EFL TEACHERS' BELIEFS AND THEIR PRACTICES IN GRAMMAR TEACHING AND CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK: A CASE STUDY

SERHAT BAŞAR

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2019

EFL TEACHERS' BELIEFS AND THEIR PRACTICES IN GRAMMAR TEACHING AND CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK: A CASE STUDY

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

English Language Education

by

Serhat Başar

Boğaziçi University

2019

EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Their Practices

in Grammar Teaching and Corrective Feedback:

A Case Study

The thesis of Serhat Başar

has been approved by:

Assoc. Prof. Sumru Akcan
(Thesis Advisor)

Prof. Yasemin Bayyurt

Assist. Prof. Zeynep Cumhur
Çamlıbel Acar
(External Member)

May 2019

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Serhat Başar, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date .....06.05.2019.....

ABSTRACT

EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Their Practices in Grammar Teaching and Corrective Feedback: A Case Study

This Language Teacher Cognition (LTC) study primarily explores language teachers' beliefs and practices about two common Instructed Second Language Acquisition (ISLA) constructs: Grammar Teaching (GT) and Corrective Feedback (CF). This study also aims to investigate to what extent teacher beliefs and practices compromise with each other and cognitive and contextual factors behind their cognition. The data were collected through multiple sources including interviews, observations, and stimulated recall with the teachers from the preparatory school of a state university. The findings after a within-case and cross-case analysis revealed that coursebook-based beliefs, experience-based beliefs, lack of theoretical knowledge and inclination for communicative activities influence what teachers believe about GT. There are both congruent and incongruent relationships between beliefs and practices varying from one teacher to another due to the effect of experiential knowledge, unconscious decisions, and some contextual factors. The teachers commonly lack theoretical knowledge about CF, they use recast most, and they tend to avoid CF during communicative activities; however, they differ from each other in terms of their CF choices for the target structure, grammar exercises, students and context. CF practices are aligned with their beliefs except for a few divergences stemming from unconscious and instant decisions. The findings can contribute to the integration of LTC into ISLA studies to reach more comprehensive results and to LTC framework by exploring the effects of many variables on teachers' decision making processes.

ÖZET

Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Dilbilgisi Öğretimi ve Düzeltici Dönüte Yöenilik İnanış ve Uygulamaları: Bir Durum Çalışması

Dil Öğretmeni Bilişselliği (DÖB) konulu bu çalışma dil öğretmenlerinin Sınıf Ortamında İkinci Dil Edinim (SOİDE) alanına ait iki genel konudan Düzeltici Dönüt (DD) ve Dilbilgisi Öğretimi (DÖ) kapsamında inanış ve uygulamalarını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışma ayrıca öğretmen bilişselliğini etkileyen bilişsel ve bağlamsal etmenleri ve öğretmenlerin inanış ve uygulamalarının birbirleriyle ne ölçüde tutarlı olduklarını araştırmayı hedeflemektedir. Bu çalışma için veriler bir devlet üniversitesinin hazırlık okulunda, öğretmenlerden görüşme, gözlem ve hatırlatıcı görüşme aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Durum içi ve çapraz durum analizlerinden sonra elde edilen bulgular göstermektedir ki ders kitabı temelli inanışlar, deneyim temelli inanışlar, teorik bilgi eksikliği ve iletişimsel aktivitelere olan eğilim öğretmenlerin DÖ kapsamındaki inanışlarını etkilemektedir. Deneyimsel bilgiler, bilinçsiz kararlar ve bazı bağlamsal etmenlerden dolayı birbirlerinden farklı olmak üzere, öğretmenlerin inanış ve uygulamaları arasında hem tutarlı hem de tutarsız ilişkiler mevcuttur. Öğretmenler ortak olarak DD hakkında teorik bilgi eksikliği yaşamakta, DD türlerinden en çok yeniden biçimlendirmeyi tercih etmekte ve iletişimsel aktivitelerde DD kullanmamaya meyillidir. Ancak, öğretmenler, hedef yapı, dilbilgisi alıştırmaları, öğrenciler ve bağlam kapsamındaki DD tercihleri açısından birbirlerinden farklı düşünmektedir. Öğretmenlerin DD uygulamaları bilinçsiz ve hızlı verilmiş kararlardan kaynaklanan etmenlerden dolayı ortaya çıkan birkaç tutarsızlık dışında genel DD inanışlarıyla uyuşmaktadır. Bu bulgular, öğretmen bilişselliğinin SOİDE alanındaki çalışmalara dahil edilmesi ve bu

bütünleşik çalışmaların daha kapsayıcı sonuçlar elde etmesine ve DÖB çalışma alanına birçok değişkenin öğretmenlerin karar alma süreçlerindeki etkilerini inceleyerek katkıda bulunabilir.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my special thanks to my thesis advisor, Assoc. Prof. Sumru Akcan for the valuable and constant help that she provided whenever I needed. What pioneered the change in my perspective towards Teacher Cognition as a theoretical framework was her invaluable guidance in the graduate course. Her organized, well-planned and affective efforts enabled me to complete this thesis successfully and satisfactorily without having to destruct my daily life.

I would like to thank Assist Prof. Şebnem Yalçın for the insightful contributions that helped me to conduct my studies constituting the skeleton of my thesis. I also would like to thank Prof. Yasemin Bayyurt for the encouragement that let me have a more critical approach for my study by broadening my perspective.

I also would like to extend my thanks to The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) for the financial support within the scope of the 2210-A National Scholarship Programme for Master's Students.

For their constant support and encouragement, I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to my mom, Fatma, my dad, Mustafa, my brother Ömer and my sisters Dilek and Dilay. My final thanks go to my dear friends Burak Ozan, Esat Kuzu, Fatma Ege, Hanife Emel, Saime Kara, Yasin Alkan and Yusuf Cengiz for their constant encouragement, feedback, and words of appreciation, which motivated me to have an absolute determination and never-ending energy to keep going.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Statement of the problem 3

1.2 Purpose of the study 4

1.3 Significance of the study 6

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 8

2.1 Language teacher cognition 8

2.2 L2 grammar teaching 14

2.3 Corrective feedback 19

2.4 LTC in L2 grammar teaching and corrective feedback studies 25

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY 45

3.1 Problem statement and research questions 45

3.2 Setting and participants 46

3.3 Instrumentation 53

3.4 Data analysis 59

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS 63

4.1 Within-case analysis results 63

4.2 Cross-case analysis results 120

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 131

APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR TEACHERS 151

APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR STUDENTS 153

APPENDIX C: ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL 155

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW FOR BELIEF QUESTIONS 156

REFERENCES 158

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. A Taxonomy of CF Strategies 21

Table 2. Participants' Background Information 50

Table 3. Instruments, Participants, and Timing of Data Collection 58

Table 4. Distribution of Feedback Types in Sezen's Lessons.....75

Table 5. Distribution of Feedback Types in İrem's Lessons.....87

Table 6. Distribution of Feedback Types in Merve's Lessons.....102

Table 7. Distribution of Feedback Types in Ayça's Lessons.....116

Table 8. Distribution of Feedback Types in the Teachers' Lessons.....128

ABBREVIATIONS

CEFR: Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

CF: Corrective Feedback

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching

COC: Curriculum Innovation Project

DD: Corrective Feedback (Düzeltici Dönüt)

DÖ: Grammar Teaching (Dilbilgisi Öğretimi)

DÖB: Language Teacher Cognition (Dil Öğretmeni Bilişselliği)

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELF: English as a Lingua Franca

ELT: English Language Teaching

GT: Grammar Teaching

GTM: Grammar Translation Method

ISLA: Instructed Second Language Acquisition

LTC: Language Teacher Cognition

MoNE: Ministry of National Education

PBI: Production Based Instruction

PCK: Pedagogical Content Knowledge

PI: Processing Instruction

PPP: Presentation Practice Production

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

SOİDE: Instructed Second Language Acquisition (Sınıf Ortamında İkinci Dil Edinimi)

TPR: Total Physical Response

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Language teacher cognition studies drew substantial attention especially in the last 25 years, and the number of studies conducted in this research domain has dramatically increased. Teacher cognition as a theoretical framework refers to a complex combination of knowledge, beliefs and thoughts hold by language teachers regarding their instructional decisions and actions (Borg, 2006). It is also foregrounded that this complex cognitive activity of teachers has its roots from their experience-based, personalized and context-sensitive perspectives and attitudes (Farrell & Lim, 2005). On the basis of this complexity, the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their instructional practices has been the interest of many studies in the field of Language Teacher Cognition (LTC). This relationship between beliefs and practices has been examined based on a variety of language learning issues including L2 writing, speaking, listening, reading, vocabulary, grammar, corrective feedback, and pronunciation. This examination mostly reveals two types of relationships between language teachers' beliefs and practices. The beliefs that they hold may be consistent with what they carry out in the classroom, or they may be inconsistent with their instructional actions. Both cases can require a more in-depth analysis of the reasons for consistency or inconsistency.

One of the most prominent research concerns has been the issue of whether stated teacher beliefs correspond with what they achieve in the class. Underlying reasons for the congruence or mismatch between beliefs and practices, contextual factors influencing the relationship and how teachers retrospectively reflect on these relationships have constituted the main focus of LTC studies, which also represents

the foundation of the theoretical framework within which LTC studies are employed. In this sense, LTC studies can provide an opportunity to explore teaching contexts for the situation in which language teachers deviate from their epistemological beliefs by adopting practices that are not in line with these beliefs (Basturkmen et al. 2004).

Reasons for the consistency between stated beliefs and teachers' practices are attributed to the powerful influences of beliefs on language teaching (Pajares, 1992). As for the underlying reasons for the deviations from beliefs, several contextual factors are mentioned to have a role in adopting a teaching practice that is at odds with beliefs. Institutional curricula, time limitations, high-stakes examinations are among these contextual factors (Phipps & Borg, 2009). In this sense, both convergences between epistemological beliefs and instructional practices and divergences from stated beliefs have the potential to reveal the core cognition beyond the teaching of language teachers.

Likewise, recent trends in SLA have paved the way for more communication-oriented, democratic, student-centred and active student-engagement in a classroom, and there has been an interest between the relationship of teacher beliefs and student beliefs regarding L2 pedagogy (Brown, 2009). As the concept of beliefs as a mental construct is thought to be about mental states signifying the underlying principles of human actions (Richardson, 1999), learner beliefs in the language learning process can be regarded as a prominent factor affecting academic achievement (Williams & Burden, 1997). While these beliefs could be compatible with teacher beliefs, they may also differ from what teachers believe. This kind of discrepancy might adversely influence learners' affective state and lead to dissatisfaction (Schulz, 1996).

1.1 Statement of the problem

As there is lack of generalizability in L2 teaching studies in terms of the outcomes because of several factors including teaching styles, individual learner differences, power relationships, gender identities, religious beliefs and more (Long, 2017), this problem of generalizability requires examining other confounding variables such as teachers, their beliefs and their teaching more closely to have a deeper understanding of each instructional context and specific instruction that is implemented in that context. Thus, this study will offer a teaching context to be analyzed on the basis of two aspects: corrective feedback and grammar teaching.

Based on the literature examined above, language teachers may hold consistent or contradictory beliefs and practices depending on the context in which they teach. The way they deliver target linguistic form and correct students' mistakes can vary from one teacher to another. It can even change within a case of a single teacher. The reasons for these variations have been attributed to contextual factors stated by teachers or some interpretations of researchers who coded the data obtained from language teachers. In this sense, it can be put forward that complex natures of both ISLA and LTC may require both context-sensitive and particular studies encompassing the variables existing in ISLA literature and inclusion of teacher cognition perspective into the findings related to those ISLA components.

In addition to the gap between ISLA and LTC studies, the other problem in LTC studies is lack of comprehensive studies that encompass the cognitive and contextual factors considered to be influential in teacher cognition rather than a single variable such as academic background, teaching experience, and learning experience. Lack of this kind of studies impedes having insight into how language

teachers' beliefs and practices compromise with each other and to what extent cognitive and contextual factors affect the way they make instructional decisions.

1.2 Purpose of the study

Considering the baseline and the significance of teacher cognition in language teaching, this study investigates belief systems of four EFL teachers and their classroom practices with regard to providing corrective feedback and grammar teaching in a Turkish context. Starting with their general beliefs about oral feedback and grammar instructions, their actual performances are compared to their beliefs to see to what extent beliefs and practices correspond with each other and the underlying reasons for congruence and divergence between epistemological beliefs and observed practices.

This study contributes to the existing body of research by exploring teachers' beliefs in corrective feedback and grammar teaching and relating them to ISLA studies in order to provide a perspective within which the role of instruction in language teaching can be analyzed in a relatively more inclusive way. Correspondingly, this study provides a chance for teachers to reflect on their performances based on their beliefs, which offers a basis to have a better understanding of the rationale behind the relationships between stated beliefs and observed practices. As it is widely accepted that instructional practices can have a context-sensitive nature (Sanchez & Borg, 2014), the role of the cognitive and contextual factors in shaping the teachers' practices is another focus of the study.

What teachers think about the pattern between their beliefs and practices constitutes another substantial purpose of this study in that whether they critically reflect on their teaching for personal development is highlighted. Likewise,

detrimental factors mentioned by the teachers are stated to be considered for institutional policies regarding both curricular objectives and teacher education policies.

For grammar teaching, the main focus is on how teachers deliver a target grammar structure and what they use to make students learn that target structure. More specifically, beliefs and practices regarding grammar teaching are expected to include whether the teachers use form-focused instruction or meaning-based instruction (Spada, 2011); if they make use of form-focused instruction whether it is isolated or integrated (Spada & Lightbown, 2008); whether grammar is taught inductively or deductively (DeKeyser, 1995); whether grammar is instructed explicitly or implicitly (Suzuki & DeKeyser, 2015) and whether the teachers utilize from grammar practices (Ellis, 1991). The inclusion of teacher cognition into grammar teaching studies can be beneficial in that teachers' epistemological beliefs shape the way they teach grammar, and it may be unlikely to change these beliefs with teacher education or research findings without creating an awareness and reflection opportunity to revise the aforementioned beliefs (Basturkmen, 2007; Borg, 2011).

When it comes to corrective feedback (CF), the study is based on how the teachers correct their students' mistakes and which feedback types they use in case of an error in their language production. Feedback types that are taken into the analysis in this study consist of recast, metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction and prompts like elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic clue and clarification. Studies in ISLA have primarily carried out within various perspectives including input hypothesis (Long, 1996), noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 2001) and output hypothesis (Swain, 1985). However, the relationship between CF and teacher cognition has not

been drawn attention compared to CF studies. The reason why teachers correct learners and how they do it can yield more tangible research outcomes as it can widen the perspective that we have towards CF (Lyster & Mori, 2006). One of the reasons why the focus is on oral CF instead of written CF is the concern that oral and written CF studies may distinctively differ from one another considering the findings (Bitchener, 2008). In order not to widen the scope of the study with some salient differences in terms of CF forms, oral CF was chosen as the CF form to be studied. The other reason is related to the fact that the modality of CF had to be in line with the nature of the other research construct, which is grammar teaching. Focusing on both grammar teaching and oral CF was thought to be more relevant for data collection concerns.

1.3 The significance of the study

In light of this brief background, the significance of LTC studies can be explained in a variety of ways. First, it sheds light on the decision-making process through which language teachers go and come up with an instructional decision (Osam & Balbay, 2004). Second, teachers can have a chance to reflect on the relationship between their beliefs and practices. Even if they are congruent which each other, it might offer a cognitive awareness about teacher learning (Freeman, 1992, 1993). In case stated beliefs and practices are different from each other, it is acknowledged that the results can urge teachers to recognize the inconsistent components in their cognition, which may lead to a self-development process (Golombek & Johnson, 2004). Third, the findings of LTC studies can substantively contribute to teacher education. Regarding professional development, the findings can make contributions to the institutional policies in that administrators can have an opportunity to be aware of the detrimental

contextual factors negatively influencing the teachers' performances and they might plan to hold proper in-service teacher education programs.

Another significance of LTC studies is its crucial place in language teaching studies, and the study results in this field can be evaluated together with those of Instructed Second Language Acquisition (ISLA). Both experimental and descriptive studies in ISLA do not tell much about teacher cognition (Borg, 1999) ISLA studies predominantly focus on research domains such as explicit-implicit teaching, form-focused instruction-meaning based instruction, integrated focus on form-isolated focus on form, corrective feedback, input, interaction, output, procedural-declarative knowledge, individual learner differences and so on. In this regard, LTC studies can put forward another perspective to ISLA in that what teachers believe and what they do in their class can be taken into consideration together with ISLA findings in order to have a more comprehensive basis both for implication and further research studies.

Following the gap between these two fields, more comprehensive studies aiming to integrate teacher cognition and instructional L2 domains can yield a broader picture of the relationship between theory and practice and to what extent research findings are related to teachers' beliefs.

The next section firstly draws attention to the SLA literature to examine how L2 grammar teaching and corrective feedback are discussed. Secondly, previous studies exploring teacher cognition in L2 grammar teaching and corrective feedback within LTC framework are presented. Finally, an overview of these studies is presented to shed light on the gap in the literature.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Language teacher cognition

Before the concept of teacher cognition started to be used dominantly in the literature, teacher belief was defined as "broadly as tacit, often unconsciously held assumptions about students, classrooms, and the academic material to be taught" (Kagan, 1992, p.65). Teacher cognition is defined as "what teachers know, believe and think and teachers are active, thinking decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex practically-oriented, personalized, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs" (Borg, 2003, p. 81). Having aimed to operationalize the teacher cognition framework, Borg (1997) states that teacher cognition encapsulates "beliefs, knowledge, theories, attitudes, images, assumptions, metaphors, conceptions and perspectives about teaching, teachers, learning, students, subject matter, curricula, materials, activities, and self." (p. 82). As for the factors shaping the dynamics of this operational definition, Borg (1997) puts forward four main factors as follows:

(1) "Schooling": the experience classrooms as a student and pre-service education, which plays a substantial role in early cognition.

(2) "Professional Coursework": Completed work and studies may consciously or unconsciously affect the cognition.

(3) "Contextual Factors": they can affect the practice by changing cognitions, which may induce inconsistencies between practice and cognition

(4) "Classroom Practice": classroom practice can influence teacher cognition in an unconscious way or through attentive reflection (p.82).

This complex nature of teacher cognition is claimed to have a significant influence on instructional decisions made by teachers in class and their pedagogical and instructional practices since teachers' beliefs regarded as cognitive filters underlying teachers' performances in instructional settings (Shavelson & Stern, 1981). For this reason, the role of teachers' belief system in language learning achievement has been emphasized in the field. Like the case of teachers, learners' perceptions and beliefs are also thought to be substantial to reach an adequate achievement level. Based upon this, Williams and Burden (1997) claimed that "learners' perceptions and interpretations... have been found to have the greatest influence on achievement" (p. 98). Handling the issue within a social constructivist framework because of the nature of classroom dynamics and teacher-learner interactions, Williams and Burden (1997) drew attention to the association between teacher beliefs and their actions and the necessity of identification of beliefs in social constructivist framework by saying that teachers beliefs "will influence their actions in the classroom" (pp. 48–49). This relationship between teacher cognition and classroom practice is also called "symbiotic relationships" (Foss & Kleinsasser, 1996, p.441). As classroom practices do not completely indicate teachers' "stated beliefs", "personal theories" and "pedagogical principles", this relationship between practice and cognition is multi-faceted in that teachers' classroom practices are thought to be the reflection of interrelated and somehow contradictory factors and teacher cognition is the crucial factor framing those practices (Borg, 1997, p.91).

When it comes to change in teacher cognition, Musumeci (1997) argues that the reason why recent approaches and changes in language learning fail to be adopted by teachers because of the difficulty in changing what teachers believe. As it is assumed that teacher beliefs constitute one of the most prominent factors

influencing instructional decisions, whether any changes in teachers' belief systems can bring about a parallel change in their actions has been widely questioned in order to reach a fulfilling answer that can be used in teacher education programs prepared based on teacher beliefs. Kagan (1992) assumes that such a change in teacher beliefs may not be different from other kinds of changes in personal beliefs. He acknowledges that teachers may not go through a change process after reading research articles, but they may change the way they believe by their own teaching experience or by being exposed to their peers' teaching experience. Previous studies put forward two possible assumptions with respect to the concept of change in teacher belief. While the first assumption is about the stable and conservative nature of teacher belief (Brousseau, Book, & Byers, 1988), the second assumption is against the idea that teacher beliefs are not susceptible to conceptual changes (Evertson & Weade, 1989).

Regarding this issue of change in language teachers' cognition, teacher education is considered to be influential in forming the state of cognition (Richards, Ho, & Giblin, 1996); however, some studies found that teacher education may not remarkably alter what language teachers believe. Most of the research studies have been conducted in pre-service education contexts, and the findings vary significantly. Freeman (1993) reports that language teachers can go through cognitive change processes during teacher education and it can be possible to keep track of those changes in their classroom practices based on the data collected from in-service master degree language teachers. Similarly, it is asserted that language teachers may show some behavioral changes after training, but those changes may not resonate a more profound cognitive change (Almarza, 1996). As for the scope of aforementioned changes in teacher cognition, Sendan & Roberts (1998) states that

though fundamental changes may not occur in the content of teacher cognition, the way teachers organize their beliefs may change structurally. However, this kind of change is not defined as a linear change that means the addition of new beliefs to pre-existing ones in a cumulative way. Besides, Cabaroglu & Roberts (2000) operationalizes the concept of change in cognition by some definitions such as “re-ordering” (changing beliefs in order of priorities), “re-labeling” (Giving different names to existing labels) and “reversal” (acquiring a contradictory belief) (p. 393).

On the contrary to these statements, Peacock (2001) suggests that pre-service teacher education may not substantially influence teacher cognition except for a few minor changes. Also, there is another dimension that has to be paid attention, which is individual differences. In this vein, both pre-service and in-service teacher education might not end up with the same change in all cases because language teachers can differ from each other in terms of their understanding and interpreting the education based on their own beliefs and experiences (Richards, Ho, & Giblin, 1996).

Another fundamental aspect of teacher cognition that has received attention recently is the scope of the relationship between language teachers’ beliefs and their practices in relation to those beliefs. Johnson (1994) educational research on teachers' beliefs share three basic assumptions: (1) Teachers' beliefs influence perception and judgment. (2) Teachers' beliefs play a role in how information on teaching is translated into classroom practices. (3) Understanding teachers' beliefs is essential to improving teaching practices and teacher education programs (p. 439). Teacher cognition studies primarily focus on teachers’ stated beliefs and their classroom practices and to what extent they are in line with each other (Borg, 2009). Stated beliefs refer to teachers’ personal opinions, and perceptions conveyed as

“should be done,” “should be the case,” and “is preferable” (Basturkmen, Loewen, and Ellis 2004, p.244). However, stated beliefs might not reflect the real beliefs in that teachers may hinder what they believe in order to be in line with the prevailing teaching trends in the field and societal standards (Kamiya, 2016). This discrepancy is also attributed to the effect of interview questions directed to the teachers by researchers since those questions or researchers might entail an expected answer (Woods, 1996). Another perspective touching upon differences in beliefs belongs to Phipps and Borg (2009), and they claim that language teachers can have two different belief systems: peripheral and core beliefs. While they have core beliefs formed based on their ideology, teaching philosophy and education, they also adopt some peripheral beliefs that are at odds with their core beliefs. The reason for this is attributed to the contextual necessities urging teachers to adapt their beliefs and perform accordingly.

While consistencies are taken into account and considered to be key to language achievement, inconsistencies between beliefs and practices can also be the source of research studies (Karavas & Doukas, 1996; Richards et al., 2001). In this kind of studies, teachers are not seen as passive recipients of the research findings as it is thought that they have an active role in what is being studied (Johnson & Golombek, 2004). Notably, the concept of “tension between peripheral and core beliefs” (Phipps & Borg, 2009, p.381) can shed light on the underlying mechanisms activating classroom decisions that are not in line with language teachers’ beliefs. Thus, it can be said that the inconsistencies occurring in class in terms of core beliefs and practices can be attributed to peripheral beliefs adopted by language teachers in order for a better learning environment. As for the mechanisms activating in-class decisions, there is a variety of factors thought to be influential in the process of

decision making. For instance, Richards (1996) puts forward eight maxims triggering in-class decisions:

1. “Involvement”: involving students into the lesson by considering their interest
2. “Planning”: planning what is to be taught and following the plan
3. “Order”: providing order and discipline in class
4. “Encouragement”: encouraging the students to take an active role in learning
5. “Accuracy”: making learners have accuracy in production
6. “Efficiency”: adjusting timing for efficient use of classroom time
7. “Conformity”: trying to be consistent with the given principles
8. “Empowerment”: providing learner autonomy (pp. 287-291).

Likewise, there are five categories of teachers’ concerns affecting their in-class decisions (Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver, & Thwaite, 2001):

1. a concern with how the learner undertakes the learning process
2. a concern with particular attributes of the learner
3. a concern with how to use the classroom and its human and material resources to optimize learning
4. a concern with the subject matter of learning — with what is being taught and learned
5. a concern with the specific contributions that they can make in their role as teacher (p. 484).

When it comes to the notions influencing teacher cognition, they include teachers’ learning experience, their pre-service education, and the context in which they work (Johnson, 1994). Teachers’ previous language learning experiences can have

substantial effects on their cognition (Holt Reynolds, 1992; Lortie, 1975). Likewise, teachers' pre-service education is regarded as one of the main factors playing a role in teacher cognition (Jafarigohar & Kheiri, 2015); however, it is also acknowledged that what teachers believe as a part of teacher cognition can surpass the effect of teacher education (Kagan, 1992; Richardson 1996). As for the role of contextual factors, it is widely accepted that contextual factors of an institution such as timing, syllabus and students' proficiency level and their attitudes can substantially influence teachers' beliefs and their instructional decisions in those institutions (Andrews, 2007).

2.2 L2 grammar teaching

As for teaching grammar, it is relatively a broad term which can be operationalized in multiple ways. Even though grammar constituted a substantial role in language teaching especially for teaching methods based on a structural syllabus such as Grammar Translation Method (GTM), Audiolingualism, Total Physical Response (TPR) and situational language teaching, after the predominance of communicative language teaching approach (Allwright, 1979) and natural methods (Krashen, 1982) taking their roots from universal grammar theories did not include grammar teaching as a component in their syllabi since grammar teaching was not related to grammar acquisition (Ellis, 2002). Based upon this reality Ellis (2006) defines grammar teaching as following "Grammar teaching involves any instructional technique that draws learners' attention to some specific grammatical form in such a way that it helps them either to understand it metalinguistically and/or process it in comprehension and/or production so that they can internalize it" (p.84). However, recent grammar teaching studies have aimed to include focus on form into language

teaching in order to integrate both meaning and form for grammar teaching (Doughty & Williams, 1998) since natural language teaching methods do not yield high competence in grammar and sociolinguistic competence (Ellis, 2002). This lack of competence is evident in the case of Canadian immersion school learners' failure in grammar and sociolinguistic competence on the contrary to their high proficiency in discourse and strategic competence (Swain, 1985). Then, some fundamental issues regarding teaching L2 grammar have been focal points of the research studies. Ellis (2006) denotes that these issues are mostly about

- teaching grammar or learning it in a context in a natural way
- the content of grammar to be taught
- the timing of teaching grammar (at the beginning of L2 learning or after a while)
- lesson time allocated for grammar teaching (teaching in a short time or a scattered long period)
- intensive and extensive grammar teaching (many structures in one lesson or one structure in a single lesson)
- the importance of explicit grammar teaching
- implications of implicit grammar teaching
- the way grammar instruction is provided (instruction in an isolated lesson or integrated instruction with communicative activities)

Hence, subsequent studies have been conducted within a perspective highlighting the role of grammar in form-focused language teaching in a similar way given above, and some of these research areas on ISLA include whether grammar should be taught (Spada, 2007; Gass & Varonis, 1994), comparison of inductive grammar teaching to deductive approach (DeKeyser, 1993), use of grammar terminology (Garrett, 1986),

timing of grammar instruction (Spada & Lightbown, 2008) and effectiveness of grammar practices (Ellis, 2010).

Regarding the issues in ISLA aforementioned above, a large body of research has attempted to scrutinize the role of grammar instruction language learning. Firstly, it is acknowledged that grammar instruction can make a significant difference in terms of proficiency and pace of the acquisition compared to the situations in which grammar is not taught (Norris & Ortega, 2000). However, discussions about making use of grammar instruction are not limited to whether it has to be taught. As VanPatten, Williams, Rott, and Overstreet (2004) state, grammar instruction should be provided in an integrated way by highlighting form and meaning together. This relation between form and meaning can offer a broad aspect of L2 grammar, which can invalidate the discussions going around choosing proper structures to teach (VanPatten et al., 2004). These discussions about the content of grammar instruction foregrounded two types of structures needed to be prioritized, which are the forms that are not similar to learners' L1 and the forms that are marked (Ellis, 2006). Nevertheless, Ellis (2006) opposes the idea of using similarities and differences of languages as a basis arguing that differences or similarities do not guarantee that learners will acquire the target structure without learning difficulty. Ellis (2006) adds that as markedness does not have a clear definition, it is not possible to design syllabus based on this principle.

