Research Article

STUDENT TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

ADAY İNGİLİZCE ÖRETMENLERİNİN BAKIŞ AÇISINDAN DÜZELTİCİ GERİBİLDİRİM

Ali REZALOU

Ataturk University, Institute of Educational Science, Erzurum, Turkey

e-mail: dostayanar@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0402-9156

Abstract

This research study compared the student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback in the EFL learning context in the 2018-2019 academic year, spring semester. The participants (n=180, male=67, female=113) in the EFL learning context completed a 20-item questionnaire dealing with various aspects of feedback. Descriptive statistics were used to identify the frequency of participants' responses with different degrees to different aspects indicated by each item and responses were surprisingly interesting. To determine the effects of gender and grade level factors on choosing items, independent sample t-test and one-way ANOVA were used. The results suggest that student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback are not mainly influenced by their genders and grade levels. The results demonstrated student teachers perceived explicit and implicit correction, form-focused correction, and clarification requests positively. It was also indicated that self-correction was preferable to teacher correction and peer-correction. Also, oral corrective feedback was preferred to written corrective feedback. As for the timing, it was found that student teachers preferred delayed corrective feedback to immediate corrective feedback. Recasts were perceived as the second commonly used corrective feedback technique by student teachers. The major conclusion that emerged from this study was the EFL student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback that can be helpful for their initial teaching practices.

Keywords: Students teachers' beliefs, corrective feedback, EFL

Öz

Bu çalışma öğretmen adaylarının 2018-2019 akademik yılında düzeltici geribildirim hakkındaki fikirlerini karşılaştırmıştır. İngilizce Öğretmenliği programında öğrenim gören katılımcılar (n=180, erkek=67, kadın=113), geribildirimin çeşitli yönlerini ele alan 20 maddelik bir anketi cevaplamışlardır. Katılımcıların, her bir maddeye verdiği yanıtlar betimsel istatistikler kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Cinsiyet ve sınıf düzeyi faktörlerinin madde seçimine etkisini belirlemek için ise bağımsız örnekler t-testi ve tek yönlü ANOVA kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar, öğretmen adaylarının düzeltici geribildirim hakkındaki fikirlerinin cinsiyetlerinden ve sınıf seviyelerinden etkilenmediğini göstermektedir. Sonuçlar öğretmen adaylarının açık ve örtük, form odaklı ve açıklama istekli düzeltmeleri olumlu olarak algıladığını da göstermiştir. Kendi kendine düzeltmenin öğretmen düzeltmesine ve akran düzeltmesine tercih edildiği de bir diğer önemli

sonuç olmuştur. Ayrıca sözlü düzeltici geri bildirim, yazılı düzeltici geri bildirime tercih edilmiştir. Geribildirimler zamanlama açısından incelendiğinde, öğretmen adaylarının gecikmeli düzeltici geribildirimi anında düzeltici geribildirime tercih ettikleri görülmüştür. Çalışma kapsamında ayrıca yeniden düzeltme, öğretmen adayları tarafından yaygın olarak kullanılan ikinci düzeltici geribildirim tekniği olarak bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğretmen adaylarının fikirleri, düzeltici geribildirim, ELT

INTRODUCTION

There are different definitions of learners' beliefs in language learning. Wenden (1999), defines learners' beliefs as learners' metacognitive knowledge about language learning. Dörnyei and Ryan (2015, p.187), define learners' beliefs as learners' characteristics that are significant and should be taken into account when explaining learning outcomes. They are highly dynamic and depended on some factors like lerner's, emotional state, situation and can be changed (Barcelos and Kalaja, 2011). It is important for teachers and learners to have a better understanding of these beliefs.

Although there are many studies that investigated student beliefs in relation to language learning, limited investigations have been conducted to focus on learner beliefs in some important areas of language study such as grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary teaching or learning (Loewen *et al*., 2009; Simon and Taverniers, 2011). Therefore, there is more need for these types of important and necessary investigations in the language learning area since they can show learners' thoughts about effective instruction that are helpful and useful for improving learning.

The present study aimed to identify Turkish EFL student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback that is defined as aimed move of any teacher to warn the learner in place of an error (Carroll and Swain, 1993). Knowing learners' thoughts about corrective feedback can help teachers for planning and providing their students' necessary information about accuracy of learners' lexical, grammatical, phonological skills and for considering learners' needs and specific expectations. Error correction can be ineffective or be beneficial for some grammatical structures. Recently, studies have proved the importance and effectiveness of error correction in language learning but there are some obstacles such as teacher inconsistency and unsystematic ways of dealing with errors that prevent error correction from being totally effective. Basturkmen (2012) states if teachers know more about their students' beliefs and preferences, they can understand how to manage unexpected area of teaching such as corrective feedback (CF). If students have understanding of their beliefs about corrective feedback, this may be useful for them to recognize CF and supplied feedback benefits (Basturkmen, 2012). Although studies into students' beliefs about corrective feedback have indicated that students totally see CF favorably, some evidence show some factors like students' language learning and cultural backgrounds have effects on the degree of students' desire for error correction (as cited in Loewen *et al*., 2009; Schulz, 2001; Yang and Kim, 2011) and preferring the type of CF techniques.

