance to the learners' cognitive processing of the languages. Swain (1985) illuminates: "Output pushes learners to process language more deeply than does input". That is supposed to demand more mental efforts. According to Swain (1995), the learner is able to develop his or her interlanguage communication through output. According to Swain, the learner might fake understanding the linguistic material, but he or she is unable to do so while trying to produce output.

In addition, Swain (1993) is certain that "pushed" output helps the language learner in three important ways: 1) makes the learners be aware of the distance of what they would like to mean to and what they are able to utter. Ultimately this noticing might begin cognitive processes that aid language acquisition; 2) aids learners in considering their own language through meta-talk (Schmidt & Frota, 1986); 3) helps the learner to test the views regarding his or her own language that might lead to feedback and aid them amend their production according to his or her communicative needs (Swain, 1993).

In another study, Swain and Lapkin (1995), focusing on using a think-aloud protocol, looked at student comments in order to gain information on whether output led them to notice the gap in their knowledge pertaining the TL. They concluded that students did find diversions in their linguistic knowledge. Occasionally, the students handled the differences by modifying their output. An interesting portion of the study was that learners worked on their own, and not with a partner, thus focusing on a version of the output hypothesis that could be the narrowest view of the utility of output in SLA. This view focuses on the noticing-the-gap function of output for the learner. According to Swain and Lapkin (1995), even without feedback from an interlocutor, yet the learners might notice the difference between their interlanguage (hereafter, IL) and TL when they have difficulty uttering in the TL.

In addition, Schmidt and Frota (1986) focused on identifying or noticing within the output hypothesis. They claimed that learners first need to notice the form before any acquisition takes place. There are many studies that verify a connection between noticing and learning (Ellis, 1994; Swain & Lapkin, 2003; Mackey et al., 2000). Swain and Lapkin (2001) found that the stdents who worked in a second language writing activity noticed gaps in their interlanguage and identified their problems. Swain (1995) states that this must be the proof that the learner can notice what their problems are with their output. Swain also believes that learners can use output as a tool for hypothesis testing. Swain and Lapkin (2001) concluded in their study that learners used the opportunities they had for output as a way of collecting linguistic information about the language. Their findings are evidence that learners can engage in output to think about the language and learn from it.

2.1.4. Selinker's Interlanguage Hypothesis

The notion of "interlanguage" (hereafter, IL) had initially been coined by Selinker (1969) to refer to an Israeli student's efforts to produce English, that was implemented in L2 research:

> "Interlanguage may be linguistically described using as data the observable output resulting from a speaker's attempt to produce a foreign norm, i.e., both his 'errors' and 'nonerrors'. It is assumed that such behaviour is highly structured. In comprehensive language transfer work, it seems to me that recognition of the existence of an interlanguage cannot be avoided and that it must be dealt with as a system, not as an isolated collection of errors" (Selinker, 1969 republished in Selinker 1988: 117).

The concept of interlanguage plays a crucial role and stands right in the center of all efforts to explain SLA theories. According to Selinker (1971), '*interlanguage*' is the product of the interactions amongst the several variables in at least two languages to which the learners are exposed relatively at the same time. Selinker (1972), through interlanguage hypothesis, refers to the independent temporary linguistic system constructed by each learner of L1 or L2. In addition, Selinker (1974: 35), defined '*interlanguage'* as a "separate linguistic system". According to Selinker, *interlanguage*

suggests that there has been a development through which every single language learner builds a new and unique system belonging to the target language with its own set of rules. Namely, '*interlanguage'* belongs to an individual who is learning an L2 or an FL, and that can be considered to be an amalgam of the target language and the mother language. It has characteristics of both language and is somewhere between them (Gass & Selinker, 2008). Seeing that the learner's efforts in producing expressions in L2 cannot always be supposed to follow the norms of the L2. Consequently, an *interlanguage*, which can be seen as a collision between the L1 and L2, is an unavoidable stage of the language learning and should be seen as a natural part of the process.

On the other hand, the term of "interlanguage" was initially proposed under different names in the works of many applied linguists, for example "idiosyncratic dialect" (Corder, 1971), "approximative system" (Nemser, 1971), and "transitional competence" (Corder, 1981). As generally accepted, learner language is regular, systematic and meaningful and L2 acqusition can be a restructuring and creative procedure, yielding in the individual a developmental continuum (e.g., Corder, 1967, 1981; Dulay & Burt, 1974; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Nemser, 1971; Selinker, 1972, 1992). The grammar of the interlanguage is therefore the grammatical system that learners have internalized in the process of acquiring an L1 or L2. According to Hung (2000), interlanguage integrates characteristics of both the L1 language and the L2, along with characteristics exclusive to itself and progresses in time further along the learning continuum and toward the target language system.

Selinker's (1972, 1992) account of the interlanguage systems puts a cognitive importance and an emphasis upon the methods that are employed by the learner while acquiring an L2. Adjemian's (1976) approach to interlanguage theory was distinct since he attempted to specify the essence of the interlanguage structures differently. Adjemian argued that interlanguage is a natural language with a number of characteristics, including systematicity, permeability and fossilization. Unlike Selinker, Adjemian (1976: 302) distinguishes between the strategies that help the learner to learn better and the grammatical regulations which can be "crucially concerned in the actual form of the language system". He claims that applied linguistic studies need to deal with primarily the definition of certain language rules that display the characteristics of the grammar of the learner.

Since the advent of the interlanguage theory, subsequent research on second language acquisition seems to have taken two different although closely related directions, with one focusing on the descriptions of interlanguage rules, such as studies on the linguistic representations of learners' grammars (e.g., White, 2003), and the other seeking explanations to the developmental success and failure, such as studies on individual differences (e.g., Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003). The developments of different trends in L2 acquisition research have been well reported in numerous works, such as Ellis (1985, 1994), Larsen-Freeman & Long (1991), Doughty & Long (2003), etc. Yet, research on analyzing learner language remains a central focus in L2 acquisition research.

Thus, interlanguage might be considered to be an effort of adaptation approach in which the learners try their best to use the languages of the interlocutors, while they have not enough aptitude in the target languages (Selinker, 1972). According to Selinker, the principal concepts of *interlanguage* strategy involve, simplifications, overgeneralizations of the forms in the target language, substitutions, omissions, borrowings or transfers from the mother language, and restructurings. Fossilizations occur when the learner produce persistent ill-formed utterances in the target language, no matter how old they are and how much instruction they have had. Selinker classifies fossilizations into permanent and temporary, and individual and group types. Fossilizations can be related to the level of semantics, phonology, morphology, syntax, or pragmatics. The language teachers should be tolerant to interlanguages of the learners, employ appropriate approaches or methods, expose the learners to the target language settings, and decrease harmful transfers from the L1 so that fossilizations can be minimized or diminished.

2.2. Definition of Error and Mistake

Language learning is not straightforward, on the contrary it is a dynamic system with several elements that operate together allowing learners to learn the target language. There are several challenges on the subject of acquiring languages, and there have been frequent disputes concerning different subjects throughout this area. As Long (1991) states, the need for a more interactional method of learning has become greater over the last few decades, with still giving importance to grammar. According to interactional approach, exposing students to the TL is not enough for them to acquire all linguistic features of the TL, as the accurate forms in the TL usually go unnoticed (White, 1991). They should get to the opportunity so that they make up statements in the TL and make necessary amendments through interactional activities (Swain, 1989). When the learners are allowed to produce the language, then it is inevitable that the learner will make mistakes or errors along the way. There is a need to make an important distinction between what “error” and “mistake” refer to . An error occurs resulting from a lack of knowledge, whereas a mistake is the lack of competent performance of what one already knows (Corder, 1981). In other words, mistake can be defined as a diversion in the speaker’s production which happens when the speaker, though aware of linguistic rules, fails to produce native like utterances that are consistent with their competency. On the other hand, error can be described as a diversion stemming from ignorance of the rule. While an incorrect utterance might be the result of one or the other, the important issue remains as to what to do with those errors or mistakes. It is, in part, from this issue that stems the research on feedback. It is believed that feedback will draw attention to these problematic linguistic structures, either explicitly or implicitly, thus providing the opportunity for the learner to notice his or her error and to modify it accordingly, in an effort to advance in the acquisition of the TL.

In addition, the theory concerning oral corrective feedback provision has generated several questions for examination and discussion. Lyster and Ranta (1997) mentioned a few questions related to OCF provision which is hard to answer: 1) Do the teachers need to correct the learners' errors? 2) When do the teachers need to have the errors corrected? 3) What errors do the teachers need to focus on? 4) How do the teachers need to have the errors corrected? 5) Who is supposed to correct the errors? While these questions are all linked to oral corrective feedback, it is possible that each of these questions could be a subtopic of corrective feedback and each deserves separate consideration. There is, however, one of these questions which has been selected as the main focus of this research, and that is the question of EFL pre-service teachers' beliefs oral corrective feedback. More specifically, this research shall study what do pre-service ELT and non-ELT teachers believe of the issues about OCF provision such importance of OCF and their preferences for error types, OCF types, extent of OCF provision, timing and sources, and their actual practices in the classroom.

2.2.1. Types of Foreign or Second Language Errors to be Treated

Since attitude of both the teacher and the student towards error differs, many different opinions have been expressed on student erroneous utterances and language teachers' OCF provision to them in EFL settings. An error in a language is distinctive because language is uniquely human. Therefore, what is the definition of "error"? A very common definition of it refers to the learners' oral production that diverges from the target language forms. Moreover, what does '*target language forms'* mean? Although the phrase is associated with the language norm (Allwright & Bailey, 1991), yet, this is much debated issue due to the fact that target language speakers' utterances differ for the most part and it is known that majority of EFL teaching is being carried out in non-native settings by non-target language speakers. The lack of enough awareness and information of a particular foreign language is the main cause of an error, which mirrors a learner's existing level in the inter-language progress (Selinker, 1972). It encourages the learner to try something out, despite a learner's insufficient knowledge to create any form correctly. Many scientists have tried to establish a definition that still remains incomplete, however, it can be stated that an erroneous utterance is the produced form by an EFL student, and it shows the distance between the student's IL and the target TL.

In regards to teacher's choice of feedback strategy, two important issues arise in learning an L2 or a FL that teachers should take into account. The first one is about the kind of the student errors to target. The research studies carried done in classroom have proven to us that the real techniques the teacher employs in regards to error treatment might be idiosyncratic, unsystematic, ambiguous, and arbitrary, despite OCF's central role of playing in enhancing acquiring a foreign language (Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010). There might be many causes related to these problems as including the language teachers' general knowledge about quality of error treatment and when, what and how to

treat in particular. Furthermore, while a few research studies have focused on students' perspectives, the aim of many research studies on OCF was to target exclusively on teachers' viewpoints.

In addition, while error correcting, EFL teachers must decide what type of errors to target to treat. Nevertheless, some types of errors are occasionally ignored to some extent, and only the most "important" ones are treated. In other words, EFL teachers can encounter certain erroneous utterances that probably do not impede interaction between the EFL teacher and the student, but they may also have to deal with errors that might affect communication negatively. Thus, the learner's error type should be identified and it is generally up to teacher's choice or desire whether to correct everything. Of course, not all kinds of errors are worth giving feedback to, unless they prevent mutually understanding. The categorization of errors was formed by Nishita (2004) as:

- Grammar error: the incorrectly use of words, tense, conjugations and particles by the learner.
- Pronunciation error: mispronunciation of words by learners along with problems with stress or intonation)
- Vocabulary: Code-switching to the mother language due to lack of knowledge or using vocabulary incorrectly.
- Semantic and pragmatic error: Misunderstanding the utterance, despite inexistence of grammatical, lexical or phonological error.

And, the second problem is in regards to weather feedback should be focused or unfocused. While the unfocused feedback refers to giving feedback to all kinds of errors and mistakes made by students, the focused one refers to targeting only specific errors made by learners which breaks the communication (Ellis, 2009). The focused approach is considered to be very important by L2 researchers (Bitchener et al., 2005; Ellis et al., 2006; Lyster, 2004) since they believe that that method has the highest amount of benefit and assists the teacher to detect the errors that are "ill-formed" utterances and they should correct head of the time. Similarly many results of OCF studies endorsed focused error treatment, because this way of treatment was reported to be reliably more effective than unfocused way of error treatment. For example, Ellis et al. (2008) stated that OCF helps EFL students notice more than unfocused error correction does and, it also helps with learners' accuracy. Similarly, Bitchener and Knock (2008) argue that the process of CF is affected by unfocused CF negatively and this is due to the difficulty for language learners in focusing on wide range of linguistic forms and students' limited ability of processing.

In short, language teachers must take important decisions besides one of them is related to the kind of errors to treat. Basically, the foreign language teachers are subjected to make critical decisions while dealing with errors and the vital one is the type of error to correct. There are some error types that can be disregarded to some extent, or only the erroneous productions that are seen

very important should be corrected. It is strongly believed that some errors are not creating any problematic issues between teacher and student communication; however, these erroneous utterances are the type of errors that might weaken the communication with speakers that are unfamiliar with foreign accent or nonnative speakers. Thus, another complex task for the teacher is to identify and target what kinds of erroneous utterances that are important and crucial in becoming an effective EFL learner.

2.3. Oral Corrective Feedback Types

When appropriate time is taken to analyze a typical language learning classroom, it will be noticed that the language teacher frequently uses a wide range of ways to correct students' erroneous utterances. It is then no surprise that the earliest research concentrated strictly on classifying, analyzing, and quantifying the variety types of OCF and learners' reaction to these types of OCF provision technique. The study is going to use Lyster and Ranta's (1997) taxonomy of OCF strategies, which includes 6 key OCF types. The classification of the six types of OCF follow the explanations of the studies of Ellis (2009), Lyster and Ranta (1997), Panove and Lyster (2002), and Sheen (2004). Through their study, Lyster and Ranta (1997) developed a model that was consisted of different techniques in dealing with error treatment. As a result, they decided to classify six types OCF techniques employed by the teacher. In terms of labeling, identifying, and quantifying the various techniques of oral correction adopted by teachers, this was one the first studies. Pushing learners to develop the accuracy of their erroneous utterance is a common trait shared by all feedback types.

Among the all feedback types, *clarification request*, *repetitions*, *elicitations* and *metalinguistic clue* encourage learners to self-correct and lead learners to engage in verbal communication towards the fixing of the error. The categorization of these four feedback types was done according to their attempt to create a better repair, forcing them to retrieve information that learners already know. According to Lyster (2002) employing this type of feedback produces an ideal interaction between interlocutors and these moves return to students with cues that allow them to draw from their own resources. Lyster also stated that, unlike negotiation for meaning suggested in Long's (1981) "interaction hypothesis" which centers purely on spoken parts affecting comprehension among speakers, such feedbacks encourage a more pedagogical emphasis both on form and accuracy, and it is much more sustained negotiation that is based on communicative aspects. Oral feedback types are going to be elaborated on below in more detailed.

2.3.1. Elicitation

According to Panova and Lyster (2002), in this way of OCF provision the student is urged to reformulate the incomplete of utterance without a highlight on erroneous part by the teacher. The

prime feature of an elicitation is to direct student's focus on the erroneous part of statement by requesting them to complete remaining part of sentence, urging them to reformulate mistaken segment. Elicitations are considered to be arguably the most outstanding way of self-corrective technique adopted by the teacher, since with this way, the teacher make it clear to the students that the teachers' corrective attempt needs a form of logical completion. This form easily can be compared by a repetition of the learner's utterance. The following is one example of an elicitation feedback type:

Example 1
Student: My father swim_ very well.
Teacher: My father...?
Student: My father swims well.

In the example above, the utterance by the student is problematic as the student omitted third person suffix '-s' accidentally. In an attempt to help the student to repair what is wrong, the teacher here prefers elicitation as he/she repeats unerroneous part of the student's utterance and stops just before where there is something wrong with a hope that this way will help the student to elicit the right form. Lyster and Ranta (1997) also stated that elicitations can take the form of questions which prompt students to elicit the correct form (i.e. Can you repeat that again?). Used only 14% of the time by teachers in their study, this form of feedback was the most successful corrective move at leading students to repair their error.

2.3.2. Clarification Request

According to Panova and Lyster (2002), clarification requests can be defined as corrective methods whose purpose is to have the student repeat or restate his or her erroneous utterance. In their study, clarification request accounted for 11% of total given feedback. Lyster and Ranta (1997) possit that the learner restoration in response for this type of feedback is very high (88%). It is suspected that the ambiguity in this method may have added to relatively low rate repair (%28) made by students as they have had been comparing to other excessively explicit ways of OCF provision. The following is an example of a clarification request feedback type provision:

Example 2
Student: He _ _ studying in the library at the moment.
Teacher: I'm sorry?
Student: He is studying in the library now.

2.3.3. Repetition

Repetition technique is the repeating of the student's statement with a stronger tone on the mistaken part of the utterance. According to research carried out by Lyster and Ranta (1997), repetition is the least frequently repeated form of feedback that teachers' use (5%), however,

language teachers often use this technique together with other types of OCF. The following is an example of a repetition feedback type provision:

Example 3
Student: Ali have got two brothers.
Teacher: Ali **have** got two brothers?
Student: Ohhh! Ali has got two brothers.

In the example of Repetition oral feedback type, the student committed a grammatical error replacing the word 'has got' with 'have got' by mistake. And the bold text in the teacher's repetition indicates stress on the students' erroneous utterance with a purpose that repetition will lead to a self-repair the erroneous part. Based on their study Lyster and Ranta (1997) reported that students who self-corrected their mistakes by this method ended up with an uptake of 78% of the time, and with 31% self-repair.

2.3.4. Metalinguistic Feedback

The word '*metalinguistic'* is a term pertaining to the form of the language such as the grammar of the language or its lexis. Lyster and Ranta (1997) defined metalinguistic clues as the feedback that involves making remarks, giving facts, or directing questions that will allow the student make necessary amendments to the erroneous utterance, avoiding giving correct form explicitly. By asking questions or making comments that aims to identify the error, this method provokes the student for the response. In the study, the metalinguistic feedback was one of the less frequently employed feedback type (8%) with 86% uptake and 45% repair. The following example illustrates metalinguistic feedback type:

Example 4
Student: My sister and I **am** going to go to the theatre tomorrow.
Teacher: Is 'am' the right form for two people referring to 'we'? Can we say in this way?
Student: Ohhh! My sister and I are going to the theatre tomorrow.

In the example, the student made an error as he or she said 'am' after 'My sister and I'. The reason is that the student just ignored 'My sister', supposing that he or she had to say 'am' right after subject pronoun 'I', as they had done before. The teacher, as a metalinguistic feedback, intended to focus the learners' attention on the auxiliary verb asking questions without giving the right form since self-repair was aimed at by the teacher.

2.3.5. Explicit Correction

In comparison to other types of feedback that alerts student to come up with some form of self-correction, according to Lyster and Ranta (1997), this feedback type which is categorized as explicit correction contains the teacher's any attempt in order to provide students with direct correct form after the teacher openly indicates to the student about the mistake he or she made. The study of Lyster

and Ranta (1997) showed that this infrequently used feedback type (7%), had an effect of 86% uptake in the students, though half of the uptake did not lead to any repair. In the Example 5 the nature of an explicit correction is illustrated.

Example 5
Student: They speak**ed** to me rudely.
Teacher: No, you cannot say that. You should have said; "They spoke to me rudely."

The example above indicates that the student made an overgeneralization of simple past 'ed' to the irregular verb 'speak'. The teacher immediately told the student what he or she had said was wrong then provided the correct form without allowing the student to take an opportunity for self-repair.

2.3.6. Recasts

Panova and Lyster (2002) defined recasts as corrective moves that comprise of the instructor's restatement of the student's whole production without mentioning the erroneous part or parts. Recasts provide learners with the corrected form of their error. Although it is similar to explicit correction, the recast is implicit since it reformulates a student error in a discreet way and it never harms the flow of communication between the learners and the teachers. In other words, the teachers are careful enough not to imply that an error was made on the part of the student. Therefore, it can be said that the students who made errors will never lose face in front of their classmates because of recasts, since most of the students in the classroom will probably not notice that an error was committed. Example 6 illustrates a recast:

Example 6
Student: I like apple_ very much.
Teacher: Oh, I see. Ok. You like apple**s**.

As can be seen in the Example 6, the student omitted the plural '-s' for countable nouns such as apples in the text. The teacher immediately provided the correct form reformulating what the student had said, except the error. That is, the teacher reacted as if he or she did not discover that there was something wrong with the learner's oral production. Moreover the teacher reformulated the student error in an unobtrusive manner and at no point were words used to point out that an erroroneous utterance had been made by the student.

Findings of the Lyster and Ranta (1997) study concluded that this method of correction resulted in infrequent attempts by students to recognize and repair their error, although it was the most freaquently favored form of OCF used, accounting for 55% of corrective moves used by teachers. Only 31% of errors corrected using recasts led to some form of uptake by students and it was the least successful in generating student repair (18%). This may give some indication that students were

possibly unable to distinguish a recast as corrective in nature. The aforementioned explicit types of OCF provision brought about greater student uptake and contributed to rising repair rates produced by students.

2.3.7. Prompts

Feedback types acknowledged by the study of Lyster and Ranta (1997) were also classified according to common similarities. In Lyster's study (2004) prompts have been defined as a family of feedback type that contains variety of signals, reconstructing the initial error, and whose solely purpose is to push students to self-correct. The sings of approval and correct form are one crucial feature in common among feedbacks in this category, and students are provided with opportunities for self-repairing by creating altered responses. The feedback types in this category are clarification requests, elicitations, metalinguistic requests, and repetitions.

In their meta-analysis of OCF provision study, Mackey and Goo (2007) found out that among the all six types of feedback types recasts are the most popular feedback type used by many language teachers and the ones that influence learning in a positive way in both laboratory and classroom settings. On the other hand, in an another meta-analysis study of feedback in classrooms Lyster and Saito (2010) stated that although workshop research normally detected recasting most beneficial, language students in classrooms benefited, thorugh prompts, greatly when they were pushed to self-treat compared to getting the teacher's direct provision. Lyster (1998) also states that since recasts are not often explicit and quite ambiguous, In particular, witin the classrooms with their teachers, rather than in the laboratory with researchers, language learner find it difficult to be aware of his or her intent to repair. When teachers employs recasting with treaing morphosyntactic errors, teachers efforts go unnoticed (Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000). In addition, through recast, the interaction between the teacher and the student and the student and the student is insufficient. To sum up, it can be concluded that OCF provision can be beneficial as long as it promotes intarction at least between the teacher and the student. On the other hand, many studies discussed in the literature indicate that most of the language instructors try their best to treat the stydent errors but stick to mainly one strategy, recasts, which does not include mutual interaction as propmpts do (Lyster, 2001).

2.4. Research on Oral Corrective Feedback

The questions of if OCF plays a contributory role in making a good progress in a L2 or FL give rise to much curiosity Therefore CF research has evolved from classroom observations of how teachers intentionally or unintentionally respond to learner errors to experiments that examine how the technique can improve learners' L2 knowledge. Discussions over OCF provision have caused important discrepancy over what forms of input are functional for FL teaching and what forms are

not. Oral corrective feedback is a potentially controversial learning tool and the role it plays in foreign language acquisition has generated a lot of interest in the pedagogic community. Rather than relying on anecdotal evidence to support or refute the efficacy of this learning method, much formal research has been done. This research has generated a body of knowledge which guides language teachers in the most useful learning methods for foreign language acquisition.

That is, researchers are interested in which types of feedback are more effective on what structures, drawing on the rapidly growing research including laboratory experimental (Han, 2002; Ishida, 2004; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Mackey, Philp, Egi, Fujii, & Tatsumi, 2002; K. McDonough, 2007; Ortega & Long, 1997; J. Philp, 2003; Trofimovich, Ammar, & Gatbonton, 2007), classroom observational (R. Elliset al., 2001; Havranek, 2002; Havranek & Cesnik, 2001; Loewen & Philp, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Ohta,2000; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004), classroom experimental (Ammar, 2008; Ammar & Spada, 2006; R. Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Lyster, 2004a; Sheen, 2007; Y. Yang & Lyster, 2010), and laboratory-classroom combined (Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009) studies. In this literature, there are several studies carried out both in classroom and laboratory settings used to explain OCF effectiveness.

Due to the existence of negative evidence in the learning or acquisition environment, some researchers assert that it does not plays an important role in L1 learning. Some research has shown (e.g., Gregg, 1996; Krashen, Schwartz, 1999; Truscott, 1999) that "comprehensible input" is the primary way a language learner grasps new information. The argument follows that even though corrections might cause the learner to be self-conscious in their language use, ultimately it does not impact the learner's ability to acquire information or use what they have learned. For instance, Krashen believes that FL acquisition is fundamentally the result of implicit processing supported by "comprehensible input the only causative variable in SLA" (Krashen, 1982: 22). According to him, negative evidence, which could trigger an explicit learning process, can only facilitate learning but not acquisition; therefore, the effects OCF are only "peripheral and fragile" (Krashen, 1993: 725). Truscott is another researcher who rejects CF effectiveness both in written (Truscott, 1996) and oral formats (Truscott, 1999). According to him, OCF (form-focused feedback in his terms) has superficial effects on metalinguistic knowledge which do not last long and it does not contribute to acquisition of "genuine knowledge of language" (Truscott, 1998: 120). In addition, he questioned whether CF is a feasible and favorable teaching technique from both teachers' and learners' perspectives, claiming that OCF is even harmful for L2 acquisition and a bad idea for teachers to practice in the classroom (Truscott, 2005).

On the other hand, many oral corrective feedback studies have established the fact that OCF can have positive impacts on L2 development (e.g., Ferris, 1999; Lyster, Lightbown, & Spada, 1999). That is, language acquisition necessitates clues that disconfirm learners' incorrect hypotheses, that is, errors (see Corder, 1967). In addition to the different types of linguistic evidence (Gass, 1991;

Gass, Mackey, & Pica, 1998; Gass & Varonis, 1994), OCF can be discussed within a general framework of grammar instruction and error correction in L2 classrooms. Chaudron (1977: 32) looked at teachers' feedback on learners' errors by defining error correction as "any reaction of the teacher which transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner's utterance". He claimed that it should be one of the teachers' primary roles to provide "error correction, a form of negative feedback, and positive sanctions or approval of learners' production" (Chaudron, 1988: 132). Many more researchers (e.g., N. Ellis, 2005; Long, 1996) support the idea that corrective feedback is a useful tool that facilitates second language acquisition. They point out that such corrective feedback enables the language learner to make distinctions between their native and second languages.

Two decades ago, Lyster, Lightbown, and Spada (1999: 464) stated that through research on this field we now have "increasing evidence that feedback on error can be effective and what was needed at the time was methodical research into the influence of feedback type, instructional context, and learner characteristics". Although with some exceptions (e.g., Truscott, 1990) research studies, especially recently published meta-analyses, have discovered that OCF treatment can be useful (Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Skehan, 1998) and there are ample ways of language progress available for language teachers. These studies also examined what type of feedback results in L2 learning most effectively in terms of the implicitness and explicitness of feedback, that is, how explicitly or implicitly teachers commented on the structures or linguistic aspects with which their students had trouble. In general, a common type of implicit feedback is the recast, which is a limited or whole reformulation of a student's problematic L2 production that maintains its meaning (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). The examples of explicit feedback is metalinguistic feedback, in which teachers provide learners with metalinguistic comments about their erroneous production (Ellis, 2006), and explicit error correction, in which teachers or native speakers specifically talked about errors made by learners (Lyster, 1998). Ample numbers of empirical research studies indicated that OCF provision can have a positive effect on L2 development.

2.4.1. Studies Comparing Effectiveness of Feedback Types

Ellis (2006: 28) describes OCF as "responses to learner utterances containing an error". Since Lyster and Ranta's (1997) descriptive study, in which OCF provision is observed for almost 20 hours of foreign language French classes, made a classification of different types of teachers' OCF types, SLA research has descriptively and experimentally corroborated the role of CF in FFI Form Focused Instruction) in classrooms as well as lab settings. The OCF strategies are often classified regarding whether they are overt or covert. Although recasts have are regarded as implicit way (Long & Robinson, 1998), they can be rather obvious (Sheen, 2006) based on the setting (e.g., Sheen, 2004; Lyster & Mori, 2005), form of education in classroom (Nicholas et al., 2001; Mackey & Goo, 2007), content of the class (Long et al., 1998), student proficiency level (Mackey & Philp, 1998; Ammar &

Spada, 2006), frequency of ill-formed utterances (Philp, 2003). As for the prompts and explicit treatment, the case with overt types of OCF is not different at all, which can be quite covert at the same time if this group of strategies just imply that there is something wrong with the statement (e.g., Carroll & Swain, 1993). If they provide extra grammar information and correct form, then these group of classification can be considered more explicit (Sheen, 2007).

Beside their implicit and explicit category (e.g., Ellis & Sheen, 2006), OCF types can be categorized as Ranta and Lyster's (2007) classification like reformulation followed by explicit OCF provision and recasts that provide learners with target reformulations of their erroneous utterance, and prompts, which allow the student with some clues without reformulations, generating occasions for the students to treat his or her own erroneous utterances. In other words, the classifying of OCF types can also be based on whether OCF provision type is an input- or output providing way of correction allowing the student to amend their ill-formed oral production. Since recasts, explicit corrections and direct metalinguistic clues provide accurate forms of the erroneous utterances, these methods are categorized as "input providing" while prompts are "output-pushing" ones as these strategies do not give students direct correction in TL but, encourage students to correct their own mistakes (Lyster & Mori, 2006; Ranta & Lyster, 2007). In addition, as Lyster and Ranta (1997) state, recasts are the moves taken by the teacher in the form of reformulation to amend student's nontarget-like utterance excluding the problematic part. Explicit feedback also supplies the correct form yet, overtly shows that the learner's oral production was problematic. Thus the "input-providing" feedback types can make use of evaluations in the "working memory" making it easier for the students to figure out the gap between the ill-formed utterances and the correct structures in the TL and the target-like reformulation (Long, 1996; Schmidt 2001). Shortly, as the leraners receive more meaningful, FL students can concentrate on their own mistakes (VanPatten (1990). On the other hand, according to Lyster (2007), output prompting OCF strategies, which include a wide variety of OCF strategies such as *metalinguistic clues, elicitation, clarification request, and repetitions* never supply accurate systems but offer clues to assist students to self-repair, retrieving target-like forms from their own knowledge. Similarly, as VanPatten (1990) asserted, the teacher's use of prompts make students remember the data which is present in their long-standing recall giving the opportunity to correct their own mistakes.

