

A Case Study of Three EFL Teachers' Cognition in Oral Corrective Feedback: Does Experience Make a Difference?

*Shahab Moradkhani 

Assistant Professor of TEFL, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran

Ahmad Goodarzi 

Ph.D. Candidate of TEFL, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran

Received: April 24, 2020; **Accepted:** June 13, 2020

Abstract

Even though many classroom-based studies reported the possible advantages of oral corrective feedback (OCF) for language learning, little information is available about teachers' beliefs about OCF in classrooms and its relationship with their experience. This study attempted to compare the stated beliefs and classroom practices of three female English as Foreign Language (EFL) teachers about OCF. In so doing, data was collected through video-recording three sessions of their teaching procedure and the follow-up stimulated recall interviews. The results of the study showed that irrespective of their teaching experience, the participating teachers unanimously believed that the provision of OCF in the class is of prime importance. However, the use of all types of OCF practices was just observable in experienced teachers' classes and the novice one preferred the duality of explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback and did not provide any recasts and elicitations. It was also found that learner-related issues seemed to be working within the limits of teaching experience in shaping the three teachers' beliefs about providing OCF practices. Moreover, the novice teacher showed to resort to her language learning in justifying her OCF practices. Implications of the findings are discussed and some suggestions are provided for further research.

Keywords: Errors; Oral corrective feedback; Teachers' beliefs; Teaching experience

*Corresponding author's email: moradkhani.shahab@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The effectiveness of oral corrective feedback (OCF) in foreign language teaching has been documented by several meta-analysis studies (Brown, 2016; Goo & Mackey, 2013; Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Russell & Spada, 2006). Many early studies attempted to describe the types (e.g., recasts, elicitation) and amounts of OCF in language classes and brought significant insights in this regard (e.g., Ellis et al., 2001; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Roothoof & Breeze, 2016).

There are also some studies examining teachers' cognition on OCF provision, as OCF has long been deemed to be one of "the primary role[s] of language teachers" (Chaudron, 1988, p. 132), and, more recent lines of research in this regard provide the opportunity to obtain a better understanding of the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their provided OCF (Bao, 2019; Fallah & Nazari, 2019; Kamiya, 2016; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Roothoof, 2018).

Moreover, an influential modifier of the relationship among teacher cognition, provision of OCF, and the type of provided OCF are teaching experience. As Mackey et al. (2004, p. 307) believe, "one individual difference that may play an important role in L2 teachers' use of incidental focus-on-form techniques (such as OCF) is teachers' level of experience." Accordingly, the literature of teaching and teacher education offers that experienced and novice teachers make different decisions in language classes (see, for example, Akbari & Tajik, 2010; Gatbonton, 2008; Kalra, 2018).

Viewing these differences in teachers' cognition and OCF, and the type of OCF provided from a methodological perspective have not been largely investigated via introspective measures, such as stimulated recall protocol (e.g., Ellis et al., 2001; Junqueira & Kim, 2013), which is a useful tool for revealing teachers' dispositions behind their utilization of OCF (Mackey et al., 2004). To shed light on these issues, the current study aims to explore the OCF beliefs and practices of three English as Foreign

Language (EFL) teachers with different years of experience.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teachers' Beliefs about OCF

Borg (2003) defines teachers' cognition as "the unobservable cognitive dimension of teaching - what teachers know, believe, and think" (p. 81). The effects of teachers' cognition on different language classroom activities and issues, such as grammar instruction (Borg, 1999; Svalberg, 2015), pronunciation (Burri et al., 2017; Couper, 2016, 2017), writing activities (Ngo, 2018; Shi et al., 2019), decision-making processes (Li, 2020; Lloyd, 2019), lesson planning (Enow & Goodwyn, 2018; Pang, 2016), and code-switching (Nguyen & Duy, 2019; Ghafar Samar & Moradkhani, 2014) have been explored. However, few studies have attempted to investigate EFL teachers' beliefs about their provided OCF in their real classroom practices (Fallah & Nazari, 2019; Kamiya, 2016; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Roothoof, 2018).

Lyster and Ranta's (1997) seminal study identified six types of OCF that teachers use in response to students' errors; explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, clarification request, repetition, and recast. This taxonomy was used as the criterion for the classification of OCF in many studies. In this regard, Roothoof (2018) carried out a study to compare the beliefs of EFL teachers at private language institutes and ELF teachers at public schools. He explored their views about how and when to correct students and what types of errors to correct. To do so, data was gathered through a questionnaire. Although the teachers were from different teaching contexts, both groups, to a large extent, asserted that OCF moves are necessary and essential; however, they stated that too many stops for making corrections can affect the students' fluency and confidence when they are speaking. Moreover, while secondary school teachers thought that recasts were more effective, language teachers working at private institutes preferred elicitation. However, in his study, classroom-based data and

interviews were not included in the data collection procedure.