Foreign language setting often has an extensive focus on language form, whereas, in a second language setting, the meaning is prioritized to form (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011). This can affect the approaches that teachers choose to CF for addressing every error. Horwitz (1990) and Nunan (1989) stated language learners have the expectation to get feedback in relation to the grammaticality of their interactions that may be resulted in any possible mismatch between teachers' and students' beliefs system. This can be harmful to foreign language learning and can decrease students' motivation. In this paper, the

researcher's main purpose is to provide some essential information in regard to corrective feedback types and analyzing their effects on the foreign language learning process by referring their effectiveness or ineffectiveness. To understand and clarify the effect of context on EFL learners' perceptions about CF, this research firstly identified and secondly compared EFL student teachers' beliefs about CF techniques generally and specifically.

Literature Review

In the process of language learning and acquisition, corrective feedback has an important role. Especially, corrective feedback provides opportunity for language teachers to provide information about students' production accuracy that helps learners to raise their awareness of second language input. According to Ellis (2006), corrective feedback techniques can be divided into two types: first, input-providing and second output-pushing. The first one includes CF techniques (recasts and explicit correction) and provides a target form for correction of an error. The second category of CF techniques warns learners in place of an error and push them for recognizing the purposeful corrective behind the CF and for self-correcting (prompts). These two categories have special effectiveness but prompt generate more learning in compared to recast in the context of learning (Ammar and Spada, 2006; Lyster, 2004).

Horwitz (1987, 1988) introduced learners' beliefs into the second language literature for the first time. He studied the relationship between language learners' attitudes and their second language outcomes and stated that various linguistic, and cultural backgrounds are effective in presenting certain beliefs about language learning. Loewen et al. (2009) studied 754 foreign and second language learners' beliefs about the role of grammar instruction and error correction. Their questionnaire mainly focused on special parts such as the efficacy, role, and importance of grammar, but giving lesser weight to error correction. Learners and teachers have different views about CF. Overall, teachers in compare to the learners tend to provide fewer corrections.

Schulz (1996) in his study, compared 824 American FL students and 92 teachers' responses. His findings showed that although each group emphasized on the importance of correction on written errors similarly, their beliefs about oral feedback varied unbelievably and all students strongly preferred using feedback for spoken errors (90%), but it was not important for most of the teachers (70%). With paying attention to the role of context in learning, limited studies were conducted to understand learners' feedback preferences in different settings. The best example of this is the study conducted by Loewen *et al.* (2009). In their study, there is an attempt for reporting English learners' beliefs mainly Korean and Chinese that negatively perceived the corrective feedback and accuracy in grammar. Nearly, 81% of English learners of foreign languages (e.g., Arabic, Chinese, Spanish) preferred feedback and emphasized the need for grammatical accuracy in language learning.

Lastly, there are not more studies in relation to learners' beliefs about specific CF techniques. Based on the findings, some language learners emphasized correcting their errors through prompts (Yoshida, 2008) and other learners especially high level learners preferred recasts techniques (Brown, 2009). Lyster *et al.* (1999), stated that corrective feedback on errors could be provided in different ways. Hence, researchers still face the dilemma of choosing effective CF techniques in the classroom setting. It is not easy to make a decision for choosing the best feedback type for all contexts. Therefore, there are still debates over what sorts of CF are more effective in the classroom setting. In fact, it is not available any 'ideal corrective feedback recipe' (Guénette, 2007). Since the

numerous variables mediate feedback effectiveness, research examining corrective feedback effectiveness is still inconclusive (Lyster and Saito, 2010; Russell, 2009). Since learners' responses types to corrective feedback are different, Ellis (2009) and Lyster and Saito (2010) recommend us that a wide sort of corrective feedback techniques to the particular learners' cognitive, and affective needs should be adapted and adjusted flexibly by the teachers. By considering the above-mentioned points, the researcher attempted to respond to three questions in this study:

Research question 1. What do EFL student teachers believe about corrective feedback?

Research question 2. Do EFL student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback differ significantly according to their gender?

Research question 3. Do EFL student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback differ significantly according to their grade level?

METHOD

Participants

The current study was conducted at the English Language Teaching Department, Faculty of Education, Atatürk University, Turkey in the 2018-2019 academic year. A total of 180 EFL student teachers from the first-year, second-year, third-year, and fourth-year (113 females, 67 males, mean age: 21years) participated in the present study. All subjects were ELT students that were enrolled in a four-years teacher education program to become EFL teachers in the future.

Data Collection Instrument and Procedure

The participants completed a closed-ended questionnaire that consisted of 20 items about corrective feedback. This survey examined the EFL student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback in the FL classroom setting. In this study, the researcher used "EFL student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback" questionnaire (r=0.88) that was developed by Karavas-Doukas (1996) and was adapted by Agudo (2014). The participants were asked to express their intended responses to the statements through a five point Likert scale from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Data Analysis

In this part, the researcher analyzed the main findings of obtained data considering research questions. Due to the Shapiro-Wilk (W(180)= 0.98, p= 0.157) test, it was determined that data showed normal distribution. Therefore, the researcher used parametric tests in data analysis process. To respond to the first question of the study, descriptive statistics, frequency analysis, for the second and third research questions respectively an independent samples t-test and one-way ANOVA were used by the researcher.

