

THE EFFECTS OF A PRACTICUM
ON PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS' L2 GRAMMAR TEACHING

EDA ÜZÜM

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2019

THE EFFECTS OF A PRACTICUM
ON PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS' L2 GRAMMAR TEACHING

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
English Language Education

by
Eda Üzüm

Boğaziçi University

2019

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Eda Özüm , certify that

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

Signature.....

Date 24/05/2019.....

ABSTRACT

The Effects of a Practicum on Pre-Service English Teachers' L2 Grammar Teaching

This study explores the beliefs and preferences of pre-service English teachers about the place and function of grammar in learning and teaching English in a communicative foreign language (EFL) environment. One of the most frequently discussed aspects of communicative language teaching is when and how grammar rules should be presented to learners. Spada and Lightbown (2008) focus on two types of grammar teaching: isolated (focusing on form separately from meaning) and integrated (focusing on form during meaning-based instruction). This study focuses on pre-service teachers' perspectives on these two types of grammar teaching. Data was collected through a questionnaire and one on one interviews. The study investigates the effects of the practicum program (where student teachers observe their mentor teachers and have teaching experience in a real classroom) on the student teachers' preferences of grammar instruction. Findings reveal that pre-service teachers favor integrated focus on form over isolated focus on form especially before the practicum. They express their concern about the effectiveness of an isolated approach to grammar. However, after the practicum, they accept that there may be certain uses of isolated focus on form when used in combination with integrated focus on form in a communicative curriculum. The results indicate that the perceptions of the pre-service teachers as shaped by their own language learning experiences and theoretical courses they have taken undergo changes in the practicum period. Practice in a real language teaching context seems to have helped pre-service teachers appreciate the benefits of complementary use of different approaches to focus on form.

ÖZET

Öğretmen Eğitimi Programının İngilizce Öğretmeni Adaylarının İkinci Dildeki Dilbilgisi Öğretimine Etkileri

Bu çalışma İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının iletişim odaklı bir yabancı dil eğitimi ortamında İngilizce öğrenme ve öğretmedeki rollerine ilişkin inanç ve tercihlerini ortaya çıkarmaktır. Bu öğretim modelinin tartışılan yönlerinden biri, öğrencilere dilbilgisi kurallarının nasıl sunulması gerektiğidir. Spada ve Lightbown (2008) iki dilbilgisi öğretimi türünün üzerinde durmaktadır: ayrık (içerikten ayrı olarak biçime odaklanma) ve bütüncül (anlam temelli etkinlikler yaparken biçime odaklanma). Bu çalışmanın odak noktası öğretmen adaylarının bu yöntemler hakkındaki bakış açılarıdır. Araştırma için gerekli veriler bir anket ve bire bir görüşmeler yoluyla toplanmıştır. Çalışma, öğretmen adaylarına mentor öğretmenlerini gözlemleme ve gerçek bir sınıfta öğretmenlik deneyimi kazanma şansı sağlayan öğretmen eğitimi programının, adayların dilbilgisi öğretim tercihleri üzerindeki etkilerini araştırmıştır. Bulgular, öğretmen adaylarının özellikle uygulamadan önce bütüncül biçim odaklı öğretimi ayrık biçim odaklı öğrenmeye tercih ettiklerini ve ayrık yaklaşımın etkinliğine şüpheyile yaklaştıklarını ortaya koymuştur. Ancak, uygulamadan sonra, iletişim temelli bir müfredatta ayrık yaklaşıma da bütüncül yaklaşımla birlikte yer vermenin mümkün olabileceğini ve bunun fayda sağlayabileceğini kabul etmişlerdir. Sonuçlar, öğretmen adaylarının önceki dil öğrenme deneyimleri ve aldıkları teorik dersler ile şekillenmiş olan algılarının staj dönemiyle birlikte belirli değişikliklere uğradığını göstermektedir. Gerçek bir dil öğretimi ortamında deneyim edinmek, öğretmen adaylarının biçim odaklı öğretime farklı yaklaşımların birbirini tamamlayacak şekilde kullanımının yararlarını anlamalarına yardımcı olmuştur.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to my thesis advisor, Assoc. Prof. Sumru Akcan, for her support at each and every step of my thesis. I am thankful to her for her patience, motivation, profound knowledge, and experience. I am also grateful to her for believing in me even in my times of hopelessness.

I am grateful to all the faculty members of Foreign Language Education Department for making it possible for me to collect data by welcoming me to their classes. I would like to thank Prof. Gülcan Erçetin for her comments about statistical procedures. Many thanks to Vuslat Şeker, Abdullah Açar and Merve Cevheroğlu Açar for helping me in the statistical issues. I would also like to thank Ertuğrul Ergül and Özge Yıldırım for their technical support. I am thankful to my school principals Süleyman Alıcı and Furkan Yavuz for their understanding attitude. I would also like to thank all my students and colleagues for their kind supports. Many thanks to all of the participants for their precious contribution, patience, and welcoming attitude.

Special thanks to my best friend, Aylin Sürer for always being there for me. Many thanks to my dearest friends Bilge Çelik, Mehmet Atıcı, Nimet Acır, Sezen Bektaş and Mahsume Öz for their support and motivation. I am thankful to my dear friends, Serhat Kurt, Ceyda Yaba, İrem Konuk and Gizem Mutlu for both their friendly and intellectual support, and for bringing a lot of joy to my university years. I am very grateful to Şule Başarslan for being such a supportive flat-mate.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest love to my mother, Nadya, my father, Züheyir, my brothers, Mişel and Özcan and thank my family for their affection, care, and support. I would also like to thank my dearest aunt, Natalya, for being the best teacher to me and for leading me to where I am.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Statement of the problem	2
1.2 Purpose of the study.....	4
1.3 Significance of the study.....	4
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
2.1 Instructed second language acquisition	6
2.2 Focus on meaning vs. focus on form.....	8
2.3 Isolated versus integrated focus on form	12
2.4 EFL learners' and teachers' preferences	18
2.5 Error correction and feedback	22
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	27
3.1 Research context	28
3.2 Participants.....	29
3.3 Instrumentation	30
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	35
4.1 Beliefs and preferences of pre-service teachers before the practicum.....	35
4.2 Effects of the practicum on preferences regarding isolated and integrated focus on form.....	41
4.3 The effect of students' age and level of proficiency of pre-service teachers' preferences.....	46
4.4 Role of teacher and error correction.....	48
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	55
5.1 Role of instruction and focus on form.....	55

5.2 Integrated FFI or isolated FFI.....	56
5.3 Age and level of proficiency.....	59
5.4 Error correction and feedback.....	60
APPENDIX A: ETHICS COMMITTEE REPORT	65
APPENDIX B: PRE-TEST SURVEY.....	66
APPENDIX C: POST-TEST SURVEY.....	70
APPENDIX D: PRE-TEST INTERVIEW.....	73
APPENDIX E: POST-TEST INTERVIEW.....	74
REFERENCES.....	75

ABBREVIATIONS

CR: Consciousness Raising

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ESL: English as a Second Language

FLED: Foreign Language Education Department

FFI: Form-Focused Instruction

FonF: Focus on Form

FonFs: Focus on Forms

GTM: Grammar Translation Method

L1: First Language

L2: Second language

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

ST: Student

UG: Universal Grammar

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Teaching of English, an undeniably international language is one of the most speculated subjects among students, teachers, parents, and policy makers. Especially, the place and type of grammatical instruction for the best possible language acquisition outcomes has been discussed for over 50 years. Although there has been a common practice of focusing on the communicative functions of language teaching in the past few decades, the role of the grammar is still not denied. As stated by Burgess and Etherington (2002), there is an appreciation of focus on form among researchers and teachers, and “teaching and learning with a focus on form is valuable, if not indispensable” (p. 433).

Before the value of focus on form was recognized, methods of instruction which were centered on meaning-based instruction were predominantly well-accepted. That’s why, meaning-based L2 teaching is one of the most prevalent and investigated topics of the recent language teaching research. However, there is also a shift to form-focused instruction because a purely meaning-based learning context may fail to ensure the acquisition of certain grammatical forms. Extensive support for the insufficiency of a purely meaning-based approach has come from immersion schools.

Literature has shown that meaning-based language teaching plays a significant role in higher order skills such as fluency in language, analysis and synthesis (Alptekin, Erçetin & Bayyurt, 2007; Bayyurt & Alptekin, 2000; Chapple & Curtis, 2000; Crandall, 1987; Flowerdew, 1993; Kasper, 1997; Met, 1991). However; Lightbown & Spada, 1990) drew the attention to the need for teaching linguistic forms in a communication-based language teaching environment. Now that a

consensus about the place and importance of form-focused instruction is reached, the most effective methods to teach in a form-focused classroom are being investigated. Timing of form-focused instruction was proposed as an important determinant by Spada and Lightbown (2008), and the terms integrated form-focused instruction and isolated form-focused instruction have started to be used to refer to different modes of timing.

1.1 Statement of the problem

Although research findings which suggest the most effective methods to achieve successful second or foreign language education are determining factors in language teaching practices, teachers who are the ultimate authority to implement the methods, are the ultimate variable determining the overall achievement of the language teaching programs.

Research on teachers' beliefs and preferences has become more of an issue because grammar teaching methods were already debated among language teachers. The shifts in related framework have been repeated continuously. Earlier, grammar instruction through distinct teaching of structures and drills was the main focus of the curriculum and it was emphasized over content. With the arrival of communicative and meaning-based approaches, traditional grammar teaching was replaced by meaning-based instruction. And when these meaning-based methods didn't yield successful language learning, form-focused instruction claimed its previous position. As grammar instruction is so controversial because of the radical shifts it has gone through, grammar instruction is an issue very far from being a topic of common-sense.

Teachers generally have established beliefs from their own prior language learning experiences, and they may perceive their own teachers' practices as the ultimate way of teaching. Improving reflective skills and the ability to understand the characteristics and value of their own teaching will definitely improve the quality of their methods. The teachers' awareness about their own insights and preferences must be determined as soon as possible because these opinions bring their strengths, weaknesses and misconceptions about teaching to the fore. The earlier, the better. Moreover, teacher training programs may play a chief role in forming pre-service teachers' beliefs as early as possible. For example, the study by Cabaroğlu and Roberts (2000) has shown that practicum impacts teacher beliefs and preferences for practice. Busch (2010) also had similar findings indicating the effect of the practicum program on teachers' preferences and opinions.

Although SLA research has slid to a framework which investigates the impact of timing in form-focused instruction, there has not been a lot of work focusing on teachers' perspectives on the subject. Not only teaching grammar separately from communicative activities (isolated focus on form) but also teaching it embedded in communicative tasks (integrated focus on form) have a place in the communicative language classroom as suggested by pervious research; however, the opinions of the practitioners may differ from what research findings suggest in this sense. Especially; the opinions of the pre-service teachers may be totally different from what the research suggests. It is extremely necessary for pre-service teachers to be aware of their own beliefs to be able to identify the aspects they are efficient in and areas to improve. It is also crucial to know how close they are to successful teacher practices as suggested by previous research; and reflection on beliefs is a source of professional growth (Valeo & Spada, 2015).

Teacher training is undoubtedly one of the building blocks of education system. According to Darling-Hammond (2012), student success is strongly correlated with teachers, and the characteristics of the teacher are strongly correlated with teacher training. The insights obtained through the practicum period are very precious because practicum is the first chance for pre-service teachers to connect theory with practice. Making these connections healthily and progressively lay the foundations of their teaching philosophies.

1.2 Purpose of the study

The primary focus of this study is the investigation pre-service teachers' perspectives and preferences of different approaches to form-focused instruction (i.e., integrated or isolated). The study aims at finding answers to questions about (1) pre-service teachers' preferences of isolated and integrated focus on from before they participate in the teacher training program, (2) changes in perspectives and preferences after the teacher-training program, and (3) preferences and views in terms of feedback, correcting errors; and role of the teacher in the teaching of grammar. The findings of the study will be interpreted by addressing the possible reasons and outcomes related; and hopefully will provide insights for further research.

1.3 Significance of the study

Being able to keep up with the current methodological developments is one of the most desired values of an effective teacher. As language instruction has been an object of little consensus, it is especially important to be informed about the most effective methods for a specific context. While the place of language teaching which is centered on form-focused practices has started to be highly appreciated, and quite

a few studies related to the effectiveness of such an instruction have been conducted, timing of instruction is still open to speculation. Especially further research which links this subject with teachers' beliefs is needed.

The results derived from the study will hopefully depict teacher trainees' preferences of grammar teaching and will provide insights which will add to the structure and planning of practicum programs. It is also hoped that the results will show the areas which need improvement. The process of data collection; especially the pre-tests will also draw the pre-service teachers' attention to a recent topic in research and practice. Through these questions they will also develop a better familiarity with the subject of isolated and integrated focus on form which will hopefully help them integrate them in their practicum period effectively.