In another study, Kamiya (2016) set out to investigate the relationship between the stated beliefs of four English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers about teaching and OCF, and their classroom practices via class observations and follow-up interviews. The results of this study revealed that the teachers' classroom practices were greatly in accordance with their stated beliefs concerning OCF. He also found that the participants used OCF in a quiet and limited way, and recast was the most frequently used type of OCF. Nevertheless, in Kamiya's study, the classroom observation was conducted only once and as he mentioned, "as the relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices is fluid, it would be ideal to collect data more longitudinally" (p. 13); thus, more sessions are needed to be observed to grasp a clearer picture regarding teachers' provision of OCF. Moreover, Kamiya did not use video-recording to examine teachers' practices, and his study did not benefit from the stimulated recall technique, which is known as one of the main data collection techniques in the studies concerning teachers' cognition.

Similar procedures to the above-mentioned studies were also utilized in some recent studies within different contexts which generated similar results (e.g., Bao, 2019; Kartchava et al., 2020; Tadayyon, 2019).

Novice and Experienced Language Teachers' Beliefs about OCF

Despite an abundant body of research on teachers' cognition and their classroom practices, studies have not broadly inspected how teaching experience and cognition may affect the instructors' OCF provision and awareness of OCF practices while teaching. We could only retrieve three studies investigating novice and experienced ESL teachers' OCF beliefs and practices (Fallah & Nazari, 2019; Junqueira & Kim, 2013; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015). Fallah and Nazari (2019) collected data from 71 experienced and 66 novice English teachers through questionnaires and interviews. They found

that teachers with less teaching experience considered OCF as a personalized issue and significantly disagreed with immediate OCF practices. On the other hand, the experienced teachers viewed OCF as a learning aid and showed more preference toward peer and delayed feedback. The results of their study also revealed that whereas novice teachers considered feedback as an affective personalized practice, the experienced teachers believed that it provides developmental learning assistance to the students.

In the second study, Rahimi and Zhang (2015) explored the differences in teachers' cognitions about corrective feedback between two groups of novice and experienced Iranian EFL teachers. They collected data through a questionnaire and follow-up interviews with 20 novice and 20 experienced teachers. The results of their study showed significant discrepancies between the two groups. They revealed that teachers' teaching experiences increase their awareness of the part played by mediating factors, such as error frequency, types and severity of errors, instructional focus, and their beliefs about the necessity, timing, and types of OCF. Although novice teachers strongly emphasized the necessity to provide OCF, they ascribed their beliefs to their own learning experience as a language learner. Much similar to Fallah and Nazari (2019), although Rahimi and Zhang (2015) made a valuable contribution to the literature, classroom observations and stimulated recall protocol, as important introspective data collection instruments, were not employed in their data collection procedure.

Similarly, Junqueira and Kim (2013) applied a triangulation of data collection in a study and gathered data from their two female ESL teachers through observations, stimulated recalls, and interviews. They found a comparable amount of OCF on the teachers' side and the subsequent learners' uptake. Additionally, both novice and experienced participants happened to provide a relatively equal amount of OCF in the sessions observed (51.9% and 62.8%, respectively); however, the experienced teacher resorted to a wider range of OCF types. The researchers also concluded that teachers' own learning experience (rather than their years of

teaching) seemed to play an influential part in creating differences between teachers' beliefs about the effectiveness of various types of OCF.

Taken together, compared with the studies which have investigated the modifying role of teaching experience in the association between teachers' cognition and OCF, the use of stimulated recall protocol, an illuminating data collection method in this line of research, can shed light on the unknown horizons of OCF provided by teachers. Therefore, the present case study, by employing video-recording of EFL classes and holding follow-up stimulated recall sessions, seeks to examine OCF practices and beliefs of three Iranian EFL teachers with different teaching experiences. In this study, OCF practices include the types and quantity of OCF supplied by teachers while teaching.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The enticement to carry out the present research was three-fold. First, compared to the range of studies investigating various aspects of OCF, teachers' beliefs about OCF are still poorly represented in the literature. Second, concerning the demand of ELT researchers' call for taking the contextual requirements of practice into account (Borg, 2009, Johnson & Golombek, 2018), the investigation into Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs about OCF remains underexplored. Third, Nassaji (2018) believes experience is an influential factor in EFL teachers' use of incidental focus-on-form techniques (i.e., OCF); hence there is a need to examine the role of experience in forming EFL teachers' beliefs about OCF. On these accounts and to guide the study, the following research questions were proposed:

1. Is there any significant difference between novice and experienced teachers' beliefs about the types and frequency of OCF?
2. What do the teachers perceive from their OCF practices and their effectiveness?

METHOD

Participants and Context

Among the teachers working at a private language institution in Doroud (a city in the west of Iran), three female EFL teachers who had differences in the length of teaching experience were selected. The teacher with the least teaching experience, Zahra is used throughout the paper), was spending her first year of teaching, and was doing her last term of Bachelor's degree in English Literature when the study was conducted. The second participant of the study was Hoda, a Bachelor in English Literature. She had been teaching English for 7 years and was regarded as a moderately experienced teacher. The last participant of our study was Bahar, who had been teaching English for 13 years at the time of data collection and held a Bachelor's degree. All three teachers spoke Persian as their mother tongue. Moreover, to observe the anonymity of the participants, pseudonyms were used in this study.