RESULTS

To answer the first question, the number of respondents who expressed their agreement or disagreement to different degrees for each item in the survey was quantified and then these responses were analyzed. The results of the data analysis and percentages on an item basis are as follows:

Table 1.
Frequency of EFL Student Teachers' Beliefs About Corrective Feedback

	Items	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Undecided (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
1	Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.	8.3	28.3	21.7	37.2	4.4
2	Form-focused correction helps students to improve their grammatical knowledge.	2.8	2.8	18.9	63.9	11.7
3	Teachers' feedback must focus on the appropriateness and not in the linguistic form of the student's speech (oral or written).	5.0	26.1	31.1	26.7	11.1
4	Since errors are a normal part of learning, much correction is a waste of time.	5.6	20.0	22.8	35.0	16.7
5	If grammatical errors are not corrected, this will result in imperfect learning.	3.9	8.3	10.0	53.3	24.4
6	Teachers should correct all the grammatical errors students make.	11.1	28.9	26.7	25.0	8.3
7	Teachers should only correct some mistakes students make in order not to discourage them.	3.9	16.1	15.6	45.6	18.9
8	All grammatical errors should be corrected in the students' written work.	3.3	11.7	11.7	51.1	22.2
9	Teachers should let the learners self-correct rather than correct the errors themselves.	3.3	9.4	11.1	50.6	25.6
10	Teachers should prompt their learners to self-correct.	0.6	4.4	13.9	52.2	28.9
11	Self-correction reduces the stress and anxiety among learners.	0.6	2.8	13.9	45.6	37.2
12	Peer-correction is more facilitative than teacher correction.	2.8	8.9	32.2	36.1	20.0
13	Peer-correction brings less anxiety in comparison to teacher correction.	1.7	6.1	21.1	44.4	26.7
14	Teachers should reformulate students' errors by correcting the erroneous part themselves and give them as corrective feedback.	1.1	3.3	21.1	55.0	19.4
15	Telling the learner there is an error and vocally stressing the correct form helps learners notice the difference between what they know, and what they don't know in a L2/FL.	0.0	2.8	22.2	55.0	20.0
16	Teachers should give metalinguistic feedback, i.e. use grammatical terms such as past, present, future, adjective, verb...in their corrective feedback.	1.7	3.9	25.0	55.0	14.4

17	Teachers should ask for clarification when an error arises through clarification requests such as 'I don't know what you mean.'	1.1	6.7	26.1	49.4	16.7
18	Teachers should correct all the learners' errors immediately after the error has been made.	14.4	26.1	27.8	25.0	6.7
19	Teachers should postpone their error correction to the end of the class.	15.6	24.4	25.0	28.3	6.7
20	Teachers should provide learners with oral rather than written corrective feedback.	2.2	14.4	40.6	31.7	11.1

Looking at data presented in Table 1 we can see there is a high level of agreement (strongly agree and agree) in several statements. Thus, while 41.6% of the respondents expressed their disagreement with the idea that language performance should be mainly judged on grammatical correctness (item1), by contrast, we can see nearly 75.6% of the participants remarked their agreement about the importance and effectiveness of form-focused correction for improvement of grammatical accuracy (item 2).

Current views on second and foreign language teaching methodology put emphasis on the importance of form-focused instruction within the communicative perspective since a lack of focus on the form can produce permanent errors. In this regard, nearly half of the respondents (51.7%) expressed that over-correction was a waste of time (item 4), but nearly more than two-thirds of the participants (77.7%) thought that error treatment was necessary and helpful. It can be understood if the errors were left uncorrected; this would likely result in imperfect learning (item 5).

In relation to the argument about whether errors should be corrected or not the results are interesting. While only one-third of the participants (33.3%) expressed their agreement on the necessity of correcting all grammatical errors (item 6), nearly two-thirds of the respondents (64.5%) thought, in contrast, that only some mistakes should be corrected in order not to discourage students (item 7). However, the majority of the participants (namely, 73.3%) recognized and emphasized correcting all grammatical errors in the students' written work (item 8).

To answer the issue: who should do the correcting? The results revealed that 76.20% of the respondents expressed their agreement on the effectiveness of self-correction in comparison to teacher- correction (item 9) and nearly more than half of the participants (56.1%) thought that peer-correction is more efficient than teacher-correction (item 12). Furthermore, a high percentage of participants (82.8%) believed that self-correction would make a better contribution to reducing learners' stress and anxiety (item 11) in opposition to peer-correction (71.1%) (item 13). In this way, most participants (namely, 81.10%) thought that self-correction should be encouraged among students (item 10). In other words, the resulting data suggest that self-correction seems to be preferable to teacher correction and peer-correction.