Many studies have directly compared the OCF types in terms of their effectiveness, and overall, these studies reported the beneficial function of those ones which generate a negotiation or an interaction between the teacher and the student in language classes. Generally speaking, explicit feedback which engages learners in interaction has many advantages over implicit way of treatment in studies in which the treatment allows the learners to produce in TL. For one thing, there are some studies that concluded that prompting learners can be more beneficial than explicit corrections and recast. Recasting, where learners are parroted back the correct form of made statements, is considered to be a form of input-providing OCF types. In contrast, prompts, which give FL students the

opportunity to self-correct, are regarded as output-pushing OCF types (Ellis, 2006). The latter approach coincides with Swain's output hypothesis (Swain, 1995, 2005). The hypothesis was that language teachers needed to offer comprehensible input and to foster opportunities for learners to self-correct made statements. It is thought that these two forms of corrective input challenge language learners in unique ways. When responding to prompts, language learners rely on their long-term memory to modify their previously made statements. In contrast, recasting seems only to engage short-term memory functions (Lyster, 2004). Other research has shown that prompting further conveys benefits to learners since instead of providing the correct response, it forces learners to rewire their thinking such that they commit to long-term memory the correct form or phrase and no longer use the incorrect version (de Bot, 1996).

The initial OCF study (Carroll & Swain, 1993) explored the efficacy of some types of negative OCF strategies, the participants of which are a hundred native Spanish speakers. Carroll and Swain compared explicit correction, prompts, recasts and a control group receiving no feedback. During this exercise, the researchers provided four types of feedback: (1) metalinguistic feedback, (2) negative feedback without metalinguistic feedback, (3) recasts, and (4) indirect feedback (e.g. "Are you sure?"). Finally, the participants took part in two recall sessions that were designed to measure their understanding of the target structures. They found that the groups treated with "metalinguistic feedback" and "recast" turned out to be the ones who made the most progress among the other conditions in the immediate recall session, and the group which was treated with metalinguistic OCF strategy meaningfully outperformed the other groups in the recall session later. In addition, Carroll (2001), in her later study, also found that the groups provided with explicit outperformed the other groups treated with recast. The prompts were either "explicit" (overtly rejecting participants' utterances as wrong) or "implicit" (asking whether participants were sure of their response). The results showed that all groups which received feedback outclassed the control group. Also, the explicit group surpassed all other counterparts, suggesting that, while all forms of corrective feedback tested were more beneficial than no corrective feedback, explicit corrective feedback was the most effective.

In another study, Leeman (2003) looked at recasts without enhanced salience, recasts with enhanced salience, and what she termed "negative evidence". The participants were 74 English native speakers (38 males, 36 females) enrolled in a year 1 Spanish tertiary level class. The pre-test, post-test and treatment all took place individually between each participant and the researcher and lasted for approximately one hour. The delayed post-test was given following seven days later. The treatment consisted of information-gap activities designed to elicit responses using noun-adjective gender agreement, the target grammatical forms. By means of that treatment, the researcher provided OCF provision in the form of either recasts, recasts with enhanced salience (prosodic cues and enhanced stress) or negative evidence. Her results indicated that the negative evidence group performed identically to the control group. There were no improvements for those participants

exposed to negative evidence. The groups provided with recast significantly outperformed the ones provided with explicit correction. Additionally, the enhanced salience group performed best on all four post-treatment measures. These results led the researcher to conclude that corrective feedback with enhanced salience leads to greater development by causing specific items in the input to be more salient.

In a laboratory study, Rosa and Loew (2004) concluded that the explicit group outperformed implicit counterparts. The researchers explored several task features and manipulated the degree of explicitness to assess whether exposure to varying types and degrees of explicit corrective feedback types would have a differential effect on L2 development. The participants (n=100) were advanced level English speakers at a US university. The researchers controlled for the proficiency level of the participants by admitting only native English speakers with abilities in no other Latin languages. Participants had to demonstrate very little or no proficiency in producing the Spanish grammatical structure. The researchers employed ANOVA test to ensure that there were no significant differences among the participants at the beginning of the study just before the pre-test. This ensured that any gains detected on the post-test were due to the feedback received during the treatment. The tasks were computer-based and created to compare the effects of various levels of explicitness. The treatment consisted of grammar cards with glossed examples. There was a pre-task that exposed the participants to the Spanish contrary-to-fact conditional and showed glossed examples for its usage in both present/future and past tenses. For feedback, the participants had to click on a button and were then provided feedback on their wrong answers at various levels of explicitness. The treatment consisted of 28 puzzle questions that the participants had to figure out. For every single puzzle unit, they were provided with two pieces of a sentence and four movable pieces (subordinate clauses). They were instructed to complete the sentence fragments with the correct subordinate clause. The results of the study indicated that exposure to implicit feedback affected the students' capability to identify old examples of the forms in the FL and to retain the knowledge three weeks after treatment. The researchers advised caution in interpreting this result as the scores for the control group also showed significant gains on the post-test. They indicated that these scores regarding implicit feedback might be more indicative of memory and learners ability to recognize old exemplars. Further results did indicate, however, that more drastic increases were demonstrated for higher levels of explicitness. That is, those learners who were provided the most explicit feedback types demonstrated the highest levels of accuracy.

In another study, the efficacy of prompting versus recasting was tested and ultimately prompting demonstrated a stronger link with learning the proper usage of the irregular past forms in English (Ellis et al., 2006). Leaners from three different classes were asked to narrate stories; the first group were given prompts to correct errors, for the second group errors were corrected for them as a form of implicit feedback, and the third group acted as a control group so no interventions were offered. Student performance was then recorded by using a number of a measures: an oral repetition

task, and a test administered twice, once immediately after the intervention and then two weeks later, to evaluate grammar and language acquisition by the differing corrective method receiving groups. Ultimately the research showed students prompted to make corrections outperformed the other participants on grammar usage and the test administered two weeks after the exercise took place. The authors concluded prompting is a more efficient learning method as students are readily able to recognize their erroneous utterances and correct them as when compared with recasting or no intervention at all.

Similarly, in another OCF study (Ammar & Spada, 2006) explored the efficacy of different COF types in a L2 setting in Canada and stated that prompt groups outperformed significantly the recast groups. Sixty-four students from three different intensive ESL classes participated in a four-week, 11-session long study which targeted the correct use of third person possessive determiners. Similar to the structure of the previously detailed study, there were three groups: one group was given prompts to correct errors, the second group had errors corrected for them as a form of implicit feedback, and the third group acted as a control group so no new interventions were offered beyond their typical curriculum. The study employed a pre-test, an immediate post-test, and a delayed post-test. For the pre-test, researchers gathered a baseline evaluation of student's current knowledge of possessive determiners. After the practice sessions concluded, students were issued a test immediately to evaluate their improvement and again four weeks later to evaluate their retention of the target structure. These evaluations showed that both groups receiving some form of corrective feedback performed better than the control group and also indicated that prompts were especially beneficial for low proficiency students. Overall, output pushing corrective feedback was shown to be a more effective tool than input providing corrective feedback. For students who scored above 50% in the baseline evaluation, the two types of feedback were equally useful whereas students who scored lower than 50% in the baseline evaluation were much more successful when offered prompts rather than recasts.

On the other hand, the study whose findings led to a conflicting results in two different classrooms for both recast and prompt in terms of frequency of usage, uptake, and repair was Lyster and Mori's (2006). The researchers re-analyzed the data collected for their previous studies in order to try to justify differences commonly observed in the classroom feedback literature. Data from French lessons originally collected and examined by Lyster (2004) along with data from the Japanese lessons that were analyzed by Mori (2002) were re-analyzed in terms of Spada and Frölich's (1995) "Communicative Orientation to Language Teaching coding scheme" and Lyster and Ranta's (1997) "error treatment model". The key objective of the re-analyzing of data was to figure out two questions: 1) what is the general distribution OCF types provided in Japanese and French immersion lessons, 2) what is the amount of "uptake" and "repair". The research revealed that in two classes recast was the most frequently used OCF types (65% for Japanese, 54% for French), with prompts being the second most frequently (26%, 38% respectively), whereas explicit correction was the least

frequent feedback type provided in those two classrooms observed (9%, 7% respectively). As for the second question, even though recasts were the most beneficial in the Japanese classes result in uptake (61%) and repair (68%), in the French Immersion classrooms prompts were found to lead to the most uptake (62%) and treatment (53%). With the help of these results, Lyster and Mori (2006) suggested that Counterbalance Hypothesis asserting that OCF types that produce infarctions might be more beneficial on condition that it differs from the main communicative focus of the lesson. Therefore if, for example, the activities in a language lesson are mostly form focused, the most beneficial OCF strategy for students in this setting can be recasts. Whereas, prompts may possibly be more beneficial in directing the students' focus on the form which is aimed at, if a classroom is mostly content-based, with little attention to form, as they are more explicit and counterbalance the main communicative emphasis of such lesson.

Further evidence that prompting can be more advantageous than recasting comes by the study (Loewen & Nabei, 2007) in which the researchers compared these methodologies and their impact on learner question development. The study was conducted with 66 native Japanese speakers learning English which were divided into four groups: a 10-person received input providing corrective feedback, an 8-person group received clarification questions, a 7-person group received metalinguistic clues, and the remaining group acted as a control group and received no feedback. Native speakers guided group exercises during which students formulated questions. After the intervention, a test was administered to evaluate group performance in terms of the OCF types received. Results demonstrated enhanced mastery of the topic by all students who had received some type of intervention when compared with the control group, but it did not indicate that one methodology was more effective than another. This was in contrast to a 2006 study conducted by the same authors where they had concluded that output prompter OCF was significantly more beneficial than input providing OCF types for adult EFL students. The authors believe the different experimental outcomes is due to the shorter nature of the 2007 test. In spite of the evidence of enhanced information retaining with prompting, the authors still feel that recasting is a useful teaching tool. The concluded that it allows for feedback in a less confrontational and less disruptive way that still focuses on effective communication.

Ammar (2008) analyzed data, previously unevaluated, that had been collected during a previous study (Ammar, 2003). The 2008 study used results from a 2003 computerized task to compare the effectiveness of different OCF provision methods regarding the correct usage of possessive determiners. 64 Canadian sixth graders learning ESL were split into three groups for four weeks of treatment: first group was provided with output pushing oral corrective feedback, the second one with input providing OCF provision, and the last one formed the control group and was not provided any additional OCF treatment. The researcher employed a pre-test, an immediate post-test and a delayed post-test. Both tests included a couple of activities: a multiple-choice test taken on a computer and an oral description exercise. Only the oral description exercise was administered for

the delayed post-test, which was carried out about a month after the treatment ended, and only given to some students due to limited time. The results showed new findings: the control group with n no treatment performed the best on the multiple-choice computerized test. This differed from the earlier 2003 study that relied only on information gleaned from the oral exercise and had concluded that the students who are provided treatment overtook the control group in terms of performance, especially the prompt group. Ultimately Ammar concludes that prompting is still the most effective intervention, given that the computerized test results on possessive determiners might have been affected by their clear meaning, and that students maximize their learning when provided explicit corrective feedback techniques, and therefore that can explain why prompts seemed to be more beneficial than recasts. However, it is surprising that the control group had done so well in the computerized task but not in the oral picture-description task. The difference in results lead Ammar (2008) to wonder what construct the computerized task may be measuring, if not implicit knowledge.

In a 2009 study, Nassaji looked at two types of OCF (recasts and elicitations) throughout classroom interactions. The participants were 42 adult learners of English (16 female, 26 male) from various linguistic backgrounds. Their ages ranged from 18 to 35. All participants had been assessed as being at an intermediate level through a placement exam taken for their ESL program. Each participant engaged in a written description of a picture sequencing task followed by oral interaction during which the teacher could choose which type of feedback (recast or elicitation) to provide. Additionally, the researcher could employ a more or less explicit type of recast or elicitation, as determined by the researcher at the time of treatment. The researcher coded recasts that repeated the error with no additional cues as implicit. Recasts that highlighted the errors through emphatic stress and/or rising intonation were operationalized as more explicit. All elicitations for a response that in no way highlighted the error or simple requests for clarification were coded as implicit. Those elicitation requests that highlighted a non-nativelike utterance by repeating it with emphatic stress or metalinguistic prompts were coded as more explicit. After the interaction, a copy of the original written description was returned to the learner for correction of any errors based on the interaction just completed. After 2 weeks, a copy of the original unedited version of the description was given to each participant for correction in order to assess whether any gains were retained over time. The findings revealed that, although recasts resulted in more post-interaction corrections, those corrections made as a result of elicitations were more likely to be recalled over time. Additionally, the two explicit OCF types resulted in more post-interaction corrections than their implicit counterparts. Nassaji determined on the basis of these data that a close correlation between the efficacy of corrective feedback in an interactionist framework may exist and the degree of explicitness, as indicated by many other studies (R. Ellis et al., 2006; Loewen & Philp, 2006).

In another study, Lyster and Izquierdo 2009 examined the differential efficacy of provision of prompt, recast, and no OCF treatment. They conducted a combined classroom and laboratory study by adult university learners (n=25, with 21 female, 4 male) with a mean age of 21. The students were

of various L1 backgrounds and had been enrolled in an advanced French classes. The participants undertook three exams and two treatment sessions over a 9-week period. Additionally, for the classroom treatment, the researchers created a form-focused unit that the teacher implemented for 3 hours over a period of fortnight. All participants received the same OCF provision. As for the laboratory portion of the study, however, the participants engaged in two 30-minute sessions during which they were provided either recasts or prompts on the target grammatical structure of gender in noun endings. In order to maintain consistency across types of feedback, the researchers chose recasts, which are the most implicit way of treatment, and prompts, which are the more explicit. For their study, they operationalized prompts as clarification requests, and a repetition when deeded. Employing a pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test design, findings showed that the progress over time for both groups was identical There were notable advances in both groups in the pre- and immediate post-test, and both groups maintained their levels of improvement in the post-test which was conducted a certain time later. They stated that recasts and prompts yield similar results in dyadic interactions.

In conclusion, although recasts are considered as commonly provided frequent type in many foreign language classrooms, many studies concluded the most students who are provided correction through recasts are not able to notice that the uttered some problematic expressions and their errors are treated. That is the result of a misunderstanding that they may think that the teacher is trying to interact with their students through another way of same expression because such recasts may be interpreted as another way of what the lerner uttered (Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Lyster 2007; Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada, 2001). As a remedy, several recent empirical studies confirmed the importance of employing more academically-oriented OCF methods (i.e., prompts). On the one hand, in a series of quasi-experiment studies in adult ESL classrooms in New Zealand (Ellis, 2007; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006), it was shown that prompts as a form of metalinguistic clue led learners to gain more control over their already acquired knowledge of the English past tense and comparative than implicit feedback such as recasts. Similarly, Sheen (2007) demonstrated that explicit correction (i.e., explicitly reformulating learners' non-target like production with metalinguistic explanation) benefited adult ESL learners' acquisition of English articles more than recasts. In contrast, the relative efficacy of prompts over recasts has been confirmed in the case of young immersion students' acquisition of French gender attribution (Lyster, 2004a), young ESL students' acquisition of English possessive determiners (Ammar & Spada, 2006), and university-level EFL students' learning of regular past forms (Yang & Lyster, 2010). In sum, with respect to OCF effectiveness on L2 morphosyntactic development, the results of the study (Ellis & Sheen, (2006: 597) concluded, "there is no clear evidence that recasts work better for acquisition than other aspects of interaction such as models, prompts, or explicit corrective strategies".

2.4.2. Relevance of Studying Teachers' Beliefs

Beliefs have an essential function to play play in teaching and learning, therefore, experience, expectation, and belief of learning, indeed, are taken seriously by effective students (Altan, 2012; Benson, 2001; Dörnyei, 2005; Horwitz, 2007; Rad, 2010). In addition, what students and teachers believe of language learning is essential in each involvement regarding human's behaviors (Horwitz, 2007). Especially teachers' belief, which is basically an amalgam of the view, the value, and the thought about regarding learning, has an important enfluence the teacher's lesson plans and educational activities therefore has an impact on the student's learning experiences (Altan, 2006; Borg, 2006).

Thus, about three decades ago research on teaching and learning has moved from the traditional examination of how teachers' actions affected student achievement to observing and exploring teacher cognition (Fang, 1996). Research on teachers' assumptions or beliefs is vital since it has been concluded that teacher's practices are influenced by their beliefs, even though there sometimes discrepancy between their practices and beliefs (Borg, 2003). Therefore, it is worth finding out the main reasons of why language teachers behave so. Schulz (2001), who studied EFL teacher's and student's beliefs of error treatment found that most of the students favor error correction, but most of the teachers do not agree with the idea that error correction always works positively. Some studies investigating the effect of teachers' beliefs on their practice of OCF provision revealed interesting results. For example, Jensen (2001) revealed that these teachers' perception of feedback was consistent with their real practice in classes. Moreover, Basturkmen et al (2004) observed that language teachers attempted to treat learners' erroneous utterances even when the message was understandable, although the right thing to do about OCF is that it is only needed to provide OCF provision if the erroneous expressions become hard to comprehend. In another study, Mori (2011) observed that EFL teachers do not only intend to enhance the learners' language learning, but also to introduce values such as self-esteem, free choice and skill to communicate, and as a result that can affect the way they provide OCF.

Teacher education programs, on the other hand, can be an important aspect in that process shaping teachers' perceptions. Studies on this issue have shown that most teachers can gain their beliefs about language learning through teacher education (Borg, 2003). For example, Borg (2003) stated that the language teachers can, for the most part, form his or her belief on language teaching and learning during studying the language as a student. Furthermore, Pessoa and Sebba (2006) reported that while exposed to new theories, teachers go through a cognitive process making them inevitably examine what they already knew and what they have just learned about teaching and learning to see how they are different or related. Similarly, Vieira (2006) explored student-teachers' beliefs before they started an educational program and right after the graduation and concluded that the pre-service teacher can change his or her opinion about teaching and learning.

In contrast, some research have concluded that the teacher training program has slight or no impact on prospective teacher's beliefs. For example in the contexts outside Turkey, Peacock's (2001) study explored the beliefs of language teachers who were enrolled at a training program. The research showed that the difference was not significantly important between the students from freshmen to seniors, with some exceptions regarding teaching and learning structure and vocabulary of the language. In the same vein, Çapan (2014) studied and compared what the prospective and in-service EFL teachers' believe about grammar teaching and did not conclude noteworthy differences between their beliefs before and after practicum classes. As for Turkish context, the study of Kunt and Özdemir (2010) examined the beliefs of ELT candidate teachers who were freshmen and seniors. The results of the study showed that there were only some changes in their beliefs, with most of them remained the same. In another study, Tercanlıoğlu (2005) explored pre-service EFL teachers' language learning beliefs in order to decide whether beliefs and genders were significantly related. Her study detected no statistically relationship between their beliefs in terms of their genders. Likewise, Altan (2012), the participants of which were from seven different universities and were studying English language teaching, explored the pre-service teachers' beliefs of language learning, and reported that there was not significant difference between their beliefs in terms of their status at the department.

Now, the issues about OCF ranges from benefits of OCF provision for foreign language teaching and learning, techniques of OCF, best time for feedback provision, and types of errors requiring amendment (Ellis, 2009; Kim, 2004; Ma & Zhang, 2010). These issues have produced significant number of experimental research about the possible influence of OCF on FL and L2 learning and its functions in real language classroom (Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004; Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Ellis, 2009; Ellis, Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima, 2008; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Sheen, 2007a).

Besides certain experimental works (Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Mackey & Goo, 2007) suggesting that OCF can enhance learning a FL or L2, yet more research studies are required in order to find out how pre-service English teachers perceive, use and select the types of OCF in order to enhance learning a FL or L2 (Li, 2010). Basically, it is necessary to determine before their graduation whether pre-service language teachers are aware of different types of OCF that would better facilitate language learning, or not how and when pre-service English teachers would provide feedback. Or, do they learn about these strategies through experience on the job? Regarding when and how to treat students' erroneous utterances, collecting more information about what the pre-service English teachers state they believe and do in the classroom regarding OCF provision is necessary, if it is proposed FL and L2 research influence on teacher education and ultimately language education. One important question must be answered: Are pre-service EFL teachers aware of the recent research or do they shape their beliefs of language teaching and learning through teaching experience after graduation? The present study of 152 pre-service ELT and non-ELT teachers in Turkey will add to

the limited number of studies dealing with this matter as there are no studies done on this issue in Turkey to the knowledge of the researcher of this study.

2.4.3. Reseach on Teachers' and Learners' Beliefs of OCF

It is crucial and a strategic aspect of an effective language teaching and learning to reveal the language teachers' and learners beliefs of OCF provision. As this issue affect the efficacy of OCF treatment, this phenomenon has been investigated by research studies. Educational research studies have teachers state their beliefs through interviews and questionnaires. Beliefs can be characterised as "statements [language] teachers made about their ideas, thoughts, and knowledge that are expressed as evaluations of what 'should be done', 'should be the case', and 'is preferable'" (Basturkmen et al., 2004: 244). We should admit that teachers and learners' beliefs are sometimes inconsistent, but Schulz (2001) reported that language teachers ought to avoid any inconsistency or disagreement between what they do in the classroom and what their students' believe in order for EFL teaching and learning to be effective and fruitful.

Many studies revealed that EFL learners and teachers positively agree that students' errors should be provided with OCF strategies. Nevertheless, some studies indicated that a discrepancy existed between what the teachers actually practiced and what the learners understanding was regarding to the amount of OCF (Basturkan, 2004), when to provide OCF (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005), and which OCF strategies to employ (Brown, 2009; Lee, 2008). That is to say, a discrepancy exists between what the teachers' practices are like and what their learners' expectations from their teachers in language classes are like.

In an earlier study with Japanese high school students and teachers, Fukuda (2004) investigated the beliefs of language teachers and learners regarding OCF provision and reported that there were important disagreements especially regarding the extent of OCF provision. Although learners preferred extra OCF provision, language teachers stated that the extent of OCF was satisfactory based on their level of exposure. The results showed that learners are not pleased with the extent of OCF provided by language teachers. The teachers stated that providing errors with OCF disturbs the course of communication and makes learners avoid speaking. The study advices that language teachers should consider their learners' interests, requests, level of proficiency, enthusiasm, grade, and further dynamics influencing students' attitudes toward OCF provision.

In another study conducted by Basturkmen et al. (2004), the researchers aimed to discover any possible mismatch between teachers' views and their deeds in language classrooms. The study indicated that important differences occurred among the three teachers in terms of their beliefs and practices most probably due to their subjective perceptions rather than internal reasons as all three

language teachers had classes with intermediate level students under the similar conditions. The participants of the study were three English instructors who had English classes with students of intermediate level. The study concluded that while one of the teachers maintained self-correction OCF strategies, the second teacher supported teacher correction and stated that self-correction OCF types are essential when they are employed in the company of some other OCF methods including recast. The findings of this research also revealed that the teacher repaired the students' error with instant OCF strategies and broke up the course of students' conversation with himself, although he had reported that he frequently delays the OCF provision to the students' error, with an aim of avoiding interrupting the students' speaking. There was a discrepancy between what he had stated he believed of OCF and what he practiced in his classes. Although he had reported that the teachers need to avoid interrupting the flow of the communication, he generally broke up learners' speaking while trying to repair the errors.

In the same vein, Chavez (2006) carried out a case study to examine and compare learners' and teachers' beliefs to teachers' practices for OCF a at a university classes. The participants of the study were three lecturers teaching German to students of intermediate grades. The results of the study discovered that the each of the three tutors' stated beliefs were inconsistence with their own practices regarding OCF. For example, the first teacher's main focus was on form since he provided explicit OCF to the students' errors. However, the other two tutors hardly ever treated their learners' errors with OCF strategies. This perspective was apparent as their main focus was on fluency instead of accuracy. Therefore, they stated that they never considered OCF provision in order to avoid interrupting the flow of the students' dialogues. Different from the first teacher, these two teachers frequently employed other strategies enhancing communication rather than correcting explicitly. Unlike the research studies discussed earlier, the results of this study indicated that both the teacher's and the learner's beliefs are consistent in relation to OCF provision.

Later, Zacharias (2007) examined language learners' perceptions of teachers' OCF provision. The findings of the study revealed that language learners have affirmative attitudes towards OCF provision. The results also showed that the learners, no matter what their grades are, wanted more of their errors should be provided with OCF. Also, it was found that learners of high proficiency level were keener on receiving compared to their counterparts of lower level proficiency. In addition, it was revealed that learners from all level of proficiency expected errors should be provided with explicit OCF types.

In another study, Lee (2008) investigated both learners' and teachers' attitudes towards OCF provision and revealed a significant discrepancy among what these language teachers believed and how they actually acted in classroom and what their students' preferred. The findings of this research proposed that the language teachers need to employ those methods that promote communication between the teacher and the student like peer correction and self-correction. The results also

suggested that the language teachers introduce the OCF methods to the students and decide together on the methods to use in the lessons. Or else, the students' misunderstanding of OCF use in the classroom setting may affect language learning in a negative way. The findings of Lee's research are in consistence with the results that teachers need to take the learners' perceptions and opinions into consideration and give details about the significance of using such kinds of methods.

As for studies conducted in Turkey in relation to the teacher beliefs of OCF, Phipps and Borg (2007) conducted a case study with two EFL teachers examining EFL teachers' beliefs and practices. While the Turkish EFL teachers reported that they regarded explicit OCF provision to be useful, one teacher avoided treating students' errors with OCF provision due to feeling not enough confident and worrying about the students' emotional states. In addition, although second teacher, whose beliefs and practices were consistent, reported that she had not had complete confidence when making her mind up as she had not been certain about what the learners' replies would be like.

In a more recent study, Roothoft (2014) investigated what ten adult EFL teachers believe and actually do in the classroom regarding OCF provision, and detected an important discrepancy between what they state they believe and actually do. Among the seven instructors who reported giving importance to fluency in communication and avoiding interruptions, five teachers actually provided students' errors with immediate OCF on many occasions, even if the students' errors did not obstruct communication, which means that the students were not allowed to express their thoughts at liberty for no good reasons. Therefore, most of the teachers did not act in line with their stated beliefs that fluency and communication are given priority. On the other hand, only two of them promoted fluency and communication as they treated low rate of the students' oral errors, generally allowing them to utter their ideas freely.

In summary, the reviewed studies here agree that there is an important mismatch between what the students believe and what the teachers do in relation to OCF strategies, extent and efficacy of OCF provision, (Schulz, 2001). Many studies stated that learners prefer their teachers to treat their errors with more OCF provision. On the other hand, language teachers assert that constantly treating learners' errors with OCF provision disturbs the natural course of their dialogues. Most of the studies also revealed that also both teachers and learners were less in favor of OCF methods that promote self-repair than teacher correction (Panova and Lyster 2002).

2.5. The History of Teacher Education in Turkey

Teaching is a discipline that identifies the educational needs of students and takes different ju dgments on topics such as assessing student achievement and enhancing the standard of teaching (Gözütok, 2004). Besides, it aims to raise new generations that will fulfill the needs of the country based on the country's culture, traditions and values. It can be stated that teachers are the main

component of education since he or she is the one with whom students interact face-to-face in the classroom in addition that the quality and variety of the training depends on the teacher in classroom. Moreover, they are the very first mentors of the new generations that might be leading the country in the future.

However, it should be noted that teacher education is not limited to only a set of knowledge of the subject matter that will be imparted, it also aims to raise teachers who have essential pedagogic skills that enable them understand the child psychology and make appropriate decisions for students' ideal development. Thus, the quality of teacher education affects indirectly the students' education, as well. When all these reasons are taken into consideration, teacher education has always been of prime importance in all of the countries as well as in Turkey. Specifically in Turkey, teacher education has undergone various changes parallel to thr economic, political, and the social status of Turkey.

In the initial years of the Ottoman Empire, the education system consisted of primary schools which were known as *Sıbyan mektebi*, *madrasah*, private schools, military and technical schools and school of minorities (Akyüz, 2003). The teachers in '*sıbyan*' schools were called as '*muallim' (*referring to "teacher" in Arabic). In addition, teachers were called '*müderris'* who worked in *madrasas*, which could be regarded as today's upper secondary school or higher education. After graduating from a mekteb, the person who wanted to be a *müderris* had to apply for internship which was called as "*mülazemet sistemi*". However, in order to work in a high level madrasa, they had to be successful in an examination for this regard. Moreover, the criteria to be a teacher in Enderun schools was to graduate from *Enderun* schools, as well since those schools aimed to raise proficient statesmen for the empire. The teachers, who were called as "*lala*", were selected from experienced, competent, reliable and wise statesmen.

Due to westernization and modernization movement, Ottoman Empire needed new schools whose mission was different from madrasa's, as a result, a new curriculum and new teachers. Due to this need, the establishment of teacher training system in 1848 came true (Çalık & Kılınç, 2017). Consequently, *Darulmuallimin* which was an institution training male teachers was founded. Depending on the regulations prepared by Ahmet Cevdet Paşa in 1851, the students had to be successful in the examination to be accepted to the school. The graduates were appointed according to their graduation grades. Moreover, Çalık and Kılınç (2017) stated that students had to take "lecturing and teaching methods" course which could be interpreted as the primary goal of the new institution was to raise qualified teachers. Nearly 20 years later, Darulmuallimat as a female teacher training school was established because of the fact that there were not enough female teachers for female students (Altın, 2017). The students who fulfill the requirements such as knowing Arabic, Persian and Turkish, having basic mathematic and linguistic knowledge as well as not being ill or physically disabled were trained for three years (Çalık & Kılınç, 2017).

Radical changes and developments pertaining to education have taken place during the Turkish Republic's earlier years in order to raise new generations that could fulfill the economic, social, and political needs of the newborn state. In 1924, "The Law of Unification of Education" passed as a result, all the schools were attached to Ministry of National Education.

As stated by Çakıroğlu and Çakıroğlu (2010), due to the wide discrepancies between the needs of rural and urban areas of the country, different approaches to teaching programs for the two areas have been developed. For this reason, two kinds of educational system for teachers have been designed: a) primary teacher training schools for urban areas, b) rural village teacher training schools for rural areas. However, village teacher training schools were reformed into *Village Institutes* that were believed to meet the practical needs of villagers in 1940s. These institutes started to offer to teach their student teachers so that the can teach male students in the villages how to be a good farmer and blacksmith, and female students to handle domestic economics, to look after kids and to sew for girls (Gürşimşek et al, 1997). However, because of the changes in political arena, *Village Institutes* were closed in 1954 (Gürşimşek et al, 1997; Çakıroğlu & Çakıroğlu, 2010). Consequently, all schools that were training teachers were unified as Primary Teacher Schools in which the education lasted for 6 years. According to 'National Education Basic Law' accepted in 1973, those who want to be primary teachers had to attend educational colleges for two years following three year of education in secondary schools . The students who are graduated from these institutes were employed as class or form teachers in primary schools (Gürşimşek et al, 1997). In 1989, two-year educational institutes were transformed into four-year educational faculties and all teachers had to graduate from 4-year-education faculties no matter what their majors were. Since then, the number of education faculties have been increasing in an attempt to meet the teacher needs in Turkey.