To control the intervening roles of age and students' proficiency level, the participants of the study were selected in terms of their different teaching experiences and the homogeneity of the level and age of their students. The age of the students in each class ranged from 13 to 14 and they were from the same language (Persian) and cultural background (based on their registration forms available in the language institute). Moreover, the teachers were teaching the same coursebook (*Family and Friends 1*) to teenage lower-intermediate learners. Their classes were held twice a week, with each session lasting for 90 minutes.

Data Collection Procedure

To investigate teachers' cognition about OCF and their OCF practices in their teaching procedure, video-recording stimulated recalls were adopted. The classroom video-recordings were conducted over two weeks in the teachers' classes. During these two weeks, three sessions of each teacher's class were video-recorded (a total of 270 minutes of teaching for each

participant).

Even though the three teachers covered different units of the same coursebook, they tried to follow relatively the same teaching procedures presented in the teachers' guidebook. Additionally, in order to preclude any probable artificial act from the participants during teaching, they were not informed of the exact goal of the research; instead, they were told that they were part of a study focusing on classroom interactions between the teachers and students.

To avoid any time lapse which might lead to the teachers' forgetting of the details (Gass & Mackey, 2000), stimulated recalls were carried out with each teacher a very short time after the classroom video-recordings. The time-lapse varied from 30 to 60 minutes. The purposes of video-recordings were two-fold; first, to examine teachers' OCF types and frequencies; second, to use them as the stimulus of stimulated recalls. Stimulated recalls were conducted to investigate teachers' awareness of their OCF classroom practices, and interviews to dig into the logic behind their provided OCF and detect any possible relationship between the type of OCF and educators' teaching experience.

OCF provision episodes including students' oral errors and teachers' follow-up OCF were selected by the researchers for the stimulated recall and subsequent interviews. Throughout these stimulated recalls, we asked the participants to state why they corrected the students' error in that way and what their logic was for correcting the students the way they did.

Right after administering the stimulated recalls, semi-structured interviews in the form of follow-up questions were carried out by one of the researchers to dig into the teachers' perspectives and beliefs about OCF. During interviews, the teachers were asked about different types of feedback, their effectiveness, and how they exploited OCF in their classes. Each individual stimulated recall and interview lasted about 45 minutes and they were all audio-recorded and transcribed carefully for succeeding data analysis.

To ensure the validity of the extracted data from stimulated recalls, a

video recorder camera was installed in the classroom; thus, the presence of an interloper would not contaminate the data obtained from the teachers' and students' activities and performances. Additionally, to minimize the possible influences of the teachers' inapt fetch of their pedagogic thought, the stimulated recall procedures were clarified for the teachers before the interviews (Meijer, Beijaard, & Verloop, 2002). Furthermore, before launching the video-recording procedure, in a short debriefing session, the participants consented to take part in the study and video-record their classroom practices. Also, the students were ensured that they would be in the blind spot of the camera. Besides, assurance was provided for the teachers that the data collected from the videos and interviews would be employed only for the research purpose and be kept confidential.

Data Analysis

Classroom videos were meticulously watched and error-feedback episodes were identified and counted. Thereupon, the OCF episodes were categorized based on Lyster and Ranta's (1997, p. 46-51) typology:

1. Explicit correction: The explicit provision of the correct form indicating what the student has said is incorrect;
2. Recasts: The teachers' reformulation of the student's erroneous utterances without the error;
3. Clarification requests: the teachers' indication of misunderstanding and ill-formedness of the student's utterance;
4. Metalinguistic feedback (MF): teachers' comments and explanation on the erroneous utterance without providing the correct form;
5. Elicitation: teachers' use of gap-filling techniques to help students provide the well-formed utterance;
6. Repetition: teachers' requests from the students to repeat the well-formed utterance.

In agreement with Lyster and Ranta (1997), based on the nature of the translation provided, the participants' use of Persian to correct students' errors was categorized as an explicit explanation.

The data collected from the three participants of the study were then compared through descriptive statistics, which mainly included type and frequency of occurrence of OCF practices of three participants during the three sessions of instruction.

As a final point, to detect any possible associations among teachers' cognition about OCF, their teaching experiences, and their classroom OCF practices, data gathered from stimulated recalls, follow-up interviews, and classroom videos were presented and compared.

RESULTS

Zahra's OCF Practice

All OCF practices committed in the classes were detected, and Zahra's OCF moves were categorized, in accordance with Lyster and Ranta's (1997) typology. However, some OCF practices were not employed by Zahra and some others were left untreated in the class. The OCF practices Zahra utilized are exemplified in the following. (See Appendix for transcription conventions).

1. Explicit correction:

Example 1 (September 11)

Student: My father drives a motorcycle.

Zahra: You should say Ride.

2. Clarification requests:

Example 2 (September 11)

Zahra: which balloon is your favorite?

Student: (broo) balloon.