Regarding the corrective feedback strategy type which is the most effective, we can see that more than half of the respondents similarly preferred explicit and implicit strategies. In other words, more than two-thirds of the participants (namely, 75.00%) agreed on explicit correction (item 15), and this followed by metalinguistic explanations (statement 16) which also received a high percentage (69.4%), recasts (74.4% — item 14) and clarification requests (66.1% — item 17). Therefore, the results reveal that explicit

corrective feedback strategies received high levels of acceptance for at least this sample of the population.

With regard to the best timing for corrective feedback, we can see similar results. While nearly one-third of the respondents (31.7%) highlighted their agreement with the choice of immediate correction of the students' erroneous utterances (item 18), similarly 35.0% of the participants preferred delaying the correction to the end of the class (item 19). Consequently, it can be concluded that delayed corrective feedback seems to be preferable to immediate corrective feedback. It must also be added that specifically 42.8% of the respondents preferred oral to written corrective feedback (item 20) and 37.8% of participants emphasized the teachers' focus on the appropriateness (oral or written) (item 3).

Table 2.
The Effect of Gender Factor on Preferring Items

Gender	N	$\overline{X}$	SS	sd	t	p
Male	67	3.53	.24	.177	-.977	.330
Female	113	3.58	.33			

In response to the second question, an independent samples t-test (t= .97, df=177, p= 0.330) was conducted between males and females to compare their beliefs about corrective feedback. As indicated in Table 2 there was not a significant difference between males' and females' beliefs about corrective feedback. Therefore, based on the result, we can not see the impact of gender factor on expressing student teachers' beliefs.

Table 3.
The Effect of Grade Level Factor on Preferring Items

Dimension	Grade I	N	$\overline{X}$	SS	F	p
	A	68	3.5	.27	.723	.540
Corrective	B	23	3.4	.32		
feedback	C	42	3.6	.34		
	D	47	3.5	.29		
	Total	180	3.5	.30		

To answer the third question, as shown in table 3 the results indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference between grade levels (class) of student teachers in beliefs about corrective feedback as determined by one-way ANOVA (F= .723, p= .54). Thus, we did not see the impact of grade-level factor on preferring any type of corrective feedback. Regarding the second and the third question in this study, we can conclude that the gender and grade level of student teachers had not affected expressing their beliefs about corrective feedback.

DISCUSSION

The main purpose of the current study was to identify and manage a variety of CFs techniques in EFL classroom from the student teachers' perspectives. For such intentions, the study investigated the topic of "Corrective Feedback" from the perspective of a sample of EFL learners. Despite the students' learning contexts, the results suggest

that these English learners understand the importance of corrective feedback and the types of error correction techniques they want to be used in the classroom. In addition, learners can distinguish various corrective feedback techniques like recasts and prompts. From one side, they have expectations from the teacher to prepare the correct form in response to errors and from other side they do self-correction that is prompted by teachers' cues, comment, and linguistic information in their language learning processes.

The importance of corrective feedback in language learning cannot be neglected. As reported in some previous researches, in general learners prefer correcting their errors rather than ignoring them. In fact, this is true in two different contexts: second language learning context (as cited in Cathcart and Olsen, 1976; Chenoweth, Day, Chun, and Luppescu, 1983; Jean and Simard, 2011) and similarly in foreign language learning context. In this study that was conducted in the EFL context more than two-thirds of the participants (77.7%) thought that error treatment was necessary and helpful. It means that the errors should not be left uncorrected; otherwise, this would likely result in imperfect learning (item 5).

Another interesting similarity is that specifically 42.8% of the respondents preferred oral corrective feedback to written corrective feedback (item 20). In Quebec we can see this opinion easily among ESL learners, 54% of learners desired to correct oral errors every time and nearly 41% of learners expressed the necessity of feedback only in the situation that they cannot understand by themselves (Jean and Simard, 2011, p. 474). According to some researchers'suggestions, learning in the second language environment is more influential in predicting positive attitudes toward teaching grammar, and CF (Schulz, 2001). As presented by Loewen *et al.* (2009), ESL learners immersing in the target language learning context, had more attention to communication and had negative attitudes towards learning grammar, corrective feedback and were not really worried about accuracy. On the other hand, EFL students (learning Arabic, Chinese, or other foreign languages in USA) were completely dependent on grammar learning and receiving corrective feedback and had positive attitudes toward grammar and CF. Results of the current study indicate that language learning background played a major role in EFL learners' reliance on learning grammar rules and receiving CF. In this study, nearly 75.6% of the participants expressed the importance and effectiveness of form-focused correction for improvement of grammatical accuracy (item 2). Additionally, the majority of the participants (namely, 73.3%) recognized correcting all grammatical errors in the students' written work (item 8).

The results of the current study revealed that 76.20% of the participants expressed the effectiveness of self-correction in comparison to teacher- correction (item 9). Nearly more than half of the participants (56.1%) showed their agreement adversely that peer-correction is more efficient than teacher-correction (item 12). Furthermore, a high percentage of participants (82.8%) believed that self- correction would make a better contribution to reducing learners' stress and anxiety (item 11) as opposed to peer-correction (71.1%) (item 13). In this way, most participants (namely, 81.10%) thought encouraging self-correction among students (item 10).These results are in line with Yoshida's (2008) study in which the seven Australian learners of Japanese emphasized self-correct instead of correcting errors by recasts. Also, we can see this case in the other study (Mohamed Hassan Mohamed, 2011). Participants of the study were 25 French teachers and 175 French learners in Egypt. His findings indicated that teachers preferred recast techniques for correcting their students' spoken errors, but conversely, the students favored prompt instead.

