

Novice and Experienced Teachers' Beliefs and Stated Attitudes About Oral Corrective Feedback*

Mesleğe Yeni Başlamış ve Deneyimli Öğretmenlerin Sözel Düzeltici Dönüte İlişkin İnançları ve Tutumları

Hale Ülkü AYDIN¹, Kemal Sinan ÖZMEN²

¹ TED University, English Language School, e-posta: ulku.aydin@tedu.edu.tr

² Gazi University, English Language Education, Foreign Language Education, e-posta: sozmen@gazi.edu.tr

Makale Türü/Article Types: Araştırma Makalesi/ Research Article

Makalenin Geliş Tarihi: 06.03.2024

Yayına Kabul Tarihi: 15.05.2024

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate novice and experienced teachers' stated beliefs and attitudes about oral corrective feedback (OCF) and the similarities and differences between them. Certain qualitative and quantitative research techniques were employed in this study to answer the research questions. Regarding qualitative design, some interviews were conducted to find out novice and experienced teachers' stated beliefs about OCF. The quantitative part of the study is based on data collected through Situations for Error Correction (SEC) Simulation. The novice and experienced teachers were asked to write how they would respond to each situation and why they would respond that way. The aim of this tool was to identify the novice and experienced teachers' stated attitudes. The results indicated that although there were some similarities between the novice and experienced teachers' beliefs and attitudes about OCF, their OCF strategies and beliefs varied regarding correcting errors concerning language components.

Keywords: *Oral corrective feedback, EFL novice teachers, Novice teachers' beliefs, EFL experienced teachers, Experienced teachers' beliefs*

ÖZ

Bu çalışma mesleğe yeni başlamış ve deneyimli öğretmenlerin sözel düzeltici dönüt hakkındaki inançları ve beyan edilmiş tutumlarını ve bu iki grup arasındaki benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları

* **Reference:** Aydın, H. Ü., & Özmen, K. S. (2024). Novice and experienced teachers' beliefs and stated attitudes about oral corrective feedback. *Gazi University Journal of Gazi Education Faculty*, 44(2), 1115-1144.

incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışmada araştırma sorularına cevap bulmak amacıyla belirli nitel ve nicel araştırma tekniklerinden faydalanılmıştır. Nitel yöntem olarak mesleğe yeni başlamış ve deneyimli öğretmenlerin sözel düzeltici dönüt hakkındaki inançlarını ortaya çıkarmak için bazı mülakatlar gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çalışmanın nicel kısmı Hata Düzeltme Durumları Benzetimi'nden gelen veriden oluşmaktadır. Mesleğe yeni başlamış ve deneyimli öğretmenlerden her bir duruma nasıl ve neden karşılık vereceklerini yazmaları istenmiştir. Bu aracın amacı mesleğe yeni başlamış ve deneyimli öğretmenlerin beyan edilmiş davranışlarını belirlemektir. Sonuçlar mesleğe yeni başlamış ve deneyimli öğretmenlerin sözel düzeltici dönüte ilişkin inanç ve tutumları arasında bazı benzerlikler olmasına rağmen, dil bileşenlerine ilişkin hataları düzeltme konusunda kullandıkları sözel düzeltici dönüt tekniklerinin ve inançlarının farklılık gösterdiğini ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Sözel düzeltici dönüt, EFL mesleğe yeni başlamış öğretmenler, Mesleğe yeni başlamış öğretmenlerin inançları, EFL deneyimli öğretmenler, Deneyimli öğretmenlerin inançları*

INTRODUCTION

Language classrooms are very similar to other social contexts all around the world. A language class should be accepted as a social context which is co-constructed by teachers and learners through interaction. This type of an interaction is claimed to be at the center of language learning because “learning arises not through interaction, but in interaction” (Ellis, 2000, p.209). It is a well-known fact that the main element of learning is interaction which should be made with a more experienced person that can lead and support the novice (Vygotsky, 1978). It is maintained that second language acquisition is improved when learners are active participants of the context and ask for clarification and confirming questions (Long, 1983; 1996) in order to negotiate for meaning. It is also emphasized that it is the responsibility of the more competent interlocutor to make the input more comprehensible for learning to take place (Long, 1996).

In light of this, some of teachers' tasks are seen important to make the learning process easier and the input more comprehensible for learners. One of the most important tasks is addressing the errors made by the learners. This has been problematic in the field as it has been investigated in several studies with a variety of research concerns: Linguists

treat it as negative evidence (e.g., White, 1989), discourse analysts as repair (e.g., Kasper, 1985), psychologists as negative feedback (e.g., Annett, 1969), second language teachers as corrective feedback (e.g., Fanselow, 1977), and in more recent work the second language acquisition (SLA) researchers study on it as focus-on-form (e.g., Doughty & Williams, 1998; Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Long, 2001). All these various focuses of research concern with the same practical matter of “what to do when students make errors in classrooms that are intended to lead communicative competence” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p.38).

Oral Corrective Feedback

In the late 1970s, it was accepted in the field of language teaching that learners’ errors in the language learning process were important and inevitable, and also, they were signs of learning. It is argued by some experts that error correction is not necessary since errors will disappear in a natural way as the processes go on if students receive enough comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982). However, many specialists expressed that one of the most significant roles of a teacher is providing error correction (Chaudron, 1977; Lightbown & Spada, 1999; Lyster & Ranta 1997). This view has encouraged second language (L2) researchers and they have focused on oral error correction with the aim of understanding how valuable it can be for SLA. They have also worked hard to identify the best practices that can be displayed by teachers to enable better learning.

Even though it might seem easy and practical, how teachers should handle errors while learners are speaking needed to be clarified for teachers to implement the best practices in classrooms. They always have some questions in their minds, such as “Should learners’ errors be corrected? When and how should learners’ errors be corrected? Which errors should be corrected? Who should do the correcting?” (Hendrickson, 1978, p.12). Giving answers to all these questions can be illuminating for language teachers and it can enhance effective language learning and teaching.

