It's Not Just Grammar: A Teacher's Introspection on Corrective Feedback

Kelsey Ulrich-Verslycken and Eva Kartchava

This article presents a seasoned ESL teacher's self-observation account of how her oral corrective feedback (CF) beliefs and practices evolved over a 20-week period of participation in a CF professional development course alongside regular reflective journal writing. The teacher wrote three reflective journals (before, midway, and after the study) and kept weekly pre- and post-class lesson journals in which she documented and reflected on the ways she provided oral CF to a group of adult learners in a synchronous computer-mediated context (SCMC). Both the reflective journals and lesson journals underwent multiple rounds of qualitative coding, identifying the areas of the teacher's CF foci—themes of CF provision (in terms of type, quantity, and timing), perceptions of student engagement with the provided feedback, and ways she strategized her lesson plans to promote CF provision. Results showed changes in how the teacher adjusted her lesson plans to promote specific CF types and increase the saliency of the feedback she provided but solidification of the type and target type (i.e., a propensity for recasts and grammatical corrections), amount, and timing of her CF provision. The findings build upon results of previous studies by mirroring divergence between the teacher's beliefs and practices and exploring the factors that motivated the teacher to adjust her CF practices.

Cet article présente l'auto-observation d'une enseignante d'anglais langue seconde chevronnée sur l'évolution de ses croyances et de ses pratiques en matière de rétroaction corrective à l'oral (RC) au cours d'une période de 20 semaines dans le cadre d'une participation à un cours de développement professionnel en RC, en plus de la rédaction régulière d'un journal réflexif. L'enseignante a rédigé trois entrées dans le journal réflexif (avant, à mi-parcours et après l'étude) et des entrées hebdomadaires dans un journal de cours avant et après la classe dans lesquels elle a documenté et réfléchi à la façon dont elle a fourni la RC à l'oral à un groupe d'apprenants adultes dans un contexte d'enseignement synchrone des langues assisté par ordinateur. Les journaux de réflexion et les journaux de cours ont fait l'objet de plusieurs cycles de codage qualitatif, identifiant les sujets et thèmes de l'intervention de l'enseignante en matière de RC (en termes de type, de quantité et de temps), les perceptions de l'engagement des apprenants à l'égard de la rétroaction fournie, et les façons dont elle a élaboré ses plans de cours pour promouvoir les possibilités de RC. Les résultats ont montré des changements dans la façon dont l'enseignante a ajusté ses plans de cours pour promouvoir des types spécifiques de RC et mettre davantage l'accent sur la rétroaction qu'elle fournissait. Toutefois, elle a continué à privilégier certains types et cibles de RC (c'est-à-dire une propension aux reformulations et aux corrections grammaticales), la quantité et les moments où elle fournissait de la RC. Les résultats s'appuient sur les résultats d'études antérieures en reflétant

https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v42i1/1418

les divergences entre les croyances et les pratiques de l'enseignante et en explorant les facteurs qui ont motivé l'enseignante à ajuster ses pratiques en matière de RC.

Keywords: action research, grammar, oral corrective feedback, professional development, reflective teaching, synchronous computer-mediated classroom, teacher beliefs and practices

---

In *TESOL: A Guide*, Liu and Berger (2015) explore what Nunan (2015) called the "chameleon-like character" (p. xiii) of the acronym that can refer to the three dimensions of TESOL: the profession, the field of study, or the association of English language professionals around the world. While the three characteristics often intertwine, the guide places the profession and, by extension, professionalism, at the core of TESOL. This is because language teaching is necessarily seen as a profession in that it entails such fundamentals as a code of ethics and disciplinary standards, a developed body of knowledge that is informed by continuous research and knowledge-building initiatives, established certification and licensing requirements, as well as advocacy and outreach activities that promote the field and its contributions to wider communities. While the TESOL membership is varied in terms of both the professionals involved—from language teachers and material writers to researchers and program administrators—and goals pursued (e.g., determining one's identity in the community or exploring possibilities for professional growth), the authors argue that "the TESOL profession constitutes an ongoing process of professional development—one that does not necessarily begin with one's first teaching job nor end with retirement" (Liu & Berger, 2015, p. 37), a sentiment echoed by many in the field (e.g., Bailey et al., 2001; Cirocki & Hallet, 2024; Johnson, 2009; Lange, 1990; Richards & Farrell, 2005).

Since the 1990s, reflection—as a learning activity—has become an established part of professional development (PD) offered to language professionals. This is evidenced in the mandates of various teaching associations, including TESOL International Association, and offerings of educator-focused conferences (e.g., TESOL Inc., TESL Canada, TESL Ontario), as well as by the reflection-type activities put forth for their effectiveness by several publications on the topic of PD (e.g., Bailey et al., 2001; Cirocki & Hallet, 2024; Johnson, 2009; Liu & Berger, 2015; Richards & Farrell, 2005). Touted for its power to help teachers to "subject their own beliefs of teaching and learning to a critical analysis, and thus, take more responsibility for their actions in the classroom" (Farrell, 2001, p. 23), reflection is said not only to arm teachers with a better understanding of the factors that shape and affect their teaching but also to highlight areas in need of improvement (Alemi & Tajeddin, 2020; Farrell, 2022). Yet only thinking about one's teaching or the lacunae that need to be addressed is insufficient to effect change, as teachers need to engage in reflective teaching, in which they critically examine their assumptions about teaching and juxtapose these with their in-class practices (Zeichner & Liston, 1996) to engender better future practices (Farrell, 2016). For increased effectiveness, reflective teaching needs to be driven by an inherent sense of responsibility and open-mindedness that reflective teachers wholeheartedly pursue (Zeichner & Liston, 1996).

While research on teacher reflection has produced mixed results in terms of the benefits and challenges (e.g., Wolfensberger et al., 2010; Yayli, 2009), it has also ascertained several factors (e.g., teaching/learning experiences and lack of reflection training) that can affect the quality of the practice (e.g., Afshar & Farahani, 2018; Farrell, 1999a, 1999b; Ulas, 2018; Yin, 2018). What has not been done consistently, however, is having teachers themselves—instead of researchers—critically examine and reflect on the assumptions they hold about their practice (or particular aspects of it) with the purpose of enhancing their teaching. The need for such teacher-led research has been iterated by many (e.g., Burns, 2010; Burns et al., 2022; Cirocki & Burns, 2019; Cirocki & Hallet, 2024), not only to promote classroom-based investigations done for teachers by teachers but also to have teachers contribute to wider PD initiatives for improvements in their own pedagogical practices and those across other classrooms and institutions. After all, teachers who conduct classroom-based research tend to better understand student learning (Edwards & Burns, 2016) and deliver improved instruction (Cirocki & Burns, 2019; Sato & Loewen, 2019), all the while becoming motivated to partake in additional research (Yuan et al., 2016) and establish a new identity for themselves as teacher-researchers (Edwards & Burns, 2016).

According to Richards and Farrell (2005), teacher-led or action research can be defined as "teacher-conducted classroom research that seeks to clarify and resolve practical teaching issues and problems … [to help] teachers … develop a deeper understanding of many issues in teaching and learning as well as acquire useful classroom investigation skills" (p. 171). Because this type of inquiry aims to address problems of the classroom, practitioners can investigate myriad concerns ranging from lesson planning to unplanned in-class behaviours, such as provision of corrective feedback (i.e., a teacher's reaction to learner erroneous utterances, CF). While the importance of CF to language development has largely been ascertained (e.g., Li, 2010; Nassaji, 2015, 2016; Nassaji & Kartchava, 2017a, 2021), teacher-led investigations of their own attitudes about CF and related practices are rare. In fact, we know of only three studies that involved language practitioners examining their feedback practices (Delante, 2017; Kartchava et al., 2021; Min, 2013), and these focused solely on providing CF to writing.

Understanding how language teachers view the complex phenomenon of feedback, the effectiveness of which is mediated by a wide range of factors, including feedback type, error type (e.g., grammar, lexis, pronunciation), contextual limitations, and learner variables (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2017b) and enact it in their practice is, therefore, paramount, especially when investigated by the practitioners themselves. This article provides a detailed account of one in-service teacher's (i.e., the first author's) reflection on her CF attitudes and actions. Specifically, it outlines how the teacher's beliefs about feedback evolved in a span of a 20-week term as a result of her keeping two types of journals and attending a university-level seminar on corrective feedback taught by the second author.

Literature Review

Reflective Practice and Teacher-Led/Action Research

Reflective practice among teachers has long been recognized as important in language education and has been sought for development among pre-service and in-service teachers alike (Farrell, 2007, 2015). Engaging in regular and critical reflection of one's teaching is a hallmark of effective teachers (Alemi & Tajeddin, 2020) who, in addition to being autonomous, knowledgeable, and sensitive to the changes in their instructional settings, are "complex individuals who are expected to have a range of personal qualities, to be able to satisfy the needs of their students, and to have the knowledge and skills to provide instruction in a range of language areas" (Griffiths & Tajeddin, 2020, p. xxvi). Ongoing reflection enables teachers to remain aware of their practice by consistently analyzing its strengths and weaknesses, identifying needed changes and possible ways to address them, and assessing the effects of the implemented changes, all the while avoiding burnout – a serious concern in the field (Farrell, 2015, 2022). To reflect on teaching, practitioners are generally advised to engage in reflection-on-action, reflection-in-action, reflection-for-action, exploratory practice, or classroom-based research (e.g., Cirocki & Hallet, 2024).

