**PREPARING TABLES AND FIGURES**

**Standard font size is 12 but font size in tables can be reduced to 9 considering the page layout.**

Table 1.

*Types of oral corrective feedback*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| CF Types | Definition | Example |
| Explicit Correction | Indicates an error; identifies the error, and provides the correction. | S: On May.T: Not on May, in May.We say, “It will start in May.” |
| Recast | Reformulates all or part of the incorrect word or phrase to show the correct form without explicitly identifying the error. | S: I have to find the answer on the book?T: In the book |
| Clarification Request | Indicates that the student’s utterance was not understood and asks the student to reformulate it. | S: What do you spend with your wife?T: What? (Or, Sorry?) |
| Meta-linguistic feedback | Gives technical linguistic information about the error without explicitly providing the correct answer. | S: There are influence person who.T: Influence is a noun. |
| Elicitation | Prompts the student to self-correct by pausing, so the student can fill in the correct word or phrase. | S: This tea is very warm.T: It’s very.?S: Hot. |
| Repetition | Repeats the student’s error while highlighting the error or mistake by means of emphatic stress. | S: I will showed you.T: I will SHOWED you?S: I’ll show you. |

Table 2.

*One-Way ANOVA results*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Personal Readiness | Between Groups | 4.456 | 3 | .8124 | 5.367 | .053 |
| Within Groups | 93.481 | 434 | .232 |
| Total | 94.937 | 411 |  |
| Professional Readiness | Between Groups | 19.241 | 3 | 6.123 | 9.827 | .000\* |
| Within Groups | 269.552 | 434 | .642 |
| Total | 297.733 | 411 |  |

*p*<.01
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**USING QUALITATIVE DATA IN-TEXT**

The analysis of the interview protocols showed that this lack of information is a negative factor that influenced practitioners’ attitudes towards the efficiency of curriculum change process. This point was illustrated by the following excerpt from Lecturer 13:

L13: “*We did not have voice during this process. Nobody asked for our opinions. I do not think that anybody’s opinions were taken into consideration. It was a top down process, as usual.”*

Another interviewee expressed similar concerns:

L20: “*They claim that they had involved stakeholders in the process. But when we spoke with colleagues from different universities, nobody told that they had participated in this process. I want to know who participated in the process.*”