Oral error correction has been a subject that merits attention of SLA researchers as it gives teachers one of the most effective tools to monitor, guide and help learners to reflect on their own learning (Walsh, 2006). It also gives hints about SLA processes by making researchers ask whether explicit or implicit instruction is required, if giving attention and noticing are enough, or how the interactional and environmental factors can assist SLA.

Teachers' Beliefs

As the active decision makers of the classrooms, teacher role in the process of error correction is quite important. How they conceive, interpret the world, their beliefs about teaching and learning shape the way they correct errors in the class as their attitudes are formed in relation to their beliefs (Borg, 2015).

In the previous studies conducted in the field of teacher education, the main focus was on how teachers behaved in the classrooms. The basis of the behaviors, in other words, their mental processes were not taken into account. Until the 1970s, teaching was considered as a group of separate attitudes that could be worked on. It was thought that when teachers were taught these attitudes, students' high performances would be ensured. However, there was a shift in the focus of research in the field of teaching and the focus was directed to teachers' thinking processes rather than their classroom performances (Clark, 1984).

It was clear that teacher was not there to apply whatever experts prescribed. On the contrary, they are the ones who are actively involved in the process by monitoring, diagnosing students and making decisions on what they observe (Borg, 2015). They do not simply follow the principles or techniques described and determined by the experts (Baştürkmen, Loewen & Ellis, 2004), but they are the professionals who assess and interpret what happens in classrooms and respond to it in such a complex context like a classroom.

In this regard, how teachers correct learners' errors and why they choose these ways appear as a critical factor in understanding how teachers' way of thinking and their

beliefs have an impact on their practice, and this leads us to find out how teachers' beliefs shape their teaching practice. In line with this purpose, treating teachers' beliefs as an important factor in the studies focusing on error correction can be quite insightful for some reasons. First of all, a teacher's way of thinking, her/his opinions, judgments, and so decisions shape their classroom attitudes (Fang, 1996). Therefore, being informed about teachers' beliefs can deepen the understanding of how teachers correct errors in practice in real classroom atmospheres. It is possible to obtain more valid explanations of how teachers deal with oral errors in their teaching practice by understanding mental processes involved in the process of their practice.

Secondly, if the aim is to make a difference in the practice, the first thing that needs to be taken into account is teachers' beliefs. The reason why many studies did not achieve convincing results is that they did not pay enough attention to teacher beliefs. These studies are important indicators of how teachers' thought processes, their beliefs are effective in their decision-making process and their teaching, so learning and why this aspect should be considered as an important factor. Dealing with teachers' beliefs as a component in oral error correction research can be beneficial as in this way teachers will be provided with an opportunity to reflect on their existing knowledge and beliefs. This research study aims to discover novice and experienced teachers' beliefs and stated attitudes about oral error correction and their similarities and differences. To this end, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are novice teachers' beliefs and stated attitudes about oral corrective feedback (OCF)?
2. What are experienced teachers' beliefs and stated attitudes about oral corrective feedback (OCF)?
3. What are the similarities and differences between novice and experienced teachers' beliefs and stated attitudes about oral corrective feedback (OCF)?

METHODOLOGY

Context and Participants

The current study was carried out in a school of foreign languages at a foundational university in Ankara, Turkey. There are 69 English instructors in the school. The instructors have to teach 20 hours in a week. A skill-based syllabus is used in the school, and different skills (namely reading, writing, speaking, listening, and main course) are taught by different teachers. The university where the participants work is a private university. One-year English preparatory class is compulsory for most of the students. The students are from different departments, such as engineering, flight training, business management, and aviation management.

Ten novice teachers and 10 experienced teachers took part in the study. The novice teachers started teaching at this university this term. The experienced teachers were chosen among the instructors with more than 5 years of experience. All the participant teachers took part in the study on a voluntary basis. There were 2 males and 8 females in each group of teachers. The novice teachers' group participants were aged between 22 and 25. The participants in the experienced teachers' group were aged between 27 and 35.

Data Collection and Procedures

There were two data collection instruments utilized in the present study. One of them is a simulation questionnaire that offers situations or scenarios in which OCF might be necessary. The second instrument is an interview collecting data about novice and experienced teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback. Before data collection, a consent form was given to each participant, and they were informed about their roles and rights. They all signed the consent form.

Situations for Error Correction (SEC) Simulation is a data collection tool that is developed to investigate novice and experienced teachers' stated attitudes of oral corrective feedback and developed by the researcher (see Appendix A). It involves 20

situations that English teachers may frequently face in English language classrooms. All the situations include an erroneous utterance regarding different proficiency levels and student profiles is included in all the situations (Özmen & Aydın, 2015). The participants were requested to identify the error type (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation) and the focus of the activity (fluency, accuracy) and answer the question of how they would correct the error and why they would correct it that way. Language components (grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation), proficiency level (from elementary to upper-intermediate) and age group (from young learners to adults), which are the factors behind the scenarios in the SEC Simulation, were distributed fairly and equally. In order to develop this tool, first of all, common errors of the learners of English were searched and most common errors included noted the studies (Brians, 2003; James, 1998; Swan & Smith, 2001) were identified. Then, these most common errors were used in the situations, taking the proficiency level of learners who made the errors (from elementary level to upper-intermediate level) and their age (young learners, adolescents, adult learners) into consideration. However, this research paper reports only on OCF for language components.