The first three types of reflection—reflection *on*, *in*, and *for* action—were put forth by Schön (1987) to examine past and future actions in one's teaching. Reflection-on-action invites teachers to retrospectively assess the quality of a taught lesson, with the goal of identifying any problems with it, finding reasons for these, and offering possible remedies to be tried in the future. Reflection-in-action enables teachers to build a repertoire of methods to effectively react to both positive and negative events as they unfold in the classroom, whereas reflection-for-action helps practitioners to connect theory and practice to predict and address future issues. Cirocki and Widodo (2019) have recently expanded on these three reflection types by proposing a four-component reflective practice model of reflection-before-lesson, reflection-during-lesson, reflection-after-lesson, and reflection-beyond-lesson. They argue that the model accounts for the need for teachers to reflect from initial planning (reflection-before-lesson) to execution (reflection during and after lessons) of their lessons and beyond (reflection-beyond-lesson). This final type of reflection parallels Farrell's (2015) "beyond practice" concept that accounts for critical explorations of "the moral, political and social issues" (p. 30) that surround and affect teachers' reality within their classrooms and the wider field of language education. To examine a classroom environment, for example, exploratory practice (i.e., the fourth method suggested for reflection) can be used for both the teacher and the students to collaboratively negotiate the reality of the instructional setting they share. Teachers may also choose to consider how their practice may be affected by their individual morals, beliefs, and social understanding, as well as by the broader socio-political values imposed on them (wittingly or not) by their educational experience and workplace policies.

Classroom-based or action research, in turn, is pursued by teachers

> to support standardised and methodical reflective practice, improve their teaching and that of their colleagues, scrutinise the assumptions that underpin the implementation of educational theory, examine the positive and negative impacts of educational practice, explore different components of the way in which students learn, and/or assess and enact the priorities of the school as a whole. (Cirocki & Hallet, 2024, pp. 91–92)

The term "research" here is intentional to highlight teachers' ability to produce high-quality investigations that link theory to practice and yield broad implications of impact for language education, teacher education, and policy building. Furthermore, teachers who conduct research are said to be autonomous, for they are reflective and self-directed (Dikilitaş, 2020) in identifying and seeking solutions for issues in their own practice (Dikilitaş & Griffiths, 2017; Wang & Zhang, 2014). A sustained pursuit of action research opportunities increases teacher autonomy (Dikilitaş & Griffiths, 2017) and empowers practitioners to determine the direction of their own teaching and professional development.

Cyclical in nature, action research involves several steps. It can begin with identification of a problem or self-observation that ignites the cycle of questioning, preliminary investigation (in the form of observation or review of existing literature), hypothesis formation, research plan construction, data collection and analysis, interpretation, and results dissemination (Bailey et al., 2001; Cirocki & Hallet, 2024). The findings are then carefully considered for further follow-up or action that may involve a new cycle of reflection and research (Farrell, 2022). While systematic collection of data is what designates this type of reflective practice as research, Cirocki and Hallet (2024) advocate for the use of mixed data sources and "ethically" necessary dissemination of the findings "to help improve student well-being and instructional practices within classrooms and to devise strategies that will improve the quality of language education more generally" (p. 94).

Teaching Journals as Instrument for Research and Reflective Practice

Whereas teachers may use various sources to collect data on the problem or issue they are trying to solve through action research, some of the more commonly documented sources include journals, lesson recording, blogging, focus groups, peer observation and/or coaching, post-observation conferences, and lesson study projects. Among these, teaching journals are perhaps best suited to serve as both a data-collection instrument and an aid in the action research process. This is because, as the former, teaching journals provide an ongoing account of observations, reflections, critical incidents, lesson insights, and thoughts or ideas that a teacher might want to consider or review at a later point in time. As a data-collection tool, journals enable teachers to keep a record of classroom events and observations, without which they "often [have] no substantial recollection of what happened during a lesson and cannot use the experience of successful (and sometimes unsuccessful) teaching as a source for further learning" (Richards & Farrell, 2005, p. 69). These data can then be subjected to analyses of patterns, which not only may be continuously reassessed but also may yield new or recurrent insights about the initial observations that the process of writing about teaching is likely to generate.

In reviewing the various tools used in published TESOL investigations of reflective teaching, Farrell (2016) found journal writing to be the second most studied reflection tool (29 of 116 studies), with discussion (that included teacher discussion groups and post-observation conferences) being the first ($n = 40$). Thematically, the journals focused on the participants' (both pre- and in-service teachers') views about engaging in journal writing (e.g., Abednia et al., 2013), understanding of TBLT principles and practices (East, 2014), development of teacher identity (Kanno & Stuart, 2011), and autonomy and decision-making skills (Genc, 2010), to name a few. More recently, journal writing has been utilized in explorations of the issues teachers choose to reflect on in their learning and teaching experiences (e.g., Khanjani et al., 2018; Kömür & Çepik, 2015; Yee et al., 2022). Still, these studies were conducted by L2 scholars, with teachers serving as participants, not as researchers of their own beliefs and practices. Because journal writing allows for an intrapersonal, introspective, and critical examination of one's daily teaching experiences and enables practitioners to solve the issues they identify as problematic, teaching journals may prove conducive to teacher-led examinations of such little-understood areas of classroom teaching as teachers' CF practices. Having teachers scrutinize their own CF beliefs and practices in a regularized manner is likely not only to shed light on how and why they supply or withhold correction but also to sustain their CF-related reflective practice and, by extension, professional development in the long term. To date, there have been only three teacher-led accounts of their own feedback beliefs and practices (Delante, 2017; Kartchava et al., 2021; Min, 2013), with only one having used journals as a data source. Min (2013) generated journal entries to document her beliefs about feedback to writing (WCF) as she taught a university-level course on academic writing in Taiwan. To understand her own WCF practices, the teacher-researcher examined the comments she supplied on her students' compositions at the beginning and end of the term. The findings indicate that while the teacher's beliefs and WCF actions generally matched throughout the term, the quality of her feedback changed toward the end, when she prioritized probing the students' communicative intentions and helping them to more effectively relay their intended meanings instead of identifying what she thought to be the problem in their writing at the beginning of the term and simply supplying a relevant correction for it. Min attributed the change to implementing peer review and training students in the practice as well as to consulting her learning log of notes on CF research.

While research on training teachers about CF has shown that reading research alone is insufficient in effecting change in teachers' feedback practices, it may be enough to engender practitioner-initiated reflection on their CF-related attitudes and behaviours (Kamiya, 2016b; Kamiya & Loewen, 2014). Li (2017) posited that for systematic and substantial changes to occur in teachers' beliefs, reading about research should be combined with hands-on practice activities to consolidate the empirical knowledge with the teachers' reflections on practice (p. 152). Such activities could include conducting a replication study, tutoring an L2 learner, or engaging in a focused discussion. Vásquez and Harvey (2010), for example, found that having graduate students attend a course on SLA theory, participate in a partial replication of a published study on CF, and reflect on their CF knowledge at the beginning and end of the course brought on changes in how they viewed feedback and the CF-related practices they vowed to pursue in the future.

Tutoring a language learner and learning about SLA allowed pre-service teachers to reconcile their initial views on the role of error in language learning with those in the research literature (Busch, 2010). Similarly, combining theory with an experiential component of providing L2 learners with WCF allowed graduate students in Kartchava et al. (2021) to better understand the theoretical and practical aspects involved in effective feedback provision. Kartchava et al. (2020) argued that exposure to theoretical knowledge about CF in combination with in-class discussions on the topic may have prompted novice teachers who attended an SLA course to see the timing of feedback provision differently from those who did not. University-level teachers of Spanish in the United States who had taken SLA courses were more likely to consider learner characteristics and error types when providing in-class feedback than their counterparts without such experience (Gurzynski-Weiss, 2016). More recently, Ha and Murray (2021) reported on a PD training program (that consisted of a workshop and reflective follow-up activities) conducted with ten in-service EFL teachers in Vietnam to explore their CF beliefs about oral CF and possibly reshape some of their CF practices. The results showed that participation in the carefully designed PD program helped the teachers to align their CF beliefs and practices with the findings from SLA research. Specifically, these teachers strengthened their beliefs about the importance of CF, types of errors to address, and having teachers, peers, and learners themselves generate CF. Considerable changes were noted in the teachers' beliefs about the effectiveness of the different CF types and the need to broaden the range of corrective techniques they used in practice. The teachers also grew more comfortable with supplying immediate feedback without the fear of interrupting students.

What this body of research has yet to demonstrate is whether teaching a group of adult language learners, keeping a reflective journal on one's CF views and behaviours, and simultaneously attending targeted training on CF (in the form of a graduate seminar) yields change in a teacher's feedback beliefs and practices. This article represents a collaborative effort between an experienced teacher and a teacher-educator to attempt such a study, with a focus on oral CF provision.