As for the way grammar instruction is delivered, a great number of studies have been conducted to measure to what extent explicit and implicit grammar teaching differ from each other in terms of language proficiency. Like the studies conducted on this distinction between explicit and implicit grammar teaching, many studies have sought to answer the questions raised about the effectiveness of form-

focused instruction (Spada & Lightbown 2008). Firstly, though it is claimed that explicit teaching can result in a high proficiency level in L2 (Norris & Ortega, 2000), it is still not possible to argue that explicit grammar teaching is more effective than implicit teaching or vice versa. Main issues in this comparison have been the conversion of one knowledge type into the other one. Though Krashen (1981) argues that implicit and explicit knowledge types are stored separately, so they cannot be converted into one another; DeKeyser (1998) suggests that explicit knowledge can turn into implicit knowledge through sufficient communicative activities. The reason why there has not been a common ground about these knowledge types is the fact that these types of knowledge are not easy to measure during a pedagogical task. Another perspective about providing explicit information for L2 grammar teaching requires taking "Processing Instruction (PI)" and "Production-based Instruction (PBI)" (Soruç, Qin, & Kim, 2018) into consideration to be able to see how effective explicit information is in terms of L2 learning. These terms take their roots from VanPatten (1996, 2004) and he proposes that input processing requires learners to realize the form while trying to understand the meaning after explicit information about the form is given. While processing instruction is supported with focused practice and structured input activities; production-based instruction is supported with structured output activities (Soruç et al., 2018) In this sense, it is reported that even explicit information was given in PI and PBI cases, the PI and PBI groups to whom explicit information was taught could not outperform the PI and PBI groups to whom explicit information was not given. Another study conducted with the aim of comparing the effectiveness of implicit and explicit grammar instruction reports that while explicit instruction can give rise to better learning than implicit instruction for

complex grammatical rules, there is no significant difference between explicit and implicit instruction types for simple rules (Andrews, 2007).

In addition to explicit and implicit grammar teaching aspect, which is given above, of form-focused instruction, there have been ongoing discussions about the effectiveness of the time the target form is taught. In form-focused instruction, the target form can be given in an isolated way not together with meaning-based communicative activities or an integrated approach can be adopted to deliver both form and meaning together through communicative activities (Spada & Lightbown, 2008). Regarding this concern, Spada and Lightbown (2008) suggest that "isolated lessons may be necessary to help learners who share the same first language (L1) overcome problems related to L1 influence on their interlanguage; integrated instruction may be best for helping learners develop the kind of fluency and automaticity that are needed for communication outside the classroom" (p. 181). Additionally, a study conducted in a Turkish context revealed that integrated form-focused instruction could yield more successful outcomes especially in terms of vocabulary, writing, and grammar compared to isolated form-focused instruction (Elgün-Gündüz, Akcan, & Bayyurt, 2012). Positive outcomes in primary school students' performance in this study shows that content integrated instruction through communication can be regarded as one of the alternatives for grammar teaching.

Besides, another dimension related to grammar teaching is about the role of deductive and inductive grammar teaching. In a deductive way, grammar structures and rules are given first, and learners are expected to practise these structures; however, inductive teaching requires learners to come up with generalizations after they are exposed to related examples of the target forms (Ellis, 2006). As for the implications and effectiveness of the approaches, while Herron and Tomosello

(1992) found that inductive teaching yielded a better result, Erlam (2003) found that deductive teaching could be more advantageous. However, there are many components that have to be considered in order to reach a better conclusion such as features of the target form and learner aptitude (Ellis, 2006).

What has been discussed so far shows that there are many variables taken into account for grammar teaching in ISLA; however, teacher cognition is not a substantial part of the field neither in theory nor in practice. The inclusion of teacher cognition into grammar teaching studies can be beneficial in that teachers' epistemological beliefs shape the way they teach grammar, and it may be unlikely to change these beliefs with teacher education or research findings without creating an awareness and reflection opportunity to revise the aforementioned beliefs (Basturkmen, 2007; Borg, 2011).

2.3 Corrective feedback

Corrective Feedback (CF) studies in ISLA have been a significant issue studies in the literature because the studies conducted in this field prominently show that providing feedback can make a difference in students' linguistic competency. While early CF studies aimed to find the strategies adopted by language teachers in a descriptive way (Allwright, 1975; Chaudron, 1977) along with discourse features of corrective feedback (Seedhouse, 2004), most of the research studies have recently focused on the most effective ways to provide CF and the role of negative evidence, input and output regarding these feedback types (Li et al., 2016) These studies have largely carried out within various perspectives including input hypothesis (Long, 1996), noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 2001) and output hypothesis (Swain, 1985). In addition to these main baselines, CF studies have also focused on feedback types and

learner uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 1998, 2001; Panova & Lyster, 2002) in order to see the role of specific feedback types in learners uptake and their following output. Also, the relationship between feedback types and students' noticing (Mackey, 2006), cultural differences in teachers' and students' ideas about feedback (Schulz, 2001), teacher beliefs and classroom practices (Oskoz & Liskin-Gasparro, 2002), corrective feedback and classroom affect (Magilow, 1999) issues have been the focus of CF studies in ISLA.

The reason why the number of CF studies has remarkably increased is the fact that though L2 learners reach a high a proficiency level in language and become fluent, they have difficulty in accuracy in language production (Ammar & Spada, 2006). This is a situation in which L2 learners have to pay attention to the form and linguistic features of the target language by noticing (Schmidt, 1990). In this sense, form-focused language instruction is regarded as a remedy for drawing attention to form in communicative classrooms (Doughty, 2001), which shows the significance of the role of corrective feedback in L2 learning. Also, an analysis over 56 studies conducted related to CF, Russell and Spada (2006) report that CF is beneficial in language learning; however, there is not a consensus about the most effective way to deliver feedback.

The lack of generalizable conclusions regarding the most useful feedback types requires an overview of the studies investigating various feedback types such as, "recast, metalinguistic feedback (metalinguistic explanation), explicit correction and prompts: elicitation, metalinguistic clue, clarification request and repetition" (Panova & Lyster, 2002; Lyster, 2004) in different contexts.

Feedback types can also be categorized as given in the table (see Table 1). Unlike the existing feedback types, the paralinguistic signal is provided and defined

as the feedback delivered by language teachers via mimics and gestures. As the way feedback types are grouped might change in CF studies and there is not a consensus about the categorization, a grouping made by Panova and Lyster was adopted to offer the literature review accordingly.

Table 1. A Taxonomy of CF Strategies

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

Source: (Ellis, 2009, p.8)

Firstly, recast is claimed to help L2 learners to recognize the mismatch between target L2 and their production in that L2 teachers reformulate the erroneous utterances in a grammatical way (Ammar & Spada, 2006). For the benefit of recasts, VanPatten (1990) posits that while it can be challenging for L2 learners to focus on both meaning and form at the same time, recast can be advantageous as learners will be able to focus on form in a context where meaning is taken for granted. Additionally, recast is considered effective in terms of its advantage in communication because it is thought that it does not interrupt the communication, and meaning is prioritized (Doughty & Varela, 1998). However, the ambiguous nature of recast raises questions about its effectiveness. It is acknowledged that learners may regard recast as a reaction of agreement or disagreement reflected by language teachers rather than a warning made for the incorrect form (Lyster, 1998). Also, there are some variables needed to be taken into account such as proficiency level (Mackey & Philp, 1998), target form (Long, Inagaki, & Ortega, 1998) and

orientation of the instruction (Lyster & Mori, 2006). According to Mackey and Philp (1998), recast might yield more effective outcome for the learners who have relatively higher proficiency level, which shows that a threshold level can be required to benefit from recast. Another issue is about the features of the target form, and it is reported that the effectiveness of recast can vary from one linguistic form to another (Long et al., 1998). As for the orientation of the instruction, Lyster and Mori (2006) state that "instructional activities and interactional feedback that act as a counterbalance to a classroom's predominant communicative orientation are likely to prove more effective than instructional activities and interactional feedback that are congruent with its predominant communicative orientation" (p.269).

Another feedback type that has been the focus of many studies is explicit correction which "provides explicit signals to the student that there is an error in the previous utterance. Explicit correction involves a clear indication to the student that an utterance was ill-formed and also provides the correct form" (Panova & Lyster, 2002, p.584). In this sense, explicit correction is thought to be less effective than recast and prompts since it may not provide a chance for learners to repair their erroneous utterance after taking feedback (Panova & Lyster, 2002). Based on the data gathered in CF studies, it is asserted that explicit correction is not used as frequently as recasts and prompts are used (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). As for metalinguistic feedback, Lyster and Ranta (1997) define it "comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the learner's utterance" (p. 47). While it is considered a kind of explicit feedback as it provides explicit metalinguistic information (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006), Lyster and Panova (2002) posit that metalinguistic correction is a kind of elicitation. For the effectiveness of metalinguistic feedback, it is reported that metalinguistic feedback can activate

learners to engage in interaction in order to negotiate the problematic forms (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). This involvement can end up with repairs and learner uptakes for further use of the language (Lyster & Panova, 2002). Besides, it is stated that metalinguistic feedback can be more effective than recasts in that it can yield awareness in learners' mind about their mistake and it is regarded as a feedback type requiring a brief focus on form without breaking the flow of the communication (Ellis et al., 2006). However, Sanz (2003) argues that metalinguistic feedback does not provide any advantages compared to implicit feedback types.

When it comes to prompts, which is mostly considered an implicit way of giving feedback, it is claimed that implicit prompts can be less effective than explicit feedback even though both implicit and explicit feedback can positively make contributions to L2 learning (Ellis et al., 2006). However, it is also believed that output-prompting feedback types can result in better outcomes compared to recasts (Lyster, 2004; Ammar & Spada, 2006). In this sense, it is highly possible to argue that there is not enough empirical evidence to show that a specific feedback type can outperform the other ones, which leaves a blurred answer to the question asking which feedback is the most effective one (Ellis, 2009). The subcategories of prompts are elicitation, metalinguistic clue, clarification request and repetition (Lyster, 2004). These feedback types are thought to have learners attempt to go through their mistakes and employ self-repair mechanisms (Loewen & Nabei, 2007). Prompts can also be influential in "the transition of declarative to procedural knowledge" (Lyster, 2004). What is more, it is acknowledged that prompts are the second most frequent feedback type after recast in the literature and prompt types aim interaction, not correction itself (Lyster & Mori, 2006).

Apart from the feedback types, the timing of feedback has been another prominent concern in CF studies. There are two points related to the timing of feedback: immediate feedback and delayed feedback. While the former one aims to correct errors soon after they are uttered, the latter one requires going over the mistakes in a different session at the end of the activity or lesson (Ellis, 2009). Hedge (2000) touches upon the possible underlying purposes of the timing by stating that delayed feedback can be more effective in fluency oriented activities. However, for accuracy oriented activities immediate feedback is highlighted (Ellis, 2009). According to Doughty (2001), immediate feedback given in fluency activities can also play a substantial role in helping learners to make a connection between meaning and form. He argues that while the attention is on meaning, they can also focus on form with the help of immediate feedback. Besides, the idea that immediate feedback negatively affects the flow of communication is not empirically supported (Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001).

To sum up, what the studies conducted within the scope of CF tell is that though recasts and prompts are the most frequently used feedback types respectively, we are far beyond a conclusion pointing out one type as the most effective one. Likewise, the question of whether feedback should be given soon after the mistake or given separately in a different session requires more studies to reach a common ground in the field. As it can be followed from the piece of literature given above, feedback types, their effectiveness, and timing of the feedback have been drawn attention for many years; however, the relationship between CF and teacher cognition has not been in high demand compared to CF studies. The reason why teachers correct learners and how they do it can yield more tangible research

outcomes as it can widen the perspective that we have towards CF (Lyster & Mori, 2006).

2.4 LTC in L2 grammar teaching and corrective feedback studies

There is an extensive literature on teacher cognition in a variety of research domains including grammar teaching and corrective feedback. Even though the number of studies has dramatically increased for the last twenty-five years, the studies that have been chosen in order to provide a basis for this study are among the recent studies conducted between 2005 and 2017. The reason why this time period (the last thirteen years) has been chosen stems from the purpose of this study which requires analyzing the most recent studies to have a understanding of whether the latest theories and approaches discussed in the field of ISLA are reflected in teacher cognition and if they are reflected how they are applied by language teachers.

2.4.1 L2 grammar teaching studies

Farrell and Lim (2005) conducted a qualitative study about the beliefs of two experienced EFL teachers (in a primary school in Singapore) about grammar teaching and their actual classroom practices within the framework of these belief systems. They explored the factors influencing teachers to diverge from their beliefs or converge with them and the reasons behind these factors that induce a change in the decision-making processes of the teachers. This study suggests that beliefs held by both teachers are mostly in line with their actual classroom practices. For the factors influencing convergence with beliefs or divergence from them, it is pointed out that time constraints and reverence for traditional grammar teaching have a substantial role in the decision-making processes of teachers.

Liviero (2017) investigated the relationship between the teachers' perception and implication of the new policy requiring teachers to adopt a more communicative, functional and skill-focused approach to grammar teaching rather than grammatical competence and translation. Findings obtained from eight 8 Modern Foreign Language (French, Spanish and German) teachers teaching at five different state secondary schools in England show that underlying approaches to grammar teaching are based on grammar in their educational background, micro and macro-level policies of the school and declarative beliefs and observed practices in grammar teaching. How they learned the language and their experience with learning affected their epistemological beliefs. It is also reported that what worked in their current teaching context could change these beliefs regardless of the policy or the curriculum.

Nishimiro and Borg's study (2013) provides insights into the mental lives of 3 EFL teachers, critical features of their pedagogies in grammar teaching and the cognition underpinning their work and how teacher cognition and contextual factors interact with each other in shaping the pedagogical decisions in a Japanese high school. Based on the qualitative findings, they propose that 80% percent of the observed lessons were spent on teacher-led grammar presentation and all teachers thought that this was because they had to catch up with the syllabus and prepare the students for midterm and final exams including mostly discrete-point grammar questions. Besides, they expressed that they paid attention to this because of time limitation and the need for catching up with the other classes. Likewise, the reason why explicit instruction was used was related to the need for analysis of the target structure. The participants' cognition and their pedagogical decisions are based on their former experience with learning and teaching English, the well-being of their

students and test-preparation, which shows a relationship between teacher cognition and contextual factors influencing their decision-making.

Another study about LTC in grammar teaching (Sanchez & Borg, 2014) focuses on pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) of 2 EFL teachers and its relationship with contextual factors. PCK of teachers is operationalized as the knowledge of instructional techniques (e.g., metaphors, analogies, examples) in an Argentinian context. Contextual factors refer to psychological, socio-cultural and environmental realities of the class and institution. Findings reveal that that instructional practices of both teachers were aligned with their stated beliefs and there was no trace of tensions between these beliefs and practices. The reason for this consistency is attributed to the context of the school since it does not restrict the teachers' pedagogical preferences. The findings also illustrate the notion that the teachers were able to base their pedagogical decisions on some elaborate rationales, which can be a substantial aspect of the complex nature of teacher cognition and decision-making processes.

Phipps and Borg (2009) investigated the tensions between 3 EFL teachers' classroom practices of grammar teaching and underlying beliefs behind these practices in a Turkish context with a particular focus on the distinction and tensions between the core and peripheral beliefs underpinning their actual classroom performance. Based on their qualitative data, they point out that while some teacher beliefs are at odds with their practices, some of them are consistent. Two kinds of beliefs are hypothesized: core and peripheral beliefs. The former one is related to the broader underlying belief system of teachers (theoretical knowledge), yet the latter one (experiential knowledge) is a more influential belief system which affects the instructional decisions which teachers make for teaching practices.

Another LTC study (Graus & Coppen, 2016) was conducted through a questionnaire to have insight into the belief systems of student teachers (709 undergraduate and 123 postgraduate student teachers) of English as Foreign Language about grammar teaching and to what extent these belief systems are related to learner level and grammatical difficulty and where these beliefs originate. Results reveal that postgraduate participants were influenced most by their work experience, student expectations, and their undergraduate and postgraduate courses. For undergraduate participants, undergraduate course, teaching experience, student expectations and their teachers at the secondary level were main factors affecting their beliefs.

A quantitative study (Borg & Burns, 2008) conducted with 176 EFL teachers, who were teaching English to adult learners, from 18 countries attempted to analyze teachers' stated beliefs and their reported practices with regard to the teaching of grammar and skills in an integrated way. The relevance of these beliefs and reported practices to SLA theory was also one of the main purposes of the study. The responses given to the questionnaire were analyzed, and the results show that these teachers prefer to teach grammar and skills in an integrated way rather than teaching grammar in an isolated way despite the claim that teachers teaching adults have a tendency to teach grammar explicitly (Schulz, 1996). The data show that the reason why they prefer to teach grammar and skills in a combined way stems from the fact that teachers count on their prior teaching experience and practice, which constitutes the underlying beliefs regarding teaching grammar. It is also evident that they do not refer to SLA theories for the rationale behind their stated beliefs and reported practices.

A study conducted by Moini (2009) touches upon the effects of cognitive and contextual factors on language teacher cognition. A questionnaire including 25 items expected to elicit personal beliefs and the reasons beyond them was administered to 130 EFL teachers having various backgrounds in an Iranian context. The study firstly aims to investigate the influence of teachers' experience, gender and academic background on their stated beliefs and secondly it intends to compare the beliefs held by school teachers to private language institute teachers. The findings show that while gender does not cause any significant differences, experience and academic background do. Less experienced teachers pay more attention to grammar teaching compared to more experienced teachers, which is explained with the effect of the learning experience on less experienced teachers and the effect of teaching experience on more experienced teachers. Likewise, the academic background might cause variation in teachers' beliefs in that M.A. teachers prefer to teach grammar with form and meaning focus and inductively; however, B.A. teachers prefer to teach grammar structurally and deductively. As for the second purpose of the study, it is reported that private institute teachers seem to use different approaches and activities compared to state school teachers. Limitations at schools and motivation of learners in private institutes are thought to be the possible reasons for this difference.

Another study (Brown, 2009) drawing the attention to the relationship of beliefs regarding L2 grammar teaching between language teachers and students aimed to determine to what extent teacher beliefs compromise with student beliefs. For this purpose, a Likert-scale questionnaire including 24 items about perceptions of effective language teachers was administered to both students (1600) and teachers (49) in foreign language classes of a university. The results revealed that teachers have a tendency to integrate grammar into communicative and authentic activities

rather than teaching grammar solely in an explicit way. However, the students hold a contrasting belief that prioritizes grammar-based teaching of L2. Possible reasons for this mismatch are attributed to the students' concerns about testing, teachers' will to teach communicative language and the distinction between their background of L2. In this sense, it is suggested that this mismatch can shed light on future considerations to increase the effectiveness of L2 grammar teaching.

A quantitative study conducted by Çakır and Kafa (2013) investigated how secondary school EFL teachers in Turkey prefer to present target grammar based on the reflections provided by 63 prospective English teachers (practicum trainees) who observed these secondary school English lessons. Findings of this study indicate that the most frequently used method is Grammar Translation Method (GTM) by the observed EFL teachers. Main reasons attached to this finding are shared L1, use of Turkish in EFL teachers' language learning processes and practicality of GTM for large classes. The second frequent method is claimed to be Total Physical Response (TPR). When it comes to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), it is stated that nearly half of the teachers use it; however, it is not used as frequently as the aforementioned GTM and TPR methods. According to Çakır and Kafa (2013), this stems from that this approach may not be adapted and understood clearly by teachers and the coursebooks provided by the government may be found enough to cover grammar structures. Also, it is pointed out that most of the teachers prefer to use deductive teaching rather than inductive grammar teaching due to the amount of time needed to be spent on inductive teaching. When findings are compared to the curriculum innovation project COC, which was introduced in 1997 to foreground CLT approach in Turkey, inconsistencies between objectives and outcomes are highlighted by the researchers at the end of the study.

Another study conducted in a Turkish context aimed to explore the relationship between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices (Hoş & Kekeç, 2014). For the beliefs, a questionnaire including 12 items was administered to 60 teachers while they were observed for the practices. The findings revealed that most of the teachers preferred to implement communicative language teaching; however, the practices showed that they used grammar-translation method rather communicative language teaching, which is regarded as a mismatch between beliefs and practices. The reasons for the mismatch are attributed to "students' expectations, time limit and catching up with the curriculum, or washback effect" (Hoş & Kekeç, 2014, p.85).

Uysal and Bardakçı (2014) conducted a mixed-design study with 108 EFL teachers to look for the main beliefs and practices of teaching grammar and reasons for these patterns at the elementary level in a Turkish context. Findings are given in three sections including, behaviors, beliefs, and reasons respectively. For behaviors, it is stated that more traditional aspects of grammar teaching are adopted by the teachers rather than communicative ones. As for the beliefs, teachers' beliefs are more in line with their reported traditional based grammar teaching. Also, most of the teachers favored the use of L1 in grammar teaching to make the rules more understandable. As for the reasons for these patterns, three main reasons affecting classroom teaching are given as Ministry of Education curriculum, students' expectations and textbook respectively. Secondary reasons are reported as previous language learning experience, research-based readings, in-service teacher training and collaboration with peers successively. Additionally, the reasons pinpointed for traditional grammar teaching are time constraints, crowded classes, low student

motivation, and classroom management, which is seen as an obstacle for more CLT based approach in grammar teaching.

2.4.2 Overview of the studies

These studies conducted in the field carry a prominent potential to show us what kind of variables influence teacher cognition and how these variables are reflected in L2 grammar teaching practices. Firstly, Farrell and Lim (2005) put forward the fact that language teachers' beliefs and practices can constitute a unity in a compatible way in that most of the beliefs and practices of language teachers were found to be consistent. Likewise, Sanchez and Borg (2014) revealed some findings that support this compatible aspect of beliefs and practices in that the participants were observed and it was found that their beliefs and practices consistently complement each other. The reason for this consistency was attributed to the flexible nature of the context because teachers were not restricted with the institutional policies and they were allowed to implement their pedagogies in class. However, this kind of context is not always available in all language learning environments. For instance, Nishimiro and Borg (2013) state that the participants in their study used teacher-led grammar instruction for 80% of the time and the teachers related it to the necessity to catch up with other classes, time limitations stemming from the pacing and the exams containing discrete-point grammar questions. Similarly, Moini (2009) touches upon the differences between state and private schools, which affects how language teachers perform. It is stated that language teachers in private schools carry out various activities compared to state schools and this difference is related to the limitations in state schools and the students' low motivation.

However, it is also possible to see that while there is a plausible context; language teachers may not adapt their previous cognition in accordance with the requirements of this context. Liviero (2017) points out that although there has been a new policy ensuring a more communicative, functional and skill-based curriculum for modern languages in England, the teachers maintained the traditional approach. This mismatch is attributed to the teachers' personal language learning experience and the previous teaching context. The studies conducted in the Turkish context provide some substantial points to take into account. Çakır and Kafa (2013) revealed that the language teachers mostly preferred to teach L2 grammar deductively through GTM and sometimes TPR. Even though the Ministry of National Education started the project of COC to implement a more communicative-oriented curriculum, the teachers expressed that shared L1, their language learning experience and the practicality of GTM encouraged them to use it in class. Similarly, Uysal and Bardakçı revealed similar findings and added that time constraints, crowded classrooms, and low motivation prevented them from adopting a more communicative approach. Like stated in Liviero's (2017) study, the teachers seem to have a resistance to adopt new approaches because of cognitive and contextual factors. This kind of inconsistencies was studied by Phipps and Borg (2009) and it is stated that even though teachers may have core (theoretical) beliefs, they may rely on their peripheral (experiential) beliefs because of the necessities arising from the context. Given that distinction between two belief systems, inconsistent relationships between beliefs and practices can be explained this way.

Apart from consistent and inconsistent relationships between beliefs and practices and the influence of contextual factors stated above, another pattern that can be obtained from these research studies is the role of teachers' background in

their cognition. Graus and Coppen (2016) conducted the study with undergraduate and postgraduate language teachers and they revealed that the role of student expectations and teaching experience are in common in both groups. Besides, they differ from each other in that undergraduate teachers rely more on their language learning experience than postgraduate teachers do. In a similar study, Moini (2009) highlights that postgraduate teachers (M.A.) teach grammar inductively and form and meaning are integrated. However, undergraduate teachers (B.A.) teach L2 grammar more structurally and deductively. It can be inferred that the academic background of language teachers might have an influence on their cognition, however Borg and Burns (2008) revealed some findings that do not support the role of academic background EFL teachers use a more integrated way of teaching grammar and it does not come from teacher education, but their language teaching experience. Besides, another point emphasized by Moini (2009) is the role experience in cognition. The study revealed that experienced teachers tend to pay less attention to grammar teaching than novice teachers do.

As for the Turkish studies, there is a common finding that annotates about the fact that Turkish EFL teachers have a tendency to implement traditional grammar teaching methods that are based on discrete-point, explicit and deductive instruction no matter what they believe and what they are suggested to do through curriculum (Çakır & Kafa, 2013; Hoş & Kekeç, 2014; Uysal & Bardakçı, 2014). The reasons for this discrepancy are generally attributed to contextual factors such as time constraints, syllabus, students and materials.

Based on this piece of literature and overview, there a few gaps that constitute the skeleton of this study. First, the studies include substantial dimensions; however, these dimensions studied in these articles are not comprehensive enough in

that not all aspects of teacher cognition have been analyzed in detail. So, this study focuses on teachers' beliefs, practices, the relationship of beliefs and practices, comparison of this relationship among the teachers, reasons for incongruence, contextual and cognitive factors affecting this relationship rather than working on a specific aspect of teacher cognition such as experience, academic background. Including these dimensions can yield a more comprehensive picture of the institution, which can contribute to the policies of the institution in terms of curricula, in-service teacher education, and materials. Another gap is related to the fact that research findings have not been discussed within the scope of ISLA studies, which means to what extent teachers know and apply what has been recently addressed in the field of second language acquisition. In this sense, this aimed to compare teacher cognition to ISLA findings in terms of grammar teaching and corrective feedback to provide a linkage between these two fields.

2.4.3 Corrective feedback studies

When it comes to corrective feedback studies in LTC, Jafarigohar and Kheiri (2015) investigated the stated beliefs and practices of two groups of English teachers (university graduates and certified teachers) about corrective feedback provided in the classroom. It is acknowledged that graduates paid more attention to mistakes, whereas TCELTs were less meticulous because of their different educational backgrounds and the role of corrective feedback in their education.

Another study (Mori, 2011) explores the foundations of Corrective Feedback practices of two Japanese EFL teachers by examining complex and multifaceted characteristics shaping CF practices in class and how these characteristics inform the teachers' CF practices. Findings of the study indicate that as one of them was

relatively more communication-oriented and he was worried about the fact that students could be afraid of being corrected, he predominantly used recast (92.9%). The other one was more experienced and familiar with the Japanese education system, and he valued using written communication exercises in his speaking classes, which influenced his choice of induce, which is defined as providing Japanese hints (64.8%) and provide, which means providing correct answer (15.2%) feedback types.

Likewise, Rahimi and Zang (2015) investigated nonnative English teachers' cognitions about Corrective Feedback (CF) in oral communication, yet it also puts a focus on differences between experienced and novice English teachers regarding their cognitions in terms of the timing, necessity, and type of feedback. Based on the findings, it is indicated that there is a significant difference between novice and experienced teachers. While novice teachers base their beliefs on their previous learning experience, experienced teachers emphasize their teaching experience. Additionally, while recast and clarification request had the highest mean among novice teachers, explicit feedback and recast were the top choices by experienced teachers.

Another study conducted by Roothooft (2014) investigates the main reasons why these teachers deal with oral error and to what extent they are aware of their practices in the classroom. The study shows similarities to other studies in that recasts are used mostly, and the type of feedback provided by teachers can depend on the contextual factors such as students' age and class size. The reasons for the inconsistency are attributed to the unplanned aspect of feedback, teacher training, experience, and contextual factors.