In sum, the effects of both meaning-based and form-based instruction, the chronological flow of the shifts in practice and theory, feedback to error, and particularly beliefs of the students and pre-service teachers in terms of timing in teaching of grammar (i.e, integrated and isolated focus on form) will be the major components of this study. Before discussing the afore-mentioned aspects of language teaching methods, it is best to define isolated and integrated focus on form. Isolated FFI is defined as "instruction that separates attention to form from communicative/content-based instruction" (Spada, Jessop, Tomita, Suzuki, & Valeo, 2014, p. 456), while integrated FFI is defined as "instruction that combines attention to form within communicative/content-based teaching" (Spada, Jessop, Tomita, Suzuki, & Valeo, 2014, p. 456). Isolated focus on form requires a separate attention to grammatical structures while integrated focus on form requires presenting grammatical structures embedded in communicative activities.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Instructed second language acquisition

Before discussing different methods of L2 grammar teaching, the role of instruction in second language education should be specified. The term instructed SLA is generally used to refer to language acquisition through instruction. Instructed SLA can be defined basically as learning of a second language by an adult learner (i.e., post-critical period) in an environment in which content and skills are organized, presented and explained to the learner (Doughty, 2003). In other words, it is learning of another language than the L1. Instructed SLA includes systematic attempts which facilitate learning by stimulating learners' learning mechanisms (Housen & Pierrard, 2005).

Instructional environments have been speculated about in the field of SLA since 1970s. While some researchers are against instruction, others came up with theories and research results that support its integration. Felix (1981) exemplifies the position against instruction by stating that learning a foreign language in a classroom cannot be different from other types of language acquisition such as the L1. Krashen (1985) also supports this position by stating that teaching can only be helpful because it provides comprehensible input that may not be available in a naturalistic environment. These proposals were based on several theories. One of the most widely held ones is "strong non-interventionist position" (Long & Robinson, 1998). According to this hypothesis, second language learning is possible thanks to universal grammar as in the case of first language acquisition. According to this hypothesis, L2 learning is incidental just like L1 acquisition. So instruction is not

helpful for acquisition of any languages. Krashen's (1982) "Input Hypothesis" also suggests a position against instruction because according to this hypothesis knowledge learned through instruction can never become acquired knowledge. That's why instruction does not lead to permanent language acquisition. What is learned through instruction is doomed to be forgotten.

Research results and theories supporting instruction also emerged. As Doughty and Williams (1998) put it, most of second language acquisition may be possible in the absence of instruction; however, there may also be some merits of instruction that may take the learners beyond what is possible without instruction. Long (1983) also took a position for instruction. Long (1983) was the first researcher to test Krashen's learning/acquisition distinction, and the findings from his meta-analysis pointed to the superiority of instruction primarily in terms of "rate or ultimate attainment" by the learners (p. 360). Also, Housen and De Graaf (2009) took a position for instruction stating that it can affect any one of the following variables of language acquisition: route, rate and ultimate levels of attainment. When the timing is appropriate; in other words, when the target structure is within the learners' developmental reach, instruction may help learners move faster while also following the natural flow of language acquisition. As in Pienemann's teachability hypothesis (1999), when instruction matches the developmental readiness of the learner, teaching forms may contribute to the reinforcement of the grammar acquisition. Instructed learners reach higher levels of grammatical accuracy compared to the ones who acquire the language in a naturalistic environment. Instruction may be especially helpful in earning of certain grammatical subsystems that are not easily noticed by the learners through mere exposure to the language.

The main framework to be discussed in the scope of this literature review will be focus on form (FonF) which is a sub-category of instructed second language education (SLA) and before discussing the theories and research related to focus on form, mentioning different approaches to instructed SLA would be helpful. Instructed SLA can be discussed under two broad categories based on whether the meaning or linguistic forms are emphasized. We can mention two broad frameworks at this point; focus on meaning and focus on form instruction.

2.2 Focus on meaning vs. focus on form

In meaning-focused instruction, content is the immediate focus of the language classroom, and it was preferred because traditional language teaching methods which incorporated intensive grammar had failed to enhance language skills. In meaning focused instruction, students receive a big amount of input to enable L2 acquisition. This kind of instruction can also be called communication-focused instruction. It regards language not as a school subject to be studied but a communication tool. Proponents of meaning-focused instruction are critical about teaching discrete linguistic items.

Contrary to the expectations after the implementation of traditional language teaching methods, meaning-based instruction did not prove to be effective on its own. It is clear from the evidence derived from empirical studies that only focusing on meaning does not guarantee the correct use of language and fluency. Empirical evidence has pointed to a need for focus on form to ensure an overall better level of language proficiency. The use of form-focused instruction has shown to improve both knowledge of grammar and understanding of content. For example, a study conducted by Hayashi (1995) with university students in Japan has pointed out to a

very strong correlation between grammar knowledge and proficiency, which shows that grammar knowledge effects L2 proficiency in English positively. Also, there is evidence showing that focusing on form enhances understanding of content even to a greater extent than meaning-focused instruction.

Also, Valeo (2013) investigated the impact of focus on form on language and content learning in a content-based instructional environment. 36 adult participants were distributed to different groups. Both groups were taught in a content-based environment but the treatment group was also given instruction on grammatical forms for a semester. The group focusing on form received corrective feedback, explicit instruction on grammatical forms and tasks focusing on form. There were two target structures to be studied. The efficiency of these two methods' was measured in a pre-post-delayed test design. Also, content tests were given to evaluate the effect of the two methods on content learning. According to the results, no group was superior to the other in terms of grammatical accuracy; however, inclusion of FFI enhanced content learning. The treatment groups' performance was better in both of the post-tests measuring comprehension of content. Understanding the grammar may have helped understanding of the content, too.

There are also studies which investigated the effect of FFI on vocabulary. File and Adams (2010) explored if isolated and integrated methods affected vocabulary retention positively. Two intermediate classes of 10 adult students were given tests before and after instruction, also they underwent a delayed post-test. Eighteen days after the pretest, four reading lessons, and experimental treatments were given. After the reading assignments, participants were asked to take reading comprehension tests and vocabulary tests. After that, another post-test was conducted. Both FFI types led to meaningful differences in learning and remembering new vocabulary than natural

exposure alone. The results pointed out that integrated or isolated instruction were not different from each other in promoting vocabulary learning.

Long (1991) defines focus on form as a type of instruction in which the main focus is on meaning not form through incidental teaching of linguistic forms. It involves a shift to the target linguistic form when the main focus is still on meaning. Spada's (1997) definition of focus on form is a broader one in this term. As stated by Spada (1997), Long's definition is exclusively based on spontaneous and incidental focus on form while her definition includes both spontaneous and planned focus on form. It is both proactive and reactive focus on linguistic forms in a meaning-focused environment. In other words, it not only entails planning of form-focused instruction but also reacting to certain circumstances in the language classroom. As Ellis (2001) defines it, form-focused instruction is based on attempts to facilitate L2 development by directing learners' attention to linguistic forms or creating opportunities to practice those forms. In other words, form-focused instruction aims at teaching mainly grammar; however, the communicative nature of the instructional environment is also maintained.

There is a lot of support from recent research for the use of form-focused instruction in communicative language learning environments. The positive effects of form-focused instruction are not only on the acquisition of grammatical forms but also on other aspects of language such as content learning, reading comprehension, sociolinguistic competence and pragmatics knowledge etc. A study conducted by Lyster (2004b) investigated the effects of form-focused instruction on the learners' sociolinguistic competence, especially the use of second person pronouns in different contexts. The study included 8th grade French immersion classrooms and the results

were in favor of form-focused instruction both in oral and written language production.

SLA research has shown that input has an important place in language acquisition, and for the input to be effective it should be noticed by the learners. Special attention to input features that may not be noticed through natural exposure should be considered. That is why input saliency should be increased through input enhancement (William & Evans, 1998) or consciousness raising (CR) as defined by Ruherford and Sharwood Smith (1985). For the forms to be noticed the incidence of the target forms may also be increased. Sogutlu and Veliaj-Ostrosi (2015) compared the effect of direct grammar instruction and indirect consciousness-raising activities in terms of explicit L2 knowledge, based on Ellis' conceptualization of form-focused instruction. As Ellis (2002b) puts it, the aim of CR tasks is to enhance learners' understanding of the grammatical feature to help them develop explicit knowledge about it. The study showed that both direct explicit instruction of grammar and indirect consciousness-raising tasks have good effect but a combination of two will bring better results.

Another study was carried out by Lyster (2004b) to observe whether FFI improved the immersion learners' ability to choose the correct grammatical gender form in French. According to the results, FFI enhances the learners' ability to select the grammatical features and helps them acquire grammatical knowledge. According to Nguyen et al (2012), although both explicit and implicit form-focused instruction have positive effects in developing the pragmatic performance of the learners, explicit instruction results in more performance gains. The study by Tomita and Spada (2013) showed the role of grammar in L2 learners' language socialization

process, which proved that FFI encouraged the learners to participate in communication in the target language.

The studies investigating the effects of form-focused instruction have indicated that neither an exclusive form-focused nor an exclusive meaning-focused instruction was effective; a combination of the two brings better results in terms of not only correct use of form but also communicative skills. There seems to be a consensus that the primary focus should be on meaning while form is also embedded in it as there may be some linguistic features which are not easily acquired without guidance (Spada, 2008). There seems to be another aspect to be discovered though, the timing of focus on form within meaning-based instruction.

2.3 Isolated versus integrated focus on form

As previously stated, the effects of instruction have been hotly debated in SLA research for a few decades. Most of that debate arose as a result of the observations in immersion schools or naturalistic environments. These environments showed that while there is a focus on meaning at language classes, the linguistic features may be underestimated. Although research has shown that language learners engage in communication in naturalistic environments, instruction gives them the opportunity to get closer to native-like second language ability. Research in French immersion schools has shown that big amounts of target language input brings high levels of comprehension and fluency; however, it does not guarantee accuracy (Harley & Swain, 1984; Harley, 1992).

The discussion of whether to focus on form or meaning started to be evaluated as an old-fashioned one. As there is a recent appreciation of instructed SLA and form-focused instruction, the most effective ways to focus on form started

to be discussed. The timing of form-focused practices in a communicative language learning environment has been one of the most recent topics of discussion. This need has led to the emergence of two main approaches to form-based instruction: isolated focus on form and integrated focus on form. According to Spada et al (2014), as long as form and meaning based practice are combined together, isolated and integrated FFI can both enhance L2 learning. In both isolated and integrated FFI the primary focus is on meaning. Attention to form is planned in both of them. The primary difference between the two methods is the time when form is presented. So basically, in integrated FFI attention to grammatical structures is embedded in communicative activities while in isolated FFI attention to grammatical structures is kept separate from communicative activities.

Isolated FFI is the type of instruction through which attention of the learners is drawn to form separately from meaning-based and communicative activities. Therefore, the teachers focus on form before, in preparation, or after the communicative activities. Attention to form is mainly separate from meaning-based and communicative activities. It doesn't refer to teaching of drills or discrete point grammar rules and structures, though. It is supported by skill acquisition theory (DeKeyser, 1998) which focuses on the need to teach grammar to achieve understanding.

On the other hand, in integrated FFI, learners' attention is drawn to linguistic forms during communicative activities. Attention to form is always embedded in meaning-based and communicative teaching methods. Linguistic items to be covered in the classroom may occur incidentally during communication or they may be planned before the lesson. It enables learners to attend to grammar spontaneously and contextually.

Isolated focus on form is closer to the traditional practice. It may not be easy for language learners to pay attention to both content and form simultaneously. So, it may reduce the cognitive load to a certain extent. This may also increase the motivation as there is no interruption of the interaction. Stern (1992) takes communicative tasks as primary contents of a language however also points out to the need for “a separate analytic language syllabus.” Ellis (2002) also mentions the importance of teaching grammar separately. Isolated FFI is also in line with input processing studies and theory about “input processing” (Van Patten, 1990, p.287) which states that human mind can pay attention to limited aspects of what is being learned. Isolated focus on form also shares similarities with the principles of skill acquisition theory (DeKeyser, 1994) which is also based on the idea that grammar teaching should be done explicitly and separately for the maximum understanding.

However, to prevent a misconception about isolated FFI, it should clearly be stated that it is not the same as isolated grammar teaching as in the Grammar Translation Method which is also called “focus on formS” (Long, 1991). Focus on formS refers to exclusive attention to grammatical structures and underestimates the communicative nature of the language.

Integrated focus on form is efficient because grammar and content learning is possible together. In this type of instruction, grammar is taught “with reference to meaning, social factors, or discourse—or a combination of these factors” (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 467). This type of instruction is in line with revised interaction theory (Long, 1996). According to the interaction theory, L2 comprehension and production is possible through negotiation of meaning which is in the nature of oral communication. There is a lot of empirical support for integration from French immersion classes (Harley, 1998; Lyster, 1994).

Why do language learners need a focus on form even in environments which provide rich input in the target language? Because some forms are not noticed only by receiving the input. As put by Doughty and Williams (1998), saliency and communicative function are important factors in noticing. Frequent forms are said to be more easily noticed. However, the position that the most frequently occurring forms are the easier ones to notice does not explain the whole story because some of the most frequently occurring forms like singular third person –s cannot be acquired early.

The choice between these two different models of form-focused instruction is also highly dependent on the type of the measures the learners will go through. The research conducted by Spada and Lightbown (2008) indicated that L2 knowledge gained through integrated FFI might be more useful for communicative tasks which draws learners' attention to form and meaning simultaneously. On the other hand, knowledge gained during isolated FFI would be more helpful when the learner is required to take a grammar test which focuses on forms separately from a communicative task.