Teacher Corrective Feedback Beliefs and Practices

Corrective Feedback

Defined as any information that alerts a learner to the inaccuracies of their L2 (oral, written, or computer-mediated) output, corrective feedback has been of interest to both L2 researchers and teachers, since they want to understand whether—and if so, how—CF aids in language learning. While research has confirmed a facilitative role for CF (e.g., Brown, 2016; Brown et al., 2023; Kang & Han, 2015; Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010b; Nassaji, 2015; Nassaji & Kartchava, 2017b, 2021), it has also outlined several variables that mediate its effectiveness. Among these are CF type, CF noticeability, the nature of the error, timing of feedback, learners' L2 proficiency, and individual factors (e.g., age, gender, anxiety, literacy, etc.—see Nassaji & Kartchava, 2021, for review). Descriptive research has identified the kinds of techniques teachers use to target errors in their classrooms (e.g., Ellis, 2009; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). For oral CF, Lyster and Ranta (1997) have identified two broad categories of techniques—reformulations (recasts and explicit correction) and prompts (elicitation, metalinguistic cue, repetition, clarification request)—that differ in application in terms of their explicitness and type of learner reaction (i.e., uptake) they generate. Along the implicit–explicit continuum, recasts are implicit since they rephrase an erroneous utterance without drawing explicit focus to the nature and scope of the error, but explicit correction overtly notifies the learner not only to the presence of an error but also to how best to correct it. While prompts are generally explicit, they, too, vary, with clarification requests ("Pardon me?," "Sorry?") being the most implicit. Furthermore, while reformulations are input-providing and allow learners to process the correct form, prompts are output-pushing and encourage learners to self-correct. Yet the absence of a response on the part of a learner could imply that the learner is simply unable (due, for example, to task constraints or a dearth of opportunities to react to CF) or developmentally not ready to act on the provided correction. Distribution-wise, recasts tend to dominate, especially in L2 contexts (Brown, 2016; Ha & Murray, 2023; Sheen, 2004), with teachers preferring recasts for their non-intrusive nature and ease of employment (Nassaji, 2016). Teachers, however, may not always be cognizant of their preferences when it comes to CF types or whether these preferences align with their CF actions in the classroom (Ha & Murray, 2023; Junqueira & Kim, 2013).

Teacher CF Beliefs and Practices

The relationship between teacher beliefs (i.e., assumptions teachers hold about the theoretical and practical aspects of their work) and teacher practices has been classified as "bi-directional" (Kartchava, 2021, p. 602) in that beliefs influence the decisions teachers make in the classroom (Farrell, 1999a) but also that these beliefs stem from the teachers' experience as language learners, through teacher training, and from their classroom practice (S. Borg, 2003; Kartchava, 2021). This influence is not stable, though, as teachers' beliefs are not always reflected in their classroom practice (Farrell & Ives, 2015; Farrell & Kun, 2007), including their provision of CF. Explorations into teacher beliefs and CF behaviours have shown both parallels (Junqueira & Kim, 2013; Kamiya, 2016a) and divergences (Bao, 2019; Basturkmen et al., 2004; Ha & Murray, 2023; Roothooft, 2014; Yüksel et al., 2021) between what teachers state they do and what they actually do in practice. In the oft-cited study by Basturkmen et al. (2004), three ESL teachers' CF practices were compared in relation to their reported beliefs and showed both convergence and divergence within and among the teachers. Specifically, one teacher mirrored their preference for recasts in their practice, and even though all three teachers believed in types that prompted student self-correction, only one teacher demonstrated this type in practice. Even though the teachers also varied on which types of errors to focus on, with one teacher positioning grammatical corrections as paramount and the other two prioritizing communication, they corrected grammatical, lexical, and pronunciation errors relatively equally in practice.

Similarly, Roothooft (2014) compared the CF beliefs and practices of ten Spanish teachers of English and found divergences in CF type, timing, and quantity by target error type. While the teachers overwhelmingly reported preferring prompts, they relied on recasts in practice. Timing-wise, seven out of ten teachers felt uncomfortable interrupting their students to provide CF, but only two reflected this belief in their classrooms. Finally, half of the teachers significantly misestimated both the total percentage of errors they corrected and the percentage of errors they corrected by target type, overestimating their correction of grammar errors and underestimating their correction of vocabulary errors. Bao (2019) examined the CF beliefs and practices of Chinese L2 teachers and found that while some stated beliefs were reflected in the teachers' practice (i.e., how often and by whom CF should be provided), other beliefs (on CF types and quantity by target types) diverged from their practice. Reflective of Roothooft, Bao also found that teachers tended to overestimate how often they corrected grammatical errors, but that overestimation extended to all three target types. Similar findings were reported in Yüksel et al. (2021), who found parallels between 20 Turkish university EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in terms of CF quantity and who should provide CF, and incongruences between CF target type, timing of provision, and type of CF. While Yüksel et al. found that the gap between teachers' beliefs and practices of grammar errors to be the biggest among the three target types, they also noted that the correlation between teachers' beliefs and practices for grammar errors was the strongest. Ha and Murray (2023) have also found inconsistencies in oral CF beliefs and practices among primary-school EFL teachers in Vietnam. While the teachers cited importance in supplying correction to pronunciation errors, in practice they prioritized feedback to vocabulary errors even though pronunciation and grammatical errors were the most prevalent. In terms of CF techniques, the teachers stated that prompts were more effective than recasts, but they used more recasts when teaching. Notably, these studies parallel each other in that teachers' beliefs about who should provide CF and how much CF should be provided seem to be more consistently reflected in teachers' practices over beliefs about when, how, and on what errors.

Teacher beliefs have also been considered in conjunction with the experience of the teacher, with findings suggesting that more experienced teachers show more alignment between their beliefs and practices (Basturkmen, 2012) and may consider the pedagogical intent of CF over novice teachers, leading them to incorporate more delayed and peer-provided feedback in their classrooms (Fallah & Nazari, 2019). Junqueira and Kim (2013), for example, compared the CF beliefs and practices of a novice and an experienced EFL teacher teaching the same curriculum and found that although both practitioners provided similar amounts of CF, the experienced teacher created more opportunities for CF overall and incorporated varied CF techniques to address more error types. Kartchava (2021) argued that targeted training in CF alongside reflection on feedback practices may be instrumental in helping all teachers, regardless of experience, recognize how they provide feedback, improve their CF practices, and better understand how their learners perceive and engage with those corrections. Support for this has already been demonstrated in several investigations (e.g., Ha, 2022a; Ha & Murray, 2021; Ha et al., 2024). This training can be long or short, include conference workshops or ad-hoc discussions on the topic between professionals, or incorporate a learning log of notes or a complete course on CF. Ha et al. (2024), for example, showed that even a very experienced teacher's beliefs and practices about CF can be positively reshaped through carefully designed CF training that includes a workshop along with follow-up practical and reflective activities. Yet we know of no study that has considered how training and reflection in parallel with actual teaching might affect a teacher's oral corrective feedback beliefs and practices, nor have changes in beliefs and practices been explored in conjunction with an online classroom context—the setting of the study reported here.

CF Provision in SCMC

Synchronous computer-mediated classrooms (SCMCs)—that is, applications or platforms that allow for simultaneous video/audio and text-based communication among the teacher(s) and students (Kozlova & Zundel, 2013)—offer affordances for teacher–student and student–student interaction that expand beyond face-to-face (FTF) context. Such features as the chat box, screensharing, and screen annotation features allow for multimodal CF provision, combining video and audio with written input/output (Cerezo, 2021; Hampel & Stickler, 2012). The multimodality of SCMC has been postulated to increase learners' noticing of focus-on-form (Ziegler & Mackey, 2017), in terms of both learners' noticing of their own errors (Lai & Zhao, 2006; Payne & Whitney, 2002) and their noticing of teacher-provided CF (Shekary & Tahririan, 2006). Yilmaz and Yüksel (2011) compared learners' noticing of recasts between FTF and written SCMC CF provision, finding that learners who received recasts through text-based chat scored higher in a post-test oral picture description task over those who received recasts in FTF communication. These findings indicate that the written form may increase the saliency of recasts, which the researchers attributed to the learners' opportunity to read and re-read written corrections. In a direct comparison of video-based SCMC and FTF classrooms, Rassaei (2017) considered learners' understanding of teacher recasts and found that although learners noticed recasts more in the FTF context, they interpreted a higher percentage of the SCMC recasts as corrective in nature. Kartchava and Nassaji (2019) compared the noticeability of CF in FTF and computer-mediated 3D environments (i.e., a 3D virtual world application), noting almost twice as many utterances were produced in FTF over the 3D context. However, the percentage of errors receiving CF in the two contexts was very similar, as was the percentage of errors that the learners repaired, leading the researchers to conclude that noticeability of CF was comparable between the contexts.

To date, only one study has explored teacher CF beliefs and practices in SCMC, finding similar incongruences as were shown previously in FTF contexts. Uludağ (2024) compared 10 experienced tertiary teachers' beliefs about CF in general, CF techniques, and CF target types in the SCMC classroom. All 10 teachers believed in the importance of CF, preferred recasts to the other CF types, and prioritized phonological errors over grammatical and lexical ones. Practice-based findings confirmed the teachers' proclivities toward recasts, accounting for 57% of provided feedback, but deviated in terms of target type, with 47% of CF targeting lexical errors over 29% that targeted phonological errors. These findings reflect evidence from face-to-face contexts with respect to the propensity of recasts (Brown, 2016) and lexical errors (Ha, 2022b). Notably, all 10 teachers reported having to adapt their CF provision for the SCMC context to overcome the challenges of immediate CF provision due to computer lag.

