

**EFL Teacher's Beliefs and Classroom Practice on Oral Corrective Feedback: A Case Study at an English Classroom at a Senior High School in Surakarta**

**Denita Noor Aliya Kuri, Joko Nurkamto, Hefy Sulistyawati**

English Education Department  
Teacher Training and Education Faculty  
Sebelas Maret University of Surakarta  
e-mail: kuridenita@student.uns.ac.id

*Received:*  
*Reviewed:*  
*Accepted:*

**Abstract**

This study examined the EFL teacher's beliefs and classroom practice on oral corrective feedback regarding the amount, type, and timing of oral corrective feedback. This study applied a case study as the research method. This study took place in one of the high schools in Surakarta. The participant of the study is an EFL teacher. The researcher applied semi-structured interviews to discover the teacher's beliefs on oral corrective feedback regarding the amount, type, and timing. The researcher also observed the teacher's practice in performing oral corrective feedback in the class. This research applied interactive model analysis to analyze the data. The finding from interviews was that the teacher did not correct the students frequently and preferred metalinguistic feedback and delayed feedback. In practice, the teacher corrected the student frequently, performed mainly recasts, and put mostly delayed feedback. The findings revealed a discrepancy between the teacher's beliefs and their practices regarding the amount and type, but consistency in the timing of oral corrective feedback used. This research highlights the importance for EFL teachers to reflect on their beliefs and align their practices with appropriate and effective oral corrective feedback strategies in the classroom.

**Keywords:** Teacher's beliefs; classroom practice; oral corrective feedback; case study; EFL teacher.

**INTRODUCTION**

Teacher's beliefs have been viewed as a window into teacher's decision-making, practices, and in some cases, effectiveness (Nespor, 1987). The way teachers conduct their lessons and make decisions is more influenced by teacher's beliefs than by teacher's knowledge (Pajares, 1992). Teacher's beliefs are influential in creating a proper teaching and learning atmosphere (Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2016).

One area where this is particularly evident is in the use of oral corrective feedback, a type of feedback that focuses on correcting students' speech errors. Corrective feedback plays a vital role in teaching and learning as it emphasizes a

learner's errors so they can become aware and enable them to stop making such errors (Alsolami, 2019). Besides, feedback provision aims to facilitate the learners with error correction and improve their understanding, fluency, and accuracy in producing the target language (Ellis, 2001).

Despite the significance of oral corrective feedback, there has been little research on how EFL teachers in Indonesian senior high schools perceive and use it in their online classrooms. Moreover, it is necessary to explore teacher's beliefs and practice oral corrective feedback to improve language teaching. By exploring the teacher's beliefs and practice, various perspectives related to oral corrective feedback could be revealed. This might contribute to the teacher making more sophisticated decisions relating to oral corrective feedback.

The previous studies have mostly focused on teachers in universities and language institutes (Roothoof, 2014; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Ölmezler-Öztürk, 2016; Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh, 2016; Yüksel et al., 2021). There are not many investigations in secondary education. For that reason, the researcher tries to fill the gap by researching EFL teacher's beliefs and practice regarding oral corrective feedback in a senior high school so that this research will provide new insights into the teacher's beliefs and practice regarding oral corrective feedback in secondary education. Besides, unlike the previous studies that held the classroom activity directly, the classroom practice of this research is held online using Microsoft Teams.

This study aims to explore and answer the research questions as follows:

1. What is the EFL teacher's belief in oral corrective feedback on students' error utterances?
2. What is the classroom practice of the EFL teacher on oral corrective feedback on students' error utterances?
3. Is there any discrepancy between teacher's beliefs and classroom practice of the EFL teacher on oral corrective feedback on students' error utterances?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Teacher's Beliefs

Borg (2001) explained teacher's beliefs as "the teacher's pedagogic beliefs or those beliefs of relevance to an individual's teaching. Those pedagogical beliefs were disclosed by Pajares (1992) as beliefs about education, schooling, teaching, learning, and students. Teacher's beliefs play a crucial role in determining teacher decisions and actions in the classroom, including implementation and the selection of tasks, cognitive tools, and curriculum development (Borg, 2001; Cheung & Ng, 2000; Pajares, 1992). Teacher beliefs also play a role in determining the acceptance and adoption of new approaches, techniques, and activities, as well as assessment in the classroom. (Li, 2013).