A pilot study was carried out after the initial preparations of the SEC Simulation were completed in order to secure the construct validity. The pilot study was exploited to make sure whether all the language components, proficiency levels, and learner groups were represented in an equal and fair way, whether the situations included in SEC Simulation reflected the real—life experiences they faced in their teaching contexts, and whether there were any terms or situations that needed to be improved or modified. Ten teachers who represented the target participants of the study attended the pilot study. As a result of the analysis of the data collected from the pilot study, two situations in the SEC Simulation were modified and some wording revisions were made. Then, a professor in the field of English language teacher education was asked to get expert opinions. Upon the reviews of the professor, a few linguistic modifications were made in two of the situations in the simulation.

The participants responded to the situations in the SEC Simulation in a 45-minute session conducted at the school. During this data collection procedure, they were monitored by the researcher. A sample situation was shared and discussed with the participants of the study in order to show them the content and the structure of the scenarios in the SEC Simulation before the data collection session.

Twenty-five semi-structured interview items were included in the interview questions (see Appendix B). Two interviews were conducted for piloting. Then, the interview questions were revised specifically to involve all the items aiming to measure same points with the SEC Simulation. The interviews were carried out once with each teacher in a face-to-face session. Each interview lasted about 20 to 45 minutes. The interviews were recorded and then transcribed verbatim.

Data Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative procedures were applied in the analysis of the certain parts of SEC Simulation depending on the nature of the data and requirements of the research questions. The qualitative data collected from SEC Simulation and interviews were analyzed by using constant comparative method derived from grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1977). However, to analyze those data, different coding procedures were used, so they were analyzed separately. In the SEC Simulation, the novice, and experienced teachers' answers to the question 'how and why to correct errors' were categorized by using the taxonomy of Lyster and Ranta (1997). Seven types of oral corrective feedback were identified in the study: (1) explicit, (2) recasts, (3) clarification request, (4) meta-linguistic feedback, (5) elicitation, (6) repetition and (7) multiple feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). For the answers of the participants to the question of 'why' in the situations, the same themes that were applied in the answers used for the question of 'how' were employed. In order to reach a common point, the responses given to the question of 'why' were re-read cyclically and the ones that were found related to these themes were categorized under them. Regarding the feedback type, the categorized data were analyzed based on calculating the frequency and percentage of OCF for each situation in the SEC Simulation.

In the analysis of the interviews, some specific themes on novice and experienced teachers' beliefs about OCF emerged from the data. Those themes were: (1) overall attitude toward OCF, (2) selecting errors to correct, (3) most corrected error type, (4) time of OCF, and (5) factors having an impact on the efficiency of OCF.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question 1: What are novice teachers' beliefs and stated attitudes about oral corrective feedback?

Novice Teachers' Beliefs about OCF

To be able to find out novice teachers' beliefs about OCF, some face-to-face interviews were conducted. The analysis of the data gathered through the interviews revealed that all the novice teachers thought that errors were normal and expected in the process of learning a foreign language. They also attached importance to their students' errors and one of the novice teachers stated, *"I want my students to make mistakes because if they don't make mistakes, I can't be sure whether they understand what I told or not (Int5)"*.

Although all the novice teachers reported that error correction was necessary, they stated that they would not correct all of the errors in order not to discourage the students and that they would correct the errors hindering the meaning: *"The most important criterion is meaning for me and I think it is the same for most teachers (Int2)"*. They would choose to correct the errors caused by lack of knowledge (3 out of 4 participants) and they would correct the errors hampering the meaning. Also, they expressed that the focus of the lesson and the activity was very important: *"...if we are focusing on grammar, I will correct grammatical errors, but if we are doing a speaking activity, I will focus more on pronunciation and correct errors on pronunciation (Int6)"*.

As for the type of the errors the participants corrected frequently, there were two answers: vocabulary errors and pronunciation errors. 2 out of 4 participants said that they corrected vocabulary errors most frequently because *"different vocabulary items mean different things. It directly affects the meaning (Int2)"*. The other 2 participants

expressed that they corrected pronunciation errors because most of the learners' errors were on pronunciation. However, one of the participants said "*I don't think that feedback I give on pronunciation errors is effective because most of pronunciation errors are fossilized. Correction doesn't help them (Int7)*". The same participant also stated "I cannot interfere with students' errors on intonation or stress because I don't feel competent enough to correct them. I'm not a native speaker of English, so I'm not always sure about correct intonation and stress". This is an important and generally ignored issue in error correction studies. The reason of correction or no correction can be teachers' knowledge. A teacher must be competent enough to detect and correct an error.

As for the time of correction, 3 out of 4 novice teachers stated that they would choose immediate feedback if the activity was not fluency-based:

If the student is eager to talk about something or if there is a discussion in the class, I don't want to interrupt him/her. I can give delayed feedback in this situation. However, I believe that immediate correction is more effective to notice the error so I generally prefer immediate feedback (Int7).

When the participants were asked to elaborate on the factors having an impact on efficiency of OCF, time of the feedback, level of the students, age of the students, focus of the activity, students' expectations and their reactions were repeatedly stated by the participants. These findings are in congruence with the findings of Méndez and Cruz (2012) and with those of Roothoof (2014). In those studies, the participant underlined the importance of the factors related to the students.

