UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES

TEACHERS' PRACTICES AND BELIEFS REGARDING CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN EFL CLASSROOM

MA thesis

KETLIN VESSART
SUPERVISOR: *Lect.* REELI TORN-LEESIK, PhD

TARTU
2021

ABSTRACT

Making errors is considered a normal occurrence in the process of language learning, which teachers are expected to guide and support by providing suitable and beneficial guidance and error correction. Although teacher training programmes prepare the teachers for such situations, best practices and beliefs are only developed through time and classroom experience. The aim of this MA thesis is to analyse the practices and beliefs of two experienced EFL teachers in Estonia regarding oral corrective feedback.

The thesis consists of introduction, two main chapters, conclusion, a list of references and two appendices. The first chapter provides an overview of the theoretical background and some prior research done in the field, answering the questions of when, how and by whom should oral corrective feedback be provided. The second chapter describes the participants, data collection and analysis methodology of the study before presenting the main findings and suggestions for further research. The analysis indicates that teachers combine different corrective feedback strategies in their classroom practice with minor differences in fluency and accuracy work, and their beliefs are quite consistent with the observed practices.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CA – conversation analysis

CF – corrective feedback

CEFR – Common European Framework of References for Languages

EFL – English as a foreign language

IRF – initiation-response-feedback

L1 – first language

L2 – second language

SLA – second language acquisition

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

It is a well-known fact that being successful in language teaching requires a lot more than speaking the language, and there are several aspects to language acquisition. Although current technology with its language-learning applications and the wide range of possibilities to travel and experience different cultures offer plenty of possibilities for independent language learning, our society still values the work of a qualified teacher. Teacher training programmes provide primary knowledge and skills for working in a classroom. However, best practices and beliefs are developed only through time and classroom experience.

Feedback is an important part of teaching and learning a language that fosters learner motivation and encourages linguistic accuracy (Ellis 2009). Positive feedback, such as praise and conversational encouragement, indicates to the learner that their response to an activity is correct and the teacher is listening with interest. However, learners are bound to make mistakes and errors in the learning process as a natural part of language learning, and nowadays most scholars believe that they should be corrected (Sheen 2011: 39). Commonly, researchers distinguish between a mistake and an error (Edge and Harmer 2015: 155, Ellis 2009: 6). Mistakes in language learning generally occur because of the learner having trouble processing new information and limitations in memory, yet they are able to correct it themselves once it is pointed out to them. An error is a mistake that the learner cannot correct themselves as they lack the necessary knowledge for doing so. As mistakes are often considered a performance phenomenon (Sheen 2011), most teachers choose to focus on the errors. Therefore, this thesis focuses on the correction of errors occurring in natural classroom interaction.

If a learner has made an error in their speech or writing, teachers may turn to negative or corrective feedback (CF) that implicitly or explicitly points to the incorrect part. Sheen (2011: 2) defines corrective feedback as "feedback that provides learners with evidence that

something they have said or written is linguistically incorrect". In this study, the author chooses to focus on oral corrective feedback and its use in classroom. Researchers have identified several feedback strategies used in classroom interaction that should be adapted to different tasks and learners' needs. Most commonly, research uses the categorization provided by Lyster and Ranta (1997): explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Choosing the most suitable and beneficial feedback strategy for each individual learner's needs could be quite challenging, especially for a novice teacher, which is something that the author of this thesis has experienced as well during her classroom practice. An opportunity to observe, analyse and reflect on different strategies used for correcting the learners' errors in an EFL classroom is the main motivation for writing this thesis.

The current thesis aims to analyse the beliefs and practices of two teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL) regarding oral corrective feedback. The analysis is based on non-participant observations and semi-structured interviews with the participating teachers and follows the transcription conventions set in conversation analysis (CA) approach (Hutchby 2019) for transcribing the instances of CF identified in the observed lessons. As prior research (Sheen 2011, Li 2013, Mendez and Cruz 2012) suggests that teachers may have different views on using CF in tasks focused on fluency and accuracy, the author collected data about both. In fluency tasks, the focus should generally be on the content and comprehension of the learner's speech whereas in accuracy tasks, the main emphasis is on the correct form of the target language (Sheen 2011). The observed students were pre-intermediate learners in Year 7 and Year 10. The thesis aims to answer the following research questions:

- Which CF strategies do teachers use in classroom practice?

- Is there a difference in strategies used during fluency/accuracy activities?

- Are teachers' own beliefs regarding CF consistent with their practices identified in the observations?

The thesis is divided into two main chapters. The first chapter of the thesis gives an overview of the theoretical background and some research done in the field, answering questions of when, how and by whom should oral corrective feedback be provided. In addition, the chapter explains the strategies categorized by Lyster and Ranta (1997) in closer detail. Second chapter provides information on the participants, data collection and analysis methodology of the study before presenting the main findings and suggestions for further research and discussion.

1 CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN EFL CLASSROOMS

Nowadays it is expected that a teacher can effortlessly embrace many roles when standing in front of a group of learners. As Chaudron (1988: 132), a renowned scholar of linguistics and language acquisition has once said, the primary role of a language teacher when teaching a language is to provide a fair balance of both error correction and positive sanctions or approval. This is a given right to impose judgement on the behaviour of others, a phenomenon that rarely occurs in other social interactions. However, with great power comes great responsibility and the matter of error correction is considered one of the most complicated and controversial in language learning. This is an issue that both novice and experienced teachers often face – how, when and which kind of errors made by learners should be corrected, and who should do the correcting?

The first chapter of the thesis provides an overview of literature and prior research on the topic of corrective feedback. First, the author looks at the categorization of mistakes in SLA theories and the attitudes towards them. Then follows a discussion on when, how and by whom should oral corrective feedback be provided as well as the descriptions of different corrective feedback strategies. Finally, this chapter gives insight into prior research done in the field.

1.1 Categorization of Mistakes in Language Learning

According to Edge and Harmer (2015: 155), one of the common ways of categorizing mistakes in language learning is as follows: slips, errors and attempts. A slip is a mistake that learners are able to correct themselves once it has been pointed out to them. Other scholars (Ellis 2009: 6) have referred to this simply as a "mistake", where the learner is having trouble processing new information due to competing information and limitations in memory. The language structures are not yet natural or automatic for the learner, but they

have been largely acquired. Secondly, an error is a mistake that the learners cannot correct themselves and it needs further explanation, usually from the teacher (Harmer 2015: 155). Errors occur due to lack of knowledge, rather than performance issues (Ellis 2009). Finally, an attempt is when a student tries to say something but does not yet know the correct way of doing so (Harmer 2015: 155).

Second language acquisition (SLA) researchers have had different views regarding errors and their correction throughout time. In the 1950s, the behaviourist views of language learning regarded errors as damaging to process, therefore they needed to be eradicated immediately (Sheen 2011: 9). A couple of decades later, the nativists believed language acquisition to be mainly driven by positive input and error correction was deemed a less important role. Nowadays most scholars agree that language learners are bound to make mistakes and errors in their learning process, and it is a vital part of acquiring a new language (Ellis 2009). In addition to accepting the natural occurrence of errors, most scholars believe that oral errors should be corrected (Sheen 2011: 39). Moreover, studies show that students themselves would prefer to be corrected in their speech (Sheen 2011, Schulz 1996), even if some may occasionally find corrections embarrassing (Havranek 2002).

Teachers are generally most concerned about the category of error as researchers mostly believe mistakes to be a "performance phenomena" (Sheen 2011: 41). Yet, it must be kept in mind that errors and mistakes are in practice rarely as easy to distinguish as in theory, being largely a matter of personal opinion (Ellis 2009: 6). Distinguishing between an error and a mistake is not as clear because the learner's intended meaning can often only be guessed (Sheen 2011). Therefore, before a teacher can begin to choose the most suitable correction strategy, they are faced with the challenge of deciding whether the erroneous utterance is merely a slip of the tongue or a systematic gap in learner's knowledge that could benefit from correction.

Harmer (2015: 156) points out two most common sources for error: first language (L1) interference and developmental errors. L1 interference in EFL learning means that English and the learner's first language come into contact and the arising confusion provokes errors. These can happen at the level of sounds, grammar or word usage. In addition to second or foreign language learning, developmental errors also occur when learning the first language and they typically refer to over-generalization of some language rule or element. The learner has acquired a new language rule, often subconsciously, and starts to mix it with their prior knowledge, sometimes making mistakes in aspects that they already seemed to know. However, for second language (L2) learners it is a good sign, demonstrating a part of the natural process of language acquisition.

1.2 Use of Corrective Feedback – when, how and by whom?

Feedback is considered to be a powerful force in language learning that should foster learner motivation and ensure their linguistic accuracy in most SLA theories, both structural and communicative approaches (Ellis 2009). Feedback is commonly divided in two: positive and negative feedback. According to Ellis (2009: 3), positive feedback is considered important for it provides encouragement and support to the learner, affirming that their utterance or response to an activity is correct. However, it has not received much attention in terms of research as it is often vague or indistinct (phrases such as *Good* or *Yes*) and is frequently followed by corrections or modifications.

As errors are an inevitable and vital part of language learning, teachers must decide on a method for dealing with them in the most beneficial way. The right kind of feedback given at a suitable time is of utmost importance towards the learner's success (Harmer 2015: 154). Classroom conversations between the teacher and students frequently follow the

initiation-response-feedback (IRF) sequence, which is often followed by positive feedback or evaluation by the teacher on what the student has said.

Although teachers often want to respond to the learner's contribution with praise or encouragement (positive feedback), research shows that phrases like *Good* and *Very good* might shut down the possibility of further discussion, therefore teachers should be careful when using them (Harmer 2015: 154). Moreover, Ellis (2009) states that too much of praise without specifying what it is exactly that the learners have done right could minimalize its effect on them. Therefore, in addition to positive feedback, teachers often practice negative feedback and one aspect of it in general, which is corrective feedback.

In literature about SLA theories the term "corrective feedback" (CF) covers a large area of meaning, including "negative feedback, error correction and error treatment" (Sheen 2011: 1). Chaudron (cited from Sheen 2011: 1) provided one of the first definitions of CF as "any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance". In simpler terms, Ellis (2009: 3) defines CF as "responses to learner utterances containing a linguistic error" and Sheen (2011: 2) as "feedback that provides learners with evidence that something they have said or written is linguistically incorrect". In addition to feedback given by teachers in a classroom setting, CF can also be seen in naturalistic settings, e.g. conversations between friends, where the correction is provided by native or non-native speakers (Sheen 2011). CF may be both written and oral; however, due to present aims of research this thesis focuses on the latter.