The participants also expressed a preference for recasts. The reason for preferring recasts may be for being the only method to address students' errors in the classroom context, or in the situation that there is not any correction as the desired corrective feedback technique. The current study results indicated that recasts received a high percentage (74.4% - item 14) of learners as the second commonly used CF technique in this study. In line with the results of this study, in researches in different contexts and languages (Lochtman, 2002; Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Panova and Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004, 2006; Slimani, 1991), recasts have been defined as the best CF method.

According to the results, the explicit correction technique was perceived positively by participants since they think teachers through explicit correction indicated clearly the errors and then presented appropriate explanations for identified errors. This is in line with many studies. According to Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006), explicit error correction produces more effective results. Lee (2013), by examining learners' and teachers' feedback preferences found that learners expressed getting explicit feedback during the conversation. Rassaei (2013), focusing on students' perceptions in regard to explicit correction and recasts, stated that participants had positive perceptions of explicit correction. Reviewing all mentioned studies, similarly, this study indicated that student teachers had a positive perception of explicit correction.

The other important side of findings in this study is about clarification requests. The results revealed that more than half of the students (66.1% - item 17) had positive beliefs about clarification requests. Similar studies demonstrated a clarification request as one of the most preferred feedback type (Panova and Lyster, 2002). As Ammar and Spada (2006) concluded in the other study, clarification request is more influential in comparison to explicit correction and recasts since it provides an opportunity for the learner to perform self-correction.

Meta-linguistic feedback as an effective technique has provided positive results in many studies. The findings of Rassaei and Moinzadeh's (2012) study on learners' perceptions of recasts and metalinguistics feedback are the best evidence of producing more accurate sentences by learners when they receive meta-linguistic feedback. Therefore, they preferred receiving metalinguistic feedback to recasts feedback. It should be mentioned that in this study metalinguistic explanations (statement 16) received a high percentage (69.4%).

The timing of CF is a controversial topic. Different scholars have put forward different approaches. Long (1997) recommends delayed feedback for teachers to prevent interrupting the communication flow, but Doughty (2001) emphasizes providing immediate feedback for teachers to give learners the opportunity for comparing the erroneous form with the correct form. In any case, there is not a focus on this topic from the learners' perspectives for timing of CF. Regarding the classification of immediate and delayed feedback, the results showed that nearly 31.7% of respondents preferred immediate correction of the students' erroneous utterances (item 18) and 35.0% of the participants preferred delaying the correction to the end of the class (item 19). Therefore, it can be concluded that delayed corrective feedback seems to be preferable to immediate corrective feedback in this study. There is a parallelism between the findings of the current study and Zhang and Rahimi's (2014) study that demonstrated highly preference of receiving feedback by learners after finishing their utterances. In fact, immediate feedback is perceived negatively by learners because the interruptions by teachers discourage learners to participate in further activities.

In relation to the effects of gender factor on preferring CF techniques, some researchers (e.g., Bernat and Lloyd, 2007; Rifkin, 2000; Tercanlıoğlu, 2005) have argued that not only gender but other factors such as age, context, personality, intelligence, motivation, anxiety, self-efficacy, and many others, can affect expressed beliefs. In addition, currently, we can not see more studies that investigated male and female beliefs about language learning, and the results are not consistent. Jean and Simard (2011) in their study, tried to measure the impact of gender on a specific area of language learning. They found that the females were more receptive to grammar instruction and error correction than the males. In the current study, we did not see the impact of gender factor on preferring CF techniques.

There is evidence that learners with different proficiencies prefer types of CF strategies in different ways. According to Ammar and Spada's (2006) study conducted for young English learners in Quebec, the feedback effectiveness depended mostly on the student's proficiency level. Based on the findings of their study, high-level students benefited equally from prompts and recast techniques, but low-level students preferred more prompts to recasts. In a similar way, Brown's (2009) study of older learners revealed that learners with high proficiency preferred implicit feedback types that promoted self-correction among old learners. Also, there is evidence that language learning experience can affect learners' beliefs in the language learning process (Banya and Chen, 1997, cited in Bernat and Lloyd, 2007). The findings of the current study showed that grade level factor did not have an impact on preferring any type of CF. Thus, the result is not in line with the mentioned studies. Finally, we can conclude that the gender and grade level of student teachers were not effective in expressing their beliefs about corrective feedback.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this study, EFL student teachers' thoughts about the effectiveness of corrective feedback were revealed. Summarizing the results, we can say that form-focused correction, especially in the students' written work is needed for improvement of grammatical accuracy. In this study, the findings showed that students should be encouraged to self-correction when they make errors. In other words, it seems that self-correction was preferable to teacher correction and peer-correction. Additionally, the results indicated that explicit corrective feedback techniques received high levels of acceptance for this sample of the population in the current study. Concerning timing for corrective feedback, delayed corrective feedback was preferable to immediate corrective feedback. Besides, this study found evidence of the emotional influence derived from the corrective feedback process which makes learners find oral corrective feedback more preferable than the written corrective feedback.