Junqueria and Kim (2013) carried out a study with two ESL teachers (one experienced, Sandra, and one novice, Amy) with the aim of exploring these teachers'

performances in CF in terms of the amount of feedback they provide, the types of the feedback and learner uptake. The study also investigated how teacher training, teaching experience, and learning background affect the way teachers provide feedback in class. The data collected through observations, stimulated recalls and interviews revealed that while Sandra provided feedback 62.8% of the time, Amy did it 51.9% of the time. Recasts and clarification requests were the most frequent types. Sandra used recasts (48.3%), clarification requests (18.3%) and two CF types that Amy did not use: explicit correction and repetition. However, Amy used recasts (58.2%) and clarification requests (36.4%) mostly. Also, Sandra is reported to have followed a more balanced way in terms of target linguistic features to give feedback compared to Amy. Based on these types, Amy' CF led to more learner uptake (45.4%) than that of Sandra (41.7%). The data show that while Sandra and Amy believe that CF is not effective in oral communication class, the amount of CF they used causes a mismatch between their beliefs and practices. Based on the qualitative data, this situation is explained with the effect of "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975) in that the teachers' language learning experience might have led them to use CF in class, however teaching experience and teacher training is thought to have a more limited effect than expected.

A similar study conducted by Kamiya (2014) aimed to investigate what 4 ESL teachers believe regarding the use of CF and how they implement these beliefs in class. The study also analyzed the effect of experience on the teachers' CF beliefs and practices. Of these four teachers, one of them was novice, and three of them were experienced. The data collected through observations and interviews indicate that of 4 teachers, just two of them expresses strong beliefs regarding the use of CF; however, the other ones did not state strong beliefs about CF. The firm belief uttered

by these teachers was about inessentiality of CF. The common belief among the four of them was the necessity of having a pleasant atmosphere in class without humiliating anybody by correcting their mistakes. Practices observed in their classes were congruent with these beliefs since the amount of CF was limited, and nobody used explicit correction in order not to humiliate learners. However, just one of the experienced teachers (John), who is less experienced than two others, showed a mismatch in that he corrected 57.% of the errors and explained the reasons for those errors. The inexperienced teacher (Cecile) and John did not express strong beliefs. Cecile informs that she does not have enough experience and she does not have a strong belief for CF, which is congruent with her CF practices. However, John used CF a lot in class, which is not consistent with his stated belief especially compared to two other experienced teachers. In this sense, Kamiya (2014) attributes this mismatch to lack of "proceduralized technical knowledge" (p.12), which shows experience itself may not inform about the relationship between beliefs and practices.

A comprehensive study (Schulz, 2016) was conducted with 607 Colombian foreign language students and their 122 teachers and 824 American students and their 92 teachers in order to explore the relationship between teacher beliefs and student perceptions and also cross-cultural differences regarding teacher and student beliefs regarding grammar teaching and corrective feedback. The data gathered through a questionnaire indicates that students in two cultures strongly agree that teachers should correct learner errors in class; however, the degree of agreement among the students is stronger than that of teachers in general, which shows that CF seems more desirable to students compared to teachers. Also, the rate of discrepancy is higher among teachers compared to students. Schulz (2016) reports that the reason for congruence among students in two countries can be attributed to the way they are

tested, prevailing belief about the essence of correction and their perception about the traditional role of teacher. However, the difference among teachers in two cultures is related to their various language learning and teaching experiences.

A different study (Yoshida, 2010) conducted in a Japanese language school in an Australian context aimed to explore the teachers and the students' perception of CF and the student reactions to CF in the light of the teachers' perception of their learners and these learners' perception of communications taking place in class. The data collected from two teachers and seven students through observation, audio-recording and stimulated recalls indicate that learners' reactions to given feedback do not guarantee that learners realize and understand CF. Also, it is reported that teachers have strong beliefs about successful learners' noticing CF though they do not actually notice. Likewise, they might be less sure about weaker students' noticing of CF, so they tend to give no feedback to these students in order not to compel them. As for the learners' perception of CF, Yoshida (2010) states that learners might not notice and pay attention to CF because of the anxiety when they respond to CF or relief after they are done with the interaction. It is suggested that these perceptions may help teachers to reconsider their CF practices to make sure that it is noticed and understood.

Before the study mentioned above, Yoshida (2008) administered a more particular study with two Japanese teachers and seven learners in a Japanese as a Foreign Language (JFL) context. The aim was to examine the teachers and the learners' CF choices with the help of audio-recordings and stimulated recalls. The data revealed that even though the teachers and their students are of the opinion that self-correction can work better than being corrected, the most frequent CF type was recast, which is not congruent with neither the teachers nor the students' preferences.

The reason for this mismatch is attributed to time constraints and the fear of causing learners to feel ashamed. The teachers also resorted to elicitation and metalinguistic feedback when the learners wanted to think about their errors and find out the correct use on their own. What is more, the learners' choices indicate that they are willing to be provided with some time to think about errors and correct them rather than being corrected by teachers with recasts. Yoshida (2008) posits that these findings revealed a mismatch between what teachers do and what students prefer, which can provide insight with language teachers about CF perceptions.

The number of studies conducted in a Turkish context with the aim of investigating teacher cognition in CF is quite limited. Kırkgöz, Babanoğlu, and Ağçam (2015) aimed to explore what CF types EFL teachers use and to what extent these CF types lead to repairs in a primary level context. The study revealed that the teachers used explicit correction, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, paralinguistic feedback, and elicitation, but explicit correction was the most frequent one. While the learners were observed to repair their errors more successfully through clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, paralinguistic feedback, and elicitation, explicit correction did not lead to self-repairs as much as the other CF types. Öztürk (2016) included teacher beliefs in addition to their CF practices in his study to explore the reasons for the mistakes ignored by the teachers through observation and stimulated recall. Öztürk (2016) states that recast and explicit correction are the most frequently used CF types; however, it is added that while experienced teachers use recast most, novice teachers prefer to use clarification request. Öztürk (2016) puts forward that teachers may ignore some mistakes due to reluctance to interrupt the students, unwillingness to correct the same mistake, lack of knowledge to correct the mistake and fear of influencing the students negatively.

2.4.4 Overview of the studies

Studies mentioned above conducted in the field of Language Teacher Cognition (LTC) in Corrective Feedback (CF) inform us of several issues. Firstly, it is acknowledged that what language teachers have in their mind about CF may not be reflected in a parallel way in action, which causes a mismatch between beliefs and practices. The reason for these mismatches lies behind some factors such as time constraints (Yoshida, 2008), affective state of learners (Kamiya, 2014; Yoshida, 2010) and teachers' language learning experience (Junqueria & Kim, 2013). Also, what most of the studies highlight is the fact that there is a lack of compromise between teacher and student beliefs in relation to CF, which is seen as a detrimental factor influencing learning.

Considering these studies, three main motives encompass the realm of the findings. These motives are about the role of teachers' background (experience, teaching orientation, and academic background), the reasons for providing CF and the comparison of teachers' beliefs and students' perceptions regarding CF. Jafarigohar and Kheiri (2015) put forward that university-graduate teachers pay more attention to CF than certified teachers do. Regarding this effect of background Mori (2011) revealed some findings indicating that the communication-oriented teacher gave less feedback than the experienced teacher did because the former one was worried that the students would be ashamed. For the experience aspect of teachers' background Rahimi and Zang (2015) points out that the experienced participant mostly used recast and explicit feedback and she relied on her teaching experience for this choice; however, the novice one preferred to give recast and clarification question most because she resorted to her learning experience. Even though some differences that might have stemmed from different backgrounds are given,

underlying reasons for these differences and the degree of relation between beliefs and practices is not foregrounded. Unlike these findings, Junqueria and Kim (2013) focus on the relationship between beliefs and practices of experienced and novice teachers. While findings indicate that the experienced teacher had a more balanced way to deliver CF, it was noted that there was mismatch between what teachers believe and what they do because of their language learning experience, which is at odds with Rahimi and Zang's (2015) study showing that just novice teacher relies on language learning experience. Besides, Junqueria and Kim (2013) state that teaching experience and teacher education may have only a limited effect on teacher cognition in CF, which challenges the what Jafarigohar and Kheiri (2015) and Mori (2011) state about the role of academic background and experience respectively.

The second prominent aspect of these studies is the reasons for teachers' CF preferences. Roothooft (2014) states that recast is the most frequent CF type because of some factors such as class size and learners' age. It is also added that inconsistencies between beliefs and practices have their source from the unplanned aspect of CF, teacher education, experience, and contextual factors. Unlike Junqueria and Kim (2013), the role of teachers' learning experience is not highlighted as a substantial reason for the mismatch. Additionally, Kamiya (2014) states experience may not be regarded as a significant reason for teacher cognition in CF, which is contrary to what Roothooft (2014) revealed. "Lack of proceduralized knowledge" (p.12) is considered the main reason that explains teachers' choices.

The final aspect that can be recognized out of these studies is the comparison of what teachers believe regarding CF with students' perceptions. These studies share a common point which assures that teachers differ from students in terms of the effect and practice of CF. Yoshida (2008) draws attention to the consistency between

teachers and students' beliefs in that they both appreciate self-correction, but findings show that the teachers preferred to use recast because of time constraints and students' feeling of shame. However, the study also indicates that students expect to correct themselves, which induces a divergence between them and their teachers' practices. On the other hand, Yoshida (2010) emphasizes that while teachers believe that reactions to CF show learners realize and understand CF, the study indicates that learners may not realize it because of the feelings of anxiety during CF and relief after CF. Another study by Schulz (2016) points out that students hold stronger beliefs for being corrected compared to their teachers because of exams. These findings prevent us from reaching a general conclusion regarding this aspect.

Considering EFL teacher cognition towards correction and changing dynamics of the global English, English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) perspective highlights a distinctive role for EFL teachers to be able to meet the needs of international communication. Hence, it is suggested that language teachers should refrain from correcting all the mistakes uttered by the students and they are suggested to consider the vagueness of correct and standard English while correcting learners' mistakes (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015). In this sense, teachers are expected to be "very careful with providing corrective feedback and should find ways to make their feedback more relevant to the constraints of the different communicative situations that arise with each different activity" (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015, p. 129).

Like stated for L2 grammar teaching studies, several components have been studied separately in these studies, which constitutes one of the gaps in this piece of literature. In this sense, this study aimed to bring together all components regarding CF rather than individually focusing on particular components such as teachers'

background, reasons for CF and students' perceptions. By doing so, this study might provide a more comprehensive picture of CF in teacher cognition by shedding light on various components such as teachers' beliefs and practices, the relationship between them, the role of their background in CF decisions, and the underlying contextual and cognitive reasons for their choices. This is regarded as a gap since it can be challenging to have a deeper understanding of teacher cognition with the consideration of a single component. The second gap arises from the lack of discussion concerning the effect of recent ISLA studies on teacher cognition. It can be beneficial to discuss teacher cognition findings within the scope of recent ISLA studies to pave the way for more up to date studies that can help to evaluate what has been theorized in the field and what has been implemented in class more extensively.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Problem statement and research questions

Language teachers may hold consistent or contradictory beliefs and practices depending on the context in which they teach. The way they deliver target linguistic form and correct students' mistakes can vary from one teacher to another. It can even change within a case of a single teacher. The reasons for these variations have been attributed to contextual factors stated by teachers or some interpretations of researchers who coded the data obtained from language teachers. Within this point of view, this study examines the way language teachers teach L2 grammar and provide corrective feedback and underlying reasons that might have shaped their instructional decisions in class. Likewise, the degree of parallelism between their personal beliefs and pedagogical decisions is investigated thoroughly to see whether what teachers believe is the basis of their instructional decisions. Also, cognitive and contextual factors concerning the gaps between beliefs and practices are reported together with what L2 learners think about the way their teachers teach L2 grammar and correct their mistakes. These purposes paved the way for the following research questions:

EFL teachers' beliefs

1. What are the beliefs of EFL teachers regarding L2 grammar teaching?

2. What are the beliefs of EFL teachers regarding giving corrective feedback?

EFL teachers' practices

3. What instructional practices do EFL teachers use to teach grammar?

4. How do EFL teachers provide corrective feedback in their classes?

The relationship between beliefs and practices

5. How do EFL teachers' cognition and their practice compromise with each other?

6. What are the reasons for consistencies or inconsistencies between EFL teachers' beliefs and instructional practices?

Contextual factors

7. What are the contextual factors influencing EFL teachers' instructional decisions?

3.2 Setting and participants

3.2.1 Academic background

The preparatory school where the study was carried out hosts more than 1000 students from different levels: A1, A2, and B1. The levels were determined based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The number of classes for each level is four, twenty and six successively. For A2 classes, which constitute the focus group of this study, students have 24 lesson hours in a week, and these lessons include integrated skills taught under the title of main course, which means all skills including reading, writing, speaking, listening, grammar and vocabulary are taught by means of a course book (Oxford English File, 3rd Edition) and complementary packs. Apart from main course books, students are provided with extra materials such as readers, workbooks, vocabulary packs and online sources for grammar.

Twenty-four main course lessons are shared by three teachers for each class, and these teachers are expected to keep up with each other and complete the requirements of the weekly and monthly lesson plans. These teachers also inform

each other about the pacing of the main course book and other materials in order not to fall behind the syllabus. One of these teachers is the academic advisor of the class, and that teacher is responsible for the academic announcements, online assignments and overall grading of the class. For the grading, that teacher is expected to take the other two teachers' grades to determine the average for yearly assessment. The second teacher is responsible for the speaking tasks and the evaluation of these tasks including projects and presentations. The third teacher of the class is expected to check writing portfolios and evaluate them periodically. Even though they have different roles for the class, the content of the lessons does not change because of these roles. They continue from where the other leaves. Additionally, these teachers complete 24 hours of teaching in a week, which means they have eight lessons for each class and 24 lessons in total for three class. While one teacher is the academic advisor of a class, that teacher can be responsible for speaking tasks in another class and writing portfolios in a third class.

These students are expected to attend a proficiency exam at the end of the year to pass preparatory school. Before this exam, they are required to attend six monthly exams, four quizzes, ten pop-quizzes and they have to complete speaking tasks and presentations and writing portfolios. The passing grade is 60 to be able to complete preparatory school successfully. Proficiency exam constitutes 40% of the passing grade, and the students' minimum score has to be 50 for this exam no matter how they score in monthly exam and quizzes. Apart from the proficiency exam, other requirements including monthly exams, quizzes, speaking tasks and presentations, and writing portfolio constitute 60% of the passing grade. For these requirements, the minimum score to be able to attend the proficiency exam is 60. The syllabus is in line

with the content of the main course books and complementary packs, and it includes both form and meaning focus.

3.2.2 Contextual background

Apart from the institutional context described above, one of the factors which can contribute to our perspectives towards the findings is the macro-level background information of the setting to which both institution and participants are subjected. The institute where the study was carried out is a technical university in the west of Turkey, İzmir. The institute hosts about five thousand students enrolled in science programs such as engineering, architecture, physics, chemistry, biology, and genetics. The students can only enroll in these programs if they achieve to obtain a high score in the national placement exam, which means the students ranking the highest are accepted to the university. Although some students come from various cities of Turkey, the majority of the students are from İzmir. İzmir is known as a relatively more secular city compared to other cities in Anatolia, which influences the way people live.

Izmir is the third biggest city in Turkey, and its population is about three million. The city is well known for its financial strength, commercial opportunities, commercial ports, education, and social life. Educationally, as there are six state universities, two foundation universities and many prestigious private schools in İzmir, the city offers many facilities and opportunities for students to get involved in academic and social activities. While the institute where I worked on my study is forty kilometers away from the city center, the students are quite willing to attend activities and events held both in the campus or city center. University and student clubs actively provide many academic and social events for the students. The

atmosphere of the city is also available at the university in that most of the students do not have a conservative lifestyle and they are quite interested in western culture. They want to live there either after graduation or as an Erasmus student before graduation. This interest is thought to be parallel to their interest in English at a preparatory school. Most of the students try to learn English not only to pass preparatory school but also to learn the culture and to be able to communicate in the target language, which might be considered an intrinsic motivation. This interest in foreign languages, namely English, has its reflections in the city as well. There are numerous language course centers and private schools offering education in English and people prefer these places for a better education.

In brief, based on this short background about the city and the institute, it can be stated that there is a tendency to learn a foreign language and to make efforts in this way both in the city and among the students, which can be regarded as a notion that is compatible with their lifestyles. However, one thing that has to be taken into consideration is the reality that not all the people living in the city can be labeled with the same patterns based on what the majority do.

3.2.3 Participants

Four EFL teachers (4 females) working at the preparatory school of a state university in Turkey participated in this study. Year of experience ranges from 1 to 15. The criteria considered for the selection of the participants are the convenience of the participants and their lessons and their willingness. Experienced teachers who have been teaching more than three years constitute the majority of the academic staff of the school, but the number of novice teachers is limited. Even though this study does not primarily aim to investigate the role of experience and degree programs from

which participants graduated, the sample was chosen based on a criterion requiring the gathering of teachers from different backgrounds in order to reach a more comprehensive perspective (see Table 2).

Table 2. Participants' Background Information

Name	Level taught	Years of experience	Education
İrem	Elementary	1	• B.A. English Language and Literature
Sezen	Elementary	10	• B.A. English Language Teaching
Ayça	Elementary	2	• B.A. English Language Teaching
Merve	Elementary	15	• B.A. English Language and Literature • M.A. American Culture and Literature

In this sense, two of the participants had to be experienced (over three years), and two of them had to be novice (less than three years). Both for the experienced and novice groups, one of them had to be an ELT graduate, and the other one had to be a non-ELT department graduate. These four teachers were invited to participate in the study, and they voluntarily want to be a part of it. These teachers are required to teach the main course 24 hours a week in three different classes, and they have three different roles for three classes: academic advisor, speaking advisor, and writing. These teachers are teaching at elementary levels. Among those teachers, 2 of them are graduates of English Language Teaching (ELT) department. The third and fourth ones are graduates of English Language and Literature (ELL) department. As for the year of experience, two teachers can be regarded as novice teachers as their year of experience does not exceed three years, but the other ones are experienced because

one of them has been teaching for ten years and the other one has been teaching for fifteen years. One of the novice teachers (İrem) completed a TESOL certification program before starting her professional career. Apart from this, the participants acknowledge that they have not participated in any seminars or conferences apart from the in-house seminars organized by the administration and publishing house. After the participants decided to take part in this study, they were informed about the processes and requirements of the research both verbally and inscriptively. Their questions regarding the flow of the research were answered in detail, and they were reminded of the right to withdraw from the study. After the agreement, they signed the consent form (see Appendix A) encapsulating the content and stages of the research. Also, pseudonyms were used for the participants' names.

In addition to academic background information about the teachers, it can be beneficial to provide information in relation to their social lives, their routines and their relationship patterns in the institute, which can offer a fruitful perspective considering the qualitative nature of the data. The participants have morning lessons, which means they have free time in the afternoon to deal with their lesson plans, committee meetings, and personal needs. As there is not an obligatory clock-out time, the teachers have the liberty to leave if they do not have a pre-scheduled meeting or some work needed to be completed urgently. This flexible atmosphere of the preparatory school made it difficult to hear some substantial about the policies of the administration.

In this atmosphere, after the teachers are done with their lessons, they have lunch, and then they come back to their offices to work on their daily agenda. As there are several committees including writing, speaking, reading and testing, the teachers expected to carry out some tasks throughout the year related to a particular

committee in which they work, however as all teachers work collaboratively, the teachers do not regard this work as an extra burden on their shoulders. Another point that makes the teachers feel happy about the atmosphere is the fact that there is not a competitive environment, which encourages them to work collaboratively with their partners. What is more, the teachers exclusively state that they do feel comfortable in class because the students do not behave disruptively, which might stem from the profile of the students, who are successful and interested in learning a foreign language.

When it comes to my relationship with the participants, even though I started to work in this institute as an English instructor in August 2018, I could develop a good rapport with the teachers. Particularly, the participants voluntarily wanted to be a part of this study when I mentioned that I was working on teacher cognition. Also, as I had constant contact with the participants even before and after the study, I could interpret their cognition in the light of their personal profiles with which I was familiar, and I could reach them quickly in case of any ambiguity about the data. Additionally, the participants felt comfortable during the interviews, which ended up with more sincere and fruitful data for the research questions.

The students, whose lessons were observed, were informed about the procedure and another consent form was given to them. (see Appendix B). The students have to complete the preparatory school successfully in order to continue in their programs. As the university where the study was administered is a technical university, the students' departments are science and engineering. Their ages range from 18 to 20. Also, The Ethics Committee for Master and Ph.D. Theses in Social Sciences and Humanities of Boğaziçi University approved both informed consent forms and the instrumentation procedures that were applied in this study (see Appendix C).

3.3 Instrumentation

Selection of a small sample and the aims of the study led me to use a qualitative research paradigm to collect data. As the main focus is on teachers' in-depth cognitions and their instructional decisions, qualitative instruments can afford to provide an insight into the complex belief systems held by language teachers, which yielded the use of three qualitative data collection instruments: unstructured observation, stimulated recalls, and semi-structured interviews supported with field notes and artifacts.

In this sense, it is substantial to touch upon the theoretical underpinnings of qualitative research and its underlying components that can shed light on how effectively it can serve for the purposes of this study. Some theoretical foundations of qualitative research paradigm include "feminism, postmodernism and critical theory" (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p.19). Power relations among people and organizations, gender constructions, discourse analysis studies, the questioning of what is taken for granted as certain and the role of interpretation yielded a situation in which qualitative studies have dramatically increased. According to Bogdan and Biklen (2003) in qualitative studies, "the data collected have been soft, that is, rich in description of people, places, and conversations, and not easily handled by statistical procedures. Operationalizing variables do not frame research questions: rather, they are formulated to investigate topics in all their complexity, in context" (p. 2). There are some aspects of this research paradigm, and they make it appropriate for this case study: "naturalistic, descriptive, concern with process, inductive and meaning" (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p.4). The naturalistic aspect of the research can offer in-depth contextual information that can support research findings together with descriptive data that take everything into account without skipping even less critical details. The whole process is provided, and the procedures followed in data

collection are used in inductive data analysis in generating grounded theories. Also, meaning obtained from participants is triangulated with the data to reach a broader perspective to make meaning out of data.

Before the data collection, a comprehensive piloting study was conducted with three EFL teachers in order to see how the data collection instruments worked and what kind of shortcomings could occur while applying these instruments. The piloting was conducted in a preparatory school context of a foundation university in İstanbul. The data were collected through three instrumentation tools like in the real study: semi-structured interviews, unstructured observation, and stimulated recall. The first interview was conducted before the observation. Then, each teacher was observed for two lessons and one day after the lesson, a stimulated recall interview was carried out with them. Piloting process was quite useful in that it helped me to revise the tools and make some changes in the procedure of data collection. First, I decided to administer the semi-structured interview after the observation in the real study in order not to affect the way the teachers deliver their lessons because the participants were observed to adapt their classroom performances based on the interview questions in the piloting study. Second, I revised the interview questions and increased the number of questions about their learning history and pre-service education because I had limited data about these issues after the piloting. Third, I decided to use audio-recordings in stimulated recall interview since the participants tended to give the same answers to the incidents reminded by the researcher especially for the last ones, which might have been due to boredom or difficulty in recalling the exact memory of specific decisions. Finally, I decided on how to take field notes for observation because the piloting showed that it could be better to write down mistakes and feedback directed to these mistakes on a different piece of paper

to have well-organized notes to be used in data analysis not only for observation but also for the interviews. In this sense, the procedures of observation, interview, stimulated recall and small group discussion were revised with the aim of obtaining relevant data that can feed the research questions.

3.3.1 Unstructured observation

The very first stage of data collection was unstructured observation during which the researcher was an observer as participant since the researcher's contact with the students was brief, formal and openly classified as observation (Burgess, 2011). Before starting the data collection, the stages that had to be followed were revised after the piloting study. The teachers whose lessons were observed for piloting were not included in the real study. Four participants' lessons were individually observed in the one-week period. It took six weeks to complete all the sessions with four teachers. For each participant, five lessons were observed. Before observation sessions started, participants were asked to invite the researcher to their lessons which included both grammar instruction and interaction with students. The reason why this criterion had been determined was the focus of the study in terms of grammar teaching and corrective feedback. The lessons were audio-recorded with the permission of the participants. The teachers were requested to share their lesson plans with the researcher before the lessons. This information about the lesson plans provided me a chance to go over what was planned to do in the lesson and compared those planned content to the teachers' real classroom practices after the lessons were over.

Two main categories constituted the framework of the field notes taken during the lesson. First, descriptive notes were taken about the flow of the lesson.

Secondly, analytical notes were taken as an interpretation of the actions and decisions made by the participants. Two focuses were foregrounded while observing the lesson. Analytical notes were categorized under two sub-titles: grammar instruction and corrective feedback. The way grammar was taught was noted down with explanations. For corrective feedback, erroneous utterances made by the students was noted down and whether the participants corrected these incorrect utterances was stated in the field notes. Also, the feedback type chosen by the participants were given in these notes for further analysis.

The primary purpose of conducting an observation with each participant was to collect data to be able to compare their instructional practices and decisions to their core beliefs stated in the interview that was conducted after observation sessions. Even though there are some doubts about the authenticity of teacher behaviors when they are observed, it is also acknowledged that observation is an effective way to see how theories and methodologies are perceived and implemented by language teachers in that their perception and implementation differ from one another even if they are observed (Ulichny, 1996).

3.3.2 Stimulated recall interview

For the second stage of the instrumentation, a stimulated-recall interview was carried out with each participant one or two days after their observed lessons. Each interview approximately lasted 30 minutes. The issues raised during these interviews were mostly associated with their practices in the class. A semi-structured model was employed so that participants could touch upon the issues which were not asked by the participants. This chance enabled participants to have an active role in the research rather than being passive objects (Holstein & Gubrium, 1997). Field notes

were used in order to remind the teachers of substantial points that occurred during the lessons. Their instructional decisions and pedagogical practices, which was based on the observed lessons, were provided with the teachers and they were expected to reflect upon them by giving the rationale behind their decisions. Another opportunity of this final stage of instrumentation was teachers' retrospective reflections on their practices based on their initial practices performed in the previous stage of data collection, which led me to interpret the data to see whether there was consistency or discrepancy between their beliefs and practices regarding grammar teaching and corrective feedback. The inclusion of the teachers' retrospective analysis to decide on whether they had consistent beliefs and practices provided the chance to go over the data and revise the belief-practice relationships established by the researcher.

3.3.3 Post-observation semi-structured interview

The third stage of data collection was post-observation semi-structured interviews. Interview questions were prepared to elicit information about the participants' background learning and teaching profiles. Main questions were raised to have a basic understanding of their takes on grammar teaching and corrective feedback. Feedback types that had been studied in the literature were provided for the participants with the aim of constructing a standardized baseline for further analysis, yet they were also be informed about the option that they could talk about other feedback types that were not available in the chart given to them (see Appendix D). Interviews were conducted individually one week after the stimulated recall interview and each interview took approximately 20 minutes. This instrument was conducted within the consideration of having a positive relationship with interviewees by developing a good rapport, which was advantageous for the quality

of data (Fontana & Frey, 1994). The reason why a semi-structured interview was used in this stage was the necessity of gathering data about teachers' core beliefs in order to be used in comparison with their actual classroom performances. Having a basis established by the statements of teachers yielded a more inclusive understanding of the decision-making processes used by the participants. A brief summary of the methodological process is provided to keep the stages in mind (see Table 3).

Table 3. Instruments, Participants, and Timing of Data Collection

Instruments	Participants	Duration of Data Collection
Observation	4 EFL Teachers	5 lessons (each class)
Stimulated Recall Interview	4 EFL Teachers	30 minutes (each teacher)
Post-Observation Interview	4 EFL Teachers	20 minutes (each teacher)

3.3.4 Field notes and artifacts

Although it was planned to take field notes just for observation, it was also used for both interviews and small group discussion after the necessity noticed during the piloting. Field notes are thought to complete the data collection tools as a supplement that enables researchers to reflect their ideas while collecting data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). It also functions as a guide in that researchers can keep track of what they have been doing during the whole process of gathering data. In the light of these functions, field notes were used in all steps of the instrumentation, and two types of field notes were taken in the study: descriptive and analytical. According to Bogdan and Biklen (2003), descriptive notes should include "portraits of the subjects, reconstruction of dialogue, description of physical setting, accounts of particular events, depiction of activities and the observer's behavior" and analytical notes

should cover “reflections on analysis, method, ethical dilemmas and conflicts, observer’s frame of mind and points of clarification” (p. 113). These points were applied in the field notes taken about the teachers’ beliefs and practices in relation to grammar teaching and corrective feedback. In addition, some artifacts including memos, lesson plans, pacing table, policy papers, meeting notes, website documents, and course materials were used to supplement the data to provide a better description and interpretation of the study.

3.4 Data analysis

For each category of data sources (interviews, stimulated recalls and observation field notes), the data were triangulated and coded through a qualitative analysis software (NVivo 11) in order to reach comprehensive themes to be used for analysis. The analysis process was meticulously carried out in order to obtain encapsulating themes based on the most frequent and recurring codes for all data sources.