Novice Teachers' Stated Attitudes about OCF

The SEC Simulation involves 8 simulation items that led novice teachers to implement oral corrective feedback moves relating to grammar, 6 items that are relevant to vocabulary and 6 items related to pronunciation, either fluency or accuracy). Data analysis was carried out based on calculating the frequency of OCF for each situation in the SEC Simulation. For all the eight situations including grammar errors, frequency of OCF was calculated. As for the six situations including vocabulary errors, it was

calculated for all of them. For the pronunciation errors, the frequency of OCF was calculated for the six situations involving pronunciation errors. The findings indicate that the novice teachers preferred to use different feedback types in order to correct the errors on different language components: vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. In Details are provided in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Language Component and Feedback Type (Novice teachers)

	Language Components					
	Grammar		Vocabulary		Pronunciation	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
EXPLICIT	12	18.46	11	22	13	27.1
RECAST	21	32.3	6	12	8	16.6
CLARIFICATION	2	3.1	4	8	0	0
REQUEST						
METALINGUISTIC	6	9.23	9	18	7	14.6
FEEDBACK						
ELICITATION	10	15.38	5	10	2	4.2
REPETITION	1	1.53	0	0	1	2.1
MULTIPLE	0	0	0	0	0	0
FEEDBACK						
NO CORRECTION	13	20	13	26	17	35.4
IRRELEVANT	0	0	2	4	0	0
RESPONSE						
MISSING DATA	0	0	0	0	0	0

Most of the novice teachers preferred to use recast to correct grammatical errors (32.3%). As the reason why they would use recast to correct grammatical errors, they stated that they should correct students' errors, but it should be done without demotivating them and they indicated recasts as the least demotivating type of error

correction: “...if I am their teacher, I should lead them to the right path, but I shouldn't discourage them at the same time. For this reason, I can use recasts to do so (Int6)”. This is concurrent with the findings of Brown (2016), Havranek (2002), Lyster and Ranta (1997), Panova and Lyster (2002), Roothoof (2014), and Sheen (2004). Among the other types of correction, no correction ranked second (20%) and explicit correction ranked third (18.46).

When the error was on a vocabulary item, most of the participants preferred not to correct the error (26%). The second most frequent response to situations including vocabulary errors was explicit correction (22%). The novice teachers reported that vocabulary errors directly affected the meaning, so this type of errors should be corrected explicitly: “...if there is a vocabulary error, it will hinder the meaning of the utterance, so I will correct it directly in order to avoid any misunderstanding (Int7)”. Metalinguistic feedback was the third most frequent correction type (18%) and the participants stated that they would use it because it was easy and effective for vocabulary errors especially for the errors on parts of speech (i.e. if a learner uses an adjective instead of a noun).

As for the pronunciation errors, most of the novice teachers preferred not to correct the errors (35.4%). The second most frequently preferred feedback type was explicit correction (27.1%). They state that they would use explicit correction because they thought that if they did not correct pronunciation errors, these errors would be fossilized: “...I will correct this error (on pronunciation) explicitly because the student must notice and understand the correct pronunciation. If s/he ignores it, it will be fossilized (NT3)”. Recast was the third most common feedback type preferred by the novice teachers to correct pronunciation errors (16.6%). As the reason why they would recast they expressed that repeating the correct pronunciation would be enough for some students to understand the correct pronunciation of a word in some situations.

Research Question 2: What are experienced teachers' beliefs and stated attitudes about oral corrective feedback?**Experienced Teachers' Beliefs about OCF**

All of the experienced teachers, as novice teachers did, stated that they accepted errors as expected results of learning and that they were signs of learning: "...making mistakes indicates that the learner is active in the process of learning (Int3)". For this reason, they (3 out of 4 experienced teachers) expressed that teachers should create an atmosphere making students feel relaxed and that teachers should say that making mistakes is so normal.

When the participants were asked to elaborate on how to select which errors to correct, repetitive errors, focus of the activity and lesson, the reason of the error (whether it is caused by a lack of knowledge or it is a slip of tongue) were repeatedly articulated. Additionally, all of them expressed that if the error does not hinder the communication, if there is no obstacle to delivering the message, there is no need to correct any errors.

As for the most frequently corrected error type, 3 out of the 4 participants stated that they corrected pronunciation errors: "... while speaking if a student makes a pronunciation error repeatedly, I generally can't help myself and correct it. I don't know whether it is good for the student or not, but I do that (Int1)". When the participants were asked the appropriate time for correction, most of them (3 out of 4) expressed that they did not prefer immediate correction if it is not an accuracy-based activity:

"...most of my students have low self-esteem (in terms of speaking in English), so I try to encourage them and I don't want to correct their errors immediately. Instead, I try to keep their errors in mind and create situations to make the student use that erroneous utterance again. If s/he is making the same mistake, I will make the student realize that the utterance isn't clear and that there should be something to correct (Int3)"

When the experienced teachers were asked to reflect on the factors that have an effect on the efficiency of OCF, all of them emphasized the importance of the teachers'

attitude and one of the participants stated “...just telling it’s normal to make mistakes to the students is not enough, we (teachers) should also make the students feel that by behaving in accordance with what we say, with our attitudes toward their errors (Int8)”. This finding is line with the finding of Lyster and Saito (2010). In that study, the teachers indicated teachers’ attitude toward errors as the most important factor having an impact on the efficiency of correction. The level of anxiety at the moment of correction, students’ attitude toward the teacher, the number of the students, and learners’ educational background were repeatedly expressed by the participants. One of them stated that building trust between the teacher and the students was quite important: “...the student should know that I am not trying to make fun of him/her. It (correcting errors) is something I am doing for his/her own good. Also, the students should trust in the teacher’s knowledge (Int4)”.

Experienced Teachers’ Stated Attitudes about OCF

The SEC Simulation involves 8 simulation items that led experienced teachers to implement oral corrective feedback moves relating to grammar, 6 items that are relevant to vocabulary and 6 items that are relevant to pronunciation, either fluency or accuracy). Data analysis was carried out based on calculating the frequency of OCF for each situation in the SEC Simulation. For all the eight situations including grammar errors, frequency of OCF was calculated. As for the six situations including vocabulary errors, it was calculated for all of them. For the pronunciation errors, the frequency of OCF was calculated for the six situations involving pronunciation errors. The findings indicate that the experienced teachers preferred to use different feedback types in order to correct the errors on different language components: vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. The details are provided in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Language Component and Feedback Type (Experienced teachers)

	Language Components					
	Grammar		Vocabulary		Pronunciation	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
EXPLICIT	1	1.8	5	12.5	11	26.2
RECAST	10	18.18	3	7,5	5	11.9
CLARIFICATION	0	0	0	0	1	2.38
REQUEST						
METALINGUISTIC	11	20	14	35	3	7.14
FEEDBACK						
ELICITATION	3	5.45	3	7.5	8	19
REPETITION	1	1.8	0	0	0	0
MULTIPLE	0	0	0	0	0	0
FEEDBACK						
NO CORRECTION	27	49.1	15	37.5	13	30.95
IRRELEVANT	2	3.6	0	0	1	2,38
RESPONSE						
MISSING DATA	0	0	0	0	0	0

Most of the experienced teachers preferred not to correct grammatical errors (49.1%).