This paper also invites teacher educators to consider how EFL student teachers' beliefs have an influence on the process of learning to teach, their professional identity and classroom instructional decisions and actions. Accordingly, influencing students' beliefs about foreign language (FL) learning and teaching today should become a primary goal of the FL teacher education system to improve FL language pedagogy. Caution should be considered for generalizing the current findings beyond this research population sample, or other wider populations. Considering the limited size of the current study and findings evidently, replication on a larger sample and in different teaching contexts is necessary. For conducting future studies in this field, a larger number of participants and the inclusive questionnaires containing open-ended questions in the research instrument can also be considered. In addition, other research instruments such

as interviews can be used for gathering additional data. Despite the importance of researching EFL student teachers' beliefs in the field of FL teaching, few studies have been conducted so far to explore their beliefs about the effectiveness of corrective feedback (Baleghizadeh and Rezaef, 2010). Further research is actually needed to investigate the connection between teachers' expressed thoughts and their observed instructional practicesin the classroom.

In addition, more longitudinal studies of language teacher cognition in both pre-service and in-service teacher education contexts are actually needed (Borg, 2003). Another aspect of this study that can be highly hopeful that is the student teachers' beliefs can be compared to more experienced teachers' beliefs about different areas of language learning and teaching. There has been little research into the extent to which teacher education does actually impact in some ways on the beliefs of prospective teachers. Therefore, future studies might also examine how teacher training courses may shape or modify the prospective teachers' beliefs concerning other areas of language instruction. Finally, these studies should be carried out among other age groups, and target languages.

REFERENCES

Ammar, A. and Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(4), 543-574.

Agudo, J. (2014). "Beliefs in learning to teach: EFL student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback." In *English as a foreign language teacher education*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill | Rodopi.

Baleghizadeh, S. and Rezaef, S. (2010). Pre-service teacher cognition on corrective feedback: A case study, *Journal of Technology and Education 4*(4), 321-327.

Barcelos, A.M.F. and Kalaja, P. (2011). Introduction to beliefs about SLA revisited. *System*, *39*(3), 281-289.

Basturkmen H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *System*, *40*(2), 282-295.

Bernat, E. and Lloyd, R. (2007). Exploring the gender effect on EFL learners` beliefs about language learning. *Australian Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, *7,* 79-91.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching 36*(2), 81-109.

Brown, A. (2009). Students and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal*, *93*(1), 46-60.

Carroll, S. and Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *15,* 357-386.

Cathcart, R.L. and Olsen, J.E.W.B. (1976). Teachers' and students' preferences for correction of classroom conversation errors. In J.F. Fanselow and R.H. Crymes (Eds.), On *TESOL* '76 (pp. 41-53). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Chenoweth, N.A., Day, R.R., Chun, A.E. and Luppescu, S. (1983). Attitudes and preferences of ESL students to error correction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6(1), 79-87.

Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206-57). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rezalou, A. (2020). Student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. *416-430*.

Dörnyei, Z. and Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA Review*, *19,* 18-41.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development, *L2 Journal, 1*(1), 3-18.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S. and Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *28,* 339-368.

Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing, *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16,* 40-53.

Horwitz, E.K. (1987). Surveying student beliefs about language teaming. In A.L. Wenden and J. Robin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 119-132). London, England: Prentice-Hall.

Horwitz, E.K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *Modern Language Journal*, *72*(3), 283-294.

Horwitz, E.K. (1990). Attending to the affective domain in the foreign language classroom. In S. Magnan (Ed.), *shifting the instructional focus to the learner* (pp. 15-33). Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Middlebury, VT.

Kalaja, P. and Barcelos, A.M.F. (2003). *Beliefs about SLA: New research approaches*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach, *ELT Journal, 50*(3), 187–198.

Lee, E.J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, *41,* 217-230.

Lochtman, K. (2002). Oral corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom: How it affects interaction in analytic foreign language teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3), 271-283.

Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S. and Chen, X. (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *93,* 91-104.

Long, M.H. (1997). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C. Ritchie and T.K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts on form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26*(3), 399-432.

Lyster, R. and Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(1), 37-61.

Lyster, R., P. M. Lightbown and N. Spada (1999). A response to Truscott's 'What's wrong with oral grammar correction'?, *Canadian Modern Language Review* 55 (4): 457-467.

Lyster, R. and Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 265-302.

Mohamed Hassan Mohamed, R. (2011). *Les croyances des enseignants et des apprenants adultes quant à la rétroaction corrective à l'oral et la pratique réelle en classe de français langue étrangère en Égypte* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Montreal.

Nassaji, H. and Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating Form- Focused Instruction in communicative context*. London, England: Routledge.

Nunan, D. (1989). Hidden agendas: The role of the learner in programme implementation. In R. Johnson (eE.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 176-186). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Panova, I. and Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *36*(4), 573-595.