There have not been a lot of studies which compare the effects of the two because it is a recent topic of discussion. However, among the research conducted recently, there are studies which showed that neither of these two ways is superior to each other. The study by Spada et al. (2014) investigated the impact of isolated and integrated form-focused instruction on various types of second language knowledge. The study further explored if these two types of form-focused instruction provide different types of learning. For both the isolated FFI and integrated FFI same topics and themes were used. While the group which was instructed through the isolated form-focused methods received explicit grammar teaching separately from

communicative activities, the integrated instruction group was instructed about grammar during communicative and meaning-based activities. According to the results of the study, there was not a significant difference between the two groups in terms of language outcomes. The combined use of isolated and integrated focus on forms yields the best results and timing of grammar instruction does not create a significant difference.

One of the most inclusive studies directly examining the outcomes related to isolated and integrated focus on form was conducted in Turkey. Elgün-Gündüz, Akcan and Bayyurt (2012) explored the effects of instruction based on integrated focus on form and isolated focus on form in primary level school English classrooms in Turkey. Their study examined two different instructional methods. The study evaluated language outcomes related to writing, grammar, and vocabulary. Learner attitudes and preferences of teaching methods were also under the scope of this study. In order to investigate students' preferences of each type of focus on form instruction, they implemented the questionnaire developed by Spada, Valeo, Barkaoui, So, and Peters (2009) at the end of the school year. Also 20 students were interviewed and teachers' opinions were elicited. Results showed that integrated focus on form led to better grammar and vocabulary learning compared to isolated focus on form. Also, the students who received integrated focus on form had better writing results than the ones who were instructed in an integrated way. Explicit and isolated methods led to better learning of certain grammar rules and isolated focus on form helped the learners manage grammar tasks better. However, transferring the knowledge gained through isolated focus on form to communicative tasks required extra effort on the part of the learner. That's why most learners stated that they had more positive opinions about integrated focus on form.

Iraji and Gholami's (2018) study is also a recent one which investigated the effectiveness of isolated and integrated FFI in terms of certain language structures such as passives and conditionals. The results of the study which was conducted in Iran showed that the group who received integrated focus on form was significantly more successful in production and recognition tests. So it could be concluded that integrated focus on form leads to successful acquisition of grammatical structures while also helping learners produce meaningful output.

There are also studies which discussed the effects of combining both integrated and isolated focus on form on productive skills. Barrot (2014) studied this effect through a pre-test and post-test writing exam and oral exam with 41 participants of English Communication Art in an ESL context. 11 students were assigned to the control group while 30 were assigned to the treatment group. The group which went through a combination of the two methods improved significantly better in both writing and speaking tasks.

While research about the academic and skill outcomes of the previously mentioned methods is important in determining how language teaching should be, there is also another factor affecting the methods used in the classrooms; the beliefs of the ones who do the teaching. Teacher beliefs may play an important role in designing instruction (Johnson, 1994; Wong, 2010). For example, some teachers are in favor of exposing students to more grammar while others may not prefer to include grammar teaching at all. These beliefs are mostly shaped by pre-service theoretical education they receive at the university and their classroom experience. As Borg (2006) also mentions, pre-service language teachers' cognition studies focus on the beliefs and attitudes of the teacher trainees; and investigate how their preferences and perspectives are shaped according to their prior experiences of

language learning while also taking their practical knowledge and pre-service experiences into consideration.

2.4 EFL learners' and teachers' preferences

Theoretically supported methods and recent research results may be determining factors while choosing the proper teaching methods for a certain learner group with specific characteristics and instructional needs. However, there is one more factor leading instructional perspectives and preferences. The opinions of the instructors and learners are some of the ultimate determinants of how a language class will be designed.

2.4.1 Teacher beliefs

There are different ideas about the role of grammar instruction in foreign language classes. Some scholars exclude grammar instruction (Prabhu, 1987) whereas some of them are in favor of teaching grammar in communicative contexts (Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Nassaji, 2000). There are some studies conducted in order to examine the effectiveness of form-focused instruction (Celce-Murcia, 1991; Long & Crookes, 1992). Although the studies indicate that the students taught with form-focused instruction outperformed their peers who did not take instruction on the target forms (White, 1991), there are teachers who believe that focusing on grammar can cause problems especially when they are working on meaning. It can also be problematic especially for inexperienced teachers in terms of deciding on the most appropriate target grammatical structure. At this point, teacher beliefs can shape their choice of instruction (Johnson, 1994; Wong, 2010). According to Shavelson and Stern (1981),

it is necessary to understand teacher beliefs to examine the role of grammar teaching in English and their practices in the classroom.

To be able to talk about the effects of teacher beliefs on the choice of teaching methods, the notion of belief should be defined. Multiple definitions are possible however in the scope of this study; a definition based on experience would be the most proper one. Beliefs are “convictions or opinions that are formed either by experience or by the intervention of ideas through the learning process” (Ford, 1994; as cited in Borg, 2006, p. 36).

As stated by Borg (2006), studies about pre-service education focus primarily on the impact of previous language learning experience on teacher cognition, beliefs about language teaching, cognition about pre-service experiences, practical knowledge and decision making in instruction. Considering knowledge of teachers, Robert (1998) lists different types of knowledge which include “content knowledge” and “pedagogical content knowledge.” Firstly, teachers who teach foreign or second languages are supposed know language structures because grammar is seen as a significant part of both the content knowledge and the pedagogical knowledge. Secondly, as the general pedagogical knowledge, they are expected to know how to help their students learn content knowledge. In terms of grammar teaching, Borg (2003) lists different categories of teacher cognition. The first category is about teachers’ grammar knowledge which refers to prospective or practicing language teachers’ explicit grammar knowledge. The second one examines teachers’ beliefs about grammar instruction and the third category is related to teachers’ cognition and practices. He also acknowledges that previous learning experiences affect the pre-service teachers’ beliefs concerning instruction (Borg, 2009).

According to Borg (2009), pre-service teachers start their education with strong beliefs which are influenced by their previous learning experiences, which can be explained by Lortie's (1975) notion of "apprenticeship of observation". There are many factors contributing to what teachers believe to be effective teaching. For example; according to Farrell (2008), teacher beliefs are shaped by their prior learning experiences, practicum experience and socialization which creates opportunities for development with the help of other teachers such as colleagues or mentors in the practicum program or in the first years of their teaching practice.

2.4.2 Research related to teachers' and learners' preferences

Previous research has indicated that integrated FFI is efficient with structures that affect the flow of communication negatively (Lightbown, 1998; Spada & Lightbown, 2008) whereas isolated focus on form is suitable to the situations in which the form in focus is not significant enough to carry the meaning (Spada et al., 2005). That is basically the summary of what research has suggested concerning the choice of each method. However; teachers' practices are not based solely on study results; as mentioned before, teachers' own experiences as learners and teacher trainees also affect their preferences.

Baleghizadeh and Khodarahmi (2015) studied the effects of learners' proficiency levels on the preferences of teachers and students on integrated or isolated focus on form. The study included 157 Iranian EFL students with different proficiency levels and both the teachers and the students answered a questionnaire. The study revealed that advanced level students preferred more isolated focus on form than lower intermediate participants. According to the study, in order to assure the maximum understanding teachers should teach the target structures prior to or

after communicative activities for intermediate students. For advanced students, the structures that are too complex should be taught using integrated focus on form. As a result of the study, it can be observed that teachers think that isolated instruction is more appropriate for intermediate learners whereas integrated and isolated instruction can be used for advanced learners, which showed the correlation between the learners' proficiency and the learners' and teachers' attitudes towards isolated and integrated instruction.

Ustunbas (2016), on the other hand, conducted a study with 651 learners of different proficiency levels and their 42 instructors in Turkey to discover teachers' and learners' preferences of integrated and isolated focus on form. The results were in favor of integrated focus on form for both learners and teachers and the level of proficiency did not make any difference. The findings did not point out to a gap between learners' and teachers beliefs.

Uysal and Bardakçı (2014) explored English teachers' beliefs in Turkey and investigated the reasons behind their choices. The results showed that teachers mostly prefer the focus on forms approach. The most important factors affecting their preferences were found to be the ministry of national education curriculum, students' expectations, and textbook respectively. Teachers were not knowledgeable about the FFI approach. The findings of this study indicate a gap between actual teacher practices and developments in the field of foreign language teaching.

There are also studies which focus on learners' preferences of isolated and integrated FFI. Ahmadi, Farsani and Zadeh (2016) conducted a study which focused on learners' preferences. The study investigated whether learners' awareness of these preferences leads to a better learner performance. They asked the learners about the ways they preferred, isolated or integrated. The ones which did not state a preference

were put in the control group. Target forms were given separately from communication in the isolated group. Forms were presented while they were completing the tasks in the isolated group. The students in the control group were provided with both of the approaches. Both isolated and integrated groups outperformed the control group in the given tasks but there was not a significant difference between isolated and integrated groups. Learners who received instructions in line with their preferences had better results.

Ansarin, Abad and Khojasteh (2015) were interested in finding out the influence of EFL learners' level of proficiency on their preferences of isolated and integrated FFI. 454 Turkish learners of English participated in the study. In contrast to what the researchers' expected, level of language proficiency did not affect the preferences of the learners significantly. The results rejected the general assumption that advanced learners would prefer integrated FFI and beginners would like more isolated methods.

2.5 Error correction and feedback

Another sub-topic discussed in the scope of this research is pre-service teachers' perspectives about error correction and feedback. Feedback can be defined as drawing learners' attention to the problems in their utterances during communication or to other mediums of language production such as in written tasks in order to help language learners monitor and reflect on their own production. It further enables learners to come up with hypotheses about language forms they are learning and they have already learned partially (Lyster, 2004). Basically, it is a strategy used by language teachers to facilitate language learning (Lyster & Mori, 2006). Corrective

feedback is the type of feedback provided to the learners in response to their oral or written language errors in the target language (Sheen& Ellis, 2011).

Error correction has been a matter of great controversy in instructed SLA for the last 3 decades. The role of corrective feedback has been discussed thoroughly. The issue of dealing with errors has significant theoretical and pedagogical implications. The impact and effectiveness of error correction and feedback depends on different factors like type of the feedback, explicitness of the feedback, nature of the target linguistic forms, context, and individual differences among students (Nassaji, 2000).

While some researchers believe that exposure to language in a natural environment is all what a language learner needs, others believe that natural exposure alone is not enough to acquire language forms correctly. The same conflict was also seen among the instructors in practice; teachers. The teachers who stated their negative opinions on the use of corrective feedback thought that error correction in the classroom lead to higher levels of anxiety and a higher affective filter (Krashen, 1985); however, another factor contributing to students motivation came to fore: the students' expectations from their teachers.

The students who were used to error correction and take it as the norm of classroom teaching took teachers' not correcting as, which is a face validity problem. Casciani and Rapallino's (1991) study and Bang's (1999) study showed that majority of the students in their studies thought error correction to be an essential element in the foreign language classroom. Burgess and Etherington (2002) also found that learners and teachers had positive opinions about error correction. According to Krashen (1982), grammar should not be taught because it interferes with the natural course of language learning. For the learners to acquire a language

comprehensible input is needed and acquisition is possible when the comprehensible input is slightly more advanced than the inter-language of the learner. According to applied linguists who agree with Krashen (1982), grammatical structures are acquired in a certain order no matter how, when or how much they are instructed or no matter how much corrective feedback is given to the learners.

Although comprehensible input is helpful in acquiring a foreign language, learners may also benefit from corrective feedback which helps learners discover the gap between their inter-language and the target forms. Spada (2011) adds to the affective factors and expectations effecting learners' preferences and draws the attention to the learners' awareness of corrective feedback. Learners' approach to form-focused instruction may differ from each other. Some learners may like to approach language in a more analytical way. These learners may benefit from corrective feedback embedded in communication. Marzban and Mokhberi (2012) compared the two types of approaches: reactive focus on form and pre-emptive focus on form. Reactive focus on form is applied when learners produce an error and it involves didactic negotiation. Pre-emptive focus on form is applied even though when there is no problem related to language production. In the pre-emptive group grammar was taught explicitly while in the reactive group attention was drawn to grammar when there was an error. There was also a control group which received no grammar instruction at all. The reactive group outperformed the pre-emptive and control group in grammar tasks. The reactive approach to focus on form is in line with the approach which supports the use of corrective feedback.

In the scope of this study, the main type of feedback to be discussed will be oral corrective feedback because the research is mostly based on student teachers' observations of the classroom. As Gass and Selinker (2008) define it, oral corrective

feedback is the information provided to the learners about the success of their utterances and it also includes the chances given to the learners to reflect on their language production. The main types of oral corrective feedback are recasts and prompts. In Nicholas, Lightbown and Spada's (2001) definition, recasts are corrected restatements of incorrect learner utterances. Prompts are defined as moves which trigger self-correction by the learners. Lyster (2004) lists four types of prompts: clarification requests which are signals that indicate the message the learner is giving is not understood by the receiver (e.g., "Pardon?"), metalinguistic clues which provide information and questions about learners' utterances (e.g., "Do we say it like that in English?, That is not how we use adjectives in English"), elicitations which is giving learners time to complete teachers' sentences e.g., "It's a-----, it is a -----."), repetitions which are done by repeating learners' utterances in a different intonation to draw the attention to the error (e.g., "They does? They does?").

As previous literature has demonstrated recasts are the most popular feedback type among language teachers because they do not interfere much with the flow of the communication in the classroom. Lyster and Ranta (1997) reported that based on the classroom practices of four French immersion teachers in Canadian context, recasts are the most popular type of oral feedback. Lyster (2004) also reported that phonological and grammatical errors are better handled through recasts. Lyster and Mori (2006) also found a similar situation in French and Japanese immersion classes. Hawkes and Nassaji (2016) also studies the effects of recasts on students' awareness of their own grammatical errors and the results were in favor of recasts.