No previous study, to the best of our knowledge, has directly explored the impact of simultaneous PD training on teachers' CF beliefs and practices in the SCMC space, let alone conducted by the teachers themselves and longitudinally across an intact course. To that end, this study attempts to fill the gap by exploring one teacher's CF beliefs and practices in conjunction with targeted CF training. Specifically, the study was guided by the following research question: Did the teacher's participation in CF training impact her CF beliefs and practices? If so, how was this manifested, and why?

Methodology

Context and Participants

The focal participant of the study is an experienced English language instructor in second and foreign language contexts. She holds an MA in applied linguistics and an English language teaching certification. At the time of the study, she was in the beginning stages of a doctoral degree in applied linguistics and had been teaching young and adult learners full time for eight years in both FTF and SCMC contexts. She regularly attended PD conferences and seminars offered by her employers and TESL organizations, amounting to approximately 30 hours annually. Her training on CF was, however, limited. This prompted the teacher to undertake this self-observation not only to identify her stance on CF in general but also to understand when, how, and why she provided CF to her learners. To assist her in this, the teacher attended an elective university-level CF seminar course.

The students participating in this study ($n = 4$) were employees of a private company based in Quebec. Ranked at the B1 proficiency level (Council of Europe, 2020), the students attended a 40-hour course, taught by the teacher, with the purpose of improving their English-speaking skills. Two were native speakers of French, whereas the other two spoke French with high proficiency but claimed Spanish and Arabic as their mother tongues. In addition to the two-hour weekly group classes, each student had a 30-minute private telephone conversation with the teacher. The group classes followed the same general structure of a warm-up activity, teacher-led class discussion, grammar lesson, student-led discussion, and a wrap-up activity. The private telephone conversations were individualized for each learner and were generally used for small talk or to review previously studied grammar structures. Group classes were conducted through Cisco Webex, a videoconferencing software that includes screensharing, screen annotations, and a chat box.

Because the focus of this study was on the teacher's own beliefs and behaviors, students were informed of the study, but their consent was neither required nor sought.

The PD Course

A graduate-level CF seminar course served as the PD opportunity that the teacher pursued. The course spanned 13 weeks and provided an overview of the theory, research, and practice of corrective feedback in L2 learning and teaching. A range of core and developing themes in the area were addressed, including the effectiveness of feedback, instructional contexts, research methods, learner and teacher views about CF, training in CF, and feedback types and modes. The topics were explored through readings, lectures, guest-based events, hands-on experiences, and group and class discussions. In terms of the assignments, the participants were required, by way of a reflective journal, to conduct a case study on themselves to determine whether their views on CF changed throughout the term, interview a CF scholar, and research and present a CF-focused topic of choice to peers.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were gathered through two sets of journals: weekly pre- and post-class lesson journals ($n = 34$) and three reflection journals (pre-study, mid-study, and post-study). The first set of journals (i.e., lesson journals) focused on the teacher's CF practices, whereas the second set of journals (i.e., reflection journals) addressed her beliefs about CF. The audience for the journals was the teacher herself, as the goal was to explore her own perceptions and practices. It is important to note that the data collected for this study differed from the assignments in the PD course.

Weekly pre- and post-lesson journals were collected for 17 out of 20 weeks of the group classes. These were produced within one hour before and after each class and were guided by the following three questions: (1) How do I incorporate CF in the class? (2) How do students respond to the CF I provide? and (3) Do I think my CF strategy is effective, and why (not)? The reflection journals were collected before, during, and after the course and probed the teacher's beliefs about her use of CF in the SCMC context. The first reflection journal was completed two weeks before the lesson journaling began, the second reflection journal was produced after the week 8 lesson journal, and the third reflection journal was written one week after lesson journaling was completed.

Both sets of journals were read four times to gain a tentative picture of the contents. Data were then analyzed qualitatively following an interpretive phenomenological approach, which situates the data within the circumstances of the participants' experience and participants' self-interpretation of the experience (Adu, 2019, p. 12; Dörnyei, 2007). This approach was selected to separate the participant's perspective of the study from the researcher's interpretation. In alignment with this approach, data were coded three years after data collection to reduce the influence of the participant's memory of the situation on the data analysis.

Both sets of data underwent multiple rounds of first- and second-cycle thematic coding (Saldaña, 2013, 2016). Specifically, four rounds of first-cycle coding identified patterns of CF types and target types (provisional coding), teacher beliefs (values coding), reflections on the CF course and its impact (in vivo coding), and the teacher's perspective of the efficacy of her CF practices through learner response (structural coding) (Saldaña, 2013, 2016). First-cycle provisional coding quantified how often the teacher perceived her use of each CF type and on what target type, providing descriptive evidence for her general CF tendencies as well as qualitative evidence for why this provision occurred. Second-cycle coding focused and then themed the data into three recurrent phenomenological patterns of CF provision, perceptions of learner engagement with CF, and considerations of CF in lesson planning.

Results

The reflection journals anchored the teacher's beliefs at three set points in the study, whereas the weekly lesson journals gave evidence to how these beliefs were realized or unrealized in her classroom practice. The analysis of the three reflection journals showed changes in terms of (1) how the teacher approached her provision of type, quantity, and timing of CF, (2) how she elicited students' engagement through considering students' uptake and her use of written CF to support oral CF, and (3) how she strategized her lesson planning to consider the quantity, target type, and who should provide the CF by activity type. The results are reported in terms of these three reflection areas and their manifestations across the term (i.e., before, at the midpoint [week 8 of 17], and after the teaching).

Approach to CF Provision

The analysis showed themes of CF type, quantity, and timing in terms of how the teacher approached CF provision in the classroom.

Preconceptions

In terms of CF type, at the onset of the study, the teacher acknowledged a propensity toward recasts. In the pre-study reflection journal, she explained that she "expected to see … how much I rely on recasts." She attributed this to the communicative nature of recasts, believing the implicit nature of recasts to be "friend[lier]" in that they "[do] not impede the flow of conversation" and she could help "co-construct meaning." She also noted some use of metalinguistic feedback, but not because it is a type she "lik[ed] to use" but rather because she thought her students "expect[ed]" it.

The teacher did not discuss quantity in general but did note that she provided more CF in some sections of the class over others. She also did not consider feedback timing at all.

Mid-Study Review

In her mid-study reflection journal, the teacher repeated her assumption that she uses "recasts the most," although she reflected on trying to incorporate other types of feedback. She stated that she doesn't "prompt very much" but felt "more confident giving these students explicit corrective feedback." In her early pre- and post-class journals, the teacher reiterated that she was providing recasts the most, stating, "it has become pretty clear … that I tend to recast a lot." However, as the PD course explored divergent perspectives of the efficacy of recasts versus prompts (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Goo & Mackey, 2013; Mackey & Philp, 1998), the teacher reconsidered her recast-centric approach, saying that she "want[s] to prompt more" because "research suggests that prompts are more salient and more conducive to repair than recasts." Ultimately, this goal was only partially realized. She did note for some weeks that she found herself prompting more than before but ultimately found it frustrating that she was "struggl[ing] to consciously choose which type of feedback to produce at any one time."

Her consideration of CF type was also impacted when the PD course discussed feedback provision by error type (grammatical, lexical, phonological; Brown, 2016; Lyster, 1998). At that time, she considered how she allocated CF by target type, noting that she thought she didn't give much phonological feedback but gave lexical feedback when a student was struggling to find a word, and that she primarily provided grammatical feedback. Descriptive analysis of the provisional codes of the lesson journals confirmed her assumption, finding a prevalence for grammatical corrections (49%) over lexical (26%) and phonological (25%) across the study.

Although at the beginning the teacher did not consider how much CF she provided, she started questioning the practice after learning about expert teachers tending to provide more CF in the PD course (Kartchava, 2021; Kartchava et al., 2020). For many consecutive weeks, she expressed frustration that she "did not give enough feedback," indicating that she wished to increase the overall quantity of her CF provision without a defined metric of what is "enough."

In terms of timing, the teacher noted a reliance on delayed CF. She expressed that she didn't like interrupting her students and preferred to "wait until the utterance feels complete and then provide feedback." She referred to a specific procedure, where she would "type the error and provide delayed feedback for how to change the utterance." She attributed this technique to the affordances of the SCMC space.

Post-Study Review

By the end of the study, the teacher had shifted her focus from CF type to error types. In her post-study reflection journal, she ruminated on why, stating, "in the beginning of this journey I expected to really know the types of feedback I used, whether that be recasts, etc., and perhaps thought I could change my own CF practices, but in the end, I realized that I couldn't …."

Values coding showed that this shift might be attributable to her teaching perspective, as she frequently expressed her desire to create a "student-centered classroom," seeing the role of a teacher as a "co-constructor of meaning" rather than an authority figure (particularly with adult learners).