As for in-field-teacher training, there were no institutes that training subject matter teachers for middle schools during the very first years of Republic. Thus, the first teacher training school for subject matter teachers was opened in Konya in 1926 -1927 academic year. One later, this teacher training school was closed and reopened in Ankara and it was named as Gazi Middle Teacher School and Training Institute in which pre-service student teachers were trained and educated throughout 3.5 years.

On the other hand, in the early states, branch teachers used to be trained and educated in High Teacher Training Schools which covered 4-year education in Ankara and İzmir in 1959 and 1964 respectively. With a lot of teacher training models which had been integrated until 1981, profound changes occurred in 1982 when "the responsibilities and activities of teacher training were transferred from The Ministry of Education to the universities" (Altan, 1998: 408). After the passing of the law of higher education, all these teacher trainin institutions, which had been under the control of the ministry of education, were attached to Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu (Higher Education Council) referred to as YÖK, and provided teachers to schools through the training in education faculties.

Since then, education faculties have become the leading institutions to meet the need for in-field-teachers for secondary schools (Gürşimsek et al., 1997; Çakıroğlu & Çakıroğlu, 2010). Today, the training period is 4 years for those who will work in primary or secondary schools while high school teachers take 5 year training in the faculties. In their senior year, students have a practicum course in which students observe how in-service teachers perform their responsibilities, assist them in teaching and do their own micro-teachings to have experience before starting to work.

2.6. The History of Foreign Language Teacher Education in Turkey

In the early years of the newborn country, only literacy became the central concern, therefore learning and teaching a FL was not a priority until 1943. In that year, FL education was brought to the agenda of the meetings organized by The Board of Training and Order (BOTO), which gathers around the professionals regarding education and addresses the problems relating to education. It is in 1988 that BOTO developed an educational strategy for teaching foreign languages. Without the need for FL, there would not be demands for FL teachers. FL teacher training could be started only after establishing a FL.

Since English Language has been becoming a main tool for communication and has become the only language in every aspect of life all over the world, it has been always gaining importance in educational system in Turkey too. Turkey has been in need of English as foreign language for a long time. It especially gave distinctive status to English Language education in 2013 and made it obligatory for school children to start to take 2 hour-English classes a week in year two, and 3 hours a week starting from year 5, and during secondary and university education. The private schools even have their students take their English classes during reception classes. Therefore, the need for EFL teachers has been increasing promptly.

Universities of Çapa and Gazi are the two pioneering universities at which ELT teacher education started in 1944 with under the name of Teacher Training Institution (TII). When teachers' training formally began at Dar-ül Muallimin (Teacher Training College) in 1948, Gazi Öğretmen Okulu (Gazi School of Teacher Training) was the only institute that had been training teachers offering pedagogy courses since 1926 (Aydın, 2007). As for foreign language teacher training, the training of French language teachers started in 1941, English language in 1944, and German language in 1947 at Gazi Institute of Education (Demirel, 1991). The length of training in these three departments was two-years, and it was extended to three years in 1967, and four-years in 1978, under the name of Gazi Higher Teacher Training School. Later, as Akyüz (2009) reported, this institution was transformed into Gazi University and the Faculty of Education in 1982.

Gradually the number of EFL teachers needed increased in Turkey as the subject of English was made compulsory starting from year two at state primary schools and reception or nursery classes

at private schools all the way through university education. Therefore, having sufficient number of qualified English language teachers was significantly beneficial. In order to satisfy the needs for qualified English teachers, MONE made it possible for graduates from English Language and Literature (ELL) or American Language and Literature (ALL) to apply for the job vacancies as English teachers provided that they obtain a certificate after attending a special course organized by Educational (Demirel, 1990). However, since the ELT programs at faculty of education, and ELL and ALL at faculty of education failed to train sufficient number of English teachers needed, by the law of 1982 the YÖK allowed the ELT programs to increase the number of students they accept and to open evening classes in 1994 to double the number of students enrolling.

At present, the main focus of foreign language teaching and learning is to teach English for the most part. Graduates who are going to be accepted into the national education system must pursue a four year English-related Bachelor's degree (Seferoğlu, 2004). With the decision of 340 taken by head council of education and morality of MEB in 2003, ELT graduates of faculty of education, those who have graduated from English Language and Literature, and American Language and Literature departments from faculty of letters who are qualified with a certificate, those of the English-medium Department of Linguistics who are qualified with a certificate, those of the English-medium Departments who are qualified with a certificate are entitled to apply for vacant job opportunities at state schools. For example, a pedagogy certifying program contained a training program of thirty-one hours of classes weekly and it was offered by faculties of education of 34 state or private universities in Turkey (Bektaş-Altıok, 2006).

As for the differences between two sources that train English teachers, the aim of the ELT department at faculty of education is to educate English teachers, with a program providing ELT methodology and educational pedagogy along with skill courses such as reading, speaking, academic writing, and grammar. On the other hand, English Language and Literature departments at ELL provides their students with mainly literature and skill courses and their main goal is not to train EFL teachers. The graduates of ELT who studied English language and literature are still eligible for teaching English posts at state or private schools on condition that they attend any ELT department at faculty of education for one academic year to take methodology and pedagogy courses. One more dissimilarity between two institutions was that the English aptitude of those students who had graduated from ELL departments was higher than that of their counterparts from ELL departments since the ELL was a 4-year program and had more qualified teaching members. In brief, both institutions had advantages and disadvantages compared to each other but reality is that many English teacher candidates who lacked sufficient qualification were appointed by MEB (Ministry of National Education) (Demircan, 1988). In this study, participants were two groups of students, first one is ELT students and the other one is non-ELT students with "teaching certificates" at a major university in eastern Turkey.

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODOLOGY

This study followed a mixed-method research paradigm so as to find answers to the research questions posed previously. Mixed-method research, the third research paradigm (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007), aims to answer research questions by combining quantitative and qualitative approaches and this method has been gradually more used for the purpose of many studies recently (O'Cathain, 2009). Although both methods are claimed to have been rooted in a epistemologically different spectrum in the sense that they hold opposing views about the ways in which social reality is to be investigated, the methodological pluralism was chosen to utilize the strengths of both qualitative and quantitative research to capture the picture as comprehensive as possible. The qualitative tradition which took the form of interview and observation in this study allowed me to understand, in detail, the pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs of OCF provision and their actual practices in the classroom during their practicum classes in its possible naturalistic context. With the qualitative part, the the current study sought to reveal EFL teachers' preferences from their angle, relying on its capacity to explore the invisibility of reality.As the aim of this study is not only to explain what happens but to understand the source of their beliefs and their practices in naturalistic environment, qualitative method enabled me as a researcher to obtain a set of representations of the participant's experiences and the way the participant interprets his or her experiences. In order to collect first hand and detailed data and, see the phenomena through the eyes of the participants as close as possible, I referred to qualitative data collection instruments. So, the use of qualitative research tradition in addition to the quantitative one is not a matter of choice but necessity for the research questions. This also served to provide triangulation for the research in that the use of a variety of methods to collect data on the same topic not only assured the validity of findings but also increased the depth of knowledge and strengthened my standpoint from various perspectives.

The researcher made use of qualitative data gathered by observing EFL classrooms and interviewing, and quantitative data through a survey to obtain to triangulate the results (De Groot, 2002; Dörnyei, 2003). In this method, the qualitative analysis plays a supportive role by providing additional context for interpreting the quantitative findings (Teddie & Tashakkori, 2009). The aim at using multiple strategies in order to gather data that these way of analyses are regarded beneficial tools for revealing what the participants do, they believe and why they do so (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010).

When it comes to the quantitative method employed in this study, the main function was to capture the reality through testable and standard measurement thus allowing us, if not to generalize, but to transfer our findings to similar settings.The attempt to make comparisons between ELT and non-ELT departments in terms of the stated dim of research questions made it necessary for me to approach the issue objectively through the accumulation of verified facts. To thie end, the Beliefs Questionnaire was employed in this study as discussed in detail the flollowingwing part.

This chapter provides an in-depth account of the overall approach exploited in this study including: the research design and the tools exploited for the purpose of this study, methodology, accounting of selecting of the participant and the setting, findings from the piloting studies testing the study design and materials, and changes due to piloting studies.

1.1. Research Design

The aim of this study was to discover what prospective ELT and non-ELT teachers believed about oral corrective feedback provision and whether there was a significant difference between the beliefs of pre-service EFL teachers from ELT and ELL departments. As the focal purpose of qualitative research studies is to discover phenomena from the perspective of participants (Seliger and Shohamy, 1989) during their practices and to do so in the participants' natural environment, such type of research (both qualitative and quantitative) might be considered to be as the best model for this type of investigation.

While classroom observations and recordings were employed to be able to discover the teachers' real practices practices on OCF the classroom, the follow up interviews and the survey were exploited to be able to reveal their stated beliefs regarding OCF. Data collection took place over a period of one semester program at a Turkish state university. Twenty trainee English teachers had one 40-minute lesson observed and videotaped and following the classroom observation, the prospective teachers of English also filled out the Belief Questionnaire about their teaching practices and attitudes towards oral corrective feedback provision. Then, those participants who had one lesson observed and videotaped in the beginning of the data collection were interviewed as a second step to the data collection process. The use of a diversity of means in order to collect the data (i.e., data triangulation) was seen as a way to facilitate its validation and present a holistic view of the issue at hand. And the last stage of this research meant to find out the the participant's beliefs of oral corrective feedback in general and his or her actual use of oral corrective feedback through semi structured interview (see Appendix 3).

In order to commence the observations, interviews and the survey, I had to take permission from the Office of National Education Directorate in the province where the study took place and

management of Faculty of Education where the participants were studying ELT or the certificate program (see Appendix 7). After getting necessary permittion, twenty prospective student teachers of English were drawn randomly for observations of the classes from all of 152 participants who had given their consents to take part in the study. Data collection took place over a period of one semester program at a Turkish state university. There were three steps to the investigation: first, as the purpose of the research was to investigate, observe, and elicit the way EFL student teachers deal with learners' errors in the authentic classroom at various state schools and to reveal their stated beliefs related to OCF provision during their obligatory work experience, for the qualitative data gathering, twenty trainee English teachers, ten of them were from ELT and ten of them were from ELL department who were selected randomly, had one 40-minute lesson each observed and videotaped. Following the observations, the same participants took part in the follow up interviews, in order to reveal what they did in the classroom and why they did so during practicum classes.

The third part investigated the beliefs that 152 pre-service EFL teachers had about employing OCF provision especially. Since the observations of the classes and the interviews revealed that the participants had not had the knowledge of OCF strategies the researcher held an hour of workshops on OCF provision with the participants in three sittings, with 50 participants in first sitting, 50 in the second, and 52 in the last. Following the workshops, to gather their beliefs of and preferences for OCF provision, 152 the prospective teachers of English also filled out Belief Questionnaire about their teaching practices and attitudes towards oral corrective feedback. The following sections provide a more detailed description of the setting, participants, materials, data collection, and data analysis procedure.

1.2. Setting

This research study was conducted in both English Language Teaching department (henceforth, ELT) at Faculty of Education and in English Language and Literature (henceforth, ELL) department at a state university in the northern east part of Turkey. The Departments of English Language Teacher Education in universities in Turkey offer generally a four-year program and a concrete base in the English language, English literature, methodology, educational sciences in order to make them fully qualified English teachers who are able to work for from primary schools to high schools and universities. That is to say, these institutions provide their students with a solid foundation consisting of wide range of courses regarding to L2 acquisition and L2 teaching methodology and organize practicum teaching classes in certain schools. Most graduate students are expected to work for state and private instititions all over the country. The courses that ELT students can take are displayed in Table I.

Table 1: **Courses Offered by ELT Department**

ELT Courses	
Term I	**Term II**
Introductıon to Educatıonal Sciences	Psychology of Educatıon
Contextual Grammar I	Contextual Grammar II
Oral Communicatıon Skills I	Lıstenıng and Pronunciation II
Advanced Reading I	Oral Communication Skills II
Advanced Writing I	Advanced Reading II
Ataturk's Prıncıpals and History of Revolutions I	Advanced Writing II
Turkısh Language I: Writing Expression	Ataturk's Prıncıpals and History of Revolutions II
Information and Computing Technologies I (Elective)	Turkish Language II: Speaking Expression
	Information and Computing Technologies II (Elective))
Term III	**Term IV**
Instruction Principles and Methods	English Literature II
English Literature I	Linguistics II
Linguistics I	Special Teaching Methods I
Oral Expression and Public Speaking	Teaching Technologies and Materials Design
Approaches to ELT I	Language Acquisition
History of Turkish Education(Elective)	Approaches to ELT II
English-Turkish Translation (Elective)	Scientific Research Methods(Elective)
Term V	**Term VI**
Classroom Management	Measurement and Evaluation
Teaching English to Young Learners I	Teaching English to Young Learners II
Teaching Language Skills I	Teaching Language Skills II
Second Foreign Language I	Second Foreign Language II (Elective)
Poetry Analysis	Turkish English Translation (Elective)
	Community Service Applications (Elective)
Literature and FL Teaching I	Literature and FL Teaching II (Elective)
Term VII	**Term VIII**
Guidance	Turkish Educational System and School Management
School Experience	Teaching Practice
Special Education	Classroom Interaction Skills
Second Foreign Language III(Elective)	English Language Testing and Evaluation
Advanced Speaking skills I(Elective)	Advanced Speaking Skills I(Elective)
Language Teaching Materials Adaptation and development (Elective)	Discourse Analysis (Elective)

On the other hand, other source which also recruit and partly train English language teachers is ELL programs at faculty of letters. Their main objective is to educate their students in English literature, languages, and cultures. To realize this purpose, ELL programs offer basic skill courses and in-depth study of target literature, culture, linguistics, philosophy, and comparative studies and teaches them analytic, critical and communication skills through reading a large variety of classical and contemporary texts. Like ELT graduates, the students who graduate from the departments work in various fields and institutions such as tourism, banking, broadcasting companies, airlines companies, translation offices, ministries, and publishing houses. The graduate students have the option of working as an teacher or a teacher after taking pedagogy courses. In order to be able to work as English teachers, the students who are in their final in the ELL programs apply to the EFL programs at faculty of education to have pedagogy certificates with the start of fall semester in that final year. The second option is to take Language Teaching Certificate after completion undergraduate program. They take courses pertaining to English language teaching methodology and educational sciences at weekends along with their courses during weekdays at their faculty of letters. The courses offered by ELL programs to their students are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: **Courses Offered by ELL Department**

ELT Courses	
Term I	**Term II**
History of English Culture and Literature I	History of English Culture and Literature I
Ataturk's Principals and History of Revolutions I	**Ataturk's Principals and History of Revolutions I**
Turkish Language I: Writing Expression	**Turkish Language II: Oral Expression**
Contextual Grammar I	**Contextual Grammar II**
Literary Terms and Concepts (Elective)	Critical Thinking Skills (Elective)
Academic Writing I	**Academic Writing II**
Mythology (Elective)	Classical Literature(Elective)
Introduction to Drama	Medieval Drama
	History of English Culture and Literature I
Term III	**Term IV**
Introduction to Linguistics I	**Introduction to Linguistics II**
Short Story I	Short Story II
American Literature I	American Literature II
18th Century British Novel	19th Century British Novel
Medieval Literature	Renaissance Literature
Renaissance Drama (Elective)	Restoration and 18th Century Drama (Elective)
Life and Society in Britain (Elective)	Selected Works From World Literature

Table 2: (Continue)

ELT Courses	
Term V	**Term VI**
American Novel I	American Novel II
Linguistics I	Linguistics II
19th Century British Drama (Elective)	Drama in the 20th Century and after
Poetry and Prose in 17th and 18th Centuries (Elective)	19th Century British Poetry
20th Century British Novel	Contemporary Novel
English-Turkish Translation (Elective)	Community Service Applications (Elective)
Discourse Analysis (Elective)	Literature and FL Teaching II (Elective)
Term VII	**Term VIII**
Literary Criticism I	Literary Criticism II
American Drama	Shakespeare
Literature and Language Teaching I (Elective)	English Poetry after 1950
Term I	**Term II**
Teaching Language Skills I (Elective)	**Literature and Language Teaching II (Elective)**
Advanced Translation I (Elective)	**Teaching Language Skills II (Elective)**
20th Century British Poetry)	**Advanced Translation II (Elective)**

*Note: Those courses written in bald indicates the courses shared by both departments

3.3. Participants

The purposeful sampling method was employed for this research. This purposive way of selecting is beneficial because it makes it feasible for the researchers to recruit particular groups of participants from the target people having the features they preferred to work on (Patton, 1990). Among the various types of purposeful sampling methods, the criterion and the homogenous methods were employed. According to Patton (2002), the crierion method allows the researchers to concentrate on certain features, reducing the differences among the participants. Follow up interviews are facilitated through that method. The homogenous technique lets the investigator study on different traits and eliminates variations among groups. The criteria technique let researchers chose the participants who have the characteristics they intended to study earlier.

With this in mind, the participants were supposed to meet the following criterion: (1) being in their final year at the English Language and Literature department of the Faculty of Letters and attending a certificate program in teaching English as a foreign language, (2) or being in their final

year at the English Language Teaching department of Faculty of Education, (3) no experience in teaching EFL at all. Through employing this criteria in choosing the participants, it was intended to ensure that EFL student teachers were qualified theoretically and had adequate training. With the no-experience criteria, the researcher intended to eliminate the effect of teaching experience and study the effect of training only as this study aimed to explore pre-service teachers' beliefs and practices of OCF provision.

While purposive sampling technique was employed to gather data related to their beliefs of OCF provision and preferences for OCF strategies, random sampling technique was used to select twenty participants among 152 volunteering participants to observe classrooms and to get their justifications of their practices in the observed classes in this study. There were approximately 220 final year students at the time of data collection. The participants of this study aged from 22 to 38. Brief information regarding the participants are displayed in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Brief Descriptions of Participants (n=152)

		F	%
Sex	Female	99	65,1
	Male	53	34,9
Faculty	Education	61	40,1
	Letters	91	59,9
Age	22-25	112	73,7
	26-30	33	21,7
	31 and above	7	4,6

As previously mentioned, the participants of this study were 152 EFL candidate teachers recruited from two different faculties at one of the major state universities in eastern Turkey. Any senior students teaching an EFL course for the first time during school experience at state schools (first and second stage primary schools, or high schools) during the spring semester of 2017 was recruited and eligible to participate in the study on condition that they had had no teaching experience before. This was the excluding criteria only and those students who reported to have worked at any state or private schools were eliminated promptly. As a lecturer researcher giving classes at the English Language Teaching department at the university, I met the students in person and asked them to meet after classes and recruited student teachers during early spring of 2017. The researcher explained the study, invited students to participate (see Appendix 5), and handed out sheets for Participant Consent Form (Appendix 3) and the Participant Background Questionnaire (hereafter, PBQ) and Belief Scale Questionnaire (hereafter, BSQ) (Appendix 6) for the pre-service English teachers to complete. The researchers never told the participants about the particular foci of the

research until after first data collection of the classroom observations were accomplished; at the beginning, they were simply informed that the researcher was interested in EFL learners' taking part in conversations so that they taught as they generally would and were provided necessary information right after their participations were finalized.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure and Materials

The data collection process took in the following steps: first, in January 2017, in order to be able to conduct the study with the final year ELT and ELL students I received permission from the executive board of the Faculty of Education of the University and National Education Directorate of the province. Then, I prepared a timetable for conducting observations of EFL practicum classes. Next, as I had classes with both final year students from ELT and ELL departments , I collected their contact information right after a class in the first week of March. The stages of the data gathering lasted six weeks and is outlined in Table 4.

Table 4: The Process of Data Gathering

No.	Procedures	Data to be collected	Time (minutes)
1	Observations	The pre-service EFL teachers' classroom uses of OCF	800
2	Interviews	The pre-service EFL teachers' stated beliefs of OCF	510
3	Training	Introduction, types, and simulated practices of OCF	90
4	Administration of the survey	Background information on the participants and their beliefs on OCF provision	45
		Total	1445

As shown in Table 4, the data of the study were collected through: (a) observing and recording of practicum classes of EFL student teachers in April 2017, (b) interviewing in the first week of May, (c) a background questionnaire, and (d) English as a foreign language teacher's beliefs questionnaire in the third week of April 2017 (consisting of all three parts). Those approaches were preferred to collect data because they are believed to be useful instruments to obtain, understand and explain both the essence of specific issues being investigated and the background information of the target population's beliefs and practices. In addition, these ways of gathering data let the researcher to collect more detailed evidence related to the issues that are under investigation. For example, Weiss (1994: 1) reports that, "Interviewing gives us a window on the past. We can also, by interviewing, learn about settings that would otherwise be closed to us: foreign societies, exclusive organizations, and the private lives of families…". Validity together with consistency of the interview questions have been checked by means of a pilot study conducted with student EFL teachers from the same

two departments in advance. It turned out that no amendments have been necessary to make since the findings turned out to be reliable and valid.

In addition to the data gathering, a training program about OCF strategies was held after the interviews as I discovered during the classroom observations and the interviews that the participants did not know the different ways of error treatment other than explicit feedback type. I planned and provided about a ninety-minute long training program in order to find out how they would treat student errors if they were aware of OCF provision techniques. The design of the training course was planned following a comprehensive study of 11 relevant materials including book excerpts and studies on OCF provision from journals. The results have been tailored to the important information that should be familiar to any foreign language teacher. The following is the layout of the training session:

1. Terminologies of OCF provision,
2. Definition of errors and mistakes,
3. Types of OCF techniques to prefer (taxonomy by Lyster & Ranta, 1997),
4. Studies on the effectiveness of OCF provision,
5. Practicing OCF provision upon simulated possible student errors.

On the other hand, the issues regarding "Who should provide the error treatment?", "What errors should be treated?", "When should the errors be treated?" were not mentioned deliberately as their preferences were targeted to be discovered.

The gathering qualitative data began in early March, 2017 with observations of the participants' first teaching experience followed by surveys with all 152 student language teachers. Afterwards, I called the participants whom I chose randomly among volunteering participants to arrange for the interviews with the student teachers who had not their classes observed. The process of gathering both qualitative and quantitative data took nearly ninety days.

3.4.1. Informed Consent Procedure

Before video-recording took place, all 20 student teachers participating classroom observations, and interviews, as well as those student teachers taking just the surveys (152 in total), signed informed consent forms which contained information about the study goals, procedures, participants' rights, and the measures taken to ensure participant anonymity. A copy of the consent form is provided in Appendix 3.

3.4.2. Observing and Recordings of EFL Classroom Observations

The first data source is comprised of classroom observations. Observing classrooms can produce valuable data for researchers. Borg (2003a) states that obtaining data through the observing the classes are a critical element for studying teachers' beliefs and practices. Employing the observation technique, the researcher is able to discover several issues that participants have not knowingly or unknowingly mentioned in interviews.

Classroom observations can be classified into structured and unstructured. The former one is employed by those researchers investigating participants' both oral and physical actions. In addition, structured observations can be employed for observations in order to recognize and infer from cultural deeds and social interaction among the target (Glense, 2006). For the purpose of the current research, structured observation was used with the help of checklist so that the interviewees' replies could be confirmed.

Qualitative data gathering through structured observations is based on several presumptions. First, the researcher employing structured strategy begins the observation with determined opinions regarding participants' actions being observed. Therefore, they definitely know that to focus on in advance. Second, the researchers act completely. On the other hand, the researchers in studies using unstructured observations find themselves parts of the study and associate themselves with the participants (Glense, 2006).

Before training pre-service teachers, I called them to (1) get their schedule for teaching and (2) to have a suitable time to videotape a lesson of the teacher. Twenty classroom observations, each of which lasted 40 minutes, were carried out during the participants' final semester. The data obtained from classroom observations is an important part in order to explore teachers' practices and beliefs (Borg, 2011). After three weeks passed and the student teachers and the students got to know each other very well, I decided to start video-recording their practice classes. Two separate classes taught by two different student teachers were observed and recorded each week and completed in ten weeks, totaling twenty classes.

All the classes were video-recorded. I used my own mobile phone and placed it on the corner so that I can get the recording of all of the events in the classroom. As the pre-service teachers stated that it would have not been a problem with me being present during the recordings and felt comfortable with the presence of the me, I myself carried out the recordings. Therefore I was able to capture the classes as authentic as it could have been since both students and the pre-service teachers acted like it was a normal class. They did not have to feel under stress with the presence of someone they did not know, since it could have caused them feel anxious and made the pavement for them to

act differently as they normally would have. Recording one 40-minute class of each student teacher must have represented authentic OCF provision as it normally would have happened.

3.4.3. Participant Background Questionnaire

The aim of the PBQ was to decide on participants' grouping in advance of gathering the data. The questions of the PBQ were designed to uncover: (1) demographic information, (2) educational background, (3) and any oral corrective feedback instructions and any teaching experiences the participants might have had. It has consisted of a mixture of close-ended and questions requiring short answers, providing the researcher with closed data for statistical comparison along with open-ended data for qualitative analyses. It aimed to gather information if they were able to name different types of oral corrective feedback, too. The survey questions were written in English and all the participants reported that the items were clear and they all understood well. In addition, the participants were informed that they should feel free to answer to the questions in either English or Turkish as they prefer.

3.4.4. Background Questionnaire

The items of the questionnaire were chosen and adapted from the studies existing questionnaires (Burgess & Etherington, 2002; Baleghizadeh & Rezaef, 2010).The questionnaire was designed to investigate beliefs of oral corrective feedback and administered to the all students (N=152) in final year and was made of of three units totaling 34 statements with 5-point Likert-scales (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = moderately agree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree). They were told that (a) their identifications would be kept confidential, and (d) their responses would be treated with complete confidentiality. Main objective of the survey of this study to detect what pre-service EFL teachers believed of the importance of OCF provision in the EFL setting, when and what type OCF strategies to provide, how much OCF to provide to the learners' errors. The survey consisted of two parts: Part 1 (28, in total) dealt with beliefs topics such as importance, timing, sources, extent, targeted error types, frequency, use of explicit or implicit feedback and output prompting or input providing feedback and types of OCF provision. In addition, second part (6 items in total) dealt with the preferences for OCF types only. For each statement, the participants were asked to report their beliefs as to how much they agreed with the each item on the questionnaire where 1 indicated strong agreement and 5, strong disagreement. Here is an example of a statement used in Part 1 of the Beliefs Questionnaire. A sample question follows: Item 10: *Oral corrective feedback is of great importance in the language development* (It was assessed by means of Likert scale ranking of 1-5, with "5" being "strongly agree" and "1" being "strongly disagree". Operationalization was provided for each ranking.). In part I, there were only closed questions for each topic, making an allowance for analyses quantitatively (see Table 5).

Table 5: Belief Questionnaire Topics

Topics	Items
Importance of OCF provision	1, 2, 3, 6, 10, 12, 13, 18
Preferences for explicit or implicit feedback	27, 28
Extent of error treatment	8, 9, 11, 24
Preferences for error types	24, 13, 22, 25
Preference for oral feedback types	29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
Preferences for OCF sources	7, 19, 20
Preferences for timing of OCF provision	5, 15, 17

In part 2 of the Beliefs Questionnaire, the participants were provided with one example of a student's possible erroneous utterance ("*Ali have got one brother*") and six possible ways a teacher could correct it. Both the context of a given error and corrective strategies for it were written down to facilitate the task for the participants. They were asked, on a scale from five to one, where 5 implied total effectiveness ("very useful") and 1 meant complete ineffectiveness ("not at all useful"), to indicate the usefulness of each corrective strategy. The possible correction strategies in the part 3 were explicit, elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, recast and clarification feedback based on the study of Lyster and Ranta (1997).

3.4.5. Interviews

For qualitative research, interviews are regarded as one of the most common ways of collecting data. Interviews allow researchers to gather accurate information regarding the issues (Kvale, 1996). According to Kvale, the primary objective the interviews convey is to reveal both empirical and significance level. On the other hand, not many researchers are able to hold interviews at the *level of significance*. With all of its advantages, this qualitative way of gathering data technique may also involve certain risks, such as taking up too much time and money, and interviewing the participants unable to remember all the details needed. Therefore, studies need to identify these distinctive features of interviews. Therefore, this technique is much more functional if the researcher does his or her best to make it dynamic, open-ended in nature and concentrate on the participants' experience instead of their views relating to the issues (Patton, 2002). In addition, the researchers should establish rapport with each participant in order to gather as much information as needed.

Although questionnaires can help researcher to gather ample amount of data relating to the topic which is being investigated, at the same time they may get unreliable sometimes because: (a) participants may get the items wrong, (b) they may not pay serious attention to answer the questions, (c) the researchers cannot be sure what extend the participants they move away from what items

really mean, and (d) the participants may get affected by the items of as they can notice the important issues about the topic (Winne, Jamieson-Noel, & Muis, 2002). The researchers can conduct other ways of gathering data to triangulation the findings and the results so that they avoid disadvantages of questionnaires such as interviews which is the most commonly applied method in order to gather qualitative in-depth information (Kvale, 1996). Since its questions are not close-ended ones, the researcher can meet other extents of the issue they are studying. (Maxwell, 2005; Seidman, 2006). However, Patton (2002) states that the questions of the interview should be as simple, purposeful, and open-ended as possible for the purpose of the study so that they make it possible for the participants to reveal valuable information from which the researcher benefit. On the other hand, as Bryman (2001) asserts, the researchers should always ask the easiest ones first then hard questions later in order to make the participants feel comfortable enough and leading questions must be avoided definitely. In addition, questions about some characteristics of the participant should be included on the list.

In this study, in addition to other ways of data collection, randomly selected interviewees among the volunteering participants were interviewed at the end of data collection process. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 20 student teachers those who had their one class observed in this study. Since their actual practices and beliefs, what they did and why they did so, were meant to be observed, I decided to include them also in the follow up interviews. Each interview lasted about twenty five minutes and they were held in both English and Turkish. They were interviewed individually rather than in focus-groups. This decision was made because the interviewees did not want to express their opinions when their classmates were present.