The second most frequently preferred correction type to correct grammatical errors was metalinguistic feedback (20%). Most of the participants stated that they did not like giving the correct form directly and it was not effective:

...if I correct students' errors directly, it may be discouraging for them, so I generally prefer to make the student find his/her error and correct it because in this way they learn better. For example, a student is telling a story happened in the past, but s/he uses simple present tense. I make the student remember that it happened in the past, s/he should use simple past tense (Int3).

The third most frequent type of correction choice was recast (18.18%). As the reason why they would use recasts to correct vocabulary errors they stated that repeating the correct form would be enough for the students to notice their mistakes and correct it.

As for the vocabulary errors, most of the experienced teachers preferred not to correct them (37.5%). The second most frequent type of correction choice was metalinguistic feedback (35%). The participants preferred to define the meaning of a vocabulary item or ask some yes-no questions to guide the students to the correct use of the word. Explicit correction was the third most common correction type preferred by the experienced teachers (12.5%). The participants stated that this type of correction would be helpful for learners because if there was a vocabulary error, it was generally caused by lack of knowledge: “...most of the time, the students make mistakes because they don't know suitable words for that situation. When they don't know the correct vocabulary item, I must provide the correct version directly (Int8)”.

The majority of the experienced teachers chose not to correct pronunciation errors (30.95%). They expressed that if the utterance was intelligible and the error did not have an effect on the meaning, they would not correct it:

... I don't want my students to feel discouraged because they are making a lot of pronunciation mistakes and if I correct all of them, I will have to interrupt them a lot. Also, their mother tongue is Turkish and pronunciation of some words in English is really difficult for them, so I don't want to push them (Int1).

If we think that the students the experienced teachers currently teach, they are prep class students, and their English level is not high. Most of them are engineering students and they are not good at English. Most of them are graduated from state schools without learning English at all. Therefore, they are not able to pronounce some of the words properly. The second most frequent way of correcting pronunciation errors was reported as explicit correction (26.2%). The participants expressed the importance of explicit correction of pronunciation errors said that it was effective because it was direct and clear for the learners. Elicitation was the third most frequent type of correction when

there was a pronunciation error (11.9%). The participants stated that “...if I can lead to the student to the correct form and s/he finds and produces the correct pronunciation, they feel more confident (Int4)”.

Research Question 3: What are the similarities and differences between novice teachers’ and experienced teachers’ beliefs and stated attitudes about oral corrective feedback?

Similarities Between Beliefs About OCF

The first similarity between novice and experienced teachers in terms of their beliefs about OCF was how they perceived errors. Both groups of the teachers stated that they had a positive attitude toward errors, and they were normal in the language learning process. When they were asked to reflect on how they selected errors to correct, in both groups, the teachers underlined the importance of intelligibility. The main aim of learning and teaching a language was communicating in that language according to all the teachers. Therefore, their main criterion to correct an error was whether it hampered the communication. This is an issue mentioned in some other studies (e.g. Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013; Roothoof, 2014). In these studies, the teachers stated that they will not correct the errors if the erroneous utterance does not cause ambiguity in meaning.

Lastly, one of the most important points emerged from the data collected from the interviews was the sources of the teachers’ beliefs. Even though there was no specific question asking the sources of their beliefs, in both of the groups, while the teachers were talking about the techniques they used in the class in order to correct their students’ errors, they referred to their own learning experiences as learners and they mentioned the techniques that their teachers used while giving feedback to them. One of the experienced teachers stated: “...to be honest, feedback I got from my teachers is more effective on the techniques I use in my teaching to correct errors than what I have learned from books and in my undergraduate education (Int3)” and one of the novice teachers expressed that: “...while giving feedback, I generally model my own teachers. I take feedback given to me into consideration and decide which type of correction was

effective for me and I behave depending on the types that worked for me (Int2)". This finding is in accordance with the findings of Bailey (1996), Numrich (1996), Peacock (2001).

Differences Between Beliefs About OCF

When the interviews were analyzed, it was clear that there were also some differences between experienced and novice teachers' beliefs about OCF. The most important difference between them was that experienced teachers emphasized the importance of individual differences and educational background of the students in almost every question although most of the novice teachers did not mention it. The second difference between these two groups of teachers was the person who would correct the errors (i.e. self-correction, teacher correction or peer correction). All of the novice teachers stated that peer correction was the most effective feedback type. However, the experienced teachers expressed that self-correction was better because if they corrected their mistakes, they would be aware of it anymore. Also, most of them added that peer-correction, especially for their learners (prep class students), may be detrimental to the students' learning because they would not feel comfortable if their friends always corrected them. As for the time of the feedback, most of the novice teachers said that s/he would mostly prefer immediate correction whereas the experienced teachers stated that they would not use immediate correction except the activities focusing on accuracy. Finally, when the teachers were asked to elaborate on the factors affecting on efficiency of OCF, most of the novice teachers articulated student-related factors such as age of the students, level of the students, students' expectations. However, most of the experienced teachers emphasized the teacher-related factors such as teachers' attitude, the relationship between the teacher and the students as well.

