

Vol. 12, No. 3
pp. 347-376
August &
September
2021

Received: 23 December 2020
Received in revised form: 9 February 2021
Accepted: 27 March 2021

Exploring Tensions Between Novice and Experienced EFL Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback Beliefs and Practices

Elnaz Goldouz¹ & Sasan Baleghizadeh^{2*} 

Abstract

The present study was conducted to identify novice and experienced Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs towards the most effective written corrective feedback types and the most serious errors they might address while correcting students' paragraphs and see whether there exist any tensions between what they believed and what they practiced through the methodology of pre-observation interview, observation, and post-observation interview. The results revealed that for novice teachers, there were fewer tensions between their stated beliefs and observed practices, yet this tension was more obvious while interviewing experienced teachers. Some implications for language teacher education will also be discussed.

Keywords: teacher beliefs, teacher practice, written corrective feedback, EFL

1. Ph.D. candidate of TEFL, Department of English Language & Literature, Faculty of Letters & Human Sciences, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

2. Corresponding author, Associate Professor of TEFL, Department of English Language & Literature, Faculty of Letters & Human Sciences, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

Email: s_baleghizadeh@sbu.ac.ir, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2290-8322>

1. Introduction

Beliefs are generally studied under the heading of teacher cognition, which also includes related constructs such as attitudes and knowledge (Borg, 2015). In the 1970s, teaching was perceived as a largely behavioral activity and little attention was given to the mental side of teaching. This started to change in the 1980s, motivated in part by developments in cognitive psychology, which posited strong relationships between human behavior and underlying cognitive processes which, therefore, implied that teaching, too, was shaped by teachers' thoughts, judgments, and beliefs (Borg, 2006). Language pedagogy research has shown that teachers' practices are primarily influenced by personal theories and beliefs (Borg, 2003). Johnson (1994) suggested that since they are not clearly measurable, teachers' beliefs are neither easy to describe nor study. What we know is that teachers' beliefs are founded on unconscious assumptions and beliefs about teaching and learning (Kagan, 1992). Consequently, researchers started to investigate various methods through which teachers correct students' writing and the impact these strategies could have. These studies examined the effect of different feedback strategies on students' immediate revision (Ashwell, 2000; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Sheppard, 1992), and students' opinions on feedback from teachers (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Leki, 1990; Montgomery & Baker, 2007). However, studies on teachers' practice, and the alignment between teachers' beliefs and their actual written corrective feedback practices (Jodaie & Farrokhi, 2012; Junqueira & Payant, 2015; Lee, 2009), are scarce. Studying teachers' beliefs and practices is important since, as Bazerman (1994) claimed, "it is within students, of course, that the learning occurs, but it is within the teacher, who sits at the juncture of forces above, below and sideways that the learning situations are framed" (p. 29).

As emphasized by Junqueira and Payant (2015), the relationship between the beliefs and practices of teachers when responding to the writing of L2 students is an area that requires further investigation. It has been extensively observed that teachers have some beliefs about teaching and learning languages and that these beliefs influence their teaching practices (Gebel & Schrier, 2002; Johnson, 1992; Richardson et al., 1991; Woods, 1996;). Furthermore, WCF has generally been examined as an independent phenomenon (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012), while in reality, it occurs alongside many other interacting elements of a writing course. Studies in which teachers' WCF is simply collected and analyzed may fail to see

the big picture (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). The present study, therefore, aims to provide a deeper understanding of teachers' views regarding the most optimal type of feedback and the most serious errors teachers would focus on and see whether there existed any tensions between what they believed and what they practiced. To this end, the study seeks to answer the following questions:

- 1) Are there any tensions between novice Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in relation to written corrective feedback? If so, what is the nature of this tension?
- 2) Are there any tensions between experienced Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in relation to written corrective feedback? If so, what is the nature of this tension?

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Relationship between Teachers' Beliefs and Their Classroom Practices

The importance of studying beliefs began to be realized by a number of researchers (e.g., Borg, 1999a, 1999b, 2006; Kagan, 1992; Lin et al., 1999; Pajares, 1992) as it not only affected attitudes but also enhanced teachers' professional growth and practices. As suggested by Phipps and Borg (2009), although teachers' beliefs would dominate the interpretation of new experiences and information, they are not always observed in their actual classroom practices.

The relationship between beliefs and practices has been examined in a growing number of studies (e.g., Andrews, 2003; Borg, 2006; Elbaz, 1983; Karavas-Doukas, 1996; Kennedy & Kennedy, 1996; Woods, 1996). This is not a linear relationship, but a highly complex one (Fang, 1996), which is not always expressed in their classroom practices (Karavas-Doukas, 1996; Kennedy & Kennedy, 1996; Richards, 1996). Farrell and Kun (2008) conducted a case study to examine teachers' beliefs and practices in Singapore about the role of teachers in providing feedback and correcting students using Singlish. The findings showed that teachers' beliefs were often observed in their practices. One teacher's classroom observation in the study, for example, showed that when Singlish was used, he/she rarely provided feedback.

Unlike the studies above, which found consistency between teachers' beliefs

and practices, Basturkmen (2012) reviewed many other studies and found that there is little alignment between teachers' beliefs and their actual practices. For example, Phipps and Borg (2009) interviewed and observed three experienced EFL teachers' beliefs and practices on grammar instruction in the Turkish context. Concerning grammar instruction and group-work activities, they found tension between teachers' beliefs and their practices. One tutor, for example, although did not believe in the effectiveness of controlled grammar practice activities, applied them in the class. The teacher justified her practice by mentioning that students at times got unruly in class and she tried to fulfill their expectations as well.