As it is a case study which is defined as an in-depth investigation of a single context on a specific focus (Yin, 1989), the data obtained from the instruments explained above were analyzed in detail in order not to miss any significant point. As this case study includes observation and it is supported with interviews and small group discussion, it can be taken as “observational case study” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p.55). In this kind of case study, the data regarding the setting, the participants and the focus activity are triangulated comprehensively to be able to have a saying encompassing the whole picture of the case. Also, even though this study can be regarded as a single case in terms of the setting and focus activity, the presence of four participants and their individual analysis resulted in four cases to be analyzed. Therefore, they were first analyzed separately (within case analysis) and then, these

four cases were compared to each other inductively (cross-case analysis) to reach more comprehensive findings regarding the setting, focus activity and the participants. Additionally, the data analysis was neither "modified analytic induction" nor "the constant comparative method" (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p.63) in that I did not test a pre-existing theory for the former one, and the data analysis was not almost done towards the end of the data collection for the latter one.

Analysis of the data started with the transcription of both post-observation interviews and stimulated-recall interviews. Also, audio-recordings of the lessons were transcribed to analyze some points that had not been noted down during observation sessions. For the transcription of the interviews and the lessons, *Transcribe* was used. All transcribed data were analyzed inductively (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Silverman, 1993) and cyclically since all four stages of instrumentation were interrelated to one another and analysis of one stage was used as a basis for the next stage in a cumulative manner (Sanchez & Borg, 2014). It means all the data obtained through data collection instruments were triangulated (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This inductive approach towards the data was in line with grounded theory (Hutchinson, 1986) in that the study aimed to end up with grounded theories emerging from the data rather than testing an existing hypothesis.

Additionally, for the beliefs held by the participants and their practices, the data from observation, field notes, stimulated recalls and interviews were analyzed in a manner including thematic analysis, codification and thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998; Yin, 2009). Codification and developing coding system required to go through the data and note down "certain words, phrases, patterns of behavior, subjects' way of thinking and events that repeat and stand out" (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p.161). The topics related to the research focus were coded based on these criteria.

Additionally, the codes were grouped under appropriate categories for each research focus. These categories of codes were about their beliefs, practices, the degree of consistency between beliefs and practices and contextual factors influencing the relationship between these beliefs and practices. The codes obtained from the data were used to define regular themes.

The same procedure was applied for all the data obtained from participants through observation and interviews to have thematic categories for each participant. All recurring codes including patterns and notions used by the teachers were highlighted, and field notes supported audio-recording transcriptions of the lessons for more comprehensive categorization of the practices. Thematic categories emerging from the coding of data for each participant were analyzed to examine what teachers believe, whey they do in class, how consistent the teachers' beliefs and practices were and what affects the consistency between beliefs and practices.

More specifically, for each participant, a within-case analysis (Patton, 1990) was conducted for two pre-determined themes: grammar teaching and corrective feedback. While analyzing the stimulated recall and interview data for teacher beliefs, topics emerging as teacher beliefs associated with these two themes were coded. Coding process ended up having more specific sub-themes with the help of comments and explanations made by the participants and the interpretation of the researcher. Coded data were brought together to have more precise categories under both grammar teaching and corrective feedback beliefs of the participants. The same procedure was repeated for observation transcriptions and field notes based on the findings of the interview themes and categories so that teacher practices could be coded and categorized in a similar way. Then, for each participant, these belief and practice categories were compared and interpreted to analyze convergences and

divergences between the aforementioned beliefs and practices. The final step of data analysis consisted of a cross-case analysis (Creswell, 2007), which requires to work on all participants' cases to evaluate findings with regard to ISLA literature about grammar teaching and corrective feedback.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1 Within-case analysis results

The data were analyzed within two main frameworks: within-case analysis and cross-case analysis. In the within-case analysis, the data obtained from each participant were analyzed in two categories: beliefs and practices of L2 Grammar Teaching (GT) and beliefs and practices of Corrective Feedback (CF).

4.1.1 Sezen

4.1.1.1 Sezen's GT beliefs and practices

For the interview questions that were answered by Sezen after her lessons were observed revealed some prominent information about her declarative beliefs regarding grammar teaching. For her language learning experience, she stated that she graduated from an Anatolian high school and she attended the preparatory class of that high school in the first year. During her language education, she was only exposed to L2 in that use of L1 was prohibited in class and the school environment was rich in English posters and wallpapers. She also added that they were quite lucky in terms of the courses they had taken and the materials they had used. They used various books including, coursebook, reader, vocabulary book and the lessons used to include communication, reading, listening, writing, vocabulary and grammar. As for her experience with grammar learning, she put forward that they had learned grammar with form and meaning focus. She added that:

> We used to learn the rules, but we inferred the rules out of the examples. First, we were exposed to the meaning (examples), and then we would find out the rules. The rules were given explicitly, but with meaning focus. Our teacher used to use the target grammar structures in her speech in the following lessons. So, it was easy to learn and remember them. (Sezen, Interview 2, 13 Nov 2018)

With the aim of answering the research question concerning what language teachers believe regarding L2 grammar teaching, this part presents the related beliefs held by Sezen. Considering recurring patterns and the frequency of recurring, three main themes occurred to analyze and categorize codes related to Sezen's beliefs about L2 grammar teaching: (1) theoretical aspect of Sezen's teaching; (2) practical aspect of Sezen's teaching; and (3) contextual factors affecting Sezen's teaching. The findings related to these themes are explained in detail below.

The theoretical aspect of Sezen's teaching includes the theoretical foundation of her beliefs shaping the way she teaches grammar. She principally believes that Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theories or English language teaching theories that she was taught at university does not have a role in her teaching philosophy. She bases her language teaching philosophy and grammar teaching philosophy in particular on her experiential teaching practice. She also states that she does not remember what she learned during her undergraduate education:

> I don't rely on a specific theory or approach in grammar teaching. Actually, I forgot all of them. It was twelve years ago. The only thing I remember is that translation is not beneficial. I remember I thought theories were not appealing to me even when I was at the university. Teaching improves in class with students and class dynamics. So, I don't have a theoretical background; I have a practical background (Sezen, Interview 2, 13 Nov 2018).

She also adds that the coursebook is satisfactory enough, so she does not need to support it with extra materials or activities, which she regards as the reason for not having room to implement any personal teaching philosophies. She also focuses on

the significance of fluency rather than accuracy since she values communication and pays less attention to grammar to encourage more fluent language production. Besides, for the questions exploring her grammar teaching methodologies, she wanted the explanations of the methodologies asked in the interview. As the participant did not know the terms such as explicit-implicit, deductive-inductive grammar teaching, focus on form-focus on meaning, she was briefed about these terms with the help of the literature. After the briefing, it can be said that she is of the opinion that inductive teaching can yield better results; however, she defines inductive teaching as a situation in which learners find out the rules out of meaningful examples in her case. She does not extend the scope of inductive grammar teaching with contextualized reading or listening. However, she also states that she uses deductive grammar teaching in accordance with the instruction of the coursebook. For this reason, she thinks how she teaches is not certain as she follows what is suggested and provided in the coursebook. She also notes that she prefers explicit grammar teaching as it is essential to know and be aware of the rules explicitly. Apart from these, there was no further answer to the questions related to the theoretical beliefs about her L2 grammar teaching.

The practical aspect of Sezen's teaching constitutes the beliefs that she holds about her L2 grammar teaching practices and the implementation of her instructional decisions in class. The most frequent codes obtained from the triangulated data include the use of pair-work, coursebook-based grammar instruction, controlled grammar practices, use of examples, elicitation for the rules and answers, use of grammaticality judgment questions and explanation of meaning. The most notable code emerged from the interview and stimulated recalls is the use of pair-work for speaking activities aiming to make students produce the target grammar structure in a

meaningful context. Sezen believes that pair-work activities work well and she refers to one trainer who observed one of her lessons a few years ago. The trainer advised her to make use of pair-work in case students might feel ashamed to speak up in class and then she took up pair-work and continued to use it more for her further lessons. She also prefers to walk around the class to provide feedback during pair-work activities. Another prominent belief that she holds for grammar teaching is her preference to depend on the coursebook. She points out that she uses the examples given in the coursebook to instruct the target structure and she makes students do exercises given in the coursebook. She does not refer to any autonomous practices that she implements in class as she thinks what the coursebook offers for grammar is satisfactory enough. She explains the situation as follows:

> The coursebook and the other materials are appropriate enough. It includes both pair-work and group work, so I mostly depend on the book. For this reason, there is no room for teaching philosophy. I do not need it. It is important to be able to communicate, so communication is the main concern, not grammar. According to me, fluency is more important than accuracy for this reason (Sezen, Interview 2, 13 Nov 2018).

The last prominent code obtained from the transcribed interview is associated with Sezen's belief about the use of translation from L2 to L1 or from L1 to L2, which she avoids doing since she believes that students may expect everything to be translated if the teacher uses it once. She also relates it to her language learning experience in order to rationalize the reason why she avoids.

Contextual factors affecting Sezen's teaching encompass the external concerns that have a role in shaping her beliefs regarding L2 grammar teaching. It also acknowledges the research question investigating contextual factors influencing teachers' instructional decisions. These concerns include learners' profile, lack of teacher autonomy and time constraints. The most notable code emerged from the

data was the profile of the learners, which is defined as technical learners as they are all from technical departments. Sezen believes that it is hard to do something creative with them since their perspective towards language learning can be technical too. Time constraints are related to the pacing of the curriculum and the urge to catch up with the weekly requirements. Likewise, the lack of freedom is explained as a problem of not being able to make autonomous decisions about the timing of the lessons. As she has to obey the schedule of the start and finish hours, she thinks it could be better if she decided on the timing of her lessons to be able to plan her activities accordingly.

As for the research question exploring what instructional practices language teachers use to teach L2 grammar, there were two major target grammar structures taught by Sezen in observed sessions: comparatives and superlatives and sentence connectors such as so, although and because. The triangulated data revealed that her instructional decisions and practices in class mostly compromise with her stated beliefs in that it was observed that what she stated as beliefs in the interview were employed in the class. However, it is also evident that there are some incongruent patterns between beliefs and instructional practices. Incongruent practices, in this case, refer to the practices that were not mentioned in the interview or the practices that were observed to be at odd with Sezen's stated beliefs. In this sense, the themes that emerged from the data are as follows: (1) use of elicitation; (2) explicit teaching; (3) controlled grammar practice; (4) use of examples; (5) use of grammaticality judgement questions; (6) explanation of meaning; and (7) lack of adaptation for communicative purposes.

It was observed that Sezen does not give everything completely and use of elicitation has a significant role in her grammar teaching since she wants the students

to be a part of the teaching process. Elicitation in this context refers to the inclusion of students to the process of inferring rules, completing sentences in target structure, noticing the mistakes in problematic sentences and explaining the meaning of the sentences in target structure practices initiated by the teacher. Sezen rationalizes this practice by stating that it can help students to benefit from their background and realize that they know something about the target structure. It is also defined as a positive practice through which students can learn from each other. This practice of grammar teaching is also mentioned in the interview held for stated beliefs for grammar teaching, which can be regarded as an implication of a belief based on experiential practice employed in the class by Sezen. Another prominent theme coded from the data is her preference for explicit teaching. It was noted that she explains the rules and the meaning of target structure explicitly over the grammar information and examples provided in the coursebook:

> I think it is more permanent, so I prefer explicit teaching. I also learned grammar explicitly, and if I learn something explicitly, it is hard to forget for me. It also helps me to engage learners because they are not passive during explicit teaching. When I instruct the rules and explain everything, they can feel sleepy, but if I urge them to participate by answering questions, they do not stay passive (Sezen, Interview 1, 7 Nov 2018).

The excerpt about the use of explicit grammar teaching shows that she regards elicitation as a part of explicit teaching, which can be interpreted as a lack of knowledge about the theoretical aspect of L2 grammar teaching. Additionally, it is evident that there is a relationship between her own learning experience and the way she prefers to teach as she thinks explicit teaching can yield more permanent learning outcomes based on her own learning experience. As it is a practice of what she perceives as an essence, it reflects a consistent relationship between her beliefs and practices.

The data revealed that controlled grammar practice has a significant role in Sezen's grammar teaching practices since she spent a great deal of time on both individual and group-based grammar practices. She benefitted from workbook and practice booklet, and she preferred to do controlled practice as a self-study, but in the last session, she wanted students to form groups and answer rewriting practice questions together, which was done as a competition in which the earliest group would be the winner. She was observed to have an active role during these activities in that she walked around the class to observe and help the students who had difficulty in answering questions. This pattern shows that what she believes about the role of grammar practice is reflected in her instructional practices. However, it is not compatible with her beliefs highlighting communication aspect of grammar teaching because she spent most of her time on controlled practice. Another theme coded in her data is the use of examples. It can be said that she makes use of examples as a part of her inductive grammar teaching as she wanted students to make explanations about the rules and target structure based on the examples given in the coursebook or the ones she wrote on the board. She elicited answers from the students to help them to reach the target rule. This practice of grammar teaching was observed to be used after she taught the target structure rules deductively, which revealed another consistent relationship between her beliefs and practices because this practice can be regarded as evidence to prove her theoretical belief that she defines as "partially inductive."

What is more, another theme that was coded out of frequently occurring practice of use of grammatical judgement questions revealed that Sezen attaches great importance to the use of target structure in appropriate context because she provided students with several sentences and she wanted them to analyze the

sentence in terms of grammaticality, which is not stated in the interview for grammar teaching beliefs. Sezen points out that she used it to let them notice the correct use of the target structure. She also adds that students may perceive this practice negatively if they misremember the example as the model one, so she believes it is better to apply it to target structures which may cause common mistakes. This practice employed for teaching the target structure is stated as a practical belief about L2 grammar teaching, which makes it a compatible practice with her beliefs. The reason for this practice is related to Sezen's prior learning experience and the expertise she has gained through her teaching.

Another substantial theme is explanation of meaning. Observed practices show that Sezen usually explained the meaning of sentences including the target structure in order to provide a clear understanding of the target form in context instead of the explanation of the rule when students asked for clarification. It was also observed that she frequently resorted to this kind of explanation during the individual and group-based controlled practices. It is explicitly stated as a practical belief, and the importance attached to this practice of grammar teaching might be attributed to her beliefs foregrounding communicative and fluency aspect of language. In this respect, stated beliefs and instructed practices compromise with each other. The last theme emerging from the data is about lack of adaptation for communicative purposes. This theme emerged as a result of recurring codes annotating missed opportunities to lead a communicative activity with students. It was observed that some topics drew the attention of the students. However, Sezen did not prefer to continue after she let one or two students stated their opinions, which emerged as an inconsistent practice. Though she believes communication and fluency are the key purposes in grammar teaching, this practice does not meet this

expectation. For the question that was about adults' difficulties in learning languages, she asked it the whole class, but she did not maintain the discussion after two answers. The reason given by the teacher can be interpreted as an unconscious decision that is made instantly independent of a pre-existing belief or philosophy, which is explained as follows:

> It was not planned; it just occurred to me. When I notice there is something related to them, I want to push them to participate and make it permanent in their mind. If I teach everything, they will be passive recipients. I tried to make it student-based and provide motivation. It is always successful. I did not want to continue; I do not know why. I might make quick decisions automatically without overthinking. I wanted them to participate and state their opinions. It did not have a purpose. It was not planned, it was to grab attention, so it lasted too short. (Sezen, Interview 1, 7 Nov 2018)

Based on above-mentioned themes regarding Sezen's beliefs and practices of L2 grammar teaching, this part aims to focus on the research questions regarding to what extent teacher cognition and practices compromise with each other, the reasons for the inconsistencies between these beliefs and practices and the contextual factors influencing the teacher's instructional decisions. Firstly, it seems that the priorities stated as beliefs are put into effect on a large scale. Her compatible beliefs include not depending on any theories or methodologies taught at university, depending on the coursebook, teaching grammar both deductively and inductively, teaching over examples and using grammar practices. These notions stated in the interview designed to gather information about her belief system were implemented in the class. Contextual factors such as intensive curriculum and integrated skills system requiring the use of a single main coursebook might have facilitated this consistent relationship since the coursebook provides the content and technique that are highlighted by Sezen and she does not have to resort to any sources or theories, which can be considered a factor restricting the scope of her beliefs. Secondly, in the

case of inconsistent patterns, the data revealed that although she believes communication and fluency are her primary concerns, it was neglected in some situations in which she adapted the questions for whole class discussion, yet failed to maintain. Even though there was not an obvious timing problem, she cut it short. This divergence may shed light on some blurred decision-making processes that happened in class depending on the variables occurring at that specific time in that teachers may not have an explanation for all the decisions they make in class. A strong belief about the use of pair-work for grammar practices and communication was not observed except for a pen and paper-based group activity. Thirdly, some practices taking part in stated beliefs such as the use of elicitation, grammatical judgment questions, and explanation of meaning were frequently used in class, but they were reminded in detail to elicit Sezen's beliefs about them. It can be interpreted that Sezen might not have a declarative knowledge about these practices, but they are available as procedural knowledge, which can also be the case for the overall situation in that observed practices constitute a more comprehensive framework for Sezen's grammar teaching compared to the restricted belief knowledge about what she prefers. Even though it was not explicitly stated, it can be inferred from the interview and the stimulated recall that elicitation and explanation of meaning but not the rule might have stemmed from the importance attached to the communicative aspect of L2 grammar.

4.1.1.2 Sezen's CF beliefs and practices

Based on the research question asking what language teachers believe regarding giving corrective feedback, Sezen states that recast is the most frequent feedback

type that she uses in class after she was informed about the feedback types as she said that she did not know feedback types and how they were called in the field:

> I prefer recast to get more information from students. I wonder what they can say more, so I do not interrupt them. I just use recast and let them continue. Also, it is time-saving. Otherwise, I may fall behind the pacing. I prefer to correct the target structures only. I do not want to deviate from the lesson plan, and they may feel confused if I correct something they have not learned yet. (Sezen, Interview 2, 13 Nov 2018)

Apart from recast, she also acknowledges that she sometimes uses metalinguistic feedback, metalinguistic clue, elicitation, and clarification requests, but not as much as recasts. When it comes to the underlying reasons for her CF preferences and the factors influencing her decision-making processes while giving corrective feedback, five themes emerged from the data can shed light on Sezen's beliefs about the role of corrective feedback in her teaching: (1) target structure focus; (2) communicative purposes; (3) learners' individual differences; (4) focus on form and meaning; and (5) few and fast feedback moves.

Sezen states that she may ignore some mistakes that are irrelevant to the target structure taught at that time. These ignored mistakes range from the structures that have not been taught yet to the ones that have already been covered, which shows Sezen considers target structure focus in order to make sure that the target structure is understood correctly. As for the reason for this preference, she draws attention to the logistic reality of the classes, which is the fact that each class' population is over twenty-five and it is difficult to correct all the mistakes that she hears. In this regard, she also adds that she tends to correct some significant mistakes influencing the structure of the sentence or the ones causing meaning problems whether it is relevant to the target structure or not. It is explained with a personal trait as she thinks she is obsessed with mistakes and she cannot stop herself to disregard

them. Another theme that emerged from recurring codes is Sezen's concern about communicative purposes as she believes that students' answering her questions is her primary goal, but not their mistakes. She is of the opinion that her constant reactions to correct mistakes may result in hesitation to participate in whole class speaking activities. That is why she prefers recast in order to maintain a conversation, and she states that she prefers to correct pronunciation mistakes in pair-work activities because she thinks incorrect pronunciation should be corrected before they are fossilized.

In addition, Sezen emphasizes that her students are aware of being corrected, but their mistakes are entirely different from each other because of learners' individual differences. She informs that their strong and weak points differ from each other, so the way she delivers feedback to them varies from one student to another. She also emphasizes that she likes giving individual feedback during pair-work or group activities in this respect. Another substantial theme constituting Sezen's belief system is she does focus on form and meaning to correct mistakes. Meaning is prioritized because of her beliefs annotating the role of comprehension and communication while the form is foregrounded because of the situation in which students are assessed in exams, and they take it more seriously. She also reports that she would have a different attitude if she had a different target group, which can be regarded as a statement informing about the assumption that beliefs may change in accordance with the dynamics of different contexts. The last theme related to Sezen's stated beliefs about corrective feedback is that she provides few and fast feedback moves because of some contextual factors such as time constraints, the population of the class and students' attention. She states that she would provide more feedback if she were given enough time and she thinks that the time that she spends on

correcting mistakes may make students lose their attention, so she prefers to keep it short.

When it comes to the research question concerning how language teachers provide corrective feedback (CF) in class, a very limited number of CF was noted down. As she spent most of the time with controlled practice, CF opportunities in which teacher interacts with the students was restricted. Following table (Table 4) illustrates the amount of feedback she provided in the class and distribution of the feedback types. Field notes revealed that there were 19 mistakes made by the students in the class and 8 of these mistakes were left uncorrected by the teacher. Sezen corrected 11 mistakes, which constitutes 58% of the total mistakes (see Table 4). Examples for each feedback type provided by the teacher is given through excerpts under the table. Also, it was observed that the students reacted to elicitation and metalinguistic clue feedback types by correcting their mistakes; however, it was not apparent whether they understood the CF given as recast as the conversation went on with other sentences or ended soon after recast was given.

Table 4. Distribution of Feedback Types in Sezen's Lessons

Feedback types	Total (n = 11)
Recast	8 (73%)
Elicitation	2 (18%)
Metalinguistic clue	1 (9%)

Recast

Before covering the main reading passage about free time activities, Sezen wanted the students to tell how they spend their free time. One of the students responded, and Sezen corrected the lexical mistake by using recast as follows:

Student: I like reading tradition [sic] stories.
Teacher: Traditional stories.

Elicitation

While practising grammar exercises of comparatives, Sezen wanted the students to tell a few sentences to compare their past and present situations. One of the students made a tense mistake. He also used the time connector “then” at the beginning of the sentence. Sezen initiated the sentence and expected him to correct the rest of it as follows:

Student: Then I am [sic] more relaxed.
Teacher: I . . . change from there.
Student: I was more relaxed then.

Metalinguistic clue

While covering the activity to practise sentence connectors, one of the students made a preposition mistake. Sezen corrected her by providing a metalinguistic clue as follows:

Student: We went to [sic] a picnic together.
Teacher: a preposition mistake
Student: We went on a picnic.

Based on Sezen’s beliefs as mentioned above and table and the examples given above, it can be said that patterns of relationship between her beliefs and practices are mostly consistent with each other in her case. Firstly, as there were no recorded mistakes about the target structure, it cannot be said that the focus was not on the target structure. Additionally, as stated by Sezen beforehand, she corrects some significant mistakes no matter they are relevant to target structure or not, there is a compatible relationship between her beliefs and practices regarding this point. She provided feedback for several non-target structures such as tense, word formation,

pronunciation, vocabulary and subject-verb agreement. However, which patterns of mistake constitute significant ones is not explicitly stated, which led Sezen to have an interpretation that she decides on what to correct during the mistake occurs. She explains the reason for her choices as follows:

> Something happens to me when I go into the class. Even though I stick to the overall lesson plan, I do not have any idea about why I make some decisions about the flow of the lesson. Especially the detailed points that you declared. I do not decide on these decisions by myself. The class dynamics lead me to do so. As a result, I teach and interact differently in each class despite the same coursebook and the same content. I am not sure whether it is good or bad (Sezen, Interview 1, 7 Nov 2018).

Another belief was about her preference of recast for the sake of communication, which is compatible with her practices since recast is obviously the most frequent CF type. One of the reasons why she ignored 42% of the mistakes is attributed to this purpose as well. Sezen also states that she ignored some mistakes in order not to interrupt the students. Another compatible relationship between her beliefs and practices is about the few and fast feedback she provided. She provided a limited amount of feedback, and she did not spend too much time for correction, which is parallel to her stated belief.

As for the research questions related to the degree of consistency between beliefs and practices and the reasons for the inconsistencies, it can be said that there were not many situations in which learners' individual differences were taken into consideration based on the field notes and stimulated recall. She was observed to walk around to help students during controlled practice, which might indicate her concern about individual feedback. It was also noted that she only focused on form for the CF she provided even though she believes mistakes stemming from meaning is also essential to provide CF. Although there were some short answers needed to be

elaborated in terms of meaning, she was not observed to pay attention to them. The teacher does not know the reason for this practice, and she regards it as an instant decision made in accordance with the flow of the lesson.

4.1.2 İrem

4.1.2.1 İrem's GT beliefs and practices

For the preliminary question about her prior language learning experience, İrem states that she started to learn English at a private primary school in the first grade and she was communicatively exposed to the language with different skills as they used to read big storybooks, listen to songs and write English compositions. However, it is stated that it turned to more grammar-based after a while. As for high school, İrem informs that they used to get prepared for the high-stakes exams and they did not do any writing or speaking during three-year language education. Activities such as translation, discrete grammar exercises and vocabulary without contextualization with the aim of improving test skills for the university entrance exam.

As the interview questions are the same as the ones directed to Sezen, the data were coded within the same themes in consideration of recurring patterns and frequency of recurring. In this regard, the data for the research question investigating İrem's stated beliefs about L2 grammar teaching were coded and categorized under three themes (1) theoretical aspect of İrem's teaching; (2) practical aspect of İrem's teaching; and (3) contextual factors affecting İrem's teaching. The findings related to these themes are explained in detail below.

The theoretical aspect of İrem's teaching refers to the underlying theories and approaches shaping what she believes about L2 grammar teaching. She admits that she does not have much to say about theories because of lack of knowledge in language teaching theories in the literature. She elaborates on this statement as follows:

> I don't know many things about the theories. I attended the TESOL certification program, and I read a book written by Jeremy Harmer. Apart from this, I studied some theories for the job interview, but I don't remember them now. As far as I know, I think I have an eclectic approach. I don't use a unique method, and it depends. I like being flexible. (İrem, Interview 2, 20 Nov 2018)

She also adds that she searched for the task-based approach and tried to implement it in her class after she realized that it had been very popular among her colleagues. However, she reflected that it did not work well and it did not appeal to her. As she stated that she was not sure about the methodologies and approaches that could be used in grammar teaching, she was briefly informed about explicit-implicit, deductive-inductive grammar teaching and focus on form and meaning. Based on her answers, it can seem that the way she prefers to teach grammar mainly draws on mostly inductive teaching, which is supported by the use of examples and context to teach the target structure. However, it is also noted that she believes that explicit instruction after inducting the target structure constitutes her basic preference. Overall, İrem concludes that all theories have been built based on ideal class students, so it is not possible to implement what has been suggested in theories. Based on given justification, she thinks it is better to depend on experiential teaching and learners' wishes in that she is into learning by experience and considering learners' wishes to adapt her lessons.

The practical aspect of İrem's grammar teaching covers the instructional practices and decisions that are thought to inform about what she believes within the scope of L2 grammar teaching in class. To differentiate the distinction between theoretical and practical aspects, it can be noted that practical beliefs predominantly refer to particular activities and patterns employed by the participant while theoretical aspect denotes more comprehensive foundations including theories, approaches, and methods stated as components of beliefs. In this regard, the data obtained through interview and stimulated recall revealed that these particular practices that İrem believes to be effective are elicitation of rules and answers, explicit instruction of rules after elicitation, controlled grammar practice, use of L1, departure from coursebook if necessary, use of games for target structure and use of metalinguistic terms. She also believes that the use of reading and listening contexts to deduce target grammar rules and production right after learning target structure are not effective practices in L2 grammar teaching. She adds that even though she learned these techniques during TESOL certification program, she does not think that they work well for her learners since she believes 70% of the students may tend to perceive the context and the rules separately without building a relationship. Therefore, she prefers to instruct the rules explicitly. Additionally, she is of the opinion that providing a reasonable amount of time for learners to get prepared to speak can work better than the situation in which students are expected to produce the target structure soon after they are taught.

Contextual factors affecting İrem's beliefs inform about significant dimensions of external factors represented in her belief system. Also, as a response to the research question about the role of contextual factors, İrem acknowledges that each class particularly has its own dynamics paving the way for constructing various

relationships and teaching practices in the classes where she teaches. Under the acceptance that one of her classes is more easy-going and motivated, the scope of her grammar teaching varies more dramatically compared to the more challenging class where what she conducts is restricted because of disruptive factors. She also addresses that lack of technological aids may be considered a hindrance preventing her from providing more online sources. Apart from these, İrem notes there are not any other contextual factors that stem from the institute and detrimentally affect her. Talking about this issue, İrem commented:

> I think I am not capable of criticizing the curriculum or pacing because I am not a graduate of ELT department. I can apply what I have in mind. There is not a contextual factor affecting me. On my first days at school, my partner was very experienced. We used to share a class, and I remember I wished she would teach some grammar structures. I felt I was not qualified enough to teach complex grammar structures. The problems were about me, not the school. I am young, not experienced. I am afraid of not being taken seriously by students. (İrem, Interview 2, 20 Nov 2018)

When it comes to the research question regarding how İrem performed L2 grammar teaching in the sessions where she was supposed to teach contrastive linkers such as although, despite, even though and in spite of and revision of past, present and future tense forms, field notes and the transcription of stimulated recall led me to come up with some broad themes coded from the data. These themes include (1) rewrite activities; (2) eliciting answers and rules; (3) controlled grammar practice; (4) use of extra examples based on L1; (5) departure from the coursebook and extra materials; (6) grammaticality judgement questions; and (7) use of metalinguistic language. Based on the findings, it is significantly apparent that her practices are principally in line with her beliefs, which is analyzed in detail below.