In term of CF quantity, in week 10, the teacher noted that she thought she "corrected more in today's class" than she had "ever corrected … previous to this," indicating an intentional increase of CF quantity. She also began to notice when and why she was providing more CF. In week 11, for example, she attributed her increase in CF quantity to the activity, as it "provided a lot of opportunities for lexical CF." Overall, as the course drew to a close, the teacher focused more on specific opportunities for CF as opposed to a general consideration of the quantity that she was providing. In her final post-class journal, she lamented that "there was not a lot of feedback given today" but did delineate when she gave feedback for what error types, noting that there was "some lexical at the beginning of class [and] during the student-led discussion," "some grammatical in our grammar lesson," and "some phonological … doing a reading activity."

The teacher continued to rely on delayed CF, which she reasoned was easier to implement in the SCMC space due to the "lag" in video/audio. She did, however, try to incorporate immediate feedback when the PD course discussed timing of CF (Quinn, 2021; Quinn & Nakata, 2017) in week 9 of the study. She outlined one specific instance:

> The next time, I decided to [i]nterrupt her …. She started her utterance "I am agree." And I tried to interject "Here …," but she kept speaking her opinion. Because we are on a computer, my interruption came later …, so it interrupted her. Then we went back and forth trying to negotiate who should speak …. Finally, I gave the explicit correction "You can just say that you agree, you don't need 'am' there."

Ultimately, the teacher did not change her approach to CF timing, as delayed CF maintained the classroom flow better than immediate CF, but she did consider students' responses to her delayed feedback timing as the study progressed.

Adjustments for Student Engagement

Throughout the study, the teacher reflected on how she perceived students' engagement with the CF she provided through explorations of student uptake (response and/or repair; Ellis et al., 2001) of the target form and the integration of written CF (WCF) to support her oral CF (OCF) in the SCMC context.

Preconceptions

Although the teacher acknowledged a propensity for recasts early on, she recognized that this was not the most salient CF type. The teacher noted that she "[had] worked to increase how much metalinguistic feedback" she gives because she thought "French speakers have strong metalinguistic instruction in their native language" and she therefore "expected [her] students to attend to" metalinguistic feedback more than others.

She also noted that she knew students would not always uptake the feedback she provided. She believed this may be because she did not give students enough time "to critically consider my feedback and then … repeat it back to me" or that perhaps "they may not notice the feedback." Finally, she noted that even if the students did notice the CF she was providing, they might not repeat back the target form due to students "not understand[ing]" or being unready to process the feedback, choosing not to uptake because they disagreed with the supplied correction, or not feeling it necessary to reply in that instance.

As for the integration of WCF to support OCF in the context, the teacher would "typically write comments on the lecture notes during class for students to see their mistakes" but did not explore her beliefs about this method.

Mid-Study Review

In her mid-study journal, the teacher expressed her attempts to incorporate more explicit correction, as she saw her students being more "comfortable" with explicit correction. She also speculated on the efficacy of the feedback she was providing in conjunction with error type. In her week 2 pre-class journal, she stated that she thought "grammatical feedback [to be] the least salient for my students" and that lexical and phonological feedback were "easier for students to attend to." She attributed this to the "complexity" of grammatical reformulations, noting that "if my correction involves changing more than one element in the utterance, it makes sense that the students are less likely to uptake and repair that suggestion."

As for uptake, she expressed early that she didn't feel she provided enough time for students to notice the feedback and repair the target form. In her mid-study reflection journal, she reiterated this struggle and lamented that although she "ha[d] been working on trying to wait for students to repair the error before moving forward" it just "[didn't] happen all of the time." She also noted that her use of recasts might be preventing uptake, reflecting the readings from the PD course that explored how the efficacy of recasts was mediated by a multitude of factors, including learner proficiency (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Mackey & Philp, 1998), recast saliency (Ellis & Sheen, 2006), and the extent of the repair (Sheen, 2006). She wanted to incorporate more prompts to "focus more on [the] clarity of [her] corrective feedback."

In terms of her use of WCF to support OCF, her mid-study review reiterated her efforts to write students' erroneous utterances in a screencast document, then "underline, bold, or italicise" the error before "writ[ing] … the correction" in conjunction with "giv[ing] oral feedback." She noted that "this is to draw attention to the error and show as well as tell students how I'm correcting the error." She supported her belief by referencing a reading from the PD course that stated how a "written record" (Ziegler & Mackey, 2017, p. 83) in the SCMC space could support learner's noticing of divergences between their output and the target. She also stated that when she writes the error into the screencast document “sometimes my students even recognize that there is an error before I correct them.” Even though she repeatedly referenced this method as a strategy for her to “increase the saliency” of her CF provision, the teacher worried that her typing of the students’ utterances was “distracting” for them or that they might feel “embarrassed” by seeing their mistakes on the screen, although recent literature seems to suggest that this concern may be misguided and that these multimodal affordances might positively impact learners’ engagement (Huang & Li, 2024; Lee & Liu, 2024) . Regardless of her concerns, she continued the practice, arguing that it was “more salient” for “more complex corrections” and that she was able to explicitly “point out” the error and provide the correction.

Post-Study Review

By the second half of the study, the teacher had largely abandoned discussion of the type of CF she used and instead considered how her approach to CF was affecting her students. She recalled two conversations with different students about her CF style. One student asked the teacher directly about her CF style as it was different from that student’s previous teacher, who “would correct everything by saying ‘no, you have to say ….’” Another student “expressed … earlier … that she wasn’t really interested in getting more corrective feedback because she didn’t want to feel stressed,” but in week 13 that same student asked for more CF. The teacher reflected on these conversations in her post-study reflection journal, noting that “it was a really important moment because it told me that students were aware of CF as a practice and … expect their teacher to correct their mistakes.”

In terms of uptake, the teacher focused more on specific instances of feedback-repair in the second half of the study. When the PD course explored research into how learners perceive teachers’ CF (Kartchava, 2016; Kartchava & Ammar, 2014; Loewen et al., 2009), she tried to notice how students would respond to feedback. In week 10, she “noticed that … I was getting a lot of verbal confirmations … [but] not many … were repaired.” She remarked that “some of the corrections were … applied later” and outlined one specific episode where she gave whole-class explicit feedback to reformulate “I go to grocery” to “I go grocery shopping.” She stated that “two of the students started to use the correct form as our discussion progressed” and reflected that she “[thought] this was a great end result” because “it was obvious that the CF was noticed.”

As for the teacher’s use of WCF to support her OCF, by the end of the study she had stopped mentioning the method outside of expressing her “surprise” that “even though this is largely an oral discussion class, OCF is not the only type of CF that is used.”

Considerations of Lesson Planning

In terms of lesson planning, the teacher considered activity type to have an impact on the quantity of CF provided per task, target type, and who would provide the feedback.

Preconceptions

At the onset of the study, the teacher predicted that she would give differential amounts of OCF depending on the section of the lesson and the task types therein. She noted specifically that she expected to “give the brunt of feedback during focus-on-form activities, specifically the grammar portion of the class.”

She made no mention of target type or who should provide feedback in the pre-study reflection journal.

Mid-Study Review

As the teacher grappled with the quantity of CF she was providing, she began to reflect on whether the tasks she selected were conducive to CF in general. She stated early in the study that she thought her class plans "flow[ed] well with a variety of activities and a lot of encouragement for student output," but she was still dissatisfied with the quantity of her provision. The PD course also considered the role of task in CF provision (Foster & McGettigan, 2021; Kartchava & Gatbonton, 2014), and from there her perception of the tasks she was creating was shaped by her consideration of whether those tasks might encourage opportunities for CF. In week 8, she described a task that she thought "[would] be conducive to corrective feedback because it's a more defined task with more defined targets." As the teacher started to recognize the relationship between the tasks and CF opportunities, she realized that "more structured activities (i.e., activities with more defined linguistic goals) gave … more opportunities for feedback." She considered that perhaps her struggle to provide "enough" feedback could be attributed to how she structured her lesson plans, which she saw as something that she could improve.

At the mid-point of this study, the teacher had still not considered strategizing target type in her lesson planning.

As for feedback provider, it wasn't until the PD course explored peer CF (Iwashita & Dao, 2021; Sato, 2013; Sato & Lyster, 2012) that the teacher considered whether peer CF was occurring in her class. She directly referenced the PD course in the week 5 pre-class journal, stating "this week … we are reading about peer-to-peer feedback." She then set it as her goal for that day's class to "notice whether and how my students are using peer-to-peer feedback." In her post-class journal that day, she notes a specific instance of peer negotiation: "One student was saying that she had a friend that was 'proche to me' and another student rephrased it as 'rare to me' and they negotiated to conclude that the friend was 'close to me.'"

As the class progressed and the teacher became more comfortable with how her students interacted with each other, she found that some students were "more willing … to give feedback," prompting her to give them the space to negotiate meaning on their own without her feedback. This was a notable change in the teacher's practice, as due to her learning about peer CF in the course and noticing how her students interacted on their own, she felt more confident allowing the student-led discussion section of the class to be entirely student-directed.

Post-Study Review

In terms of quantity, the second half of data collection showed more consideration of quantity of CF per activity type. In week 9, she mentioned that she "made a conscious effort to provide more corrective feedback," which she attributed to "more structured activities [that] gave me more opportunities for feedback." For the rest of data collection, her pre-class journals showed an emergent pattern of considering what activities she had planned in conjunction with what error types those activities would create opportunities for:

> For today … we have a fairly structured class. Our warm-up activity is focused on specific vocabulary … [and] the discussion activity also has provided target phrases … this means that today's activities and discussions will be a good foundation for specific lexical and grammatical feedback.