2.2. Factors Influencing Teachers' Practices

Magno and Amarles (2011) noted that besides the needs of the students and the perceived possible difficulties in their writing classes, which might affect feedback practices, there also exist some external factors, including teachers' beliefs on feedback, cultural, and institutional contexts.

Factors related to contextual factors are time limitations, heavy teaching loads, and the need to cover the syllabus/text-books. In Lee's (2009) study, for instance, teachers did not allow the students to write another draft because teachers did not have sufficient time and more importantly, more writing types that were part of their syllabus had to be covered. Lee (2013) concluded that it is a challenging task for EFL teachers to provide WCF because it needs hard work and gives teachers immense burden as they face other challenges such as heavy workloads.

Mandated syllabus, broad classes, instructional materials, institutional requirements, insufficient time for teaching, scheduling, exam pressure and culture are other factors relevant to the institutional context (e.g., Feryok, 2008; Gahin, 2001; Hiep, 2007; Lu, 2003). Other studies have shown that the burden of the exam adversely impacts teachers' practices. This is called the negative washback effect, which is focusing on exam preparation and avoiding those activities that will never lead to passing the tests (Alderson & Wall, 1993). The cultural system in which instructors work often has a significant impact on their practices (Kennedy, 1988).

Teachers' beliefs and practices are informed both by teachers' previous experiences as a learner at school and also by their teaching experiences. Many scholars have suggested that teachers' experiences would exert influence on

teachers' beliefs and beliefs. In Egypt, Gahin (2001) in a study found that in-service teachers are more inclined to follow form-based views of language teaching (e.g. teaching language grammar), whereas novice teachers tend to express communicative views of language teaching. With regard to applying different feedback strategies, Norouzian (2015) who gathered the data from 15 Iranian teachers to find the influence of teaching experience on the teachers' perception towards type (indirect and direct) and amount (selective and comprehensive) of their written corrective feedback, found that teaching experience has a significant effect on the direct method of feedback provision by highly experienced teachers.

2.3. Feedback Types

When it comes to delivering WCF strategies in classrooms, literature has divided the discussion into two main classifications: direct and indirect strategies. Ferris (2006) proposed that indirect feedback must be provided on treatable errors (i.e., errors which can be self-corrected by students, such as errors in subject-verb agreement and tenses), whereas direct feedback should be given on untreatable errors (errors which can be difficult to be self-corrected, such as lexical errors, and word-order). From another perspective, Ferris (2003), Bitchener and Knoch (2010) propose that although indirect error feedback is more effective in students' long-term writing, direct feedback can be more effective for learners who have low proficiency levels.

There is, however, another evidence by Nassaji (2011), which suggests that relying merely on unidirectional feedback when there is no student-teacher interaction would not bring fruitful results. As Nassaji (2011) rightly asserted, "it is possible that if the feedback is provided in a negotiated and interactive manner, it may become more effective because in such cases the feedback can become more fine-tuned and adjusted to the learner's level of interlanguage through negotiation" (p. 317). There have also been many other studies confirming favorable impacts for negotiation (e.g., Braid, 2002; Lyster, 2002; Nassaji, 2007, 2009; Van den Branden, 1997).


Eslami and Derakhshan (2020) propose advantageous approaches to deal with corrective feedback for both teachers and students. Corrective feedback must be

viewed as highly complicated, according to the researchers' discussions, particularly when it comes to learners' autonomy in second language development and successful strategic use of it. The researcher has made a few suggestions for how to promote CF practice in second language classrooms.

The results concerning teachers' beliefs about feedback explicitness are not always consistent. Although some studies indicated that teachers favored explicit WCF (Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010; Jodaie & Farrokhi, 2012; Lee, 2003), other studies (Hamouda, 2011; Lee, 2009) found the opposite, i.e. teachers preferred indirect approach. In Lee's study (2009), teachers stated that since many students cannot identify and correct errors themselves, they could not provide them with indirect feedback.

Having considered the points mentioned, the researchers in this study, therefore, aimed to adopt different kinds of feedback proposed by Nassaji (2011) through combining them with the most common types of feedback, namely direct and indirect ones along with their specific concrete approaches mentioned in the literature to have the comprehensive framework with regard to all types of written feedback. Figure 1 below, based on Goldouz and Baleghizadeh (2021) shows a typology of feedback types.

Figure 1
Typology of Feedback Types



2.3. Error Types

The type(s) of errors writing teachers should focus on bring about an important challenge for them. The most common classification is the one between frequent errors and infrequent ones (Ferris, 2011). Research has focused on stigmatizing errors, “the type of error[s] that might label the student as a less proficient writer” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012, p.146). Lee (2013) argues that most teachers would focus on more common and stigmatizing errors. In addition to these dichotomies, the idea of whether L2 writing teachers should concentrate on local errors (language form) more or less than the global ones (content and organization) has been the topic of heated debate. In many studies (Ferris et al., 1997; Lee, 2003, 2004, 2009), researchers described the content as “the information you provide in your essay, organization as the way in which these ideas are organized, and language form as the correct use of mechanics” (Ferris et al., 1997, p. 23).