Rewrite activities denote the activities prepared by the teacher before the class in order to have students differentiate the usage of although and despite and

convert them to one another. İrem spent nearly a lesson hour on this activity after she elicited some answers to the first question and instructed the rule explicitly. Even though it is not a practice available in the curriculum, she applied in order to make sure that students could use the form correctly and be aware of the fact that they can convey the meaning in other words. In response to the question of the reason for this activity, İrem answered that she actually had prepared the activity for the other class to manage the class and make them take grammar session more serious. Having noticed it worked well in that class, İrem decided on implementing the same activity in the observed session under the assumption that students could benefit from that, which compatible with the belief suggesting that she likes being flexible and experiential teaching affects how she teaches. Another common practice is eliciting answers and rules from the students, which İrem did at the beginning of above-mentioned rewrite activity and during the practice of tense forms. Elicitation in this context consisted of engaging the learners into the rule-making process based on the sample example and guiding students to make them answer the questions related to target structures. Even though this practice can be interpreted as an example of a compatible relationship between beliefs and practices, a concern expressed by İrem is that she does not think contextual sources used for elicitation such as reading and listening passages can help learners to notice and comprehend target structures. However, she was observed to use the aforementioned contexts provided in the coursebook in order to elicit some rules, which can be viewed as a divergence from beliefs stemming from the coursebook requirements. Another notable practice emerged from the data is controlled grammar practice, which is a particularly prominent belief held by İrem. She preferably resorts to extra grammar exercises in case of a need in class, and this preference was obviously observed as she wanted the

students to complete the optional workbook grammar practices. Even though it is not included in the pacing, it can be deduced that this practice can be seen as a noticeable reflection of what she believes regarding grammar teaching.

Use of extra examples based on L1 to enhance grammar teaching is noted as another theme that came up from the data. This practice refers to verbal and written examples created by the teacher to assure that students understand how target structures are used in their first language. İrem states that she has a tendency to have students analyze the similarities and differences between the target language and their first language, so she makes use of some questions related to their L1 to help them to be aware of the target structure and its function. As it is supported and justified by the teacher, it would not be wrong to claim that what she believes about the role of L1 is also implemented through specific questions in class. Departure from the coursebook and extra materials is a theme that emerged out of the data about İrem's beliefs regarding her use of supplementary materials and her preference to change the way grammar is expected to be taught. In this sense, she is of the opinion that she can adapt the way of grammar instruction suggested in the coursebook as she thinks this kind of adaptation may lead to better learning. This concern is supported with her practice of rewrite activity, which was not a part of the institutional syllabus and her extra instruction based on the use of timeline instead of the chart provided within the grammar bank part of the coursebook to show the differences among the tenses that have been covered by the students. Another compatible relationship between beliefs and practices can be traced in this pattern. Additionally, her decisions about playing games to revise target grammar structures can also be considered an example of departure even though it was not observed within the allotted time for data collection.

Grammaticality judgment questions constituted another prominent practice of grammar instruction. Irem was observed to pursue this practice frequently by writing mistaken sentences on the board and encouraging students to accommodate the sentence to find out the mistake and correct the sentence. It was also noted that this practice was mostly conducted after the teacher walked around during controlled grammar practice and pair-works. The last theme coded from the data is the use of metalinguistic language while explaining the sample sentences to the students. The view, which compromises with what she did in class, about this aspect of grammar instruction was echoed by İrem as follows:

> When I use "noun clause," I know that they do not understand the meaning of the noun clause. I explain that it is not a full sentence itself. We have to use a verb after that because it is in subject position. I try to show it because they can understand better if they make a distinction between a full sentence and a clause. Also, knowing these terms such as adjective, adverb, verb, noun is essential. I take it for granted. (İrem, Interview 1, 13 Nov 2018)

Regarding the research questions concerning the degree of consistency between beliefs and practices, the reasons for the inconsistencies between these beliefs and practices, and the role of contextual factors, the data show that there is not a significant inconsistency between her beliefs and practices in that she thinks what she did in class is not against what she believes about her language teaching in general. She briefly mentioned the theoretical, practical and contextual aspect of her belief system and these beliefs were also supported in the stimulated recall. However, one of the substantial points about the data is that İrem had difficulty in explaining and elaborating what she believes regarding grammar teaching and the reason for this lack of knowledge and hesitance noticed during the interview forwarded for stated beliefs might be associated with lack of theoretical knowledge about the field and practice-based belief system. A practice-based belief system can

be noted as natural decisions and practices observed in class, but when it comes to stated beliefs, the scope within which beliefs were shared is relatively shorter than expected, which can be regarded as an obstacle to shed light on core beliefs held by the participant. Apart from this, both theoretical and practical aspects of İrem's belief system were observed to be reflected in class without a noticeable divergence from these beliefs. As for her views regarding contextual factors, the belief about her changing attitudes and practices in different contexts was not investigated as just one of her class was observed during the data collection. Data from another class might have yielded an inconsistency between her beliefs and practices as she firmly believes that class dynamics have a substantial role in changing her practices in order to maintain classroom management and prevent disruptive behaviors.

4.1.2.2 İrem's CF beliefs and practices

Based on the interview questions prepared to reveal what teacher believe about the role of Corrective Feedback (CF), types of CF and the reasons for their preferences, İrem informs that the most frequent CF types that she uses in class are recast and explicit correction. As she stated that she did not know the names of the CF types, she was informed about the CF types in the literature, and for each type, a sample case was illustrated and explained briefly. She started to mention her beliefs by reporting that:

> I generally do not interrupt students. In case of a pronunciation mistake or grammar, I wait until students end their sentences. After that, I state their mistakes and correct them. At the beginning of my teaching career, I used to interrupt them constantly. However, after getting some feedback in TESOL, I started to change my style. It was a logical change. The trainers told me students might feel bad. I mostly use recast and explicit correction. When I use explicit correction, I write the mistaken sentence on the board, and I want the students to correct it. Then I explain why it is incorrect. I sometimes use

> elicitation and repetition. I rarely use metalinguistic clue and clarification request. (İrem, Interview 2, 20 Nov 2018)

Even though she states that she is inclined to correct most of the mistakes in class, it can be deduced that she decreased the amount of correction after she got feedback from the teacher-training program. She does not believe that all the mistakes should be corrected now. As for the reasons influencing her to hold these beliefs, two main themes emerged from the data: (1) learners' feelings; and (2) learners' individual differences.

She prioritizes learners' feelings while deciding on correction by stating that she fears that students might feel humiliated for being corrected and it may impede their willingness to speak. Therefore, İrem favors correcting solely significant mistakes that may cause a communication gap. She also reports that if she uses recast or explicit correction soon after a mistaken output, students will think that she intends to humiliate them and they will feel discouraged and end up with avoiding speaking, which urges her not to give CF in some cases. Under this assumption, she prefers to correct significant mistakes and mitigates the way she provides CF as follows:

> If the mistake made by shy students is very serious during the whole class activities, I tend to mitigate the way I give feedback. For instance, I say that it is very normal to make this kind of mistake. Many people use it like this, but it could be better if you use it this way. (İrem, Interview 1, 13 Nov 2018)

The other theme that can be seen as a reason for İrem's CF choices takes its roots from learners' individual differences. In this regard, these differences are told to be related to their level, personality, motivation to learn and awareness. İrem states that she decides on feedback type by considering these differences and she adds that it develops as she knows her students better. She exemplifies the case by annotating

that some students might be happy for being corrected and they want to be corrected to learn better, so she prefers to provide explicit correction. Additionally, she believes that some students are aware of being corrected, so she is inclined to use recast as well. These students are told to be corrected publicly, and İrem thinks they do not feel ashamed for being corrected. As for the shy learners, İrem informs that she tries not to correct them publicly, so she prefers to give individual feedback to these students later.

When it comes to the research question aiming to reveal how İrem performed in class in terms of her CF choices, filed notes show that the learners uttered 30 sentences including mistakes which were expected to be corrected by CF were observed in the allotted time occurred, and she provided CF just for 19 (63%) of these mistakes (See Table 5). It was noted that learners were able to correct themselves after receiving CF as metalinguistic clue, clarification request, and repetition; however, it was out of the possibility to make sure that the learners realized their mistakes in the case of recasts. Samples from the data for each feedback type are demonstrated below.

Table 5. Distribution of Feedback Types in İrem's Lessons

Feedback types	Total (*n* = 19)
Recast	11 (58%)
Explicit correction	5 (26%)
Metalinguistic clue	1 (5%)
Clarification request	1 (5%)
Repetition	1 (5%)

Recast

While covering the revision part of the unit, the teacher wanted the students to answer the follow-up questions to revise the topics that had been covered beforehand. So, she asked about the healthy habits in their families. One of the students answered, but she made a subject-verb agreement mistake in addition to a mistake about uncountable nouns.

> Teacher: Do you have a healthy habit in your family?
> Student: My father never buy [sic] a cola.
> Teacher: He never buys a bottle of coke.

Explicit correction

While talking about the reading passage about a TV series and one character of this TV series, one of the students wanted to state that she did not have enough information about him, but she made a lexical mistake and İrem corrected this mistake as follows:

> Student: I don't recognize [sic] him very well.
> Teacher: What is the meaning of "recognize"?
> Student: You say I don't know you or I don't recognize you.
> Teacher: No, it is not like that. When you recognize someone, you identify that person.

Metalinguistic clue

While practising some adjectives and the prepositions that they take, one of the students used an incorrect preposition, and İrem provided a metalinguistic clue to help her to correct the mistake as follows:

> Student: Picture A is different for [sic] picture B.
> Teacher: For? Maybe it is another preposition.
> Student. From.

Clarification request (rewrite activity: interested-keen)

Within the same activity, one of the students made a preposition mistake, and İrem pretended not to understand to encourage him to revise his sentence as follows:

> Student: I think Jean is keen in [sic] Simon
> Teacher: What?
> Student: I think Jean is keen on Simon.
> Teacher: Good, you corrected yourself.

Repetition

During the same activity about adjectives and prepositions, one student made a preposition mistake, and İrem preferred to repeat the erroneous part.

> Student: Çeşme is nice for [sic] stay.
> Teacher: Nice for?
> Student: Nice to stay.

Based upon the findings, İrem's CF practices can be evaluated within the framework of her beliefs regarding CF preferences and two themes stated to be profoundly effective on her beliefs: learners' feelings and learners' individual differences. The most frequent CF type used by İrem is recast followed by explicit correction, which can be taken into account as a compatible consequence of her beliefs. The other types were already stated to be used rarely, so infrequent use of other CF types (Table 5) can be added as another consistent dimension of CF beliefs and practices. Another point found to be consistent with CF beliefs is İrem's reluctance to use the board for explicit correction. It was observed that she did not use the board in the case of explicit correction. Instead, she preferred to correct verbally, which can be associated with her belief emphasizing the fear of humiliation.

As for the learners' feelings, İrem states that she left some mistakes uncorrected in order not to discourage relatively weaker learners from speaking. She

also avoided giving explicit correction to shy students even though she previously stated that she sometimes preferred to correct significant mistakes on the board explicitly. The second reason influencing the way she delivers CF is learners' individual differences, and it can be noted that İrem considered this concern while providing CF in the class. More specifically, for two similar mistakes in pronunciation by two different students, İrem preferred to use explicit correction for one of the students, yet she did not correct the other one. The reason for this choice is stated as follows:

> I corrected Yiğit's "helped" pronunciation mistake explicitly because I knew Yiğit would be happy to be corrected. However, If I correct the other student, who rarely speaks for the same mistake, it would be embarrassing for him, and he would not speak later. Therefore, I try not to intervene in students' mistakes on my first days with the class in order to know them better. Their personality and level determine the way I provide feedback. (İrem, Interview 1, 13 Nov 2018)

As for the research questions related to whether her beliefs and practices compromise with each other and the reasons for the inconsistencies, it can be inferred that İrem performed consistently considering what she believes about CF since there is not a significant gap between her instructional CF practices and her beliefs constituting the base for these beliefs. Additionally, it should be noted that even though she is not aware of the theoretical aspect of CF in the field, she is practically aware of the instant decisions made in the class in terms of her CF preferences and underlying reasons influencing her choices.

4.1.3 Merve

4.1.3.1 Merve's GT beliefs and practices

Interview with Merve preliminarily revealed some details about how she went through her language learning process. She started to learn English in the preparatory class of a vocational high school of tourism and hotel management. She informed that they had speaking classes including practices such as hotel dialogues, job interviews, restaurant conversations, debates, and pair-work. Based on the answers to the questions, it was noted that she was exposed to language skills through a variety of practices related to writing, speaking and listening. As for the grammar instruction, it is considered to be explicit and deductive since grammar rules used to be delivered to her in a teacher-centered way with a particular focus on explicit rules and explanations.

In keeping with previous participants, there is a variety of perspectives obtained from the interviews conducted with Merve and these perspectives are handled within the same categories that were used for the previous participants in that the same interview questions directed to the participants showed that their answers to these belief questions could be evaluated within the same categories. In respect to the research question exploring what language teachers believe regarding L2 grammar teaching, the data revealed that Merve's perspectives regarding L2 grammar teaching can be addressed with the following themes coded from the data: (1) theoretical aspect of Merve's teaching; (2) practical aspect of Merve's teaching; and (3) contextual factors affecting Merve's teaching.

The theoretical aspect of Merve's teaching denotes the underlying principles constituting her perspectives towards L2 grammar teaching. In contrast to the

specific details about practical implementations, it adds up to the vision taken on by the participant. Within this perspective, Merve firstly touches upon her reality that is not based on theories, but her experience and intuition, which results in making instant and unconscious decisions for the sake of teaching. In addition, the data show that she preferred to elaborate on her in-class practices rather than explaining the theoretical background of her beliefs. Instead of relating her opinions to a theoretical framework, she gave specific examples retrieved from her teaching experience, which may give rise to an interpretation annotating that her beliefs are based on her experience rather than theoretical approaches or frameworks. The comment below illustrates how she defines the situation:

> I do many things without thinking that much. At that moment, I decide on the right thing for them and apply it. I am not an ELT graduate. I graduated from the Literature department. I rely on my experience and intuition, and I do not think it is disadvantageous. (Merve, Interview 1, 3 Dec 2018)

A substantial point highlighted by Merve is her tendency to create opportunities for communicative teaching. She states that her teaching philosophy primarily depends on communicative teaching in that she is inclined to implement role-plays, pair-work and group work excessively rather than rote memorization. Knowing that language is used to communicate with people, the perspective adopted by her requires the engagement of students into all stages of teaching by providing active participation through teacher-initiated questions and elicitation. In response to the question of how she adopted this perspective, the participant related it to her improvisatory decisions made in class and her experience by acknowledging that she lacks technical details to provide the comprehensive rationale behind her beliefs. She also informs that she read about the theories beforehand and she suggests that she has an eclectic approach to language teaching rather than depending on a single method. She exemplifies it

with her use of Suggestopedia in that she always motivates the students and acts in order to prevent students from having to be preoccupied with the load of new target structures. The data also revealed that Merve pays particular attention to meaning in grammar instruction rather than solely focusing on the form. The final point that raised frequently is the use of inductive grammar teaching preference, and this preference is substantially associated with the assumption that students can learn better as long as they are actively engaged into the teaching process.

The practical aspect of Merve's teaching is a theme coded from the data with the aim of showing her particular beliefs regarding the activities, techniques and instructional decisions that foster or hinder her L2 grammar teaching practice. As mentioned beforehand, she has practically-oriented beliefs about grammar teaching, and she puts forward a variety of practical beliefs. Firstly, she believes eliciting grammar rules inductively is of benefit to students. As a consequence of this belief, she intends to conduct elicitation while instructing grammar. Elicitation is considered to be a technique that fosters learning, and it is frequently carried out throughout her lessons. It is also mentioned that interesting and engaging examples are used to make students deduce target rules and the teacher situates herself as a facilitator to guide them by asking questions and requesting the students to form similar sentences without knowing the rule. Merve assumes that interesting examples should be used to create opportunities to grab students' attention and encourage them to contribute to the examples with their own examples, which shows she has a special focus on meaning. In addition, she is of the opinion that grammar should be delivered in a simple, effective and practical way, which signifies her reluctance to copy the instructions and examples provided within the coursebook. Touching upon this issue, the participant said:

> I do not prefer to write the long sentences given in the coursebook. For instance, we covered defining relative clauses. I started with the definition of defining, and I emphasized that we call it adjective clause and I asked for the reason why we call it adjective clauses over the examples. I asked about the function of an adjective. It defines the noun. I wrote "girl" on the board and elicited some adjectives for this target noun. We can write beautiful or the girl who is beautiful. I drew attention to the similarity between these functions. (Merve, Interview 2, 10 Dec 2018)

As it can be deduced from the excerpt, Merve is likely to adapt the resources to be in line with her stated belief foregrounding the importance of being practical in teaching grammar. She is against teaching grammar with a complete reference to the coursebook without making any changes. Aside from adaptation, she believes that contextualization is a prominent aspect of grammar teaching in that students can deduce the meaning out of context without having to be taught explicitly.

Contextual factors affecting Merve's teaching include time constraints, materials, and standardization problems. These factors are considered to Merve's reflection on the research question investigating the effect of contextual factors as well. In this sense, Merve believes that trying to cover all the materials required to be completed in accordance with the syllabus makes her feel stressed as she may not have enough time to be able to suit herself, which may result in inconsistencies between her beliefs and practices. Another substantial factor is called the problems that may stem from the content of the materials. Merve expresses her concern regarding the need for adaptation for this kind of materials in that her adaptations may lead to standardization problems. The reason why she might have standardization problems is associated with the situation in which all classes at preparatory school are expected to follow the same pacing via the same material, and partner teachers of each class are required to work collaboratively to be in line with

each other. Having to do so restricts Merve to be more autonomous to take instructional decisions more independently.

When it comes to the research question about how Merve performed in class, she was supposed to teach gerunds and infinitives during the sessions when she was observed. Field notes and stimulated recalls conducted on these notes revealed several recurring patterns briefing how she prefers to teach a particular target structure. These themes include (1) use of elicitation; (2) explicit instruction after inductive teaching; (3) focus on written output in grammar exercises; (4) practical ways to grab attention; (5) engagement of students through related questions; (6) use of L1 when necessary; and (7) pair-work to have speaking material. These themes coded from Merve's practices and her reflections on her practices indicate that her instructional decisions substantially compromise with her beliefs concerning L2 grammar teaching.

A prominent dimension observed in Merve's lessons is her frequent use of elicitation throughout the session. Starting from having the students deduce the function of gerunds and infinitive, she guided the students to comprehend and produce the target structure via leading questions that directed students to go through a learning process to be able to reach the point their teacher had in mind. Based on several examples written on the board, the teacher wanted students to deduce the function of the brand-new target structure. In the case of production, she encouraged them to form similar sentences and comment on the meaning and structure of the sentences through elicitation. This practice is stated to be one of her underlying beliefs erecting her language teaching practices, which is considered to be a corresponding relationship between aforementioned her practices and aforementioned stated beliefs. In this case, the participant thinks that:

> I think it is more beneficial and permanent. If I directly provide the answer, it will not help them. They push themselves to think when I ask for clarification during elicitation. So, it is easy for them to remember later. If I directly and explicitly say, we will not spend enough time to focus on the structure. It is better to elicit. (Merve, Interview 1, 3 Dec 2018)

It was also noted that Merve preferred to carry out an inductive way to have students understand the target structures after going through several stages including analysis of examples, distinguishing the different uses and functions of the target structure. This bottom-up approach was followed by an explicit instruction session. Explicit instruction after inductive teaching was stated to be done to make sure that all students correctly understood the target structure. Even though she made use of the instructions and examples provided within the coursebook, she preferred to start in an inductive way first and continued with explicit instruction. This practice shows she performed consistently with the belief that makes it necessary for her to adapt the material in order to turn it into more useful and practical for the sake of learning.

Merve was also observed to focus on written output in grammar exercises in that she especially wanted the students to write their answers for all exercises. She reflects on this practice by arguing that speaking is based on writing. She adds that she always reflects the answer key on the board in order to show the correct written version of the answers to help them internalize the target structure and use it automatically.

One substantial theme coded from the data related to Merve's particular preferences to maintain more effective teaching is practical ways to grab attention. More specifically, this theme signifies a variety of instructional decisions taken by the teacher to grab the students' attention. These decisions include the use of interesting and related examples, animating the structures by sounding them and narrating while giving explicit instruction. For instance, she was observed to sound

some verbs as if they had been animated in order to show some verbs that have to be used with gerund forms. This practice is notably consistent with the belief that foregrounds using alternative and improvisatory ways to grab students' attention and to be able to provide them a meaningful and practical context where they can learn efficiently. As for the main reason for this preference, Merve commented that:

> I do not think that teaching something in an elaborated way is effective. As I am a teacher, I have to teach it as simply as possible. I do not aim to show my English proficiency. My main objective is to teach in the simple and most effective way, and I have to grab their attention. If they are not interested, it will be impossible to learn. Firstly, I have to grab their attention, and if I repeatedly explain the rules explicitly, it will be too boring. (Merve, Interview 1, 3 Dec 2018)

A repeated practice noticed in the observation sessions was the engagement of students through related questions. The apparent influence of these questions on the students' answers are significant in that the teacher directed some questions related to their lives based on the exercise questions provided within the coursebook, which resulted in more output and production that helped the teacher to see to what extent the students could use the target structure in a meaningful context and provide corrective feedback for the mistakes. In addition, this particular practice indicates that the teacher intends to make use of adaptation so that the exercises based on the form can extend to the context that can give rise to meaningful output. This decision is told to be unconscious and based on an instant decision, which can be related to Merve's tendency to make improvisatory decisions. In this sense, it can be deduced that this practice is in line with her stated beliefs. Another possible reason for this practice is related to personal life experience, and the effect of this experience on her teaching is reflected as follows:

> I have not questioned myself or the reason for that practice until you asked, it was unconscious. Maybe, we are six siblings. I am the elder one. I had to deal with them, and I knew that I would not be successful by ordering them. I used to make them do something willingly as I do for my children now. As for the students, firstly I try to make them feel eager to do something. They get it; they are not aware that they are learning. They talked to me at that time and so that they could learn unconsciously. (Merve, Interview 1, 3 Dec 2018)

Use of L1 emerged as another noteworthy practice because Merve used it several times to make the students use target language without teacher-initiated prompts, which means the teacher gives a statement or question and expects the students to translate them into English. Merve states that it motivates children as it is based on their own culture and they can realize that they are learning the language for daily use as well. She also adds that she used to be very strict not use L1 at the beginning of her teaching career, but she changed her belief after attending a few teacher training seminars advising on the use of L1 when necessary. Even though it is not explicitly stated as one of her beliefs regarding L2 grammar teaching in the belief interview, it cannot be said that it is an inconsistent practice in terms of the fact that the teacher does think that it is of benefit to the students.

The final theme coded from the data is about the use of pair-work to have speaking material. Merve was observed to let the students work in pairs for an activity about the use of gerunds and infinitives in the coursebook as she believes it can lead to a more comfortable environment to speak in contrast to teacher-student interactions. Pair-work is assumed to work well in that students may ask questions to each other in case they have a problem, but they may avoid asking the same questions to the teacher. Additionally, she believes that students may have difficulty in coming up with ideas to speak; however, pair-work can enable them to get prepared and provide them with a speaking material that they can efficiently use when the teacher chooses one during the whole-class speaking to answer the same

questions discussed in the pair-work. This practice indicates Merve has a communicative perspective for grammar teaching as well as her belief supporting the role of communication in grammar teaching, which reveals another consistent relationship between beliefs and practices.

Regarding the research questions related to the degree of consistency between beliefs and practices, the reasons for the inconsistencies and the effect of contextual factors, the findings evidently show that the aforementioned beliefs that Merve holds regarding L2 grammar teaching are aligned with her instructional practices in that there is not a significant disagreement that may induce any conflicts hindering Merve's teaching. Merve confidentially points out that there are not any practices that she considers to be inconsistent with her beliefs since she strongly claims that she would not implement the decisions that are against her belief system. Apart from her decisiveness in this respect, another point that can be used for the representation of her case is the fact that her beliefs are primarily based on instructional practices that she has experienced so far. As a consequence of this, the theoretical aspect of her beliefs lacks to be able to make a more comprehensive analysis of her core beliefs and relate it to the existing literature. Lack of theoretical knowledge of L2 grammar teaching is not regarded as a deficit because Merve assertively believes that depending on experience, intuition and improvisation fosters her teaching and yields effective outcomes. Her being a graduate of the literature department and her reliance on long-time experience might be seen as some possible reasons for her beliefs. Another remark on her case is the fact that time constraints, which was reported to be one of the contextual factors detrimentally affecting her teaching, did not influence her teaching as she had enough time to complete pacing of the week. Moreover, problems stemming from the materials were observed to be handled by Merve via

adaptation, which indicates no significant influence of contextual factors on her teaching was observed during the sessions.

4.1.3.2 Merve's CF beliefs and practices

Based on the research question aiming to reveal what teachers believe about the role of Corrective Feedback (CF), types of CF and the reasons for their preferences, Merve reports that she most frequently prefers elicitation, clarification questions and recast respectively. As she stated that she did not know what kind of feedback types were available in the field, feedback types taking place in the literature were introduced to her with specific examples to make sure that she could differentiate them from each other. Merve's preliminary belief about the role of CF in class is stated as follows:

> I always remind them that they should not be afraid of making mistakes. They should make mistakes to learn the correct form. I always remind it. It is speaking. Even teachers can mistakes. Don't be shy; you can make mistakes because you are learning. You can laugh at me, and I can laugh at you. At the end of the day, you will learn it. I motivate them to speak. You have to push yourself to speak. (Merve, Interview 2, 10 Dec 2018)

Her answers to the questions seeking for her beliefs regarding CF revealed three themes to which she attaches importance: (1) preference to use implicit CF types; (2) using CF particularly in grammar exercises; and (3) using mistakes to revise previous target structures.

One prominent belief holding by Merve is about her preference to use implicit CF types. In this case, implicit CF types mostly refer to elicitation, clarification request and recast. She believes that providing an opportunity for the students to correct themselves within the context of communication without explicitly pointing their mistakes can help them to learn better. It is stated that using

more implicit CF types such as elicitation, clarification question, and recast can yield more permanent learning as students cognitively focus on the mistake to notice and correct it by themselves.

The second recurring belief denotes that Merve uses CF particularly in grammar exercises in contrast to communicative activities since she does not prefer to interrupt students when they speak fluently and they are eager to speak. As for grammar exercises, she states that she generally retells their mistaken sentences and stops where the mistake is made. She makes use of intonation so that students can correct themselves. In case students fail to correct their mistakes after this kind of elicitation, Merve resorts to recast to have students realize their mistakes. She is not in favor of using explicit correction.

The last theme that informs about Merve's beliefs about CF shows that she tends to use CF to revise previous target structures. Previous target structures refer to the grammar structures that have been recently covered in class. She also adds that this kind of mistakes provide her with a chance to teach and make students internalize grammar in use. Teaching, in this case, is stated to be implemented through teacher-led questions eliciting the correct use of the mistaken structures.

As for the research question about how Merve performed regarding the use of CF, the data revealed that the students uttered 42 mistaken sentences or phrases and she provided corrective feedback for 30 (71.5%) of them. She preferred not correct 28.5% of the mistakes noted during the observation sessions (see Table 6). The most frequent CF type used by Merve is recast followed by metalinguistic clue, elicitation, clarification request, and explicit correction respectively. It was noted that the students were able to correct themselves after being provided with metalinguistic clue, elicitation and clarification request; however, it was not possible to keep track

of learning in the case of recasts. Samples from the data for each feedback type are demonstrated below with the descriptive backgrounds.

Table 6. Distribution of Feedback Types in Merve's Lessons

Feedback types	Total (*n* = 30)
Recast	15 (50%)
Metalinguistic clue	5 (20%)
Elicitation	4 (13.3%)
Clarification request	4 (13.3%)
Explicit correction	1 (3.3%)

Recast

Merve wanted the students to work in pairs to do the speaking activity aiming to practise the use of gerunds and infinitives in meaningful contexts. She chose one student to answer a question given in the activity during the pair-work, and she asked the following question.