Jason: what?

Student: Blue balloon.

Jason: Very good.

3. Metalinguistic feedback (MF):

Example 3 (September 6)

Zahra: [explains that the word “Clara” needs “she” as a pronoun] here, you should say “she” not “he”.

4. Repetition:

Example 4 (September 9)

Student: I eat tea for breakfast.

Zahra: I drink tea for breakfast. Repeat, please!

Student: I drink tea for breakfast.

Table 1 shows the frequency and type of OCF provided by Zahra in the class. As this table suggests, explicit correction appropriated the highest number in Zahra’s OCF practices by around 61%, followed by metalinguistic feedback (26%). Furthermore, a few numbers of her OCF moves were allocated to repetition (10%) and clarification requests (3%). To justify applying a great deal of explicit corrections metalinguistic feedback, Zahra mentioned that:

Excerpt 1

It is necessary to explain first-time errors, but the items which have been taught before and have been repeated several times should not be used erroneously anymore as they are so easy...so I just provide the correct form because I think they just need a hint to remember the point. (September 11)

Table 1: Frequency and type of the OCF utilized by Zahra

	Frequency	Percentage
Explicit correction	19	61
Metalinguistic feedback	8	26
Repetition	3	10
Clarification request	1	3
Total	31	100

Zahra's Beliefs about the OCF

Zahra's class was comprised of elementary young English learners. This communicative language teaching methodology current in language institutes in Iran was more or less different from what she had received at high school, where memorization and doing extensive grammar practices were at play to help them with admission in the university entrance exam (Zarrinabadi & Mahmoudi-Gahrouei, 2017).

At the interview session (stimulus-recall protocol), Zahra asserted that OCF is useful; however, exploiting her own language learning experience, she emphasized on the fact that for an OCF to be effective, it should have learning values. She, however, stated that:

Excerpt 2

...OCF can be useful if the students can learn something from it...I always put myself in students' shoes and I think they like to learn why their utterance is erroneous (September 11, 2016)

To justify the low number of recasts in her class, Zahra added:

Excerpt 3

I have tried recast many times, but it takes a lot of time for my students to get across the kind of feedback. They immediately ask for further explanations so the recast changes to explicit explanation. If I skip the explanation, they do not learn the correct form and continue using the erroneous sentence. (September 11, 2016)

The nature of the classroom and students' level seems to be other important factors affecting Zahra's choice among OCF practices. In other words, she claimed that metalinguistic feedback and explicit corrections are of paramount significance when she is teaching English to elementary and lower intermediate learners and implicit OCF moves are helpful when the target learners are more proficient in English.

Although Zahra did not have much of teaching experience, when she

was asked about the errors which remained untreated, she asserted that she aimed not to damage her students' confidence and flow of communication. She mentioned this concern regarding the students' confidence in Excerpt 4.

Excerpt 4

Correcting the errors which are beyond learners' proficiency level or have not been taught yet, can just have harmful effects on learners' confidence and stops them from taking part in speaking activities. This way of treating errors, albeit by means of an OCF practice, will produce a kind of unwillingness to speak among the students. (September 9, 2016)

Zahra's cognition on fostering students' confidence can be generated from the ideology prevalent in the English institute which is rather learner-centered. In this regard, Zahra supposed that "Here in private language institutes, learners' affective issues receive much attention" (September 11, 2016).

In a nutshell, Zahra, as a novice English teacher, admitted the efficiency of OCF in EFL classrooms. She, however, did not employ any recasts and elicitations and believed deeply in the duality of explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback. She exploited her short experience with her students to vindicate the effectiveness of some OCF practices over the others. To justify her OCF practices, she brought some learner-related issues into discussions, such as students' needs, proficiency level, and affective domains.

Hoda's OCF Practice

According to Hoda, the answers that the students made in oral practices, based on their textbook, were informal, and consequently tailor-made for speaking exercises. In each unit, students were confronted with a topic, a simple structure, and a list of related pictorial vocabulary. An audio CD accompanied the English textbook, which included readings, conversations, pronunciation practices, and songs. Hoda utilized textbook topics to practice speaking employing short questions and answers. She believed that her

students did not enjoy a high level of English proficiency and were a little perfunctory at doing their homework. Therefore, she had confidence in the fact that this technique of eliciting students' short responses outperformed other techniques. The following examples are some of Hoda's provided OCF practices.

1. Recast

Example 6 (September 11)

Student: My father goes to work by car.

Hoda: Oh, your father goes to work by car, what about your father, Mahdi?

2. Elicitation

Example 7 (September 14)

Student: I have a umbrella.

Hoda: A umbrella or an umbrella?

Student: An umbrella.

3. Metalinguistic feedback (MF)

Example 8 (September 14)

Hoda: [Explains the difference between "have" and "has"]
We use "has" for "he", "she", and "it", and "have" for others.