Most scholars in the field have researched and agreed on the benefits of corrective feedback in language learning, yet they have frequently disagreed on the specifics. When to correct errors, what errors to correct, how to correct them and who should do it – the teacher, the learner or their peers. These are the questions that spark controversy and remain the topic of discussion (Ellis 2009). Even the *Common European Framework of References for*

Languages (CEFR) (2001: 155), which is used to evaluate and guide the learner's language acquisition process, provides teachers with a list of different attitudes to be taken regarding errors but does not dictate the best approach.

The CEFR (2001: 155) points out four key elements to giving feedback in a beneficial way. First, the recipient of the feedback needs to be in a position to notice the feedback that is being given to them, meaning that they are "attentive, motivated and familiar with the form in which the information is coming". Second, the learner needs to be in a suitable state to actually receive the feedback, meaning that they are not already overwhelmed with various information. This is also referred to as the "window of opportunity" (Sheen and Ellis 2011: 596). Third, a teacher must make sure that the learner is able to interpret the feedback on the basis of their prior language knowledge and awareness, and finally, integrate or make use of the feedback in order to avoid making the same error in the future (CEFR 2001: 155).

When considering the question of when to correct the learners' errors in case of oral CF, researchers mainly divide the correction approaches in two categories: online and offline correction (Harmer 2015, Li 2013). The same distinction is also discussed in literature as immediate and delayed feedback (Ellis 2009, Sheen 2011). According to Harmer (2015), online or immediate correction means on-the-spot correction of a language error. First, the teacher often indicates that something is not quite right, giving the learner a chance to correct themselves. This could be done by a facial expression and body language, rising intonation or phrases such as *Sorry?* or *Could you try that again?* Then they could use a number of correction techniques such as specifying or echoing the incorrect part, using metalanguage, reformulation, or further explanation of the problematical topic.

Online or immediate correction is more often used in accuracy or form-focusing tasks as it immediately draws attention to the erroneous forms and offers learners "a brief timeout

from the ongoing interaction" (Li 2013: 197). If the aim is effective language acquisition and activating the learner's cognitive mechanisms required for noticing the gap between their language and the target form, it is important to provide online correction in the "window of opportunity" (Sheen and Ellis 2011: 596). However, the issue with online correction might be that learners perceive it as natural part of student-teacher interaction in classroom and do not notice the correction implied by the teacher (Harmer 2015). Moreover, it might disturb the learners' flow of thought and focus on fluency (Ellis 2009).

As for offline or delayed correction, Harmer (2015: 160) describes it as feedback that takes place after the activity and is generally less personal, focusing on the overall assessment of the activity and often points out mistakes made by several learners. Some teachers believe that the best time to intervene in learner's talk is as late as possible and that learners should never be interrupted when speaking, i.e. fluency work (Sheen 2011). The purpose of this is to not obstruct the communicative flow until the activity has been completed. Offline correction is also a method most likely used during distance learning as teachers often do not even have an option to give immediate CF and must give individual or group feedback to learners and their submitted tasks after the activity.

For offline or delayed correction to be effective, the teacher should use a strategy that allows them to give proper feedback after the activity has ended, e.g. take notes as it might be easy to forget what exactly the student has said or record the activity and ask learners to point out their own mistakes (Ellis 2009: 11). In the post-task stage, it might also be easier to contextualise the form-focused mistakes (Li 2013). Before pointing out the specific errors, Harmer (2015) suggests that the teacher could first give an overall assessment of the activity and also ask for the learner's opinion on what they considered the easiest and most challenging aspects of the task. Some of the errors could be noted on board and

analysed together, but this needs a sensitive approach as some learners might take it too personally (Harmer 2015).

Although teachers often seem to favour offline correction in fluency work, studies indicate that their beliefs are not always in accordance with their actual classroom practice, and they might still give immediate feedback (Sheen 2011, Mendez and Cruz 2012). Besides online and offline correction, there is a less discussed third option of "gentle correction", which means that the teacher reformulates the learner's idea, correcting their error(s) and helping them communicate their message while moving the conversation further (Harmer 2015). This is also a good way to indicate that the teacher has listened with great interest. All things considered, there is no definite evidence that one correction (immediate or delayed) is significantly more effective than the other.

In addition to the time of correction, another question is what exactly should be corrected. This is also a topic that has not reached general consensus. One approach is that teachers should mostly focus on errors that affect the whole sentence and its organisation, e.g. word order, sentence connector and syntactic errors, not local errors that may only affect single elements in a sentence (morphology or some grammatical functions). Ellis (2009: 5) suggests that the focus of CF should be on all elements that seem to be problematic for the learners. In order to make distinguishing those easier, the teacher should learn more about their students' needs and attitudes towards CF as well as agree on expected outcomes (Ellis 2009: 14).

Harmer (2015: 157) suggests that the main elements a teacher should focus on are grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, register mistakes or any combination of these. However, it is not advisable to focus on more than one or two types at once. Instead, a teacher should emphasise the language point in focus during the current task or an error that largely disrupts communication, making a distinction between accuracy and fluency work. Over-

correction of language errors might have an opposite effect and discourage the learner's language learning motivation. However, responding to a learner's language production is very important, even if it is a simple framing or follow-up move (e.g. *right, so, okay*). If the teacher provides no response at all, the learners might begin to doubt in their answers or abilities (McCarthy 1991).

In order for corrective feedback to be effective, it has to be provided in the most suitable way for the learner. Another assessment that a language teacher must make is whether to provide the correction themselves, let it be self-corrected by the learner or to encourage peer-correction. Sheen (2011) maintains that while the teacher is often assumed to be responsible for providing corrective feedback, they should not be dominant in it. Instead, learners should be given the means and encouragement to correct their own errors as this provides them with an opportunity to pay closer attention to the gaps between their target and interlanguage, which is "the version of the language which a learner has at any one stage of development" (Harmer 2015: 156).

Although self-correction might be effective for some learners, there are also issues to consider. First, studies show that many learners actually prefer the teacher to provide correction, while self-correction is the least popular preference among them (Sheen 2011, Mendez and Cruz 2012). Secondly, in order for the learner to be able to self-correct they must possess the necessary linguistic knowledge or interlanguage (Ellis 2009). Therefore, they might be able to correct their slips or mistakes, but not their errors for which they simply lack the knowledge. In this case it might be effective for the teacher to first encourage self-correction but be prepared to provide correction themselves, if necessary (Sheen and Ellis 2011). Lastly, some CF strategies indicate that there is something wrong with the learner's utterance and require self-correction, but the learner might not be able to notice that the problem is linguistic, rather than simply communicative.

As language learning often takes place in groups of learners, it provides an opportunity to give peer-to-peer corrective feedback. Correcting the errors of their peers enables the learner to analyse the language in use further. Studies have shown that encouraging peer-correction could be beneficial for language acquisition (Lyster et al 2013), yet teachers need to acknowledge that this approach may not suit all learners and groups as it requires a supportive, low-anxiety atmosphere (Harmer 2015). Moreover, giving constructive and beneficial feedback is a skill that needs to be taught before it could be used, which is something that teachers need to consider before applying peer-correction strategies in their classrooms (Sheen and Ellis 2011).

1.3 Corrective Feedback Strategies

Researchers and methodologists have identified several different ways in which errors can be corrected. Most of the strategies have been derived from studies conducted over decades among practicing teachers, observing methods that they use for error correction in a classroom situation as well as laboratory experiments (Ellis 2009). In oral CF, scholars have mainly distinguished between implicit vs explicit CF, and input-providing vs output-prompting CF (Ellis 2009: 8). Examples of these are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. A taxonomy of CF Strategies. (Ellis 2009: 8)

	Implicit	*Explicit*
Input-providing	Recast	Explicit correction
Output-prompting	Repetition Clarification request	Metalinguistic feedback Elicitation Paralinguistic signal

Implicit strategies indicate that something is incorrect about the learner's utterance without clearly pointing out the erroneous part, while explicit strategies directly correct the error and/or provide additional metalinguistic explanation (Sheen and Ellis 2011). Input-

providing CF supplies the learner with the correct form without encouraging a response, whereas out-put prompting CF expects the learner to attempt self-correction. Output-prompting CF strategies are often also referred to as "prompts" (Li 2013).

Out-put prompting CF strategies or prompts generally require the learner to provide a response, which is also referred to as "learner uptake" (Sheen and Ellis 2011). Lyster and Ranta (1997: 49) define uptake as "a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance". Learner uptake could either result in repair of the focused error or in an utterance that still needs further repair, and possibly a different choice of CF by the teacher.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) were one of the first scholars to provide a categorisation of different types of CF that they based on an observational study of six French teachers. This categorisation mostly continues to be used in research to this day. The six categories of CF identified by Lyster and Ranta (1997) are: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Ellis (2009) also distinguishes the category of paralinguistic signal that refers to various facial expressions or gestures used to indicate an error in the learner's utterance, and some researchers have supplemented the list by translation and multiple feedback (Ahangari and Amirzadeh 2011). The six categories along with their descriptions and examples are provided in Table 2.

Table 2. CF Strategies (Lyster and Ranta 1997, examples from Sheen 2011).

CF Strategy	Description	Example
1. Explicit correction	Explicit provision of the correct form. The teacher clearly indicates that the learner's utterance is incorrect.	S: I'm late yesterday. T: You should say 'I was late', not 'I'm late'.
2. Recast	The teacher reformulates all or part of the learner's utterance, minus the error.	S: How many people in your picture? T: How many people are there in my picture? Three people.
3. Clarification request	Signals that something is wrong with the learner's utterance by phrases such as 'Sorry?' or 'Pardon me?'.	S: Why does he taking flowers? T: Sorry?
4. Metalinguistic feedback	The teacher provides a metalinguistic comment (e.g. grammatical rule or word definition) but withholds the correct form.	S: He kiss her. T: You need past tense.
5. Elicitation	Repetition of the learner's utterance up to the point where the error occurs, enabling them to 'fill in the blank'.	S: Once upon a time, there lives a poor girl named Cinderella. T: Once upon a time, there…
6. Repetition	Teacher repeats the learner's erroneous utterance, either partially or entirely, eliciting self-correction. Teacher generally adjusts their intonation to highlight the error.	T: Mrs. Jones travel a lot last year. S: Mrs. Jones travel a lot last year?