This pattern continued through the end of the study, and she frequently mentioned how the activities she had selected were targeting one or more error types and then reflecting on whether her intended CF error type was realized. She reflected in a post-study journal that although she “couldn’t really change” the CF type she relied on, she was able to “cater activities” to “different types of feedback.” She found that it was easier to provide CF when she had developed the task specifically for a certain type of CF as opposed to providing CF by reacting to unexpected errors.

With regard to feedback provider, once the teacher felt confident in peer negotiation in the student-led discussion section, she refrained from mentioning peer CF for the rest of the study outside of week 14, where she specified peer CF as one of the types she used.

To summarize, the teacher’s CF beliefs and actions changed as a result of keeping a journal and attending a course on CF. As Table 1 shows, the changes were particularly notable in how the teacher planned for, provided, and had learners engage with CF in her lessons.

Discussion

This study set out to document one teacher’s journey to understand her CF beliefs and behaviours over a 20-week term. In conjunction with taking a course on CF, the teacher kept a journal in which she reflected on her CF beliefs and recorded day-to-day observations of her feedback practices. Analysis of the journals has outlined the complexities inherent to CF conceptualization and provision as well as a multitude of factors that the teacher contended with as she attended to the accuracy of her students’ output. These tensions are evident in how the teacher questioned and then solidified her CF approach, the matters the teacher had not considered before participating in the PD course, and several points of change in alignment with her developing beliefs.

In the beginning of the study, the teacher’s understanding of her beliefs and practices were mediated by her background knowledge on CF, which—given the paucity of direct training she had received on CF at the onset—was relatively sparse. Notably, she made no mention of target error types, peer CF, or CF timing in her pre-study reflection journal. The lack of these aspects of CF indicates that the teacher was unaware of them or, at least, didn’t consider them in her practice. While she firmly established an approach to timing (i.e., delayed) due to the SCMC space, considerations of peer CF and error types were more emergent. She directly referenced course readings on peer CF (Iwashita & Dao, 2021; Sato, 2013; Sato & Lyster, 2012) to guide her questioning of whether peer CF occurred in her class, as well as when and how often. By the end of the study, she became confident in how peer CF was provided in her classroom and had stopped questioning the practice. This result mirrors Cirocki and Hallet’s (2024) multi-step cycle of action-based reflection and research, where the teacher has an experience (the PD course), reflects on that experience (journaling), and takes action (establishing a new practice in her classroom) (Cirocki & Hallet, 2024, p. 73). These findings also support the call for research in conjunction with practice-based reflection (Zeichner & Liston, 1996), as a theoretical understanding alone may not have spurred change in the teacher’s practice.

The teacher’s inclination for using recasts as the main CF method was apparent from the start. She attributed this inclination to the conversational nature of recasts, which mirrors literature on recasts as the most-often used CF type in conjunction with teachers’ belief that they do not impede the flow of conversation (Bao, 2019; Roothooft, 2014; Yüksel et al., 2021). Due to her participation in the PD course, she was exposed to literature that compared the saliency and noticeability of recasts and prompts (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Goo & Mackey, 2013; Mackey & Philp, 1998), which led her to reconsider her practice and try to incorporate more prompts. Ultimately, she was unable to change her primary CF type but did attempt to incorporate a wider variety of CF types into her practice, which signals the effectiveness of the critical examination of her CF beliefs and practices that the teacher undertook by way of regular journaling. Scrutinizing her stance on CF and corrective behaviours allowed the teacher not only to understand herself as the supplier of feedback but also to identify remaining gaps in her knowledge of the area. Participating

Table 1

Summary of Changes to the Teacher's Beliefs and Perceived Practices

Theme	Factor	Pre	During	Post
CF provision	CF type	Propensity toward recasts	Desire to incorporate more prompts; change in focus to CF target error type	No longer a priority
	Quantity	CF in some sections over others	Need to incorporate more CF overall to align with "expert" teachers	Increased satisfaction with quantity; more consideration of quantity by error type
	Timing	Not considered	Reliance on delayed CF due to SCMC audio/video lag	No change in timing method
Learner engagement with CF	Uptake quantity	Students didn't always uptake CF	Lack of uptake could be due to complexity of correction or allotment of time for student repair	Direct consideration of which students would repair what CF
	WCF to support OCF	Noted but not explored	Written corrections are more salient, but may embarrass students	Practice solidified
Lesson planning considerations	CF quantity by task	More CF noted in focus-on-form / grammar activities	Some task types are more conducive to CF than others	Activities planned to target specific grammatical and lexical forms
	Error type targeted	Not considered	Not considered	Create specific opportunities for specific error types
	Who provides CF	Not considered	Teacher should be comfortable giving students space to provide peer CF	Peer CF included in practice

in professional development and by extension drawing on the information about CF in her practice are likely to sustain the teacher's CF-related reflective practice in the long run (Farrell, 2015, 2022).

Target error types emerged as a core consideration of the teacher's practice as the study progressed. Although she did not mention error type in the pre-study reflection, indicating that she was not necessarily aware of them as a category of CF, the PD class's discussion (Brown, 2016; Lyster, 1998) of error type led to multiple changes in the teacher's beliefs and practices. First, the teacher started considering error type as opposed to CF type/method in her understanding of her CF practices. This may be attributed to her expressed belief in a "student-centered" classroom, as the focus on error type as opposed to CF type was easier for her to notice, as it stemmed from paying attention to her learners' errors instead of her own actions. The introduction of error type as a consideration also led the teacher to evaluate how her selected activities brought about certain types of errors. This evolution of practice to cater to students' needs over the actions of the teacher was a key finding of Min (2013), whose reflective process identified an issue in her written CF (the tendency to focus on her perspective of what the writer meant instead of uncovering the writer's intention) that led her to evolve her feedback practice to better cater to her students.

The teacher's shift in focus from herself as the feedback provider to her students as the feedback receivers was also reflected in her considerations of learner uptake as an indicator of student engagement. CF effectiveness (i.e., noticing and uptake) was explored early in the PD course (Lyster & Saito, 2010a; Nassaji, 2016); the same week that the teacher completed the pre-study reflection journal. While she knew that her students didn't always uptake the CF she provided and mentioned it as a consideration for the study, she was entirely unsure of how her CF practices affected uptake. This became a central consideration in how her practices changed across the study, where she would consider how the tasks she chose might create or hinder opportunities for certain types of errors. In this case, the practice of reflection analysed the teacher's existing practices (Cirocki & Hallet, 2024; Farrell, 2001, 2015, 2022) and highlighted areas where the teacher could improve her practice (Alemi & Tajeddin, 2020). This shift in focus resulted in the largest overall change across the study, where the teacher became far more aware of how her task selection catered to different types of CF, leading her to intentionally choose tasks that might promote certain error types and therefore create more opportunities for CF. These findings support CF's role as reactive form-focused instruction, where teachers may preplan activities to generate certain communicative output and give more overt feedback (Ranta & Lyster, 2017, p. 48).

When the research presented in the PD course spoke to the comparable efficacy of immediate and delayed CF (Quinn, 2021; Quinn & Nakata, 2017), the teacher attempted to incorporate immediate CF into her practice to emulate the PD readings. She was ultimately unsuccessful, which may be attributed to her general reluctance to interrupt her students, but her reliance on delayed CF aligns with the literature on CF in the SCMC space that reflects her experience with the audio/video 'lag' (Uludağ, 2024). Furthermore, the SCMC context provided affordances that were not present in FTF contexts, particularly the ease in which the teacher could incorporate written support (i.e., through screensharing and the chat box) of her oral CF. These multimodal affordances have been supported in the literature, with indications that written CF may be more salient (Yilmaz & Yüksel, 2011) and that the mixed modality of SCMC may increase noticing of CF (Ziegler & Mackey, 2017).

Finally, some topics were the result of conversations that the teacher had directly with the students in her course. While these conversations were only tenuously explored, it should be noted that the teacher had never directly asked her students their opinion of her CF method before undertaking this study. In week 4 of lesson journaling, she asked her students what they thought about her CF method. While their responses at the time were somewhat generic (i.e., "yes, it's good"), she did note multiple times throughout the rest of the course that her students brought up her CF method on their own. It seems, then, that the teacher felt emboldened enough by the action research process to engage directly with the learners about their perspectives and preferences, emulating the teacher autonomy associated with self-directed action research (Dikilitaş, 2020; Dikilitaş & Griffiths, 2017; Wang & Zhang, 2014).

Implications and Limitations

The present study gives evidence for the pedagogical value of regular reflective journaling and review (Cirocki & Hallet, 2024; Cirocki & Widodo, 2019) in conjunction with exposure to professional development (Prodromou, 2020) in that it may prompt changes in teachers' beliefs about and approach to CF in the classroom. Notably, these changes may be longitudinally traced across the action research period to ascertain specific themes of amelioration that may be individually ascribed; that is, reflective journaling in teacher training may impart positive change in general, but the specifics of those changes might depend on the teacher and the focus of their reflections. In the case of the present teacher-led research, changes were identified through themes of how the teacher provided CF by type, timing, and general quantity, how she promoted student engagement through evidence of learner uptake and the incorporation of written CF to support oral CF, and how she developed her lesson plans to strategize CF provision in terms of task type, specific error types, and recognizing both herself and learners as feedback providers.