A teacher's background as a student and their educational environment are crucial factors that affect their beliefs and practices, as argued by Borg (2003). Teacher beliefs are influenced by the educational environment and can be honed through education programs that offer knowledge on teaching and subject matter. These programs also help teachers adjust their beliefs, leading to the identification of effective teaching methods (Hall, 2005). Additionally, Pajares (1992) argued that teacher gains more experience in the classroom, and their beliefs about teaching become more refined and nuanced. Over time and with the acquisition of teaching experience, teachers gain a more profound comprehension of the teaching process,

which enables them to recognize successful teaching approaches that can improve student learning.

### **Oral Corrective Feedback**

Oral corrective feedback is any reactions or responses of the teacher which transforms, disapprovingly refers to or demands improvement of the learner's errors in their oral production (Chaudron, 1977). The responses include, first, an indicator that an error has been made; second, the provision of the exact target language form; and last metalinguistic information concerning the nature of the error or any combination of those responses (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006). Oral corrective feedback is an essential tool for improving language skills in students as it highlights the errors made by a learner so they can realize their errors and enable them to eliminate such errors. It allows teachers to communicate with students, identify common errors, and focus on improvement. This feedback is beneficial for both linguistic improvement and second language acquisition (Alsolami, 2019; Sa'adah et al., 2018).

Generally, oral corrective feedback is divided into two; there are based on timing and based on type. Ellis (2017) divided the timing of providing oral corrective feedback into two that are immediate feedback and delayed feedback. Immediate feedback is when the teacher stops a learner on the spot after the error is committed and corrects it immediately. Alternatively, correction can be delayed at the end of communication by encouraging the student to express their point again in a meaningful manner (Quinn & Nakata, 2017).

Based on an extensive analysis of classroom interaction, Lyster and Ranta (1997) identified six types of oral corrective feedback, which later be classified into two broad categories: reformulations and prompts. Reformulations involve presenting learners with revised versions of their erroneous language production. Reformulations include recasts and explicit correction. While prompts provide various signals that push learners to self-correct. Prompts include metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, repetition, and clarification requests that push learners to self-repair. Types, definitions, and examples of oral corrective feedback are presented in Table.

Table  
Types of Oral Corrective Feedback (Lyster and Ranta, 1997)

Categories	Types	Definitions	Examples
Reformulations (input-providing)	Recasts	Restatement of a student's statement, either in whole or in part, without the inclusion of the error in the original statement	S: I have to find the answer on the article T: So, you have to find the answer in the article.
	Explicit correction	Involves identifying the error, providing metalinguistic comments, and reformulating the student's utterance	S: The birds is chirping T: The birds are chirping. We use "are" in plural things
Prompts (output providing)	Metalinguistic feedback	Comments, metalinguistic information, or questions of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form.	S: There was a lot of people there T: Do we say 'there was a lot of people' or 'there were a lot of people'? The word 'people' is plural, so...? S: There were a lot of people there?
	Elicitation	A technique used to elicit self-correction from learners by using questions and pausing in highlighting the student's error.	S: So, I need peace to study (/stud.i/, the incorrect pronunciation for /stʌd.i/) T: to...? S: study /stud.i/ T: to...? (smiling) S: to study /stʌd.i/ S: If I had enough time, I will come to the party now. T: I WILL come? (raising intonation) S: Sorry. If I had enough time, I would have come to the party now.
Repetition			
Clarification requests			

## Classroom Practice

Beliefs impact behaviour, and there is a connection between classroom practices and teacher's beliefs in language teaching (Borg, 2009). A teacher's actions in the classroom are shaped by their beliefs, which often impact their instructional choices and decisions (Farrell & Lim 2005). Teachers' classroom practices are influenced by their beliefs about language learning and teaching, as well as important factors for creating a good teaching and learning environment (Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh 2016).

The frequency of corrective feedback varies among teachers, with some providing high-frequency and others low-frequency feedback. Teachers also adjust the amount of feedback provided based on students' proficiency levels and emotional sensitivity, providing more feedback to advanced learners and fewer corrections to lower proficiency students to avoid causing frustration and anxiety (Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2016; Fu & Nassaji, 2016). The timing of feedback is also a factor that varies, with no conclusive evidence on whether immediate or delayed feedback is more effective in language learning. However, previous studies suggest that teachers and learners generally prefer to use delayed feedback (Tomczyk, 2013; Rahimi and Zhang, 2015; Ölmezler-Öztürk, 2016; Sakiroglu, 2020). Related to the type of oral corrective feedback, some studies revealed that the dominant preference for the oral corrective feedback type used by the teacher was recast, as it is considered practical and has several advantages, such as promoting a supportive classroom environment, not interrupting the conversation flow, and not provoking learner anxiety (Yoshida, 2010; Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2016; Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Llinares and Lyster, 2014; Ölmezler-Öztürk, 2016).