Explicit correction is one of the most straight-forward types of corrective feedback, where the teacher explicitly provides the learner with the correct form of their erroneous utterance. Lyster and Ranta (1997) found in their study of French immersion teachers that explicit correction was more commonly used in lower levels where the students have less

knowledge and experience with the language; however, the situation was reverse for native speakers and this correction strategy was used more in higher grades. Explicit correction is less likely to lead to learner uptake, which is helpful for engaging the students and acquiring the correct form (Lyster and Ranta 1997), yet studies have shown that it is more effective than implicit recasts (Sheen 2011).

Recast in CF is a technique where the teacher reformulates the erroneous utterance either entirely or partially, correcting the error. In general, recasts are considered to be implicit meaning that the teacher does not point out the correction with phrases such as *You should use…* or *You mean…* (Lyster and Ranta 1997). Sheen (2011) also distinguishes between *didactic* (draws attention to the exact location of the error) and *conversational* (communication error, teacher clarifies the learner's intended meaning) recasts. If the teacher provides a translation in response to the learner using their L1, it is also considered as a recast (Lyster and Ranta 1997).

While studies (Ahangari and Amirzadeh 2011, Sheen 2004) show that recasts are widely popular among practicing teachers of different backgrounds, they might not be as effective as using explicit correction or prompts. The problematic aspect of recasts is that the learners are often simply not capable of noticing them. Moreover, using recasts has been proved to be more effective in laboratory settings rather than classroom practice (Sheen 2011). Ahangari and Amirzadeh (2011) concluded in their study among Iranian EFL teachers that similarly to explicit correction, the use of recasts as a CF strategy significantly reduced as the learner's proficiency levels increased, making more way for output-prompting strategies and offering opportunities for learner uptake.

According to Lyster and Ranta, a clarification request "can refer to problems in either comprehensibility, accuracy, or both" (1997: 47). Phrases such as *Sorry?* or *Pardon me?* indicate to the learner that there is something incorrect about their utterance, or the teacher

has misunderstood (Sheen 2011). Its effectiveness lies in its ability to elicit uptake from the learner in most cases (88% in the study conducted by Lyster and Ranta), forcing the learner to analyse what they are saying in closer detail. If the error still remains, the teacher could use a more explicit strategy or opt for peer-correction.

Metalinguistic feedback prompts self-correction by commenting (e.g. *You need an indefinite article*), giving information (e.g. *It is better to use past tense)* or asking questions (e.g. *Can we say so in English*?) about the error without providing the correct form (Sheen 2011). Lyster and Ranta (1997) also discovered that while metalinguistic feedback is very likely to elicit learner uptake, it also elicits repair (correct self-correction) in nearly half of the observed errors. In the same study, metalinguistic feedback was often used in combination with elicitation and explicit correction.

Elicitation is a strategy that could be used in several ways. First, the teacher could elicit learners to complete their own utterance by pausing and waiting for their response (e.g. *It is a …)* (Lyster and Ranta 1997). The same pause can be used when repeating the learner's erroneous utterance, as seen by the example in Table 2. Lyster and Ranta (1997) also point out a third option, which is using questions to elicit correct forms, e.g. *How do we say X in English?* In their study of French teachers, elicitation also turned out to be the most successful in eliciting learner uptake, as it "cannot be ignored by the learner" (Sheen 2011: 28).

Repetition occurs when a teacher mimics the learner's erroneous utterance either partially or completely, highlighting the incorrect part by rising intonation or emphatic stress (Sheen 2011). In literature, it is occasionally discussed together with recasts, although recasts generally eliminate the incorrect part of the utterance. Lyster and Ranta (1997) noted a minimal use of repetition in their findings, because it often occurred in combination with other strategies that prompted more basis for analysis. Repetition might also require further

CF from the teacher as this implicit strategy may not help the learner acknowledge their errors.

Experimental studies (Lyster et al 2013, Havranek 2002) suggest that oral corrective feedback is significantly more effective than no corrective feedback at all and demonstrate more gains in learner development. It has been discussed that explicit and output-prompting CF techniques might lead to better results than implicit ones (Lyster et al 2013). However, it would be inefficient to look for the most effective correction strategy as one could never cover all the needs of the different learners, and most scholars in the field believe that the various techniques work best when used simultaneously (Sheen 2011). The most effective teachers are able to use a wide range of corrective feedback types that best suit their learners' requirements (Lyster et al 2013).

1.4 Corrective Feedback Research

Both oral and written CF continue to be a subject of interest for language researchers. Ellis and Sheen (2011: 601) emphasise that there could be "no single set of guidelines for conducting either oral or written CF that is appropriate for all instructional contexts." Questions and debates about CF efficacy, what errors to correct and who should correct them are most likely best discussed and investigated by empirical research (Sheen 2011).

As observational studies are often the preferred method in CF research, scholars frequently use conversation analysis for data interpretation. Conversation analysis (CA) is a research approach originating in the work of Harvey Sacks that "investigates the sequential organisation of talk as a way of accessing participants' understandings of, and collaborative means of organising, natural forms of social interaction" (Hutchby 2019: 1) in the naturally occurring settings. In CF research, CA theories help to structure the classroom discourse and

analyse learner-teacher interaction (Sheen 2011) as CF also generally occurs in conversational sequences.

A distinctive feature of CA methodology is the use of recordings, both audio and video. Recordings are transcribed in close detail, following set conventions, and focusing on turn-taking and speech delivery (Hutchby 2019). When compared to observation, this provides the researchers with an opportunity to "re-live" and thoroughly analyse a situation as many times as necessary, although the main focus still remains on the recorded data itself.

Many scholars have carried out studies researching the learner's perception and beliefs on CF. Lyster et al (2013) conducted a research in second language classrooms, which amongst other findings revealed that learners prefer to receive more corrective feedback than the teachers feel they should provide. Moreover, a research conducted by Schulz (1996) at the University of Arizona indicated that only a minor percentage of learners dislike it when they are corrected in class. In traditional settings, learners tend to believe that their teachers have superior knowledge on the topic, granting them the right to provide constructive and corrective feedback. The same study also discovered that teachers did not often believe their students liked to be corrected in their language errors.

Zhang and Rahimi (2014) examined the differences in learners' anxiety levels in correspondence to their beliefs about CF. This is relevant as some teachers are extremely cautious about applying CF in their classrooms because of concerns about their students' feelings and reactions to it (Mendez and Cruz 2012). However, the study conducted among 160 Iranian EFL students indicates that despite their levels of anxiety, learners have similar beliefs about CF and are in favour of receiving it in EFL classes (Zhang and Rahimi 2014). Naturally, each teacher should be able to adapt their CF strategies to the individual needs of their learners.

Some studies show that learners are more likely to pay attention to CF if they believe in its usefulness (Leontjev 2016), and not understanding the reason behind it could minimise the effect of both praise and corrections (Harmer 2015). Thus, the aims and benefits of CF should be acknowledged and communicated to them by the teacher as learners' beliefs regarding the usefulness are transformed through social interaction and positive experience. Havranek (2012) found that learners subject to CF benefit from it in approximately 50% of the cases. Additionally, it is important to notice that in classroom context, the peers of the corrected learner can also learn from the correction as they are able to listen and concentrate without the anxiety and pressure to react.

The importance of knowing and practicing various corrective feedback techniques is often more visible to the learners' benefit, but it is also important for teachers. Reflecting on – and perhaps improving – their feedback and error correction practices is a valuable part of teacher development, therefore should be further encouraged not only among teacher training students but also experienced teachers (Ellis 2009: 14). Teachers' understanding of teaching and their abilities keep evolving through time and practice, and corrective feedback strategies could always be improved and adapted on the basis of constant self-analysis.

Studies focusing on teachers have researched both their preferred methods of corrective feedback in the classroom as well as compared those with teachers' beliefs and perceptions. Mendez and Cruz (2012) found in their study of Mexican teachers that the importance of CF may vary among teachers, depending on their prior training and experiences as teachers as well as language learners. In general, teachers find oral CF to be important in language learning, while those in doubt have concerns about students' feelings and perceptions. As for the techniques, the teachers providing oral CF preferred unfocused and implicit strategies. Similar findings were present in a study of Iranian teachers, who mostly used recasts in their classrooms (Ahangari and Amirzadeh 2011).

When comparing a novice and an experienced language teacher, Junqueira and Kim (2013) discovered no significant differences in the amount of CF used in classroom. However, it was noted that an experienced teacher was more successful in generating teacher-learner interaction and uptake, as well as using more types of CF. In Estonia, a similar study was carried out by Leemet (2015), who analysed the CF use of a novice and experienced teacher and concluded that the teacher with less experience also used a limited number of CF types. Both of the teachers preferred to use output-prompting rather than input-providing (recasts) CF.

Becoming an EFL teacher generally requires prior training and pedagogical knowledge, which leads to an assumption that teachers are aware of various feedback strategies and use these in their classroom. As mentioned earlier, it takes time and experience to find the most suitable ones. However, a common feature in research is that teachers tend to be inconsistent in their actual CF practices (e.g. different responses to errors, correcting some mistakes/learners and ignoring others, correcting students during fluency activities when they believe it to be unnecessary etc.) (Sheen and Ellis 2011). Therefore, teachers' views on CF strategies and their actual classroom practices is a field that could be further researched.

2 CASE STUDY: TEACHERS' BELIEFS AND PRACTICES OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN EFL CLASSROOM

The empirical part of this thesis includes a case study of the teachers' beliefs and practices regarding error correction in EFL classroom. First, the second chapter provides background information on the participating teachers and learners as well as the data collection and analysis methodology. Second, the data collected in fluency and accuracy lessons are analysed in separate subsections along with illustrative examples. The final subsection provides a summary of the teachers' own beliefs and compares them with the author's findings and conclusions.

2.1 Participants and Data

The thesis aims to analyse the corrective feedback strategies used by two teachers in pre-intermediate level EFL classroom interactions as well as compare the findings with the teachers' own beliefs regarding CF. The study includes one female and one male teacher. The female teacher (hereafter referred to as Teacher A) has completed teacher training, while the male teacher (hereafter referred to as Teacher B) has a higher education in business and marketing. The teachers have approximately 20 and 17 years of teaching experience, respectively. The current sample was chosen out of convenience as the author is previously acquainted with the selected teachers.

The observed students currently study in Year 10 (aged 16-17) and Year 7 (aged 13-14) in Tartu, Estonia. The lessons take place in smaller groups of 10-15 learners. The students have four 45-minute English lessons per week, and more than half of them have been learning English since Year 1. Most of the lesson is conducted in the target language. Their apparent language level is between B1 and B2. The author recognises that this sample is too limited and subjective to draw definite conclusions about teachers' beliefs and

practices in Estonia, but it gives a sufficient overview of the topic under the current scope of research.