Linguistic errors have also been classified as treatable and untreatable errors (Ferris, 1999). Whether an error is treatable depends much on the nature of the linguistic feature, specifically whether the feature is “rule-governed” (Bitchener et al., 2005) or “rule-based” (Bitchener, 2012). Treatable errors are errors that “occur in a patterned, rule-governed way” (Ferris, 1999, p. 6). They include subject-verb agreement, verb tense or form, articles, pronouns, and spelling (Ferris, 2006). On the other hand, untreatable errors are idiosyncratic by nature and, therefore, cannot be treated by a certain set of rules (Bitchener et al. 2005; Ferris, 1999). They are also called “item-based features” (e.g., Bitchener, 2012). Untreatable errors, or item-based features, can belong to one of the following categories: word choice, idioms, and sentence structure (Ferris, 2006).

Although studies provided contradictory findings when it comes to teachers’ beliefs about the focus of the WCF, studies on classroom practices (Lee, 2004, 2009; Montgomery & Baker, 2007) reached a similar finding, indicating that teachers typically concentrate on language errors. As Ferris (2003) suggested, such a finding shows teachers’ behavior to be controlling and directive. It may also mean that most writing teachers in order to meet their students’ needs and expectations, follow a form-focused feedback.

As for the most serious error types, Figure 2 below based on containing different aspects of errors in learners’ pieces of writing (based on the literature)

was also proposed by the researchers (see Goldouz & Baleghizadeh, 2021) to be applied in the study:

Figure 2
Typology of Errors



3. Method

This qualitative research was conducted in order to examine the relationship between teachers' beliefs and observed classroom practices with regard to written corrective feedback. In order to provide a deeper understanding of teachers' views when it comes to the most optimal type of feedback and the most serious errors they would focus on and see whether there exist any tensions between what they believed and what they practiced, the methodology of pre- observation interview, observation and post- observation interview was conducted. The interviews were semi-structured in nature, allowing both the interviewer and the interviewees the opportunity to introduce and pursue themes of relevance that arose during the conversation.

3.1. Participants

Participants were a volunteer sample of 4 experienced and novice EFL teachers (three males, one female) with at least 3 years of teaching experience teaching English to young adult learners to determine their beliefs and practices surrounding the written corrective feedback at a large well-known institute in Iran (See Table 1). The researchers aimed to ask about the two most serious errors they focus on and the two most dominant feedback types (based on the model proposed earlier) they would use while correcting students' paragraphs, and to find possible (mis)matches (if any) with regard to their feedback strategies they apply. They were all teaching the same level of students (Young adult learners aged between 11 to 14) at the same institute. Confirmed by the results obtained from the Oxford Placement Test (OPT), the participants' level of proficiency was found to be B1 (Threshold level).

Table 1
Participant's Experience and Education Background

	Experienced		Novice	
	2	2	2	2
Gender	Male 1	Male 1	Male 1	Female 1
Years of teaching experience	Ali: 10	Mohamad: 12	Saeed: 3	Sara: 4

*All names are pseudonyms.

3.2. Instruments

The main instruments for data collection in this study were interviews and observation.

3.3. Interviews

The teachers' semi-structured interview questions were divided into two main parts (see Appendix A): (I) - general background questions and (II) - specific beliefs about giving written corrective feedback (WCF). The first section includes

the teachers' profiles and contains questions, for example, about the teachers' level of education and teaching experiences. Part II is divided into two sections. It asks about the following issues regarding teachers' beliefs in giving written corrective feedback (WCF): (1) the focus of WCF, (2) the explicitness of WCF.

The second part or the first interview was conducted to have teachers voice their views (based on the models) regarding their beliefs on what errors they believed to be the most serious ones to deal with when it comes to young adult learners. They were also asked to say what strategies and kind of feedback they preferred to provide the students with revolving around those errors. This semi-structured interview (Kvale, 1996) was used to allow the exploration of issues as they emerged, within a planned framework of themes. Therefore, to this end, the following questions prior to observation were asked:

1) What types of error (based on the model shared with them) do you prefer to correct? Why?

2) What kind of correction do you prefer? Type 1 (provision of correct form + metalinguistic comments) or Type 2 (negotiated). Why?

3.4. Research Ethics

After obtaining ethical approval for the research from the institute, permission was obtained through contacting the Deputy for Research and Planning of the Institute two months before conducting the study. Moreover, the researchers arranged a meeting with the teachers in which the topic, the purposes, the methods, and the participants needed for the research were all explained in detail.

3.5. Observation Phase

In this phase, with the participants' permission 5 recent writing samples of their students were observed to see what feedback type they employed in addressing their errors. Needless to say, the paragraphs belonged to students at the young adult department. This observational phase offered clear evidence of the manner in which feedback was provided by the teachers while correcting the paragraphs. The stimulus for the third stage of data collection was also provided by a post-observation interview. It took the researchers a week to ask all 4 teachers to

provide them with their students' writing tasks.

3.6. Post-observation Interview

After the observation phase, the post-observation interview was conducted in order to ask participants' views regarding the observation phase i.e. the manner in which they corrected the students' paragraphs, the types of feedback they provided, and the justification for those decisions. The purpose of these interviews (which lasted for about an hour and were also semi-structured and audio recorded using MP3 player recorder) was to examine the techniques the teachers applied when doing the correction, to analyze the variables influencing teachers' decisions, and the rationale behind them.