Bell (2005) was one of the researchers who examined the effects of different types of feedback: elicitation, recasts, and a combination of the two on a specific grammatical form. Results have demonstrated the positive short-term effect of

recasts but delayed tests showed that a combination of recasts with elicitation questions was the most effective. Simard and Jean (2011) also found that recast and explicit correction were used more compared to other types of oral corrective feedback in L2 French and English instruction contexts. Lee's (2013) study also showed that recasts were the most popular type of oral corrective feedback which led to self-correction by the student in most cases. Dilāns, (2016) investigated teachers' perspectives on oral feedback given to minority students of Latvian as a second language and the results indicated that teachers had a tendency to use explicit and isolated recasts. There are also studies which showed the discrepancies between teachers' preferences when asked and their actual classroom practices. Basturkmen, Loewen and Ellis's research (2004) showed that teachers' beliefs about and actual practices of error correction didn't match each other.

In conclusion, studies have illustrated that corrective feedback has an important place in foreign language teaching. However its use and effect depends highly on learner and context. So its use is a matter of "suitability" not "superiority" (Al-Rubai'ey & Nassaji 2013). Also as stated by Schultz (1996) the effectiveness of error correction is highly related to learners' attitude. "If it is welcomed, it may well have more positive effects than if it is resented" (Schultz, 1996, p. 349).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study is to explore the beliefs and preferences of pre-service English teachers concerning the role of grammar in learning and teaching English in an EFL context. The study investigates the effects of the practicum program in which the teacher trainees have the opportunity to observe their mentor teachers in the collaborating schools and to teach on the student teachers' preferences of grammar instruction.

It also aims to explore whether pre-service teachers' perspectives on isolated and integrated focus on form are consistent with current theoretical views and research about the timing of grammatical instruction. As a further aspect, the study explores the role of teacher and feedback to errors in these two different types of form focused instruction. To this end, this study will seek answers to the following research questions:

1. What are the beliefs of pre-service teachers about the role of grammar in learning and teaching English as a foreign language before they take the practicum course and having the practicum experience (as shaped by their prior language learning experiences and methodological courses they have taken)?
2. Do their beliefs and preferences change after one semester of observations and teaching experience in the practicum? If so, in which aspects?
3. What are the preferences of pre-service teachers in terms of role of the teacher and error correction in teaching grammar?

3.1 Research context

As a part of a highly prestigious state university in the country, the department of foreign language education has been training pre-service English teachers since 1984. It is one of the most efficient teacher training programs in Turkey because graduates of the program are recruited generally by prestigious private and state schools in addition to various state and private universities. Also compulsory attendance to courses and the observations in the practicum school are among the requirements of the program.

The pre-service teachers in the undergraduate program are admitted to the department after a central exam and to be admitted in the program they have to get top scores and a good ranking in the mentioned exam. The courses offered at the senior year of the foreign language education department include School Experience in TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language), Practice Teaching in EFL, and Seminar on Practice Teaching in EFL. At the first 6 semesters of the program the students take all of the methodology courses and at the 7th and 8th semesters they have courses where they can reflect on their practicums with their practicum supervisors. In the practicum schools the students are observed by both their supervisors and mentors. They also have other pre-service teachers in some of the classes they teach as observers. In these processes they are provided with feedback and guidance by their mentors, supervisors, and peers.

After the topic and subjects of the study were determined, the title of the study and the summary of the research including the theoretical background, research questions and procedures the participants were going to be subject to were sent to the ethics sub-committee of the institution, and they were analyzed and approved by the committee (see Appendix A).

3.2 Participants

The participants of this study are 75 pre-service English teachers in their senior year in a 4 year program. 14 of these students were also interviewed at the beginning and at the end of the practicum process. These students were registered for the 2017-2018 academic year. The participants took the School experience in TEFL course in the fall of 2017-2018 academic year and Practice Teaching in EFL and Seminar in Teaching in EFL in the spring semester of the same academic year. The teacher trainees were required to observe 3 classes a week in the cooperating schools during the fall semester. On the other hand, they were required to observe 3 classes a week while also teaching four macro-teaching sessions throughout the spring semester. The cooperating schools where the observations took place included private and public schools, and primary, secondary and high schools. In these schools, teacher trainees had the opportunity to observe a real classroom, help the mentor teacher in the classroom, and practice teaching in a real teaching environment. Table 1 and table 2 show the number of students assigned to each school type.

Table 1: Number of Student Teachers Allocated for Private and State Schools

School type	<i>N</i>	%
Private	58	77.33
State	17	22.67

Table 2: Number of Student Teachers Allocated for Each Level

School level	<i>N</i>	%
Primary	21	28
Secondary	23	30.66
High school	31	41.34

10 of the 75 participants were males while 65 of them were females and the age range of the participants was between 21 and 25. The participants who took part in the survey of the pre-test were asked if they wanted to participate in the interview, too. The ones who agreed left their phone numbers and they are called after the surveys were completed. 80 of the students answered the pre-test survey questions and 15 of them participated in the interview. After they were contacted for the post-test, 75 of them answered the survey and 14 of them participated in the interview. So 5 of the participants were eliminated from the survey and one student was eliminated from the interview due to various reasons. Some of them were abroad due to the Erasmus program and some of them quitted the program due to health problems.

3.3 Instrumentation

Data collection process of the present study lasted more than a year because the pre-test was conducted at the end of the 6th semester when theoretical courses were completed and the post-test was conducted at the end of the practicum. This period allowed the pre-service teachers to gain the required observation and teaching experience necessary for the study questions to be answered. As a result, the participants could relate the survey and interview questions to their experience in the cooperating schools.

Two main instruments were utilized to collect data for the study: A survey and an interview; and both of these instruments were used both in the pre-test and the post-test. Some minor changes were done between the pre and post test versions. For example; the pre-test questionnaire didn't include questions about the teachers they observed while the post-test did because the pre-test survey was conducted before the participants had any observation experience. Similarly, the open-ended survey

question in the pre-test focused on participants' previous language learning experience while the question in the post-test was reformulated to cover not only previous learning experience but also observations in the practicum process.

3.3.1 Survey

All of the quantitative data was provided by the survey. The mentioned survey including a five-point likert scale was adopted from various sources. This survey was an adaptation of the questionnaires used by Burgess and Etherington (2002) and Spada and Valeo (2015). A survey of 29 items including an open-ended question was conducted. Cronbach's alpha, a measure of internal consistency, was used as a measure of scale reliability for the survey. The Cronbach alpha of the 29 items was .651. However; after reliability analysis 5 items which affected the Cronbach's alpha negatively were omitted. Finally .732 reliability was reached with the 23 questions left.

3.3.1.1. Pre-test survey

The survey consisted of 23 five point likert scale items and an open-ended question. The 23 five-point likert scale items judged degrees of agreement (i.e., 1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Somewhat Disagree, 3: Neither agree nor disagree, 4: Somewhat agree, 5: Strongly Agree). The pre-test survey also included an open-ended question about student teachers' grammar learning experiences. The open-ended question was added after consulting two professors working in the field of EFL for an expert opinion. The final version of the survey was shaped according to both previous research and expert opinion (see Appendix B). One week after, an online version of the survey was sent to students abroad due to exchange programs and to the students who were

absent when the classes were visited by the researcher. 8 students filled the online version.

3.3.1.2. Post-test survey

The post-test survey also included the same 23 five-point likert scale questions as the pre-test (see Appendix C). It also had three open ended questions: “Was your mentor teacher native or non-native speaker of English?”, “How did your mentor teachers focus on grammar, implicitly or explicitly? How and when did your mentors provide feedback for grammar errors? Was their approach efficient?” and “Did your approach to teaching grammar change after your practicum experience? If yes, how?” The first open-ended question was asked to test the assumption that native teachers will use more implicit methods while non-native teachers will use more explicit methods. The other two questions aimed at exploring whether the practicum period and the mentors’ approach to grammar teaching have an impact on student teachers’ beliefs and preferences.

3.3.2 Interviews

The interviews were conducted individually by the researcher. All of the interviews were done face to face. Each interview lasted approximately 25-30 minutes and all of them were voice recorded. At the end of the spring semester of 2016-2017 academic year, the survey was given to teacher trainees who will be doing their practicum the following year. After they took all of the theoretical courses the undergraduate program offers, their classes were visited and they were asked to fill the survey. They were also asked if they wanted to participate in the second phase of the study:

interview. They were informed about the topic and expected duration of the interview.

The main purpose of conducting an interview was to gain an in-depth view about how student teachers approach grammar teaching and two distinct types of focus on form. The questions were a detailed version of the survey items. It enabled the researcher to explain two different types of form-focused instruction before the participants answered the questions directed at them. The interview questions were in English but the participants were asked about their language preference. Some of them preferred to speak in their mother tongue, Turkish; however, all participants used field related terminology in English. Although some of them started to answer the questions in Turkish they switched to English for terminology because it was the language they received their formal education during their undergraduate years.

The format of the interview was a semi-structured interview. It is more flexible compared to structured interview in that it provided the opportunity to expand responses (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). There were a set of questions prepared to prompt the participant to speak but these questions were followed by further questions which were shaped according to the answers so that expansion of the topic and an in-depth thinking about the questions the study was answering was possible. Expert opinion was also consulted to while preparing the prompts for the interview. There were minor changes between the pre-test interview (see Appendix D) and post-test interview (see Appendix E). The pre-test questions were centered on previous language learning experiences and theoretical courses only while the post-test questions also included questions related to teacher training experience. Table 3 summarizes the data sources and analysis for each research question.

Table 3. Research Questions, Data Collection and Analysis

Research Questions	Data Collection and Timing	Data Analysis
1. What are the beliefs of pre-service teachers about the role of grammar in learning and teaching English as a foreign language before they take the practicum course and having the practicum experience (as shaped by their prior language learning experiences and methodological courses they have taken)?	Pre-test survey (likert scale and open-ended questions), pre-test interview	Quantitative analysis (means, standard deviations for scales, and qualitative analysis of the survey and interviews.
2. Do their beliefs and preferences change after one semester of observations and teaching experience in the practicum? If so, in which aspects?	Pre-test and post-test survey(likert scale and open-ended questions), pre and post-test interview	Quantitative analysis (means, standard deviations for scales), and qualitative analysis survey questions and interviews.
3. What are the preferences of pre-service teachers in terms of role of the teacher and error correction in teaching grammar?	Pre and post-test Survey(likert scale), post-test interview	Quantitative analysis (means, standard deviations for scales, and qualitative analysis survey questions and interviews.

As it is clearly stated in the table, the data collection was done through not only qualitative methods but also quantitative methods; and more than one of the two methods were adopted to find answers to each of the questions. The variety in the data collection instruments provided a wider point of view to understand the phenomenon.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The results of the study will be presented according to sub-titles which are shaped with the help of previous literature and research questions which were formed accordingly.

4.1 Beliefs and preferences of pre-service teachers before the practicum

The beliefs of the pre-service teachers regarding isolated and integrated focus on form were explored through the survey and the questionnaires before the practicum period. The participants answered this question by relating to their own language learning experience, the observations of their own English teachers; and by taking the methodological courses they have attended throughout their undergraduate years into consideration. Descriptive statistics of pre-service teachers' scores can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Pre-test survey: Scale-level analysis

	<i>N</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Integrated FFI total	75	33.00	49.00	40.24	3.81
Isolated FFI total	75	18.00	48.00	34.49	5.86
Integrated FFI mean	75	3.30	4.90	4.02	.38
Isolated FFI mean	75	1.38	3.69	2.65	.45

There were 10 items showing the tendency for integrated focus on form and 13 items showing the tendency for isolated focus on form. The mean of the preferences is higher for the integrated focus on form ($M = 40.2$, $SD = 3.81$) compared to isolated

focus on form ($M = 34.4$, $SD = 5.86$). However, because the number of the items showing the tendency for integrated focus on form and isolated focus on form is different, the means needed to be divided by number of items in each category (13 items for isolated and 10 items for integrated focus on form).

As the test was done on a 5-point likert scale, the calculation was made accordingly. The means for the items showing the tendency to use integrated focus on form ($M = 4.02$), and for the items showing the tendency to use isolated focus on form ($M = 2.6$) were different from each other and the results seemed to be in favor of isolated focus on form. To determine if this difference is statistically significant a paired sample t-test was conducted and the results indicated that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores for integrated focus on form ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.38$) and isolated focus on form ($M = 2.6$, $SD = 0.45$) preferences; $t(74) = 21.03$, $p = .00$. The results were significantly in favor of integrated focus on form. According to these results, pre-service teachers have a higher tendency to prefer integrated focus on form compared to isolated focus on form.

As mentioned before, the question about pre-service teachers' preferences before the practicum was addressed also through an open-ended question in the pre-test and interviews. The open-ended question (Remember your language learning experience. Do you have positive or negative feelings in general? Which practices of your teachers were the most useful?) was answered by 58 (77.3 %) of the participants. The rest did not answer this question.

The majority of these participants (91.3%) describe the language education they went through as teaching of isolated grammar structures. They received only grammar instruction and they had no communicative activities at all. One participant stated that the process of learning English was like "learning mathematics formulas."

The focus of the lessons was generally grammar and the teachers prepared the students for central exams such as university entrance exam, which is based on grammar. They don't remember receiving instruction of productive skills such as writing and speaking:

I liked being provided with rules explicitly however there should have been more attention on production (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #29).