In order to reach the aims of this thesis, the author used different data collection methods: non-participant observation, video and audio recording, and semi-structured interviews. The observed students and their legal guardians received a prior notice on the study procedures and gave their consent to use the collected data for the purposes of this study.

2.2 Methodology

The current analysis is based on data collected through non-participant observation and semi-structured interviews with the teachers. The observation data were collected in five lessons between February and April 2021, totalling in 225 minutes and 41 analysed instances of CF. The selected teachers received minimum information about the purpose of the study in order to avoid any possible adjustments to their behaviour. Two of the five observed lessons took place in a classroom setting in which both the audio and video were recorded. Three observations took place during the distance learning period in an online environment *Google Meet*. Due to the more complicated conditions of distance learning and restrictions on visibility (some students do not have access to cameras or refuse to turn them on), only the audio of these lessons was recorded.

After the observations, instances of corrective feedback were identified from the recordings and transcribed using the conventions of conversation analysis that can be seen in Appendix 1. The transcriptions further support the contextual analysis of CF occurrences, illustrating the elements of turn-taking, duration of pauses, prosodic features such as stress and intonation, and other relevant details of real classroom interaction. Incomprehensible or unclear utterances are marked by empty brackets in the transcription.

The identified instances of CF were categorised on the basis of strategies suggested by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Sheen (2011), as previously discussed in 1.3. Corrective Feedback Strategies, Table 2. The thesis analyses the instances of CF in fluency and accuracy focused lessons separately as prior research on CF suggests that teachers might prefer to use different strategies and time for correction depending on the nature of the task (Harmer 2015, Sheen 2011). As the transcribed extracts of CF are only a minor part of the interaction, further context and background information are provided in the analysis. Finally, teachers' own beliefs and commentaries on a few chosen CF instances were discussed in the semi-structured interviews and then also included in the analysis.

2.3 Corrective Feedback in Fluency Tasks

According to Sheen (2011: 55), the main emphasis in tasks focused on fluency should be on the "learner's ability to speak without undue pausing or repair". As mentioned in Chapter 1, it is often believed that it is better not to impede with the learners' speech during communicative fluency tasks where the main focus is on comprehensible meaning and content of the speech, and delayed error correction should be provided after the activity (Sheen 2011: 40). This thesis analyses two lessons focused on fluency, one of each participating teacher. The teachers were instructed to conduct a lesson that included a speaking task for which the learner had been able to prepare, and some spontaneous discussion. In both lessons, students had prepared a short oral presentation on their preferred topic (museums, a person they admire).

In the observed lessons, both of the teachers chose to give feedback and correct possible errors after the activity, i.e. offline correction. However, Teacher B did provide positive feedback to more anxious or nervous students during the task with encouraging nods, thumbs up gestures or comments such as "it's alright" or "take it easy". Perhaps, as he

is teaching Year 7, the younger students have less experience with giving oral presentations and therefore need more encouragement. It was interesting to note that one of the teachers took notes during the presentation, which is recommended as it might be easy to forget what exactly the student has said (Ellis 2009), while the other did not. The teachers' comments after the presentations were generally positive and reassuring, mainly focusing on the content and manner of the presentation as shown in Example 1.

Example 1

1	Teacher:	Well thank you it was very very detailed and uh (1.0) it was uh: just
2		the right uh length a::nd also it was interesting that you (.) mentioned
3		the <u>Arab</u> Spring the Egyptian Revolution (1.8) people call it
4		differently a:nd uh (2.0) you mentioned all the things that I asked you
5		to do (1.5) include and also you presented it very <u>confi</u>dently that it
6		was really interesting to listen to (.) I hope everybody enjoyed [it?
7	Student:	[Mhhmm

First, the teacher thanks the student for the presentation, which was a common feature in both of the observed lessons, creating a polite and positive atmosphere. Then she gives their evaluation on the content, while adding details as the student did not refer to the Egyptian Revolution in his presentation. The teacher also gives feedback on the manner in which the presentation was carried out before addressing the rest of the students. During fluency tasks, both of the teachers encouraged further classroom discussion by requesting the students to comment or ask questions regarding the topic of the presentation, but only Teacher A also urged the students to tell what they liked and what could be improved regarding the manner and execution of the presentation, although the learners were quite reluctant in doing so. In the post-observation interview the teacher explained that the classroom relationships might not be strong enough yet and students are hesitant to comment on each other's performances as not to hurt anyone's feelings. In general, older learners tend to be more mature and better prepared to give constructive, beneficial feedback. With younger learners, the feedback and correction were mainly provided by the teacher.

While the teachers used a lot of positive feedback and evaluation, only six instances and four strategies of corrective feedback were identified in the lessons focused on fluency: explicit correction, recast, metalinguistic feedback and elicitation. Use of repetition and clarification requests as CF strategies was not identified in the observed lessons. A summary of CF strategies used in fluency tasks is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. CF strategies used in fluency work.

	Teacher A *(1 lesson)*	*Teacher B* *(1 lesson)*	*Total:*
1. Elicitation	1	0	1 time
2. Metalinguistic feedback	1	0	1 time
3. Recast	0	1	1 time
4. Explicit correction	2	1	3 times
Total:	4	2	

The table indicates that during lessons focused on fluency, the teachers provided a minimum amount of corrective feedback. Teacher A teaching Year 10 provided CF in four instances, while Teacher B teaching Year 7 in only two. Older students receiving more corrective feedback is most likely not an indicator of them generally making more errors in their speech but could be due to the nature of the task as they had to prepare longer presentations. The most common CF strategy was explicit correction, used altogether in three instances, two of which can be seen in Examples 2 and 3.

Example 2

1	Teacher:	Uhm okay just a fe::w things was it <u>chamber</u> ((/ˈtʃeɪmbə/))
2		okay (.) the kamber the chamber [mhm
3	Student:	[mhm
4	Teacher:	alright a:::nd (1.0) it was good that you mentioned that it's possible
5		to visit this museum on<u>line</u> as well
6	Student:	yeah

In this CF example taking place after the activity, the teacher points out the learner's pronunciation error that took place during the presentation by saying the word correctly, then referring to it in the learner's first language (Estonian) and then repeating the correct pronunciation once more. The learner acknowledges the feedback with an approving sound. A similar correction can be seen in Example 3.

Example 3

1	Teacher:	Uhm (0.6) I don't think I have much. yes and we say ren<u>aiss</u>ance
2		((/ɹəˈneɪsəns/)) mitte renessa::nss ((/ɹəˈnesɑːns/)) re<u>naiss</u>ance,
3		otherwise everything was (0.4) good
4	Student:	Okay

In Example 3, the teacher once again explicitly points out the pronunciation error and also says the word incorrectly (phonetic transcriptions provided in double brackets) as previously done by the student, possibly because of the influences of their first language. In both of these examples, the teacher does not require a correct repetition of the word from the learner, or learner uptake, which would indicate that the learner has noticed the error and is able to fix it. This is conflicting with her statement mentioned in the post-observation interview, where she emphasized the need for repeating a mispronounced word correctly several times and in different manners. Repeating the correct target form or pronunciation could be more beneficial to its acquisition.

In addition to pronunciation errors, explicit correction was used regarding hesitant or incorrect use of vocabulary, which can be seen in Example 4. This example was also the only instance of corrective feedback that happened during the fluency task or online as the learner was struggling with vocabulary choice and required correction from the teacher.

Example 4

1	Student:	and by that logic, first VR headset uh would be:: (1.5) I don't know
2		what they're <u>called</u> but they're, they're these little boxes that have
3		two holes (.) and you can look at <u>picture</u>s with them (2.0)
4	Teacher:	Uhm:: you mean the: (1.0) <u>pinhole</u> camera.

5   Student: Yes, I I think that that's what they're called

As the student is doing the task, he clearly indicates his lack of knowledge about a word and begins to describe the thing itself. The teacher steps in and explicitly says the correct word. The student agrees in response but does not repeat the word. However, the interaction between the student and teacher seems natural and does not interrupt the flow of the task. The teacher chose to correct the error himself, although he could have encouraged peer-correction in this case, possibly believing that other students did not know the answer. In this example, the student clearly indicates his need for correction; however, with presentations given by other students it was visible that the teacher chose not to instantly intervene in a fluency task in case of a pause, giving the learner time to gather his or her thoughts and come up with a suitable word by themselves.

Another CF strategy that was used in the observed fluency tasks was recast. Recasts are generally implicit in nature as the teacher reformulates all or part of the learner's utterance, minus the error, without explicitly drawing attention to it (Lyster and Ranta 1997). In Example 5, recast was used for correcting an error in the learner's choice of vocabulary.

Example 5

1   Teacher: He (1.5) now he's ve-very <u>famous</u> uh after his death (1.2)
2   Student 1:   that's like the most (   )
3   Teacher: Uhuh
4   Student 2:   He was famous during he lived too=
5   Teacher: =uh during his <u>lifetime</u> as well. okay

During a spontaneous classroom discussion, the student uses the word "during" with a pronoun "he" and a verb "lived", which the teacher immediately corrects to a more suitable expression, stressing the word "lifetime" as a way of emphasizing the error. The teacher then continued with the conversation. As the interaction happened quite rapidly and moved on to another topic, it was not clear whether the learner had even acknowledged the correction as there was no uptake. It is possible that the teacher believed that the learner actually knows

the expression, and this was only a slip. Therefore, he chose an implicit CF strategy as not to draw too much attention on it.

The third type of CF used in fluency tasks was metalinguistic feedback in which the teacher provides metalinguistic comments on the erroneous form or answer but withholds the correct one (Lyster and Ranta 1997). While explicit correction and recasts are input-providing, metalinguistic feedback is the only output-prompting strategy observed in the lessons, meaning that learners have to come up with the correct answer themselves. An example of metalinguistic feedback can be seen in Example 6.

Example 6

1	Student 1:	It was in New York
2	Teacher:	It was not in New <u>York</u> it was somewhere in the [United States
3	Student 1:	[in the in the in <u>the</u>
4		<u>Americas</u>=
5	Teacher:	=in the Americas okay (.) can you remember the <u>place</u> where it wa-
6	Student 2:	the capital=
7	Teacher:	=in the capital what is the capital?
8	Student 2:	[DC
9	Student 1:	[Washington
10	Teacher:	Okay right yeah

The teacher and learners were having a discussion about the location of a museum that they had spoken about. Student 1 said that it was in New York, to which the teacher responded negative, but commented on it being in the United States. Another student then says that the museum is located in the capital, which the teacher repeats and asks for further clarification. This now could be considered an example of elicitation, a CF strategy where the teacher asks a guiding question or repeats the utterance up to the point of error in order to elicit correct response or repair (Lyster and Ranta 1997). As metalinguistic feedback was not enough for repair, the teacher also uses elicitation after which two students give the correct answer at the same time. This combination of correction techniques was most likely

chosen as the teacher knew her students were aware of the correct answer and encouraged them to find it themselves by guiding them in the right direction.