The inherent lack of generalizability within the singular case study design must be recognized. Likewise, this study focused solely on the teacher-researcher's personal account of her beliefs and practices; without classroom observation, this study is firmly parameterized by self-exploration and introspection. The egocentrism of the first author filling the role as the sole participant of the study must also be acknowledged. Some conditions have been implemented to ensure validity, namely the time span between data collection and analysis and the inclusion of the second author, who, as the instructor of the PD course, served as a guide to overcome (Gray, 2020) the teacher's "apprenticeship of observation" (i.e., perspectives of pedagogy based on the teacher's experience as a learner, M. Borg, 2004; Lortie, 1975) and provided an intersubjective perspective on the results (Færch & Kasper, 1987). Nonetheless, a researcher's own account of their practice will always be emic in nature. Finally, the timeline of events was not wholly parallel: the PD course began one week before the teacher's first reflection journal (though this did not influence the first reflection), the weekly lesson journals began in week 4 of both the PD course and the participant course, and the PD course ended seven weeks before the participant course concluded. Nevertheless, direct correspondences could be drawn between the topics of the PD course and the evolution of the teacher's perspective of practice.

To overcome these limitations, further research would benefit from a greater participant number, particularly multiple participant cases with the same PD training and teaching context. Likewise, further studies might consider PD training and reflection with varied levels of teacher education, teacher experience, and educational contexts to better generalize the findings.

The Authors

Kelsey Ulrich-Verslycken is a PhD candidate in the School of Linguistics and Language Studies at Carleton University. Her primary research interest is the dynamic interplay between teachers and learners in the second language classroom. Her research focuses specifically on how teacher task selection and provision of corrective feedback is influenced by and influences learner engagement, willingness to communicate, and feedback noticing and uptake.

Eva Kartchava is associate professor in the School of Linguistics and Language Studies at Carleton University. Her main research interest is to explore the processes involved in the acquisition and teaching of second/additional languages (L2) in the classroom setting. Her research has focused on form-focused instruction, corrective feedback, the role of noticing in L2 learning, individual differences, as well as teacher cognition and education.

References

Abednia, A., Hovassapian, A., Teimournezhad, S., & Ghanbari, N. (2013). Reflective journal writing: Exploring in-service EFL teachers' perceptions. *System*, *41*(3), 503–514. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.05.003

Adu, P. (2019). *A step-by-step guide to qualitative data coding*. Routledge.

Afshar, H. S., & Farahani, M. (2018). Inhibitors to EFL teachers' reflective teaching and EFL learenrs' reflective thinking and the role of teaching experience and academic degree in reflection perception. *Reflective Practice*, *19*(1), 46–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2017.1351353

Alemi, M., & Tajeddin, Z. (2020). Reflection and good language teachers. In C. Griffiths & Z. Tajeddin (Eds.), *Lessons from good language teachers* (pp. 41–53). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108774390

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *28*, 543–574. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060268

Bailey, K. M., Curtis, A., & Nunan, D. (2001). *Pursing professional development: The self as source*. Heinle.

Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes: Teachers' beliefs versus their practices. *System*, *82*(3), 140–150. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.004

Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *System*, *40*(2), 282–295. https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.system.2012.05.001

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. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.243

Borg, M. (2004). The apprenticeship of observation. *ELT Journal*, *58*(3), 274–276. http://doi.org/10.1093/elt/58.3.274

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

Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(4), 436–458. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814563200

Brown, D., Liu, Q., & Norouzian, R. (2023). Effectiveness of L2 written corrective feedback in developing L2 accuracy: A Bayesian meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research* [Advance online publication]. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221147374

Burns, A. (2010). *Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners*. Routledge.

Burns, A., Edwards, E., & Ellis, N. J. (2022). *Sustaining action research: A practical guide for institutional engagement*. Routledge.

Busch, D. (2010). Pre-service teacher beliefs and language learning: The second language acquisition as an agent for change. *Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 318–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810365239

Cerezo, L. (2021). Corrective feedback in computer-mediated versus face-to-face environments. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 494–519). Cambridge University Press.

Cirocki, A., & Burns, A. (2019). Language teachers as researchers. *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL*, *8*(2).

Cirocki, A., & Hallet, W. (2024). *Professionalising English language teaching: Concepts and reflections for action in teacher education*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009350235

Cirocki, A., & Widodo, H. P. (2019). Reflective practice in English language teaching in Indonesia: Shared practices from two teacher educators. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *7*(3), 15–35. https://doi.org/10.30466/IJLTR.2019.120734

Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching assessment—Companion volume*.

Delante, N. L. (2017). Perceived impact of online written feedback on students' writing and learning: A reflection. *Reflective Practice*, *18*(6), 772–804. http://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2017.1351351

Dikilitaş, K. (2020). Teacher autonomy and good language teachers. In C. Griffiths & Z. Tajeddin (Eds.), *Lessons from good language teachers* (pp. 54–66). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108774390.008

Dikilitaş, K., & Griffiths, C. (2017). *Developing language teacher autonomy through action research*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Oxford University Press.

East, M. (2014). Mediating pedagogical innovation via reflective practice: A comparison of pre-service and in-service teachers' experiences. *Reflective Practice*, *15*(5), 686–699. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2014.944128

Edwards, E., & Burns, A. (2016). Action research to support teachers' classroom materials development. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *10*(2), 106–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2015.1090995

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, *63*(2), 97–107. http://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, *51*(2), 281–318. http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00156

Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *28*, 575–600. https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310606027X

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1987). *Introspection in second language research*. Multilingual Matters.

Fallah, N., & Nazari, M. (2019). L2 teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback: The mediating role of experience. *English Teaching & Learning*, *43*, 147–164. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-019-00020-7

Farrell, T. S. C. (1999a). The reflective assignment: Unlocking pre-service English teachers' beliefs on grammar teaching. *RELC Journal*, *30*(2), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829903000201

Farrell, T. S. C. (1999b). Reflective practice in an EFL teacher development group. *System*, *27*(2), 157–172. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00014-7

Farrell, T. S. C. (2001). Tailoring reflection to individual needs: A TESOL case study. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, *27*(1), 23–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607470120042528

Farrell, T. S. C. (2007). *Reflective language teaching: From research to practice*. Continuum.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). *Promoting teacher reflection in second language education: A framework for TESOL professionals*. Routledge.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2016). The practices of encouraging TESOL teachers to engage in reflective practice: An appraisal of recent research contributions. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(2), 223–247. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815617335

Farrell, T. S. C. (2022). Operationalizing reflective practice in second language teacher education (SLTE). *Journal of Second Language Teacher Education*, *1*(1), 71–88. https://doi.org/10.1558/slte.21881

Farrell, T. S. C., & Ives, J. (2015). Exploring teacher beliefs and classroom practices through reflective practice: A case study. *Language Teaching Research*, *19*(5), 594–610. http://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541722

Farrell, T. S. C., & Kun, S. T. K. (2007). Language policy, language teachers' beliefs, and classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(3), 381–403. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm050

Foster, P., & McGettigan, M. (2021). The role of task in the efficacy of corrective feedback. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 777–795). Cambridge University Press.

Genc, Z. S. (2010). Teacher autonomy through reflective journals among teachers of English as a foreign language in Turkey. *Teacher Development*, *14*(3), 397–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2010.504028

Goo, J., & Mackey, A. (2013). The case against the case against recasts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *35*(1), 127–165. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263112000708

Gray, P. L. (2020). Mitigating the apprenticeship of observation. *Teaching Education*, *31*(4), 404–423. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2019.1631785

Griffiths, C., & Tajeddin, Z. (2020). Preface: An overview of good language teachers. In C. Griffiths & Z. Tajeddin (Eds.), *Lessons from good language teachers* (pp. xxv–xxix). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108774390

Gurzynski-Weiss, L. (2016). Factors influencing Spanish instructors' in-class feedback decisions. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*(1), 255–275. http://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12314

Ha, X. V. (2022a). Effects of a professional development program on teachers' oral corrective feedback practices. *System*, *110*, 102917. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102917

Ha, X. V. (2022b). High school EFL teachers' oral corrective feedback beliefs and practices, and the effects of lesson focus. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2021-0213

Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2021). The impact of a professional development program on EFL teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. *System*, *96*, 102405. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102405

Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2023). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, *27*(1), 137–167. http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.12801.99682

Ha, X. V., Murray, J. C., & Reynolds, B. L. (2024). "Without the video I wouldn't have known": An experienced EFL teacher learning to provide oral corrective feedback. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *34*(3), 1141–1158. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12556

Hampel, R., & Stickler, U. (2012). The use of videoconferencing to support multimodal interaction in an online language classroom. *ReCALL*, *24*(2), 116–137. https://doi.org/10.1017/S095834401200002X

Huang, H., & Li, M. (2024). The impact of technology-enhanced language learning environments on second language learners' willingness to communicate: A systematic review of empirical studies from 2012 to 2023. *Language Learning & Technology*, *28*(1).