Table 2: Frequency and type of the OCF utilized by Hoda

	Frequency	Percentage
Explicit correction	17	32.5
Metalinguistic feedback	10	19
Recast	8	15
Elicitation	7	14
Repetition	6	12
Clarification request	4	7.5
Total	52	100

As Table 2 suggests, Hoda employed all types of OCF in her three sessions of instruction; however, the frequency pattern of the OCF practices is much similar to Zahra's. Recast (15%) and elicitation (14%) were the two new OCF moves utilized by Hoda through different techniques. In the majority of cases, recasts were employed when the short question and answer technique of speaking was proceeding in the class.

Moreover, while explicit correction was the OCF which appropriated the lion's share in Hoda's OCF practices (32.5%), repetition and clarification requests seemed not to be appealing enough to Hoda (12% and 7.5%, respectively).

To signal an erroneous form or elicit the correct one, in some cases, Hoda employed a relatively engrossing use of body language. For instance, she raised her eyebrows to induce the students their wrong answers and guidance to the correct one using a guessing game. Waving the index finger was another technique utilized by Hoda to prompt the students to correct their utterances. Besides, she shook her head to impel the students to find the ill-formed part in their utterance and correct it (Example 9). She continued applying these signals until the students or other students came up with an accurate form.

Example 9 (September 9)

Student A: Three dolphins. [[t] instead of [θ]]

Hoda: [shaking head]

Student A: Wales?

Hoda: [continued shaking head]

Student B: No, three dolphins [pronouncing [θ]]

Hoda: Yes [continued with metalinguistic feedback]

Furthermore, Hoda explained how she resorted to comparison as an elicitation technique for treating grammatical errors. She believed that comparison helped not only the learner who committed the error but also the

other learners. Although this strategy was applied more or less by all three teachers, Hoda used it more frequently. She explained this technique:

Excerpt 5

When an error occurs, I provide students with some options including the correct form and I ask them to choose the correct one...comparison creates a situation in which students can think, compare, and finally choose... sometimes peers help the student choose...comparison helps the students remember formerly discussed errors. (September 14, 2016).

Hoda's Beliefs about the OCF

Hoda's students can be characterized as active. Right after the class started, they got involved with the class procedure by participating in nearly all activities. A friendly atmosphere was ongoing in the class and all students were invited to try their guesses whenever a question was raised whether by Hoda or the students.

Hoda clearly emphasized the central role of OCF in overcoming learners' errors and helping them elevate their noticing skills (Kartchava, 2019). She stated that:

Excerpt 6

Whenever a student commits an error and I correct it using a kind of OCF, the students' error may be resolved, but I cannot make sure whether s/he has learned the issue or it is not any other students' potential error. So, I would rather use a kind of OCF which provokes the highest amount of students' attention. (September 11, 2016).

The soft flow of the teaching procedure and maximum involvement of the students delineated the high level of Hoda's "pedagogical content knowledge" and the depth of her commitment to students' learning of the materials (Gudmundsdottir & Shulman, 1987, p. 8).

The variety of OCF practices with peculiar techniques and the way

the classroom procedure was managed by Hoda, highlight the modifying role of teaching experience in her classes. She repeatedly uttered the phrase “as my experience says” during the interview which justifies her reckoning on her teaching experience. This point turned to be much more crystal clear when she was asked about the explicit corrections after the metalinguistic feedback on the frequently occurred errors:

Excerpt 7

As far as my experience suggests, depending on the severity of the error, if I feel that the students still have a problem with the occurred error, I try to explain it, but next time, I just correct it and pass on...because I think commonplace errors do not need further explanations. (September 11, 2016).

To emphasize the role of recast, Hoda put up her knowledge about the affective domain of pedagogy for discussion. She declared that,

Excerpt 8

The students feel insecure when they are repeatedly corrected, so sometimes I correct the students' utterances in a way that they do not get embarrassed about their error. That is, if they make an error in terms of third-person singular “s”, I correct it and change the subject and state it from my point of view with a stress on the “s”, for example, “oh, your father likeS spaghetti”.... As a result, they get my point without any embarrassment, and after a while they try to utter more sentences, using the structure in the correct way. (September 9, 2016).

What makes Hoda's beliefs conspicuous regarding OCF practices can be summarized in her utilization of teaching experience and its pedagogical ramifications in her choices (Fallah & Nazari, 2019; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015).

To sum up, Hoda, as a moderately experienced teacher, pinpointing the effectiveness of OCF, utilized all types of OCF practices. Nevertheless,

much similar to Zahra, the duality of explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback ranked the two mostly-employed OCF practices by Hoda. She also benefitted from “comparison” as an elicitation technique. Embarking on her teaching experience and her pedagogical knowledge, she justified her OCF practices.

Bahar’s OCF Practice

Bahar as a teacher participant with more teaching experience than Zahra and Hoda (around 13 years) preferred to hold her classes wholly in English and allowed her learners to speak English as much as they were able to. Thus, in her class, many courses of teacher-student and student-student interactions could be easily observed. Most interactions, however, were carried out without the provision of any OCF practices by Bahar. Roughly, the situations in which OCF moves were at work occurred when the oral questions or grammar exercises were being done.