## RESEARCH METHOD

The present study adopted a qualitative approach, utilizing a case study as the research method. As highlighted by Baxter & Jack (2008), a qualitative case study is an approach to research that facilitates the exploration of a phenomenon by employing a variety of sources of data, with the purpose of investigating and describing the phenomenon that occurs within a real-life setting.

The participant of this study was an EFL Teacher in one of the High Schools in Surakarta. The researcher collected the data by conducting an interview and observation to gather information about the teacher's beliefs and teacher's practice in applying oral corrective feedback within the online classroom environment, respectively. The observation was held during 2 class hours (about 60 minutes). The teaching and learning process was held online through Microsoft Teams. The collected data was analyzed using Miles and Huberman's (1994) interactive model, and the results were qualitatively interpreted and concluded by the researcher.

## FINDINGS

### The EFL Teacher's Beliefs on Oral Corrective Feedback on Students' Error Utterances

During the interview, the teacher explained that she did not correct errors frequently. The teacher chose to correct only the errors that were most relevant to the learning objectives and did not adhere to the communicative principle, believing that as long as the sentence was understandable, it was not necessary to correct every error. She identified three factors that influenced the amount of feedback she provided: affective factors, student proficiency level, and time allotment. She recognized the

importance of attending to students' emotions in creating a positive classroom atmosphere and therefore avoided excessive correction that could discourage students. Additionally, the teacher believed that student proficiency level played a role in determining the amount of feedback given. For students with high proficiency levels, the teacher tended to provide more feedback, as they were more likely to prefer spontaneous and to-the-point feedback. For students with lower proficiency levels, the teacher provided feedback more selectively and made sure it was prominent and easy to notice.

Moreover, the teacher acknowledged that time allotment was another factor that influenced the amount of oral corrective feedback she provided. Online classes presented additional challenges, such as technical issues and time-consuming activities like device preparation and waiting for attendance. As a result, the teacher had to manage time efficiently to meet her teaching objectives and did not correct errors excessively.

Regarding feedback types, the teacher stated that she preferred and frequently used metalinguistic feedback as it challenged students to self-correct. In metalinguistic feedback, the teacher only provided the metalinguistic clue related to the errors. Hence, she believed that this type of feedback is effective for the students since the teacher expected the students to be able to identify the errors and self-correct. Recasts, on the other hand, were less preferred. The teacher explained that recasts were less challenging for the students since the students' errors were corrected directly by the teacher without giving any opportunities for the students to self-correct.

Based on the interview, the teacher expressed that she preferred correcting after the students finished their sentences, or in other words, delayed feedback. She preferred delayed feedback because it does not interrupt the conversational flow and less provokes students' anxiety in the class. Moreover, the teacher considered correcting students' errors immediately in the middle of the flow as unethical. The teacher usually listed the students' errors and discussed them later after the students finished their utterances.

### **The EFL Teacher's Classroom Practice on Oral Corrective Feedback on Students' Error Utterances**

Based on the classroom activity, the total number of errors students made was 33. The teacher corrected 22 errors, while 11 errors remained uncorrected. The examples of uncorrected errors are as follows:

#### **Example 1**

T: What information do you get?

S: The information I know (**is**) about the date of birth

T: Good.

In Example 1, the teacher asked the student what information the student got from the text. The student's answer is presented in Example 1. The student made a grammatical error in which the student did not provide a linking verb to connect the subject and predicate in the sentence. In this case, the student did not provide "is" after the subject. The teacher left the error untreated. Instead, she responded by giving a positive comment "good" to the student.

Among 22 errors corrected, the teacher performed recasts eleven times. The example of recast used by the teacher is as follows:

#### **Example 2**

T: Can you tell me a little about him?

S: He **was be** the third president of Indonesia

T: He was the third president of Indonesia. What do you know more?

In Example 1, the teacher asked the student to tell the information about the character in the text. The student answered the question in the incorrect form of the sentence. The word 'be' is unnecessary and should be removed from the sentence to make it grammatically correct. The verb "was" is sufficient to express the idea of existence, so the word "be" is unnecessary and should be omitted. The teacher then responded by reformulating the erroneous phrase to show the correct formation. In this action, rather than addressing where the error is and providing an explanation related to the error, the teacher chose to reformulate the student's words into the correct formation.

The teacher used elicitation once in her class. The example of elicitation used by the teacher is as follows:

Example 3:

S: He moved to Germany in 1955 /naInti:n fefti: faIv/

T: Okay, *tadi gimana mbak?* Nineteen...?

S: (silent)

T: Nineteen...?