The general atmosphere in the lessons was positive and supportive, yet some students showed signs of nervousness and anxiety, which was most likely due to the nature of the task and the presence of an observing teacher and cameras. However, both of the teachers encouraged and supported the learners throughout the lesson, using body language (thumbs up, nodding, indicating to go on), affirmations (*it's alright, very good, take it easy,* etc.) and asking further questions. After the lesson, the teacher of older learners gave reasoning for her choice of not correcting the pronunciation and grammar errors of one visibly anxious learner as she noticed the student was clearly too uncomfortable in front of the classroom and not in a suitable state to receive and benefit from the feedback. This indicates that a teacher should know their learners and "read the room" before providing feedback in order for it to be beneficial.

The analysis was based on two lessons focused on fluency work, which included only a few instances of corrective feedback, most of which took place after the activity as not to impede with the learners' flow of thought. As the number of observed lessons and identified CF instances was rather small, there are no specific differences to point out in the teachers' habits. The CF strategies used were mainly explicit and input-providing (explicit correction, recast) and the teachers did not require learner uptake or self-repair. Most of the corrected errors focused on pronunciation and vocabulary use, while slips or errors regarding use of grammar received little or no attention. As the general language level of the learners was rather high, the teachers' main focus during fluency tasks was on the content of the presentations, which is often recommended by scholars (Sheen 2011).

2.4 Corrective Feedback in Accuracy Tasks

In form-focused or accuracy work, the main emphasis is "on the extent to which learner output conforms to the target language norms" (Sheen 2011: 55), while fluency errors, pronunciation errors and slips might receive secondary attention. Studies indicate that in order to encourage learner uptake, repair and acquisition of the correct form, teachers generally tend to provide more feedback, especially corrective feedback, during accuracy tasks, which was also visible in the scope of this research.

The analysis of teachers' feedback strategies in accuracy tasks is based on three non-participant observations. All of the lessons were held online in *Google Meet* as classroom meetings were prohibited due to the Covid-19 pandemic. As student-teacher interaction in an online setting is slightly different and more complicated than in a regular classroom setting, the author acknowledges that observations carried out in a real classroom could have led to different conclusions. In the observed lessons, the teachers were instructed to carry out regular grammar practice of a recently learned or revised topic. Year 10 practiced the use of *would* and *used to* when talking about habitual behaviour and Year 7 revised the different uses of *will* and *going to* for definite plans and intentions.

In accuracy work, most of the corrective feedback occurred immediately after the learner's erroneous utterance. If the learner's utterance contained no error, the teachers usually provided positive feedback or affirmation with phrases such as "very good", "excellent", "well done", and thanked the learners for their response. Altogether, the author identified 35 instances of corrective feedback in the observed lessons and several times an error required more than one CF strategies before repair.

The observed teachers chose to use the following strategies for correcting learners' errors in accuracy work: elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, recast, explicit correction, and clarification request. An overview of CF strategies identified in lessons focused on accuracy

is presented in Table 4. Repetition was the only CF strategy that the author did not identify in the observed lessons. Lyster and Ranta (1997) have also found minimal use of repetition in their studies, most likely due to the fact that this implicit strategy often requires using another strategy as well, therefore teachers choose not to use it at all.

Table 4. CF strategies used in accuracy work.

	Teacher A (2 lessons)	*Teacher B (1 lesson)*	*Total:*
1. Elicitation	3	1	4 times
2. Metalinguistic feedback	12	1	13 times
3. Recast	2	2	4 times
4. Explicit correction	4	2	6 times
5. Clarification request	1	7	8 times
Total:	22	13	

As visible in Table 4, the observed teachers had slightly different preferences regarding CF strategies in accuracy tasks. While Teacher A mostly opted for metalinguistic feedback as her favored CF strategy, Teacher B mainly used clarification requests. Besides teachers' personal preference, this choice could be related to the age and language level of the learners. Teacher A was working with older students who might be a more suitable target group for metalinguistic feedback as a CF strategy as they already have a better command and understanding of the target language. Teacher B, however, has younger learners and giving comments or information about language rules may not be as beneficial. Both of the favored strategies are output-prompting as they require learner uptake and active participation.

Considering that the analysis includes two lessons conducted by Teacher A and only one by Teacher B, the teachers used almost an equal amount of corrective feedback in their lessons. The preferred techniques of the teachers were mainly explicit and output-prompting

as to point out the error and encourage the learner to try and provide correction themselves. The implicit and input-providing strategy of recast was only used in four instances and generally in combination with other strategies. In accuracy work, the teachers primarily chose to correct errors themselves or initiate self-repair right as the errors happened, in contrast to fluency work, where most corrections took place after the activity.

The most popular CF strategy that was identified 13 times during the observed lessons was metalinguistic feedback. Metalinguistic feedback is an output-prompting explicit strategy that is highly likely to elicit learner uptake and self-correction (Ellis 2009). Lyster and Ranta (1997) found that metalinguistic feedback elicited correct repair in nearly half of the observed errors, and it is often used in combination with elicitation and explicit correction. In this CF strategy, self-correction is prompted by commenting, giving information or asking questions about the error without prompting the correct form (Sheen 2011). Metalinguistic feedback as a comment on the learner's erroneous utterance can be seen in Example 7.

Example 7

1	Student:	uhm my grandparents used to talk about it very much (1.2)
2	Teacher:	probably you should need (.) y-you should use a negative sentence
3		here
4		(4.0)
5	Student:	<u>didn't</u> use to talk about it very much
6	Teacher:	mhm <u>didn't</u> <u>use</u> <u>to</u> (.) very good (.) okay

In this example, the learner forms a grammatically correct sentence "My grandparents used to talk about it very much." However, that sentence is incorrect in the context of the task, where the meaning should be negative. The teacher gives a metalinguistic comment about it, withholding the correct form. There is a pause after the teacher's comment, giving the learner enough time to think about the error before self-correction. The teacher then repeats the correct utterance, most likely in order to further emphasise the correct form. While in this case the teacher gives only a brief comment on the correct form

and it is enough for learner repair, in many instances the teacher provides longer information
on the erroneous grammar form.

Example 8

1	Student:	E:h when Elsie was young eh she: (1.5) used to go? to ballet lessons
2		twice a week for ten years (1.2)
3	Teacher:	mhmm (1.5) okay (.) um do you remember the part of the rule which
4		tells you about for how <u>long</u> something happened (3.5) can we use
5		used to (.) when it's <u>mentioned</u> how long (1.5) something was
6		happening
7		(3.0)
8	Student:	um no?
9	Teacher:	eeh no we can't use it exactly we use past simple then yeah? so
10		please correct yourself
11		(2.5)
12	Student:	eh she went to [ballet lessons
13	Teacher:	[mhm thank you (student's name)

In Example 8, the learner makes an error in using the expression *used to* when talking
about habitual behavior. The learner's doubts are visible in her uncertain tone and the manner
in which she gives the answer. The teacher seems to take notice of this and chooses to correct
the error using a metalinguistic comment, referring back to the rule which they had
previously revised together. She makes the learner think about the rule by asking "Can we
use *used to* when it's mentioned how long something was happening?" The learner takes
time to think and responds negatively in the same doubtful manner. The teacher then
provides further information about using past simple and then asks the learner to correct her
erroneous sentence by explicitly saying "please correct yourself". The learner manages to
self-repair the error. In this example, the teacher sticks to the chosen CF technique and waits
for learner uptake as they probably believe that the learner is capable of correcting the error.
In a similar case of metalinguistic feedback, the teacher requires repair by saying "What
should you use instead?" However, Example 9 analyses an instance of CF where the teacher
does not wait for learner uptake or repair but provides the correct answer herself.

Example 9

1	Student:	Okay eh e::h (2.0) we would live in Washington DC
2	Teacher:	mhm. can we say that (1.2) does it sound right to you? (1.8)
3	Student:	maybe I don't know it I (1.4)
4	Teacher:	okay u::h actually with (.) there are three verbs please remember
5		them (.) which is <u>live</u> <u>study</u> a:nd <u>work</u> (.) which are not really <u>state</u>
6		verbs but they're ca:lled (.) <u>permanent actions</u> so with the:se ones
7		we d<u>on't</u> normally use would okay they <u>act</u> as states alright (1.2) so
8		here u:h we cannot use would so (.) we used to live in Washington
9		DC not we would okay (.) ri:ght

In this example, the teacher provides the learner metalinguistic feedback about his erroneous utterance by saying "Can we say that? Does it sound right to you?" This indicates that the teacher believes the learner to have the necessary knowledge to correct his error. However, the learner responds with "Maybe, I don't know." The teacher proceeds by giving more information about the error, explaining the grammatical use of permanent action verbs. In here, the teacher could have also required learner uptake and repair, but she chose to state the correct answer herself, possibly because she had not explained and discussed this aspect of the topic yet. This CF strategy is called explicit correction. The combination of metalinguistic feedback and explicit correction occurred in three more analyzed erroneous utterances, one of which is presented in Example 10.

Example 10

1	Student:	I spent weeks trying to train my dog (.) but i::t (.) uh (2.0) hm (6.0)
2		I-I I don't know (.)
3	Teacher:	Well there are (2.0) well you need to use <u>would</u> and (.) one of the
4		verbs in the box yeah? (.) but it would? (3.5) instead of escape you
5		could say run (.) [off
6	Student:	[run off yeah it would run off
7	Teacher:	mhm (.) alright thank you

In this example, the learner says the first part of the sentence but struggles to finish it with the correct grammar form. After giving sufficient time for an opportunity to self-repair, the teacher provides a metalinguistic comment on what the task requires from the

learner. She also waits a few more seconds before then explicitly providing the correct answer herself. As the teacher is about to finish the sentence, the learner also gives the correct answer. This is an instance which possibly could have turned out differently in a physical classroom. As the learner self-repairs almost at the same time as the teacher, it is possible that she could have provided the correct answer sooner but perhaps experienced some technical difficulties, e.g. turning on the microphone.