As illustrated in Table 3, the variety and order of OCF practiced by Bahar bear a resemblance to Hoda’s with a difference in the order of repetition and elicitation as Bahar employed elicitation (4 cases) in fewer cases in comparison with Hoda (7 cases). The superiority of explicit corrections and recasts in Bahar’s OCF moves brings up an ad hoc conclusion that these two types of OCF practices are favored by experienced English teachers (Fallah & Nazari, 2019; Sephrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2018; Tadayyon, 2019).

Bahar believed that repetition, as a kind of OCF, is the solution to vocabulary and pronunciation errors. Additionally, she showed her tendency to use explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback for correcting grammatical errors. Bahar mentioned her interest in explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback in this way:

Excerpt 9

I pause on errors...then I explain them... when the students are making a sentence, and then abruptly stop, it means that explaining errors is

needed...explaining erroneous forms lowers the percentage of committing that error by the students again. (September 21, 2016).

Table 3: Frequency and type of the OCF utilized by Bahar

	Frequency	Percentage
Explicit correction	19	41
Recast	8	16
Metalinguistic feedback	7	15
Repetition	5	12
Elicitation	4	9
Clarification request	3	8
Total	46	100

As Bahar advocated extensive use of English in the class and emphasized the flow of communication, in some cases she allowed the learners to speak without stopping them for providing OCF. However, she employed recasts when she wanted to change the topic or speaker (Example 10).

Example 10 (September 18)

Bahar: Saman, what do you do every day?

Student: hmmm...I wake up at 7 and I eat breakfast [wrong pronunciation of "breakfast"]...I go to school...I eat a lunch and sleep 2 hour...I watch TV...

Bahar: So you have breakfast [the correct pronunciation of breakfast], go to school, sleep for two hours, and watch TV. Ok, What about you Mitra?

Here, although three errors were committed by the student, Bahar did not break the students' chain of thought and flow of speaking, she postponed it to a recast at the end of the monologue.

Bahar's Beliefs about the OCF

Bahar's teaching experience and her dependence on her educational background were observable in her teaching procedure. Specifically, this experience as a veteran English teacher played a critical role in her choice of OCF practices. Additionally, although Bahar had a lot in common with Zahra and Hoda as the way he corrected errors, she seemed to be different in that she trained her students on how to speak in a stress-free way. She also believed that the learners must be exposed to the maximum English input.

In response to a question about her favoritism toward of explicit correction, Bahar mentioned that she strongly believed that providing indirect OCF in their classes such as clarification request, repetition, recast, and elicitation, was not much effective and did not necessarily bring about learning of the correct form; however, recast could be utilized in situations when students' continuous speaking was desirable. This claim is admitted in the following excerpts by Bahar:

Excerpt 11

I do not think that we can eradicate an error through implicit correction...because the students should be aware of their errors unless they use the erroneous form again... how the students can use the correct form when they are not aware of it...as my students are not highly proficient in English, they need to be corrected and errors need to be highlighted. (September 21, 2016).

Moreover, Bahar legitimized her reluctance toward clarification request as an OCF practice by emphasizing her learners' preferences and level. She claimed that even though she had tried clarification requests in different situations in response to various errors, the students did not identify the errors in their utterances. She continued with this memory she had:

Excerpt 12

I clearly remember once one of my students made an error using “how much” with a countable noun...I asked her to recite it, but I received the same erroneous error more than three times until I reminded him of the usage of “how much” ... he immediately got the point and corrected the utterance... I remember he said “why didn’t you say that earlier. Since then, whenever I attempted to use this kind of OCF, I remembered his words, and use other OCF practices. (September 18, 2016).

Concisely, Bahar showed to have broad pedagogical and contextual knowledge. This issue was evident during the interview, as she brought up discussions about the aims and techniques of Communicative Language Teaching to justify her choices among the OCF moves which were highly anchored and adapted to her class.

DISCUSSION

The results of the study showed that irrespective of the teaching experience of the teachers, they unanimously believed that use of OCF in the class is of prime importance (Fallah & Nazari, 2019; Kartchava et al., 2020; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015) This finding is in contrast to those of Jean and Simard (2011) and Kamiya (2014) whose participants believed OCF practices are of the least importance. The main motive of the participating teachers of this study to provide OCF can be traced in the fact that, if they leave the errors untreated, the process of learning English will remain unaccomplished. Moreover, in some cases, it has been claimed that learners prefer to be aware of their errors (Farrell & Bennis, 2013). This perspective toward error correction can be tracked down in the findings of most studies carried out in the context of Iran (e.g., Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2018; Tadayyon, 2019).