3.7. Procedure

Four one-hour interviews at a one-month interval with each participant were conducted at times convenient to them in order to explore their beliefs. The pre-observation semi-structured interview contained questions where the participants were encouraged to talk freely about different issues and dimensions. These questions were also followed by why follow-up questions to obtain further details from the respondents regarding the motives and reasons behind a certain answer. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed, and afterwards a copy of the transcription was sent to the participants and they were asked to confirm it as an accurate record of their views. A 5-newly written tasks were collected from each teacher to observe how they checked, corrected, and marked the students' paragraphs i.e., the type of error they addressed and feedback strategy they employed while correcting students' paragraphs. This collection phase took the researchers a week, in that they needed to access all the teachers with all paragraphs needed for the study. Thereafter, the researchers spent a week checking the students' paragraphs with close scrutiny. After the observation process, a one-hour post-observation interview was conducted to elicit participants' views on the methods they adopted, and their justification for those decisions. The questions used in the post-observation interviews following the WCF analysis aimed at addressing the reasons behind teachers' WCF practices.

This was with regard to (1) the focus of WCF, (2) the explicitness of WCF. A closing question was about the factors that affect the WCF techniques they use that were not mentioned before. Each post-observation interview took place a few days after checking the students' paragraphs corrected by their teachers so as to give the researchers time to prepare, but not too long that participants' ability to retain information might be negatively affected.

3.8. Data Analysis

The analysis of the data consisted of three phases; pre-coding (transcription of data, writing of analytic memos, initial development of categories), coding (reduction of data, checking and refining categories), and theorizing (a cyclical process of interpreting data, drawing conclusions, developing theoretical frameworks). Thus, over time tensions were categorized in terms of types and factors which influenced them. Observational and interview data were collected in three phases for each teacher: pre-observation interview, observation, and post-observation interview. These interviews were audio-recorded (with permission), conducted in English by the researcher. Following the pre-observation interview, observational data were collected from the participants, which provided direct evidence of the manner in which the teachers were applying feedback types to correct students' compositions. These data also provided the stimulus for the third phase of data collection with each teacher: a post-observation interview. The purpose of these interviews (which lasted an hour and were also semi-structured and audio recorded) was to discuss with the teachers the options they used while checking students' paper, and to examine the factors shaping teachers' decisions.

The interview data were transcribed and subjected to a process of qualitative content analysis through which a range of beliefs held by the teachers was identified (initially through coding) and then categorized; contextual factors that teachers cited in explaining their feedback strategy were identified in a similar manner. Overall, the process involved close and repeated readings of the interview transcripts and identifying from the data (i.e. inductively) the themes that characterized the teachers' commentaries as they articulated the rationale for their decisions. The teachers were also given the chance to read and comment on the researchers' interpretations of their work.

4. Results and Discussion

In order to delve more into teachers' beliefs and practices to see if there were tensions between them, the teachers were first asked to voice their opinions about the most serious error types and the most effective type of feedback to address them. Then, 5 recent writing samples of their students were observed to see what feedback type they employed in addressing their errors. Post-observation interviews were conducted after the observation phase in order to ask for participants' views of the observation, i.e., the manner through which they corrected the students' paragraphs, the types of feedback they applied and the rationale for those decisions, and to see if there were any discrepancies between their beliefs and practices.

Having interviewed 4 teachers, the researchers found that there were few tensions between novice teachers' stated beliefs and observed practices. However, in the case of experienced teachers more tensions were found.

Regarding the question of what error type based on the model they preferred to correct, all teachers claimed that global treatable errors need to receive meticulous attention, as the students studying at this level may find it difficult to tackle them and are not able to correct errors by themselves, and such errors obviously impede communication. They highly focused on the global section of the errors compared to their level of treatability.

Sara (novice) reported:

Students at this level might use some structures which affect the intelligibility of the text and this is because they haven't mastered that structure fully to use it correctly, so it is the responsibility of the teachers to point it out to them.

Ali (experienced):

such errors, though treatable, are by nature hard to be revised alone. So I guess I would go for this category as it might affect the whole text sometimes if left unnoticed.

However, in practice, all 4 teachers did the opposite and focused on local treatable errors. When asked for justification, experienced and novice teachers mentioned some factors, which influenced their practices:

Students at this level, can hardly self-correct some errors, and therefore need to receive feedback on global treatable errors and we know that. But when it comes to practice and addressing such errors, my experience shows that even when they are corrected, in the follow-up drafts students still make the same errors, and aren't able to self-correct, as their range of vocabulary and knowledge of structure is limited and they can't uptake the correct version in no time, and it takes time. The topics they are also asked to write about is straightforward and easy, and they are more likely to make local errors compared with more global ones. (Mohamad, experienced)

Saeed (a novice teacher) also said that:

Low frequency of some errors is the reason why we highly focus on more frequent ones, in this case local errors and the ones students can come up with the correct version of. As they have gone through some structures before, which are somehow manageable and easy to tackle with, and the writing topics and the content in general are way easy to deal with, they are more likely to use them in their paragraphs, and therefore chances are they are used inaccurately.

Following extracts illustrate examples of his practice:

snack

...my sister and I ate ~~snake~~ at 5:00.

thought

My sister ~~thinked~~ for a long time. The past tense of think is thought as it is the example of an irregular verb

As for question 2, novice teachers preferred type 1 (provision of correct form + metalinguistic comments) and they also did so based on what they said before. They claimed that students at this level expect their teachers to correct their errors as directly as possible; also the syllabus of the teaching context and the methodology (Audiolingual) compelled them to apply this commonly used strategy in their classes. Novice teachers, therefore, practiced what they preached and opted for direct plus metalinguistic comments. They preferred such feedback owing to the fact that young adult learners have not reached the level of competence yet and intellectual capacity to self-correct their errors and they need direct support and help from their teachers.