While learning English grammar, I only remember studying to the structures separately from a meaningful context. We learned grammar structures in the sentence level (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #61).

For example, I knew that we have types for "If clauses" like Type 0, and 1 and etc. But when I tried to speak the language and was supposed to form a sentence including those ones, I could not do it fluently because I need to figure out the rule and then apply it to my sentence. What I mean is that those rules never became automatic for me because we did not use them in authentic contexts in my English course (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #48).

As far as their perspectives and feelings are concerned, minority (15%) of the 53 students who received form-focused education were happy about their teachers' approach. This is a very small rate when the number of the pre-service teachers who stated their negative perspectives on their language learning experience is considered. This minority explained their reasons for remembering a positive language learning experience as such: Having an instruction of isolated focus on form helped them see grammatical forms more clearly and they felt safer because they knew exactly what to expect to learn from the class. When grammar is integrated in context, learners may get lost in meaning and may not be able to concentrate on grammatical structures:

I learned English through focus on form. I find grammar useful because it is more concrete (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #75).

My teacher used to introduce the grammatical structure first, then go on building upon that. That was useful for me because I was aware of what is going to be involved in the class (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #12).

From my foreign language learning experiences I can tell that explicit instruction and terminology helps me a lot because I am also interested in linguistics (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #4).

Different from what is generally thought, grammar was not the boring part for me. I strongly believe that explicit teaching of grammar is needed for learners to develop their language skills...Basic grammar activities fill in the blanks consisted of repetitions of the same structure and they helped me learn grammar (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #7).

However, some of them also acknowledged the absence of more communicative methods. They felt the need for more opportunities for them to practice the language. The instruction was sometimes too mechanical and too abstract to transfer to real conversation. One of the participants stated the need for more communicative methods as such:

I actually prefer explicit instruction at first to help students not to get lost in the topics but mere exposure is not enough for us to improve in that language and use it in everyday life conversations (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #39).

However, the use of communicative methods was not practical and easy in the traditional language classroom even in the situations when the teacher wanted to use them. It was not how learners received instruction in any of the courses in traditional Turkish classrooms. When they encountered a method different than what they had experienced they reacted negatively fearing that the teacher was not teaching

effectively. Some participants drew the attention to students' unfamiliarity with communicative activities and integrated focus on form saying:

As most students expected this way of teaching, it wasn't very effective when the teacher tried to integrate songs and stories into the class (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #40).

They tried a more integrated way through texts in high school but because everyone was used to isolated focus on form there was a lack of comprehension. So the teachers went back to teach in an isolated way (ST interview, participant# 15).

There was only focus on form; we cannot talk about even an isolated focus on form. Isolated from what? There was no communication to be isolated from (ST interview, participant # 11).

These students believe that they benefited from this method, and as a result of this method they could communicate after a while. Although they had some difficulty in speaking English when they first came to university and started to undergo an English medium education, they got used to it easily.

On the other hand, only the minority of the participants (8.6%) who answered this open-ended question defined their learning process as a communicative one. Their teachers enabled communication in a meaning-based context. They listened to songs, they acted in plays, they did role-plays and productive activities such as essay writing and speaking about a specific subject. One of them even remembers doing debates. All of these students have positive feelings about their own learning process and their teachers' approach:

Showing the grammatical structure in context and then taking attention to the relations between the meaning and grammatical structure is the most useful way (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #26).

I think presenting the grammar in context is the best way to teach grammar and we generally used to do that (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #32).

Positive, because my teacher was so successful combining the activities with communication and form (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant # 25).

I remember learning in an environment which embraces context and language at the same time. It was really helpful (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #1).

In high school, we focused more on other skills other than grammar. We learnt the grammar in meaningful ways and they contributed to me a lot (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant #45).

The use of authentic materials and text-based communicative exercises helped a lot without the explicit grammar teaching (ST open-ended survey item 24, participant # 16).

The responses to the open-ended question of the survey were in line with the other 23 five-point likert items. The questionnaire showed that pre-service teachers generally had negative feelings about their English learning experience due to an overload of explicit grammar teaching lacking context. Focusing only grammar and ignoring other elements of language (i.e., the communicative and productive aspects) made learning more challenging for the majority.

Although there is a general tendency to prefer an integrated focus on form, there were also some students who stated that focusing on grammar isolated from meaning and context helped them. They enjoyed realizing the language focus of the lesson explicitly. They knew what to focus on better. The positive perspectives about the isolated focus on form instruction were detected thanks to the open-ended item.

It is also clear that their experiences and what they learned from their methodological courses have similar effects on their perspectives about grammar

teaching. Their answers generally reflect the communicative approach, which entails integration of form in context. Only two of the participants stated that there was no need for grammar instruction at all. The rest of the students who answered the open ended survey questions and the ones who were interviewed valued instruction and form-focused methods although they mostly had negative learning experiences through isolated from-focused methods which included no communication at all. Most of the pre-service teachers have pointed out to an ideal language classroom that is meaning-based and form-focused at the same time. The participants who also reflected on the reasons behind their thinking stated that focus on form instruction contributed to all receptive and productive skills. Its contribution to social aspects of language, pragmatic knowledge, and understanding of content were also among the reasons listed.

4.2 Effects of the practicum on preferences regarding isolated and integrated focus on form

To understand if the pre-service teacher's preferences change after the practicum, the pre-test and post-test scores of the integrated focus on form and isolated focus on form preferences were compared via a paired sample t-test. There was not a statistically significant difference in the integrated focus on form pre-test ($M = 40.24$, $SD = 3.81$) and post-test ($M = 40.28$, $SD = 3.77$) preferences; $t(74) = -0.80$, $p = .0936$. Similarly, there was no statistically significant difference between pre-test ($M = 34.49$, $SD = 5.86$) and post-test ($M = 33.43$, $SD = 5.17$) isolated focus on form preferences; $t(74) = 1.505$, $p = 0.137$.

The data demonstrated that the minor mean differences between the pre and post-test are not statistically significant for both integrated and isolated focus on

form preferences. This means there is not any significant change in pre-service teachers' preferences after they went through the practicum period according to quantitative data.

Results were also compared taking different factors into consideration. The type of practicum schools (i.e., state and private) was determined as one factor which may affect the results. To make comparisons according to school type, two independent sample t-tests were administered. There were not significantly meaningful differences in the integrated focus preferences for private schools ($M = 40.03$, $SD = 3.79$) and state schools ($M = 40.38$, $SD = 3.84$), $t(78) = -0.359$, $p = 0.721$. Also, there were not significant differences in the isolated focus preferences for private schools ($M = 35.11$, $SD = 6.06$) and state schools ($M = 35.09$, $SD = 9.12$), $t(78) = 0.013$, $p = 0.990$.

Another factor was the level of the observed classrooms: primary, secondary and high schools. A one-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run to compare the role of classroom levels on integrated focus on form preferences. There was not a statistically significant difference in the integrated focus on form preferences for the classroom levels ($F(2, 77) = .83$, $p = 0.43$). Likewise, a one-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run to compare the role of classroom levels on isolated focus on form preferences. There was not a statistically significant difference in the isolated focus on form preferences for the classroom levels ($F(2, 77) = .75$, $p = 0.47$).

The changes in terms of pre-service teachers' perspectives were also investigated through qualitative methods. Out of 75 students who participated in the research, 52 (69.3%) of them answered the open-ended question in the post-test asking if their preference about how to teach grammar changed after their practicum

experience. 32 (61.5 %) of these students stated that their approach did not change. They used to favor an integrated method which is more communicative and their opinion was the same after the practicum experience. They stated that they still preferred to teach grammar in a more integrated way. Three of them stated their teaching approaches were shaped by the methodological course they have taken before the teacher training program, Teaching Grammar in TEFL while 8 of these pre-service teachers stated that they did not have enough teaching experience in the practicum to change their teaching philosophy:

Explicit grammar teaching does not lead to real language learning (ST post-test open-ended survey item 31, participant # 36).

I still find separate grammar teaching boring and redundant (ST post-test open-ended survey item 31, participant # 11).

6 (11.5 %) of these 52 students who answered the open-ended question in the post-test stated that their approach changed and they realized the need to present grammatical forms separately from context. These teacher candidates stated that they could see how students lacked explicit grammar knowledge. They could easily notice during their observation process that some grammatical structures were not acquired by the learners for months. They state the need for separate attention to form:

I was thinking it was going to be more meaningful but the students are confused unless they learn the grammar rules explicitly and separately. They are expecting to learn concrete grammatical rules (ST post-test open-ended survey item 31, participant #16).

I believe grammatical structures can be given beforehand (ST post-test open-ended survey item 31, participant #60).

I realized the importance of the balance between structure and meaning. Now, I will focus on grammar more (ST post-test open-ended survey item 31, participant # 12).

I used to think grammar should be taught only through communicative context based activities. I think there is a place for an isolated grammar now (ST post-test open-ended survey item 31, participant # 64).

Majority of the participants (73%) who answered the question about the teacher they observed stated that they worked with non-native speaker English teachers. 14 of them (27%) stated that they worked with a native speaker English teacher. 30 (78.9%) of these 38 students who worked with non-native teachers stated that their mentor teacher approached grammar in an explicit way. Some of them described it as an isolated approach to grammar. Most of them describe an isolated focus on form instruction although they do not use the term “isolated” although a few students described a method closer to “focus on forms” which is not based on a communicative approach at all.

My mentor focused on grammar explicitly. First, she teaches the target structure, then implements communicative and meaningful activities (ST post-test open-ended survey item 30, participant # 46).

Explicit before moving to tasks...Students want a structure, rule for the grammatical subjects (ST post-test open-ended survey item 30, participant #60).

The rules are given explicitly. Then, he makes meaningful and practical activities. Firstly, giving explicit rules and then constructing it with meaningful activities seem helpful for students (ST post-test open-ended survey item 30, participant #45).

50% of the 14 students who observed non-native teachers stated that they liked the implicit way of presenting grammar. These teachers used stories to contextualize the

target structure. Such an environment does not require memorizing grammar rules and students feel more welcomed when they make mistakes.

My mentor is always practicing grammar in a context which has a specific theme or unit. I can observe that students feel more comfortable and curious (ST post-test open-ended survey item 30, participant #3).

Only two of them stated that they observed primary school level which was based primarily on vocabulary and they did not have enough opportunity to see how their mentor teachers approach grammar. Some of the participants stated that there might be a need for more isolated methods when it comes to more complex structures. After observing their native mentors, some pre-service teachers stated the need for a balance between isolated and integrated focus on form:

I believe that grammar should be taught both explicitly and implicitly (ST post-test open-ended survey item 31, participant #74).

I realize the importance of the balance between structure and meaning now. I will try to focus on more grammar now (ST post-test open-ended survey item 31, participant #12).

Some students were surprised to see the native English teacher mentors they observed use integrated and isolated focus on form instruction at the same time. Observing a native or non-native English speaker mentor did not affect teacher trainees' perspectives. Although the general expectation from a native teacher is to focus on grammar in a more integrated way, their mentor teachers used both:

He focuses on grammar explicitly on grammar lessons. He talks about grammatical rules and provides exercises without context (ST post-test open-ended survey item 30, participant #2).

While the survey results showed that the big majority of the students were in favor of a more integrated approach before and after the practicum, interview results showed that teacher candidates were more positive towards the inclusion of isolated focus on form after the practicum experience. When they were asked if their approach changed after the practicum through an open-ended question in the post-test, the majority of them stated their approach was exactly the same. Thanks to the one to one interviews, it was clear that although they cannot name it as a term, the teacher candidates realized a gap in comprehension and acquisition of some grammatical structures. 85.7% of the students who participated in the interview admitted that they were more positive about isolated focus on form after the practicum process.

4.3 The effect of students' age and level of proficiency of pre-service teachers' preferences

One of the aspects discovered through the interviews was the effect of age and level of proficiency on pre-service teachers' preferences of isolated and integrated focus on form. Before the practicum, out of 14 participants who took part in the questionnaire, 6 (42.8%) of them stated they would prefer isolated focus on form for adult learners of lower proficiency. Especially for beginner and lower-intermediate groups, isolated focus on form is regarded as the only way learners can proceed to higher levels because of time constraints. One of the participants stated that it would be unrealistic for an adult learner to be patient enough to wait for the integrated methods to work. One of the participants stated the situation as:

I cannot tell my beginner adult learner to wait for the integrated methods to show their effect, I cannot do that to the students in the prep school when they have three months before the exam, they would fail for sure (ST interview, participant #68).

67% of these participants stated that their opinions did not change after the practicum. They stated that they still think that there could be a shift to more integrated methods as the level of proficiency increases. Two of these participants stated that after the practicum they realized that there could be a place for isolated FFI even in higher levels of proficiency. They realized that some forms were not noticed through integrated methods.

The 10th grader I observed could not understand “if only”. I think my mentor should have switched to isolated focus on form or maybe even to Turkish, the class could not get it. There may be difficult structures that may not be noticed. Isolation is necessary (ST interview, participant #3).

21% of the participants, who volunteered for the interview, stated a preference for integrated focus on form regardless of the proficiency and age level. The reasons were generally the permanency of the acquisition through integrated methods. One of them stated that:

I do not care what my students want, I know the good for them, I studied for that, I will take some time but it will last longer, they will understand it finally (ST interview, participant #14).