In addition to explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback was also used in combination with recasts in two analyzed instances. Recasts are implicit and input-providing in their nature, meaning that the teacher does not explicitly point out the correction, but rather reformulates all or part of the learner's utterance (Lyster and Ranta 1997). The use of recasts as a CF strategy tends to decrease as the learner's language levels increase, making way for more explicit and output-prompting strategies (Ahangari and Amirzadeh 2011). In this study, the analysis indicates no difference between the two language levels as both of the teachers used recast as a CF strategy twice. Moreover, the minimum use of recasts contrasts with the findings of some previous studies (Ahangari and Amirzadeh, Sheen 2004), where recasts were widely popular among practicing teachers. Example 11 shows recast used in combination with metalinguistic feedback.

Example 11

1	Student:	I warned her not to swim in that river but she u:h insisted on doing it
2	Teacher:	mhm but now (.) add a bit of criticism (3.0) and irritation (1.8)
3	Student:	uu::h (1.5)
4	Teacher:	now you're so advanced you can do it (.) (student's name)
5	Student:	uuh (2.0)
6	Teacher:	use would
7	Student:	would (.) would-
8	Teacher:	-ha [ha
9	Student:	[would what? would have <u>insisted</u> on doing it I don't=
10	Teacher:	=she <u>would</u> insist yeah she <u>would</u> insist on doing-
11	Student:	oh she would insist on doing okay I get it I get it now
12	Teacher:	[yeah

13   Teacher: okay thank you

First, the teacher chooses to give a metalinguistic comment about adding criticism and irritation, which has been previously discussed in the lesson. In response to the learner's confusion, she encourages by saying "Now you're so advanced you can do it." As the learner remains hesitant, the teacher helps with another comment. When the learner is still unable to produce correct repair, the teacher opts for recast as a CF technique and repeats part of the sentence in the correct way, emphasizing the correct form. It seems to be the most suitable choice as it is followed by learner uptake "Okay, I get it now", which indicates that the learner was not capable of self-correction before. The described example could be considered a didactic recast as the teacher draws attention to the exact location of the error (Sheen 2011). In the observed lessons, the combination of metalinguistic feedback and recast seems to appear in cases where the teacher has provided several opportunities for learner repair, but it has not been successful.

Among the lower level students, recasts also occurred together with the CF strategy referred to as clarification request. A clarification request indicates to the learner that there is an issue with either the comprehensibility, accuracy, or both, in their utterance (Lyster and Ranta 1997). The strategy is implicit as it does not point out the exact location or scope of the error, however it is output-prompting and encourages the learner to further analyze their speech produce. If the error still remains, clarification requests could be used together with a more explicit strategy. Example 12 displays a combination of clarification request and recast.

Example 12

1   Student: That's not bad uh what are you gonna <u>do</u> with the money (1.2)
2   Teacher: o:h dude yeah heh [heh heh
3   Student: [oh yeah forgot=
4   Teacher: what are you going to [do
5   Student: [going to yeah (.) sorry

6   Teacher: yeah uh (1.0) it's <u>colloquialism</u> you know (.) we try to avoid that

In this example, the learner uses the colloquial form of *going to* and the teacher makes a clarification request by saying "Oh, dude*"*. The saying is followed by laughter on both sides and it is visible that the atmosphere and nature of the student-teacher relationship allows him to draw attention to the learner's error in this manner. In the post-observation interview, the teacher also claimed to use the word "dude*"* as an indicator that something is not quite right, and the learners are used to it. The learner immediately notices his error. However, the teacher is also quick to provide recast by reformulating the sentence "What are you going to do?" and it is followed by learner uptake. As this seems to be a reoccurring error that the learner is aware of, the use of recast was probably unnecessary, although it acted as part of a natural conversation. In addition, the teacher also includes a short metalinguistic comment on the nature of the error. It is interesting to note that when another student made a similar error later on in the lesson, the teacher corrected him with the same verbal clarification request followed by explicit correction "Not gonna, you know, going to be" to emphasize the preferred form even more. A similar verbal clarification request was used in Example 13.

Example 13

1   Teacher: Continue the next one as well (1.2)
2   Student: I will do the-
3   Teacher: ei ei ei ei [ei
4   Student: [I am going to-
5   Teacher: yes exactly (.) because you see the: this was a definite <u>plan</u> (.) that's
6   why

In Example 13, the learner's erroneous utterance "I will do the…" is cut off by the teacher repeating the word 'no' in the learner's target language. Although an unusual way of catching the learner's attention, it does not feel rude or unfit in the classroom atmosphere. The clarification request is followed by learner repair and the teacher's explanation of the

rule, even if the error has been corrected. Explaining the language choice could be more beneficial to other learners and support correct acquisition. The same technique as a clarification request was also used together with explicit correction. In other erroneous utterances, clarification requests such as "Could you repeat it, (Student's name)?" and "Can you try it again please?" were used on their own or in combination with a metalinguistic comment. In addition to verbal clarification requests, a teacher can indicate an error by using body language, hesitant facial expressions or sounds as discussed in Example 14.

Example 14

1	Student:	I love Mr Bean now but I: (1.2) uh didn't find him funny (2.5)
2	Teacher:	Mmm:: (1.6)
3	Student:	never <u>used</u> to find him funny
4	Teacher:	yeah that sounds much better doesn't it (.) okay u:m (.) because we
5		talk about ha<u>bitual</u> behavior. right

The student makes an error in using the expression *used to* which the teacher indicates by a lengthy M-sound, as well as a thinking pause before and after the sound, which gives the learner a chance for self-repair. This is enough for him to identify the erroneous part and provide repair, also emphasizing the now correct word choice. Once again, even though the error has been repaired, the teacher gives an additional comment explaining the language choice, providing more input that would help the learners remember the correct form.

Another corrective feedback strategy identified in the observed lessons is elicitation. In this strategy, the teacher could either elicit learners to complete their own utterances (e.g. *It is a …*) or repeat the learner's erroneous utterance up to the point of error, the pause indicating which part of the sentence requires correction (Lyster and Ranta 1997). Elicitation has been proven a beneficial technique for eliciting learner uptake as it is hard to ignore (Sheen 2011). In current research, elicitation as a CF technique was identified on three instances, both alone and in combination with metalinguistic feedback (Example 15).

Example 15

1	Student:	U:h (1.0) I'm not sure what goe:s, (1.5)
2	Teacher:	mhm alright it's a <u>question</u> now right? (.) so: to make a question in
3		the past simple (.) because used to is past <u>simple</u> right [you need
4	Student:	[did you (1.2)
5	Teacher:	mhm did your family:?
6	Student:	use to (.) be rich
7	Teacher:	<u>excellent</u> very good

First, the learner indicates her hesitation by saying "I'm not sure what goes [here]."

The teacher guides her by saying that she needs to form a question and gives her the rule for

doing so. The learner then starts to form a question but once again pauses in hesitation, which

is followed by the teacher's encouragement. She elicits a correct repair by starting the

sentence and enabling the learner to finish it, suggesting her turn by stretching the word

'family*'* and saying it in a rising tone. The learner provides correct repair. Initially the teacher

chose to give metalinguistic information as a CF strategy, but as it did not bring the desired

results, she turned to more explicit elicitation, which proved to be beneficial. In addition to

longer repetitions and questions, elicitation could also work in the form of one word as seen

in Example 16. After a long pause in the learner's utterance, the teacher elicits a correct

sentence by only saying the word 'will*'.*

Example 16

1	Student:	Alex and Mandy caught the train at nine o'clock this morning (.) so::
2		(4.5) uh
3	Teacher:	<u>will</u>=
4	Student:	=so they will arrive at London at 2.30 [afternoon
5	Teacher:	[at 2.30 yes this afternoon
6		thank you

While in most cases the teachers chose to correct the errors themselves or guide the

learner towards self-correction, there were two instances of peer correction in the lessons

focused on accuracy. In Example 17, the teacher requires error correction from other learners

in the classroom by saying "Okay, can anyone help (Student's name)?"

Example 17

1	Teacher:	I suppose you <u>must: (2.0)</u>
2	Student 1:	Eh (4.) eh (2.2) eh (2.5) eh (2.0) e:h (1.5)
3	Teacher:	Okay?
4	Student 1:	I don't know.
5	Teacher:	Okay can anyone help (student's name) (4.5)
6		if you're between two: (.) <u>things</u> can't decide what could what could
7		suit here
8		(6.2)
9	Student 2:	e:h (1.2) in two minds?=
10	Teacher:	=good good (student's name)

The task in hand expects the students to choose a suitable expression to fill in the gap. The teacher has chosen a student to answer and reads the sentence until the gap, expecting the learner to provide the correct expression. The learner takes quite a lot of time to think and seems uncertain before answering "I don't know." The teacher then turns to the peers for help. As no one responds for nearly 5 seconds, the teacher provides a comment on the meaning of the suitable expression, which could be considered either a metalinguistic comment or a form of elicitation. After a similar pause, one of the other students provides the correct answer. Example 18 displays a similar instance of peer-correction although not initiated by the teacher, which seems more likely to happen among younger learners as in this case.

Example 18

1	Teacher:	so:: the next summer Olympic Games, (2.0)
2	Student 1:	will begin ((very quietly))
3	Teacher:	u:h (student's name)? (1.8)
4	Student 1:	will begin (2.8)
5	Student 2:	will take place
6	Student 3:	[yes
7	Teacher:	[uu:h (1.0) okay ye:s you need to uh pick up uh the <u>words</u> (0.6)
8		which are given there (1.2) you [know in the box-
9	Student 1:	[oh yes-yes-yes
10	Teacher:	yeah so you need to take from there so yes <u>will</u> take place in Rio de
11		Janeiro

In this task, the learner needs to pick a word from the box to finish an expression and use it in a sentence. Student 1 uses correct tense but wrong choice of vocabulary. First, the teacher uses a clarification request to indicate an error in the utterance, which remains unnoticed by the learner. As the teacher leaves a pause before reacting, other students step in to provide correction. Although the correct word has now been identified by Student 2, the teacher further explains the correction to which Student 1 indicates their understanding. Last, the teacher repeats the utterance in the correct manner. Although peer correction is a technique supported by many scholars and teachers, it might be more difficult to practice in an online learning situation as switching the microphones on and off and taking turns in speaking might be more complicated. This could explain why peer correction was not widely used in the lessons observed during this study.

During the observed lessons focused on accuracy, the learners produced 22 erroneous utterances to which the teachers responded using five of the six corrective feedback strategies identified by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and described previously in Chapter 1, Table 2. In nearly all cases, the teachers preferred to elicit self-repair or provide the correct answer themselves and right after the error occurred. Most of the errors were related to incorrect form and a small part to the use of vocabulary. In accuracy work, the teachers gave no feedback on learners' pronunciation as there were no significant errors that would hinder comprehension. The analysis shows slight differences in the teachers' preferred CF techniques as Teacher A with older students preferred metalinguistic feedback and Teacher B with younger learners opted for clarification requests. However, this choice could be justified by the nature of the tasks and language level of the learners, and the teachers are actually using all other strategies just as well.