Sara (novice):

.... although giving direct feedback is way time-consuming at times, especially when it is used along with some explanations about the targeted structure, I think this is the safest method we can use at this level and good news is that students also welcome this, as most of the time they don't bother looking for the right answer, or it might be because students at this level need their teachers to correct their errors directly, and their level of proficiency and lack of knowledge to get the codes used through indirect feedback, wouldn't allow for such strategy. More than this, the syllabus in the institute asks the teachers to do so.

All experienced teachers, on the other hand, confidently reported that they would prefer negotiated type of feedback (type 2), as it allows more cognitive development on the part of the students. The more engaged they are in reaching the correct answer through negotiation, the more independent they will be.

Mohamad (experienced) reported:

I prefer negotiation of errors as it helps discovery learning. I think this is through such feedback that students can develop cognitive development and this is a big step which contributes to having much better learners in the future.

Follow-up interviews, however, proved the opposite and similar to inexperienced teachers they adopted direct plus metalinguistic comment. Interestingly, as novice teachers, the main reason behind this for the experienced participants was because they were worried about losing time and getting behind from the prescribed syllabus in the institute.

As Ali (experienced) Said:

...Negotiation of errors is something that has sometimes happened in my classes, and is my favorite type of feedback. However, in the context where I'm working and the requirements I have to meet, I can't do what I wish all the time. The number of the students and also lack of time don't allow me to apply the strategy I prefer. Unfortunately, I have to follow the institutes' syllabus, which doesn't leave any room for negotiation of written errors at length. Students, as well, at this level might expect their errors to be directly corrected by their teachers.

An example of direct application of feedback by Ali:

Could find

After 10 minutes we can found our house... you are talking about something in the past, so instead of can, you should use "could". After could (modal), we should use simple present tense.

Research question 1:

Based on all the evidence mentioned above, the answer to research question 1 is twofold. Regarding the error type, novice teachers stated that they preferred global treatable errors to correct, but their practice showed otherwise due to the easiness of the writing tasks, and high frequency of local errors. For the preferred type of feedback based on the model, as they believed, they adopted direct, metalinguistic feedback, since the most convincing factors for them were the level of proficiency, students' expectations, and also the institutes' syllabus.

Research question 2:

Contrary to research question 1, for the next question the researchers based on interviews with teachers, observed tensions between experienced teachers' beliefs and practices concerning both written corrective feedback and the errors they had to address. As they mentioned, related to both feedback and error type, due to the reasons mentioned they could not practice what they preached, which would be summarized into the following themes:

As for which error type to focus on, they did the same as inexperienced teachers, and although they said that they preferred global treatable errors to correct, they acted otherwise, and focused on local treatable errors. Easiness of the writing tasks, and students' lack of competence to self-correct global errors in their next drafts made the teachers address local treatable errors. For the preferred type of feedback based on the model, although they preferred negotiated feedback type, they adopted direct, metalinguistic feedback as the most convincing reasons for them were the syllabus they had to follow in the institute, large classes, and also students' expectations.

This research shows that the teachers' beliefs do not always align with their practices when it comes to WCF, as illustrated in Table 2. This table summarizes the two dimensions of written corrective feedback, the beliefs shared by teachers in relation to these aspects of practice, their observed practices in each case, and

the reasons teachers referred to in accounting for the differences between their beliefs and practices.

The Table 2 explains more specifically different forms that tensions can take. From teachers' perspective these might be addressed as follows:

Experienced and novice teachers: I believe in correcting global treatable errors, but my students' inability to self-correct, easiness of the writing tasks, and high frequency of local treatable errors oblige me to primarily focus on local treatable errors.

Experienced teachers: I believe in indirect, negotiated type of feedback, but the institutes' syllabus, students' expectations, and large classes force me to apply direct, metalinguistic feedback.

Table 2
Tensions in WCF Practices and Beliefs

Aspect	Stated belief	Observed practice	Explanation given
Error types (experienced & novice)	Global treatable errors	Local treatable errors	Inability to self-correct, ease of the writing tasks, high frequency of local treatable errors
Feedback types (experienced teachers)	Negotiated feedback	Direct-metalinguistic	Syllabus/students' expectation/large classes

Novice and experienced teachers' beliefs and practices regarding written corrective feedback; tensions and the nature of those tensions.

4.1. Error Types

All teachers' priority regarding the type of error they would focus on was global treatable ones; however, their observed practice proved otherwise. Teachers in this regard stated that the frequency of such errors in students' paragraphs, and the easiness of the writing tasks, obliged them to choose a local treatable category, and another reason mostly for experienced teachers to choose local treatable errors was that due to low frequency of global treatable errors, even when they are

addressed, they cannot make sure that students would self-correct errors and avoid that error in their next drafts. Consistent with the findings of earlier research, when the errors are treatable (Ferris, 1999) or meet the criteria of simplicity (Truscott, 2001), teachers could provide simple rules with adequate metalinguistic explanations. This would clearly justify the reason for which both experienced and novice teachers preferred treatable over untreatable errors in general.