The student teacher interviewees were asked 7 questions. The interviews began with some overall questions regarding OCF provision and their beliefs of OCF, the sources of OCF provision, and more precise interview questions were made up depending on their opinions. Through detailed open-ended questions, I was able to gather enough information regarding their beliefs of OCF provision and justifications of their practices in the practicum classes. The questions addressed specific areas. Through open-ended and close-ended questions, I tried to obtain enough data from the participants of the interviewing regarding the area of specific topics. The areas included their views on OCF provisions, targeted error types to treat, preferred OCF types (e.g., explicit, implicit, elicitation, input providing, output prompter), preferred sources (e.g., teacher feedback, peer feedback), timing of the OCF provision (e.g., immediate or delayed treatment) (see Appendix 5).

The interview data were qualitatively analyzed using thematic category coding. Finally, the quantitative and qualitative results were integrated to answer the research questions (see, for a similar design, Ivankova, Creswell, & Stick, 2006).

3.5. Data Analysis

3.5.1. Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative study has given analysis literature a peculiar status. When qualitative research is progressively acknowledged and respected, it is crucial that it should be performed intensively and systematically in order to obtain reliable and usable results.(Attride-Stirling, 2001). According to Thornen (2000), data analyzing the data can be considered to be among the most complex and detailed techniques in qualitative studies and this is the greatest critical conversation of literature. In addition, Malterud (2001) posits that data analysis carried out using a structured method may be reported straightforwardly to anyone. While Tuckett (2005) argues that the researcher of the qualitative study often needs a clear description about how the procedure is conducted in existing research papers, others have suggested that researchers should be clear on what they do, why they do that, and include a concise explanation of methodological approaches (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Unless the reader is not certain on how the investigators perceived their evidence or what hypotheses shaped their analysis, it will be rigid to assess the accuracy of the procedure of the inquiry.

3.5.2. Analysis of Quantitive Data

To complete this part, the following section discusses the quantitative analyzes utilized to answer research questions. Research questions related to quantitative data are rephrased, accompanied by a summary of the analysis exploited.

RQ1: *What are the general frequency of OCF provision in EFL classrooms in Turkish context?* To answer the first research question, other than interviews, the transcriptions of the data of classroom interaction regarding OCF provision were coded and analyzed for: (1) counts and percentage of errors committed, (2) counts and percentage of errors treated/not treated, (3) counts and percentage of OCF types employed, (4) counts and percentage of implicit and explicit feedback types, (5) counts and percentage of input providing feedback types and output prompter feedback types, (6) counts and percentage of timing of feedback provision, and (7) counts and percentage of OCF providers.

RQ2: What are the Turkish ELT and non-ELT pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs of OCF provision, and what are their actual classroom practices? Before starting to run the analysis, the data were checked for the test of normality analysis. Based on the inspection of the histograms, coefficients of variances, values of skewness and kurtosis, the detrended Q-Q plots of the data, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test significance, the variables non-normally distributed ($p>0,05$). To answer the second research question, descriptive analysis including frequencies, means and percentages were calculated for belief topics (importance of OCF provision, extent of OCF provision, OCF types, error

types, explicit OCF vs. implicit OCF, input providing OCF vs. output prompting OCF, timing of OCF, and sources of OCF).

RQ3: Do ELT and non-ELT pre-service teachers differ in their beliefs of OCF prvision? For the third and final research question, The Mann-Whitney U tests are run to see if there are compare differences between two independent groups, comparing mean ranks in the beliefs for all belief themes according to ELT/non-ELT groups.

3.6. Inter-rater reliability

The researcher coded 100% of the data. To assess the reliability of the coding categories, a subset containing 50% of all data was coded by an external rater and compared to the researcher's coding. The external rater was given information about classroom feedback, and examples of classroom feedback episodes illustrating the coding categories for target and type of feedback, used in the study. After the information session, the external rater practiced coding classroom feedback episodes and, which were not included in the analysis.

For a better assessment of inter-rater agreement, both simple percentage and Cohen's Kappa coefficient were used. Simple percentage indicated a very high degree of agreement between the two raters, with values ranging from 91% to 100%. Cohen's Kappa coefficient values ranged from ,824 to 1,000, indicating excellent inter-rater reliability (Cohen, 1992). The reliability scores are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Cronbach Alpha Values for the Scales

Scales	Cronbach alfa value	Item number
Part 1: OCF belief scale	,798	28
Part 2: OCF types scale	,739	6

3.7. Plot Studies

The pilot studies were conducted in May during the spring term of 2016, producing some key alterations. The follow-up interview questions and adapted version of the Pre-service Language Teachers' Belief Questionnaire about OCF was revised for the current study based on the pilot study results. The piloting part of the study was elaborated on below.

Three pre-service teachers from Department of English Language Teaching agreed to participate in all phases of the pilot study to be able to figure out the efficiency of: (1) consent form

and Background Questionnaire, (2) classroom observation recordings, (3) interview questions, and (4) belief questionnaires. Three additional volunteering participants from the English Language and Literature responded to both parts of the survey in order to compute the survey statistical analyses. The participants were provided with questionnaires in written so that they were able to complete.

3.7.1. Pilot Participants

The six participants (3 from ELT and 3 from ELL department) during the piloting study in the Department of ELT and English Language and Literature and were chosen based on their teaching practicum teaching schedule in the spring term of 2016. All ten pilot participants were undergraduate senior students and they had attended school experience classes and just observed EFL teachers the previous term (during the 2015 fall semester) They were about to start their obligatory teaching practicum classes at the time of pilot study in 2016 spring semester. All six piloting pre-service EFL teachers were aged between of 21 and 24 and all had been studying in their programs for 4-5 years.

3.7.2. The Results of Pilot Studies

3.7.2.1. Background Questionnaire

The researcher got in touch with the piloting EFL pre-service teachers meeting them in person an available classroom just after class in their departments, first with the participants from ELL department, and then with the participants from ELT department the following day. Having been made sure that no participants had prior teaching experience at any form, the participants were asked to complete the questionnaire with the presence of the researcher with in approximately 10 minutes and hand them back to the researcher.

Collecting the questionnaire resulted in a perfect option for the employment of the questionnaire. All participants from ELL and ELT departments had given on-target replies. None of the participants informed having any or encountering any complications regarding with the items in the piloting questionnaire, and the previous form of coding process proved that it could differentiate the three ELL pre-service teachers from their three ELT counterparts. Both piloting version and ultimate version of he study had two independent variables of ELT education (with pedagogical and theoretical knowledge during four-year education) and English Language and Literature education (with limited pedagogical and theorethical education on an intensive course during the final year), allowing for a comparision of all belief topics.

3.7.2.2. Background Questionnaire

The piloting study, which was carried out during the spring term of 2016, has provided the researcher with necessary and valuable expertise on how to video-record EFL classes. Once the researcher had obtained necessary permission from the office of local educational authority (MEB) in the province of Erzurum, Turkey, the researcher visited the three schools where the pilot participants were about to commence teaching practices and had talks with the had teachers and informed them about the process and presented them with the official permission letters. Then, the researcher contacted the possible participants in their department and asked for their participating. After the ten volunteering EFL students had had agreed to be volunteers to take part in the piloting study, the researcher had discussions with the participants and the participants about the practicum teaching schedule in order to arrange the suitable times to gather the data. Fortunately, it did not turn out to be hard to determine the dates where both the researcher and the pilot participants were available.

The researcher recorded, by means of his mobile phone, six beginner to intermediate-level EFL lessons, three with pre-service English teachers from ELT department and three with pre-service EFL teachers form ELL department. Two of the six classes were reading classes, three were related to listening and speaking, and one focused on grammar. The recordings were transcribed by the researcher of this study and coded in terms of errors types, general OCF frequencies and OCF types. The findings of the pilot study revealed both similarities and differences in the ways of ELT and ELL student teacher OCF provision. Both group tried to provide OCF at every occasion and targeted errors related to grammar and vocabulary for the most part. Almost 80% percent of the errors were provided with *explicit correction* type, with just over half of the followed by extra grammar explanation unlike *metalinguistic clues*. They also did not differ in preferences of OCF types either, with both side employing explicit correction heavily. As for the differences, while pre-service teachers form ELL considered OCF provision as one of their main roles and targeted almost 86% of errors, pre-service teachers from ELT treated errors through OCF with a percentage of 78%. As a result of the small number of participants, statistical analyses were not carried out. Overall OCF treatment tendencyfive can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7: **Numbers of Errors That Received or not Received Feedback in Piloting**

Ranking	Error types	Errors		
		Committed	Corrected	Percentage
1	Grammar	21	19	90.4%
2	Vocabulary	9	7	77.7%
3	Pronunciation	19	14	73.3%
4	Semantic	5	3	60%
	Sub-total	54	43	79.6%

All six practicum lessons were video-recorded in three days during two weeks and the follow up interviews (with one participant from ELT and one from ELL) were conducted right after the each observed piloting practicum class. The researcher and two participants watched the related recordings on the researcher's mobile phone, and in each interview, the researcher discussed with each participant about first ten interaction occurrences relating to erroneous utterances, approximately 8 of which received error treatment through OCF, and about two of which did not receive OCF provision. The first ten interaction occurrences in each class were employed in the piloting interviews, as one of the classes had twelve errors and the other one had sixteen erroneous utterances.

All piloting six participants from ELT department and ELL department noticed most errors but errors related to pronunciation. Though they both detected most of the student errors, the participant from ELL attempted to treat every error he noticed. During the follow up interviews, one of the participants from ELL stated that he was responsible for providing OCF to as many errors as he could notice. On the other hand, the only one participant of the follow up interview from ELT stated that he did not have a lot of time to lose dealing with minor errors. For preference for OCF types, both participants informed relying more on their learning experience with their own EFL teachers at elementary and high school, and the supervising experienced EFL teachers with whom they had had *school experience* and *teaching experience* classes during the fall and spring terms in their final year.

3.7.2.3. Belief Questionnaire Data

For the piloting study, each participants, following the interview, was invited to a classroom after class at the ELT Department of Faculty of Education where the researcher of this study works. The researcher handed each participant a copy of the Beliefs Questionnaire the belief questionnaire consisting of 38 items to the all six pre-service EFL teachers whose classes were recorded, as well as 26 other participants from both faculties, and asked them to complete the questionnaire during the meeting. The piloting questionnaire targeted to investigate their beliefs of; (1) importance of OCF provision; (2) use of explicit or implicit feedback groups; and (3) preferences for OCF types.

Through this pilot, the Beliefs Questionnaire was highly adjusted, some items eliminated and some belief topics added as the participants provided mix responses and stated that they did not have any knowledge of OCF treatment. The belief topics that were added after the pilot study include: preferences for input providing or output providing types; OCF sources; as well as timing of provision.

Although analyses resulted in significant differences between ELT and ELL pre-service participants, the differences occurred through the fact that the participants from ELL department had more means for all beliefs topics. For example, ELT and ELL participants preferred and rank all the beliefs items in the almost same ranking, with the ELL participants having significantly more means

than those of ELT participants. That may be the result of the fact that ELL participants had significantly more ELT courses than their ELL counterparts. ELT teachers also differed significantly regarding the importance they gave to OCF provision in EFL classes; ELL participants stated that providing OCF in EFL classes is of more importance than ELT participants. One of the main difference in eight belief topics of ELL and ELT participants was related to OCF sources. While ELL participants reported that it is best for the teacher to correct erroneous utterance, the ELT participants reported that self-correction is the best source OCF provision. Overall, ELL participants gave a significantly higher importance on OCF provision than ELT participants did.

3.7.3. Changes Based on the Findings of the Piloting Studies

In summary, the piloting study established the robustness of the ultimate study design. All qualitative and quantitative research tools proved operational and well-organized. On the other hand, a few changes were needed as a result of the quantitative analysis: since three questions on Belief Questionnaire were highly interrelated with each other, two questions along with the four items regarding their recall of observed classes were afterwards eliminated from the final form of the belief questionnaire (see Appendix 6).

The analysis quantitative analysis and observed classes also revealed the necessity of dividing the educational background information into two distinct variables: ELT with more ELT courses and ELL with less ELT so that teacher differences, which were detected in observation classes and through follow up interviews, could be explored thoroughly regarding their beliefs and their actual practices of OCF treatment. That is an essential conclusion of the pilot study for the findings of the study.

To address the issue of construct validity, a simplified and clear language was used and examples were given for items which may have been judged ambiguous. All the corrective feedback jargon had been removed from the questionnaire prior to its administration. As the Beliefs Questionnaire was designed to focus on such aspects of OCF provision such as importance of error correction, sources and timing of OCF provision, OCF types, both the choices of what to focus on as well as which items to use in uncovering the student teachers' beliefs were made on the basis of reading of what had been highlighted as important in the literature.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Qualitative Data Findings

4.1.1. General Frequencies of Errors and Oral Corrective Feedback Types Through the Observations

The first research question investigated the frequency and types of teacher feedback. It asked whether student foreign language teachers in Turkey provide OCF to student errors and if so, what types of strategies they prefer to. The researcher predicted that their provision of OCF use would be limited only some kind.

A total of 146 feedback moves that were identified to have occurred during the 20 periods (800 minutes) of observed classroom interaction. Therefore, there was on average one feedback move occurrence about every 5.4 minutes. The feedback frequency can also be presented by comparing the number of errors which received error treatment and the numbers of errors went untreated. The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Numbers of Errors that Received/did not Receive Feedback on Classroom Observations

Ranking	Error types	Errors		
		Committed	Corrected	Percentage
1	Grammar	50	49	98%
2	Vocabulary	64	53	82.8%
3	Pronunciation	65	38	58.4%
4	Semantic	13	6	46.1%
	Sub-total	192	146	76%

As can be seen from Table 8, participants of two educational status made a total of 192 errors in the observed 800 minutes of classroom interaction. Among these 192 errors, 146 of them were followed by oral corrective feedback while 46 (24%) of them were not treated with OCF provision. In other words, the teacher provided corrective feedback to 76% of the students' erroneous utterances.

As for what kinds of student errors were as targeted most by student foreign language teachers, Table 10 demonstrates that although pre-service language teachers tried to provide OCF to at least about 50% of all error types, the target feature of their OCF was grammar (98%) and vocabulary (82.8%) followed by pronunciation errors (58.4%). On the other hand, semantic errors were the ones which were targeted least frequently, although about half of them were provided OCF. Therefore, while it is true that pre-service language teachers focused on erroneous utterances regarding grammar and vocabulary categories and provided those with OCF, that did not mean that they ignored ill-formed utterances regarding other categories, nonetheless provided OCF on them as well.

The first research question also examined what kinds of OCF strategies pre-service teachers provided to the students' errors. Table 9 shows the 6 feedback types and their percentages.

Table 9: Frequency of Each OCF Types from Classroom Observations

Feedback types	Numbers	Percentages
1. Explicit correction	83+38*=121	82.9%
2. Metalinguistic clues	0	0%
3. Clarification request	7	4.8%
4. Recast	2	1.4%
5. Elicitation	16	10.9%
6. Repetition	0	0%
Total	146	100%

*Note: Of 121 explicit correction moves, 38 of them were followed by extra grammatical information

As can be seen from Table 9, explicit correction was the predominant feedback type of choice. There was a total of 121 occurrence of explicit correction, accounting for 82.9% of all feedback moves. The second most commonly employed OCF type turned out to be elicitation feedback, which occurred 16 times and took up 10.9% of all the feedback moves. Clarification request, which occurred 7 times and accounted for 4.8% of all feedback moves, was the third most frequently used feedback technique following elicitation feedback. Unlike many studies, recast was the least frequently used OCF type which occurred only 2 times by only one student teacher who reported studying under Erasmus program in an EU country for one term and learned about feedback types. The remaining two types – metalinguistic clue and repetition – were never provided at all and they both accounted for 0% of all feedback moves. It can be concluded that explicit correction was the type of choice, taking up 82.9% of all feedback types. Except this technique, the rest of the types only accounted for a very small amount of all feedback moves. Thus, it is worth pointing out that explicit correction was the predominant feedback type in this study.

As mentioned above, the student teachers, for the most part, preferred to give the correct answers to their students via explicit correction. As they reported in the interviews, their main duty

was to treat every single error their students commited, as they were provided with OCF provision when they had been students. This might have been the main reason for that. Nevertheless, we have a point to make, which is if reasons for error treatment was provided by the pre-service teachers. Their frequent employment of explicit correction during the observing the classes showed they provided explanation for the error in advance too. There were 38 explicit correction episodes that were followed by extra grammar explanation. This way was explicit correction plus extra grammar explanation, which accounted for 45.7% of all explicit correction instances. That is, the participants preferred to supply the correct form first and right after provided some grammatical information when the teachers gave feedback moves for the same student error. This can be called as "*Explicit correction with extra information*" (ECWEI). In one important way, this new technique is different from metalinguistic feedback by which teachers first give extra grammatical explanation upon the errors they identify and then let the students self-correct their own errors. Thus, this new way of providing feedback episodes in this study was not classified as metalinguistic feedback moves. As a result, it can be important to stress that a new way of providing OCF emerged in this study employed by student foreign language teachers.

As for other statistics, the observations of most of the classes showed that the student foreign language teachers had positive attitude towards OCF and revealed that teachers established both a friendly atmosphere during lessons and a good communication with their students. They also showed that student teachers depend heavily on input providing feedback types (84%) compared to output providing feedback methods (16%) and they preferred explicit methods (99%) over implicit ways of feedback (1%) for correcting students' oral errors. In addition, the participants preferred to employ heavily teacher correction (84%) to self-correction (13%) and peer correction (3%). It can be stated that most of the participants believe that they are the authority in the classroom. The results of the classroom observations revealed that pre-service language instructors frequently tought structures deductively rather than inductively. In other words, the participants of the study preferred to employ explicit instruction. Using a mixed method of data gathering for the purpose of the researcc study helped to get valuable facts and insights related to pre-service teachers' beliefs of OCF. For example, observing all twenty practicum lessons revealed that the prospective foreign language teachers were not familiar with interactional OCF strategies or methods that many language instructors employ in other settings. Moreover, the results of the classroom observations were in consistence with those of follow up interviews. In other words, with some exceptions, the observations detected that nearly all of the teachers' actual practices in the classroom were consistent with what was stated in the interviews afterwards.

In sum, when reviewing results of observations that were conducted before the interviews and the survey, it can be concluded that most of the errors (76%) received treatment with OCF provision. As to targeted error types, EFL teachers preferred for errors regarding grammar (98%), vocabulary (82.8&), and pronunciation (58.4%) most. Following the most targeted errors, explicit feedback was

the most preferred OCF types with a percentage of 82.9%, which is a input provider OCF type but not interaction promoting type. On the other hand, some OCF type including metalinguistic feedback, repetition and were never employed and two of them had only few occurrences with recasts (1.4%) and clarification request (4.8%). Therefore, it can be concluded that explicit feedback strategy, which is a type that does not allow the learner to engage in interaction with their teachers and classmates, is both ELT and non-ELT EFL pre-service teachers favorite way of treatment of learners' errors.

4.1.2. Findings from Follow up Interviews

Theme 1: importance of OCF provision

This section presents the findings of student language teachers' beliefs about error correction. The analysis focuses on student language teachers who gave clear answers to the relevant issues raised in the follow up interviewings. The analysis of interviews indicated that Turkish student language instructors believe in provision of error correction expressing that it is a crucial method that can facilitate FL learning.

As noted above, all of the interviewed student EFL teachers from both ELT and non-ELT departments equally (20 of 20]100%[) indicated that provision of error correction has a positive influence on FL learning. The student foreign language teachers mentioned many reasons for justifying the provision of error correction during FL classes. According to them, error correction is an effective teaching method that makes learners more aware of what is suitable and what is not what is not in the target language. They also reported that it can help language learners prevent making erroneous utterances or reduce the occurance erroneous productions to a minimum. Moreover, employing error correction lets learners know about the issues they should concentrate on during in the TL. The student teacher answers specifically show this emphasize during the interviewing. Interviewee student language teacher 3 explained that:

> For me, error correction is one of the most necessary elements of language teaching process. Our learners can benefit a lot from providing error correction because it helps learners avoid making errors and it also makes it possible for our learners to avoid or at least minimize the occurrence of errors to great extent. In addition, it also informs language teachers about what areas in the target language they have to have their learners revise or focus on again while learning the target language (SFLT 3, follow up interview, May, 2017).

Similarly two more student language teachers reported:

> I believe all language teachers should provide error correction to the student's erroneous utterances because giving error correction is necessary as it is the only way to help learners develop accuracy in the target language. That is why support the idea of supplying error correction whenever learners make an error. So, we can help our learners avoid same errors and prevent their errors from being fossilized. (SFLT 11, interview, May, 2017).

> Teachers' error correction is of great importance for sure because the language teacher should present the standard target language form since this is the only way to introduce the target language to learners in EFL settings. If the language teachers don't give feedback, the students will carry on making repeated errors and they will never be aware of wrong doings. Therefore, all language teachers should always recognize students' erroneous utterances and provide them with ample error correction as much as possible to lead the learners to standards of the target TL. (SFLT 8, interview, May, 2017).

Another interviewee student language teacher explained how providing error treatment helps the learner to make good progress in learning the target language. She said, "I have provided OCF on every occasions since the beginning of my work experience and I strongly believe that all language teachers should provide the learners with enough error correction because if we don't do so, learning the language cannot be promoted since our learners will never have the chances to be exposed to the TL outside classrooms (SFLT 5, interview, May, 2017).

Most of the participant student language teachers are of the opinion that language teachers are the central source of instruction, especially in the countries where the TL is not spoken by many people outside the classroom. One of the interviewee student teachers mentioned this view:

> I believe error correction is essential in teaching and learning a language. I always do my best to treat every student error I notice. I should do this to get them to notice what sort of mistakes they make, otherwise they will never know that some of their utterances are not acceptable in the target language. If the language teachers don't bother themselves, the learners will have nobody to help them deal with their errors. Therefore, language learners are supposed to make same mistakes over and over again and their errors might become persistent. Teachers only can and should provide students with more error correction to make them familiar with the errors they make while speaking in the target language (SFLT 11, interview, May, 2017).

This view is stated by most of the pre-servce English teachers as exemplified in the response below:

> Definitely error correction works for better. It makes it possible for language learners to notice what they are getting wrong or right. In this way, they can have chances to narrow the gap between their language and the target language. In addition, I believe that the language learners are keen on being provided with error correction. So, why not? (SFLT 19, interview, May, 2017).

In addition to the fact that all participants had positive attitudes towards error correction, they stated a need for friendly ways of correcting student errors. The interviewee student teachers reported that their language teachers had corrected their errors in unkind ways when they had been students back at primary and secondary schools. Thus inappropriate behavior of their language teachers towards language learners had caused them to avoid taking part in the oral activities at that time. They also reported that some language teachers had scolded them after error correction. They mentioned that they lacked a more suitable way of error correction in order not to make their learners feel embarrassed for having committed errors. This view is articulated by more than half of the interviewed students (12 of 20]60%[). One of them stated:

> As a former language student at primary and secondary schools, I remember feeling frustrated upon receiving error correction to my errors. Because every error correction meant I got something wrong. Sure I believe I was and still am for error correction because just as it helped us understand the errors that we made and prevent them from happening again, it can help our students in the future. On the other hand, we should avoid causing our student lose face with their classmates' presence. It is that inappropriate and dangerous way we as language teachers should refrain taking, otherwise it would be damaging to learners instead of supporting. We should find a better way of error correction so that learners feel comfortable (SFLT 17, interview, May, 2017).

One more student shared the above view:

> I am definitely in favor of error correction, but I think some students did not seem to be happy with their error corrected after committing too much errors and receiving too much error correction. They were not keen on participating oral activities later on. Therefore language instructors need to avoid being rude and discouraging. Especially language teachers ought to maintain a friendly athmosphere before they are providing error correction. They had better be vigilant of error treatment. And, they need to do their best in order not to let their learners to lose face in front of their peers as this will cause them not to want to learn the language eagerly (SFLT 16, interview, May, 2017).

The above discussion clearly indicates that all of the participants agree with the idea that OCF assists FL teaching and learning. However, some participants expressed their concern about the negative effect OCF can have on students' psychology such as feeling shy and as a result avoiding engaging in the oral communication activities

Theme 2: preferences for implicit or explicit feedback

Nineteen of the interviewed student language teachers both from faculty of letter and faculty of education (19 of 20]95%[) reported that they had never studied OCF strategies and they could not even name a single OCF strategy. Only one participant who reported studying in Spain for one semester stated that she had studied OCF strategies and was able to name *explicit feedback*, *metalinguistic clues*, *elicitation* and *recast*. Therefore they did not know what explicit or implicit feedback meant and they showed preferences for overt error correction. They stated that there was only one explicit way to their knowledge because their language teachers at primary, secondary and University performed this task explicitly. They mentioned that they did not know how to accomplish the task implicitly and when they thought of error correction, they thought of performing error correction explicitly as this was the only way they had observed from language teachers as a former students. Student foreign language teacher 7 stated the same opinions in her response:

> In my opinion, correcting the errors explicitly is the easiest way we can follow. There are always a lot of topics to cover, so we have no time to lose. When a student made an error, I just mentioned that what they sad was wrong in English language, wrote the erroneous utterances on the board so that other students could notice and avoid the same errors in the future and provided the correction right away. Otherwise I could not have completed the task I had planned for that period of time. To be honest, I do not know what the implicit way is (SFLT 7, interview, May, 2017).

Student language teacher 19 also shared the same view:

> I think explicit way can be quite useful and there are no alternatives [to the explicit method]. Whenever I noticed that there was something not permitted in the target language I stopped them, told what the error was, sometimes I gave extra grammar information if the error was serious and made the necessary amendments. If I had not highlighted their errors, they wouldn't have noticed what was wrong and made the same mistakes later on….. As to implicit way, I know what the word *implicit* refers to but I haven't got any slightest idea about how implicit error correction is done, but I know about explicit way because, as language students for years, our errors have been treated that way by our teachers… Yes, I am treating my students' errors just as mine have been treated as a student (SFLT 19, interview, May, 2017).

On the other hand, only one participant (SFLT 13) who studied OCF strategies abroad believed that implicit error correction is superior to explicit ways of implicit error correction. She stated that the language teachers' aim regarding error treatment should be to maintain accuracy during communicating with others rather than preventing studentss from engaging in interaction. Therefore, explicit error correction may discourage learners from speaking activities. She explained:

> I prefer implicit ways among OCF strategies. Our main target is to encourage our students to be active in oral communication activities. Providing feedback is necessary to the fact that their progress in the target language can be made through time, so at first they are possibly to make a lot of errors. If we inform them that they make so many errors in the classroom, they might feel uncomfortable. So, they will avoid being active in order not to make so many errors. I believe implicit ways are the most suitable ones to overcome this unwanted situation in the classroom and not to inhibit learners from communication. Once you discourage your students from communicating orally, it will take ages to go back to normal (SFLT 13, interview, May, 2017).

Theme 3: preferences for input providing feedback or output prompting feedback

Surprisingly, as most of the students did not provide sufficient and significant information about classification of feedback types as input providers and output prompters and almost all the interviewees expressed that they did not have any slightest information about OCF strategies and taxanomy of OCF strategies. Therefore, the researcher decided to give a nearly 60 minutes of workshop on OCF strategies and clarified with scenarios.

Although most of them had preferred input provider feedbacks as form of teachers corrections during classroom observations, the findings of follow up interview discovered that most of the participants (18 of 20]90%[) preferred output prompter feedback strategies after being aware that there are options for input providing and output prompting. It seemed that they changed their mind after the feedback instruction. Mostly, they reported that the main objective of providing OCF for students might be being guided for self-correction with the help of teacher assistance whenever needed. Almaost all participants believed that such OCF strategies could be helpful and enhance the learning on their own.

In addition, the student language teachers stated that output prompter feedback strategies can push learners to try utterances in the target language and then real learning starts to occur. These strategies make the language student use their productive skills making it possible for both language

teachers and learners to see whether they are making a good progress or not. It also can make the language students more independent with less teacher assistance and more self-reliant language learners. One of the interviewees reported, -To be honest, I didn't know that there is a feedback classification as output prompter feedback types. Now I see these feedback strategies can be a good strategy for foreign language teachers to use while correcting their students' erroneous utterance since they encourage learners to produce more in the target language and direct them towards self-learning and self-discovering. If I correct student mistakes right away, I don't think they [learners] will be aware of the reasons why they are not acceptable in the target language and as a result they cannot see the difference between what they say and what they are supposed to say. By this way for the learner the mistakes that they find and treat by themselves would not be easy to forget (SFLT 3, interview, May 2016). Thus, output prompting feedback types make foreign language learners in charge for their own learning and make them more conscious of the acceptable forms the target language. Student teachers reported that the more students get introduced to their target language, the more they can build the necessary ability to recognise the most serious types of errors. In this regard, the participants' answers in interviews 1 and 5 share this view:

> I can say that using output prompter strategies would be a useful way as it could help foreign language learners negotiate more in the target language, help them better recognize the right forms of the target language, and it could encourage them to discover the repeated errors while learning it. It could also give the language learners chances to notice these errors and correct them (SFLT 1, interview, May 2017).

> I think the more you expose your students to the target language and force them to produce more in the target language, the better. This way, you make them think and work more about the target language by letting them fix their errors and making them responsible for their own learning. Using these techniques, students may actively have a chance to improve their linguistic competence. In other words, output strategies can increase learners' autonomy and independence, making learners more capable of repairing and noticing g their own errors, and raise their awareness of the target language (SFLT 5, interview, May 2017).

In contrast, three of the participants reported that it will be much more convenient when the teacher does not make it harder and longer for students to find out the correct version of their errors since there are lots of topics to cover during a period of foreign language classes. It would be a time loss because it is hard mostly for them to notice the most important errors. They contended that the more students got direct error treatment from the teacher, the more they could build the essential skills that will help them recognize the most problematic erroneous utterances that impede messages. In this regard, SFLT 6 reported that:

> To be honest, I have never heard of existence of output prompters feedback. Yes, output prompters could be good techniques but it is difficult usually for language learners to correct themselves if they make some errors. As you know well, some kinds of errors might be difficult to correct and can take a lot of time. In addition teachers have a lot of topics to teach each year and time is very important. Since students may spend a long time on even simple errors, they should be corrected by language teachers directly (SFLT 6, interview, May 2016).