Similarities and Differences between Novice and Experienced Teachers' Stated Attitudes about OCF

The results of the SEC Simulation indicate that although there are some similarities between novice and experienced teachers' stated attitudes, there are also some

differences between them. Their stated attitudes in terms of vocabulary errors and pronunciation errors are quite similar. In both types of errors, most of the teachers in both of the groups stated that they would not prefer to correct the errors in vocabulary and pronunciation. In a similar vein, Méndez and Cruz (2012) pointed out that teachers EFL in contexts did not prefer to give corrective feedback especially for vocabulary errors. There are few studies, if any, looking for the particular types of preferred or used correction techniques used by the teachers. However, some studies aim to determine the differential effects of different feedback types on learners' vocabulary knowledge. In one of these studies, Dilan (2010) worked on the impacts of recasts and prompts (i.e. metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, elicitation, repetition) and it is noted that both oral corrective feedback types helped the students improve their vocabulary knowledge; however, the students who were provided with prompts showed more in-depth gains in terms of vocabulary knowledge. In the present study, prompts were preferred to use more frequently, so it might be claimed that the OCF preferences of the teachers in both groups for vocabulary errors might have good impacts on students' vocabulary knowledge.

As for vocabulary errors, the novice teachers' second preference was explicit correction (22%) while the experienced teachers preferred metalinguistic feedback (35%). It can be said that if the novice teachers want to correct a vocabulary error, they preferred to correct it by directly giving the correct answer. On the other hand, if the experienced teachers want to correct a vocabulary error, s/he firstly wants to give some clues about the error and wants to correct the students his or her mistake on her own.

When there was a pronunciation error, in both of the groups no correction ranked first and explicit correction ranked second. It might be because they taught the same learner groups. In other words, in both groups, the teachers stated that they attached importance to pronunciation errors and frequently corrected them. These two types might be really effective on their learner groups, which can be why they were the two most common answers to the pronunciation errors.

When the results are analyzed, it is clear that most of the differences between the novice and experienced teachers' stated OCF attitudes in grammatical errors. Almost half of the experienced teachers (49.1%) preferred not to correct grammatical errors, while the percentage of the novice teachers that would not correct these errors was 20. This result can be supported by the interviews. In the interviews, most of the novice teachers stated that they felt they should correct students' errors, and they generally correct them in order not to cause mislearning. Except for the percentage of the preference for no correction, the types of the feedback they stated to use were different.

CONCLUSION

The aim of the study was to find out the stated beliefs, stated attitudes of novice and experienced teachers about oral corrective feedback (OCF) in a preparatory school and the similarities and differences between them. In order to achieve this goal, some qualitative and quantitative research methods were integrated and used. In the qualitative part of the study, interview questions were prepared. The main function of the interviews was to identify the novice and experienced teachers' beliefs about OCF. As for the quantitative part of the study, Situations for Error Correction (SEC) Simulation was developed. The main aim of this tool was to identify novice and experienced teachers stated attitudes about OCF. The interview questions and the SEC Simulation were piloted independently in order to evaluate their applicability. After the piloting was completed, interviews were carried out with 8 novice and experienced teachers and the SEC Simulation was administered to 20 novice and experienced teachers in the actual study.

Although the novice and experienced teachers' beliefs and stated attitudes about OCF were somewhat similar, there were crucial differences. Firstly, it was surprising that there were a few differences between novice and experienced teachers stated attitudes about OCF. They all answered the SEC Simulation and their answers for vocabulary and pronunciation errors were quite similar. In other words, they preferred to correct these types of errors by using similar OCF types. However, most of the differences were

in the grammatical errors. Although almost half of the experienced teachers did not prefer to correct grammatical errors, the novice teachers' most frequent feedback type to correct them was recast. It can be concluded that grammar is a problematic issue as the participants stated in the interviews too. The place of grammar and how to approach it is not certain. There are various opinions and attitudes toward grammatical errors and the findings is a good indicator of this situation.

As for the novice and experienced teachers' beliefs about OCF, the most obvious difference between them was their overall attitude toward the teaching context. While answering the questions, most of the novice teachers focused on the students. It is something good to try to empathize with the students. However, in some cases, they ignored the importance and effect of the teacher (for example, while they are talking about the factors affecting the efficiency of OCF). Therefore, it might be inferred that gaining experience help teachers deal with teaching context from various aspects. Finally, it can be concluded from the results that experience is an important factor, especially in shaping the beliefs of teachers.

REFERENCES

- Annett, J. (1969). *Feedback and human behaviour: The effects of knowledge of results, incentives and reinforcement on learning and performance*. Penguin Books.
- Bailey, K. M. (1996). The best laid plans: Teachers' in-class decisions to depart from their lesson plans. *Voices from the Language Classroom*, 15-40.
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 243-272. doi:10.1093/applin/25.2.243
- Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Brians, P. (2003). *Common errors in English usage*. Franklin, Beedle & Associates, Inc..
- Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 436-458. doi:10.1177/1362168814563200
- Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors.. *Language learning*, 27(1), 29-46. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1977.tb00290.x
- Clark, C. M. (1984). *Teachers' thought processes* (No. 72). Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.
- Dilans, G. (2010). Corrective feedback and L2 vocabulary development: Prompts and recasts in the adult ESL classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66(6), 787-816. doi:10.3138/cmlr.66.6.787
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Issues and terminology. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, 1-11.
- Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 193-220. doi:10.1177/13621688000400302
- Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research*, 38(1), 47-65. doi:10.1080/0013188960380104
- Fanselow, J. F. (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. *Foreign Language Annals*, 10(5), 583-593. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.1977.tb03035.x
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1977). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Retrieved from <http://books.google.ie/books?id=RbWJrgEACAAJ&dq=The+Discovery+of+Gro>