One explanation for this could be justified through what Bitchener and Ferris (2012) stated as one criterion for selecting errors to mark in a particular student paper, which would be the frequency of the error, the ratio of correct/incorrect usages in obligatory contexts, the length of the text, and whether the error type would mark the student as a less competent writer when a real-world reader reads their texts. Nassaji (2017) also mentioned that it should not be assumed that only global-type errors would lead to communication problems; local errors in some contexts can also do so. The results confirm Junqueira and Payant's (2015) statement that although the novice teacher in their study believes that she provides more feedback on global errors and less on local issues, a detailed analysis of her practice displays that most of her WCF is on local issues, but only a few of her feedback is on global issues. This is also in line with Montgomery and Baker's (2007) study, which also investigated the congruence between teachers' perceptions and feedback by comparing the results to the teachers' actual practices. The researchers found that although teachers believed that they provided more WCF on global errors, local errors were ranked as the most common type of error they concentrated on while providing feedback; Less attention was given to global issues. Local errors are related to language forms (Bitchener, East, & Cartner, 2010), and as teachers in the present study stated, they considered local errors as the most frequent ones in students' paragraphs. This is in line with what Lee (2013) reported that most teachers concentrate on errors that are more frequent and stigmatizing.

Similar to the findings of Lee's study (2008), Montgomery and Baker's (2007), and Pearson's (2018), teachers might not be aware of the extent to which they should provide feedback on local and global errors. Another possible reason for teachers' choice may be related to the general policy of the institution or content of the writing classes.

The finding is also in line with Al Shahrani and Storch's (2014) research where

teachers believed they would mostly focus on global issues; however, in practice mechanics prevailed over organization issues. Also, in a study by Mao and Crosthwaite (2019), despite the teachers' beliefs, written corrective feedback on local errors received more attention than global issues. This misalignment between teachers' beliefs and practices was largely influenced by contextual factors, including time constraints and excess workload.

4.2. Feedback Types

As for the feedback type based on the model, novice and experienced teachers applied direct, metalinguistic feedback, and novice teachers particularly thought this would be the best approach for the students at this level, and negotiation of the error and reaching the correct answer is not much of a great help for them, as it needs more intellectual capacity on the part of the learners. More importantly, the syllabus in the institute and students' expectations obliged the teachers to choose this feedback type, and they were worried they might fall behind the prescribed syllabus by the institute.

The findings are in line with those of Lee (2003), Jodaie and Farrokhi (2012), and Amrhein and Nassaji (2010), in which teachers were of the opinion that direct feedback outweighs indirect feedback. The findings of this study, however, disconfirm Lee's (2009) and Hamouda's (2011), where teachers favored an indirect approach. One possible justification for the difference between teachers' beliefs in Lee's (2009) study and those in the present study is that teachers' beliefs in Lee's (2009) study were influenced by the school obligations that make teachers help students correct their own errors. Another reason mentioned by teachers in the present study was that they thought students at this proficiency level would not have linguistic competence to do self-correction. The majority of teachers in previous studies also supported this justification (e.g., Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010; Ferris, 2002). This result is in line with the general principle that feedback explicitness primarily depends on a variety of variables, one of which is the students' proficiency levels, which emerges from previous research (e.g., Ferris, 2002; Storch, 2010; Van Beuningen, 2010). Regarding proficiency levels, teachers' beliefs in this study support the results in the study by Ferris (2002) that direct feedback suits proficient students. Another justification suggested by the

teachers in this study was that students at this level would expect teachers to correct their errors as explicitly as possible.

Experienced teachers were of the opinion that indirect feedback would encourage the students as this strategy would help the learners with cognitive development. Teachers' beliefs concerning the significance of indirect WCF align with written corrective feedback literature (e.g., Ferris, 2002; Lalande, 1982; Storch, 2010; Van Beuningen, 2010), which indicated that indirect feedback is more acceptable because it provides the students with the opportunity to reflect more on their errors. As Lee (2008) believes, when teachers correct students' errors explicitly, it makes them reliant on their teachers.

Although they strongly believed that negotiation of errors is the best choice as through which students can come up with the right answers on their own or with their peers, and it would provide the chance for them to experience discovery learning, and might help them boost their confidence; in practice, however, they corrected the errors directly along with metalinguistic feedback at times. Large classrooms, students' expectations, and curriculum requirements were the main reasons for such practice. In a study to investigate the (mis)alignment between the beliefs of teachers regarding their WCF practice and their actual practice in a Chinese EFL context, Mao and Crosthwaite (2019) also found that large class sizes and student numbers caused teachers' beliefs to be incompatible with their performance concerning direct / indirect feedback. The findings of the present study are in line with Lee (2009) and Hamouda (2011) where teachers preferred indirect feedback type. One justification for the observed tensions between teachers' beliefs in Lee's (2009) study and those in the present study is that school obligations in Lee's (2009) study highly influenced teachers' beliefs that make teachers help students correct their own errors. In the current study, errors in the category of grammar, which are considered to be treatable were given direct feedback type with metalinguistic comments for some errors. This could be attributed to the fact that teachers may not have been aware of which type of feedback should be given on each type of errors. In line with Norouzian's (2015) findings, it was revealed that teaching experience has a significant effect on the direct method of feedback provision by highly experienced teachers. A similar finding was also reported. Guenette and Lyster (2013), in their study, also found that teachers also overused direct corrections compared to indirect feedback strategies, with 71% of the learner errors being corrected through the use of direct correction strategies. Time constraint was a main factor as direct corrections were considered by the teachers to

be less time-consuming compared to indirect feedback, especially in large classes.