S: 1955 /naInti:n flfti: faIv/

In example 3, the student made an error by pronouncing '1955' as /naInti:n fefti: faIv/. While the correct pronunciation of '1955' is /naInti:n flfti: faIv/. In response, the teacher provided elicitation by saying "nineteen..." to hint at the error's location. The teacher only provided the first half of the phrase with the purpose of encouraging the student to complete the phrase correctly. After the teacher provided elicitation, the student was finally able to correct the error by pronouncing 'fifty-five' correctly.

The teacher provided repetition twice. The example of repetition used by the teacher is as follows:

Example 4:

T: (Showing a picture) The man is holding something in his hand. *Dia memegang apa itu?*

S: **Aeroplane**

T: (giggles) aeroplane? (stressing the word aeroplane)

S: *Pesawat kertas.* Paper plane.

T: That's good.

In example 4, the teacher showed a picture of a man holding a paper plane. The teacher then asked the student about what is the man having in his hand. The student then answered that the man in the picture was holding an aeroplane. In this case, the student made a lexical error. The student provided the wrong word choice. The teacher then reacted by repeating the student's error with the purpose of highlighting the error by stressing the word 'aeroplane'. In this case, the student was expected to self-correct. After that, the student directly answers the correct word choice.

During the class, the teacher provided explicit six times. The examples of explicit correction provided by the teacher are as follows:

Example 5

S: In 1974, he was **promoted** /prəmət/ to vice president of the company

T: "/prəməutɪd/ not /prəmət/. Jadi ada kata yang akhiran -ed nya dibaca dan tidak. Kalau akhirannya t jadi -ed nya dibaca, menjadi

/prəmou̯tɪd/”.

In Example 5, the student mispronounced the word ‘promoted’ as /prəmot/ whereas the correct pronunciation of ‘promoted’ is /prəmou̯tɪd/. The teacher then corrected the student’s error by addressing the error and providing the correct pronunciation of ‘promoted’. She later explained that the suffix -ed in ‘promoted’ or other words ending with the letter ‘t’ needed to be voiced. So, the correct pronunciation would be /prəmou̯tɪd/.

During the class, the teacher performed metalinguistic feedbacks twice. The example of metalinguistic feedback provided by the teacher is as follows.

Example 6

T: *Apa artinya Agriculturist? Ada yang tahu?*

S: *Pertanian*, Miss. (L2-L2 translation error)

T: *Pertanian? Itu ada akhiran -ist nya lho. Agriculturist?*

S: *Petani*, Miss?

T: *Petani*, okay.

In Example 6, the teacher asked the student about the meaning of ‘agriculturist’ in Indonesia. The student then answered ‘pertanian’. Afterwards, the teacher did not perform the correct translation. She repeated the word ‘pertanian’ to highlight the error. The teacher also provided the metalinguistic information by highlighting the suffix ‘-ist’ presence. The function of the suffix ‘-ist’ is to denote a person who practices something. Later, the student answered ‘petani’, which was the correct translation of agriculturist.

Finally, regarding the timing of oral corrective feedback in the class, the result showed that the teacher mostly used delayed feedback. The teacher made 18 delayed feedbacks out of 22 feedbacks. Meanwhile, the teacher provided immediate feedback four times. The example of immediate feedback provided by the teacher is as follows.

Example :

S : He was the third president /president/ of Indonesia in .... (phonological error)

T : Okay, stop stop. Is that /president/ or /prezɪdənt/. *Kalau president (pronunciation) Inggrisnya gimana?*

S : President /prezɪdənt/ ya ma’am?

T : Ok, good.

In the example, the student made a phonological error by pronouncing the word ‘president’ wrong. Then, the teacher stopped the student in the middle of the flow by saying “stop stop” to provide feedback immediately before the student could finish the sentence. She provided corrective feedback by repeating the erroneous pronunciation while raising her intonation. The student provided the correct pronunciation afterwards.

### The discrepancy between Teacher’s Beliefs and Classroom Practice of the EFL Teacher on Oral Corrective Feedback on Students’ Error Utterances

The teacher stated she provided little oral corrective feedback, but in practice, she corrected the students frequently. The teacher corrected 22 out of 33 student errors, preferring recasts, which she used 11 times out of 22 corrected errors. The teacher preferred delayed feedback and used it 18 times, while immediate feedback was performed 4 times. There was a match between the teacher’s beliefs and classroom practice regarding the timing of corrective feedback. However, a discrepancy was

found between the teacher's beliefs and classroom practice regarding the amount and the type of oral corrective feedback.