Theme 4: extent of error treatment

When asked whether they were selective in between significant errors that interfere with meaning and insignificant ones that do not impede getting the message across, almost all the participants (19 of 20]95%[) favored every ill-formed utterances be treated and they reported that they had not considered some of errors to be important or some of the to be unimportant during the practicum classes. Most of them stated that they believed that language teachers should provide the students who commit errors or mistake with error corrections and treat every single error or mistake. As many stated, treating every single error is necessary and guiding for all students committing errors. Moreover, correction of every error was never considered as time consuming by the participants. Hence, they supported the idea of an unfocused method for treating errors in which language teachers are not selective about certain types of errors for correction. SFLT 13 and SFLT 15 stated the same views in their replies regarding this issue:

> For me, correcting all errors is necessary in order for errors not to get fossilized. I suggest that all language teachers' focus be on every single error on every occasion to introduce language students to possibly repeated erroneous utterances they might commit in the future (SFLT 13, interview, May, 2017).

> In my opinion, they should focus on all errors because if they don't the errors may get fossilized and therefore all errors will be hard to change especially the ones related to grammar and pronunciation, since they hinder the meaning. This will be the right thing for language teachers to do. I believe we should do so and correct every error. If we ignore so called "unimportant errors", they will become persistent forever. Every little possibility must count. We should start with correcting "easy, simple, or unimportant" errors first so that we can deal with "difficult, complex, or important" errors. (SFLT 15, interview, May, 2017).

Although nearly all of the interviewees were in favor for correcting every error only one student language teacher studying abroad stated support for the idea that EFL teachers should be being selective when correcting language learners' erroneous utterances, as it has a damaging effect on their fluency and can cause them to speak timidly in the target language. In this regard, Student foreign language teacher 13 expressed the above view in her responses:

> I do not agree with the idea of correcting every single error regardless of their importance. I believe that it can be quite discouraging to do so. To me, if the teachers bother themselves correcting every single error while talking with their students then it can prevent them from becoming fluent and minimize their confidence. Accordingly, the teachers should focus on only the error that impedes communication. I think it is up to us to decide at what level and at what frequency we should provide error correction. We cannot discourage them from communicating orally and experimenting for the sake of accuracy. We should make sure that our learners don't be scared of making errors to interact in the target language (SFLT 13, interview, May, 2017).

Theme 5: preferences for error types

The preferences of the interviewees revealed the following pattern for error correction: pronunciation (15 of 20]75%[), grammar and vocabulary (12 of 20]60%[), and semantic (11 of 20

]55%[). Participants ranked pronunciation errors first in order of preference for treatment as most of the student language teachers indicated that these errors need to receive most attention. It can be inferred that although the almost all participants expressed that errors pertaining to pronunciation deserve more attention, they gave equal importance to all kinds of errors during practicum classes when the practiced teaching. Then errors relating to both grammar and vocabulary ranked second and third in order of preference for treatment as most of the participants expressed that these types of errors deserve adequate attention. Following, errorneous utterances concerned with semantic ranked last but not least in the order of priority. Student foreign language teachers' choices for correcting the error types above were illustrated in student foreign language teachers' 4 and 20 responses:

> I think providing correction to all types of errors is important, but pronunciation is the most important one for communication. It is very difficult without right pronunciation, so it affects the meaning in the wrong way in the language, causing misunderstandings if the speakers pronounce words incorrectly. I believe that we should get our students to practice pronouncing words many times because pronunciation affects the learners' motivation and performance in the long run. In other words, pronunciation learning is an important feature of FL teaching and learning, therefore errors pertaining to pronunciation should be given priority [in terms of correction], but other types of errors should not be neglected either (SFLT 4, interview, May, 2017).

> In my opinion, all aspects of language have equal importance. Grammar, semantic, vocabulary, and pronunciation are of great value, but all teachers had better focus on both pronunciation and vocabulary errors because they are difficult to achieve and affect learners' speaking performance. No one can deny that most learners' problems are in speaking are related to pronunciation and grammar which is included in morphology.Without perfect pronunciation, neither can I or my partner understand each other [while communicating orally]. For example, before I started studying pronunciation at University, I had had problems in speaking with foreigners especially with native speakers of English. When I said something, they always asked for clarification saying "Sorry", "Pardon", or "Can you please repeat that again?". I remember having to write the words on a piece of paper to show them the words I pronounced incorrectly, but now, everything is different. Even if I make some errors related to grammar, we understand each other much much better than before. If the learners don't master these language areas, they cannot communicate perfectly (SFLT 20, interview, May, 2017).

Interestingly, this result is not in consistent with that of classroom observations in which 58.4% of pronunciation errors received error correction. When asked how many of the errors related pronunciation had been treated, participants all stated that they had given priority to pronunciation. When reminded of the fact that pronunciation errors were one of the two types of errors which were targeted least along with vocabulary in terms of error correction, they all reported that they had tried to treat every single errors related to pronunciation as it would cause misunderstanding and inhibit communication. Therefore, the reason might be that rest of the pronunciation errors might have gone unnoticed by the student foreign language teachers otherwise, they would have treated nearly all pronunciation errors as they stated during the follow up interviews.

Theme 6: preferences for OCF strategies

Interestingly, this result is not in consistent with that of classroom observations in which 58.4% of pronunciation errors received error correction. When asked how many of the errors related pronunciation had been treated, participants all stated that they had given priority to pronunciation. When reminded of the fact that pronunciation errors were one of the two types of errors which were targeted least along with vocabulary in terms of error correction, they all reported that they had tried to treat every single errors related to pronunciation as it would cause misunderstanding and inhibit communication. Therefore, the reason might be that rest of the pronunciation errors might have gone unnoticed by the student foreign language teachers otherwise, they would have treated nearly all pronunciation errors as they stated during the follow up interviews.

Although nineteen of the participants could not name a single OCF strategies, according to what they told how they would correct learners' errors, it was concluded that the most preferred OCF strategies by the prospective foreign language teachers for treating learners' erroneous utterances were input providing strategies in the form of explicit correction (19 of 20]95%[). On the other hand, output prompting methods in the form of elicitation (1 of 20]5%[) and clarification requests (1 of 20]5%[) were preferred least. Most of the teachers believe that OCF refers to correcting student's erroneous utterance by means of indicating what is wrong and providing correct answer [explicit OCF] and it is the only way they are familiar with since their errors as a student have been treated by this way. According to the interviewee participants, through OCF [explicit], language teachers can save time as they always have many topics to teach. In addition, this way of error treatment is practical and useful since it is the only way [to their knowledge] to be able to foster learning the foreign language. This opinion is stated by the most of the participants during the interviews. Participants 7, 11, and 19 represented this view:

> OCF [explicit] really works for better because when I point out what is wrong to the owner of the error and give extra information accordingly, it definitely makes it possible for them to notice their errors and prevent it from happening again. It is the most convenient way to provide necessary information about the utterance which is not correct in the target language (SFLT 7, interview, May, 2017).

> Making errors are human and when our students commit errors, that indicates that our students have problems relating to certain areas which they are not able to deal with themselves. It is necessary to inform the students why they should do so to help them understand why their utterance is not acceptable in some situations. Thus, they will be able to rely on themselves and have complete control over their learning. So, I believe we should all provide them with extra information then ask them to make up expression similar to the ones they get wrong to help them not to make these errors anymore (SFLT 19, interview, May, 2017).

The next but the least preferred strategies for error correction suggested by only one participant were elicitation and clarification (1 of 20]5%[). Elicitation requires language teachers offer their students some commentaries and reminders to help them notice their own erroneous utterances and

self-correct them. Interview results indicates that only one of the interviewee student foreign language teacher preferred using this strategy for correcting erroneous expressions. Interviewee 13 explained the reasons why she prefers elicitation method:

> I sometimes prefer employing elicitation to provide feedback to my students' errors. But it depends on the learners' level of proficiency, since it does not work with students who have low level of proficiency. Through elicitation I can make students feel more comfortable and less embarrassed when they make a mistake, In addition, I can have my students to be more active and so foster them to build their grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation, as elicitation pushes students to think carefully and notice if there is something wrong with their expressions (SFLT 13, May, 2017).

Finally, participant 13 (1 of 20]5%[) suggested providing OCF through recasts and the other types of OCF were neither named or mentioned at all. According to her, it would be helpful to adopt a role model for students. Therfore, provide them with a correct answer in an implicit way is essential so that the teacher and the student can negotiate meaning and take part in more communicative activities without making students feel embarrassed. On the other hand, she stated that teachers cannot make sure if the students notice their errors and teachers' correction. She said:

> I think recasting is another friendly strategy teachers can adopt in correcting their students' errors because it doesn't cause students to be shy. This technique may facilitate language learning, because I think students will appreciate when you give them a model to follow. It is a way of engaging in communication with them, but I am not sure what level of students this technique is suitable for. What is bad about this method is that teachers' correction by recast may go unnoticed depending on students understanding. In addition, it does not provide learners with opportunities to correct themselves, and in this case they rely on teachers' assistance. That is why I remember using it rarely (SFLT 13, interview, May, 2017).

Theme 7: preferences for OCF sources

The analysis of follow up interviews revealed interesting and sometimes inconsistent results with the classroom observations. Although majority of the interviewees (16 of 20]80%[) preferred self-correction techniques during the follow up interviews, they stated that they had preferred teacher correction during the practicum and observed classes. Generally, they believe that students themselves should be the main source providing the OCF strategies not teachers so that they do not depend on their teachers for assistance and be responsible for their own learning. According to the participants, self-correction methods could be more helpful and would make the learner more knowledgeable in the TL, allowing them understand the nature of their errors and the idea of self-discovery. Interviewee 2 and 7 explained this belief:

> I strongly believe that self-correction is a good strategy every teacher should consider using in correcting their students' errors because it promotes learning more than teacher correction does. Even if they try but cannot correct their own errors, it will make it possible for students to learn better since they will never forget the errors they have tried hard and thought carefully of. The more you are active, the more you learn. Moreover, they will be proud of themselves and feel more confident, thinking of not needing

> anybody to correct their own mistakes or errors. Ultimately they will not need anybody to learn and will learn to learn (SFLT 2, interview, May, 2017).

> There is no doubt that self-correction works for better. It brings about learners' awareness of their progresses they are making and pushes learners to produce in the target language. I think it is the most useful technique of all and encourages learners to better understand the most common errors in the target language. Through self-correction, the students will be given an opportunities to find out these errors and correct them, giving them a chance for self-learning. Self-correcting means a better learning experience because they will be able to know about what kinds of errors they are committing and why are they doing so (SFLT 7, interview, May, 2017).

In other words, they support the idea that main goal of error correction should be to allow learners to amend their own errors. Another is goal is not to minimize or eliminate the need for teacher help. Many of the preservice teachers interviewed agree that allowing learners to correct their own errors is really effective and promote the notion of self-learning. According to students, self-correction technique will reduce the student reliance on teacher, making them feel more confident in producing more accurate structures in the foreign language they are learning. In addition, this technique will have the students take responsibility for their own progress. Ultimately they will be more aware about the language they are learning.

The next preferred sources of OCF turned out to be peer correction (12 of 20]60%[). Similarly, They have the opinion that peer correction is a powerful asset in language learning as it would help learners to make the requisite amendments to the errors committed by their classmates and notice the nature of their friends' errors similar to theirs. The participants stress that it can be much similar for students to correct their own and their peers' errors.

On the other hand, when they were asked about the reasons why they had favored teacher correction instead of self-correction and peer correction although they thought self-correction would be of more beneficial, they stated that it was matter of time and causing embarrassment it would have caused the student to feel. Interviewee 6 and 14 explained the reasons why they preferred not to use self-correction:

> My only concern was that it was quiet possible the students would have felt anxiety and embarrassed with their classmates around if they hadn't been able to put it right. I didn't want that happen to them, so I corrected and saved the day I think (SFLT 6, interview, May, 2017).

In sum, although they favored self-correction and peer correction over teacher correction, during practicum classes, they had preferred to use teacher correction most of the time in order not to lose time in vein and not to cause the student to feel stressed out.

4.2. Quantitative Data Findings

4.2.1. Pre-service EFL Teachers' Beliefs of OCF Provision

The second research question explored what pre-service English teachers' beliefs are regarding corrective feedback use. Before starting to run the analysis, the data were checked for the test of normality analysis. Based on the inspection of the histograms, coefficients of variances, values of skewness and kurtosis, the detrended Q-Q plots of the data, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test significance, the variables non-normally distributed (p>0,05). For the analysis, descriptive analysis including frequencies, means and percentages were used. For the comparison analysis, Mann-Whitney-tests for independent sample groups were used in order to answer the second research question of the study.

Theme 1: importance of OCF provision

Their response to the eight statements aimed to figure out what prospective language teachers believe about necessity of providing OCF. The first item under this category dealt with providing OCF as being element of language teaching (item 1). The second item was concerned that error correction is crucial in promoting L2/ FL learning (item 2). The third suggested that learners are not afraid of being corrected through OCF (item3). The fourth was concerned with teachers' systematic OCF provision to repetitive errors in learner language production (item 6). The fifth conveyed the idea that OCF has great importance on language learning (item 10). The sixth expressed the notion OCF provision has profound effect language development (item 12). The seventh was related with the learners' consent about being provided with OCF (item 13). Finally, the eight described OCF techniques as being essential in promoting language learning (item 18). According to the mean score of eight items, pre-service EFL teachers believe that employing OCF strategies to student errors are of great importance (*M*= 4,01; *SD*= 0,47). Descriptive details regarding the agreement levels are presented in Table 10.

Table 10: The Importance Pre-service EFL Teachers Attribute to OFC Provision

Item No	Agreement Level . Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	Providing feedback should be a part of language teaching.	1 (0,7)	1 (0,7)	6 (3,9)	44 (28,9)	100 (65,8)
2	Providing students with oral corrective feedback is crucial.	0	6 (3,9)	13 (8,6)	58 (38,2)	75 (49,3)

Table 10: (Continue)

Item No	Agreement Level . Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
3	Second language (L2)/ foreign language (FL) learners do NOT fear being corrected by their language teachers.	9 (5,9)	32 (21,1)	35 (23,0)	39 (25,7)	37 (24,3)
6	Teachers should systematically correct PERSISTENT errors in their learner's language production.	2 (1,3)	12 (7,9)	20 (13,2)	65 (42,8)	53(34,9)
10	Oral corrective feedback is of great importance in the language development.	1 (0,7)	1 (0,7)	6 (3,9)	64 (42,1)	80 (52,6)
12	If NOT corrected, L2/FL learners cannot make a good progress.	3 (2,0)	7 (4,6)	23 (15,1)	64 (42,1)	55 (36,2)
13	Most learners like being corrected in class.	17 (11,2)	34 (22,4)	38 (25,0)	48 (31,0)	15 (9,9)
18	Error correction is essential in promoting L2/FL learning.	1 (0,7)	5 (3,3)	20 (13,2)	70 (46,1)	56 (36,8)

Note: First numbers indicate frequencies and the numbers in parenthesis indicate percentages.

According to pre-service teachers' agreement, based on the totals of agree and strongly agree columns in each item, they believe in the importance of these strategies with high percentages (e.g., item 1 94,7%). Among the statements, item 13 has the lowest agreement percentage (40,9%).

Theme 2: preferences for implicit or explicit feedback

Two items were related to explicit (item 27) and implicit feedback (item 28) preferences. Two statements were related to explicit and implicit feedback preferences. While the former statement aimed to investigate student teacher's agreement with employing explicit feedback, the latter statement targeted at finding out the level student teachers' willingness to use implicit feedback types.

According to the mean scores, though pre-service teachers prefer both implicit (*M*=3,70; *SD*=0,58) and explicit feedback strategy much (M=4,23; SD=0,85), they are in favor of explicit strategy use in feedback (*Md*=0,53). Descriptive statistics regardi ng the item agreement levels for each item are presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Pre-service EFL Teachers' Preference for Implicit or Explicit Feedback

Item No	Agreement Level . Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
27	Language teachers should inform what students have said is wrong, how it is wrong, and then they should be provided with the correct form.	8(5,3)	17(11,2)	17(11,2)	59(38,8)	68(44,7)
28	Language teachers should imply that there is something wrong with they have said without telling them exactly what is wrong (e.g., by repeating the error in the questioning tone, repeating what they have said but no correct form, asking the student to repeat their answer.	6(3,9)	10(6,6)	22(14,5)	62(40,8)	52(34,2)

Note: First numbers indicate frequencies and numbers in parenthesis indicate percentages.

According to the mean scores, though pre-service teachers prefer both implicit (*M*=3,70; *SD*=0,58) and explicit feedback strategy much (M=4,23; SD=0,85), they are in favor of explicit strategy use in feedback (*Md*=0,53). Descriptive statistics regarding the item agreement levels for each item are presented in Table 9.

Theme 3: preferences for input providing feedback or output prompting feedback

Six statements were related to explicit and implicit feedback preferences. While two statements (items 29 and 33 in Table 10 below) targeted at investigating student teacher's agreement with using *input provider* feedback family, four statements (items 30, 31, 32, and 34) aimed to find out the level of student teachers' willingness to use *output prompter* (hence, OP) feedback types. According to the mean scores, though pre-service teachers prefer both input providing OCF strategies (*M*=3,02; *SD*=1,04) and output prompter feedback strategies much (M=3,72; SD=0,67), they are in favor of

explicit strategy use in feedback (*Md*=0,37). Descriptive statistics regarding the item agreement levels for each item are presented in Table 12.

Table 12 : Pre-service EFL Teachers' Preferences for Input or Output Provider Feedback

Item No.	Agreement Level / Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
29	**Explicit feedback***	26 (17,1)	26 (17,1)	28 (18,4)	49 (32,2)	23 (15,1)
30	Elicitation	6 (3,9)	11 (7,2)	30 (19,7)	45 (29,6)	60 (39,5)
31	Repetition	10 (6,6)	12 (7,9)	26 (17,1)	56 (36,8)	48 (31,6)
32	Metalinguistic clue	12 (7,9)	15 (9,9)	21 (13,8)	31 (20,4)	27 (17,8)
33	**Recasts***	32 (21,1)	31 (20,4)	31 (20,4)	31 (21,4)	27 (17,8)
34	Clarification	15 (9,9)	30 (19,7)	25 (16,4)	51 (33,6)	31 (20,4)

Note: First numbers indicate frequencies and numbers in parenthesis indicate percentages. *Those strategies written in bold represent *input providing* and the rest of them represent *output prompters.*

Theme 4: extent of error treatment

Five statements were concerned with the extent of error correction. While the first category statements (items 8 and 24 in Table 11 below) suggested that it is essential to correct all errors that students commit in class to ensure fluency and accuracy in speaking, the other category statements (items 9 and 11) affirmed that language teachers do not need to treat every error when the some or significant erroneous utterances are treated. According to the mean scores, though pre-service teachers prefer to treat both *all errors* (*M*=3,49; *SD*=1,02) and only *necessary errors*, which do not break the communication, much (M=4,13; SD=0,67), they are in favor of explicit strategy use in feedback (*Md*=0,35). Descriptive statistics regarding the item agreement levels for each item are presented in Table 13.

Table 13: Pre-service EFL Teachers' Extent of Error Treatment

Item No	Agreement Level . Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
8	**All student errors should be corrected.***	14 (9,2)	19 (12,5)	41 (27,0)	38 (25,0)	40 (26,3)
9	Language teachers should ignore some errors depending on some factors.	1 (0,7)	9 (5,9)	13 (8,6)	71 (46,7)	58 (38,2)
11	Some errors are more important to correct than others.	4 (2,6)	5 (3,3)	27 (17,8)	52 (34,2)	64 (42,1)
24	**All errors are equally important to correct.***	11 (7,2)	33 (21,7)	19 (12,5)	45 (29,6)	44 (28,9)

Note: (1) First numbers indicate frequencies and numbers in parenthesis indicate percentages. (2)* Bold items belong to group advocating all errors should be treated and rest of the items indicate only significant ones.

According to Table 11, items regarding the belief that all errors should be treated with OCF provision have lower agreement percentages than the belief that only necessary errors (e.g., item 8= 51,3%) and pre-service teachers are in favor of the belief of treating only important errors with very high amount of agreement (e.g., item 9= 84,9%).

Theme 5: preferences for error types

Four statements were concerned with four error types (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and semantic respectively). The first statement (item 4) claimed correcting errors related to *grammar* in a language classroom is very important. The second statement (item 13) suggested that teachers should make sure that *vocabulary* errors are treated with OCF. The third (item 22) asserted that correcting *pronunciation* errors in a language classroom is more important. Finally, the fourth statement (item 25) was concerned with the idea that correcting *semantic* errors in a language classroom is more important. Student teachers show how uncertain their opinions are about this matter. Descriptive statistics regarding the item agreement levels for each error are presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Pre-service EFL Teachers' Preferences for Error Types

Item No	Agreement Level . Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
4	Grammar errors	5 (3,3)	10 (6,6)	11 (7,2)	51 (33,6)	75 (49,3)
13	Vocabulary errors	3 (2,0)	6 (3,4)	33 (21,7)	59 (38,8)	51 (33,6)
22	Pronunciation errors	2 (1,3)	14 (9,2)	33 (21,7)	66 (43,4)	37 (24,3)
25	Semantic errors	4 (2,6)	18 (11,8)	35 (23,0)	54 (35,5)	41 (27,0)

Note: First numbers indicate frequencies and numbers in parenthesis indicate percentages.

As it can be seen in Table 12, the results indicated that Turkish EFL student teachers considered grammar errors to be the most important to correct with a mean score of 4,19 (SD=1,05), followed by vocabulary errors (*M*=3,98; *SD*=0,95), then pronunciation errors (*M*=3,80; *SD*=0,96), and finally semantic errors (*M*=3,72; *SD*=1,07).

Theme 6: preferences for OCF strategies

The second research question also asked about the perceptions of the frequency of each feedback type the participants would use in the classroom. Therefore, Part 2 of the scale was created to find out in accordance with this aim, on a five-point scale with 5 indicating "very useful" and 1 "not useful". Upon completing Part 1 of belief questionnaire, they had a break for the instruction OCF types lasting 25 minutes. Then they were asked to indicate their preferences for OCF types with the help of one example of possible student error and six possible ways of dealing it. The results were obtained from item 29 to item 34 of the survey. The first example (item 29) was concerned with the idea that *Explicit* type of OCF is more beneficial, while the second example (item 30) suggested that errors are best treated by means of *Elicitation*, the third statement advocated for error treatment with repetition (item 31), the fourth example offered *Metalinguistic feedback* (item 32), the fifth example mentioned *Recast* (item 33), and finally, the sixth example (item 34) proposed *Clarification request* as way of correcting learner errors. It should be noted that this part of the survey was designed to collect perceptions on six of the seven feedback types, which were established in Panova and Lyster's (2002) study. Table 13 provides an outline of the real occurrences of six feedback types and the teachers' mean of perceived feedback frequency. Descriptive statistics regarding the item agreement levels for each OCF type are presented in Table 15 and ranking of feedback types is displayed in Table 16.

Table 15: Pre-service EFL Teachers' Preference for OCF types

Item No.	Agreement Level / Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
29	Explicit feedback	26 (17,1)	26 (17,1)	28 (18,4)	49 (32,2)	23 (15,1)
30	Elicitation	6 (3,9)	11 (7,2)	30 (19,7)	45 (29,6)	60 (39,5)
31	Repetition	10 (6,6)	12 (7,9)	26 (17,1)	56 (36,8)	48 (31,6)
32	Metalinguistic clue	12 (7,9)	15 (9,9)	21 (13,8)	31 (20,4)	27 (17,8)
33	Recasts	32 (21,1)	31 (20,4)	31 (20,4)	31 (21,4)	27 (17,8)
34	Clarification	15 (9,9)	30 (19,7)	25 (16,4)	51 (33,6)	31 (20,4)

Note: First numbers indicate frequencies and numbers in parenthesis indicate percentages.

Table 16: Ranks of the Six Feedback Types

Teacher's perception rank of the six feedback types
Elicitation＞Metalinguistic clues＞Repetition＞Clarification request＞Explicit correction＞Recasts

According to the mean scores, it can be concluded that *elicitation correction* method (*M*=3,94; *SD*=1,11) was perceived by the student teacher to be the most frequently preferable type. Following elicitation correction, the student teachers perceived *metalinguistic clues* (*M*=3,80; *SD*=1,26)) to be the second mostly preferable type. The student teacher then perceived *repetition* (*M*=3,79; SD=1,16) to be the third frequent one. The next one on the teacher's ranking after *metalinguistic feedback* was *clarification request* (*M*=3.35; *SD*=1,27). The fifth position on the teacher' ranking was *explicit* correction (*M*=3,11; *SD*=1,33). The least frequently preferred type the student teacher perceived to be was *recasts* (*M*=2,93; *SD*=1,40). This was only partially accurate.

Theme 7: Preferences for OCF sources

Similarly to the fifth theme, three statements were related to theme 6. While the first statement (item 7) was concerned with the idea that learner errors should be provided with teacher correction, the second statement suggested that errors are best treated by self-correction (item 19). And finally, the third statement advocated for error treatment by peer correction (item 20). Based on the nature of these items, a common trait intended across the statements was the sources of error correction preferred by student language teachers. Henceforth, this theme was labeled as "preferences for

sources of OCF". Descriptive statistics regarding the item agreement levels for each OCF type are presented in Table 17.

Table 17: Pre-service EFL Teachers' Preferences for OCF Sources

Item No	Agreement Level . Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7	Teacher correction	0 (0,0)	3 (2,0)	22 (14,5)	73 (48,0)	54 (35,5)
19	Self-correction	2 (1,3)	8 (5,3	15 (9,9)	51 (33,6)	76 (50,0)
20	Peer correction	13 (8,6)	13 (8,6)	36 (23,7)	52 (34,2)	38 (25,0)

Note: First numbers indicate frequencies and numbers in parenthesis indicate percentages.

According to the mean scores, Turkish EFL student teachers rated self-correction the highest (*M*=4,26; *SD*=0,93), followed by teacher correction (*M*=4,17; *SD*= 0,74), and then peer correction (*M*=3,59; *SD*=1,20).

Theme 8: preferences for the timing of OCF

Three statements were related to the timing of OCF (items 5, 15 and 16). While the first statement suggested that OCF should be provided as soon as the error is made (item 5), the second statement affirmed that the right time for OCF provision is at the end of the communicative activities (item 15), the third statement expressed that language teachers leave it to the end of the lesson (item 16). All three statements address the choices of when to give error correction and they provided student teachers with three scenarios on the timing of learner error treatment and asked them to indicate which was most important. Therefore, this theme was labeled "preferences for timing of OCF". Descriptive statistics regarding the item agreement levels for each item are presented in Table 18.

Table 18: Pre-service EFL Teachers' Preferences for Timing of OCF Provision

Item No	Agreement Level . Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
5	Immediately	8 (5,3)	10 (6,6)	35 (23,0)	39 (25,7)	60 (39,5)
15	At the end of the activity	13 (8,6)	22 (14,5)	59 (38,8)	36 (23,7)	12 (14,5)
16	At the end of the lesson	15 (9,9)	15 (9,9)	32 (21,1)	45 (29,6)	45 (29,6)

According to the mean scores, the student language teachers considered instant error correction to be the most appropriate way (*M*=3,88; *SD*=1,16), followed by feedback provision at the end of the class (*M*=3,59; *SD*=1,27), then at the end of the activity (*M*=3,21; *SD*=1,12). In other words, there was an important support by most of the student teachers for the scenario, which allowed students to produce the target language with immediate interruption, and at the end of the activity, as compared to the scenario that called for allowing learners to produce target language long after an error was made without interruption for the purposes of correction. That is, most of them believed that errors needed to be addressed immediately.

4.2.2. ELT and non-ELT Group Differences about OCF Beliefs

Mann-Whitney U tests were run in order to investigate if there are significant differences in reported OCF beliefs in terms of EFL learners in the faculty of education and faculty of letters. For each sub-theme, comparison analysis conducted and presented respectively in this section.

Theme 1: importance of OCF provision

A comparison analysis was conducted to see whether there is a difference between ELT and ELL students' mean rank scores in the importance of the provision of OCF. The results were shown in Table 19.

Table 19: Mann Whitney-U Test Results of Importance of the Provision of OFC

Group Name	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
ELT	61	57,41	3502,00	1611,000	0,000*
ELL	91	89,30	8126,00		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, the EFL teachers' rank averages in the importance of the provision of OFC significantly differed concerning department (U =1611,000; p<0,05). This finding suggests that department type is influential on the teachers' putting importance to the provision of OFC. In terms of their group means, the ELL students' (*M*=4,15; *SD*=0,46) mean significantly higher than the students in ELT department (*M*=3,80; *SD*=0,41).

Theme 2: preferences for implicit or explicit feedback

A comparison analysis was conducted to see whether there is a difference between ELT and ELL students' mean ranks in the preferences for implicit and explicit feedback families. The results were shown in Table 20.

Table 20: Mann Whitney-U Test Results of Preferences for Implicit and Explicit Feedback

Group Name	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
ELT-implicit	61	67,40	4111,50	2220,000	0,027*
ELL-implicit	91	82,60	7516,50		
ELT-explicit	61	63,98	3903,00	1860,000	0,000*
ELL-explicit	91	84,89	7725,00		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, the EFL student teachers' rank averages in the preferences for implicit feedback significantly differed concerning department (U =2220,000; p<0,05). This finding suggests that department type is influential on the teachers' implicit feedback preference. In terms of their group means, the ELL students' score (*M*=4,02; *SD*=1,17) significantly higher than the students in ELT department (*M*=3,67; *SD*=0,80).

According to the explicit feedback significance, the student teachers' rank averages in in the preferences for explicit feedback significantly differed concerning department (U =2012,000; p<0,05). In terms of their group means, the ELL students' score (*M*=4,16; *SD*=0,89) significantly higher than the students in ELT department (*M*=3,67; *SD*=0,81).

Theme 3: preferences for input providing feedback or output prompting feedback

A comparison analysis was conducted to see whether there is a difference between ELT and ELL students' mean ranks in the preferences for input and output provider feedback. The results were shown in Table 21.

Table 21: Mann Whitney-U Test Results of of Preferences for Input and Output Provider Feedback

Group Name	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
ELT-Input	61	69,11	4215,50	2324,500	0,087
ELL-Input	91	81,46	7412,50		
ELT-Output	61	63,75	3888,50	1997,500	0,003*
ELL-Output	91	85,05	7739,50		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, as can be seen in Table 18, the EFL student teachers' rank averages in the preferences for input providing feedback group did not differ in terms of department type (U =2324,500; p>0,05). This finding suggests that department type is not important on the teachers' input feedback preference. In terms of their group means, though ELL students' mean (*M*=3,15; *SD*=1,06) is higher than ELT students' mean (*M*=2,84; *SD*=0,99), it is not statistically significant.