- unded+Theory:+Strategies+for+Qualitative+Research.&hl=&cd=3&source=gbs_api
- Havranek, G. (2002). When is corrective feedback most likely to succeed?. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3-4), 255-270. doi:10.1016/S0883-0355(03)00004-1
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 62(8), 387-398. doi:10.2307/32617
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use*. Routledge.
- Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7(2), 200-215. doi:10.1017/S0272263100005374
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Permagon.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies In Second Language Acquisition*, 12(4), 429-4. doi:10.1017/S0272263100009517
- Lightbown, P. M., Spada, N., & Spada, N. M. (1999). *How Languages are Learned*. Oxford University Press, USA. Retrieved from [http://books.google.ie/books?id=wlyTbuCsR7wC&dq=Lightbown,+P.+M.,+%26+Spada,+N.+\(1999\).+How+languages+are+learned&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api](http://books.google.ie/books?id=wlyTbuCsR7wC&dq=Lightbown,+P.+M.,+%26+Spada,+N.+(1999).+How+languages+are+learned&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api)
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126-141. doi:10.1093/applin/4.2.126
- Long, M. H. (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). New York: Academic Press.
- Long, M. (2001). Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology. In K. De Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/sibil.2.07lon>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66. doi:10.1017/S0272263197001034

- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265-302. doi:10.1017/S0272263109990520
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1-40. doi:10.1017/S0261444812000365
- Méndez, E. H., & Cruz, M. R. R. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 14(2), 63-75.
- Numrich, C. (1996). On becoming a language teacher: Insights from diary studies. *Tesol Quarterly*, 30(1), 131-153. doi:10.2307/3587610
- Özmen, K. S., & Aydın, H. U. (2015). Examining student teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: Insights from a teacher education program in Turkey. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, 40(12), 141-164. doi:10.14221/ajte.2015v40n12.10
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *Tesol Quarterly*, 36(4), 573-595. doi:10.2307/3588241
- Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning: A longitudinal study. *System*, 29(2), 177-195. doi:10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00010-0
- Roothoof, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System*, 46, 65-79. doi:10.1016/j.system.2014.07.012
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 263-300. doi:10.1191/1362168804lr14
- Swan, M., & Smith, B. (2001). *Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problems* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978) *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Routledge. White, L. (1989). Universal grammar and second language acquisition. *Universal Grammar and Second Language Acquisition*, 1-210.

GENİŞ ÖZET

Amaç

1970lerin ortasından sonra eğitim araştırmacıları öğretmenlerin sınıflarda sadece uzmanların söylediği şeyleri uygulamadığını, onların sınıfı sürekli gözlemleyen, çeşitli durumları tespit edip onları değerlendirip, yorumlayıp uygun kararlar verenlerin öğretmenler olduğunu ortaya çıkardı (Borg, 2015). Öğretmenler pedagoji uzmanları tarafından belirlenen prensip ve teorilerin sadece takipçileri değil (Baştürkmen, Loewen & Ellis, 2004), kompleks sınıf ve okul ortamında akılcı kararlar verip uygulama yetisine sahip profesyonellerdir. Bu doğrultuda, öğretmenlerin sınıfta bireysel ve duyuşsal bir değişken olarak bilişlerinin hata düzeltme tercihleri üzerinde nasıl bir etkiye sahip olduğunun araştırılması kritik bir önem arz etmekte ve bizi öğretmenlerin dil öğretimine ilişkin inançları ile uygulamaları arasındaki ilişkiyi gözlemlemeye yönlendirmektedir. Bu çalışma bir hazırlık okulunda çalışan mesleğe yeni başlamış ve deneyimli öğretmenlerin sözel düzeltici dönüt hakkındaki inançları ve beyan edilmiş tutumlarını ve bu iki grup arasındaki benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Yöntem

Bu amaç doğrultusunda çeşitli nitel ve nicel araştırma teknikleri kullanılmıştır. Nitel araştırma desenine uygun bir şekilde mülakat soruları hazırlanmıştır. Mülakatların amacı mesleğe yeni başlamış ve deneyimli öğretmenlerin sözel düzeltici dönüt hakkındaki inançlarını belirlemektir. Araştırmanın nicel kısmı kapsamında, bir İngilizce öğretmenin herhangi bir dil sınıfında, yaş grubu bağlamında ve yeterlilik düzeyinde karşılaşılabileceği hataları içeren 20 ayrı durumdan meydana gelen Hata Düzeltme Durumları Benzetimi (SEC Simulation) geliştirilmiştir. Bu veri toplama aracının amacı mesleğe yeni başlamış ve deneyimli öğretmenlerin sözel düzeltici dönüt hakkındaki beyan edilmiş tutumlarını belirlemektir. Mülakat soruları ve Hata Düzeltme Durumları Benzetimi (SEC Simulation) uygulanabilirlikleri açısından birbirlerinden bağımsız olarak pilot olarak test edilmiştir. Bu süreçlerden ve pilot çalışmaların tamamlanmasından sonra, asıl çalışma içerisinde mesleğe yeni başlayan ve deneyimli 8 öğretmen ile mülakatlar gerçekleştirilmiştir ve Hata Düzeltme Durumları Benzetimi (SEC Simulation) mesleğe yeni başlamış ve deneyimli 20 öğretmene uygulanmıştır.