Rassaei, E. (2013). Corrective feedback, learners' perceptions, and second language development. *System*, *41,* 472-483.

Rassaei, E. and Moinzadeh, A. (2012). Effects of recasts and metalinguistic corrective feedback on the acquisition of implicit and explicit L2 knowledge. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, *2*(1), 144-156.

Rifkin, B. (2000). Revising beliefs about foreign language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, *33*(4), 394-420.

Schulz, R.A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: students'and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, *29*(3), 343-364.

Schulz, R.A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA — Columbia. *The Modern Language Journal*, *85*(2), 244-258.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, *8,* 263-300.

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research*, *10*(4), 361-392.

Simon, E. and Taverniers, M. (2011). Advanced EFL learners` beliefs about language learning and teaching: A comparison between grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. *English Studies*, *92*(8), 896-922.

Slimani, A. (1991). Evaluation of classroom interaction. In C. Anderson and A. Berretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 197-220). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Tercanlıoğlu, L. (2005). Pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about foreign language learning and how they relate to gender. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, *5*(31), 145- 162.

Wenden, A. (1999). An introduction to metacognitive knowledge and beliefs in language learning: Beyond the basics. *System*, *27,* 435-441.

Yang, J.S. and Kim, T.Y. (2011). Sociocultural analysis of second language learner beliefs: a qualitative case study of two study-abroad ESL learners. *System*, *39*(3), 325-334.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference for corrective-feedback types. *Language Awareness*, *17*(1), 78-93.

Zhang, L.J. and Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes. *System*, *42,* 429-439.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Amaç

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, farklı düzeltici geribildirim (DG) türlerinin yabancı dil öğrenimi üzerindeki etkilerini çeşitli yönlerden analiz etmektir.

Yöntem

Bu amaçla araştırma kapsamında ilk olarak İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının belirli geri bildirim tekniklerine ilişkin fikirleri belirlenmiş ve akabinde karşılaştırılmıştır. Araştırmanın verileri, Atatürk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği programında 2018-2019 eğitim-öğretim yılı bahar döneminde öğrenim gören öğrencilerden toplanmıştır. Çalışmaya birinci, ikinci, üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıftan (113 kız, 67 erkek, yaş ortalaması: 21) toplam 180 İngilizce öğretmeni adayı katılmıştır. Katılımcılara, düzeltici geribildirimle ilgili 20 maddeden oluşan kapalı uçlu bir anket uygulanmıştır. Bu anket ile İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının yabancı dil sınıf ortamında düzeltici geribildirim hakkındaki fikirlerini araştırılmıştır. Normal dağılım gösteren verilerin analizinde parametrik testler kullanılmıştır. Araştırmacı tarafından ilk araştırma sorusuna yanıt bulmak için betimsel istatistikler, frekans analizi; ikinci ve üçüncü araştırma soruları için sırasıyla bağımsız örneklemler t-testi ve tek yönlü ANOVA testi kullanılmıştır.

Bulgular, Tartışma ve Sonuç

Katılımcıların çoğu form odaklı düzeltmenin etkililiği konusunda hemfikir olduklarını belirtmişlerdir. Bu bağlamda, katılımcıların üçte ikisinden fazlası hata düzetilmesinin gerekli ve yardımcı olduğunu düşünmektedir. Hataların düzeltilmesi gerekip gerekmediği konusunda katılımcıların yalnızca üçte biri tüm dilbilgisi hatalarının düzeltilmesi gerektiğini kabul ederken, yanıt verenlerin yaklaşık üçte ikisi bunun tersine, öğrencilerin cesaretini kırmamak için sadece bazı hataların düzeltilmesi gerektiğini düşündüklerini belirtmişlerdir. Ayrıca, katılımcıların çoğunluğu yazılı çalışmalarda tüm dilbilgisi hatalarının düzeltilmesi gerektiğini ifade etmişlerdir. Katılımcıların üçte ikisi öğretmen düzeltmesine kıyasla kendi kendine düzeltmenin etkililiği konusunda hemfikir olduklarını belirtirken yine yarısından fazlası ise, akran düzeltmesinin öğretmen düzeltmesinden daha etkili olduğu fikrine katılmamıştır. Buna rağmen, çoğu katılımcı öğrencilerin kendi kendini düzeltmesinin teşvik edilmesi gerektiğini düşünmektedir. Benzer şekilde katılımcıların üçte ikisinden fazlası açık düzeltme konusunda hemfikirdir. Bu bulgulardan hareketle, açık düzeltici geribildirim stratejilerinin, en azından, bu örneklem için yüksek düzeyde kabul gördüğü söylenebilir. Düzeltici geribildirim zamanlamasıyla ilgili olarak da benzer sonuçlar görülmektedir. Çalışmaya katılanların yaklaşık üçte biri öğrencilerin hatalı ifadelerinin derhal düzeltilmesi gerektiğine katıldıklarını vurgularken, katılımcıların çoğu düzeltmeyi sınıfın sonuna kadar ertelemeyi tercih etmiştir. Buradan hareketle, gecikmiş düzeltici geribildirimin, anında düzeltici geri bildirime tercih edilebilir göründüğü sonucuna varılabilir. Ayrıca, katılımcılar yazılı düzeltici geribildirim yerine sözlü geri bildirimi tercih etmişlerdir. Araştırmanın ikinci ve üçüncü soruları ile araştırılması amaçlanan cinsiyet ve sınıf düzeyinin öğretmen adaylarının düzeltici geribildirim hakkındaki fikirlerini ifade etmelerinde bir etkisi olup olmadığı sorusunun yanıtı ise bu değişkenlerin DG üzerinde önemli bir etkisinin olmadığıdır. Düzeltici Geribildirim konusunu Türk İngilizce öğrenicileri perspektifinden