After the practicum all of these participants changed their mind and acknowledged the place of the isolated focus on form. Some of them stated that they would use isolated focus on form to explain certain linguistic form in the higher levels of proficiency. One of them stated that she would prefer more isolated methods for the adults. Two of the participants who stated that they would make use of isolated methods in all of the age and proficiency levels changed their minds after the

practicum, and stated that they would use integrated methods especially for young learners.

In sum, when age and language proficiency is the matter of concern, the general tendency was to use integrated methods for young learners and especially for high proficiency levels, however, there was a general shift to acknowledge the need for isolated methods after especially seeing the real classroom environment of the Turkish state schools. With the limited time allocated to English classes and limited input, most of the participants acknowledged that there was a need for isolated focus on form. Some forms were not easily noticed in the scope of meaning-based classes. Some direct and isolated attention to form was necessary. Some of the participants stated their preference referring to cognitive abilities:

I was afraid that young learners would not understand explicit and isolated grammar. Bu they learn mathematics explicitly, my 7th graders understand maths perfectly, why would not they understand explicit grammar. The thing is being ready cognitively (ST interview, participant #47).

If the learner has metalinguistic awareness, you can teach anything. We do not have perfect tenses in Turkish, you cannot expect students to get it without special teaching in any level, child, adult (ST interview, participant #42).

4.4 Role of teacher and error correction

Pre-service teachers' perspectives about role of teacher and feedback given to errors were investigated through both qualitative and quantitative methods. 3 items related to this subject were examined. Item 12 "Students' grammatical mistakes should be corrected during communicative activities" shows the tendency for integrated focus on form. Item 17 "The best time to correct students' grammatical mistakes is after, not during communicative activities." showed the tendency for isolated focus on

form while item 22 “Teachers should only correct student errors of form which interfere with communication.” showed the preference for isolated focus on form.

The means of item 12 and item 17 were so close to each other in the pre and post-tests; however, the pre and post-test means of item 22 which depicts the tendency for isolated focus on form were different from each other. There is a significant difference between the pre-test ($M = 3,16$, $SD = 1,1$) and posttest mean scores ($M = 3,57$, $SD = 1,05$) of item 22; $t(74) = -2,8$, $p = 0,006$. As suggested by the survey results, after the practicum the students showed a tendency to favor isolated focus on form for feedback while their preferences for integrated focus on form did not change in terms of error correction and feedback.

Although the 5 point likert scale provided some insights about the role of the teacher and error correction, the big amount of the data concerning feedback and error correction was generated through the interview and open-ended survey questions. Qualitative results point out to the fact that majority of the participants think that the role of the teacher on grammar teaching is very important because they have both experienced learning and teaching in classes where the students could not have intensive language because of time limitation. Especially while learning all of the participants had very limited access to technology, the only language source was the teacher for them. That is why the teacher was the primary information provider for them. Also, the approach of the teacher was the criteria determining the flow of the course. It was the teacher to determine if the class was going to be based on integrated and isolated focus on form. So when they were asked about the role of the teacher, most students were surprised about the question. They stated that the teacher was the most important factor in effective language learning environment. Both

methodological and psychological approach of the teachers affected if the learners wanted to learn the language or not.

The research question about the role of the teacher and feedback was answered through the one-to one interviews mostly. However, some students also reflected on feedback and role of the teacher through the open-ended questions in the questionnaire. Out of 14 students who were interviewed 71% of them stated that they received immediate feedback through recasts and metalinguistic questions. Their teachers mostly asked questions to help them do self-correction or peer-correction. Eight of the students who received immediate feedback stated that they liked this approach. They could see their mistakes immediately so that they could correct their mistakes immediately. These students think that if the feedback about grammatical mistakes is delayed, the students learn the form incorrectly and it is more difficult to correct these mistakes after a time interval.

Because it is critical period, feedback should be immediate especially with the young learners (ST interview, participant #15).

I do not want to accept what we learned in the methodological classes and I would like to state openly that I enjoy immediate feedback for sure (ST interview, participant #11).

The correct forms should be acquired as soon as possible. Two of these students stated that they liked the feedback more when their teachers explained the reason of their mistakes. They enjoyed receiving metalinguistic feedback. The others stated that they did not like receiving immediate feedback because they were embarrassed when their teachers did recasts or asked them questions to elicit the correct form. These students thought that their teachers did immediate error correction to humiliate them in front of their friends and took it personally. One of them stated that she

stopped participating because she was afraid that she would be corrected by the teacher. These students also stated that they did not like to be interrupted while speaking in the classroom. Recasts affected the flow of the communication negatively:

If I am giving a speech, interrupting may be disturbing for a high proficiency level (ST interview, participant #51).

Non-native teachers have a tendency for grammar fascism. They concentrate on grammar rather than meaning, they enjoy taking students' points off just because of their minor grammar mistakes (ST interview, participant #42).

Out of these 14 participants 21% of them stated receiving other types of feedback such as peer-feedback or class feedback. One of them stated that she benefitted from peer-feedback most. Her teacher would let them provide feedback to their peers' on their writing and speaking. She states that they could also see their peers' mistakes and it was the best way to learn from their own mistakes. Especially when they read their peers' essays, this type of feedback reduced the risk of feeling embarrassed because the students in the class did not know who wrote the essay and who made the mistake.

Other types of feedback included receiving feedback as a class and after some time. Some teachers who taught them made a list of mistakes or errors done in the last few classes, essays or exams. All of the students who received such kind of feedback stated that it was effective but when they asked if they would do that they were hesitant because of the possibility of learning grammar incorrectly. They stated they would use immediate feedback more safely.

These 14 students were asked about the types of feedback they encountered in their practicum schools in the post-test interview. All of these students stated that the

teachers they observed gave immediate feedback. Majority of these teachers used recasts while others used clarification requests and metalinguistic feedback. Most of the participants who encountered immediate feedback found this method effective while others thought that the level of the students did not fit the type of feedback.

There is not any problem about using immediate feedback as long as the flow of the communication is not broken. You can ask for clarification when the student is talking. “Sorry, I didn’t hear you? Can you repeat that?” doesn’t hurt anybody’s feelings; it is the cleanest way for grammatical feedback (ST interview, participant #25).

The level I observed was so low that they weren’t aware when they received recasts. They couldn’t notice if the teacher was saying the same thing as they said or not. Recasts were not noticed and metalinguistic feedback was not understood (ST interview, participant #36).

Other types of feedback they encountered were repeating the grammatical mistakes loudly to help students do self-correction. The learners understand that they made a mistake and have a chance for correcting their own mistakes. One of the student stated that she found this method to be very effective especially for kids who are shy and who cannot handle being corrected by their peers and teachers. Most of the participants stated that they liked their mentors’ approach in terms of error correction in general. Some of the mentors did not explain the reasons of the mistakes openly. Some of the participants stated that they would also explain the reasons for mistakes explicitly even if they are interrupting the flow of communication.

Out of 75 participants 51 of them answered the open-ended question about feedback in the post-test questionnaire. The question was about the type of feedback they observed in the cooperating school and their opinion about the effectiveness of the method. 62% of the students who answered this item stated that they observed immediate feedback in the classrooms. The immediate feedback was mostly given

through recasts and sometimes thorough clarification questions. 70% of the students who observed immediate feedback thought that it was an efficient type of feedback and they would use it in their own classes, too.

When students make a grammatical mistake that affects communication, she corrects them. I find it efficient mostly (ST post-test open-ended survey item, participant #4).

Explicit using communicative context. They correct students' mistakes immediately and they provide feedback most of the time. I think their approach was efficient for your learners (ST post-test open-ended survey item, participant #21).

Feedback was explicit and in the form of rephrasing and it was very efficient (ST post-test open-ended survey item, participant #11).

Minority of the participants stated that their mentors provided both immediate and delayed feedback and they stated each learner has their own preferences and their mentors knew how to approach each student. They would react depending on the specific students.

Some of the students who did not encounter explicit error correction stated that there was a need for drawing the attention to mistakes and they were disappointed by how their mentors approached mistakes and errors. Some of them stated that they could even observe how mistakes turned into errors during the period they observed the classes. This was the case especially for young learners.

They usually present it in a context, however it shows up that students have difficulty in that way. So he has to turn to explicit error correction. No matter how much you try to teach implicitly, you have to switch to explicit methods when you mention grammar separately (ST post-test open-ended survey item, participant #8).

The rules are given explicitly and he randomly corrects errors. I neither agree nor disagree about the time of the feedback but firstly giving explicit rules and then constructing it with meaningful activities seem helpful for young learners (ST post-test open-ended survey item, participant #45).

The students who observed native teachers stated that their mentors separated communicative activities from grammatical ones. They did not interfere with the flow of the communication. They corrected mistakes in separate sessions.

He focuses on grammar explicitly on grammar lessons. Other lessons are mostly focused on communication and teacher never corrected grammatical mistakes here (ST post-test open-ended survey item, participant #2).

My mentor looks for common errors among students, and develops a lesson solely on a particular structure (ST post-test open-ended survey item, participant #69).

In isolated FFI corrective feedback is not given during communication and meaning-based activities, while in integrated FFI it is given through the communication. It is clear from both the questionnaire and interview before and after the practicum, student teachers in this study are mostly in favor of feedback given in an integrated way. Although most of them cannot name the term isolated, they mostly tend to integrate from when it comes to error correction. It can also be understood from their statements that although most of the mentor teachers especially the non-native ones they observed used isolated focus on form and mostly separated communicative activities from form-focused ones, they preferred using an integrated approach when it comes to feedback on errors. It is very clear from the data that the student teachers are mostly in favor of an integrated method both in teaching in general and in terms of providing feedback. The risk of learning the forms in the wrong way irreversibly is the factor behind their approach.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

With the recent shift to focus on form, the primary concern of grammar education changed from traditional grammar and form-based teaching to focusing on grammar in a meaningful context. After this shift, the best approaches to form-focused instruction, and other determinants of effectiveness such as the timing of form-focused instruction in a communicative language teaching environment started to be the main objects of research.

This study aimed at discovering pre-service English teachers' views and preferences in terms of different types of form-focused instruction. Three main areas were under investigation: (1) pre-service English teachers' opinions about isolated and integrated focus on form, (2) the effect of the one-year practicum period on pre-service English teachers' perspectives and preferences, (3) pre-service English teachers' perspectives and preferences of role of teacher and error correction based on data collected through a one to one semi-structured interview and a questionnaire before and after the practicum period.

5.1 Role of instruction and focus on form

It was clear from both the qualitative and quantitative data generated by 75 participants that the big majority of the participants admitted the importance and function of FFI in the foreign language teaching environment. There were only two participants who disregarded the place of form-focused instruction. One of them stated that he learned English through video games, movies, and music and he never listened to his teachers who taught grammar explicitly. He connected his success in

the target language to the communicative activities he participated in and the amount of the input he received out of the classroom. Most of the participants stated that they were planning to create communicative classrooms for their prospective students but they were also planning to focus on grammar because focus on grammar would shorten the path of acquisition. In this term, the results were in line Long's (1983) meta-analysis which showed that instruction of grammar helps in terms of rate and level of language attainment. The results of the study were also similar to what De Graaf and Housen (2009) found. Instruction can facilitate learning by affecting route, rate and ultimate levels of attainment positively. The study by Valeo (2013) study which explored the effect of form focused instruction on language and content learning also had similar results. The learners who received FFI performed better than the ones who did not in understanding of content. Lyster (2004b) also demonstrated the positive effects of form focused instruction on the learners' sociolinguistic competence which also bear similar results with Tomita and Spada's (2013) study which showed the positive effect of grammar teaching on language socialization and Nguyen et al.'s (2012) study which showed the positive impact of focus on form on pragmatic competence.

5.2 Integrated FFI or Isolated FFI

When timing of grammar instruction is concerned, two approaches are widely related; integrated and isolated FFI (Lightbown & Spada, 2008). The statistical analysis provided by the quantitative measures in the scope of this study showed that there is a clear tendency to favor integrated focus on form over isolated focus on form among pre-service English teachers. Not only their preferences shaped by the methodological courses they have taken before the practicum but also beliefs after

the observations and teaching experience in the practicum schools clearly showed that these student teachers appreciate the value of integrated focus on form. However, analysis, especially the qualitative analysis done through interviews demonstrated that these student teachers also appreciate the value of isolated focus on form in certain circumstances and for specific needs arising during the instruction. This preference for integrated focus on form is consistent with the recent theoretical assumption that a language classroom integrating grammar with communicative activities creates an environment in which grammar and communicative aspects of language can be handled. One reason for this preference could be the nature of the EFL context. As Valeo and Spada (2015) put it, as EFL learners do not have a lot of opportunities to receive input in the target language outside of their instructional environment, they may perceive instruction time as their only chance for communication and focus on grammar.

It was clear from the results that isolated focus on form was preferred by the minority of the participants in the EFL context. However; these findings also suggested that although it may be found undesirable for the stakeholders, there is a place for isolated focus on form. Some participants were even uncomfortable to admit that teaching grammar in an isolated way was necessary because it was against what they learned to be effective. They stated that they criticized their own teachers who taught them grammar explicitly and separately from communication but they realized that there were some gaps in students' learning of some specific forms. Exposure to various types of input and timing can lead to desirable results in terms of grammar, receptive and productive skills. Although the results were generally in favor of integrated focus on form, the participants did not underestimate the function of isolated focus on form. A few of the participants further stated that the choice

between the two types of focus on form is highly dependent on context, learner needs, and characteristics. When learners expect something different from what the teacher provides that may cause frustration and lack of motivation.