> Teacher: What are you planning to do this month?
> Student: I am planning to go to Aydın in [sic] Christmas.
> Teacher: You are planning to go to Aydın at Christmas. Nice plan.

Metalinguistic clue

The students were supposed to work on the grammar exercises for gerunds and infinitive, and the teacher made use of metalinguistic clue in response to the mistake about the target structure.

> Student: I am afraid of the [sic] worse [sic].
> Teacher: You have to use a verb after the preposition right?
> Student: I am afraid of feeling the [sic] worse.
> Teacher: Do you need "the" there?
> Student: I am afraid of feeling worse.

Elicitation

As it happened in the case of the recast, Merve chose one student to answer one of the questions given in the pair-work activity, and she asked as follows expecting the student to use the target structure, which is gerunds and infinitives, as follows.

> Teacher: What would you like to do?
> Student: I would like to learn to [sic] Bulgarian.
> Teacher: learn . . . ? (intonation)
> Student: learn Bulgarian.

Clarification request

Merve carried on the interaction with the student mentioned above and wanted to have her speak more. For this reason, she asked for the reason for her will to learn Bulgarian and the student made a preposition mistake as illustrated below.

> Teacher: Why would you like to learn Bulgarian?
> Student: Because I want to live [sic] Bulgaria.
> Teacher: Live Bulgaria? What do you mean?
> Student: Live in Bulgaria.

Explicit correction

After one student answered the question given in the exercise part, Merve preferred to correct him explicitly, and she explained how she misunderstood the verb because of the incorrect pronunciation.

> Student: She does not want to live [sic].
> Teacher: What? If you use live, it means she wants to die. It must be “leave.”

With regard to the data revealing the CF types that are most frequently used by Merve, it can be deduced that she holds beliefs that are aligned with her instructional practices in that she attaches great importance to corrective feedback and she practically showed that she paid attention to most of the mistakes recorded in the

class. Another consistent belief that was found to be reflected in class is her preference to use recast, elicitation and clarification requests since these CF types were among the most frequent types observed in the class. One CF type that was not emphasized as much as these three CF types is metalinguistic clue, which is the second most frequent CF type that Merve used. The reason for this preference that is slightly different from stated beliefs is attributed to the productive function of metalinguistic clue, which means it can help students to correct themselves via a clue without having to be corrected by the teacher.

As for the main beliefs that have been stated before and the way they are reflected through practices and instructional decisions, it was noted that Merve performed consistently in accordance with her beliefs denoting the use of relatively more implicit CF types with the aim of providing a more convenient context to maintain the interaction between the teacher and the student. She predominantly used implicit CF types rather than correcting the students explicitly, which resulted in students' correcting themselves and maintaining the interaction. She was observed to use explicit correction once, and the reason for this use was attributed to the degree of significance of the mistake. Even though she used clarification request first, she resorted to explicit correction as the student did not notice the CF:

> I purposely misunderstood him to make him correct himself. He realized that I had not understood him. There was a mistake. I did not correct at first. His classmates corrected it. Then, I explained it explicitly. It was a significant mistake, and I preferred to correct it explicitly because If I had used recast, he wouldn't have realized it. (Merve, Interview 1, 3 Dec 2018)

Another prominent belief regarding the use of CF is about Merve's tendency to provide CF, particularly in grammar exercises. However, it was noted that the scope of the CF delivered to the class is not solely limited to grammar exercises. She was

observed to decide on giving CF to the mistakes occurred in communicative activities including pair-work, teacher-student interactions, and whole class speaking. Regarding this situation, Merve informs that she deliberately corrected the mistakes in these communicative activities since the activities were planned to make students practise the target form and she adds that she was careful in order not to interrupt students with explicit correction. It can be regarded as a consistent relationship between her beliefs and practice since these activities were not wholly communicative, yet they were somehow controlled practice. Therefore, it is a consistent practice of the belief that suggests that she does not prefer to interrupt students if they are eager to speak fluently and whether she uses CF varies from one activity to another and. In addition, the data revealed that there were not any situations in which the students were eager to speak fluently since most of the answers to the teacher-led questions were short, and they were about the target structure.

The last belief is about using mistakes to revise previous target structures, and Merve practised it a lot in that she often wanted the students to remember the rules about the target structure when there was a mistake about the misuse of the target structure, which shows her beliefs and practices compromise with each other. After one student forgot to use a gerund after a preposition, she made students remind her of the related rule, and she reflects it as follows:

> I focused on his usage. As the target structure was infinitive and gerund, I decided to refer to the previous topic to emphasize that we use a gerund after prepositions. It was a chance to teach. I generally make use of their mistakes to revise what has been done. (Merve, Interview 1, 3 Dec 2018)

Considering the research questions about the degree of consistency between beliefs and practices and the reasons for these inconsistencies, the data collected through a

variety of instruments revealed that Merve has congruent beliefs with her practices observed in the class in that there is not a significant gap between what she believes to be effective and her instructional decisions made in the class. Aside from these congruent relationships between beliefs and practices, it can be notable to report that the beliefs that she stated for her preferences for CF are based on her previous experience and practices, which might be interpreted as a situation in which her practices constitute the underlying factors influencing her beliefs about CF since it was noted that the rationales behind her decisions are mostly based on her previous experiences. Another point that can be highlighted is lack of data about Merve's CF preferences, which means she cannot explain the reason why she prefers to a particular CF type for a particular mistake except for explicit correction. She states that it depends on the moment and it naturally happens as an instant decision, which makes it difficult to shed light on her cognition leading her to make these decisions.

4.1.4 Ayça

4.1.4.1 Ayça's GT beliefs and practices

Ayça started with a brief introduction about the way she learned her second language. She informs that she learned English in traditional ways, which means they used to be taught via grammar-translation method without any focus on production neither in writing nor in speaking. She adds that she learned most of the grammar structures and vocabulary on her own as they used to be expected to study at home and work on tests at school in order to get prepared for high-stake university entrance exams. It is also stated that there was no meaningful context for grammar teaching and they were not given oral corrective feedback as there was no communication.

She reports that she felt very nervous when she started university because of a lack of communication skills.

The interview including the same questions forwarded to the previous participants led me to categorize the themes about what Ayça believes about grammar teaching into three categories in order to have parallel scheme to be used in the cross-case analysis. In this regard, the responses given to the research question concerning Ayça's beliefs about L2 grammar teaching are given under three categories: (1) theoretical aspect of Ayça's teaching; (2) practical aspect of Ayça's teaching; and (3) contextual factors affecting Ayça's teaching.

The theoretical aspect of Ayça's beliefs sheds light on how she perceives L2 grammar teaching at a macro level in terms of her underlying perspectives paving the way for the implementation of her beliefs. In this sense, the data revealed that Ayça had difficulty in remembering the theories that might have had a role in shaping her beliefs, so she states that she does not know how to express the theoretical background of her beliefs as she has never thought about it before. Despite lacking some points of this aspect, her teaching is stated to be based on PPP (Presentation-Practice-Production) since she is of the opinion that after students' being exposed to rules of a target structure, they have to be required to practise the target form with controlled practice. Finally, she is in favor of encouraging them to produce the language through communicative activities in a meaningful context. Ayça also sets forth that her teaching is based upon the grammar-translation method although she thinks it is against her belief system. After informing her about the distinction between inductive and deductive grammar teaching as she said that she did not remember the difference, she acknowledges that she prefers to use both of them, but mostly deductive teaching. She reminds that she prefers to use inductive teaching at

the beginning to draw attention to the use of the target structure in the context provided by the coursebook and later, she teaches the rule deductively. Additionally, she believes that she substantially teaches explicitly; however, she does not like teaching that way. She also adds that she does not know what to use to replace explicit teaching.

When it comes to the practical aspect of Ayça's beliefs, she mentions particular instructional practices that she prefers to do in class. Firstly, she specifies that she provides grammar within a context before she points out the rules. She follows the way suggested in the coursebook since she thinks that the coursebook requires students to find the reasons for the rules and she has a role to go over the rule explicitly after they notice the target form within the texts given in the coursebook. However, she argues that there are some parts included in the coursebook which she does not believe to effective enough. She elaborates on it as follows:

> I think the grammar exercises provided in the coursebook are not effective. It is based on the use of a single target structure and students are expected to fill in the gaps with target structure. It does not work well, and it can be done automatically without thinking too much. (Ayça, Interview 2, 27 Dec 2018)

Ayça highlights some instructional practices that she is inclined to conduct such as guessing from the picture, paraphrasing and rewriting activities. Use of extra examples to support the target form and verbal explanation is also among the most preferred instructional practices adopted by her. Verbal explanation, in this case, refers to the teacher's effort to help students understanding the meaning of the sentence including the target structure.

The contextual factors influencing Ayça's beliefs cover a variety of components. These components shed light on the research question about the effect

of contextual factors in her beliefs and practices. Firstly, exams and the content of the exams are considered to affect her negatively in that the number of exams is high and the coverage is too comprehensive to teach effectively in a short time. The pacing was coded as another dimension affecting her detrimentally since she thinks it limits her autonomy and it makes her feel in a rush. Overcrowded classrooms are stated as another disruptive effect on her teaching. Final prominent point expressed by Ayça is the fact that she carries out the activities in a teacher-led way due to learner type. She believes that students want to be taught traditionally and in a teacher-led way by adding that it is typical of Turkish learners. Even though she is in favor of the situation where the students benefit from received input and transform this input into production autonomously, she does not think that she is successful enough to achieve this objective. The other reason hindering this objective is associated with the assumption that students lack the ability to learn autonomously and spend extra time to produce the language as what they learn in class is not sufficient to accesses to success.

Based on the field notes related to the grammar lessons planned to teach sentence connectors such as after, after that, before and then and extended reflection that was carried out during stimulated recall revealed that there are several repeated practices which can be considered to inform about the research question regarding how Ayça prefers to teach L2 grammar. These repeated practices include: (1) explicit and deductive teaching of the rules; (2) use of L1 for instructions and explanations; (3) use of extra examples; (4) verbal explanation; (5) paraphrasing; and (6) controlled grammar practices. Although there are some practices that indicate consistent patterns of relationship between beliefs and practices, most of the practices performed by Ayça are at odds with her belief system.

It was noted that Ayça preferred explicit and deductive teaching of the rules soon after they covered a reading text prepared to contextualize the target forms. She made use of the grammar part of the coursebook to go over the rules without making a substantial transition between the context and the target form despite the fact that she stated that she was in favor of contextualizing the grammar structures, which is considered to be a conflict between her beliefs and practices. Moreover, she informed that she tended to use both inductive and deductive instructions. However, it was observed that she only used deductive instruction by explaining the rule at the beginning and supporting the rules via related examples. Concerning the reason why she decided to teach explicitly, it was suggested that:

> They have difficulty in making a distinction between after and after that. So, I especially focused on them. I explained the rules. I explained we use a sentence after "after" and after that is used to connect the sentences. Actually, I don't like this way. Explicit teaching can be done to some extent. I don't know what to do instead of teaching it explicitly. I think I can give the rules explicitly then I expect them to do extra work on their own. I don't think they do extra work. They have to practise to internalize and keep the rules in long-term memory. (Ayça, Interview 1, 21 Dec 2018)

As can be seen from the excerpt, she relates the reason for her decision to two situations. The first situation is the fact that she does not have any idea about alternative ways to implement grammar teaching, which restricts her to use one way. The other situation is about her expectation from the students in terms of extra work, which is quite relevant to her previous language learning. In this sense, she expects her students to learn as she did before. This practice indicates that it is not in line with her belief system.

Another significant theme denoting the way she delivers grammar teaching is Ayça’s use of L1 translation for instructions and explanations. She was observed to

use translation after giving instructions in the target language to make sure that all of the students understood the rule. Aside from this use, she also resorted to L1 when explaining the reason for the functions of the target form. Even though she believes it is not an effective way to teach grammar, she utilizes from L1 translation excessively because of several reasons based on her reflection on this practice:

> I think it is not true. I do not think what is correct and what is not in language teaching. I do not know how we can teach without translation. I do not know very well; it is a deficit aspect of me. I thought it would be better to make use of L1 at that time because students look for something concrete and they want a logical reason for grammar. I do not like translation, and I believe it is not true, but I had to use it inevitably. (Ayça, Interview 1, 21 Dec 2018)

It is evident that Ayça employs L1 translation in practical terms, yet it cannot be regarded as her core belief as she thinks it does not reflect her ideal teaching and she does not know what to use instead of it. Additionally, she believes that it is of the benefit of the students with respect to their expectations to be taught in a concrete and analytical way. In this sense, it can be deduced that she decided on this instructional decision because of her previous language learning experience, lack of theoretical and methodological background and contextual factors stemming from her students' expectations.

One prominent practice that illuminates Ayça's L2 grammar teaching practice is the use of extra examples in order to support the grammar content of the coursebook. These examples were provided for the students after the teacher completed instructing on the target form. She believes that the students do not work on further examples at home, so she presented additional examples to help them learn better. She also wanted them to connect the exemplary sentences by using an appropriate sentence connector, which indicates a consistent relationship between her

beliefs and practices since she believes that extra examples work well in that students can conceptualize the target form in their mind.

Verbal explanation is among the most frequent practices observed in Ayça's lessons. Verbal explanation refers to her detailed explanation of a sentence including the target form to make sure that the meaning of the sentence is successfully conveyed to the students. It was noticed that this explanation was conducted both in L1 and in L2. However, this practice is not believed to be congruent with Ayça's beliefs with reference to her reflection on this point:

> It may be unnecessary. I may have used elicitation or further questions to deduce the answers because you cannot be sure that they understand if you teach it explicitly. So, it can be better to use elicitation to check their comprehension. (Ayça, Interview 1, 21 Dec 2018)

It can be seen that Ayça decided to implement this kind of practice in spite of the cat that she informed about some alternatives that she might have employed rather than a verbal explanation.

Paraphrasing was mentioned as an effective practice for L2 grammar teaching, and it was observed that Ayça encouraged the students to paraphrase the sentences that she wrote on the board. The rationale behind this practice is associated with a need to be able to paraphrase the target structures so as to realize how they convey meaning in various patterns. Ayça believes that this practice is more beneficial than translation, which shows she performed in accordance with her beliefs denoting the benefit of paraphrasing.

The final theme notifying about Ayça's grammar teaching practices is her use of controlled grammar practices. She was observed to employ controlled practice activities in three different ways. Firstly, she made students do the exercises given after the instructions and rules in the grammar part of the book. As it was noted

earlier that Ayça does not believe that this kind of exercises requiring the use of only one target form, she had to cover that part in order to comply with other classes. In this sense, this gap between beliefs and practices stem from some contextual factors urging her to be on the same track with other instructors. The second controlled practice was monitored to be carried out through pair-work. The reason for this decision was attributed to students' need to check their answers by discussing them with their classmates as illustrated via the instructions of the coursebook. The last controlled grammar practice was Ayça's instruction that required the students to write three sentences including the target sentence connectors in order to continue the paragraphs given in the coursebook. As it was an independent decision from the coursebook, it can be interpreted that Ayça compromised with her beliefs by employing this practice. Ayça comments on this practice as follows:

> I wanted them to use the target structure to check their comprehension. It was within the context, and I wanted to see how they would continue the paragraph. I think it was beneficial. I could have done something better. For instance, I could have let them choose their connectors because I gave the target connectors, but it could have taken longer. We didn't have enough time. (Ayça, Interview 1, 21 Dec 2018)

Regarding the research questions about the degree of consistency between her beliefs and practices and the reasons for these inconsistencies, it is apparent that instructional decisions taken with the aim of teaching L2 grammar in the class are fundamentally incongruent with Ayça's stated beliefs except for a few practices including use of extra examples, paraphrasing and some controlled practices indicated above. The reasons why her practices are not aligned with her beliefs may stem from several factors including lack of experience, lack of theoretical knowledge about instructional theories and approaches, lack of cognitive awareness of beliefs and practices and some contextual factors restricting her to foster her teaching. Her

proposing that she does not know what to do apart from the practices she does may stem from the lack of experience since it is her first year at the preparatory school and she taught at primary level for two years before teaching at tertiary level. Additionally, she lacks theoretical and practical knowledge concerning her field, which resulted in a limited amount of data about her beliefs and practices. She claims that she has forgotten what she learned during pre-service education. Another substantial point is that she obviously lacks cognitive awareness about her beliefs and decisions since she stated that she did not question these beliefs and practices until I asked to do. Contextual factors also make it difficult for her to take autonomous decisions that are consistent with her belief system. Aforementioned reasons can be regarded as possible reasons for the conflict between Ayça's beliefs and practices based on the findings. These factors might have brought about her strict reference to the content of the coursebook, lack of autonomy to make instructional decisions that are in line with her beliefs and her preference to teach with reference to her previous learning experience.

4.1.4.2 Ayça's CF beliefs and practices

The scope of the beliefs that Merve holds regarding the use of Corrective Feedback (CF) encapsulates the role of CF in her teaching, her CF preferences in terms of CF types and the reasons considered influential in using these CF types. As she asked for explanations of the CF types, she was shortly informed about the CF types taken from the literature. In light of the research question concerning Ayça's beliefs about CF, the data revealed that Merve principally gives preference to clarification request and recast. She adds that she sometimes uses repetition, elicitation and metalinguistic clue. As she states that she does not know very well about CF neither theoretically

nor practically, she had difficulty in giving comprehensive and detailed answers, which induced relatively limited data about her beliefs concerning CF. In this regard, the themes portraying Ayça's beliefs about CF include: (1) CF particularly during grammar practices; and (2) various CF types depending on the mistake.

Ayça acknowledges that she has a tendency to provide CF, particularly during grammar practices since she expects them to produce the target structure without making a crucial mistake. However, she thinks that students should not be interrupted during communicative activities as the meaning is essential in this kind of activities rather than grammaticality. She comments on this preference as follows:

> I sometimes prefer not to correct purposely. If students have difficulty in explaining something, I don't want to interrupt their flow of ideas in order not to distract them. If I constantly give feedback, it will be broken. (Ayça, Interview 1, 21 Dec 2018)

Ayça also prefers to make use of various CF types depending on the mistake. She points out that she utilizes from explicit correction in case a significant mistake about a target structure that has been recently covered occurs. However, she prefers to ask it to the class before she resorts to explicit correction and corrects it on the board. It is also noted that she can give preference to recast if students happen to make a mistake about a complex structure which they have not learned yet. Concerning her decisions on other CF types, she informs that she is not entirely aware of the instant decisions as it depends on many variables which she cannot control.

When it comes to the research question exploring how Ayça performed in terms of her CF practices, the data indicated the number of the mistakes made by the students was 37 and Ayça provided CF for the 28 (76%) of these mistakes. 24% of the mistakes were ignored by the teacher. The distribution of CF types (see Table 7) shows that she most frequently resorted to recast (46%) followed by elicitation

(11%), explicit correction (8%), metalinguistic clue (5.5%) and repetition (5.5%). It was observed that the students were able to repair most of their mistakes after getting feedback through elicitation, metalinguistic clue, and repetition. The situations in which the students could not repair them, the teacher intervened and provided explicit correction. One sample for each corrective feedback type is presented below with a short descriptive explanation to have a better understanding of the context where the interactions occurred.

Table 7. Distribution of Feedback Types in Ayça's Lessons

Feedback types	Total (*n* = 28)
Recast	17 (46%)
Elicitation	4 (11%)
Explicit correction	3 (8%)
Metalinguistic clue	2 (5.5%)
Repetition	2 (5.5%)

Recast

After covering the reading passage including time sequencers and sentence connectors, the teacher started to ask some comprehension questions with the aim of meaning-check and elicitation of target structures. In response to one of these questions, the student made the following mistake, and she was corrected by the teacher via recast.

> Teacher: Why did Hannah go and speak to Jamie?
> Student: Because she want [sic] to change the music.
> Teacher: Yes, because she wanted him to change the music.

Elicitation

In response to another comprehension question related to the aforementioned reading passage, the student could not use a relevant tense, and the teacher elicited the correct answers by stating that it happened in the past as follows:

> Teacher: Why was Hannah driving fast?
> Student: Because she is [sic] going to be late.
> Teacher: She . . . ? (Not now in the past)
> Student: She was going to be late.

Explicit correction

Similar to the first to CF types, one student made a sentence connector mistake while answering the question about the text. Even though the teacher started to elicit the correct use of the target form, she decided to continue with explicit correction on the board.

> Teacher: What happened after that?
> Student: After [sic] he left there.
> Teacher: (T wrote the sentence on the board) What is the problem, guys?
> Students: We need two sentences.
> Teacher: Yes, you cannot use such a sentence alone; it is not a complete sentence. You can say "He was happy after he left there" or "After that, he left there."

Metalinguistic clue

As instructed in the course book the teacher wrote the words highlighted in the book and asked students to try to find the best definition for each of them. As for the definition of "Wi-Fi," one student uttered a sentence as illustrated below. Ayça preferred to give metalinguistic feedback to help the student to correct himself.

> Student: It is something which we use it for an internet connection.
> Teacher: Do you think it is necessary to use an object in this relative clause?
> Student: It is something which we use for an internet connection.

Repetition

The students were putting the sentences into a correct chronological order to make a meaningful story as instructed in the course book activity. One student uttered the next sentence, but he made a pronunciation mistake as it can be seen below. Ayça repeated the erroneous word to have the student realize his mistake.

> Student: Then another man tired [sic] to do the same thing.
> Teacher: Tired?
> Student: Tired. No, tried.

As a stated belief mentioned earlier, Ayça thinks corrective feedback has a substantial role in her teaching and the data revealed that this belief compromises with her classroom practice since she was observed to correct 76% of the mistakes. She also used a variety of CF types involving recast, elicitation, explicit correction, metalinguistic clue and repletion, which can be considered to be a practice that is in line with her beliefs because she mentioned that she tends to use various CF types consciously or unconsciously. However, a divergence was noticed between her stated beliefs and instructional practices in terms of the fact that she did not use any clarification request although she believes that she makes use of clarification request as frequently as recasts. One reason for this divergence might be attributed to the lack of communicative activities in her observed practices. As the feedback that she provided in class was particularly based on the target grammar structure, there was no context in which a communication gap occurred and yielded the use of clarification request.

The first theme denoting Ayça's belief concerning her inclination to use CF particularly during grammar activities was observed to be consistent with her observed practices since the mistakes that led to CF occurred in grammar activities.

It was also noted that Ayça's CF practices with reference to communicative activities could have provided a more comprehensive outcome to be able to witness her preferences; however, lack of communicative activities hindered that opportunity. In response to this situation, she states that she usually depends on the book and communicative activities are advised to be conducted in pairs. When the students work in pairs, she does not prefer to interrupt them, which can be regarded as a consistent practice.

The second theme informing about Ayça's stated beliefs about CF is her preference to use various CF types depending on the mistake, which was found to consistent based on her classroom practices. She used various CF types; however, she was able to explain the rationale behind her decisions for just two of them: recast and explicit correction. She explained the reason for her recast preference as follows:

> I wanted them to know the correct version. I don't remember why I decided on that. I think it is claimed that recast is effective. I am not sure. I generally do it. Also, it was a difficult structure, and they hadn't learned it yet, so I used recast. They don't know "want sb to do sth," so I preferred to use recast. (Ayça, Interview 1, 21 Dec 2018)

As it can be deduced from the excerpt, she preferred to use recast for a structure that has not been taught yet, which compromises with her stated beliefs. Ayça also performed consistently in that she used explicit correction for the mistake that was related to the target grammar form and she corrected explicitly after eliciting the corrected version from the students. However, she states she is not aware of the other decisions that happened in class.

In light of the research questions focusing on to what extent her beliefs and practices compromise with each other and the reasons leading to these consistencies, it can be deduced that Ayça performed consistently from the point of her stated

beliefs about her corrective feedback preferences. One point which can be considered divergent is the lack of clarification requests, which is thought to be because of limited opportunities for communicative activities. Apart from her CF preferences, it can be noted that Ayça could not comprehensively explain why she made some particular CF decisions regarding the type of mistakes in class. Apart from recast and explicit correction, the reason for other decisions is not explicitly stated, which can be seen as an issue informing about her instant decisions depending on the context because she has difficulty in rationalizing her decisions with theoretical or practical beliefs.

4.2 Cross-case analysis

This part of analysis informs about these four EFL teachers' beliefs, practices and contextual factors influencing their beliefs and practices of grammar teaching and corrective feedback in accordance with convergences and divergences among them. In contrast to the within-case analysis through which each teacher was analyzed individually, cross-case analysis aims to provide a more comprehensive framework that can enable us to compare what the teachers working in the same institution believe and practise, and to what extent contextual factors affect these beliefs and practices.

4.2.1 GT beliefs

What the teachers believe about L2 grammar teaching can be investigated based on three main themes emerged from the data: (1) coursebook-based beliefs; (2) lack of theoretical knowledge; (3) experience-based beliefs; and (4) inclination for communicative activities.

Firstly, it was noted that Sezen and Ayça have a strong tendency to stick to the coursebook when they teach grammar, which means they usually follow the procedures suggested in the coursebook. This tendency to rely on coursebook-based beliefs does not allow them to make use of more autonomous ways to teach L2 grammar. Instead of using adaptation or a different way to teach grammar, they prefer to depend on the coursebook as they think it is not necessary to come up with an alternative way to deliver the target structure. Even though İrem mostly depends on the coursebook for L2 grammar teaching, she is in favor of using additional activities to help students to understand and learn better. She states that she is fond of preparing extra worksheets including paraphrasing and rewriting and some games encouraging students to use target structure in a meaningful context. As for Merve, she strongly believes that it is not very effective to depend on the coursebook completely. She states that L2 grammar can be taught in an alternative way depending on the target structure, students' needs, and timing. She is prone to adapt the way grammar is suggested to be taught in the coursebook. She also believes that adaptation should not be restricted to the instruction since she thinks grammar activities and exercises provided within the coursebook may need some adaptation in order to obtain effective outcomes.

Secondly, the teachers were observed to have some characteristics in common in terms of lack of theoretical knowledge related to L2 grammar teaching because it is apparent that they lack theoretical knowledge that may constitute the underlying mechanism of their beliefs. No matter what they studied as their majors at university, the teachers themselves state that they do not know or remember the theories, approaches, and methodologies concerning L2 grammar teaching. Sezen and Ayça noted that they do not remember anything that they studied during their

pre-service teaching education and they do not benefit from the theories or approaches taught at the university as they forgot them. As for İrem and Merve, they were able to mention a few methodologies even though they graduated from the literature department. İrem mentioned task-based approach and Merve informed about her use of Suggestopedia. Apart from these, they could not provide any further theoretical aspects of their belief systems.

Thirdly, one common belief shared by Sezen, İrem, and Merve is a reference to their experience-based beliefs to teach L2 grammar. In contrast to relying on their theoretical knowledge, they acknowledge that they count on their previous experience to teach L2 grammar. Additionally, they inform that it does not happen consciously as they make instant decisions in class based on their previous teaching experiences and they do know what works well. Sezen and Merve have been teaching for more than 10 years; however, İrem also states that she resorts to her previous teaching experience and it is her third year in teaching at tertiary level. As for another novice teacher, Ayça, she does not believe that the way she teaches is based on her previous experiences, which can be due to the fact that it is her first year in teaching at tertiary level. Even though she taught at primary level for two years, her being inexperienced in tertiary level might have kept from resorting to her previous teaching experience.

Finally, it can be noted that the teachers are inclined to teach in a more communicative way because of their inclination for communicative activities. They all state that their main objective is to enable the students to communicate in the target language, so they prioritize the communicative aspect of L2 grammar teaching. They believe that communicative activities encouraging the use of target structures can contribute to better learning. Aside from communicative activities to support

grammar instruction, Merve touches upon the use of interaction while teaching grammar rules as well. In contrast to Sezen, İrem, and Ayça, she states that she prefers to present the target structure in an interactive and inductive way so that students can learn grammar rules more naturally and effectively.

4.2.2 GT practices

This section of the results aims to shed light on what the teachers practise in their classes and to what extent these practices compromise with their aforementioned beliefs. Starting with the common practices observed in the teachers' lessons, they include the use of extra examples, elicitation, controlled grammar practices and explicit grammar instruction. These practices were observed to be used frequently during grammar teaching. As for the unique practices employed by each teacher, Sezen paid close attention to meaning while teaching the target structure in that she focused on the meaning of the structure in different contexts with the aim of having the students internalizing the meaning. İrem was observed to depart from the lesson plan via extra materials prepared to enhance the students' learning. She used some worksheets and made students rewrite some sentences that she had prepared beforehand. Merve employed some practical ways to grab her students' attention, and she tried to engage the students in the activities by relating the grammar practice questions to the students' lives. She also deliberately used L1 in order to urge her students to produce the target structure in L2. Additionally, she was observed to make use of pair-work as a step to prepare the students to have enough speaking material for whole-class speaking activities. When it comes to Ayça, it was noted that she used paraphrasing to make the students practise the target structure. She was also observed to use L1 frequently both for translation and giving instructions. In

contrast to Merve's use of L1 consciously, she states that it is not a practice which she considers appropriate. She adds that she resorts to L1 for instructions and translation since she does not know what else to do to teach the target structure.