429

araştıran bu çalışmanın bulguları DG'in önemli olduğunu ve hata düzeltme türleri arasında önemli farklılıkların olduğunu göstermektedir. Özetle öğrencilerin çeşitli DG tekniklerinin farkında oldukları görülmüştür. Öğrenciler, bazen öğretmenden bir hataya yanıt olarak doğru formu sağlama beklentileri varken bazen de öğretmenden gelecek bir ipucu, yorum veyahut da cesaretlendirici bir söz ile kendi kendini düzeltme becerisine sahiptirler. Benzer olarak önceki araştırmalar da öğrencilerin genellikle hatalarının göz ardı edilmek yerine düzeltilmesini tercih ettiklerini göstermiştir. Böylece bu netice çalışmamız kapsamında bir kez daha doğrulanmıştır. Tüm bu sonuçlar hataların düzeltilmeden bırakılmaması gerektiği anlamına gelir, aksi takdirde bu muhtemelen kusurlu öğrenmeye neden olur. Katılımcılar ayrıca yeniden düzeltme tekniğini tercih ettiklerini ifade etmişlerdir. DG tipi olarak yeniden düzeltme tercihi, katılımcıların sınıftaki hatalarını ele almak için tek yöntem olarak veya düzeltmenin olmaması durumunda istenen DG tekniği olarak görülebilir. Bu çalışmada yeniden düzeltme tekniğinin yaygın olarak kullanılan ikinci DG tekniği olduğu da bir başka sonuç olarak karşımıza çıkmıştır. Çalışmanın diğer bir önemli bulgusu ise açıklama talepleridir. Öğrencilerin yarısından fazlasının açıklama talepleri konusunda olumlu görüşe sahip oldukları ortaya çıkmıştır. Meta-dilbilimsel geribildirim tekniğinin etkililiği, olumlu sonuçlar elde edilmiş birçok çalışmanın konusu olmuştur. Bu çalışmada da dilbilimsel açıklamaların yüksek bir kabul düzeyi aldığı görülmüştür. Diğer yandan düzeltici geribildirimin zamanlaması da tartışmalı bir konudur ve bu çalışmada, gecikmiş düzeltici geri bildirimin, acil düzeltici geri bildirime tercih edildiği belirlenmiştir. Bu sonuç, öğrencilerin ifadelerini bitirdikten sonra geribildirim almayı daha çok tercih ettiklerini göstermektedir. Günümüzde dil öğrenimiyle ilgili erkek ve kadın görüşlerini araştıran yeterli sayıda araştırma bulunmamaktadır. Bu çalışma ile cinsiyet değişkeninin DG tekniklerinin tercih edilmesi üzerinde herhangi önemli bir etkisinin olmadığı da görülmüştür. Bu çalışma aynı zamanda öğretmen eğitimcilerinin, İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının DG hakkındaki fikirlerinin öğrenme sürecini nasıl etkilediğini ve böylece onların sınıftaki öğretim kararlarını ve eylemlerini nasıl alabileceklerini anlamalarına yardımcı olacaktır. Zira öğrencilerin bugün yabancı dil öğrenme ve öğretme konusundaki fikirlerini etkilemek, yabancı dil pedagojisini geliştirmek, yabancı dil öğretmeni eğitim sisteminin birincil hedefi haline gelmelidir. Son olarak, bu alanda yapılacak ilerdeki çalışmalar için, daha fazla sayıda katılımcı düşünülebilir. Ek olarak, açık uçlu sorular içeren anketler, görüşmeler gibi diğer araştırma araçları da farklı veri toplamak için kullanılabilir. Bu tür çalışmalar yabancı dil alanı adına umut verici olabilir çünkü öğretmen adaylarının fikirleri, farklı dil öğrenme ve öğretme alanlarına ilişkin daha deneyimli öğretmenlerin fikirleri ile karşılaştırılabilir. Bu nedenle, gelecekteki araştırmalar, öğretmen yetiştirme kurslarının, öğretmen adaylarının diğer dil öğretim alanlarına ilişkin fikirlerini nasıl şekillendirebileceğini veya değiştirebileceğini de inceleyebilir. Son olarak, öğretmen adaylarının DG hakkındaki fikirlerine ilişkin gelecekteki çalışmalar diğer yaş gruplarını ve hedef dilleri araştırmalıdır. DG fikirleri ile öğrenme sonuçları arasındaki herhangi bir bağlantı da dikkate alınmalıdır.