Bulgular-Tartışma

Mesleğe yeni başlamış ve deneyimli öğretmenlerin sözel düzeltici dönüte ilişkin inanç ve tutumları arasında bazı benzerlikler olmasına rağmen önemli farklılıklar da bulunmaktadır. İlk olarak, mesleğe yeni başlamış ve deneyimli öğretmenlerin sözel düzeltici dönüte ilişkin beyan edilmiş tutumları arasında sadece birkaç farklılık olması şaşırtıcıdır. Bütün öğretmenler Hata Düzeltme Durumları Benzetimi (SEC Simulation) veri toplama aracı içinde yer alan durumları cevaplamış ve kelime ve telaffuz ile alakalı hataları içeren durumlara verdikleri cevaplar oldukça benzer bulunmuştur. Başka bir deyişle, kelime ve telaffuz ile ilgili hataları benzer sözel düzeltici dönüt çeşitleri kullanarak düzeltmeyi tercih etmişlerdir. Fakat, dil bilgisel hataları düzeltme ile ilgili durumlarda verdikleri cevapların büyük bir kısmı farklılık göstermektedir. Deneyimli öğretmenlerin neredeyse yarısı dil bilgisel hataları düzeltmeyi tercih etmezken mesleğe yeni başlamış öğretmenlerin birçoğunun bu tür hataları düzeltmek için kullanacakları teknik yeniden söyleme (recast) olmuştur. Bu durum Brown (2016), Havranek (2002), Lyster ve Ranta (1997), Panova ve Lyster (2002), Roothoof (2014) ve Sheen'in (2004) bulgularıyla örtüşmektedir. Katılımcıların mülakatlarda da dile getirdiği gibi dil bilgisinin problemleri bir mevzu olduğu

sonucu çıkarılabilir. Dil bilgisinin dil öğretimindeki yeri ve bu konudaki hatalara nasıl yaklaşılacağı ile ilgili belirsizlikler söz konusudur. Dil bilgisi ile alakalı hatalar konusundaki görüşler ve tutumlar birbirinden farklılık göstermektedir ve bu çalışmanın sonuçları da bu durumun iyi bir göstergesidir.

Mesleğe yeni başlamış ve deneyimli öğretmenlerin sözel düzeltici dönüte ilişkin inançları karşılaştırıldığında, aralarındaki en belirgin farklılığın öğretim ortamına karşı genel tutumları olduğu söylenebilir. Durumlara cevap verirken mesleğe yeni başlamış öğretmenlerin çoğu öğrencilere odaklandığını belirtti. Bu çalışmanın bulguları Méndez ve Cruz'un (2012) ve Roothoof'tun (2014) çalışmalarındaki bulgularla uyumludur. Bu iki çalışmadaki katılımcılar da öğrencilerle ilgili faktörlerin öneminden bahsetmiştir.

Sonuç

Bu öğrencilerle empati kurabilme açısından önemli bir özellik olarak karşımıza çıkıyor fakat bazı durumlarda mesleğe yeni başlayan öğretmenlerin, öğretmenin sınıftaki önemi ve etkisini göz ardı ettikleri görünüyor (mesela sözel düzeltici dönütün verimliliğini etkileyen faktörler hakkında konuşurken). Bu sebeple, deneyim kazanmanın öğretmenlerin öğretim ortamını ve içeriğini çeşitli açılardan ele almalarına katkıda bulunduğu sonucuna varılabilir. Son olarak, çalışmanın bulgularına bakılarak deneyimin özellikle öğretmenlerin inançlarını şekillendirmede önemli bir faktör olduğu söylenebilir.

ORCID

Kemal Sinan Özmen  ORCID 0000-0002-4454-235X

Hale Ülkü Aydın  ORCID 0009-0006-9249-378X

Contribution of Researchers

The first author contributed 55% and the second author contributed 45% to this article.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all the student teachers who answered the questions during the data collection process.

Conflict of Interest

The researchers do not have any personal or financial conflicts of interest with other individuals or institutions related to the research.

Ethics Committee Declaration

Before the data collection process started, a consent form was given to each participant, and they were informed about their roles and rights. They all signed the consent form. In the present study, formal ethics committee approval was not required.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: SEC Simulation

Situations for Error Correction (SEC) Simulation

<p>Read the situations below with the following questions in mind:</p> <p>1. What kind of error is that? (Circle the language component or activity type in the boxes given on the right. You can circle more than one item where applicable).</p> <p>2. How and why would you correct the mistake(s). (Please write down your response to the space provided below each situation.)</p>	Grammar	Vocabulary	Pronunciation	Fluency	Accuracy
<p>Age: young learner Level: Elementary</p>	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
<p>1. You are doing a warm-up activity with your class, asking them about their grandparents. One student tells the class “My grandmother is seventeen and three”.</p>					
<i>How and Why to Correct it?</i>					
<p>Age: young learner Level: pre-intermediate</p>	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
<p>2. You have just introduced “his” and “hers” for the first time. You have collected some items belonging to your class on your desk. You ask, picking up some pencils “Whose pencils are these?” A student answers, pointing at the owner of the pencils “They’re him.”</p>					
<i>How and Why to Correct it?</i>					

Age: adolescence Level: intermediate	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
3. Your class is doing an information gap activity in pairs in your speaking class. As you walk around the class and listen to them, you hear that most students cannot pronounce the words ' really ' and ' great ' correctly.					
<i>How and Why to Correct it?</i>					
Age: adults Level: intermediate	GR	VO	PR	FL	AC
4. Your class is working in pairs doing a speaking activity. One student is asking the other to go out for the evening. A student says " I want go to a Chinese restaurant ".					
<i>How and Why to Correct it?</i>					

APPENDIX B: Interview Questions

Interview Questions

1. What is your attitude toward L2 learners' errors?
Dil öğrenen öğrencilerin hatalarına karşı tutumunuz nedir?
2. Should learners' errors be corrected?
Öğrencilerin hataları düzeltilmeli midir?
3. Do you always correct student errors? If not, how do you select errors to correct?
Öğrencilerin hatalarını her zaman düzeltir misiniz? Eğer öyle değilse hangi hataları düzelteceğinizi nasıl seçersiniz?
4. Before the lesson, do you determine which kind of errors or forms you will correct?
Dersten önce hangi tür hataları ya da biçimleri düzelteceğinize karar verir misiniz?
5. How should errors be corrected?
Öğrencilerin hataları nasıl düzeltilmeli?