In addition to the similar and different practices performed by the teachers, the degree of consistency between their stated beliefs and instructional practices is another concern of cross-case analysis. In this sense, it can be noted that Merve has the most consistent relationship between her beliefs and practices followed by İrem, Sezen, and Ayça respectively. As there are no divergences from her stated beliefs based on the lessons observed during the study, it can be deduced that there is not a significant gap between what she believes and what she does in the class. She assertively states that she does not implement anything that she does not consider effective and she adds that whatever she did in the class is a part of her belief system. In response to the question about the reason for holding these beliefs, she bases her beliefs and practices on her experience, intuition, and improvisation rather than her theoretical knowledge. Likewise, İrem was observed to perform consistently considering her stated beliefs about L2 grammar teaching. One aspect that makes her case different from Merve's is her being less decisive and sure about the reason for her beliefs since she had difficulty in explaining the reasons for her instructional decisions and elaborating on them. The reason why she hesitated to rationalize her beliefs might stem from her lack of theoretical and experiential knowledge about L2 grammar teaching. As for Sezen, even though her practices are mostly aligned with her beliefs, there are some incongruences related to her belief highlighting the importance of communicative activities. Despite the importance she attaches to the communicative aspect of grammar teaching, Sezen was observed not to adapt the activities to pave the way for communicative activities. Although there were some

questions for which the students were eager to speak, she preferred to keep it short and continue with the grammar exercises. She states she does not know why she preferred to keep it short, which indicates an unconscious decision made in the class. Finally, it was noted that Ayça failed to perform in line with her stated beliefs since she does not believe the practices that she carried out in the class represent her belief system. She used L1 translation, L1 instruction and she neglected communicative activities that could have helped the students to produce the target structure. One point noticed in her case is the fact that her practices resemble her previous language learning experience, which shows that she might be under the influence of her own language learning experience because she lacks theoretical and experiential knowledge related to L2 grammar teaching. Moreover, she puts forward that she is not aware of her decisions in the class, which can be regarded as an indicator of lack of cognitive awareness about her actions.

To sum up, while there are some common practices that are performed by the teachers correspondingly, the teachers may differ from each other in terms of their preferences and the degree of the relationship between their beliefs and practices. There are two points that have to be noted down about their practices: practices based on experiential knowledge and unconscious decisions. The former one is evident in Sezen, İrem and Merve's cases in terms of the fact that they base their practices on their previous teaching experience and trial and error experiences. Also, the scope of the stated beliefs is limited compared to their practices and their explanations about these practices, which shows that their declarative knowledge is not as comprehensive as their procedural knowledge because of their reliance on their experiences. As for unconscious decisions, it is a phenomenon which was observed in all of the teachers since they all state that they may make some

unconscious decisions depending on the context regardless of a particular reason. While Sezen, İrem, and Ayça point out that they do not know why they make this kind of decisions, Merve relates it to her intuition.

4.2.3 CF beliefs

In this section of the cross-case analysis, the teachers' beliefs about their CF beliefs and the reasons influencing their CF beliefs are presented. Common beliefs shared by the teachers can be named: (1) lack of theoretical knowledge; (2) preference to use recast most; and (3) avoiding CF during communication. One common phenomenon observed in all the cases is the lack of theoretical knowledge, which hindered them from expressing a comprehensive framework for their beliefs. This lack of theoretical knowledge refers to the fact that the teachers theoretically do not know what CF types are available in the field, so they were informed about CF types through samples. Their knowledge in relation to corrective feedback is limited to their practical experiences. Even though they correct their students' mistakes in various ways, they were not able to name them correspondingly. Another common belief shared by the teachers is their preference to use recast since they all state that recast is the most frequent CF type that they use in the case of mistakes. The other shared belief is that the teachers are inclined not to correct the students explicitly especially when they try to communicate fluently. Avoiding CF during communication is coded as a common theme since they prefer not to interrupt the students in order not to discourage them.

When it comes to the factors affecting the teachers' CF beliefs in different ways, there is a variety of reasons thought to have a role in shaping their belief systems: (1) focus on target structure; (2) use of CF particularly in grammar

exercises; (3) concerns stemming from students; and (4) specific CF types depending on the context. Focus on target structures is one of the concerns shared by Sezen, Merve, and Ayça. They prominently believe that mistakes related to the target structures taught recently should be corrected. Likewise, Sezen, Merve, and Ayça particularly use CF during grammar exercises with the aim of enhancing the learning of the target structures. Use of CF particularly in grammar exercises is thought to be because students answer the questions by giving short answers in contrast to communicative activities. However, Sezen also states that she pays attention to meaning as well. She prefers to provide CF in case of a mistake related to meaning. Additionally, Merve believes that mistakes can help her to revise the grammar structures that have been recently taught through corrective feedback and short reminders about the mistaken target structures.

Some teachers' CF preferences are also based on several concerns stemming from students such as individual differences, proficiency level, motivation, awareness, and their affective states. Based on these concerns, Sezen thinks that she may perform differently in two classes. Likewise, İrem pays close attention to these concerns stemming from students. She tends to avoid correcting students if she thinks the students may feel humiliated or scared of being corrected. She also resorts to different CF types depending on the profile of the students. The teachers also state that they may use specific CF types depending on the context. For instance, Sezen prefers to use recast during communicative activities in order not to interrupt the students explicitly. İrem prefers to use recast for the students who are aware of being corrected while she uses explicit correction for the students who would be happy to be corrected. Merve prefers to use implicit CF types such as elicitation, clarification request and recast as she wants the students to correct themselves. Ayça also uses

explicit correction for significant mistakes; however, she gives preference to recast for the mistakes related to the structures that have not been taught yet.

4.2.4 CF practices

This section of cross-case analysis aims to focus on the teachers CF practices in their classes and the degree of the consistency between their beliefs and practices. Table 8 illustrates how the teachers performed in their classes considering their use of corrective feedback.

Table 8. Distribution of Feedback Types in the Teachers' Lessons

	Sezen	İrem	Merve	Ayça
Number of mistakes	19	30	42	37
Number of CF	11	19	30	28
Percantage of CF	(58%)	(63%)	(71.5%)	(76%)
Recast	73%	58%	50%	46%
Elicitation	18%	-	13.3%	11%
Explicit correction	-	26%	3.3%	8%
Clarification request	-	5%	13.3%	-
Metalinguistic clue	9%	5%	20%	5.5%
Repetition	-	5%	-	5.5%

The table indicates that the teachers' beliefs and practices are mostly congruent with each other except for a few divergences. For instance, even though metalinguistic clue is not stated as a CF type frequently used by Merve, her practices show that it is the second most frequent one. The reason is attributed to the communicative function of metalinguistic clue in that it encourages students to produce the corrected version on their own, which can be regarded as a compatible practice in her case. The other

example is that Ayça did not use any clarification request although she states that she prefers to use it as much as recasts. The reason for this gap may be associated with the lack of communicative activities, which hindered Ayça from using this type of CF.

Based on the results, it can be deduced that the teachers performed consistently considering their beliefs about corrective feedback. Apart from this consistent relationship between beliefs and practices, one prominent feature observed in the teachers' explanations is that they lack cognitive awareness about the reasons for their choices in some cases since they focus on the fact that they tend to make instant decisions when the students make mistakes. For this reason, they may not be aware of the underlying reasons urging them to choose a particular CF type in some cases.

4.2.5 Contextual factors affecting beliefs and practices

There is a variety of contextual factors stated by the teachers. The most frequent one is time constraints. Sezen, Merve, and Ayça think that timing problems and pacing restrict them to make more autonomous decisions. However, it was observed that Sezen and Ayça did not prefer to adapt the materials for communicative purposes in spite of having enough time. In contrast to them, Merve was able to adapt the material in accordance with her will. However, she states that it may not be possible to make autonomous decisions under time pressure. Another contextual factor is the learners' profile. Sezen acknowledges that the students are from technical departments, so they demand more analytical teaching, which hinders having a more communicative and creative learning environment. Likewise, Ayça complains about students' not being autonomous learners and their reluctance for self-study, which

can be associated with her previous learner profile as she states that she learned the language mostly on her own. Apart from these, Ayça touches upon the different dynamics of classes in that she performs differently in her two classes, which can be considered a factor that changes teachers' practices regardless of their beliefs. Additionally, she complains about the lack of technological aids since she cannot make use of online tools. As for Merve, she focuses on materials and standardization problems stemming from these materials. As she is in favor of adaptation of the materials, she thinks that she does not have the liberty to adapt and change the materials in accordance with her beliefs. This is because the instructors are expected to cover the same material in a similar way for the sake of standardization. Finally, Ayça mentions that the number of exams and exam coverages restrict her to make autonomous decisions. Alongside this, she also complains about overcrowded classrooms.

In conclusion, the teachers believe that these external factors detrimentally influence the way they teach. As it can be deduced from the aforementioned answers, contextual factors and the degree of their influence on beliefs and practices can vary from one teacher to another.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to (1) explore the instructional that language teachers use to teach L2 grammar and to give corrective feedback, (2) investigate their beliefs regarding L2 grammar teaching and CF, (3) report the degree of consistency between their beliefs and practices and the reasons for inconsistencies and (4) shed light on the contextual factors impacting their beliefs and practices based on the interviews conducted with the language teachers, observation sessions and stimulated recalls carried out after these observations. The study was stated to be significant within the consideration of the fact that recent SLA studies in L2 grammar teaching and corrective feedback lack comprehensive and generalizable results in language teaching since teacher cognition as a variable is not integrated into the studies despite its substantial effect on language teaching and learning. Neglecting the role of teacher cognition in SLA studies may result in a variety of discrepancies between what has been theoretically discussed in the field of English language teaching and what is happening in real classrooms in that teachers can differ from each other in terms of the way they choose to implement learning objectives. The second significance of this study was attributed to the necessity to carry out more qualitative studies in the field of language teacher cognition because of the fact that personal beliefs and practices in language teaching can vary significantly from one teacher to another, which requires conducting more studies in order to reach a more comprehensive reflection of what language teachers believe and do. The third significance was related to the possible opportunities from which both the institute and language teachers can benefit. While the study can raise the language teachers'

cognitive awareness regarding their beliefs and practices consistency-wise, it may provide the institute with a chance to be aware of the contextual factors that detrimentally affect the teachers' beliefs and practices and to plan organize relevant in-service teacher education opportunities that can positively pave the way for cognitive reflections on their theoretical and practical knowledge.

To start with what the study suggests within the perspective of L2 grammar teaching based on the literature presented before, this study makes it possible to discuss the findings based on the literature about SLA and LTC. There have been a great number of studies about whether grammar should be taught (Spada, 2007; Gass & Varonis, 1994), comparison of inductive grammar teaching to deductive approach (DeKeyser, 1993), use of metalinguistic in grammar teaching (Garrett, 1986), effectiveness of grammar practices (Ellis, 2010), effectiveness of isolated form-focused instruction (Spada & Lightbown, 2008), and successful outcomes of integrated form-focused instruction (Elgün-Gündüz, Akcan, & Bayyurt, 2012). However, the findings reveal that the teachers are not aware of what is being discussed in the field, which hinders adopting a theoretical perspective towards teaching. As they were all informed about the notions related to SLA, it is possible to argue that they lack theoretical knowledge to construct their theoretical beliefs. Similarly, the studies conducted with the aim of investigating the aforementioned issues lack a teacher perspective as a variable, which might result in various implications in real classes differing from the study results. This variation is an indicator of the fact that language teachers substantially differ from one another and they may perform completely differently under the assumption that they teach a specific grammar structure through a particular method. Additionally, it is an undeniable fact that SLA studies suggest varying findings for the issues discussed in

the literature. For instance, as a component of L2 grammar teaching, explicit instruction is thought to yield successful learning of grammar. While explicit instruction can give rise to better learning than implicit instruction for complex grammatical rules, there is no significant difference between explicit and implicit instruction types for simple rules (Andrews, 2007). On the contrary, it is reported that explicit instruction results in a significant difference in neither processing-based nor production-based groups (Soruç, Qin, & Kim, 2018). As for the teachers' perspective, it was noted they mostly prefer to use explicit instruction based on their positive reflections arose from previous experiences or instructed suggestions of the coursebook. Apart from these variations in terms of teachers and study findings, lack of theoretical awareness in language teachers constitutes another gap between SLA and teacher cognition in that the teachers have difficulty in rationalizing their beliefs and practices, which induces the deprivation of SLA components in language teachers' belief systems and instructional practices.

When it comes to the discussion of this study based on related studies conducted within Language Teacher Cognition (LTC) framework, there are both consistent and inconsistent results compared to existing literature. For the degree of consistency between language teachers' beliefs and practices, some studies indicate that language teachers can have some beliefs and perform them consistently (Farrell & Lim, 2005; Sanchez & Borg, 2014). Farrell and Lim put forward that the teachers performed consistently except for a few divergences stemming from time constraints and reverence for traditional grammar teaching. According to Sanchez and Borg (2014), the consistent behaviors were the result of a teaching environment where there were not any restrictions that hindered the teachers. It is also stated that the teachers were able to come up with complex rationalizations behind their beliefs.

However, this study reveals that there are both consistent and inconsistent relationships between beliefs and practices. While two teachers performed consistently (İrem and Merve), there are some inconsistencies in the other teachers' cases (Sezen and Ayça) stemming from cognitive and contextual factors. Also, it can be noted that the teachers failed to relate their consistent beliefs to complex rationalizations in contrast to the findings in Sanchez and Borg's (2014) study since they mostly based the reasons on their previous teaching experiences. As for the inconsistencies, it can be said that there is a tension between their beliefs and practices. This tension can be related to the tension between core and peripheral beliefs (Phipps & Borg, 2009). While the former one is related to the broader underlying belief system of teachers (theoretical knowledge), the latter one (experiential knowledge) is a more powerful belief system which affects the instructional decisions which teachers make for teaching practices (Phipps & Borg, 2009). However, one difference from this tension that is conceptualized above is the fact that theoretical knowledge is quite limited compared to experiential knowledge, which results in instructional practices performed by relying on previous teaching (Sezen, İrem, and Merve) and previous learning experience (Ayça). Overall, it can be deduced that stated beliefs and instructional practices can be in line with each other, but they may also be at odds depending on some personal cognitive factors or external factors. Additionally, the reason for incongruences may not be rational as shown in some studies since language teachers may not be cognitively aware of the rationale behind some beliefs and practices.

Another dimension in LTC is language teachers' background and its effects on their teaching. The components of this background that is discussed in this study include teacher education and experience. Even though the teachers' educational

background and year of experience were not included into research questions specifically, the participants were selected based on criteria requiring the participation of teachers who are experienced, novice and from various educational backgrounds in order to reach more comprehensive findings. In this sense, Graus and Coppen (2016) suggest that both graduate and undergraduate student teachers give reference to the academic courses that they have been taking for the factors influencing their beliefs and practices. However, none of the teachers in this study made such a connection between their cognition and academic courses taken at the university. Even though Sezen (experienced) and Ayça (novice) are graduates of English Language Teaching (ELT) department, they failed to refer to their academic background, which shows pre-service teacher education may not have a visible role in language teachers' belief system. Possible reasons for this deprivation can be related to forgetting the content of the courses and preference to rely on teaching experience. Besides, it can be because of not internalizing the theoretical and practical knowledge that could have been acquired at university. Their educational background did not yield a significant difference compared to Merve (experienced) and İrem (novice), who are not graduates of ELT department. Similarly, Borg and Burns (2008) show that the teachers prefer to teach grammar in an integrated way although it is claimed that teachers teaching adult learners tend to teach grammar explicitly (Schulz, 1996). It is also added that the teachers rely on their practical and experiential knowledge rather than basing their beliefs on an SLA perspective, which shows language teacher may construct beliefs by teaching practices. Considering the role of experience Moini (2008) states that experienced teachers pay less attention to grammar teaching compared to their novice colleagues. However, this study indicates that experience is not a significant factor inducing paying less attention to

grammar since all the teachers prioritized grammar teaching and spent a similar amount of time on grammar teaching. Showing similarity to what Moini (2008) puts forward, one experienced teacher frequently resorted to adaptation to make students speak more and one novice teacher used extra worksheets to support students' learning. However, the other experienced and novice teachers resemble each other in that they delivered the target structure in a similar way, which restrains us from making a generalization foregrounding that experienced teachers do not teach grammar as much as novice teachers do. Differing from teaching experience, the learning experience is claimed to have a role in shaping language teachers' belief system (Liviero, 2017). However, there was not a strong indicator of the effect of the previous language learning experience on the teachers' teaching. The teachers also did not make such a connection between their actual teaching and learning experience. Nonetheless, one novice teacher (Ayça) expects students to make an effort to learn the language on their own by self-study, which was noted as an experience that she employed when she was learning the language. This attitude can be regarded as an effect of previous language learning experience since she thinks it is effective to learn the language. In this sense, it can be stated that educational background, teaching and learning experience do not solely induce a significant difference among teachers.

Contextual factors arose as detrimental factors preventing the teachers from building consistent relationships between teachers' beliefs and practices. Catching up with the syllabus and preparing students for exams and time limitation are considered some contextual factors hindering language teachers (Nishimiro & Borg, 2013). Likewise, this study revealed that time constraints, materials, exams, lack of teacher autonomy, standardized syllabus and various class dynamics might negatively

influence the way the teachers perform. These detrimental factors can be taken into account by administrators in order to reduce incongruences by providing a more plausible learning environment for the teachers.

As for the studies conducted in Turkey, Çakır and Kafa (2013) revealed that the teachers were inclined to use Grammar Translation Method (GTM) through L1 although the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) started Curriculum Innovation Project (COC) in 1997 in order to encourage Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). This divergence from the curriculum was related to several reasons including the teachers' lack of knowledge in CLT, their previous learning experience, the inconvenience of the materials, shared L1 usage and the practicality of GTM in crowded classes. These findings are in line with what this study suggests in that the inconsistencies between beliefs and practices stem from some cognitive and contextual factors. Lack of theoretical knowledge about other methodologies and approaches may limit the teachers. The inconvenience of the materials may yield inconsistencies unless language teachers decide on some adaptations. Likewise, shared L1 use can bring about the frequent use of L1 rather than the target language in the observed classes. Additionally, the teachers are of the opinion that they have to be practical in grammar teaching because of time constraints and syllabus pacing, which results in the use of more explicit and deductive grammar teaching as shown by Çakır and Kafa (2013). The previous language learning experience was found to influence the teachers. For instance, one teacher (Ayça) was under the influence of her previous learning experience, and she expected the students to learn on their own, which is not congruent with institutional curriculum objectives. Another study conducted by Uysal and Bardakçı (2014) touches upon consistent beliefs and practices of language teachers by showing that the teachers prefer to teach grammar

in traditional ways through L1 and this practice is considered to be aligned with their stated beliefs despite the requirements of the curriculum based on CLT. Unlike these findings, this study indicates that the teachers have a tendency to teach grammar in communicative ways, but they may diverge from these beliefs in some cases, which results in inconsistencies. What is more, Hoş and Kekeç (2014) revealed some mismatches between the teachers' CLT-based beliefs and traditional grammar instruction because of contextual factors hindering the opportunity to reflect their beliefs. One substantial point that can make this study different from above-mentioned studies conducted in the Turkish context is the fact that this study did not only focus on the degree of consistency between beliefs and practices, but also it aimed to reach more comprehensive findings including what language teachers think about SLA theories and approaches to bridge the gap between SLA and LTC by revealing their cognitive state of mind. Overall, these studies show that language teachers have difficulty in adapting their beliefs or practices considering the curriculum requiring grammar teaching through communicative activities mostly because of contextual factors including physical conditions of classrooms, time constraints, materials, student expectations and curriculum in addition to some cognitive factors such as previous language learning experience and lack of CLT knowledge. As for this study, it distinctively shows that what language teachers know about SLA is quite limited and this lack of knowledge is compensated via experiential knowledge and this experiential knowledge constitutes the teachers' belief systems, which is not mentioned broadly in these studies. A further insight that arose from this study is the lack of teachers' awareness of their instructional decisions, which is not stated in these studies. This deprivation may shed light on a deeper understanding of language teachers' mind since they tend to take many

instructional decisions without having to base them on a particular belief. Another point that can be mentioned is the notion of inconsistencies stemming from contextual factors (Çakır & Kafa, 2013; Uysal & Bardakçı, 2014; Hoş & Kekeç, 2014). However, these factors can be minimized with the help of personal interventions such as adaptation, extra materials, and extra activity types as it can be seen in the teachers' cases.

When it comes the role of corrective feedback (CF) based on the findings of the study, the common belief among the teachers is that students can be more accurate (Ammar & Spada, 2006) after getting CF since they have a chance to pay attention to the linguistic features of the target structure and notice their mistakes (Schmidt, 1990). Even though the teachers agree upon the fact that CF is beneficial in language learning (Russel & Spada, 2006), their CF choices vary from one another except for the first choice. They all use recast more frequently than other types. It is stated that recast can yield effective outcomes since it does not interrupt meaning and help students to focus on the form (VanPatten, 1990; Doughty & Varela, 1998), which is aligned with what the teachers state for the use of recast. However, it also mentioned that recast might not be understood by students as it is intended by language teachers since students may perceive it as an agreement or disagreement rather than a corrected form (Lyster, 1998). Another point related to the use of recast is the target form since the effectiveness of recast might vary from one target form to another (Long, Inagaki, & Ortega, 1998). Also, it is added that it can be perceived by students who have a higher proficiency level ((Mackey & Philp, 1998). In this sense, this study indicates that there is not a consensus concerning the reason for recast choice. Individually, some teachers put forward a few reasons for their preferences. While some teachers state that there is not a specific reason triggering their recast

preference (Sezen), one of them focuses on her inclination not to interrupt students (Merve) and another one puts forward that she prefers recast especially in case of a complicated mistake about a target structure that has not been covered yet (Ayça). With regard to the role of proficiency level, only one teacher (İrem) believes that recast can work well for the students who have high proficiency level and aware of being corrected. These findings demonstrate that language teachers may have various reasons for some of their preferences and they may also not be aware of some of their CF decisions since they state that they make instant decisions without going through a cognitive process to base their decisions on a rationale.

As for explicit correction, the teachers did not come up with a belief against the effectiveness of explicit correction although it is claimed to be less effective than recast and prompts in terms of the inability to repair the mistake after getting CF (Panova & Lyster, 2002). The teachers used explicit correction, and they believe that it can help students to learn the form particularly when they make a significant mistake, which is a new insight obtained from this study. Besides, it is set forth that explicit correction is not used as frequently as recast (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), which was found to be true as recast was the first choice of the teachers. For metalinguistic clue, it is stated that it can be more advantageous than recast in that it can raise students' awareness of form without interrupting the flow of communication (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006); however, the findings show that it is not accepted by the teachers. None of the teachers definitely put forward one CF type as the most effective one despite the studies highlighting some CF types as more effective than the others since they believe that it is not possible to keep track of how students perceive CF and repair their mistakes in the long run, which can be regarded as a new insight that can contribute to the discussion of effectiveness of CF types.

Besides, prompts and implicit CF types, in general, are thought to be less effective than explicit CF types even though they can both make contributions to L2 learning (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006), the teachers were observed not to be aware of this distinction except for one of them. Merve believes that implicit CF types can lead to better learning since students are given a chance to notice and repair their mistakes in a communicative way rather than recast (Lyster, 2004; Ammar & Spada, 2006).

When it comes to the discussion of what this study suggests considering the similar studies conducted in the field, the findings can be reviewed in two aspects including the reasons for CF choices and the role of language teachers' background. Firstly, Roothooft (2014) touches upon the fact that some factors such as class size and age may lead to the frequent use of recast and unplanned aspect of CF, teacher training, experience, and contextual factors induce inconsistencies between language teachers' beliefs and practices. Likewise, Kamiya (2014) proposes that teachers may avoid CF considering the possibility that students might feel humiliated during conversations. This study shows that the teachers used recast as their first choices. However, class size and age were not considered among the factors influencing their choices. While some teachers prefer to use recast for communicative purposes (Sezen and Merve), one considers some individual differences (İrem) and the other one uses recast for complex structures (Ayça). As for the concerns stemming from the students, the teachers did not state a specific relationship between individual differences and their choices, yet İrem pays close attention to these differences students' affective state because she thinks that these differences have a role in her CF decisions. İrem avoids correcting some students, or she prefers to use different ways for the ones who might feel humiliated, which shows what Kamiya (2014) states can be seen in this case. What is more, teacher training and experience were

not found to affect the teachers CF decisions significantly. Sezen (experienced – ELT graduate) and İrem (novice – Literature graduate) used less CF compared to Merve (experienced – Literature graduate) and Ayça (novice – ELT graduate). However, it can be said that there is a partial effect of teacher training on İrem since she attended a TESOL certification program and she was advised not to correct all the mistakes and use alternative ways to correct them. İrem believes that it helped her to consider her CF practices, which can be regarded as a positive effect of teacher training. In this regard, it can be deduced that it is out of the possibility to make a general statement about the reasons for the choices since each teacher came up with a different rationalization for her CF decisions. Alongside this fact, lack of awareness of CF decisions can be an obstacle to analyze the deeper understanding of language teachers' belief system, which prevents researchers from making generalizations about how CF is perceived and implemented.

The studies investigating the role of teachers' background focus on language teachers' education, teaching orientation, teaching experience, and learning experience. While Jafarigohar and Kheiri (2015) claims that university graduate teachers tend to be more meticulous in giving CF compared to certified teachers, this study revealed that university degree does not have a distinctive role in language teachers' CF decisions since one literature graduate teacher may resort to more CF than an ELT graduate teacher or vice versa. This situation raises questions about the assumption that university graduates can benefit from their teacher education while the other graduates do not have this opportunity. Another dimension is the orientation of language teachers in terms of their teaching philosophies. Based on the study with two Japanese teachers, Mori (2011) revealed that communication-oriented teacher mostly used recast (92.9%) in order not to interrupt communication and

humiliate the students while the other teacher preferred to use L1 to give explicit CF. In contrast to this finding, this study shows that the teachers do not solely rely on recast and they make use of other CF types even though all the teachers state that they prioritize communication. For instance, one teacher has strong beliefs about the essence of the communicative aspect of language teaching, yet she does not limit the amount of CF. Instead, she used a variety of CF types and integrated CF practices into communication without having a communication breakdown (Merve). Although one teacher (İrem) has some concerns stemming from students' fear of being corrected, she chose different CF types in accordance with the characteristics of the students, and she mitigated the way she corrected, which evidentially shows that having a communication-oriented philosophy does not always end in a limited amount of CF or only use of recast. The effect of experience is thought to influence how CF is delivered in that experienced teachers might depend on their teaching experience while novice teachers rely on their learning experience (Rahimi & Zang, 2015). For the cases of novice teachers, neither of them went through a communicative learning process since they state that they learned the language through exam materials and root grammar instructions provided by their teachers without any focuses on speaking and writing skills. This fact minimizes the possibility that they are under the influence of their learning experience. However, experienced teachers base their CF decisions on their previous teaching experience, which is the compatible result with what Rahimi and Zang (2015) suggest. Considering the effect of language learning experience Junqueria and Kim (2013) argue that the mismatches between language teachers beliefs (inessentiality of CF) and their practices (use of CF for more than half of the mistakes) stem from apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) rather than teaching experience and

teacher education. However, there is not a significant mismatch between the teachers CF beliefs and practices in this study. Additionally, lack of interaction during language learning in novice teachers' cases and not remembering how they used to be corrected in the experienced teachers' cases prevents this study from reaching a conclusion that annotates that language learning experience has a role in CF decisions. Overall, it can be deduced that what constitutes the underlying dynamics of language teachers' CF decisions include many variables such as teaching experience, students' individual differences, personal philosophies, contextual factors and some cognitive factors that are hard to detect because of the unplanned aspect of instant CF. This reality makes it difficult to propose one aspect as the single reason for CF decisions since many factors work together and it results in complex cognition.