2.5 Teachers' Beliefs

In addition to observations and analyses of the lessons, the author considered it important to include the teachers' own views on their error correction practices, therefore the participating teachers were requested to share their opinions in semi-structured interviews. The interview topics covered the teachers' views regarding corrective feedback, what they consider important when correcting the learners' erroneous utterances and the importance of knowing the different strategies for providing CF.

Both of the teachers had heard the term 'corrective feedback' before and described it similarly as feedback given to the students to correct their errors or lead them towards error correction by themselves. Teacher A with teacher training background also pointed out the distinction between an error and a mistake and added that it would be important to provide corrective feedback on the utterances that the learner should be able to correct themselves, having the prior language knowledge for doing so. If an error occurs because of a gap in knowledge, she simply corrects it herself and gives further explanation if necessary.

When asked about the important things to consider when correcting learners' errors, the teachers agreed that it is vital to know your students and consider their abilities and readiness to receive correction. Teacher B, relying on his business and marketing background, always prefers to treat their students as equals and reminds them that it is often a "give-and-take situation". The teacher does not have to be perfect and sometimes students also correct him regarding grammar, handwriting, etc. He believes that the best thing that could happen is that the student becomes better than him. The friendly relationship based on mutual respect is reflected in his classroom practice and the observed lessons as well. In case of more anxious or sensitive students, the teachers consider it important to not draw too much attention on them and provide more thorough correction and feedback personally after/before the class, if necessary.

The teachers believe that errors should be dealt with in a subtle, positive way, and a teacher's role is to be a lighthouse, guiding the learner towards the correct answers. As to when to correct errors, teachers shared similar views. In their opinion, the time of correction depends on the nature of the error and the task in hand. For example, Teacher B pointed out that if the error is glaring or hindering comprehension, he would provide corrective feedback immediately. Teacher A added that if the task is very long, it is better to provide correction on the spot, otherwise the learner might not even remember making an error. However, if the task is short or the main focus is on the content or fluency, CF or correction might be postponed as was also done in the observed fluency lessons. Regarding positive feedback or praise, Teacher B does not like to dwell on it, but rather provides it later in person or in the school's electronic environment (Stuudium).

One aspect observed in the fluency lessons was that one of the teachers took notes during the learners' presentation while the other did not. When asked about it, Teacher B agreed that he never takes notes as he deems it unnecessary ("I've got a good memory.") Teacher A prefers to take notes during longer activities as it helps in giving more thorough feedback later on, whether in person or on Stuudium. Moreover, a technique that she likes to use involves writing the learner's erroneous sentence on board and analysing as well as correcting the errors together. She believes that the visualization of errors and their correction is important and might be more suitable for some learners, rather than only correcting the errors orally. Peer correction is generally considered useful by both teachers. Teacher A mentioned that if a classmate corrects the learner's error, it might not feel as patronizing as when she does it. Teacher B has also used peer correction in making the stronger students help the weaker ones, and he appreciates it when learners correct each other on their own initiative. However, classroom dynamics and relationships have to be taken into consideration.

While the teachers claimed to be familiar with the term 'corrective feedback', the strategies as described by Lyster and Ranta (1997) were new to them regarding terminology. *Table 2. CF Strategies* was presented to both teachers and they were asked to reflect on their classroom practice, pointing out the strategies that they prefer to use. After going through the table and examples, the teachers believed to use and mix all of the mentioned strategies, depending on the group or student. Teacher B mentioned that with older, more advanced students it is probably not necessary to use all of the strategies. Only one CF strategy, repetition, was pointed out by Teacher A as something that she would not prefer to use as repeating the erroneous sentence could be counter-productive and the student might remember it incorrectly. Repetition was also the only strategy not identified in the observations.

When asked to choose a favourite or most-used strategy, Teacher B mentioned clarification requests, which was also visible from the analysis of his lessons. In its support, he lists that clarification requests can be used both online and in classroom and it is an effective way to indicate that something is not quite right with the learner's utterance. In addition to clarification phrases, he sometimes uses signals or gestures that the students are already familiar with. Teacher A mentioned that she sometimes uses phrases such as *Sorry?* and *Pardon me?* if a student makes an error in something that they have been practicing for a longer period of time. She considers elicitation as her most favoured strategy of CF as she believes to use it quite often, and thinks that metalinguistic feedback, which was used the most in her observed lessons, is only useful with advanced students. This belief is in accordance with the observation results as her learners were in Year 10, who supposedly have a better grasp of the target language.

Both teachers said that it is important that the learner is given a chance to self-correct, and that they repeat the correct utterance if the correction is provided by someone else as it

gives them more input to remember it correctly. This is a statement that conflicts with the observed lessons as occasionally, teachers were quick to provide the correction themselves or did not require learner uptake. Teacher A did say that she sometimes might rush on to the next activity or forget to ask the learner to repeat the utterance correctly. She also mentioned that error correction and identifying the learner's reaction is more difficult in online learning, which sometimes feels like "talking to a black wall". In there, it is hard to see whether the learner has understood the correction and a lot might get lost due to technical difficulties and communication issues. Overall, the teachers consider online learning not as effective as learning in a physical classroom.

Finally, the teachers were asked if they ever reflected on their feedback and error correction strategies and if they would consider it beneficial. Teacher A said that she occasionally reflects on her error correction strategies, especially if the learners continue to make the same error. In this case, it is necessary to find a different strategy and provide more practice on the issue. Teacher B added that sometimes as he thinks back on the lesson, he realises that he had forgotten to provide feedback or correction and then gives it on Stuudium or in the next lesson. They both agree that it would be beneficial for a language teacher to know the different strategies for providing corrective feedback, and specific methods and tips could always be learned or improved. However, many of them "come naturally" or are derived from prior career or parenting experiences.

The interviews indicate that despite their different backgrounds in terms of teacher training education, the teachers share similar views on error correction and implement them in their classroom practice. The number of lessons observed in this study is not enough to draw definite conclusions, yet it is visible that what the teachers believe and what they actually do regarding error correction overlap in most areas. All in all, the teachers believe in balance of good relationships, positive feedback and constructive criticism that would

provide the learners with a great starting point for their independent life in addition to the acquired language skills.

2.6 Discussion

When comparing previous studies in the field of CF, the analyses of current observations and interviews with the teachers, the results do not show major differences, yet there are still interesting aspects to consider. Prior research (Sheen 2011, Mendez and Cruz 2013) suggests that teachers may use different CF strategies for tasks focused on fluency and accuracy. In fluency tasks, the general focus remains on the content and comprehension of the learner's speech (Sheen 2011), and teachers prefer to give minimum feedback on grammar, sentence structure, etc. The present study further supports the claim as only 6 instances of CF were identified in the two observed lessons focusing on fluency. Both teachers chose to give feedback and correct errors after the activity, so it would not impede with the learner's performance. However, the teachers provided positive feedback through their body language and supportive affirmations. The teachers' preferred CF strategies were explicit correction, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback and recast. Most of these strategies are explicit in nature as they clearly indicate the scope and location of the mistakes to the learner, which could be more beneficial in case of delayed feedback.

In accuracy work, teachers generally provide more feedback, which is also visible in the current study, where the author identified 35 instances of CF. From the six CF strategies categorized by Lyster and Ranta (1997), the observed teachers used five: metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, explicit correction, recast and elicitation. The strategies were used both in combination and on their own. Once again, a big part of the teachers' preferred strategies are explicit and output-prompting, requiring learner uptake or repair. While the teachers' favoured CF strategies were quite similar in fluency tasks, they had different

preferences in accuracy work. However, this could be explained by the differences in learners' language levels or the nature of the tasks. As Lyster et al (2013) suggest, the most effective teachers are those willing to adapt their CF strategies according to the needs and preferences of their different learners.

The corrections in accuracy work took place right as the errors happened and were mainly provided by the teachers. Although teachers claim to favour peer correction as a feedback method, the current study identified only a few instances of it in practice. This could be due to the fact that the accuracy lessons were held online, which makes the feedback process more complicated and time-consuming. It is likely that in a physical classroom, the teachers use peer correction more often. The post-observation interviews with the teachers indicate that despite differences in their training and education, the teachers share similar views regarding CF and error correction in classroom, which have mainly formed during their years of experience, and are mostly consistent with their practices seen during the observations. Both of the teachers value good relationships with their students, knowing and considering their abilities and readiness to receive correction both ways.

All things considered, the analysis provides a brief overview of the practices and beliefs of two EFL teachers in Estonia. Both of the participating teachers mentioned in their post-observation interviews the importance of knowing and reflecting on their feedback-giving strategies, therefore the author hopes that the current study granted them an opportunity for doing so now and in the future. In general, the results of the study are in accordance with prior knowledge on the topic and offer a basis for future research. In addition to widening the scope of study, it would be interesting to look at the differences between CF used in online and classroom practice as well as the effect CF has on various learners.

CONCLUSION

In addition to many important roles that a teacher is expected to embrace successfully in a classroom, providing guidance and error correction in language learning could be considered one of the primary ones. The aim of this MA thesis was to analyse which corrective feedback strategies teachers implement in their classrooms, whether there are any differences between strategies used in fluency and accuracy work, and whether their beliefs regarding error correction are consistent with their actual practices. The motivation for research arose from the author's own experiences and struggles as a novel teacher to provide a fair balance of praise and correction as well as finding the most suitable correction strategies.

Feedback is an important part of language learning process and a great tool for fostering learner motivation, when used correctly (Ellis 2009). The current thesis focuses on oral corrective feedback and teachers' responses to language errors. Researchers have identified several feedback strategies used in classroom interaction that should be adapted to different tasks and learners' needs. Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorise them as: explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. In addition to the choice of feedback, a teacher must decide whether to give feedback during or after the activity, and who should do the correcting – the teacher, learner or their peers. Prior studies have identified differences in CF provided in fluency and accuracy lessons, therefore the current research looks at both. Chapter one of this thesis provides an overview of the theoretical background and research done in the field, answering questions of when, how and by whom should oral corrective feedback be provided.