Moreover, all three teachers manifested a high commitment toward providing explicit OCF; however, for more experienced teachers recast and

elicitation as implicit OCF practices appeared in the classroom practices. This finding stands against what Rahimi and Zhang (2015) obtained as novice teachers and experienced ones are relatively fascinated by recasts. This difference can be rooted in the fact that, in the present qualitative study, a thick description of the reasons for teachers' use of specific OCF strategies has been provided, which presents a deeper insight of the teachers' rationales for resorting to various OCF techniques. The novice teacher in this study demonstrated concerns about learning values to justify her total avoidance of recasts. The experienced teachers also employed the low learning values of implicit feedback such as elicitation and repetition to defend the duality of explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback. In line with Ellis (2009), the teachers asserted that explicit feedback attracts students' attention to the erroneous utterances and help them to utilize self-correction in reprisal for self-awareness of common errors.

Nevertheless, the results suggest an array of differences between the teachers' beliefs in terms of the frequency and type of their provided OCF practices. These differences can have roots in the fact that teaching experience was a modifying factor in their beliefs about OCF practices (Fallah & Nazari, 2019; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015). However, other mediating factors were at work within the confines of experience such as learner-related factors for all three teachers and language learning experience, especially conspicuous in the novice teacher's cognition about OCF (Rahimi & Zhang, 2015).

Accordingly, research has shown that most novice teachers' cognitions are heavily affected by their experience as young learners (Phipps & Borg, 2007). These learning experiences of English teachers are assumed to be significant modifiers of their cognitions (Bao, 2019). This can be embedded in the fact that such cognitions are normally the outgrowth of long hours of classroom attendance and observations, technically known as "the apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975). For example, if English teachers concluded that a certain kind of OCF practice is applicable or not when they were English learners, the selection or rejection of that OCF can

be directly conditioned by their language learning experience. This language learning experience seemed to be employed more by teachers with less language teaching experience, as they are younger with fresh memories of their own language learning experience (Kartchava et al., 2020).

Furthermore, the results revealed that the English teachers, depending on their teaching experience, consider learners' needs when choosing the OCF moves. This finding greatly correlates with other studies in this area, such as Roothoof (2018), Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2018), and Fallah and Nazari (2019). Simply put, English teachers may prefer some OCF practices over others, as they think that such OCF practices might bring about negative impacts on the students, including an unwillingness to speak, loss of self-esteem, and embarrassment (Bao, 2019; Kamiya, 2016; Miranda-Calderón, 2013; Rastegar & Homayoon, 2012).

Overall, the findings revealed that in accordance with research-based evidence toward impacts of teaching experience on teachers' classroom practices (Borg, 2003), all three teachers resorted to learner-related issues and the novice one employed their own language learning experience to justify their classroom OCF practices. Accordingly, it can be claimed that teaching experience can be the main driving force leading them to choose and apply different types of OCF practices.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study investigated English teachers' cognition about different types of OCF and the possible impacts of experience along with other factors in modifying their thoughts. The results of the study suggested that the three teachers maintained positive perspectives toward OCF, and teaching experience seemed to be an influential factor in shaping teachers' beliefs about OCF, either overtly or covertly. In this regard, teachers' overall knowledge and students' noticing skills about the utilization of OCF can be raised using feedback training courses (Kartchava, 2019). Thereby, it can be possible to achieve the uppermost benefits of OCF practices in all language

classes.

Moreover, in line with Ellis (2009) who believes the educational programs of English language teaching should help pre- or in-service teachers overcome the “controversies regarding CF” (p. 4), this issue of OCF could be practiced in English teacher training programs and English-related education to develop pre-packaged practical techniques such as type and quality of providing OCF (Rashidi & Forutan, 2015).

This research, however, like any other studies has some limitations. Most observably, the number of participants in this study was not sizable enough to make any generalizations. Moreover, as all three teachers who participated in this study were females, it would be of great benefit to fulfill gender-based comparisons of teachers’ beliefs about OCF.

Finally, although the present research had an exploratory nature, further studies are called to be done with a larger number of experienced and novice English teachers to explore and bring more insight into the OCF practices and teachers’ cognition in EFL and ESL contexts. Investigating the influences of educational background and attended training courses on OCF classroom practices with detailed characteristics (for example, teachers’ portfolios, learners’ journals, and teaching materials) would also bring about informative findings in this regard. Besides, methodological triangulation for investigating teachers’ cognition about OCF (e.g., examining teachers’ journals and applying think-aloud sessions) could be utilized in studies aimed at exploring OCF and teachers’ beliefs. Despite the limitations, this study will help provide more insights into how novice and experienced teachers think about and manage the pervasive task of OCF provision to learners.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Shahab Moradkhani

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2129-4453>

Ahmad Goodarzi

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3549-7240>

References

- Akbari, R., & Tajik, L. (2009). Teachers' pedagogic knowledge base: A comparison between experienced and less experienced practitioners. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(6), 52-73.
- Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes: Teachers' beliefs versus their practices. *System*, 82, 140-150.
- Borg, S. (1999). Studying teacher cognition in second language grammar teaching. *System*, 27(1), 19-31.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(02), 81-109.
- Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 436-458.
- Burri, M., Chen, H., & Baker, A. (2017). Joint development of teacher cognition and identity through learning to teach L2 pronunciation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(1), 128-142.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper, G. (2016). Teacher cognition of pronunciation teaching amongst English language teachers in Uruguay. *Journal of Second Language Pronunciation*, 2(1), 29-55.
- Couper, G. (2017). Teacher cognition of pronunciation teaching: Teachers' concerns and issues. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(4), 820-843.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3-18.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language learning*, 51(2), 281-318.
- Enow, L., & Goodwyn, A. (2018). The invisible plan: How English teachers develop their expertise and the special place of adapting the skills of lesson