According to the output feedback comparison, the student teachers' rank averages significantly differed concerning department (U =1997,500; p<0,05). In terms of their group means, the ELL students' score (*M*=3,85; *SD*=0,64) significantly higher than the students in ELT department (*M*=3,52; *SD*=0,66).

Theme 4: extent of error treatment

A comparison analysis was conducted to see whether there is a difference between ELT and ELL students' mean ranks in the preferences for the extent of errors. The results were shown in Table 22.

Table 22: Mann Whitney-U Test Results of Preferences for the Extent of Errors

Group Name	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
ELT-sign. errors	61	66,51	4057,00	2166,000	0,018*
ELL-sign. errors	91	83,20	7571,00		
ELT- all errors	61	63,54	3876,00	1985,000	0,003*
ELL- all errors	91	85,19	7752,00		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, the EFL student teachers' rank averages in the preferences for *some or significant errors should be treated* significantly differ in terms of department type (U =2166,000; p<0,05). This finding suggests that department type is important on the student teachers' preferences for the extent of errors. In terms of their group means, though ELL students' mean (*M*=4,20; *SD*=0,69) is higher than ELT students' mean (*M*=4,02; *SD*=0,64), it is not statistically significant.

According to the comparison of all errors should be treated, the student teachers' rank averages significantly differed concerning department (U =1985,000; p<0,05). In terms of their group means, the ELL students' score (*M*=3,68; *SD*=1,07) significantly higher than the students in ELT department (*M*=3,21; *SD*=0,86).

Theme 5: preferences for error types

A comparison analysis was conducted to see whether there is a difference between ELT and ELL students' mean ranks in the preferences error types. The results were shown in Table 23.

Table 23: Mann Whitney-U Test Results of Group Comparison of Error Types Preferences

Group Name	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
ELT-grammar	61	64,61	3941,50	2050,000	0,003*
ELL-grammar	91	84,47	7687,50		
ELT-vocabulary	61	64,42	3929,50	2038,500	0,003*
ELL-vocabulary	91	84,60	7698,50		
ELT-pronunciation	61	66,02	4027,50	2136,500	0,011*
ELL-pronunciation	91	69,11	7600,50		
ELT-semantic	61	63,72	3887,00	1996,000	0,002*
ELT-semantic	61	85,07	7741,50		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, the EFL student teachers' rank averages in all four categories differed significantly. First, the preferences for grammar errors differed significantly in terms of department type (U =2050,000; p<0,05). This finding suggests that department type is very important on the teachers' preference for targeting grammar errors. In terms

of their group means, the ELL students' score (*M*=4,43; *SD*=0,79) significantly higher than the students in ELT department (*M*=3,84; *SD*=1,27). As for the vocabulary comparison, the student teachers' rank averages significantly differed concerning department (U =20,38,500; p<0,05). In terms of their group means, the ELL students' score (*M*=4,14; *SD*=0,93) significantly higher than the students in ELT department (*M*=3,74; *SD*=0,93). Third, the preferences for errors related pronunciation also differed significantly in terms of department type (U =2336,500; p<0,05). This finding means that department type is very important on the teachers' targeting pronunciation errors. Finally, as it is the case with three categories, the preferences for semantic errors differed significantly in terms of department type too (U =1996,000; p<0,05). This finding suggests that department type is very important on the teachers' input feedback preference. In terms of their group means, the ELL students' score (*M*=3,90; *SD*=1,14) significantly higher than the students in ELT department (*M*=3,46; *SD*=0,91). Although EFL student teachers' rank averages in all four categories differed significantly, their rank orders are the same (see their rank order in Table 24).

Table 24: **ELT/Non-ELT Group Comparison of Error Ranking**

Faculty	Rankings of error types
ELT	Grammar＞Vocabulary＞Pronunciation＞Semantic
ELL	Grammar＞Vocabulary＞Pronunciation＞Semantic

Results indicated that student language teachers from both faculties considered *grammar errors* to be the most important to correct with followed by *vocabulary errors*, then *pronunciation*, and finally semantic errors. That is, the identical order was indicated by student language teachers from both departments.

Theme 6: preferences for OCF strategies

A comparison analysis was conducted to see whether there is a difference between ELT and ELL students' mean ranks in the preferences for explicit or implicit OCF types. The results were shown in Table 25.

Table 25: Mann Whitney-U Test Results of Group Comparison of Error Types Preferences

Group Name	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
ELT-explicit	61	72,52	4424,00	2533,000	0,349
ELL-explicit	91	79,16	7204,00		
ELT-elicitation	61	67,11	4094,00	2203,500	0,024*
ELL-elicitation	91	82,79	7534,00		
ELT-repetition	61	71,24	4345,50	2454,500	0,207
ELL-repetition	91	80,03	7282,50		
ELT-metalinguistic	61	67,17	4097,50	2206,500	0,025*
ELT-metalinguistic	61	82,75	7530,50		
ELT-recasts	61	68,01	4148,50	2257,500	0,047*
ELL-recasts	91	82,19	7479,50		
ELT-clarification	61	71,51	4362,00	2471,000	0,238
ELT-clarification	61	79,85	7266,00		

*p<0.05

According to Table 25, the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, the EFL student teachers' rank averages did not differ in their preferences for OCF provision strategies like *explicit correction* (U =2533,000; p>0,05), *repetition* (U =2454,500; p>0,05), and *clarification* (U =2472,000; p>0,05) in terms of department type. This finding suggests that that ELT or non-ELT department type is not important on the EFL student teachers' preferences for employing *explicit correction*, *repetition*, or *recasts*.

On the other hand, the EFL student teachers' rank averages significantly differed in their preferences for OCF provision strategies like *elicitation* (U =2203,500; p<0,05), *metalinguistic clues* (U =2206,500; p<0,05), and *recasts* (U =2257,500; p<0,05) in terms of department type. This finding indicates that ELT or non-ELT department type is very important on the EFL student teachers' preferences for employing *elicitation*, *metalinguistic clues*, or *recasts*. Although EFL student teachers' rank averages differed in three of the OCF strategies and did not differ significantly in the other three strategies, their rank orders are similar except for two strategies. In addition non-ELT student teachers from ELL faculty rated all feedback types higher than their counterparts, with no exception (see their rank order in Table 26).

Table 26: ELT/non-ELT Group Comparison of OCF Strategy Ranking

Faculty	Rankings of error types
ELT	Elicitation ＞**Repetition** ＞**Metalinguistic clues** ＞Clarification request ＞ Explicit correction ＞Recasts
ELL	Elicitation ＞**Metalinguistic clues** ＞**Repetition** ＞Clarification request ＞ Explicit correction ＞Recasts

Note: Bold strategies indicate the difference in ranking.

With the help of their group means, we can see that *elicitation* (*M*=3,67; *SD*=1,20)) and *repetition* (*M*=3,66; *SD*=1,20)) were perceived by the ELT student language teacher to be the most favorably preferred types. Following *elicitation* and *repetition*, the teacher perceived *metalinguistic feedback* (*M*=3,54; *SD*=1,31) to be the third mostly preferred type. The next one on the teacher's ranking after *metalinguistic feedback* was *clarification* (*M*=3,21; *SD*=1,24), making it the fourth in the ranking. The fifth position on the EF student language teacher' ranking was *explicit correction* (*M*=3,02; *SD*=1,19*)*). The least frequently used type the EF language student teacher perceived to be was recast, with a mean score of 2,66 (*SD*=1,29).

On the other hand, non-ELT student teachers from ELL faculty rated all feedback types with higher scores than their counterparts, with no exception. The ELL student language teachers preferred this feedback type ranking. The ELL participants also perceived *elicitation* (*M*=4,11; *SD*=1,02) to be the most preferred type of feedback. Following *elicitation*, *metalinguistic feedback* was perceived to be the second most popular. Then the ELT participants ranked *repetition* (*M*=3,98; *SD*=1,20) as third preferable method on their perception list. However, as mentioned before, their counterparts ELT participants ranked these two OCF methods in the opposite way, ranking *repetition* second but *metalinguistic feedback* third. Then *clarification* was the fourth most commonly preferred type in their ranking (*M*=3,44; *SD*=1,30). The next OCF type on the ELT participants' ranking was explicit (*M*=3,18; *SD*=1,43)), making it the second least preferred type. Same as ELT student teachers, ELL student language teachers thought recast to be the least favorite OCF type (M=3,12; *SD*=1,45).

Theme 7: preferences for the timing of OCF

A comparison analysis was conducted to see whether there is a difference between ELT and ELL students' mean ranks in the preferences for timing of error treatment. The results were shown in Table 27.

Table 27: Whitney-U Test Results of Preference for Timing of Error Treatment

Group Name	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
ELT-immediately	61	68,30	4166,50	2275,500	0,049*
ELL-immediately	91	81,99	7461,50		
ELT- end of activity	61	72,18	4403,00	2512,000	0,302
ELL-end of activity	91	79,40	7225,00		
ELT-end of class	61	72,82	4442,00	2551,000	0,383
ELL-end of class	91	78,97	7186,00		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, while the EFL student teachers' rank averages did not differed in their preferences for treating errors with OCF strategies *at the end of the activity* (U =2512,000; p>0,05), and *at the end of the class* (U =2551,000; p>0,05), their preferences for OCF provision *immediately* differed significantly in terms of department type (U =2275,500; p<0,05). This finding suggests that ELT or non-ELT department type department type is very important on the teachers' immediate error treatment but not on their preferences for timing of the delayed error treatment. In terms of their group means, the ELL students' score (*M*=3,99; *SD*=1,21) is significantly higher than the students in ELT department (*M*=3,70; *SD*=1,09) for immediate error treatment preferences.

Theme 8: preferences for OCF sources

A comparison analysis was conducted to see whether there is a difference between ELT and ELL students' mean ranks in the preferences for the sources of OCF provision. The results were shown in Table 28.

Table 28: Whitney-U Test Results of Preference of OCF Timing

Group Name	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
ELT-teacher correction	61	73,02	4454,00	2563,000	0,384
ELL-teacher correction	91	78,84	7174,00		
ELT-self correction	61	64,72	3948,00	2057,000	0,003*
ELL-self correction	91	84,40	7680,00		
ELT-peer correction	61	82,39	5025,50	2416,500	0,162
ELL-peer correction	91	72,55	6602,50		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, while the EFL student teachers' rank averages did not differed in their preferences for *teacher correction* (U =2563,000; p>0,05) and peer correction (U =2416,500; p>0,05), their preferences for *self-correction* differed significantly in terms of department type (U =2057,000; p<0,05). This finding suggests that ELT or non-ELT department type department type is not important on the student EFL teachers' choices for teacher correction or peer correction but very important on their preferences for self-correction. In terms of their group means, the non-ELT students' score is (*M*=4,43; *SD*=0,85) significantly higher than the students in ELT department (*M*=4,00; *SD*=1,00) for self-correction way of treatment.

4.3. Discussion

The study in two English programs set out to investigate the frequency of teacher feedback in ELF classes and a sample of pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs and preferences for oral corrective feedback provision. Therefore, the study sought to answer its research questions from two aspects of inquiry. Gaining further understanding about these pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs as well as their preferences OCF can support to develop methods to deal with difficulties during teaching English in settings where the TL is not spoken including Turkey. This study exploited classroom observations during practicum lessons, oral interviews, and quantitative data through a survey to gather to be able to answer the research questions. The number of the participants of the study totaled 152, including 61 student teachers from faculty of education and 91 student teachers from faculty of letter. To analyze the data, the study followed cumulative procedure that involves: transcribing the data from classroom observations and the interviews, codings, detecting then classifying topics, comparing with the literature for qualitative data, SPSS statistics for quantitative data, and finally writing up the results.

4.3.1. General Frequencies of Errors, Targeted Errors, and OCF Strategies Provided in Terms of Belief Themes in Real FL Classes

The results indicated that during the course of the 20 hours of recorded teahing practices the student teachers made an error correction or treatment nearly every five and half minutes. Considering the focus of the course was on grammar and reading instead of speaking, it can be stated that this feedback frequency was very high. It seems like they tried to provide OCF to every single errors they noticed. Usually in a grammar or a reading class, the chances for students to initiate a dialogue with the teacher or their peers are very few since the time will be devoted to reading a text, answering the comprehension questions to the text, analyzing syntactic structures and language use. The other way of labelling feedback frequency is to count how many errors were provided with teacher feedback against those that did not. Results revealed that 76% of students' errors were treated with teacher OCF. It can be concluded that this ratio of error treatment is 28% higher when compared to Panova and Lyster's (2002) result of 48%,. This is unexpected since Panova and Lyster observed communicative language classes, rather than a grammar or reading classes. Although one would expect less interaction and less OCF treatment in reading or grammar classes compared to communicative classes, the participants of this study provided more OCF treatment to the learners' errors. In sum, lack of pre-service teachers' knowledge of OCF and the nature of the classes and may have led to interfere with learners' talk and less amount of interaction between the teachers and the students but higher percentage of OCF provision. The teachers might have found it necessary to correct students' erroneous utterances at every possible occasions enough simply because of the fact that the students had not been exposed to the target language.

4.3.2. Preferences for Error Types to Correct

The findings of the observing the interaction classes, the interviews were in complete consistence with the ones produced through the survey. The comparison of the findings to those of the survey are displayed in Table 29 below.

Table 29: Comparision of Targetted Error Types

Ranking	Observation results		Survey result	
	Error type	Percentage	Error type	Means
1	Grammar	98%	Grammar	4,19
2	Vocabulary	82.8%	Vocabulary	3,98
3	Pronunciation	58.4%	Pronunciation	3,80
4	Semantic	46.1%	Semantic	3,72

Both the results of the classroom observations in which pre-service EFL teachers' took part as teachers and those of the survey revealed the following pattern for participants' OCF preferences: grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and semantic. In other words, taking the interviewees' replies in to consideration, although majority of participants believed that errors of grammar and vocabulary ought to deserve slightly more treatment than other erroneous productions, it can be concluded they had a tendency to treat every single errors they noticed. As for the untreated pronunciation errors, the participants reported that they must have not detected if there were any untreated ones. These results are consistent with the those of Altan's (2012) study which indicated that pre-service ELT teachers had views regarding error treatment and pronunciation which might affect their teaching in a negative way and those of Arslan's study (2013: 191) that stated that "in non-native EFL settings, poor pronunciation skills may result in failure in spoken communication".

The fact that pre-service teachers prefer to target errors of grammar and vocabulary for the most part reflects the current demands on multiple-choice English exams given at the end of second stage of primary school (hereafter, LGS) and secondary school (hereafter, YKS). Turkish students at primary, secondary and tertiary level have to learn English to meet academic purposes. Therfore, they have to take and study English classes to fulfil the necessities of the programs, precisely doing a test on mainly grammar and vocabulary. The students have to pass the LGS and YKS tests which include main subjects (e.g., Math, Turkish Language, Science, Social Science, English) to be able to get as more scores as possible in order to get a place at a higher education level. As a matter of fact, during preparation period for these exams, classes are mainly devoted to grammar and vocabulary in the FL classes. As a result, participants in this study believed and reported that the English teacher ought to give more importance to teaching grammar and vocabulary more than other parts of the TL. Conversely, this view is a complete contradiction to that of Ellis's (2008) study that main aim teaching a FL or L2 have to be to allow the learners communicate with others. It should be noted since the main goal of language learning is communication. Therfore, treating the learner's erroneous utterances is necessary only when the error impedes the messages. And by means of communicating, learners are able to experience interaction with each other, exchange their views and thoughts. Then they can notice what productions are acceptable and unacceptable in the TL. Teachers main goal should be prepare their students for communication in the target language and then prepare them for the exams held nationally.

On the other hand, the aim of majority of the teachers' belief studies (e.g., Chavez, 2006; Schulz, 1996, 2001), was to find out more than just their beliefs about treating certain types of errors. The 3 language teachers in Basturkmen et al. (2004) showed quite inharmonious views: one language teacher favored correcting vocabulary and phonology, another was focused on correcting grammar and reported it to be the most important to treat, while the remaining one believed forms were the most important to target. Therefore, findings of this study regarding to error types to correct are different from the those of Basturkmen et al. (2004) regarding what they believed about error types.

What participants of this study believed and preferred for error treatment was very uniform or consistent in observation, interviews and the survey regarding the type of errors to correct: grammar, vocabulary, followed by pronunciation and then semantic.

The participants' preferences for correcting grammatical errors for the most part can be related to individual features including what student EFL teachers belieeve of the way of they teach. Their beliefs are usually fromed during their past learning experiences as learners in primary schools, secondary schools, and even in universities. The same view is sustained by Lyster's (2001) study, which revealed that erroneous productions related to grammar have been the most common errors committed in FL or L2 clasrooms. In addition, this finding is also in consistence with that of Swain (2005), which concluded that most of the teaching of FL or L2 centers on grammatical rules, therefore learners possibly commit errors in relation to grammar and the teachers target these errors for the most part.

4.3.3. Preferred OCF Strategies before and after the Workshop and the Survey

The frequency of each OCF types in this study is compared to that of Panova and Lyster (2002) and displayed in Table 30 below.

Table 30: Comparison of Frequency of Feedback Types Between This Study and Panova & Lyster (2002)

Ranking	Current study		Panova & Lyster, (2002)	
	OCF type	Percentage	OCF type	Percentage
1	Explicit correction	83%	Recast	55%
2	Elicitation	11%	Clarification request	11%
3	Clarification request	5%	Metalinguistic clues	5%
4	Recast	1%	Elicitation	4%
5	Metalinguistic clues	0%	Explicit correction	2%
6	Repetition	0%	Repetition	1%
	Total	100%	Total	100%

As it can be seen from Table 30, the findings of this study discovered that explicit correction was the most favored OCF strategy for prospective EFL teachers in the study setting, which occured 121 times, accounting for 83%. No any other OCF strategies occurred as near as to this level of percentage in the data set. This is comparable to Panova and Lyster's explicit rate which ranked second last at only 2% frequency. Although, recast had been the most preferred and convenient

method to deal with students' errors in the study the study of Panova and Lyster (2002), explicit correction seemed to be the most desired way in this study. In addition, 38 explicit correction out of 121 in total was followed by extra grammatical explanations, which could not be classified as metalinguistic clues as the participants provided the correct form first and then offered some information which could be seen like grammar lessons.

Following explicit correction, elicitation occurred 16 times, ranking second only with the frequency of 11% of all error treatment ways. In the previous study, clarification request ranked also second accounting for 11% of all feedback provision ways. From this it can be seen that explicit correction was much more favored in the current study. In other words, the student EFL teachers tended to use a more explicit instruction than implicit instruction in teaching. This might be attributed to the participant's lack of knowledge of OCF provision strategies and the dynamics in grammar or reading classes. In linguistic based reading classes, the essential arrangement between the teachers and the students was that class time would be spent in learning discrete grammatical items. This shows that the student teachers might have thought that the student could take advantage of such regular but short-term analysis, either to restore their acquired knowledge or to help students get new knowledge.

As Table 30 shows the results of this study found that clarification method was one of the least employed OCF strategies, with metalinguistic clues and repetition being never used by Turkish pre-service EFL teachers. One explanation of this finding might be that the rospective English teaching candidates had not been introduced to the all six strategies, and thus, pre-service EFL teachers overused the explicit correction which was probably known to them through their learning experience and through their practicum work experience in their final year at the university. Thus, Turkish student EFL teachers' preference for explicit correction might be ascribed not to the student EFL teachers' beliefs of the usefulness and effectiveness of this method but to the nature of this method and to the student EFL teachers' own their learning experience. With this type of strategy, English instructors continuously give their learners who commit errors clues with indications that the learner's production in the target language is unacceptable while through output prompting feedback strategies the teacher get the learners engage in interaction with themselves and with their peers and push them to notice and lead them to standard and acceptable forms (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In addition, English teachers employing explicit correction permanently direct the attention of the learner to the ill-formed utterances and breaks the flow of the talks. Therefore, that gives foreign language learners directly linguistic forms TL. Though this method is not preferred as much as recasts and elicitation (Mackey, Oliver, & Leeman, 2003), explicit correction can work well both in teaching the rules of the TL and teaching especially adults. The reason for them sticking to mainly one method (explicit correction) can be due to by lack of training at the department, therefore they preferred to teach as they had been taught. So, this result is in agreement with the those of Kagimoto and Rodgers

(2008), Katayam (2007), and Schulz (2001), which stated that the reason why the student and the teacher prefer certain strategies can be attributed usually to their learning experiences.

It should be acknowledged that what pre-service teachers learn through methodology courses and what they practice in practicum classes or in real classroom settings might not always be consistent for some reasons (Kagan, 1990; Woods, 1996). Although there are many factors influencing their practices, many studies concluded that previous language learning experience has a major negative or positive impact both on the way preservice or in-service teachers believe and the way they teach in the classrooms, as they had been students and taken many classes with a lot of teachers with different qualities (Kagan, 1992a; S. Borg, 2009b; Legutke & Ditfurth, 2009).

In addition to these studies, many past research studies examined the relationship between the teacher's belief of teaching and his or her educational history among teachers with various majors (Calderhead & Robson, 1991; Goodman, 1988; Hsiao-Ching, 2000; Powell, 1994), and with L2 (Bailey et al., 1996; M. Borg, 2005; S. Borg, 2003b; Busch, 2010; Duff & Uchida, 1997; Farrell, 1999; Golombek, 1998; Johnson, 1994; Numrich, 1996) and found out that what the teachers of many subjects' reported what they had experienced as learners strongly influenced what they believed they were doing while teaching in the classroom. For example, in his study Numrich (1996) examined twenty-six L2 teachers' beliefs who were in the beginning of their careers and concluded that 27% of them avoided providing OCF deliberately due to what they had experienced and felt negatively as their errors had been provided with feedback while being students. Moreover, there are two other elements that were described in the study of Duff and Uchida (1997) affecting teachers beliefs: previous learning experience and cross-cultural experience. Consequently, it is strongly possible that certain factors related to the teachers' past experiences have an impact on defining their beliefs they must have observed their teachers teaching and learned a lot about teaching from them. In the vein of this study, although English teachers study ELT for four years, with the effect of their learning experience of English they might think that the way they are taught might be the best way to teach English.

While the findings of the observations and the follow up individual interviews were in consistence with each other, they were inconsistent with the ones produced by the survey which was conducted after the workshop on OCF strategies. For example, the quantitative data revealed that their preferences for OCF strategy types would be contradicted what was stated in classroom observations conducted first in real classroom practices and the interviews conducted right after. In other words, while nearly 100% of the participants preferred explicit feedback which interfere with the flow of communication and hinders any possible interaction with the teacher, after the effect of workshop on OCF provision and survey, the noticed that there are other ways of OCF (prompts: elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic clues, and clarification requests) and they preferred prompt group which promote communication or interaction with the teacher see Table 31).

Table 31: Comparison of Frequencies of Feedback Types Before and After the Workshop

Ranking	Observation results before workshop		Survey results after workshop	
	OCF type	Percentage	OCF type	Means
1	Explicit correction	83%	Elicitation	3,93
2	Elicitation	11%	Repetition	3,79
3	Clarification request	5%	Metalinguistic clues	3,77
4	Recast	1%	Clarification request	3,35
5	Metalinguistic clues	0%	Explicit correction	3,11
6	Repetition	0%	Recast	2,96
	Total	100%	Total	N/A

As Table 31 shows, with the effect of OCF instruction after the classroom observations the participants seemed that they would have a preference for using almost all strategies at some frequencies with elicitation, repetition, and metalinguistic clues to be the most applied ones to treat the learner's erroneous or ill-formed utterances when actually applying explicit correction and elicitation methods. The difference in their preference for OCF strategies before and after the workshop can be attributed to the workshop effect on types OCF strategies. In other words, this may imply that if they had had a training on OCF strategies before graduation, they would have treated the student errors in different ways and employed a variety of OCF types instead of sticking to mainly one type.

4.3.4. Preferences for Input Provider or Output Prompter Feedback types

With respect to student teachers' preference for input providing or output prompter feedback, participants observed in this study used heavily input providing feedbacks. As can be seen from Table 30 above, the student EFL teachers preferred to use input providing methods with a frequency rate of 84% in total as the forms of explicit correction (83%) and recast (1%) compared to output prompters at only 16% frequency in total as the forms of elicitation (11%) and clarification request (5%). Metalinguistic clues and repetition which are remaining two forms of output prompters were never employed during classroom observations. To be more specific, the second least used feedback type in the current study was clarification request with a percentage of 5% frequency, with metalinguistic clues and repetition being never used by Turkish pre-service EFL teachers. This percentage was less than half of that in Panova and Lyster's results. In Panova and Lyster's study (2002), clarification request ranked third at 11% frequency. This is an important difference between

the current study and the earlier study regarding feedback type frequencies. Output prompters including clarification request are usually provided when the teachers do not understand the meaning that the students try to convey, or when the teacher would like to give the student an opportunity to self-repair their own errors (Panova & Lyster, 2002).

Lyster's study, clarification request ranked third at 11% frequency. This is an important difference between the current study and the earlier study regarding feedback type frequencies. Output prompters including clarification request are usually provided when the teachers do not understand the meaning that the students try to convey, or when they allow their learners opportunities to self-repair their own errors (Panova & Lyster, 2002).

Table 32: Comparision of Participants Input Providing/Output Prompting Feedback Types Preferences before and after the Workshop/Survey

Ranking	Observation results before workshop		Survey results after workshop	
	OCF type	Percentage	OCF type	Means
1	Input provider	84.3%	Output propmter	3,72
2	Output prompter	15.7%	Input provider	3,02

As Table 32 above indicates the results of the observations were not in agreement with those of the survey which was conducted after the workshop on OCF strategies. The observation data found that their heavy use input providing feedback mainly as a form of explicit correction would be replaced by output prompter feedbacks as forms of mainly elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic clues, or clarification requests. One explanation of this result might be related to the fact that the pre-service teachers who participated in this research were not familiar with all of the feedback strategies, and thus, pre-service EFL teachers overused the input providing strategy as the form of explicit correction which is known to them through their learning experience and through their practicum work experience in their final year at the university. Finally, the results of this study in agreement with the those of Kagimoto and Rodgers (2008), Katayam (2007), and Schulz (2001), which reported that the student's and the teacher's preferences for OCF provision types can be attributed to considerably their past learning experiences as students. Another one is that, as the interviews revealed, they concerned about time management and thought that there was not time to lose as they had planned topics to cover during the observed class times. In other words, this is due to curriculum effect.

Therefore, output prompter feedback types seem to be more helpful for the teacher who is teaching not beginner but intermediate level students as the chances for the students to replay the communicative requests are much higher. In addition, there were not as many teacher-initiated meaning-focused conversations, which would perhaps generate more chances of communication. It

can be clearly seen from the classroom observation part of the current study that the student EFL teachers were still focusing on form focused instruction role in the class, which led to few output prompter feedbacks as the forms of elicitation and clarification request moves. The few instances where one student teacher, fort the most part, used clarification request and elicitation were by the one who studied abroad for one term.

4.3.5. Extent of Error Treatment

Participants of the current study believed that OCF should be used for every error or even every mistake without any exceptions and vast majority of them stated that they correct every single error they notice. During the classroom observations they corrected 76% of the errors and 14% of them were left untreated. As far as understood from the interviews, most of the errors that did not receive OCF were not detected as errors such as pronunciation and semantic errors which were corrected at a relatively lower frequency compared to grammar and vocabulary. In the same vein, the survey detected that the participants had mixed feelings about targeting focused or unfocused errors. In the survey, mean of the statements (items 8, 11, and 27) suggesting that it is essential to treat all errors that the students commit during classes, and mean of the other category items (items 9 and 28) stating that language teachers need to correct some or important ones only that interfere with the communicative messages are nearly the same (3,71 and 3,73 respectively). The interview question linked to this belief topic supports the results of the survey. Participants reported that they had employed excessive OCF provision and treated all errors that are committed during classes with no exception because they had no one rather than the teacher to correct.

The belief that OCF should be employed for all errors is not in agreement with that of that of reserving OCF provision only for the which breaks the interaction, which was revealed in other language teacher-focused studies such as Basturkmen et al. (2004) which was one of the studies precisely related to teachers' beliefs. The EFL teachers in Basturkmen et al. (2004) reported OCF should be provide to the learners' errors only if they interfere the meaning. This finding also contradict that of Aydın's (2015) study in which the pre-service teachers reported that they did not need to correct every mistakes or errors their students made.

4.3.6. Preferences for OCF Sources

Regarding pre-service EFL teachers' preference for OCF sources, participants observed in this study provided heavily teacher feedback since they provided explicit correction. As can be seen from Table 33 below, the student EFL teachers preferred to provide teachers correction methods with a frequency rate of 84%. In addition, the second most or at the same time least employed feedback source was peer correction at a frequency rate of 13% and the least employed correction source was self-correction at 3% frequency.

Table 33: **Comparision of Pre-service Teachers' Preference for OCF Sources before and after the Survey**

Ranking	Observation results		Survey results	
	OCF sources	Percentage	Error type	Means
1	Teacher correction	84%	Self-correction	4,26
2	Peer correction	13%	Teacher correction	4,17
3	Self-correction	3%	Peer correction	3,80

As Table 33 indicates above, the findings of the survey which was applied after the workshop were not in consistence with those of the observations. The observation data revealed that student EFL teachers often preferred to correct directly and provided extra information to nearly 30% of the student errors. Although the participants of this study were aware of the self-correction and peer correction methods, they preferred to use teacher correction method heavily. On the other hand, survey results detected that the participants thought self-correction would be beneficial for the learners and self-correction ranked first with a mean of 4, 26. One interpretation of this discrepancy is revealed by interviews by the participants although most of the participants (80%) favored self-correction techniques during the interviews and stated that they were well aware of its benefits, they reported that they had used teacher correction during the practicum and observed classes because it would have taken too much time to allow them to correct their own errors as their level of proficiency was too low to self-repair. They also mentioned that it would have also discouraged both the teachers and the learners as it would have caused the learners to feel embarrassed if it had taken the students too much time to self-repair. ELT teachers' OCF provision leading to interaction has been preferred by most of the students of English (Lee, 2005; Leki, 2006; Weaver, 2006; Yang, Badger, & Yu, 2006).

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In consideration of the findings deliberated in this and the former chapter, a few suggestions may be made due to the findings of this study, suggestions for SLA theory, methodology, along with teacher training.