The findings of the study share similarities with Valeo and Spada's (2015) study whose questionnaire was one of the primary resources of the data collection process of this study. Their study showed that there was a distinctive preference for integrated focus on form among both ESL and EFL teachers, and the role of isolated focus on form was especially important on learning of structures which are difficult to notice only through exposure. The findings are also in accordance with Elgün-Gündüz, Akcan and Bayyurt's (2012) study which showed that integrated focus on form was more effective according to students' exam scores in terms of teaching of vocabulary and grammar. The learners who preferred isolated FFI stated that concentrating on grammar separately helps them notice grammatical forms and use them in grammar tests. The study also finds support from Üstünbaş's (2016) study which showed that both teachers and learners have a preference for integrated focus on form instruction while also admitting the benefits of isolated focus on form in certain occasions. The results share similarities with what Borg and Burns (2008) found. Both the EFL and ESL teachers in their study expressed a preference for integrated focus on form.

There is also support from research about the effect of isolated and integrated focus on form on speaking and writing performances of students. The study by Barrot (2014) demonstrated the positive effect of a combination of isolated and integrated focus on form on speaking and writing performance with a syllabus helping noticing and form-meaning connection. Majority of the pre-service teachers who were interviewed stated that they started to value isolated focus on form after

they saw the real classroom environment in Turkish state schools. At this point, referring to information processing theory by Van Patten (1991) would help us understand the reasons behind this way of thinking. Human mind can attend to certain aspects of the language at a time, noticing a language form may not be easy within a content based environment, to make sure that a form is noticed it should be presented separately from communication.

5.3 Age and Level of Proficiency

When asked about their preferences related to age and proficiency level, pre-service teachers' tendency was to favor integrated methods for young learners and adults of high proficiency levels. The majority of the participants in the pre-test stated that they may prefer isolated methods for beginner level adults especially for those who are preparing for proficiency exams and etc. Such learners do not have a lot of time to acquire the language in a meaning-based environment as long as grammar is not presented to them separately. However; after the practicum process there was a common shift to appreciate the value of isolated focus on form among the participants. After observing the situation especially at state schools, some of them changed their minds about the usage of integrated methods with young learners and high school students. For some structures to be noticed, isolated attention should be paid. These results are also supported by Ansarin, Abad and Khojasteh (2015). Their study showed that low and high level proficiency learners did not differ with regard to their preferences of integrated and isolated focus on form. Although there is a widely held assumption that advanced learners would prefer integrated FFI and beginners would prefer isolated FFI, the case may not be that straightforward. There are other learner factors to take into consideration; learning styles, context and

purposes of language learning should be considered. Learner preferences should be considered as Ahmadi, Farsani and Zadeh's (2016) study has demonstrated. Learners who received the kind of instruction they preferred in terms of isolated and integrated focus on form were more successful in various language measures. Especially with adult learners who will probably have deep-seated perceptions and beliefs, learner preferences could be an important determinant for the methods to be utilized in the instructional environment.

5.4 Error Correction and Feedback

When the question about error correction and feedback is concerned, it was clear from the data and especially from the data provided by the interviews that the participants had an experience of oral corrective feedback both in their own learning and in the classes they observed. Majority of the pre-service teachers stated that immediate corrective feedback was the most effective way while also stating that not correcting errors at all was not an option. The participants had generally positive perspectives about error correction. The most common feedback type they observed was recasts as also illustrated by previous research.

Error correction was also perceived as a strategy to earn learners' confidence in teachers. Some of the participants stated that a classroom without correction would give the impression that the teacher is not caring. The findings shared common aspects with Casciani and Rapallino's (1991), Bang's (1999), Burgess and Etherington's (2002) studies, which also point out to the opinions teachers and learners, have about feedback to language errors. Marzban and Mokhberi (2012) also showed that reactive FFI which requires taking care of language errors when they

appear in the classroom brought better test results compared to the approach which does not focus on errors.

As far as pre-service teachers' perspectives about different types of oral corrective feedback are concerned, it was clear that both in their language learning experience and practicum process, they observed recasts to be the most common type of oral corrective feedback, and the majority found recasts to be the most effective way, and the big majority of the participants stated that they would make use of recasts in their own teaching, too. In this term, the results match the results of the studies by Lyster and Ranta (1997), Lyster (2004), Lyster and Mori (2006), Lee (2013), and Hawkes and Nassaji (2016) which showed recasts to be the most preferred and widely used type of corrective feedback. The reasons for favoring recasts were their nature which give opportunities for self-correction and which do not hurt learners' feelings. As Han and Kim (2008) put it, "recasts are inherent in the discourse structure of meaning-oriented interaction" (p. 37) and they bear little risk of ruining the flow of the communicative classroom.

Removing recasts from the language classroom would break the flow and authenticity of the classroom. They fit perfectly with communicative activities because they are not interruptive. There is also support coming from Dilāns's (2016) study which indicated that explicit and isolated recasts were commonly preferred by the teachers in Latvian context. Some of the learners pointed out the use of prompts, especially repetitions and clarification requests which are also other common types of corrective feedback. In conclusion, the results clearly demonstrate that the pre-service teachers' observations and perspectives match the finding of the recent research and the commonly held theoretical assumptions in the field foreign language education.

Few of the participants stated that they observed delayed feedback in the classrooms they observed while none of them mentioned receiving delayed feedback in their own language learning experience. There were no participants who stated delayed feedback to be successful. The teacher trainees who observed that method in the classrooms they observed were concerned that the learners did not realize that they had errors; most of the feedback did not lead to noticing. One of the participants mentioned the risk of fossilization at this point. Delayed feedback is also an option but research has shown a preference of immediate feedback because if the teacher draws the students' attention to mistakes immediately when the focus is on meaning, this provides an opportunity for a better "forms-function-meaning mapping" (Doughty, 2001, p.62). In other words, immediate feedback provides the opportunity for the language learners to understand the meaning and function of a certain grammatical structure in a specific context and would more easily link up the form to the meaning it earns in the context.

Another interesting point that became clear during the data collection process was the discrepancy between questionnaire results and interview results. Qualitative results derived from the 5 point likert scale clearly showed that pre-service teachers favor integrated focus on form before and after the practicum process. However, the interview results indicate different points where learners acknowledge the function of isolated focus on form and appreciate the need for isolated attention to form. The main reason behind this difference could be the fact that most of the pre-service teachers in the program did not know isolated and integrated focus on form by definition and function. All of them had heard about focus on meaning, focus on form and focus on forms but there was a minority who knew what isolated FFI and integrated FFI meant.

Before the interview in the pre and post-test, all of the participants were asked if they heard about these two terms. The majority answered positively but when they were asked to explain, it was clear from their responses that they were not knowledgeable about the difference between the two terms as conceptualized in the field. Majority of the participants described isolated focus on form as teaching grammar exclusively and separately from a communicative syllabus. That is why all of the interviewees were informed about these different types of FFI before the interviews to help them reflect on the concepts more easily. Knowing what they mean may have changed their opinions about them. After knowing that isolation was about timing they may have approached isolated focus on form more positively. This could explain the difference between the qualitative and quantitative results to a certain extent.

Literature on isolated and integrated focus on form has demonstrated that a combination of the two can be better than sticking to one approach while neglecting the other. (Fotos, 2005; Azar, 2007; Spada & Lightbown, 2009; Ebrahimi, Saadabadi & Karampour, 2015). At the end of the day, learners' perceptions and teachers' preferences are main factors which will lead to the correct choice of when to use what. Research on isolated and integrated focus on form is still in its infancy. More research is needed for a deeper understanding of what lies behind teachers' preferences. Recent studies have shown the positive effects of both integrated and focus on form; however, when to choose one over the other still needs to be investigated. More research on the subject would make it easier to find out the conditions in which they will work the best.

Limitations

Inclusion of observations of the microteachings and sample lessons given by the participants could have added different perspectives to the study. The comparison of what pre-service teachers express as their preferences and beliefs with their real classroom behavior would have strengthened the methodology of the study by providing one more instrument which would provide a better portrait of the phenomenon. However; that was not possible because the participants' were assigned to different schools and classes of different mentors and their microteachings were not planned ahead. That is why it was not practical to observe all of the participants in the real classroom.

Another problematic area could be response effect; the participants may have answered the questions according to what is generally acceptable and appropriate for an ideal teacher as conceived by the society and as the methodological courses they have taken suggested. However, even if there is the risk of a response effect, the data is still valuable because it also reflects participants' perceptions of ideal teacher.

Another possible limitation is the number of participants. Although the big majority of the teacher trainees in the institution volunteered to participate in the study, the total number was 75. The study could be extended to include pre-service teachers in other universities

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF ETHICS COMMITTEE

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

Day: 2017-21

5 Mayıs 2017

Eda Üzüm
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi

Sayın Araştırmacı,

"Son sınıfta alınan staj dersinin İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının dil bilgisi eğitimi konusundaki tercihlerine olan etkisi" başlıklı projeniz ile ilgili olarak yaptığımız SBB-EAK 2017/35 sayılı başvuru İNAREK/SBB Etik Alt Kurulu tarafından 5 Mayıs 2017 tarihli toplantıda incelenmiş ve uygun bulunmuştur.

Saygılarımızla,

İnsan Araştırmaları Kurumsal Değerlendirme Alt Kurulu


Doç. Dr. Ebru Kaya


Yrd. Doç. Dr. İnci Ayhan


Doç. Dr. Gül Sosay


Doç. Dr. Mehmet Yiğit Gürdal


Yrd. Doç. Dr. Bengü Börkan

APPENDIX B

PRE-TEST SURVEY

Institution: Boğaziçi University

Title of the Study: The Investigation of Practicum's Effect on Pre-Service English Teachers' L2 Grammar Teaching

Project Coordinator: Sumru Akcan (thesis advisor)

Contact: 02123597042 e-mail: sumru.akcan@boun.edu.tr

Name of the Researcher: Eda Üzümlü (master's student)

Contact: 05553664468 e-mail: edamuzum@gmail.com

Dear participant,

The purpose of this master's thesis study is to investigate the effect of the practicum period on pre-service English teachers' preferences of foreign language grammar teaching. We are kindly inviting you, pre-service English teachers to participate in our project. Before taking any decisions, we would like to inform you about the study. If you would like to take part in the project after you read the information, please sign the form and contact us.

If you accept to participate in the project, we will ask you to complete a questionnaire before and after your practicum period. This questionnaire will help you understand your own preferences of methods in grammar teaching. It will take you around 15 minutes to answer the questionnaire. Secondly, we will conduct one to one interviews about the same subject with the volunteers.

This research is conducted for scientific reasons and your answers will be kept anonymous. If you would like to learn more about the project please feel free to consult to the conductor and advisor of the study.

I (name of the participant) read the text above and understand the scope and purpose of the study and know my responsibilities as a participant. I had the chance to learn more about the project and I was assured that I am free to not to participate any time and I will not face any difficulty in such a situation. I accept to participate in the study completely of my own will.

Name-Surname:.....

Signature:.....

Address and contact:.....

Date:...../...../.....

Name of the researcher: Eda Üzümlü

Signature:.....

Date (gün/ay/yıl):...../...../.....

Would you like to take part in the second phase of the study (interview)? Yes/No

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
1. Participating in meaning-based activities that include attention to grammar is the best way for students to develop their grammatical knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I prefer teaching grammar as part of meaning-based activities.	1	2	3	4	5
3. When students learn grammar in a meaning-based context, they will be able to successfully express their meaning.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Students learn grammar more successfully if it is presented within context.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Grammar is best taught through activities that focus on meaning.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Doing exercises that focus exclusively on individual structures is the best way for students to develop their grammatical knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Doing exercises that focus on individual structures is the best way to learn to use English more accurately.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Grammar should be taught separately from communicative activities.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Students learn grammar more successfully if it is separated from context.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Grammar is best taught through exercises which focus on individual grammar structures.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
11. Teaching grammar in a meaning-based context is my referred way to teach.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The most effective way to teach a new structure is to present the grammar rule before a communicative activity.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Doing meaning-based activities that include attention to grammar is the best way to learn to use English more accurately.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Students can learn grammar through exposure to language in natural use.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Student use of language does not involve conscious knowledge of the grammatical system and how it works.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Students need to be consciously aware of a structure's form and its function before they can use it proficiently.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Participating in real-life tasks with language is the best way for students to develop their grammatical knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Teachers should only correct student errors of form which interfere with communication.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Comparison and contrast of individual structures is helpful for students learning grammar.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Students expect teachers to present grammar points explicitly.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
21. Students prefer to find matches between meaning and structures for themselves.	1	2	3	4	5
22. It is difficult to find form-function matches in authentic texts without explicit direction from teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Learning grammatical terminology is useful for students.	1	2	3	4	5

24. Do you remember your experiences of learning grammar of English at school? Do you have positive or negative feelings in general? Which practices of your teachers were the most useful?