Iwashita, N., & Dao, P. (2021). Peer feedback in second language oral interaction. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 275–299). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789.014

Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. Taylor & Francis.

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. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *69*(2), 181–206. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.1536

Kamiya, N. (2016a). The relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *10*(3), 206–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2014.939656

Kamiya, N. (2016b). What effect does reading academic articles on oral corrective feedback have on ESL teachers? *TESOL Journal*, *7*(2), 328–349. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.210

Kamiya, N., & Loewen, S. (2014). The influence of academic articles on an ESL teacher's stated beliefs. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *8*(3), 205–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2013.800077

Kang, E., & Han, Z. H. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta-analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, *99*(1), 1–18. http://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12189

Kanno, Y., & Stuart, C. (2011). Learning to become a second language teacher: Identities-in-practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*(2), 236–252. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01178.x

Kartchava, E. (2016). Learners' beliefs about corrective feedback in the language classroom: Perspectives from two international contexts. *TESL Canada Journal*, *33*(2), 19–45. http://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v33i2.1235

Kartchava, E. (2021). The role of training in feedback provision and effectiveness. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 598–619). Cambridge University Press.

Kartchava, E., & Ammar, A. (2014). Learners' beliefs as mediators of what is noticed and learned in the language classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *48*(1), 86–109. http://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.101

Kartchava, E., Bu, Y., Heidt, J., Mohamed, A., & Seal, J. (2021). Towards a better understanding of the complex nature of written corrective feedback and its effects: A duoethnographical exploration of perceptions, choices, and outcomes. *Journal of Response to Writing*, *7*(2), 74–111.

Kartchava, E., & Gatbonton, E. (2014). ACCESS-TBLT and adult ESL learners' noticing of corrective feedback. *CONTACT Magazine* (Research Symposium Issue), 32–50.

Kartchava, E., Gatbonton, E., Ammar, A., & Trofimovich, P. (2020). Oral corrective feedback: Pre-service English as a second langauge teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research*, *24*(2), 220–249. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818787546

Kartchava, E., & Nassaji, H. (2019). Noticeability of corrective feedback in three dimensional environments and face-to-face classroom contexts. In R. Leow (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of second language research in classroom learning* (pp. 409–422). Routledge.

Khanjani, A., Vahdany, F., & Jafarigohar, M. (2018). Effects of journal writing on EFL teacher trainees' reflective practice. *Research in English Language Pedagogy*, *6*(1), 56–77. https://doi.org/10.30486/relp.2018.538761

Kömür, Ş., & Çepik, H. (2015). Diaries as a reflective tool in pre-service language teacher education. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *10*(12), 1593–1598. https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2015.2207

Kozlova, I., & Zundel, E. (2013). Synchronous online language teaching: Stragies to support learner development. In C. Meskill (Ed.), *Online teaching and learning: Sociocultural perspectives* (pp. 99–116). Bloomsbury Academic.

Lai, C., & Zhao, Y. (2006). Noticing and text-based chat. *Language Learning & Technology*, *10*(3), 102–120.

Lange, D. (1990). A blueprint for teacher development. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 245–268). Cambridge University Press.

Lee, J. S., & Liu, L. (2024). Dynamicity of EFL learners' willingness to communicate in an online class. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *45*(6), 2078–2096. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2039677

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, *60*(2), 309–365. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x

Li, S. (2017). Student and teacher beliefs and attitudes about oral corrective feedback. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning: Research, theory, applications, implications* (pp. 143–157). Routledge.

Liu, J., & Berger, C. M. (2015). *TESOL: A guide*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *93*(1), 91–104. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00830.x

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. 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*, 183–218. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.2001.tb00019.x

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. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010a). Interactional feedback as instructional input: A synthesis of classroom SLA research. *Language, Interaction and Acquisition*, *1*(2), 276–296. https://doi.org/10.1075/lia.1.2.07lys

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010b). Oral feedback in classroom SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 265–302. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520

Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, *82*(3), 338–356. http://doi.org/10.22158/selt.v9n3p89

Min, H.-T. (2013). A case study of an EFL writing teacher's belief and practice about written feedback. *System*, *41*(3), 625–638. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.07.018

Nassaji, H. (2015). *The interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning: Linking theory, research, and practice*. Bloomsbury.

Nassaji, H. (2016). Interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: A synthesis and analysis of current research. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(4), 535–562. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816644940

Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2017a). Conclusion, reflections, and final remarks. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning: Research, theory, applications, implications* (pp. 174–182). Routledge.

Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (Eds.). (2017b). *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning: Research, theory, applications, implications*. Routledge.

Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (Eds.). (2021). *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2015). Foreword. In J. Liu & C. M. Berger (Eds.), *TESOL: A guide* (pp. xii–xiii). Bloomsbury Academic.

Payne, J. S., & Whitney, P. J. (2002). Developing L2 oral proficiency through Synchronous CMC: Output, working memory, and interlanguage development. *CALICO Journal*, *20*(1), 7–32. http://doi.org/10.1558/cj.v20i1.7-32

Prodromou, L. (2020). Epilogue: Good language teachers—What do they do? What do they know? In C. Griffiths & Z. Tajeddin (Eds.), *Lessons from good language teachers* (pp. 309–312). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108774390

Quinn, P. G. (2021). Corrective feedback timing and second language grammatical development: Research, theory, and practice. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 322–340). Cambridge University Press.

Quinn, P. G., & Nakata, T. (2017). The timing of oral corrective feedback. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning: Research, theory, applications, implications* (pp. 35–48). Routledge.

Ranta, L., & Lyster, R. (2017). Form-focused instruction. In P. Garrett & J. M. Cots (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language awareness* (pp. 40–56). Taylor and Francis.

Rassaei, E. (2017). Video chat vs. face-to-face recasts, learners' interpretations and L2 development: A case of Persian EFL learners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *30*(1–2), 133–148. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2016.1275702

Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Roothooft, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System*, *46*, 65–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.012

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.; J. Seaman, Ed.). Sage.

Sato, M. (2013). Beliefs about peer interaction and peer corrective feedback: Efficacy of classroom intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, *97*(3), 611–633. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12035.x

Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2019). Do teachers care about research? The research-pedagogy dialogue. *ELT Journal*, *73*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy048

Sato, M., & Lyster, R. (2012). Peer interaction and corrective feedback for accuracy and fluency development: Monitoring, practice, and proceduralization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *34*, 591–626. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263112000356

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Towards a new design for teaching and learning in the profession*. Jossey-Bass.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, *8*(3), 263–300. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168804lr146oa

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research*, *10*(4), 361–392. http://doi.org/10.1191/1362168806lr203oa

Shekary, M., & Tahririan, M. H. (2006). Negotiation of meaning and noticing in text-based online chat. *The Modern Language Journal*, *90*(6), 557–573. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2006.00504.x

Ulas, K. (2018). Reflection in language teaching: A comparision between preservice and experienced teachers of English. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *13*(23), 754–763. https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2018.3619

Uludağ, O. (2024). Exploring the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices of oral corrective feedback in synchronous computer-mediated communication. *Heliyon*, *10*(8), e29507. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29507

Vásquez, C., & Harvey, J. (2010). Raising teachers' awareness about corrective feedback through research replication. *Language Teaching Research*, *14*(4), 421–443. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810375365

Wang, Q., & Zhang, H. (2014). Promoting teacher autonomy through university–school collaborative action research. *Language Teaching Research*, *18*(2), 222–241. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813505942

Wolfensberger, B., Piniel, J., Canella, C., & Kyburz-Graber, R. (2010). The challenge of involvement in reflective teaching: Three case studies from a teacher education project on conducting classroom discussions on socio-scientific issues. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(3), 714–721. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.007

Yayli, D. (2009). Reflective practices of pre-service teachers in a listening skill course in an ELT department. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *1*(1), 1820–1824. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.322

Yee, B. C., Abdullah, T., & Nawi, A. M. (2022). Exploring pre-service teachers' reflective practice through an analysis of six-stage framework in reflective journals. *Reflective Practice*, *23*(5), 552–564. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2022.2071246

Yilmaz, Y., & Yüksel, D. (2011). Effects of communication mode and salience on recasts: A first exposure study. *Language Teaching Research*, *15*(4), 457–477. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811412873

Yin, J. (2018). Empowering teachers through core reflection: A case in Korea. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 15*(4), 1005–1020. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.4.8.1005

Yuan, R., Sun, P., & Teng, L. (2016). Understanding language teachers' motivations towards research. *TESOL Quarterly*, *50*(1), 220–234. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.279

Yüksel, D., Soruç, A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in university EFL classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *31*(3), 362–382. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12336

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1996). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ziegler, N., & Mackey, A. (2017). Interactional feedback in synchronous computer-mediated communication: A review of the state-of-the-art. In H. K. Nassaji, E. (Ed.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning: Research, theory, applications, implications* (pp. 80–94). Routledge.

Copyright © 2025 TESL Canada Journal

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA 4.0

The TESL Canada Journal retains copyright of this work. The TESL Canada Journal, as the original source of publication, along with the original author(s), must be acknowledged in any reuse or adaptation of published material. Reuse includes distribution, adaptation, and building upon the material in any medium or format. The license allows for commercial use. If you remix, adapt, or build upon the material, you must license the modified material under identical terms.