In this section the most important findings and the conclusions of this current study will be presented. The aim of study was to investigate the pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs of OCF provision, their actual practices, and faculty factor (ELT/Non-ELT status). This dissertation study will contribute to current EFL research in relation to OCF provision with a focus on understanding and exploring Turkish EFL pre-service teachers' preferences for providing OCF strategies. By combining quantitative and qualitative methods, the study first detected that the most of the Turkish pre-service EFL teachers have positive attitudes towards providing OCF strategies, and they believe OCF provision should play a significant role in teaching FL and be central for learning a FL. In line with this belief, they provided OCF strategies to 76% of learners' errors. This percentage is more than Panova and Lyster's (2002) rate which was 48%. In addition, they reported, in the interviews, they had tried to treat every single error. This rate could have been much higher if the participants had noticed all the errors their students' committed. One assumption made from this finding is that EFL pre-service teachers focused very much and the context of grammar teaching may have contributed to that high rate of error correction. Since the participants believe every single error should be treated, another related assumption can be made is that teachers' understanding of students' preferences, ages, proficiency level, the nature of the error, and class size should be considered as equally vital as the FL curriculum for accomplishing more effective language teaching.

Second conclusion is that pre-service EFL teachers, as a group, have limited knowledge of OCF strategies, and ELT education can change pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs. At first they seemed to have had their beliefs of OCF provision formed through their learning experiences for their teaching practices. Out of six OCF strategies, for example, explicit correction was the leading type of OCF in those practicum lessons, sticking mainly to one type of method, as this was the only method they were familiar with. Recast accounted for 82.9% of all OCF instances. While elicitation, clarification request, and recast accounted only 17.1% in total of all OCF moves, repetition and metalinguistic clues were never present in the current study. Another related conclusion is that while the participants heavily depend on input providing methods, teacher correction, and immediate correction, they tended to prefer more output prompter OCF types, self-correction, and both immediate and delayed correction through the survey after the workshop on OCF strategies. It can be stated that participants' limited use of mainly one type of OCF stemmed from their limited

knowledge of OCF, since they showed willingness to use a more balanced and variety of strategies through the survey after the workshop regarding OCF strategies. This study made it clear that Thus, ELT education can change pre-service teachers' beliefs.

The third conclusion is that the most of the pre-service EFL teachers targeted learners' errors of grammar during classroom observation sessions, and they reported through the interviews and the survey that those errors must get the most treatment attempts followed by errors concerning vocabulary and pronunciation. This belief is in contrast with that of many language teachers who consider they should target and treat errors relating semantics and pronunciation most. Another germane conclusion drawn from this result, based on both qualitative and quantitative data, is that all of the pre-service EFL teachers favored unfocused error treatment instead of focused one, and they tried to target as many errors as they noticed regardless of the possibility whether the errors hindered the messages or not. That is to say, they did not concentrate on specific types of errors.

The fourth conclusion is that while the pre-service EFL teachers' most popular OCF strategy during observed classes and during the interviews was explicit feedback, elicitation, repetition, and metalinguistic clues were the most preferred type of OCF strategies after the workshop on OCF strategies. This result demonstrate that they were willing to change their dependence on only one type of OCF strategies. They had their own justification for sticking to explicit correction as they reported it had been left over from their learning experience as students and their work experience at various state schools during their final year at the university.

The final major conclusion is that pre-service teachers did differ in the extent of OCF they provide in the practicum lessons, and that discrepancy was meaningfully linked to faculties they attended. Data from follow up interviews made it possible to figure out the reason of that discrepancy. The fact that students teachers from faculty of letter take less pedagogy and ELT subjects made them believe that every error should be addressed and eventually correct every error they noticed. They seemed to lack knowledge of internal and external factors they should have been considering when teaching. They should be introduced to current related research.

As for the pedagogical suggestions, one of the motivations for the research was the necessity of the research that explores which OCF strategies student language teachers provided and what their beliefs were of this phenomenon just before their graduation. This study was particularly vital with pre-service language teachers to determine what their knowledge and beliefs already were of OCF types and provision, and the sources of their beliefs, since nearly all of the experienced and novice language teachers stuck to only one type of OCF provision and yet errors related to grammar and pronunciation occur frequently among students of all level of proficiency (through personal observations during supervising and guiding the student teachers' teaching experiences).

As learning a FL is extremely a hard job and requires a long time, foreign language teachers should have their students minimize or, if possible, diminish the errors that hinder oral communication. Learners' every reaction to a language teacher's effort to enhance their inaccurate oral production plays an important role in gaining the TL systems. For that reason, the provision of OCF is supposed to help learners get knowledgeable of the language in a quicker period of time than the one with no OCF provision, OCF provision can benefit for students learning the FL. In contrast, studying and raising the awareness of the multiple ways of OCF provision in speaking classroom should be an essential objective for pre- and in-service language teachers. This research study has very limited findings that can actually raise the awareness so as to make OCF provision useful in EFL settings. More research studies are needed on this issue. Through the discussion of the results of the current study, however, there are certain suggestions for teacher training programs, inservice EFL teachers, and future EFL research to promote the effectiveness of EFL learning or teaching in Turkey.

With regard to implications for ELT teacher education programs, there are some valuable implications this study brings for teacher education programs. Student language teachers from both ELT departments at Faculty of Education and from English Literature Departments at Faculty of Letter need a great deal of backing from their advisers, counselors or tutors in their programs. Those mentors, to great extent, adopt the syllabus which is followed and supervise the student language teachers by means of that syllabus; therefore, it can be stated that ELT programs are of vital roles, introducing research studies to student language teachers. That period is the time in which the pre-service EFL teachers can have the occasions to bridge what they know through research and foreign language teaching. They can teach during work experience with the help of theoretical information they get through ELT programs and research studies. Student language teacher educators can monitor and observe prospective EFL teachers teach carefully when attending practicum classes that take place in the final year and incorporate the current issues of which student language teachers have little or no knowledge into the syllabus in the ELT program. Thus, it can have an enormous effect on student ELT teachers' beliefs on current issues including OCF provision.

In observation classrooms, pre-service teachers' too much and limited to one type of OCF provision was due to their lack of OCF training. Therefore, teacher education programs should make it possible for pre-service language teachers both from faculty of education and faculty of letter to be introduced with the OCF research, especially those exploring OCF efficacy and teacher/learners' beliefs about OCF methods. ELT programs should make sure they allow pre-service teachers enough time to discuss OCF provision in such a way that they feel self-confident and become qualified enough when teaching EFL. In other word, pre-service language teachers should get to necessary training on how and when to provide OCF methods effectively. As the students in Turkey have very limited contact to English rather than in the classrooms, it would be useful when language teachers

allow enough time for interactions between the teachers and the learners, and the learners and the learners as the interaction method suggests OCF has an essential part in FL teaching.

It is vital for pre-service EFL teachers and ultimately English learners that ELT programs continually assess the effectiveness of employed methods and approaches and those recommended in this study. The main aim of this constant evaluation is to prepare qualified language teachers who can teach learners from different age and level of proficiency. As the participants of the study seemed to act like "one cures all", ignore factors such as learners' beliefs, and teach the same way regardless of learners' age, it would be beneficial that ELT programs regularly investigate learners' beliefs and inform the pre-service teachers about these beliefs before they start teaching experience. It may be useful for learners motivation towards learning if the teachers take their students beliefs into account as found in L2 studies.

On the other hand, integrating current issues determined by ELT educators during the teaching practices into syllabus by itself might not be sufficient to promote stated beliefs and their practice; ELT teacher educators may arrange assignments regarding what is needed during teaching practice period, which can assist ELT student teachers to enhance their knowledge while trying to bridge what they already have learned and classroom practices. Setting up such assignments can be integrated into midterm or final exams of Teaching Practice Classes in the last term of the graduation year. If convenient, it might be beneficial for student ELT student teachers to be able to discuss about what they have experienced regarding teaching during the evaluation sessions of practicum classes and their beliefs on significant issues. Moreover, in addition to these discussion sessions, conceivably some other techniques especially recording and watching their own classroom practices during work experience classes while recalling their beliefs and actions should be employed. Finally, these records should be documented at times and kept during the course of their teaching career, since this may enable their professional development.

Finally as for all teacher education programs, due to the limited time of work experience before graduation, student teachers should have efficient teaching experience in order to allow teacher educators to notice what student teachers lack on the verge of graduation. Therefore, it is beneficial that all teacher education programs concentrate on arranging longer and effective work/teaching experience for student teachers.

Pertaining to suggestions for in-service EFL teachers, the finding of the current study offers several implications or suggestions for EFL teachers.

- EFL teachers should know that interactional OCF provision is an interesting research topic which has been studied for years.

- EFL teachers should search and find out more about the ways of OCF types, specifically those which promote interaction not the ones which interfere with the flow of communication and impede interaction. They can make use of valuable information through OCF research in SLA. In addition, EFL teachers can negotiate about this issue so that they can rise their awareness and knowledge.
- As EFL pre-service teachers lack basic knowledge of OCF types and provision, they should educate themselves on this phenomenon. When there are inservice EFL teachers, they should meet to discuss this issue in order to satisfy the need for basic information of this topic which would support raise their awareness and also have the researcher to have useful interpretations regarding OCF provision.
- EFL teachers should employ numerous kinds of OCF strategies selectively instead of depending on one type only and regarding it as taboo in order to improve the efficiency of error treatment and EFL teaching, nurturing the different learners' needs and expectations, as Han (2001) states, the success of OCF provision depends on teachers' understanding of students' needs and objectives.
- EFL teachers should focus on treating complex errors that interfere with the communicative messages, avoiding simple errors to save time and energy.
- EFL teachers should make use of their learning experience, but also they should be open to change the way they teach according to new research on FL/L2 to meet their learners' expectations.
- Last but not least, EFL teachers should have a good balance of use of input providing OCF strategies and output strategies, and teacher correction and self-correction techniques to provide them with opportunities to practice what they learn, since OCF is a mutual practice between the teacher and a student (Han, 2001).
- EFL teachers from faculty of letter should receive more ELT and pedagogy courses since they were inclined to provide OCF to every errors that they noticed commited in the classroom.

As for the limitations, the first problem is related to the sample size of this study. The lesser (N=152) than intended (250) number of participants along with the imbalance between the number of male (N=53) and female (N=99) participants, and ELT (N=61) and ELL (N=91) participants seems to be a shortcoming of this study for any generalizations which would be made through the findings of this study. The results would not be representative for all foreign language contexts. Therefore, any claims would not be drawn or applicable to a different EFL setting.

Finally, as for the implications for future research, although this research concentrated on exploring EFL pre-service' stance on OCF provision, there are a number of ways to develop the

extent of related prospective research. This perpetuation might gained either by employing the previously gathered data of this study or employing a new data set.

1. It is recommended that future studies focus on exploring both pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs and practices regarding OCF provision and the students' preferences.
2. Future researchers may focus on teachers who are teaching at diffrerent levels such as beginners, intermediate, and advanced to find out if there any differences in the teachers's beliefs and practices.
3. Future researchers may also focus on studying the differences between the pre-service EFL teachers from faculty of education and those from faculty of letters.

REFERENCES

Adjemian, Carmen (1976), "On the Nature of Lnterlanguage Systems." **Language Learning**. 26, 297-320.

Akyüz, Yahya (2003), "Eğitim Tarihimizde Günümüze Kadar Öğretmen Yetiştirilmesi ve Sağlanması İlkeleri, Uygulanmaları", **Çağdaş Eğitim Sistemlerinde Öğretmen Yetiştirme Ulusal Sempozyumu,** Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Kültür Merkezi, Sivas, 21-23 Mayıs 2003.

_____ (2009), **Türk Eğitim Tarihi.** Ankara: Pegem.

Allright, Dick and Bailey Kathleen, M. (1991), **Focus on the language classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Almarza, Gloria Gutierrez (1996), "Student Foreign language teacher's Knowledge Growth". In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), **Teacher Learning in Language Teaching** (pp. 50-78). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Altan, Mustafa Zülküf (1998), "A Call for Change and Pedagogy: A Critical Analysis of Teacher Education in Turkey", **European Journal of Education**, 33, 407–417.

_____ (2006), "Beliefs about Language Learning of Foreign Language-major University Students", **The Australian Journal of Teacher Education**, 31(2), 45–52.

_____ (2012), Pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about foreign language learning. **European Journal of Teacher Education,** 35(4), 481-493. doi: 10.1080/02619768.2011.643399

Altın, Hamza (2017), "Osmanli eğitim tarihinde dârülmuallimât (Açılışı ve Gelişim Süreci)". **Akademik Matbuat**, (1), 21-37. Retrieved from: https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/matbuat/issue/32020/341982

Arslan, Recep Şahin (2013), "Enhancing Non-Native Prospective English Language Teachers' Competency in Sentential Stress Patterns in English", **Pamukkale University Journal of Education**, 34(2), 183-195

Ammar, Ahlem (2008), "Prompts and Recasts: Differential Effects on Second Language Morphosyntax," **Language Teaching Research**, 12(2), 183-210. doi:10.1177/1362168807086287

Ammar, Ahlem and Spada, Nina (2006), "One Size Fits All? Recasts, Prompts, and the Acquisition of English Possessive Determiners", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, 28(4), 543-574. doi:10+10170S0272263106060268

Aydın, Hale Ülkü (2015), **Student Teachers' Beliefs About Oral Corrective Feedback,** Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi – Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Aydın, Rafet (2007), **Türkiye'de Eğitimle İlgili Yapılan Bilimsel Toplantılarda ve Millî Eğitim Şûralarında Ele Alınan Öğretmen Sorunları ile Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın Politika ve Uygulamalarının Değerlendirilmesi** (1980–2004). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara.

Basturkmen, Helen et all. (2004), "Teachers' Stated Beliefs about Incidental Focus on form and Their Classroom Practices," **Applied Linguistics**, *25*(2), 243-272. doi: 10.1093/applin/25.2.243

Bear, John (1990), "Tradition and Innovation: ELT and Teacher Training in 1990s", In A. Daventry (Eds.), **Context and Content in English Language Teacher Education** (pp.24-34). The Proceedings of the First International Conference on ELT held at Hacettepe University, Vol II. Ankara: British Council.

Bektaş-Altıok, Gül Remziye (2007), **Türkiye'de İlköğretim Okullarında Etkili Yabancı Dil Öğretimi: Tarihsel Gelişim ve Açılımmları.** Unpublished master's thesis**,** Yeditepe University, İstanbul.

Benson, Phill (2001), **Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning**. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Bitchener, John & Knoch, Ute (2008), "The Value of Written Corrective Feedback in Migrant and International Students", **Language Teaching Research**, 12(3), 409-431. Retrieved from http://periodicals.faqs.org/201007/2343235631.html

Bitchener, John (2005), "The Effect of Different Types of Corrective Feedback on ESL Student Writing", **Journal of Second Language Writing,** 14(3), 191-205, doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001

Borg, Michaela (2005), "A Cases Study of the Development in Pedagogic Thinking of a Pre-service Teacher", **TESL-EJ**, 9(2), 1-30.

Borg, Simon (2003a), "Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching: A Review of Research on What Language Teachers Think, Know, Believe, and Do", **Language Teaching**, *36*(2), 81-109. doi: 10.1017/s0261444803001903

_____ (2003b), "Teacher Cognition in Grammar Teching: A literature review", **Language Awareness**, 12(2), 96-108.

_____ (2006), **Teacher Cognition and Language Education**: **Research and Practice,** London: Continuum.

_____ (2009b), **Language Teacher Cognition**. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education (pp. 163-171). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (2011), "The Impact of In-service Teacher Education on Language Teachers' Beliefs", **System**. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2011.07.009

Britton, James (1970), **Language and Learning: The importance of speech 10 children's development,** Harmondswort: Penguin

Brown, Alan (2009), "Students' and Teachers' Perceptions of Effective Foreign Language Teaching: A comparison of ideals", **The Modern Language Journal**, 93(1), 46-60. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00827.x

Brown, H. Douglas (2007), **Principles of Language Learning and Teaching** (5th ed.), New York: Pearson Education.

Bruner, Jerome (1983), **Child's Talk: Learning to Use Language,** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Busch, Deborah (2010), "Pre-service teacher beliefs about language learning: The second language acquisition course as an agent for change", **Language Teaching Research,** 14(3), 318-337. doi: 10.1177/1362168810365239

Çakıroğlu, Erdinç and Çakıroğlu, Jale (2010), "Reflections on Teacher Education in Turkey", **European Journal of Teacher Education,** 26(2), 253-264, DOI: 10.1080/0261976032000088774

Calderhead, James and Robson, Maurice (1991), "Images of Teaching: Student Teachers' Early Conceptions of Classroom Practice", **Teaching and Teacher Education,** 7(1), 1-8.

Çalık, Temel and Kılınç, Ali Çağatay (2017), "Türk eğitim Sisteminde öğretmen Yetiştirmeye İlişkin bir Değerlendirme", **Devlet,** s. 247, Retrived from: http://devlet.com.tr/makaleler/y247

Çapan, Seyit Ahmet (2014), "Pre-service English as a Foreign Language Teachers' Belief Development about Grammar Instruction", **Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online),** 39(12), 131.

Carpenter, Helen et all. (2006). "Learners' Interpretation of Recasts", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 28(2), 209-236. doi:10+10170S0272263106060104

Chavez, Monica (2006), "Classroom-language Use in Teacher-led Instruction and teachers' Self-classroom", **TESOL Quarterly,** 36(4), 573-595.

Corder, Stephen Pit (1967), "The Significance of Learners' Errors", **International Review of Applied Linguistics,** 5(4), 161-170.

_____ (1971), "Idiosyncratic Dialects and Error Analysis." **International Review of Applied Linguistics.** 9, 147-159

_____ (1981), **Error Analysis and Interlanguage.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Creswell, John W. and Plano, Clark Vicki L. (2007), **Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research**, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

David Lasagabaster & Juan Manuel Sierra (2005), Error Correction: Students' Versus Teachers' Perceptions, **Language Awareness**, 14, 2-3, 112-127, DOI: 10.1080/09658410508668828

De Groot, Elizabeth (2002). "Learning Through Interviewing: Students and Teachers Talk about Learning and Schooling", **Educational Psychologist,** 37(1), 41-52.

Demircan, Ömer (1988), **Dünden Bugüne Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil,** İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Demirel, Özcan (1990), **Yabancı Dil Öğretimi İlkeler-Yöntemler-Teknikler,** Usem Yayınları-6. Ankara: Şafak Matbaası.

_____ (1991), "Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil Öğretmeni Yetiştirmede Karşılaşılan Güçlükler", **Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,** 6, 25-39.

Dörnyei, Zoltan and Skehan, Peter (2003), Individual Differences in Second Language Learning. In Doughty, C. & Long, M. (Eds.). **The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition,** Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Dörnyei, Zoltan (2005), **The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition**, Lawrence N. J. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Doughty, Catherine J. and Long, Michael H. (2003) (Eds.), **The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition,** Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Doughty, Catherine and Williams, Jessica (1998), **Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duff, Patricia A. and Uchida, Yuko (1997), "The Negotiation of Teachers' Sociocultural Identities and Practices in Postsecondary EFL Classrooms", **TESOL Quarterly,** 31(3), 451-486.

Dulay, Heidi C. and Burt, Marina K. (1974), Natural sequences in child second language acquisition, **Language Learning,** 24, 37-53.

Egi, Takako (2007), Recasts, Learners' Interpretations, and L2 Development. In A. Mackey (Ed.), **Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquisition: A Collection of Empirical Studies** (pp.249-267). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, Nick C. (2009), "The psycholinguistics of the interaction approach. In A. Mackey and C. Polio (Eds.)", **Multiple perspectives on interaction: Second language research in honor of Susan M.Gass,** (pp. 11-40). London: Routledge.

Ellis, Rod (1985), **Understanding Second Language Acquisition,** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____ (1994a), **The Study of Second Language Acquisition,** Oxford: Oxford University Press

_____ (1994b), "Factors in the Incidental Acquisition of Second Language Vocabulary from Oral Input: A Review Essay", **Applied Language Learning,** 5, 1-32.

_____ (2006), "Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA perspective", **TESOL Quarterly**, 40(1), 83-107. doi: 10.2307/40264512

_____ (2007), "The Differential Effects of Corrective Features on Two Grammatical Structures. In A. Mackey (Ed.)", **Conversational Interaction and Second Language Acquisition: A Series of Empirical Studies,** (pp. 339-360). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____ (2008), **The Study of Second Language Acquisition** (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____ (2009), "A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types", **English Language Teaching Journal,** 63(2), 97-107. doi**:**10.1093/elt/ccn023

_____ (2010), "Cognitive, Social and Psychological Dimensions of Corrective Feedback. In R. Batstone (Ed.)", **Sociocognitive Perspectives on Language Use and Language Learning,** (pp. 151-165). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, Rod and He, Xien (1999), "The Roles of Modified Input and Output in the Incidental Acquisition of Word Meanings", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 21(2), 285-301.

Ellis, Rod and Sheen, Younghee (2006), "Re-examining the Role of Recasts in SLA", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 28(4), 575-600. doi: 10.1017/S027226310606027X

Ellis, Rod et all. (2006), "Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 28, 339-368. doi:10.1017/S0272263106060141

_____ (2009), **Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar.** In R. Ellis, S. Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philp & H.

Ellis, Rod et all. (2008), "The Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback in an English as a Foreign Language Context", **System,** 36(3), 353-371, doi:10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001

Erlam, Rosemary (2005), "Language Aptitude and its Relationship to Instructional Effectiveness in Second Language Acquisition", **Language Teaching Research,** 9(2), 147-172. doi:10.1191/1362168805lr161oa

Erlam, Rosemary et all. (2006). **Instructed Second Language Acquisition: Case Studies,** Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.

Fang, Zihui (1996), "A Review of Research on Teacher Beliefs and Practices", **Educational Research,** 38(1),47-65.292

Farrell, Tomas S. C. (1999), "The Reflective Assignment: Unlocking Pre-service English Teachers' Beliefs on Grammar Teaching", **RELC Journal,** 30(2), 1-17. doi:10.1177/003368829903000201

Fukuda, Yuko (2004), **Treatment of Spoken Errors in Japanese High School Oral Communication Classes,** Master's thesis, California State University, San Francisco.

Gass, Susan M. (1997), **Input Interaction and the Second Language Learner,** Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

_____ (2003), Input and Interaction. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), **The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition** (pp. 224-255), Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Gass, Susan M. and Mackey, Alison (2007a), **Data Elicitation for Second and Foreign Language Research,** New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

_____ (2007b), "Input, Interaction, and Output in Second Language Acquisition", In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.)", **Theories in Second Language Scquisition: An Introduction,** (pp. 175-200). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gass, Susan M. and Selinker, Larry (2008), **Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course (3rd Edition),** New York: Routledge.

Gass, Susan M. and Varonis, Evangeline M. (1994), "Input, Interaction, and Second Language Production", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 16, 283-302.

Glesne, Corrine (2006), **Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction (3rd ed.),** Boston, MA: Pearson.

Golombek, Paula R. (1998), "A Study of Language Teachers' Personal Practical Knowledge", **TESOL Quarterly,** 32(3), 447-464.

Goodman, Jesse (1988), "Constructing a Practical Philosophy of Teaching: A Study of Preservice Teachers' Professional Perspectives", **Teaching and Teacher Education,** 4(2), 121-137.

Gözütok, F. Dilek (2004), **I am Developing My Teaching,** Ankara, Siyasal Bookstore.

Gürşimşek, Işık et all. (1997), **General View of Teacher Education Policies of Turkey.** Paper Presented at Annual Meeting of the American Association of Collages for Teacher Education. February, 1997, Phoenix.

Gutiérrez, Gánem-Gabriela Adela (2008), "Microgenesis, Method and Object, A Study of Collaborative Activity in Spanish in a Foreign Language Classroom", **Applied Linguistics,** 29 (l), 120-148.

Han, ZhaoHong (2001), "Fine-tuning Corrective Feedback", **Foreign Language Annals,** 34(6), 582-599, doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2001.tb02105.x

_____ (2008), "On the Role of Meaning in Focus on Form. In Z. Han (Ed.)", **Understanding Second Language Process**, (pp. 45-79). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Harmer, John R. (2001), **The Practice of English Language Teaching** (3rd ed.), London: Longman.

Havranek, Gerdraud (2002), "When is Corrective Feedback Most Likely To Succeed?", **International Journal of Educational Research,** 37(3-4), 255-70. doi:10.1016/S0883-0355(03)00004-1

Hedge, Tricia (2000), **Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom,** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horwitz, Elaine Kolker (2007), **Becoming a Language Teacher: A Practical Guide to Second Language Learning and Teaching,** Hong Kong: Pearson.

Hsiao-Ching, She (2000), "The Interplay of a Biology Teacher's Beliefs, Teaching Practices and Gender-based Student-teacher Classroom Interaction", **Educational Research,** 42(1), 100-111. doi: 10.1080/001318800363953

Hung, Tony T. N. (2000), "Interlanguage Analysis and Remedial Grammar Teaching", **Papers in Applied Language Studies,** 5, 155-168.

Hyland, Ken and Hyland, Fiona (2006), "Feedback in Second Language Writing", **Contexts and Issues,** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, Karen E. (1994). "The Emerging Beliefs and Instructional Practices of Preservice English as a Second Language Teachers**", Teaching and Teacher Education,** 10(4), 439-452.

Kagan, Dona M. (1990), "Ways of Evaluating Teacher Cognition: Inferences Concerning the Goldilocks Principle", **Review of Educational Research,** 60(3), 419-469. doi:10.3102/00346543060003419

_____ (1992a), "Implications of Research on Teacher Belief", **Educational Psychologist,** 27(1), 65-90.

Kim, Ji Hyun (2004), "Issues Of Corrective Feedback In Second Language Acquisition", **Working Papers In TESOL And Applied Linguistics,** 4(2), 1-24. Retrieved From Http://Journals.Tc-Library.Org/Index.Php/Tesol/Article/Viewfile/60/66

Krashen, Stephen D. (1982), **Principles And Practice In Second Language Acquisition,** Oxford: Pergamon.

_____ (1985), **The Input Hypothesis: Issues And Complications,** New York: Longman Group Limited.

Kumaravadivelu, Bala (1993), "Maximizing Learning Potential In The Communicative Classroom." **ELT Journal,** 47(1), 12-21.

Kvale, Steinar (1996), **Interviews: An Introduction To Qualitative Research Interviewing,** Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Larsen-Freeman, Diana and Long, Micheal H. (1991)**, An Introduction To Second Language Acquisition Research,** London: Longman Group Ltd.

Lee, Icy (2008), "Student Reactions To Teacher Feedback In Two Hong Kong Secondary Classrooms", **Journal Of Second Language Writing,** 17(3), 144-164. Doi:10.1016/J.Jslw.2007.12.001 185

Legutke, Micheal K. and Ditfurth, Marita Schoker-V. (2009), School-Based Experience. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), **The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education (Pp. 209-217),** Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Li, Shaofeng (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

Lichtenstein, Sarah & Slovic, Paul (2006), **The Construction of Preference,** New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lightbown, Patsy M. (1985), "Great Expectations: Second-Language Acquisition Research and Classroom Teaching", **Applied Linguistics,** 6(2), 173-189.

Lightbown, Patsy M. & Spada, Nina (2006), **How Languages are Learned (3rd Ed.),** Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Lochtman, Katja (2002), "Oral Corrective Feedback in the Foreign Language Classroom: How it Affects Interaction in Analytic Foreign Language Teaching", **International Journal Of Educational Research,** 37(3-4), 271-283. Doi:10.1016/S0883-0355(03)00005-3

Long, Micheal H. (1983), "Native Speaker/Non-Native Speaker Conversation and the Negotiation of Comprehensible Input", **Applied Linguistics,** 4, 126-141.

_____ (1985), "Input and Second Language Acquisition Theory. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.)", **Input in Second Language Acquisition** (Pp. 377-93). Rowley, MS: Newbury House.

_____ (1991), "Focus on Form: A Design in Language Teaching Methodology. In K. De Bot, D. Coste, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.)", **Foreign Language Research In Cross-Cultural Perspective,** (Pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

_____ (1996), The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), **Handbook of Second Language Acquisition,** (Pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic Press.

_____ (2006), "Input, Interaction, and Second-Language Acquisition", **Annals of the New York Academy of Science,** 379, 259-278,Doi:10.1111/J.1749-6632.1981.Tb42014.

_____ (2007), **Problems in SLA**. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lyster, Roy (2002), "The Importance of Differentiating Negotiation of Form znd Meaning in Classroom Interaction. In P. Bumeister, T. Piskle, & A. Rohde (Eds.)", **An Integrated View of Language Development: Paper in Honor of Henning Wode**, (Pp. 381-397). Trier, Germany: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.

_____ (2004), "Differential Effects of Prompts and Recasts in Form-Focused Instruction", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 26(3), 399-432. Doi:101017S0272263104043025

Lyster, Roy and Mori, Hirohido (2006), Interactional Feedback And Instructional Counterbalance. **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, 28(2), 269-300. doi:10.1017/S0272263106060128

Lyster, Roy and Izquierdo, Jesus (2009), "Prompts Versus Recasts in Dyadic Interaction", **Language Learning,** 59(2), 453-498. Doi:10.1111/J.1467-9922.2009.00512.X 188.

Lyster, Roy and Ranta, Leila (1997), "Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 19(1), 37-66.

Lyster, Roy and Saito, Kazuyo (2010), "Oral Feedback in Classroom SLA", **Studies In Second Language Acquisition,** 32(2), 265-302. Doi:10.1017/S0272263109990520.

M.E.G.S.B. (1998), **XII. Milli Eğitim Şurası Hazırlık Dokümanı,** Ankara.

Mackey, Alison (1999), "Input, Interaction, and Second Language Development: An Empirical Study of Question Formation in ESL", **Studies In Second Language Acquisition,** 21, 557-587.

_____ (2006a), "(Epilogue) From Introspections, Brain Scans, and Memory Tests to the Role of Social Context: Advancing Research on Interaction and Learning (Epilogue)", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 28, 369-379.

_____ (2006b), "Feedback, Noticing and Instructed Second Language Learning", **Applied Linguistics,** 27(3): 405-430. Doi:10.1093/Applin/Ami051.

Mackey, Alison, and Gass, Susan M. (2006), "Pushing the Methodological Boundaries in Interaction Research: Introduction", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 28(2), 169-178. Doi:10.1017/S0272263106060086.

Mackey, Alison and Goo, Jaemyung (2007), "Interaction Research in SLA: A Meta-analysis and Research Synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.)", **Conversational Interaction In Second Language Acquisition: A Collection Of Empirical Studies,** (Pp. 407-446). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mackey, Alison and Philp, Jenefer (1998), "Conversational Interaction and Second Language Development: Recasts, Responses, and Red Herrings?", **The Modern Language Journal,** 82(3), 338-356.