5. Conclusion

This study sought to investigate tensions between novice and experienced Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs and practices concerning written corrective feedback. The findings showed that there were fewer tensions between novice teachers' stated beliefs and observed practices; however, this tension was more obvious while interviewing experienced teachers. With regard to the type of error to focus on, both novice and experienced teachers although at first preferred global treatable errors to address, in practice, due to frequency of such errors, they did otherwise and focused on local treatable errors. When it comes the provision of feedback type, there was no observed tension with novice teachers and they applied direct corrective feedback; experienced teachers, on the other hand, concerning this issue applied a different strategy (as opposed to negotiation).

The findings of the current study suggest that although it is inevitable to observe tensions between teachers' beliefs and practices, teachers need to have the right to exert more influence on their practices in their classrooms, as they cannot always act based on their stated beliefs and some of them are constrained by the prescribed syllabus and some other contextual factors. Another most important factor to consider is that teachers need to receive comprehensive training to provide appropriate WCF for the students.

As for the limitations of the study, the researchers could have also included students' beliefs to see what the students' expectations would be when it comes to receiving feedback. However, it should be noted that young adult learners at this level make it difficult for the researchers to reach reliable findings, as they may not allow the teachers to focus on a variety of feedback types. The present study could have added another variable of academic qualifications to see whether subject-specific knowledge would make any differences regarding teachers' beliefs and practices. Future studies would most probably find more robust findings by doing so, which will bring more significant contributions to studying teachers' beliefs. Future research can also explore emerging patterns in teachers' beliefs and practices after completing a training course aimed at increasing and raising their understanding of teachers' stated beliefs and practices.

References

- Alderson, J. C., & Wall, D. (1993). Does washback exist? *Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 115–129. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/14.2.115>
- Alshahrani, A., & Storch, N. (2014). Investigating teachers' written corrective feedback practices in a Saudi EFL context: How do they align with their beliefs, institutional guidelines, and students' preferences? *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37(2), 101–122. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.37.2.02als>
- Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers think is right and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 95–127.
- Andrews, S. (2003). Teacher language awareness and the professional knowledge base of the 12 teacher. *Language Awareness*, 12(2), 81–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410308667068>
- Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 227–257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(00\)00027-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00027-8)
- Basturkmen, H. (2012). A genre-based investigation of discussion sections in research articles in dentistry and disciplinary variation. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(2), 134–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.10.004>
- Bazerman, C. (1994). Being disciplined, paper presented at an invitational symposium. *Discursive practices in workplace, school and academic settings: recent research directions in writing*, Faculty of Education, Monash University.
- Bitchener, J. (2012). A reflection on 'the language learning potential' of written CF. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 348–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.006>
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 191–205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001>
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 193–214. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp016>
- Bitchener, J., East, M., & Cartner, H. (2010). *The effectiveness of providing second language (L2) writers with on-line written corrective feedback*. Ako

Aotearoa.

- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.
- Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development*. Multilingual Matters.
- Borg, S. (1999a). Studying teacher cognition in second language grammar teaching. *System*, 27(1), 19–31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(98\)00047-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(98)00047-5)
- Borg, S. (1999b). The use of grammatical terminology in the second language classroom: A qualitative study of teachers' practices and cognitions. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 95–126. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.1.95>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903>
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and Practice*. Continuum.
- Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Braidi, S. M. (2002). Reexamining the role of recasts in native-speaker/nonnative-speaker interactions. *Language Learning*, 52(1), 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00176>
- Elbaz, F. (1983). *Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge*. Nicholas Publishing.
- Eslami, Z. R., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Promoting advantageous ways for teachers and learners to deal with corrective feedback. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 19, 48–65. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2020.19.04>
- Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research*, 38(1), 47–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013188960380104>
- Farrell, T. S., & Kun, S. T. K. (2008). Language policy, language teachers' beliefs, and classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(3), 381–403. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm050>
- Fathman, A., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing (Cambridge Applied Linguistics): Research insights for the classroom* (Cambridge Applied Linguistics, pp. 178–190). Cambridge University Press.

- Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 1–11. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80110-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6)
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. The University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the shortand long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81–104). Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R., Pezone, S., Tade, C. R., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions & implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(2), 155–182. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(97\)90032-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(97)90032-1)
- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161–184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X)
- Feryok, A. (2008). An Armenian English language teacher's practical theory of communicative language teaching. *System*, 36(2), 227–240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2007.09.004>
- Gebel, A., & Schrier, L. L. (2002). Spanish language teachers' beliefs and practices about reading in a second language. In J. H. Sullivan (Ed.), *Literacy and the second language learner (Research in second language learning)* (pp. 85–109). Information Age Publishing.
- Gahin, G. H. M. A. (2001). *An investigation into EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in Egypt: an exploratory study* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Exeter].
- Goldouz, E., & Baleghizadeh, S. (2021). Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions about the most serious types of written errors and the most effective feedback types to treat them *MEXTESOL Journal*, 45(1), 1–13.
- Guenette, D., & Lyster, R. (2013). Written corrective feedback and its challenges for pre-service ESL teachers. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 69(2), 129–153.