More specifically, the number of studies aiming to investigate how language teachers employ CF compared to their beliefs is quite limited, which may enable this study to shed light on how CF is perceived and implemented in a Turkish context. One study investigating the teachers' practices but not beliefs at primary level revealed that explicit correction was the most frequent CF preferred by the teachers (Kırkgöz, Babanoğlu, & Ağçam, 2015). Unlike this finding, this study shows that recast is the most frequent CF type. The reason why the studies differ from each other can be attributed to the effect of different levels and a variety of language teachers' individual performances. One of these limited studies revealed that the teachers corrected 84% of the errors based on CF moves of 4 EFL teachers (Öztürk, 2016). Even though the teachers in this study were observed to correct 67% of the errors, these percentages may not yield substantial interpretations in that teachers' individual performances may prominently differ from one another and the teachers

might have intentionally paid attention the mistakes as they were being observed. Öztürk (2016) also states that teachers may ignore some mistakes as they do not want to interrupt their talk and affect them negatively. Additionally, the teachers do not want to correct the same mistake repeatedly, and they sometimes may not have sufficient knowledge to repair. While the reasons stemming from the students are considered to be influential in this study as well, reluctance to correct the same mistake and lack of knowledge were not found to be in line with the findings of this study. The teachers think that there may not be a particular reason urging them to use a specific type of CF or ignore the mistake and their decisions may depend on cognitive and contextual dynamics of the moment. Öztürk (2016) also revealed that experienced teachers use recast most while novice teachers prefer to use clarification request, which was found to be irrelevant in this study since recast is the most frequent CF type for all of the teachers and experience was not found to be a significant variable influencing their CF moves and beliefs.

One prominent aspect regarding the role of CF is the teachers' beliefs about excessive exposure to British English prioritized in the materials. While grammar teaching beliefs and practices are not related to this notion, all the teachers state that they do not prefer to teach British pronunciation, stress and intonation instructed in the coursebook. They also think that it is redundant to urge them to have a British or American accent in that they all prioritize being able to communicate internationally. Therefore, they state that they might ignore insignificant pronunciation mistakes. They are also of the opinion that ignoring some mistakes stem from their will to maintain the communication, which can be attributed to the globalization of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and its effect on the language itself (Galloway & Rose, 2015). Even though what the teachers think regarding ELF is limited to British and

American Englishes, they are against the idea that all learners should learn the target language within the same standards shared by native speakers, which leads them to motivate their students to prioritize communication purposes rather than acquiring native-like properties. Galloway and Rose (2015) mention the vagueness of the concept of native speaker and the effect of varieties of English on the pronunciation, lexicon, syntax, and pragmatics of the language. This fact can be regarded as a base point for language teachers' ignoring some mistakes. However, interviews with the teachers revealed that students might be inclined to be master in American or British English and they expect to be corrected whenever they make a mistake in order not to have fossilized mistakes in their speeches. It is also obvious that having a British or American accent is one of their main expectations. With the aim of contributing to ELF awareness in language teachers and bridge the gap between teacher and student expectations, language teachers can be provided with in-service distance education based on selective readings, discussions of these readings and preparing sample ELF-aware lesson plans (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015). This training can pave the way for having a broader perspective towards both L2 grammar teaching and corrective feedback. It can also positively affect the way EFL teachers provide CF in that they may not have a tendency to correct all the mistakes, which can be beneficial for communication. Besides, Matsumoto suggests that teachers can provide "ELF interactions" for their students to help them to have a better understanding (as cited in Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015, p. 118). It can be considered an attempt to compromise teacher and student beliefs.

What this study revealed in terms of the beliefs language teachers have, the reasons for these beliefs, reflection of these beliefs through practice and the effect of both cognitive and contextual factors on the relationship between belief system and

instructional decisions indicates that there are some gaps within the belief system of each teacher, which stems from lack of awareness and theoretical knowledge. Even though there are congruent practices of many beliefs, there are also some incongruences which may result in some performances that might negatively influence the potential of language teachers since they may end up employing some decisions that are not in line with what they really want. What is more, reflections on the questions aiming to reveal what they believe show that the scope of the beliefs is relatively limited compared to their practices and their practical reflections on their practices. This limited belief system largely depends on experiential knowledge, instructions provided by the materials, and classroom dynamics, which reveals they lack complete awareness and theoretical knowledge to reflect upon what they believe and perform. Aside from these problems, the effect of contextual factors is also mentioned. As for the possible suggestions in order to minimize these problems, institutional administration can consider several actions in order to provide an environment where the teachers can have the autonomy to perform in accordance with their beliefs. These problems regarding the above-mentioned cognitive factors resulting in a limited belief system, inconsistent practices, lack of theoretical knowledge and unawareness of the beliefs and decisions can be handled through in-service teacher education, action research, self-reflection, and some changes in pre-service education. Gore et al. (2017) state that teaching practices can be improved through professional development training based on some pedagogies and team-work, which shows that in-service professional development can be regarded as an opportunity for language teachers to go through a process that may lead to more consistent patterns of beliefs and practices. Additionally, the effect of practising action research can substantially pave the way for having “self-efficacy beliefs and

deeper practical knowledge" regarding the issues that they focus on in their research (Wyatt & Dikilitaş, 2015, p.15). This practice can also lead to having more theoretical knowledge that can contribute to having a more comprehensive belief system as well as employing a variety of practices in light of these beliefs. The other notion that can be considered to handle the problem is self-reflection that can be employed by language teachers themselves. As teachers are "both the subjects and objects of learning and development" (Avalos, 2011, p. 17), they may criticize their performances in order to come up with some decisions that can raise their awareness about their instructional decisions and minimize the incongruent patterns of beliefs and practices. One major problem of the teachers is their inability to remember what they were taught during their teacher education, which indicates there can be some revisions in teacher education programs in Turkey. Some possible changes may help the prospective EFL teachers to internalize academic knowledge to be able to make use of it in the long run. Use of "dialogue and response journals" for two-semester ELT course is claimed to foster student teachers' retrospective reflections on their beliefs (Lee, 2007, p.326). This kind of assignments supported with authentic in-class practices can offer a leverage for prospective teachers to be able to integrate their theoretical beliefs into their practices by rationalizing them.

To conclude, this study aimed to provide a particular perspective towards what language teachers believe concerning L2 grammar teaching and corrective feedback, how they perform considering their stated beliefs and cognitive and contextual factors influencing their instructional decisions in order to contribute to the growing body of research conducted both in SLA and in LTC. This study also intended to bridge the gap between SLA and LTC by providing a reflection of how theoretical knowledge is perceived by language teachers and to what extent their

implementations are aligned with what SLA suggests. As a possible contribution LTC, this study aimed to offer a comprehensive framework to have a better understanding of teacher cognition rather than relying on a single variable. In this sense, this study included two main SLA constructs (L2 grammar teaching and corrective feedback) and paid attention to consider the variables studied in the literature such as teaching experience, previous language learning experience, and educational background. Selection of participants within the scope of these variables enabled the research to compare and analyze the effects of these variables together compared to the studies focusing on the impact of a single variable. With regard to these concerns, the findings show that teacher cognition is a complex theoretical framework in that what language teachers believe and how they instruct might compromise with each other in some cases; however, they may differ from one another since cognitive factors such as experience, personal views and insights, theoretical and practical knowledge and teaching orientation influence their decisions differently. The way they are affected by contextual factors such as time constraints, syllabus, and pacing, materials, students, and exams can be regarded as the other reason for the divergence. These cognitive and contextual factors also have a role in individual inconsistencies observed in language teachers. Based on what is discussed, this study helped the teachers to go through a cognitive process through which they were able to reflect on their beliefs and practices. Consequently, apart from the possible academic contributions to the field, the findings obtained from the study can be used by the institutional administration to take some actions in order to improve the conditions that detrimentally hinder the teachers from implementing what they believe.

Limitations and Suggestions

One of the limitations of this study is the number of participants. More teachers from different backgrounds in the institute could have been invited to participate in the study. However, it was difficult for me to include more teachers in that it would have required more time to observe and interview and ask for extra time from the administration, which was not possible because of my intense course schedule. The inclusion of more teachers could have yielded a more comprehensive perspective towards the teachers' beliefs and practices. For this reason, prospective studies can consider including more teachers unless there is a time constraint because of researchers' schedule.

Another limitation is about the time allocated for observation sessions. Each teacher was observed for five lessons, which could have been increased in order to collect more data about their grammar teaching practices and corrective feedback moves. However, the density of my schedule did not allow me to do more. Also, the teachers would not have been willing to be observed for long hours, which prevented me from conducting more observation sessions. For further studies, the number of observation sessions can be increased to collect more authentic data that can tell more about language teachers' practices.

The other limitation is the absence of interviews with administrators as they are the stakeholders of the institute and they have a substantial role in policy-making that can influence the contextual factors that were mentioned to affect the teachers detrimentally. As this study includes perspectives from teachers, how the administrators perceive the issues that are discussed in the study could have paved the way for a more comprehensive perspective towards teacher cognition.

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR TEACHERS

Institution supporting the research: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi

Research: EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Their Practices in Grammar Teaching and Corrective Feedback: A Case Study

Project supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Sumru AKCAN

E-mail: sumru.akcan@boun.edu.tr

Phone: +90 212 359 7042

Researcher's name: Serhat BAŞAR

E-mail: serhat.basar@boun.edu.tr

Phone: +90 531 376 69 75

Research topic: This study aims to explore 4 EFL teachers' beliefs and practices regarding grammar teaching and corrective feedback, the degree of consistency between these beliefs and practices, cognitive and contextual factors influencing the relationship between beliefs and practices in addition to students' perspectives towards grammar teaching and corrective feedback.

Dear instructor,

Within the scope of this research which will be carried out under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Sumru Akcan from Boğaziçi University, 4 English teachers working in the English preparatory program will be examined in terms of their cognition (beliefs and practices) of corrective feedback and grammar teaching, the relationship between beliefs and practices and the cognitive and contextual factors underlying this cognition. In addition, students' perspective towards corrective feedback and grammar teaching will also be included in the study. For the teachers, 5 lessons of each teacher will be observed and audio-recorded. After the observation, each participant will be expected to participate in a 30-minute stimulated recall interview that will be conducted in the light of field notes taken during the observation and audios of the observation. Finally, each participant will be requested to attend a 20-minute interview which is conducted to investigate beliefs about corrective feedback and grammar teaching. For the students, a small group discussion will be held in each class with 5 students who will be selected randomly by the teacher. This study will be held at School of Foreign Languages of Izmir Institute of Technology with the approval of Boğaziçi University Ethics Committee.

Consent: We invite you to participate in this project in order to explore language teachers' beliefs and practices regarding grammar teaching and corrective feedback, the degree of consistency between these beliefs and practices, cognitive and contextual factors influencing the relationship between beliefs and practices in addition to students' perspectives towards grammar teaching and corrective

feedback. As a result of this study, we hope to find out the beliefs and practices of language teachers about corrective feedback and grammar teaching, how consistent their beliefs and practices are, the cognitive and contextual factors affecting these beliefs and practices, and what students think about their teachers' in class practices.

If you agree to participate in the research, we will ask you to let the researcher observe and audio-record your 5 lessons, to take part in a 30-minute stimulated recall that will be conducted one or two days after your observation session is over and to participate in a 20-minute interview for your beliefs regarding corrective feedback and grammar teaching. Your name, in-class applications, views and records will be kept confidential.

Participation in the study is entirely optional. We do not charge you and we will not make any payment to you.

Data from you can be used for further studies. You may opt out of the work at any time. In this case, the data we have received from you will be destroyed.

The research we want to carry out is not expected to cause any risks for you. On the contrary, with this research, the participants will be able to witness and evaluate their own beliefs and practices. The data to be obtained from this study can be used in writing more than one scientific article.

Before signing this informed consent form, let us know if you have any questions about the work. If you have any questions later, you can ask the project manager (Office Phone: +90 212 359 7042) or the researcher (Mobile Phone: +90 531 376 69 75). You can also consult with Boğaziçi University The Ethics Committee for Master and Ph.D. Theses in Social Sciences and Humanities (SOBETİK) regarding your research rights.

I understood what was told and what was written above. I have received / I don't want to receive a copy of this form (in this case the researcher stores this copy).

I agree to participate in the study.

Participant's name and surname:……..

Signature: ……

Date (day/month/year):...../...../.....

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR STUDENTS

Institution supporting the research: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi

Research: EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Their Practices in Grammar Teaching and Corrective Feedback: A Case Study

Project supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Sumru AKCAN

E-mail: sumru.akcan@boun.edu.tr

Phone: +90 212 359 7042

Researcher's name: Serhat BAŞAR

E-mail: serhat.basar@boun.edu.tr

Phone: +90 531 376 69 75

Research topic: This study aims to explore 4 EFL teachers' beliefs and practices regarding grammar teaching and corrective feedback, the degree of consistency between these beliefs and practices, cognitive and contextual factors influencing the relationship between beliefs and practices in addition to students' perspectives towards grammar teaching and corrective feedback.

Dear student,

Within the scope of this research which will be carried out under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Sumru Akcan from Boğaziçi University, 4 English teachers working in the English preparatory program will be examined in terms of their cognition (beliefs and practices) of corrective feedback and grammar teaching, the relationship between beliefs and practices and the cognitive and contextual factors underlying this cognition. In addition, students' perspective towards corrective feedback and grammar teaching will also be included in the study. For the class observation sessions, four classes will be observed and the lessons will be audio-recorded with the approval of administrators of School of Foreign Languages and class instructors. For each class, 5 lessons will be observed and audio-recorded and some field notes will be taken for observation data by the researcher. This study will be held at School of Foreign Languages of Izmir Institute of Technology with the approval of Boğaziçi University Ethics Committee.

Consent: We invite you to participate in this project in order to explore language teachers' beliefs and practices regarding grammar teaching and corrective feedback, the degree of consistency between these beliefs and practices, cognitive and contextual factors influencing the relationship between beliefs and practices in addition to students' perspectives towards grammar teaching and corrective feedback. As a result of this study, we hope to find out the beliefs and practices of language teachers about corrective feedback and grammar teaching, how consistent

their beliefs and practices are, the cognitive and contextual factors affecting these beliefs and practices, and what students think about their teachers' in class practices.

If you agree to participate in the research, you are kindly requested to allow the researcher to observe and audio-record five lessons that will be scheduled within the knowledge of the researcher and your instructor. During the observation sessions, the researcher will be taking some field notes and the lesson will be audio-recorded. Your name, in-class applications, views and records will be kept confidential.

Participation in the study is entirely optional. We do not charge you and we will not make any payment to you.

Data from you can be used for further studies. You may opt out of the work at any time. In this case, the data we have received from you will be destroyed.

The research we want to carry out is not expected to cause any risks for you. On the contrary, with this research, the participants will be able to witness and evaluate their own beliefs and perspectives. The data to be obtained from this study can be used in writing more than one scientific article.

Before signing this informed consent form, let us know if you have any questions about the work. If you have any questions later, you can ask the project manager (Office Phone: +90 212 359 7042) or the researcher (Mobile Phone: +90 531 376 69 75). You can also consult with Boğaziçi University The Ethics Committee for Master and Ph.D. Theses in Social Sciences and Humanities (SOBETİK) regarding your research rights.

I understood what was told and what was written above. I have received / I don't want to receive a copy of this form (in this case the researcher stores this copy).

I agree to participate in the study.

Participant's name and surname: ……..

Signature: ……

Date (day/month/year): ...../...../.....

APPENDIX C

ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL

T.C.
BOĞAZİÇİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
İnsan Araştırmaları Kurumsal Değerlendirme Alt Kurulu

2018-38

19 Eylül 2018

Serhat Başar
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi

Sayın Araştırmacı,

"Düzeltici dönüt ve dilbilgisi öğretiminde öğretmen inanış ve uygulamalarının incelenmesi: Bir durum çalışması" başlıklı projeniz ile ilgili olarak yaptığınız SBB-EAK 2018/37 sayılı başvuru İNAREK/SBB Etik Alt Kurulu tarafından 19 Eylül 2018 tarihli toplantıda incelenmiş ve uygun bulunmuştur.

.....
Doç. Dr. Mehmet Yiğit Gürdal

.....
Doç. Dr. Gül Sosay

.....
Doç. Dr. Ebru Kaya

.....
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi İnci Ayhan

.....
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Nur Yeniçeri

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW FOR BELIEF QUESTIONS

1.) <u>Participants' Background Information</u>

- How was your language learning experience? How did you learn your second language?
- How did you learn grammar of your second language? How was it taught?
- How did you use to be corrected in case of a mistake in your production?

2.) <u>Participants' Beliefs and Orientations about language teaching</u>

- What kind of teaching philosophy do you have? How do you teach grammar? Why?
- Do you have any theoretical background for these beliefs that you hold?
- Could you share some instructional practices that worked well in your classroom? Why did they work well?
- Could you tell me some instructional practices that were not beneficial? Why not?
- How do you correct your students' mistakes? Why?
- Which feedback type/s do you prefer most? Why? (Feedback types are provided below)

<u>Recast</u>: It is an utterance that rephrases the learner's utterance by changing one or more components (subject, verb, object) while still referring to its central meaning.

Example: Learner: I lost my road. Teacher: I see, you lost your way and then what happened?

<u>Metalinguistic feedback</u>: It is an utterance provides comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the learner's utterance.

Example: Learner: I am here since yesterday. Teacher: Well, ok but remember we talked about the present perfect tense.

<u>Explicit correction</u>: It is an utterance that provides the learner with the correct form while at the same time indicating an error was committed.

Example: Learner: we don't have many homework. Teacher: homework is an uncountable noun so you should say "much" instead of "many".

Prompts: 4 types of prompts are given below (Lyster & Mori, 2006, p. 272).

(a) Elicitation

Student: Ben y a un jet de parfum qui sent pas très bon. (Lexical error)

(Well there's a stream of perfume that doesn't smell very nice.)

Teacher: Alors un jet de parfum, on va appeler ça un ?

(So a stream of perfume, we'll call that a ?)

(b) Metalinguistic clue

Student: Kuruma (A car) (Lexical error)

Teacher: Kuruma janai yo. (It's not a car.)

(c) Clarification request

Student: Bashi ni. (On the wagon.) (Phonological error)

Teacher: Nani? (What ?)

(d) Repetition

Student: La guimauve, la chocolat. (Gender error)

(Marshmallow, chocolate *fem.*)

Teacher: La chocolat? (Chocolat *fem.*?)

REFERENCES

Allwright, D. (1979). Abdication and responsibility in language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *2*(1), 105-121.

Almarza, G. (1996). Student foreign language teachers' growth. In D. Freeman & J. C.Richards (eds.), *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching* (pp. 50−78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Andrews, K. L. Z. (2007). The effects of implicit and explicit instruction on simple and complex grammatical structures for adult English language learners. *TESL-EJ*, *11*(2), 1–15.

Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(1), 10-20.

Basturkmen, H. (2007). Teacher beliefs and teacher training. *The Teacher Trainer*, *21*(1), 8–10.

Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, *25*(2), 243-272.

Bayyurt, Y., & Sifakis, N. C. (2015). ELF-aware in-service teacher education: A transformative perspective. In *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 117-135). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*(2), 102-118.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theory and methods*. (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

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*(2), 81-109.

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum.

Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, *39*(3), 370–80.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Breen, M. P., Hird, B., Milton, M., Oliver, R., & Thwaite, A. (2001). Making sense of language teaching: teachers' principles and classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, *22* (4), 470−501.

Brousseau, B. A., Book, C., & Byers, J. L. (1988). Teacher beliefs and the cultures of teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(6), 33-39.

Brousseau, B. A., Book, C., & Byers, J. L. (1988). Teacher beliefs and the cultures of teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(6), 33-39.

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

Burden, R. L., & Williams, M. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burgess, R. G. (2011). *The research process in educational settings: Ten case studies* (Vol. 168). New York: Routledge.

Cabaroglu, N. & Roberts, J. (2000). Development in student teachers' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-Year PGCE programme. *System*, *28*(3), 387−402.

Çakır, İ., & Kafa, S. (2013). English language teachers' preferences in presenting target language grammar. *Dil ve Edebiyat Egitimi Dergisi*, *2*(8), 39-51.

Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors 1. *Language learning*, *27*(1), 29-46.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design – Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DeKeyser, R. M. (1993). The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, *77*(4), 501-514.

DeKeyser, R. (1995). Learning second language grammar rules: An experiment with a miniature linguistic system. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *17*, 379–410.

DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42–63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. J. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.). (1998a). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elgün-Gündüz, Z., Akcan, S., & Bayyurt, Y. (2012). Isolated form-focused instruction and integrated form-focused instruction in primary school English classrooms in Turkey. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *25*(2), 157-171.

Ellis, R. (1991). Grammatically judgments and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *13*(2), 161-186.

Ellis, R. (2002). Does form-focused instruction affect the acquisition of implicit knowledge?: A review of the research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *24*(2), 223-236.

Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 83-107.

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

Ellis, R. (2010). Second language acquisition, teacher education and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching*, *43*(2), 182-201.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, *51*, 281-318.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *28*(2), 339-368.

Erlam, R. (2003). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the acquisition of direct object pronouns in French as a second language. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*, 242–260.

Evertson, C. M., & Weade, R. (1989). Classroom management and teaching style: Instructional stability and variability in two junior high English classrooms. *Elementary School Journal*, *89*, 379-393.

Farrell, T. S., & Lim, P. C. P. (2005). Conceptions of grammar teaching: A case study of teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. *TESL-EJ*, *9*(2), 1–13.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 361–377). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Foss, D. H., & Kleinsasser, R. C. (1996). Preservice elementary teachers' views of pedagogical and mathematical content knowledge. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *12*(4), 429-442.

Freeman, D. (1992). Language teacher education, emerging discourse, and change in classroom practice. In: Flowerdew, J., Brock, M., Hsia, S. (Eds.), *Perspectives on language teacher education* (pp. 1-21). Hong Kong: Hong Kong City Polytechnic.

Freeman, D. (1993). Renaming experience, reconstructing practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *9*(5–6), 485–497.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing Global Englishes*. New York: Routledge.

Garrett, N. (1986). The problem with grammar: what kind can the language learner use?. *The Modern Language Journal*, *70*(2), 133-148.

Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *16*(3), 283-302.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Golombek, P.R., & Johnson, K. E. (2004). Narrative inquiry as a mediational space. Examining emotional and cognitive dissonance in second-language teachers' development. *Teachers and Teaching*, *10* (3), 309–327.

Gore, J., Lloyd, A., Smith, M., Bowe, J., Ellis, H., & Lubans, D. (2017). Effects of professional development on the quality of teaching: Results from a randomised controlled trial of Quality Teaching Rounds. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *68*, 99-113.

Graus, J., & Coppen, P. A. (2016). Student teacher beliefs on grammar instruction. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(5), 571–599.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Herron, C., & Tomosello, M. (1992). Acquiring grammatical structures by guided induction. *French Review*, *65*, 708–718.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1997). Active interviewing. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. (pp. 113-29). London: Sage.

Holt-Reynolds, D. (1992). Personal history-based beliefs as relevant prior knowledge in course work. *American Educational Research Journal*, *29*(2), 325-349.

Hos, R., & Kekec, M. (2014). The mismatch between non-native English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' grammar beliefs and classroom practices. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(1), 80-88.

Hutchinson, S. A. (1988). Education and grounded theory. In R. R. Sherman & R. B. Webb (Eds.), *Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods*. Lewes: The Falmer Press.

Jafarigohar, M., & Kheiri, S. (2015). A comparison of teacher cognition and corrective feedback between university graduates and teachers certified in English language teaching. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *5*(11), 2320–2326.

Johnson, K. E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *10*(4), 439-452.

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.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implication of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, *27*(1), 65-90.

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.

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

Kırkgöz, Y., Babanoğlu, M. P., & Ağçam, R. (2015). Corrective feedback in primary EFL classrooms in Turkey. *American International Journal of Social Science*, *4*(3), 90-101.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Lee, I. (2007). Preparing pre-service English teachers for reflective practice. *ELT Journal*, *61*(4), 321-329.

Li, S., Zhu, Y., & Ellis, R. (2016). The effects of the timing of corrective feedback on the acquisition of a new linguistic structure. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*(1), 276-295.

Liviero, S. (2017). Grammar teaching in secondary school foreign language learning in England: teachers' reported beliefs and observed practices. *Language Learning Journal*, *45*(1), 26–50.

Loewen, S., & Nabei, T. (2007). Measuring the effects of oral corrective feedback on L2 knowledge. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition* (pp. 361–377). New York: Oxford University Press.

Long, M. H. (2017). Instructed second language acquisition (ISLA): geopolitics, methodological issues, and some major research questions. *Instructed Second Language Acquisition*, *1*(1), 7–44.

Long, M. H., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal*, *82*(3), 357-371.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In: Ritchie, W.C., Bhatia, T.K. (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition: Second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, *48*(2), 183-218.

Lyster, R. (2001). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, *51*, 265-301.

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

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(1), 37-66.

Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition 28*, 269-300.

Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *27*(3), 405-430.

Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, *82*(3), 338-356.

Magilow, D. H. (1999). Case study# 2: Error correction and classroom affect. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, *32*(2), 125-129.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Moini, M. R. (2009). The impact of EFL teachers' cognition on teaching foreign language grammar, *Pazhuhesh-e Zabanha-ye Khareji*, *(49)*, 141–164.

Mori, R. (2011). Teacher cognition in corrective feedback in Japan. *System*, *39*(4), 451–467.

Musumeci, D. (1997*). Breaking tradition: An exploration of the historical relationship between theory and practice in second language teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nishimuro, M., & Borg, S. (2013). Teacher cognition and grammar teaching in a Japanese high school. *JALT Journal*, *35*(1), 29–50.

Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, *50*, 417–528.

Osam, U. V., & Balbay, S. (2004). Investigating the decision-making skills of cooperating teachers and student teachers of English in a Turkish context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*, 745-758.

Oskoz, A., & Liskin-Gasparro, J. (2002). Corrective feedback, learner uptake, and teacher's beliefs: A pilot study. In X. Bonch-Bruevich, W. J. Crawford, J. Hellermann, C. Higgins, & H. Nguyen (Eds.), *The past, present and future of second language research: Selected proceedings of the 2000 second language research forum* (pp. 209-228). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Öztürk, G. (2016). An investigation on the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *12*(2), 22-37.

Pajares, M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, *62*, 307–332.

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

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative education and research methods* (2nd ed). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

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.

Richards, J. C. (1996). Teachers' maxims in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 30* (2), 281−296.

Richards, J. C., Ho, B., & Giblin, K. (1996). Learning how to teach in the RSA Cert. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 242−59). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., Gallo, P. B., & Renandya, W. A. (2001). Exploring teachers' beliefs and the processes of change. *PAC Journal, 1*(1), 41-58.

Richardson, M. K., Minelli, A., & Coates, M. I. (1999). Some problems with typological thinking in evolution and development. *Evolution & Development, 1*(1), 5-7.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 102–119). New York: Macmillan Library Reference.

Roothooft, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System, 46*(1), 65–79.

Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar: A metaanalysis of the research. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133–164). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sanchez, H. S., & Borg, S. (2014). Insights into L2 teachers' pedagogical content knowledge: A cognitive perspective on their grammar explanations. *System, 44*(1), 45–53.

Sanz, C. (2003). Computer delivered implicit vs. explicit feedback in processing instruction. In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 129–158.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In: Robinson, P. (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

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

Seedhouse, P. (2004). Conversation analysis methodology. *Language Learning, 54*(S1), 1-54.

Sendan, F. & J. Roberts (1998). Orhan: A case study in the development of a student teachers' personal theories. *Teachers and Teaching, 4,* 229–44.

Shavelson, R. J., & Stern, P. (1981). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions, and behavior. *Review of Educational Research, 51*(4), 455-498.

Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text, and interaction*. London: Sage Publications.

Soruç, A., Qin, J., & Kim, Y. (2018). Comparing the effectiveness of processing instruction and production-based instruction on L2 grammar learning: The role of explicit information. *TESL Canada Journal, 34*(2), 49-70.

Spada, N. (2007). Communicative language teaching. In *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 271-288). Boston, MA: Springer.

Spada, N. (2011). Beyond form-focused instruction: Reflections on past, present and future research. *Language Teaching, 44*(2), 225-236.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated? *TESOL Quarterly, 42*(2), 181-207.

Suzuki, Y., & DeKeyser, R. (2015). Comparing elicited imitation and word monitoring as measures of implicit knowledge. *Language Learning, 65*(4), 860-895.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In: Gass, S.M., Madden, C.G. (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 236-244). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Ulichny, P. (1996). What's in a methodology? In Freeman, D. & Richards, J. C. (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching*. (pp. 178-196). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Uysal, H. H., & Bardakci, M. (2014). Teacher beliefs and practices of grammar teaching: focusing on meaning, form, or forms? *South African Journal of Education, 34*(1), 1-16.

VanPatten, B., Williams, J., & Rott, S. (2004). *Form-meaning connections in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching: Beliefs, decision-making and classroom practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wyatt, M., & Dikilitaş, K. (2016). English language teachers becoming more efficacious through research engagement at their Turkish university. *Educational Action Research, 24*(4), 550-570.

Yin, R. K. (1989). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, *94*(2), 293-314.