APPENDIX C

POST-TEST SURVEY

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
1. Participating in meaning-based activities that include attention to grammar is the best way for students to develop their grammatical knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I prefer teaching grammar as part of meaning-based activities.	1	2	3	4	5
3. When students learn grammar in a meaning-based context, they will be able to successfully express their meaning.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Students learn grammar more successfully if it is presented within context.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Grammar is best taught through activities that focus on meaning.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Doing exercises that focus exclusively on individual structures is the best way for students to develop their grammatical knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Doing exercises that focus on individual structures is the best way to learn to use English more accurately.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Grammar should be taught separately from communicative activities.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Students learn grammar more successfully if it is separated from context.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
10. Grammar is best taught through exercises which focus on individual grammar structures.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Teaching grammar in a meaning-based context is my referred way to teach.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The most effective way to teach a new structure is to present the grammar rule before a communicative activity.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Doing meaning-based activities that include attention to grammar is the best way to learn to use English more accurately.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Students can learn grammar through exposure to language in natural use.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Student use of language does not involve conscious knowledge of the grammatical system and how it works.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Students need to be consciously aware of a structure's form and its function before they can use it proficiently.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Participating in real-life tasks with language is the best way for students to develop their grammatical knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Teachers should only correct student errors of form which interfere with communication.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Comparison and contrast of individual structures is helpful for students learning grammar.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
20. Students expect teachers to present grammar points explicitly.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Students prefer to find matches between meaning and structures for themselves.	1	2	3	4	5
22. It is difficult to find form-function matches in authentic texts without explicit direction from teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Learning grammatical terminology is useful for students.	1	2	3	4	5

24. Was your mentor teacher native or non-native speaker of English? -----

25. How did your mentor teachers focus on grammar, implicitly or explicitly? How and when did your mentors provide feedback for grammar errors? Was their approach efficient?

26. Did your approach to teaching grammar change after your practicum experience? If yes, how?

APPENDIX D

PRE-TEST INTERVIEW

1. Remember your own language learning experience. How did your teachers approach grammar in general? Do you remember having experience of integrated or isolated focus on form? If you do, which one was more effective for your learning?
2. Do you remember when and how you were given feedback about the grammar errors you made? What was the most effective way?
3. What kind of grammar instruction do you think is more helpful? Explaining English grammar rules while doing a meaning-based activity or explaining them separately (i.e., before or after the activity)? Why?
4. Now as a prospective English teacher, how do you prefer to teach English grammar? What is your personal approach or philosophy regarding teaching grammar? How do you think your approach will during your practicum?
5. At what level of proficiency do you think teaching grammar separately from communication or teaching it within or embedded in communication has more applications or benefits?
6. Regarding teaching grammar, what do you think should be common procedures to draw your student's attention to forms?

APPENDIX E

POST-TEST INTERVIEW

1. How did your mentor teacher approach grammar? Do you remember if he or she used integrated or isolated focus on form? Do you think their way was efficient in general?
2. When and how did your mentor give feedback about the grammar errors in the class? What was the most effective way he or she used?
3. What kind of grammar instruction do you think is more helpful? Explaining English grammar rules while doing a meaning-based activity or explaining them separately (i.e., before or after the activity)? Why?
4. At what level of proficiency do you think teaching grammar separately from communication or teaching it embedded in communication has more benefits? Can you explain it referring to the level you observed?
6. What were the common procedures you used in teaching grammar during your practicum? Can you describe a grammar lesson you gave briefly?
7. Did your approach to teaching grammar change after your practicum? If yes, how?

REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, M., Farsani, M.N., & Zadeh, N.S. (2016). Teachers' practice and language learners' preferences for form-focused instruction: Does matching work? *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 5(4), 52-65.
- Alptekin, C., Erçetin, G., & Bayyurt, Y. (2007). The effectiveness of a theme-based syllabus for young L2 learners. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 28(1), 1-17.
- Al-Rubai'ey, F. & Nassaji, H. (2013). Direct and indirect metalinguistic feedback: A matter of suitability rather than superiority. In M. Mahmoud, & R. Al Mahrooqi (Eds.), *Issues in TEFL in the Arab world* (pp. 203-232). Muscat, Oman: Sultan Qaboos University Press.
- Ansarin, A. A., Abad, B. A. A., & Khojasteh, M. R. B. (2015). Isolated and integrated form focused instruction from learners' perspective. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 24(2), 299-307.
- Baleghizadeh, S., & Khodarahmi, E. (2015). EFL learners' and teachers' preferences for isolated and integrated focus on form: The effect of learners' proficiency. *Iranian Journal of Language Issues*, 1(1), 1-20.
- Bang, Y. (1999). Reactions of EFL students to oral error correction. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 3, 39-51.
- Barrot, J. (2014). Combining isolated and integrated form-focused instruction: Effects on productive skills. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 27(3), 278-293.
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 243-272.
- Bayyurt, Y., & Alptekin, C. (2000). EFL curriculum design for Turkish young learners in bilingual school contexts. In J. Moon & M. Nikolov (Eds.), *Research into teaching English to young learners: International perspectives* (pp. 312-322). Pecs: University of Pecs Press.

- Bell, A. (2005). *Interactional feedback and ESL question development*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Victoria, Canada.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81-109.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum.
- Borg, S. (2009). English Language Teachers' Conceptions of Research. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(3), 358–388.
- Borg, S., & Burns, A. (2008). Integrating grammar in adult TESOL classrooms. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(3), 456-482.
- Busch, D. (2010). Pre-service teacher beliefs about language learning: The second language acquisition course as an agent for change. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(3), 318-337.
- Burgess, J., & Etherington, S. (2002). Focus on grammatical form: Explicit or implicit? *System*, 30, 433–458.
- Cabaroğlu, N. & Roberts, J. (2000). Development in student teachers' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-year PGCE program. *System*, 28, 387-402.
- Casciani, S., & Rapallino, L. (1991). "Pronouns in the oven," or the correction of errors in teaching Italian. *Italica*, 68, 457–472.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(3), 453-480.
- Chapple, L., & Curtis, A. (2000). Content-based instruction in Hong Kong: Student responses to film. *System*, 28(3), 419–433.
- Crandall, J. (1987). *ESL through Content area instruction: Mathematics, science, social studies*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). *Creating a comprehensive system for evaluating and supporting effective teaching*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.
- Dekeyser, R. (1994). Implicit and explicit learning of L2 grammar: A pilot study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 188-194.
- DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42–63). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dilāns, G. (2016). Corrective feedback in L2 Latvian classrooms: Teacher perceptions versus the observed actualities of practice. *Language Teaching Research* 20(4), 479-497.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 197-261). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Doughty, C. J. (2003). Instructed SLA: Constraints, compensation, and enhancement. In C. J. Doughty, & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 256-310). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Ebrahimi, S., Saadabadi, H., & Karampour, F. (2015). EFL learners' beliefs about isolated and integrated grammar teaching and performance on a grammar recognition test. *International Journal of Linguistics* 7(6), 108-120.
- Elgün-Gündüz, Z., Akcan, S., & Bayyurt, Y. (2012). Isolated form-focused instruction and integrated form-focused instruction in primary school classrooms in Turkey. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 25(2), 157–171.
- Ellis, R. (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning* 51(1), 1-46.

- Ellis, R. (2002b). Grammar teaching-practice or consciousness-raising. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 167-174). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Farrell, T, S, C. (2008). Learning to teach language in the first year: a Singapore case study. In T, S, C. Farrell, (Ed.), *Novice language teachers: Insights and perspectives for the first year* (pp.43-56). London: Equinox Publishing Ltd.
- Felix, S. W. (1981).The effect of formal instruction on second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 31, 87-112.
- File, K.A., & Adams, R. (2010). Should vocabulary instruction be integrated or isolated? *TESOL Quarterly*, 44, 222-249.
- Flowerdew, J. (1993). Content-based language instruction in a tertiary setting. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12(2), 121-138.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition and introductory course* (3rd ed.). New York: NY Routledge.
- Han, Z-H.& Kim, J. H. (2008). Corrective recasts: What teachers might want to know. *Journal of Language Learning*, 36(1), 35-44.
- Harley, B., & Swain, M. (1984). The interlanguage of immersion students and its implications for second language teaching. In A. Davies, C. Cripser, & A. Howatt (Eds.), *Interlanguage* (pp. 291–311). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Harley, B. (1992). Patters of second language development in French immersion. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 2(2), 159-183.
- Harley, B. (1998). The role of focus-on-form tasks in promoting child L2 acquisition. In C. Doughty & J. Williams, (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second Language acquisition* (pp. 156–174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hawkes, L., & Nassaji, H. (2016). The role of extensive recasts in error detection and correction by adult ESL students. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 19-41 2016.

- Hayashi, K. (1995). Form-focused instruction and second language proficiency. *RELC Journal*, 26(1), 95–117.
- Housen, A., & Pierrard, M. (2005). *Investigations in instructed second language acquisition*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Housen, A., & De Graaff, R. (2009). Investigating the effects and effectiveness of L2 instruction. In M. Long, & C. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 736-755). New Jersey: Blackwell-Wiley.
- Iraji, S. & Gholami, J. (2018). Effectiveness of isolated vs. integrated form-focused instruction in Iranian EFL. *International Journal of Language and Translation Studies*, 6(3), 137-149.
- Johnson, K. E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of pre-service English as second language teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10(4), 439-452.
- Kasper, L.F. (1995). Theory and practice in content-based ESL reading instruction. *English for Specific Purposes*, 14(3), 223–229.
- Kasper, L.F. (1997). The impact of content-based instructional programs on the academic programs of ESL students. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(4), 309–320.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S.D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Lee, E.J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41(2), 217–230.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 429-448.

- Lightbown, P. (1998). The importance of timing in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 177-196). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(3), 359-382.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Long, H. M., & Robinson, p. (1998). Focus on form: theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in second language acquisition* (pp.15-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly* , 26(1), 27-56.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lyster, R. (1994). The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion learners' sociolinguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 263-287.
- Lyster, R. (2004b). Research on form-focused instruction in immersion classrooms: Implications for theory and practice. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 14, 321-341.
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 269-300.

- 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.
- Marzban, A., & Mokhberi, M. (2012). The effect of focus on form instruction on intermediate EFL learners' grammar learning in task-based language teaching. *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 46, 5340 – 5344.
- Met, M. (1991). Learning language through content: Learning content through language. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(4), 281–295.
- Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on form through interaction enhancement: Integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classrooms. *Language Learning* 50(4), 617–673.
- Nassaji, H. (2000). Towards Integrating Form-Focused Instruction and Communicative Interaction in the Second Language Classroom: Some Pedagogical Possibilities. *The Modern Language Journal* 84, 241-250.
- Nguyen, T.T.M., Pham, T.H., & Pham, M.T. (2012). The relative effects of explicit and implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(4) , 416-434.
- Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P.M. & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning*, 51(4), 719–758.
- Pienemann, M. (1999). *Language processing and second-language development: Processability theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robert, J. (1998). *Language Teacher Education*. London/New York: Arnold.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Rutherford, W., & Sharwood Smith, M. (1985). Consciousness-raising and universal grammar. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 274-282.
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3) , 343-64.
- Shavelson, R. J., & Stern, P. (1981). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions, and behavior. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(4), 455–498.
- Sheen, Y., & R. Ellis (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 593-610). New York: Routledge.
- Simard, D., & Jean, G. (2011). An exploration of L2 teachers' use of pedagogical interventions devised to draw L2 learners' attention to form. *Language Learning*, 61, 759-785.
- Söğütü, E., & Veliaj-Ostrosi, M. (2015). EFL learners' perceptions of grammar knowledge and grammar instruction in foreign language learning. *Anglisticum*, 4(11), 53-64.
- Spada, N. (1997). Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language teaching*, 30(2) , 73-87.
- Spada, N., Lightbown, P.M., & White, J. (2005). The importance of form/meaning mappings in explicit form-focused instruction. In A. Housen & M. Pierrard (Eds.), *Investigations in instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 199–234). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (2008). Form-focused instruction: isolated or integrated. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(2) , 181-207.
- Spada, N., Barkaoui, K., Peters, C., So, M., & Valeo, A. (2009). Developing a questionnaire to investigate second language learners' preferences for two types of from-focused instruction. *System*, 37(1) , 70-81.

- Spada, N. (2011). Beyond form-focused instruction: Reflections on past, present and future research. *Language Teaching Research*, 44(2), 225-236.
- Spada, N., Jessop, L., Tomita, Y., Suzuki, W., & Valeo, A. (2014). Isolated and Integrated form-focused instruction: Effects on different types of L2 knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(4), 453-473.
- Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2002). Talking it through: Two French immersion learners' responses to reformulation. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3), 285-304.
- Tomita, J., & Spada, N. (2013). Form-focused Instruction and Learner Investment in L2 Communication. *Modern Language Journal*, 97, 591-610.
- Uysal, H. H., & Bardakci, M. (2014). Teacher beliefs and practices of grammar teaching: Focusing on meaning, form, or forms? *SA Journal of Education*, 34(1), 1-16.
- Üstünbaş, Ü. (2016). Are EFL learners and teachers in the same camp? A study on form-focused instruction. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2 (2), 65-77.
- Valeo, A., & Spada, N. (2015). Is there a better time to focus on form? Teacher and learner views. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(2), 314-339.
- Valeo, A. (2013). Language awareness in a content-based language programme. *Language Awareness*, 22, 126-145.
- VanPatten, B. (1990). Attending to form and content in the input: An experiment in consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 287-301.
- White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research*, 7(2), 133-61.

Williams, J., & Evans, J. (1998). What kind of focus and on which forms? In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 139–155). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wong, M. S. L. (2010). “Beliefs about language learning: A study of Malaysian pre-service teachers”. *RELC Journal*, 41(2), 123–136.

Zyzik, E., & Polio, C. (2008). Incidental focus on form in university Spanish literature courses. *Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 53-70.