- planning. *English in Education*, 52(2), 120-134.
- Fallah, N., & Nazari, M. (2019). L2 teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback: The mediating role of experience. *English Teaching & Learning*, 43(2), 147-164.
- Farrell, T. S., & Bennis, K. (2013). Reflecting on ESL teacher beliefs and classroom practices: A case study. *RELC Journal*, 44(2), 163-176.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Gatbonton, E. (2008). Looking beyond teachers' classroom behaviour: Novice and experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 161-182.
- Goo, J., & Mackey, A. (2013). The case against the case against recasts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 35(1), 127-165.
- Gudmundsdottir, S., & Shulman, L. (1987). Pedagogical content knowledge in social studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 31(2), 59-70.
- Junqueira, L., & Kim, Y. (2013). Exploring the relationship between training, beliefs, and teachers' corrective feedback practices: A case study of a novice and an experienced ESL teacher. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 69(2), 181-206.
- Kamiya, N. (2016). The relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(3), 206-219.
- Kalra, R. (2018). Experienced and novice teachers' awareness and attitudes towards ICT in language classroom: A study conducted in a Thai context. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on CALL*, (4), 125-131.
- Kartchava, E., Gatbonton, E., Ammar, A., & Trofimovich, P. (2020). Oral corrective feedback: Pre-service English as a second language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(2), 220-249.
- Kartchava, E. (2019). *Noticing oral corrective feedback in the second language classroom: background and evidence*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publications.
- Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309-365.
- Li, L. (2020). Teacher Cognition and Teacher Education. *In language teacher*

- cognition* (pp. 277-312). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lloyd, C. A. (2019). Exploring the real-world decision-making of novice and experienced teachers. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 43(2), 166-182.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(01), 37-66.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1-40.
- Mackey, A., Polio, C., & McDonough, K. (2004). The relationship between experience, education and teachers' use of incidental focus-on-form techniques. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 301-327.
- Meijer, P. C., Verloop, N., & Beijaard, D. (2002). Multi-method triangulation in a qualitative study on teachers' practical knowledge: An attempt to increase internal validity. *Quality and Quantity*, 36(2), 145-167.
- Miranda-Calderón, N. (2013). *EFL learner and teacher perspectives on corrective feedback and their effect on second language learning motivation*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. McGill University.
- Nassaji, H. (2018). How to add to knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(2) 143 –147
- Ngo, X. M. (2018). A sociocultural perspective on second language writing teacher cognition: A Vietnamese teacher's narrative. *System*, 78, 79-90.
- Nguyen, N. C., & Duy, V. V. (2019). An exploratory study on perspectives of Vietnamese experienced teachers and student teachers toward teachers' code-switching. *Cambridge Open-Review Educational Research Journal*, 6, 66-79.
- Pang, M. (2016). Pedagogical reasoning in EFL/ESL teaching: Revisiting the importance of teaching lesson planning in second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(1), 246-263.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573-595.
- Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, 37(3), 380-390.

- Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2015). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' cognitions about corrective feedback in teaching English oral communication. *System*, 55, 111-122.
- Rashidi, N., & Forutan, A. (2015). On the Iranian in-service and pre-service language teachers' perceptions of educational supervision concerning their professional development. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 4(2), 27-55.
- Rastegar, M., & Homayoon, H. (2012). EFL learners' preferences for error correction and its relationship with demotivation and language proficiency in the Iranian context. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 1(2), 323-341.
- Roothoof, H. (2018). Teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: A comparison of secondary and adult education. *Filología Didáctica de la Lengua*, 18, 151-176.
- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, 25(4), 318-335.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching*, 13, 133-164.
- Ghafar Samar, R., & Moradkhani, S. (2014). Codeswitching in the language classroom: A study of four EFL teachers' cognition. *RELC Journal*, 45(2), 151-164.
- Sepehrinia, S., & Mehdizadeh, M. (2016). Oral corrective feedback: Teachers' concerns and researchers' orientation. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(4), 1-18.
- Shi, L., Baker, A., & Chen, H. (2019). Chinese EFL teachers' cognition about the effectiveness of genre pedagogy: A case study. *RELC Journal*, 50(2), 314-332.
- Svalberg, A. M. L. (2015). Understanding the complex processes in developing student teachers' knowledge about grammar. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(3), 529-545.
- Tadayyon, M. (2019). *A comparison of Iran's EFL and New Zealand's ESL teachers' stated beliefs about oral corrective feedback and their actual classroom practices*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Auckland University of Technology.

Appendix

Transcript conventions:

(): An inaudible utterance

[]: An explanation of the circumstance by the researcher

...: Hesitation or Pause