Chapter two of the thesis analyses the results of a case study conducted among two teachers in pre-intermediate level EFL classroom using non-participant observations, video and audio recordings and semi-structured interviews. Identified instances of oral CF were

transcribed for more thorough and convenient analysis, using the transcription conventions of CA. Both of the teachers, one female and one male, have nearly 20 years of teaching experience, and the observed learners were in Year 7 and Year 10. Choosing the most suitable corrective feedback strategy in a fast-moving, natural classroom discussion is not an easy task, even for experienced teachers. The analysis based on five observed lessons (2 focused on fluency and 3 focused on accuracy) indicates that teachers use nearly all of the strategies categorised by Lyster and Ranta (1997) in their classroom practice. In case of several erroneous utterances, teachers used more than one strategy to elicit learner repair. For example, the author identified combinations of metalinguistic feedback and elicitation, metalinguistic feedback and explicit correction, clarification request and recast etc.

The analysis shows that both teachers mainly prefer to use strategies that are explicit and output-prompting in their nature, meaning that they clearly indicate the location of the error and demand learner response. In most cases, the CF provided by the teachers guided the learner towards self-correction or the teacher provided the correct answer themselves. Peer-correction was encouraged in only a few instances, possibly due to the restrictions set by online learning. When looking at the differences between CF provided in fluency and accuracy activities, it is clear that in fluency work the main focus was on the content of the task and learner's speech, and the teacher provided minimum correction. In fluency work, the teachers mainly gave input-providing feedback to errors in pronunciation and vocabulary choice.

Altogether, the author identified only 6 instances of CF in fluency tasks, whereas lessons focused on accuracy work resulted in 35 analysed instances of CF as the grammar topics in practice were less familiar to the learners and required more feedback from the teachers. While the strategies used for CF remained similar, the time of correction was different in accuracy and fluency work. In accuracy work, the teachers usually corrected the

errors right as they happened, they both mainly used delayed or offline correction in fluency work, providing their feedback after the activity.

The final subsection of the thesis gives an overview of the teachers' own beliefs regarding oral corrective feedback, which were discussed in semi-structured interviews after the observations. The interviews and analyses of the lessons indicate that despite their different backgrounds in terms of teacher training education, the teachers share similar views on error correction and implement them in their classroom practice. They put equal emphasis on knowing their students' preferred correction strategies and building relationships with their students.

All things considered, the author recognises that the limited number of observed lessons and participating teachers is not enough to draw definite conclusions about teachers' oral corrective feedback practices and beliefs in Estonia, yet it provides a brief overview and ground for further research. Following studies could include more teachers and analyse their practices in closer detail and perhaps also look at the effect CF has on different learners. As error correction remains a vital part in language learning and acquisition, it is important for language teachers to be aware of the different strategies, their effects and usefulness in classroom practice.

REFERENCES

Ahangari, Saeideh and Somayeh Amirzadeh. 2011. Exploring the Teachers' Use of Spoken Corrective Feedback in Teaching Iranian EFL Learners at Different Levels of Proficiency. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 29, 1859-1868.

Chaudron, Craig. 1988. *Second Language Classroom: Research on Teaching and Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, Rod. 2009. Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, 1: 1, 3-18.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2015. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Pearson.

Havranek, Gertraud. 2002. When is corrective feedback most likely to succeed? *International Journal of Educational Research,* 37, 255-270.

Hutchby, Ian. 2019. Conversation Analysis. In Paul Atkinson, Sara Delamont, Alexandru Cernat, Joseph W. Sakshaug, & Richard A. Williams (Eds.) *SAGE Research Methods Foundation.* California: SAGE Publications.

Junqueira, Luciana and YouJin Kim. 2013. Exploring the Relationship Between Training, Beliefs, and Teachers' Corrective Feedback Practices: A Case Study of a Novice and an Experienced ESL Teacher. *The Canadian Modern Language Review,* 69: 2, 181-206.

Leemet, Merli. 2015. *Oral Corrective Feedback in Pre-Intermediate Level EFL Classroom.* Unpublished MA thesis. Department of English, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia.

Leontjev, Dmitri. 2016. Exploring and Reshaping Learners' Beliefs About the Usefulness of Corrective Feedback: A Sociocultural Perspective. *ITL: International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 167: 1, 46-77.

Li, Shaofeng. 2013. Oral corrective feedback. *ELT Journal,* 68: 2, 196-198.

Lyster, Roy, Kazuya Saito and Masatoshi Sato. 2013. Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language teaching*, 46: 1, 1-40.

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

McCarthy, Michael. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mendez, Edith Hernández and Maria del Rosario Reyes Cruz. 2012. Teachers' Perceptions About Oral Corrective Feedback and Their Practice in EFL Classrooms. *Profile,* 14:2, 63-75.

Schulz, Renate 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.

Sheen, Younghee. 2004. Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research,* 8: 3, 263-300.

Sheen, Younghee. 2011. *Corrective Feedback, Individual Differences and Second Language Learning.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Sheen, Younghee and Rod Ellis. 2011. Corrective Feedback in Language Teaching. In Eli Hinkel (ed). *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning, Volume II,* 593-610. New York and London: Routledge.

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

APPENDIX 1 – CA Transcription Conventions

The conventions used in this thesis are adapted from Hutchby (2019).

<u>Underline</u>	Underlining a word or part of it indicates speaker emphasis
(0.5)	Numbers in brackets indicate a gap timed in tenths of a second
(.)	A dot in brackets indicates a micropause of less than one tenth of a second
=	Equals sign is used to indicate latching or absolute contiguity between utterances
[ ]	Square brackets indicate the points of onset and cessation of overlapping talk
(( ))	Double brackets describe a non-verbal activity or transcriber's comments
heh	"Laugh token" to represent the sounds that speakers make while laughing
whi-	A dash indicates a sudden cut-off of the word being uttered
we::ll	One or more colons indicate noticeable lengthening of a word's enunciation. The longer the extension, the more colons are inserted.
.	A full stop indicates a falling tone
,	A comma indicates fall-rise or rise-fall, a continuing tone
?	A question mark indicates a marked rising tone

APPENDIX 2 – Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Both teachers:

1) How long have you been teaching?

2) If you think about the term 'corrective feedback', what comes to your mind?

3) What do you consider important when correcting the learner's errors? What kind of errors do you correct?

4) Are you familiar with the different types of corrective feedback strategies?

5) Which corrective feedback strategy do you think you use the most? (Table shown to the teacher)

6) Learner uptake/repair: is it important to give the learner a chance to self-correct?

7) What do you think about using peer-correction?

8) Do you prefer online or offline feedback/correction?

9) Are there any differences in CF strategies used in fluency and accuracy work? In distance and classroom learning?

10) Have you every reflected on your strategies for providing (corrective) feedback? Would you find it useful?

Teacher A (female, Year 10):

1) During the fluency activity, you took notes. Why? Do you always take notes?

2) During the fluency activity, you did not give feedback to one student as they were too anxious and uncomfortable. Did you give it later / in Stuudium?

3) In case of a pronunciation error, you did not require the learner to repeat the word correctly. Why?

Teacher B (male, Year 7):

1) During the fluency activity, you gave feedback after the activity and did not take notes. Why?

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL
ANGLISTIKA OSAKOND

Ketlin Vessart

Teachers' Practices and Beliefs Regarding Corrective Feedback in EFL Classroom
Õpetajate tavad ja tõekspidamised parandava tagasiside kasutamisel inglise keele õpetamisel võõrkeelena

Magistritöö
Aasta: 2021
Lehekülgede arv: 61
Annotatsioon:

Vigade tegemist peetakse elementaarseks osaks keeleõppe protsessist, mida õpetajad peaksid oskama juhtida ja toetada, pakkudes õppijate vajadustest lähtuvat parandavat tagasisidet. Ehkki õpetajakoolituse programmid annavad hea ettevalmistuse, kujunevad parimad tavad ja tõekspidamised välja üksnes aja ja praktilise kogemuse läbi. Antud magistritöö eesmärk on vaadelda ning analüüsida inglise keelt võõrkeelena õpetavate õpetajate vigade parandamise strateegiaid ja tõekspidamisi rääkimise ja grammatika osaoskuste arendamisel tunnisituatsioonis.

Töö koosneb sissejuhatusest, kahest sisupeatükist, kokkuvõttest, kasutatud kirjanduse nimekirjast ja kahest lisast. Esimene peatükk annab kõnealusest teemast ja varasematest uurimustest teoreetilise ülevaate, vastates küsimustele, millal, kuidas ja kes peaks andma parandavat tagasisidet. Teine peatükk kirjeldab antud töö raames läbi viidud uurimuses osalejaid, andmekogumise ning -analüüsi meetodeid ja annab ülevaate peamistest tulemustest ning soovitustest edasisteks uurimusteks.

Uurimus näitas, et õpetajad jagavad õpilastele mitmekülgset tagasisidet ning kasutavad peaaegu kõiki teoreetilises osas välja toodud parandava tagasiside strateegiaid. Grammatika- ning vestluspõhiste ülesannete puhul olid kasutatavad strateegiad sarnased, ent erinevus seisnes tagasiside andmise ajas. Uurimuse järel läbi viidud intervjuudest selgus, et enamasti õpetajate enda uskumused ühtivad vaatlustundides nähtuga.

Märksõnad:
inglise keele õpetamine, vigade parandamine, tagasiside, õpetajate harjumused ja uskumused, inglise keele didaktika, pedagoogika

Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks

Mina, Ketlin Vessart,

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) minu loodud teose

   Teachers' Practices and Beliefs Regarding Corrective Feedback in EFL Classroom,

   mille juhendaja on Reeli Torn-Leesik,

   reprodutseerimiseks eesmärgiga seda säilitada, sealhulgas lisada digitaalarhiivi DSpace kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni.

2. Annan Tartu Ülikoolile loa teha punktis 1 nimetatud teos üldsusele kättesaadavaks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace kaudu Creative Commonsi litsentsiga CC BY NC ND 3.0, mis lubab autorile viidates teost reprodutseerida, levitada ja üldsusele suunata ning keelab luua tuletatud teost ja kasutada teost ärieesmärgil, kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni.

3. Olen teadlik, et punktides 1 ja 2 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.

4. Kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei riku ma teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse õigusaktidest tulenevaid õigusi.

Ketlin Vessart
18.05.2021

Autorsuse kinnitus

Kinnitan, et olen koostanud käesoleva magistritöö ise ning toonud korrektselt välja teiste autorite panuse. Töö on koostatud lähtudes Tartu Ülikooli maailma keelte ja kultuuride kolledži anglistika osakonna magistritöö nõuetest ning on kooskõlas heade akadeemiliste tavadega.

/allkirjastatud digitaalselt/
Ketlin Vessart

18.05.2021

Lõputöö on lubatud kaitsmisele.

/allkirjastatud digitaalselt/
Reeli Torn-Leesik

18.05.2021