- Hamouda, A. (2011). A study of students and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Saudi EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 128–129. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p128>
- Hiep, P. H. (2007). Communicative language teaching: Unity within diversity. *ELT Journal*, 61(3), 193–201. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm026>
- Jodaie, M., and Farrokhi, F. (2012). An exploration of private language institute teachers' perceptions of written grammar feedback in EFL classes. *English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 58–69. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n2p58>
- Johnson, K. E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Reading Behaviour*, 24(1), 83–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10862969209547763>
- 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. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X\(94\)90024-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(94)90024-8)
- Junqueira, L., & Payant, C. (2015). "I just want to do it right, but it's so hard": A novice teacher's written feedback beliefs and practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.11.00>
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implication of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 65–90. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2701_6
- Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 187–98. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.3.187>
- Kennedy, C. (1988). Evaluation of the management of change in ETL projects. *Applied Linguistics*, 9, 329–342. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/9.4.329>
- Kennedy, C., & Kennedy, J. (1996). Teacher attitudes and change implementation. *System*, 24(3), 351–360. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(96\)00027-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(96)00027-9)
- Kvale, S. (1996). The 1,000-page question. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 2(3), 275–284.
- Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66(2), 140–149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1982.tb06973.x>
- Lee, I. (2003). How do Hong Kong English teachers correct errors in student writing? *Education Journal*, 31(1), 153–169.
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of

- Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 285–312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.08.001>
- Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 69–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.10.001>
- Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal*, 63(1), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn010>
- Lee, I. (2013). Research into practice: Written corrective feedback. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 108.
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing (Cambridge Applied Linguistics): Research insights for the classroom* (Cambridge Applied Linguistics, pp. 57–68). Cambridge University Press.
- Lin, H. L., Gorrell, J., & Silvern, S. B. (1999). Taiwan early childhood pre-service Teachers' professional beliefs. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 15(2), 242–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02568540109594964>
- Lu, J. W. (2003). The evolving contributions in international strategic management research. *Journal of International Management*, 9(2), 193–213. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1075-4253\(03\)00006-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1075-4253(03)00006-1)
- Lyster, R. (2002). Negotiation in immersion teacher–student interaction. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3–4), 237–253. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355\(03\)00003-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(03)00003-X)
- Magno, C., & Amarles, A. (2011). Teachers' feedback practices in second language academic writing classrooms. *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment*, 6(2), 22–30.
- Mao, S., & Crosthwaite, P. (2019). Investigating written corrective feedback: (Mis)alignment of teachers' beliefs and practice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 45, 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.05.004>
- Montgomery, J., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002>
- Nassaji, H. (2007). Elicitation and reformulation and their relationship with learner repair in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning*, 57(4), 511–548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00427.x>

- Nassaji, H. (2009). Effects of recasts and elicitations in dyadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. *Language Learning*, 59(2), 411–452. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00511.x>
- Nassaji, H. (2011). Correcting students' written grammatical errors: The effects of negotiated versus nonnegotiated feedback. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(3), 315–334. DOI: [10.14746/ssllt.2011.1.3.2](https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2011.1.3.2)
- Nassaji, H. (2017). The effectiveness of extensive versus intensive recasts for learning L2 grammar. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(2), 353–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12387>
- Norouzian, R. (2015). Does teaching experience affect type, amount, and precision of the written corrective feedback? *Journal of Advances in English Language Teaching*, 3(5), 93–105.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers, beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307>
- Pearson, W. S. (2018). Written corrective feedback in IELTS writing task 2: Teachers' priorities, practices, and beliefs. *TESL-EJ*, 21(4), 1-32.
- Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, 37(3), 380–390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.03.002>
- Richards, J. C. (1996). Teachers' maxims in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 281–296 <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588144>
- Richardson, V., Anders, P., Tidwell, D., and Lloyd, C. (1991). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in reading comprehension instruction. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(3), 559–586. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312028003559>
- Şakrak-Ekin, G., & Balçıkanlı, C. (2019). Written corrective feedback: EFL teachers' beliefs and practices. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 19(1), 114–128.
- Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal*, 23(1), 103–110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829202300107>
- Storch, N. (2010). Critical feedback on written corrective feedback research. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 29–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00511.x>

[org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119181](https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119181)

Truscott, J. (2001). Selecting errors for selective error correction. *Concentric: Studies in Linguistics*, 27(2), 93–108.

Van Beuningen, C. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 1–27. DOI:[10.6018/ijes.10.2.119171](https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.10.2.119171)

Van den Branden, K. (1997). Effects of negotiation on language learners' output. *Language Learning*, 47(4), 589–636. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00023>

Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

About the Authors

¹ **Elnaz Goldouz** is currently a PhD candidate of TEFL at Shahid Beheshti University in Tehran, Iran. She has taught English at the Iran Language Institute for many years and has long experience in teaching English for Examination Purposes (EEP), particularly in IELTS preparation courses. Her research interests include EFL teacher education and corrective feedback in EFL students' writing.

² **Sasan Baleghizadeh** is Associate Professor of TEFL at Shahid Beheshti University in Tehran, Iran, where he teaches courses in Applied Linguistics and Materials Development. He is interested in investigating the role of interaction in English language teaching and issues related to materials development. His published articles appear in both national and international journals including *TESL Reporter*, *MEXTESOL Journal*, *ELT Journal*, *Language Learning Journal*, and *Issues in Language Teaching*.

Appendix A: Teachers' semi-structured interview schedule**[Questions for the pre-observation interviews]**

Thank you so much for accepting to take part in this study. We would like to start by asking you some general questions.

(I) General background questions

Teachers' profiles

A. What degree do you hold? In what major?

B. What courses have you taught in English?

C. How long have you been teaching English?

(II) Specific beliefs about giving written corrective feedback (WCF)**A. Focus of WCF**

What types of error (based on the model shared with them) do you prefer to correct? Why?

B. Explicitness of WCF

What kind of correction do you prefer? Type 1 (provision of correct form + metalinguistic comments) or Type 2 (negotiated).