Mackey, Alison et all. (2007), "Teachers' Intentions and Learners' Perception about Corrective Feedback in the L2 Classroom", **Innovations in Language Learning and Teaching,** 1(10), 129-52. Doi:10.2167/Illt047.0

Mackey, Alison et all. (2000), "How do Learners Perceive Interactional Feedback?", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 22,471-497.

Mackey, Alison and Oliver, Rhonda (2002), Interactional feedback and children's L2 development. **System**, 30 (4), 459-477. doi:10.1016/S0346-251X (02)00049-0

Mcdonough, Kim (2006), "Action Research and The Professional Development of Graduate Teaching Assistants", **The Modern Language Journal,** 90(1), 33-47. Doi:10.1111/J.1540-4781.2006.00383.X

MEB. (1992). **Öğretmen Yetiştirmede Koordinasyon ve İşbirliği Toplantısı,**. Ankara: MEB Basımevi.

Nassaji, Hossein (2011), "Immediate Learner Repair and its Relationship with Learning Targeted Forms in Dyadic Interaction", **System,** 39(1), 17-29.

Nassaji, Hossein & Wells, Gordon (2000), "What's the Use of "Triadic Dialogue"?: An Investigation of Teacher-student Interaction", **Applied Linguistics,** 21 (3), 376-406.

Nemser, William (1971), Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners. International Review of Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. 1991**. An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research**. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Numrich, Carol (1996), "On Becoming a Language Teacher: Insights From Diary Studies", **TESOL Quarterly,** 30(1), 131-153.

O'Cathain, Alicia (2009), "Mixed Methods Research in the Health Sciences: A Quiet Revolution [Editorial]", **Journal of Mixed Methods Research,** 3, 3-6.

Oyler, Celia J. (1996), Sharing authority: Student initiations during teacher-led read-alouds of information books. **Teaching and Teacher Education**, 12, 149-160.

Öztürk, Cemil (2005), **Türkiye'de Dünden Bugüne Öğretmen Yetiştiren Kurumlar.** İstanbul: MEB Yayınları.

Pajares, M. Frank (1992), "Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning Up a Messy Construct", **Review of Educational Research,** 62(3), 307-332. Doi: 10.3102/00346543062003307

Panova, Iliana and Lyster, Roy (2002), "Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom", **TESOL Quarterly,** 36(4), 573-595. Doi:10.2307/3588241

Patton, Michael Quinn (1990), **Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods** (2nd Ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

_____ (2002), **Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods** (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Peacock, Matthew (2001), "Pre-Service ESL Teachers' Beliefs about Second Language Learning: A Longitudinal Study", **System,** 29(2), 177-195.

Philp, Jenefer (2003), "Constraints On "Noticing The Gap": Nonnative Speakers' Noticing of Recasts in NS-NNS Interaction", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 25(1), 99-126. Doi:10.1017/S0272263103000044

Philp, Jenefer, and Tognini, Rita (2009), "Language Acquisition in Foreign Language Contexts and The Differential Benefits of Interaction", **IRAL,** 47, 245-66.

Phipps, Simon, and Borg, Simon (2007), "Exploring the Relationship Between Teachers' Beliefs and Their Classroom Practice", **The Teacher Trainer,** 21(3), 17-19.

Pica, Teresa (1994), "Research on Negotiation: What Does it Reveal about Second-language Learning Conditions, Processes, and Outcomes?", **Language Learning,** 44(3), 493-527.

Pica, Teresa, & Doughty, Catherine (1985), "Input and Interaction in the Communicative Language Classroom: A Comparison of Teacher-fronted and Group Activities. In S. M. Gass. (Ed.)", **Input and Second Language Acquisition** (Pp. 115-136). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Powell, Richard R. (1994), "Case Studies of Second-career Secondary Student Teachers", **International Journal Of Qualitative Studies In Education,** 7(4), 351-366.

Rad, Neda Fatehi (2010), "Evaluation of English Students' Beliefs about Learning English as Foreign Language: A Case of Kerman Azad University", **Proceedings of ICT for Language Learning Conference** (3rd Edition), Simonelli Editore.

Rassaei, Ehsan (2013), "Corrective Feedback, Learners' Perceptions, and L2 Development", **System,** 41,472–483.

Richards, Jack C. at all. (1996), "Learning How to Teach in the RSA Cert. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.)", **Teacher Learning in Language Teaching** (Pp. 242-259). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Russell, Jane & Spada, Nina (2006), "The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback for the Acquisition of L2 Grammar. In J. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.)", **Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching** (Pp. 133-164). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Scherer, Klaus R. (2005), "What Are Emotions? And How can They be Measured?", **Social Science Information,** 44(4), 695-729. Doi: 10.1177/0539018405058216

Schmidt, Richard (2001), "Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.)", **Cognition and Second Language Acquisition** (Pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, Richard & Frota, Sonia (1986), "Developing Basic Conversational Ability in a Second Language. In R. Day (Ed.)", **Talking to Learn** (Pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schulz, Renate A. (2001), Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Teaching and Corrective Feedback: USA-Colombia. **Modern Language Journal,** 85(2), 244-258. Retrieved From on May 2017 http://www.jstor.Org/stable/1192885

Seferoğlu, Gölge (2004), "A Study of Alternative English Teacher Certification Practices in Turkey", **Journal of Education for Teaching,** 30 (2), 151-159.

Selinker, Larry (1969), "Language Transfer", **General Linguistics,** 9 (2), Pp 67-92

_____ (1972), "Interlanguage", **International Review of Applied Linguistics,** 10, 209-231.

_____ (1988), **Papers in Interlanguage. Occasional Papers,** No. 44 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 321 549), Singapore: Seameo Regional Kanguage Centre [Online]. Available From: <Http://Bit.Ly/5aapwk> [Retrieved On 21 January 2019].

_____ (1992), **Rediscovering Interlanguage,** London: Longman.

Sheen, Younghee (2004), "Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in Communicative Classrooms Across Instructional Settings", **Language Teaching Research,** 8(3), 263- 300.

_____ (2006), "Exploring the Relationship Between Characteristics of Recasts and Learner Uptake", **Language Teaching Research,** 10(4), 361-392. Doi:10.1191/1362168806lr203oa

_____ (2007a), "The Effect of Corrective Feedback, Language Aptitude and Learner Attitudes on the Acquisition of English Articles. In A. Mackey (Ed.)", **Conversational Interaction In Second Language Acquisition** (Pp. 301-322). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____ (2010), "Differential Effects of Oral and Written Corrective Feedback in the ESL Classroom", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 31(2), 203-234. Doi:10.1017/S0272263109990507

Schmidt, Richard (1995), Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), **Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning** (pp. 1-63). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Smith, Heather and Higgins, Steve (2006), "Opening Classroom Interaction: The Importance of Feedback", **Cambridge Journal of Education,** 36 (4), 485-502.

Swain, Merrill K. (1985), "Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output it its Development. In S. M. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.)", **Input in Second Language Acquisition** (Pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

_____ (1995), "Three Functions of Output in Second Language Learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.)", **Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honour Of H.G. Widdowson,** (Pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____ (2000), "The Output Hyposesis and Beyond: Meditative Acquisition Through Collaborative Dialogue. In Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.)", **Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning,** (Pp. 97 114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____ (2005), "The Output Hypothesis: Theory and Research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.)", **Handbook on Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning** (Pp. 471-484). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Swain, Merrill K., & Lapkin, Sharon (1995), "Problems in Output and the Cognitive Processes They Generate: A Step Towards Second Language Learning", **Applied Linguistics,** 16, 370-391.

_____ (1998), "Interaction and Second Language Learning: Two Adolescent French Immersion Students Working Together", **Modern Language Journal,** 82, 320-337.

_____ (2002), "Talking it through: Two French Immersion Learners' Response to Reformulation", **International Journal of Educational Research,** 37(3-4), 285-304.

Talamas, Adrienne et all. (1999), "From Form to Meaning: Stages in the Acquisition of Second Language Vocabulary", **Bilingualism: Language and Cognition,** 2(1), 45-58. Teacher-Student Interaction. Applied Linguistics, 21 (3), 376-406.

Teddie, Charles and Tashakkori, Abbas (Eds.) (2009), **Foundations of Mixed Methods Research: Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches in the Social and Behavioral Sciences.** Sage: London.

Tercanlioğlu, Leyla (2005), "Pre-Service EFL Teachers' Beliefs About Foreign Language Learning And How They Relate To Gender", **Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology,** 5-3(1), 145-162.

Tusi, Bik-may Amy, (1985). "Analysing Input and Interaction in Second Language Classrooms", **RELC Journal,** 16, 8-32.

Varnosfadrani, Azizollah Dabaghi and Basturkmen, Helen (2009), "The Effectiveness of Implicit and Explicit Error Correction on Learners' Performance", **System,** 37(1), 82-98.

Vygotsky, Lev S. (1978), **Mind in Society: The Development of the Higher Psychological Processes,** Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press

Wells, Gordon and Chang-Wells, Gen Ling, (1992), **Constructing Knowledge Together: Classrooms as of Inquiry and Literacy,** Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Wertsch, James V. (1990), **The Voice of Rationality in Sociocultural Approach to Mind**. From L. C. Moll, Ed, Vygotsky And Education: Instructional Implications And Applications Of Sociohistorical Psychology**,** Cambridge University Press.

White, Lydia (1991), "Adverb Placement in Second Language Acquisition: Some Effects of Positive and Negative Evidence in the Classroom", **Second Language Research,** 51(1), 303-346.

_____ (2003), **Second Language Acquisition and Universal Grammar,** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woods, Devon (1996), **Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching: Beliefs, Decision-Making and Classroom Practice,** Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Yang, Yingli and Lyster, Roy (2010), "Effects of Form-Focused Practice and Feedback on Chinese EFL Learners' Acquisition of Regular and Irregular Past Tense Forms", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 32(2), 235-263. Doi:10.1017/S0272263109990519

Zacharias, Nugrahenny T. (2007), "Teacher and Student Attitudes Toward Teacher Feedback", **RELC Journal,** 38(1) 38-52. Doi:10.1177/0033688206076157

Zambo, Lesli J. (1996), "The Language Learner's Autobiography: Examining the 'Apprenticeship of Observation'. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.)", **Teacher Learning in Language Teaching** (Pp. 11-29). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Zhang, Ying et all. (2010), "A Brief Analysis of Corrective Feedback in Oral Interaction", **Journal of Language Teaching and Research,** 1(3), 306-308. Doi:10.4304/Jltr.1.3.306-308 198

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1: Request Letter to Conduct Research (Turkish)

ATATÜRK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
KAZIM KARABEKİR EĞİTİM FAKÜLTESİ
YABANCI DİLLER BÖLÜM BAŞKANLIĞINA

KTÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü Hazırlık Programında doktora öğrencisiyim ve aşağıda araştırma bilgileri sunulan çalışmama veri toplamak için gerekli iznin tarafıma verilmesi ve son sınıf öğrencilerinin staj esnasında anlattıkları ders gözlemlerinin yapılabilmesi için gerekli iznin milli eğitim müdürlüğünden alınması için gereğini arz ederim.

Saygılarımla,

I. Araştırmacı Bilgileri	
Adı-Soyadı	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
Öğrenci Numarası	257619
Tez Danışmanı	Doç. Dr. M. Naci KAYAOĞLU
Anabilim Dalı	Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı
Program	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Lisansüstü Eğitim Türü	Doktora

II. Araştırma Bilgileri	
Tezin Başlığı	ELT and Non-ELT Pre-Service Language Teachers' Stance On Oral Corrective Feedback Provision: A Turkish Context
Araştırma verilerinin toplanacağı öğretim yılları	2016-2017
Araştırma verilerinin toplanacağı akademik dönem	Bahar
Araştırma yapılacak kurumun adı	Anket ve mülakat için Atatürk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Edebiyat Fakültesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü Son Sınıf Öğrencileri, Gözlem için Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Ortaokul ve Liseleri
Araştırma/veri toplama araçlarının türü	Gözlem, yarı yapılandırılmış mülakat, anket
Araştırma/veri toplama araçlarının uygulanacağı kişiler	İlgili bölümün son sınıf öğrencileri

Appendix 2: Request Letter to Conduct Research (English)

ATATÜRK ÜNİVERSITY
FACULLTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

I am a PhD student at Karadeniz Technical University, Institute of Social Science, the Department of English Language and Literature, and I am hereby seeking your consent to gather data for my research whose details are provided below.

Yours respectfully,

I. Researcher Info	
Name-Surname	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
Register Number	257619
Thesis Supervisor	Assoc. Dr. Mustafa Naci Kayaoğlu
Department	Western Languages and Literature
Programme	English Language and Literature
Type of Graduate Programme	PhD

II. Research Info	
Thesis title	ELT and Non-ELT Pre-Service Language Teachers' Stance On Oral Corrective Feedback Provision: A Turkish Context
Requested academic year of data collection	2017
Data collection period	Spring Semester
Research setting	Atatürk University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching, and Secondary and middle schools for observations of practicum classes
Data collection instruments	Classroom observations, survey, semi-structured interviews
Participants	Senior students enrolled in the programme

Appendix 3: Participant Consent Form

PROJECT TITLE: ELT and NON-ELT Pre-Service Language Teachers' Stance on Oral Corrective Feedback Provision

Researcher: Hayrettin Köroğlu, PhD Candidate, Department of English Language Teaching (email: hayrettin.koroglu@atauni.edu.tr)

INTRODUCTION

I would like to invite you take part in the study. It is up to you to take part or not. If you are willing to participate, please write your name, surname and a contact telephone number in the space. If you are reluctant to, don't worry, it is alright. If you decide to make contribution to this study, complete this form and stay behind after this meeting is over and I will set a date with you for observation classes, interviews and a meeting to complete the survey. Otherwise you can leave when this meeting is over.

AIM OF THE THIS RESEARCH STUDY

I would like to investigate and observe the nature of the student teacher interaction in the classroom and your beliefs regarding this interaction. I hope to use what I have learned to make a contribution to the body of knowledge in the EFL teaching. Then I will analyze the data for my dissertation.

OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

Your participation in the study will not interfere with your classes at the University or in your practicum schools. The study will include observing and recording twenty lessons and follow up interviews with the twenty participants voluntarily, which is supposed to last 70 minutes with each participants- 40 minutes observing class and 30 minutes interviewing. It will also include completing a questionnaire, which is thought to last about 20-30 minutes (maximum of 30 minutes if you are not interviewed).

CONFIDENTIALITY

Once the study has been accomplished, I will transcribe the classroom interactions and the interviews. Rest assured that identifying information is never going to be matched with the data and comments in the study. All data is going to be stored confidential in files in my personal computer.

Appendix 3: (Continue)

PARTICIPANTS' RIGHTS

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you will not be paid for your participation. However, I will be available to train all participants in the research techniques used in this study if you are interested, and I will share all results and findings with you.

IN CASE OF PROBLEMS

Please feel free to contact the researcher listed above via email if you have any problems or questions regarding the participation in the study.

RESEARCHER'S DECLARATION

I have clarified the aim and the process of the study to the participants. I have discussed the procedures and the training and have asked all of the questions that participants have asked.

Signature of the researcher: Hayrettin Köroğlu
Date: April 6, 2017

PARTICIPANT'S CONSENT

I have read the information provided in this Informed Consent Form. All my questions were answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Signature: ……..

Date: ……..

Faculty: ……..

Email address: …….....

Mobile phone: ……

Appendix 4: Classroom Observations Checklist

Teacher: …… School: …… Date: ……

Error Types

Errors Committed	**Treated**	**Not Treated**
1. Grammar ……..		
2. Vocabulary ……..		
3. Semantic ……..		
4. Pronunciation ……..		

OCF Types

1. Explicit
   ……..
   .
2. Elicitation
   ……..
   .
3. Repetition
   ……..
   .
4. Metalinguistic Clues
   ……..
5. Recast
   ……..

Appendix 4: (Continue)

6. Clarification

   ……..

Timing of Treatment

1. Immediately
2. At the end of the activity
3. At the end of the class

OCF Provider

1. Teacher correction
2. Self-correction
3. Peer correction

Appendix 5: Invitation, Interview Questions and Protocols

Hello and welcome. Thank you very much for coming. My name is Hayrettin Köroğlu. I am writing my dissertation on Turkish ELT and non-ELT EFL student teachers' beliefs on oral corrective feedback and their practices for Oral Corrective Feedback‖ in English as a second language programs. I appreciate your coming and agreement to take part in this study. In this session, you are expected talk about your beliefs and your practices in classroom regarding oral corrective feedback. Please feel free to openly express your opinion. Your comments, ideas and thoughts on the questions will definitely enrich this study. This session will approximately last for 25-40 minutes and your answers will be recorded and later analyzed to get answers to the question of the study. Your names will not appear in the published analyses, instead they will be replaced by codes. Participation in the present study is completely voluntary. Again thank you for your time. Here are the questions you are going to answer. Please try to be focused and provide relevant comments and reflections on these questions.

The questions contain prompts to investigate your opinions about the correction of errors in the classroom. These questions are designed to address different perspectives regarding this issue, such as whether or not learners' errors should be corrected, how they should be corrected (selectively or constantly), and who should correct these errors.

1. Do you believe that language teacher treat student errors??
2. Does teacher feedback help learners improve their spoken English? Why?
3. Is it necessary for teachers to correct every error?
4. Are you against or for correcting all of these errors or only some of them: grammatical errors, vocabulary errors, semantic errors or pronunciation errors?
5. Should EFL teachers point out the error and provide the correct answers or elicit the answers from other learners?
6. Should teachers encourage self-correction, peer correction, or teacher correction techniques? Why?
7. When should teachers treat student errors (e.g., right away, or at a later time)?

If you understand and agree to taking part in this study, please sign below.

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 6: EFL Pre-Service Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback Befief Questionnaire

Thank you for agreeing to complete this questionnaire. The information you provide will be very useful in helping us understand your beliefs on oral corrective feedback in EFL classes. I ask you to feel free to express what you really think and to answer ALL the questions. Thank you for your time.

Name&Surname:

Age:

Sex:

Faculty:

Language:

Have you ever taught at any state or private schools rather than school experience?

a) Yes
b) No

Have you ever had formal instruction on providing oral corrective feedback at any time during your university education?

a) Yes
b) No

Do you know about oral corrective feedback types?

a) Yes
b) No

If yes, please name them and explain how to apply them.

.....
……...
……..
……...
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Appendix 6: (Continue)

Dear respondent,

Part 1: Your beliefs about oral corrective feedback

Indicate how well you agree with each of the following statements. Please circle your answer on the scale to the right of each statement, where 5=STRONGLY AGREE and 1= STRONGLY DISAGREE. Please use the entire scale in making your decisions.

		Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Moderately Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
1	Providing feedback should be a part of language teaching.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
2	Providing students with oral corrective feedback is crucial.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
3	Second language (L2)/ foreign language (FL) learners do NOT fear being corrected by their language teachers.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
4	Correcting errors related to GRAMMAR in a language classroom is very important.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
5	Teachers should correct a learner's error IMMEDIATELY after the error has been made.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
6	Teachers should systematically correct PERSISTENT errors in their learner's language production.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
7	TEACHER CORRECTION is useful in the learners' understanding how their L2/FL Works.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
8	ALL student errors should be corrected.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
9	Language teachers should ignore some errors depending on some factors (e.g., class level).	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
10	Oral corrective feedback is of great importance in the language development.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
11	Some errors are more important to correct than others.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
12	If NOT corrected, L2/FL learners cannot make a good progress.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
13	If NOT corrected, L2/FL learners cannot make a good progress.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**

Appendix 6: (Continue)

14	Teachers should treat VOCABULARY errors.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
15	The best time for error correction is at the END of the communicative activities.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
16	Teachers should delay dealing with learners' errors until the END of a lesson.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
17	Telling the learner that there is an error and vocally stressing the correct form helps notice the difference between what they know and what they do not know in a L2/FL.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
18	Error correction is essential in promoting L2/FL learning.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
19	Learners should be allowed to SELF-CORRECT.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
20	PEER CORRECTION is a good way in the dealing of errors.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
21	Pointing out learner's errors will push them to learn better.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
22	Correcting errors related to PRONUNCIATION in a language classroom is more important.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
23	It is necessary to correct all errors, without ignoring any of them.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
24	All errors are equally important to correct.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
25	Correcting SEMANTIC errors in a language classroom is more important.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
26	Language teachers should openly point out that there is something wrong with what they have said and make an amendment.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
27	Students should be informed of what they have said is wrong, how it is wrong, and then they should be provided with the correct form (EXPLICIT).	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
28	Language teachers should imply that there is something wrong with they have said without telling them exactly what is wrong (e.g., by repeating the error in the questioning tone, repeating what they have said but no correct form, asking the student to repeat their answer (IMPLICIT).	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**

Appendix 6: (Continue)

Part 2

In this part, there are some possible examples of OCF strategies dealing with student errors. How much would you agree with each way of correcting student erroneous utterance, if a student said **"Ali <u>have</u> got one brother."?**

		Very useful				**Not useful**
29	S: Ali <u>have</u> got one brother. T: No, it is 'Ali has got one brother. Not 'Ali have…' (**Explicit**)	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
30	S: Ali <u>have</u> got one brother. T: "Sorry, Ali …..?" (**Elicitation**, explicit) S: Ali has got one brother.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
31	S: Ali <u>have</u> got one brother. T: Ali **have** (stressed) one brother**?** **(Repitition)** **S: Ali**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
32	S: Ali <u>have</u> got one brother. T: Can you use the word 'have' with 'Ali' here? 'Ali' is a third person singular noun. Don't forget to make the verb agree with the subject. So you should say something else instead of 'have'. (**Metalinguistic Feedback**) S: Ok. Ali has got one brother.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
33	S: Ali <u>have</u> got one brother. T: Ali has one child. Yes. Is it a boy or girl? (**Recast**)	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
34	S: Ali <u>have</u> got one brother. T: I am sorry? / Ali what? (**Clarification Request)**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**

Appendix 7: Copies of official permission for the study

T.C.
ATATÜRK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Kâzım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi Dekanlığı

Sayı : 29202147
Konu : Ders Uygulaması

13.05.15 01881

YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ BÖLÜMÜ BAŞKANLIĞINA
(İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı)

İlgi: 10.04.2015 tarihli ve 241 sayılı yazınız

Bölümünüz İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı öğretim görevlilerinden Hayrettin KÖROĞLU'nun doktora tezi kapsamında aday ingilizce öğretmenlerinin öğrenci hatalarına vermiş oldukları geri dönüt stratejilerini tespit etmek amacıyla son sınıf veya mezun olmak üzere olan Fakültemiz öğrencilerinin "Okul Uygulamaları" dersi kapsamında ilgi yazınızda belirtilen İlimiz Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü'ne bağlı ilköğretim ve liselerdeki analatacakları derslerde gözlem yapmasının uygun görüldüğü ile ilgili Erzurum İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü'nün 29.04.2015 tarihli ve 4509950 sayılı yazısı ekte gönderilmiştir.

Bilgilerinizi ve adı geçene tebliğ edilmesi hususunda gereğini rica ederim.

Atatürk Üniversitesi Kâzım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi 25170 / ERZURUM
Tlf : (0) (442) 2314001//Fax : (0) (442) 2314288 Elektronik ağ:www.atauni.edu.tr
Bilgi için:S. ÇAKALOT-2314041

Appendix 7: (Continue)

T.C.
ERZURUM VALİLİĞİ
İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü

Sayı : 36648235/605/4509950
Konu: Araştırma İzni

29.04.2015

ATATÜRK ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜNE
(Öğrenci İşleri Daire Başkanlığı)

Ilgi: a) Atatürk Üniversitesi'nin 20/04/2015 tarihli ve 9002 sayılı yazınız.
b) Atatürk Üniversitesi'nin 16/04/2015 tarihli ve 8811 sayılı yazısı.

İlgi yazılarda belirtilen üniversiteniz ve araştırmacıların İlimiz okullarında araştırma konuları doğrultusunda gözlem yapma istekleri, Bakanlığımızın 07/03/2012 tarihli ve 3616 (2012/13) sayılı genelgesi çerçevesinde incelenmiştir. Araştırmaların, *ekte isimleri belirtilen okullarda, eğitim öğretim faaliyetlerini aksatmayacak şekilde ve komisyon kararında belirtilen veri toplama araçlarının kullanılarak* yapılmasına ilişkin, 28/04/2015 tarihli ve 4435335 sayılı onay ekte gönderilmiştir.

Bilgilerinizi rica ederim.

Turan BAĞAÇLI
Vali a.
İl Milli Eğitim MüdürYardımcısı

Ek:
1-Onay (1 adet)
2-Komisyon kararı (2 sayfa)
3-Okul Listesi (1 sayfa)

Yönetim Cad. Valilik Binası Kat:4 Yakutiye ERZURUM
Elektronik Ağ: http://erzurum.meb.gov.tr
e-posta: arge25@meb.gov.tr

Ayrıntılı bilgi için: Çiğdem HOPUR Şb.Mdr.
Tel: (0 442) 234 4800
Faks: (0 442) 235 1032

Appendix 7: (Continue)

T.C.
ERZURUM VALİLİĞİ
İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü

Sayı : 36648235/605/4435335 28.04.2015
Konu: Araştırma İzni

MÜDÜRLÜK MAKAMINA

Ilgi: a) Atatürk Üniversitesi'nin 16/04/2015 tarihli ve 8811 sayılı yazısı
b) Atatürk Üniversitesi'nin 20/04/2015 tarihli ve 9002 sayılı yazısı.

İlgi yazılarda belirtilen üniversite ve araştırmacıların İlimiz okullarında araştırma yapma isteği Bakanlığımızın 07/03/2012 tarihli ve 3616 (2012/13) sayılı genelgesi çerçevesinde incelenmiştir. *Araştırmaların, eğitim öğretim faaliyetlerini aksatmayacak şekilde, komisyon kararında belirtilen veri toplama araçlarının kullanılarak* ekte isimleri belirtilen okullarda yapılması şubemizce uygun görülmektedir.

Makamınızca da uygun görülmesi halinde olurlarınıza arz ederim.

Turan BAĞAÇLI
İl Milli Eğitim Müdür Yardımcısı

OLUR
28.04.2015

Yüksel ARSLAN
İl Milli Eğitim Müdürü

Yönetim Cad. Valilik Binası Kat:4 Yakutiye ERZURUM
Elektronik Ağ: erzurum.meb.gov.tr
e-posta: arge25@meb.gov.tr

Ayrıntılı bilgi için: Çiğdem HOPUR Şb.Mdr.
Tel: (0 442) 234 4800
Faks: (0 442) 235 1032

Appendix 7: (Continue)

)

FORM:2

T.C.
MİLLİ EĞİTİM BAKANLIĞI
Yenilik ve Eğitim Teknolojileri Genel Müdürlüğü

ARAŞTIRMA DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU

ARAŞTIRMA SAHİBİNİN

Adı Soyadı	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
Kurumu / Üniversitesi	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Araştırma yapılacak iller	Erzurum
Araştırma yapılacak eğitim kurumu ve kademesi.	Ekli Listede Belirtilen Okullar
Araştırmanın konusu	İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Öğrenci Hatalarına Vermiş Oldukları Geri Dönüt Stratejilerini Tespit Etmek
Üniversite / Kurum onayı	Var
Araştırma / Proje /ödev / Tez önerisi	Tez Önerisi
Veri toplama araçları	Gözlem
Görüş İstenilecek Birim / Birimler.	

KOMİSYON GÖRÜŞÜ

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yenilik ve Eğitim Teknolojileri Genel Müdürlüğü'nün Araştırma, Yarışma ve Sosyal Etkinlik İzinleri konulu 2012/13 nolu genelge doğrultusunda yapılan incelemede araştırmanın kabulune karar verildi.

Komisyon Kararı	Oybirliği ile Kabulüne
Muhalif Üyenin Adı ve Soyadı	

KOMİSYON

Appendix 7: (Continue)

ARAŞTIRMA YAPILACAK OKUL LİSTESİ

S.No	İLİ	İLÇESİ	OKUL ADI	ARAŞTIRMACI
1	ERZURUM	YAKUTİYE	SABANCI ORTA OKULU	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
2	ERZURUM	YAKUTİYE	ERZURUM ANADOLU LİSESİ	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
3	ERZURUM	PALANDÖKEN	70.YIL ORTA OKULU	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
4	ERZURUM	PALANDÖKEN	SEBAHATTİN SOLAKOĞLU ORTA OKULU	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
5	ERZURUM	YAKUTİYE	KÜLTÜR KURUMU ORTA OKULU	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
6	ERZURUM	PALANDÖKEN	HACI SAMİ BOYDAK ANADOLU LİSESİ	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
7	ERZURUM	AZİZİYE	ATATÜRK ORTA OKULU	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
8	ERZURUM	YAKUTİYE	ATATÜRK LİSESİ	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
9	ERZURUM	YAKUTİYE	GAZİ AHMET MUHTARPAŞA ORTA OKULU	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
10	ERZURUM	YAKUTİYE	ERZURUM ANADOLU LİSESİ	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
11	ERZURUM	PALANDÖKEN	YAHYA KEMAL ORTA OKULU	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
12	ERZURUM	PALANDÖKEN	SALTUKBEY ORTA OKULU	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
13	ERZURUM	YAKUTİYE	ÖZEL AYDINDOĞAN ORTAOKULU	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
14	ERZURUM	YAKUTİYE	İMKB İNÖNÜ ORTA OKULU	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
15	ERZURUM	YAKUTİYE	ANADOLU İMAM HATİP LİSESİ	Hayrettin KÖROĞLU
16	ERZURUM	YAKUTİYE	RECEP BİRSİN ÖZEN EĞİTİM VE İŞ UYGULAMA OKULU	Ozan KILIÇ-Eren DURAK

CURRICULUM VITAE

Hayrettin KÖROĞLU.. He graduated from Eşmekaya Primary School in 1981; Artvin Religious Vocational Middle School in 1984; Mareşal Çakmak Teacher Secondary School in 1987; Karadeniz Technical University – Fatih Faculty of Education, Department of Primary Studies in 1989; Ataturk University – Kazım Karabekir Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching in 2000; MA program at Kafkas University – The Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Western Languages and Literature, Devision of English Language and Literature in 2010. Later, he was accepted by PhD program at Karadeniz Technical University - The Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Western Languages and Literature, Devision of English Language and Literature. He has been currently (5 February 2021) working for Ataturk University – Kazım Karabekir Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching as a “lecturer”.

KÖROĞLU is married and his foreign language is English.