## DISCUSSION

The study revealed that the teacher's beliefs about oral corrective feedback and classroom practice did not generally match. The teacher's beliefs about the amount and type of oral corrective feedback and classroom practice were consistent with each other. These findings are more in line with a study by Ölmezler-Öztürk (2016), which highlighted discrepancies between teachers' stated beliefs and classroom practice regarding oral corrective feedback. Nevertheless, the amount of oral corrective feedback the teacher performed in the classroom practice and her beliefs revealed a mismatch.

The observed classroom practice showed that the teacher corrected students frequently. Among 33 errors, the teacher corrected 22 errors. This finding was inconsistent with the teacher's stated beliefs, in which she mentioned that she did not correct a lot of the errors, with one of the reasons was the affective reason. This finding is in line with Roothoof (2014), which revealed that the teachers provided feedback on a significant number of their students' errors in classroom practice, although the teachers expressed concerns about interrupting students and giving negative affective responses.

Regarding the type of oral corrective feedback, the teacher's beliefs and classroom practice were inconsistent. The teacher, in her stated beliefs, mentioned that she preferred metalinguistic feedback and less preferred recast to correct the students' errors. The reason behind her statement was that metalinguistic feedback challenges the students to self-correct, while recast does not. Meanwhile, in classroom practice, the teacher frequently performed recasts to cope with the students' errors. However, the teacher also performed metalinguistic feedback twice. She also performed other oral corrective feedback such as elicitation, clarification request, and repetition. This finding corresponded to Ölmezler-Öztürk (2016) and Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh (2016) where the stated beliefs and classroom practice were inconsistent, where the stated beliefs of the teachers preferred output-providing feedback, however in the practice, they tended to use input-providing feedback (recasts).

The teacher's beliefs and classroom practice were similar in terms of the timing of oral corrective feedback. The teacher mentioned that she would provide delayed feedback to her students' errors since delayed feedback does not interrupt the conversational flow and less provokes students' anxiety. The classroom practice revealed that the teacher put delayed feedback 18 times out of 22 corrected errors. Contrary, she put immediate feedback four times. This finding is in accordance with Roothoof (2014), who noted that teachers frequently used delayed feedback since they believed that immediate feedback might hinder communication and have a negative influence on students' confidence and motivation.

However, it is important for teachers to recognize that there may be a discrepancy between their stated beliefs and actual classroom practices, and that such inconsistencies are a common occurrence. Having similar or dissimilar beliefs and practices does not necessarily indicate a positive or negative outcome, but rather may be part of the ongoing process of professional development (Kamiya, 2014; Yüksel et al. 2021). As Basturkmen (2012) and Ölmezler-Öztürk (2016) pointed out, teachers' feedback practices are naturally unplanned and unpredictable since it is a response to

students' output. Roothoof (2014) added that since the idea of teachers' beliefs is a complicated one, it is challenging to offer a single explanation for the discrepancy between beliefs and practice.

In addition, as Kamiya (2014) suggested that rather than convince teachers to adjust their beliefs and practices, teachers could self-reflect and build self-awareness of gaps that may exist between their beliefs and classroom practices and promote the opportunity for their professional development.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This study investigated the beliefs and classroom practices of the EFL teacher regarding oral corrective feedback. The teacher stated that she did not correct the students' errors a lot. Regarding the types of oral corrective feedback, the teacher preferred metalinguistic feedback to cope with students' errors. Later, the teacher stated that delayed feedback is preferred regarding the timing of oral corrective feedback. During classroom observation, it appeared that the teacher corrected 22 out of 33 errors. The teacher tended to use recasts predominantly during classroom practice. In terms of the timing of feedback, the teacher predominantly employed delayed feedback. The teacher's classroom practice was consistent with her beliefs regarding the timing of oral corrective feedback. Still, there was a discrepancy between her beliefs and practice regarding the amount and the type of feedback provided.

As the suggestion, for EFL teachers, this study highlights the importance of reflecting on their beliefs and classroom practices regarding oral corrective feedback and using this knowledge to inform their professional development. Institutions can benefit by developing their curricula and materials related to oral corrective feedback and supporting teachers in making informed decisions about providing effective feedback. Future researchers can build on this study by using different methodologies, participants, and subject matter.

However, it is important to note that this study had limitations. The teacher's classroom practice was only observed once, and the teacher's use of specific oral corrective feedback methods may vary across different classes. Future research could address this limitation by observing teachers' practices across multiple classes or using other research methods to investigate this topic further.

## REFERENCES

Alsolami, R. (2019). Effect of oral corrective feedback on language skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(6), 672.  
<https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0906.09>

Baxter, P., Jack, S. (2008), Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13 (4), 544-559.

Borg, M. (2001). Key concepts in ELT. Teachers' beliefs. *ELT Journal*, 55(2), 186-188.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/55.2.186>

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81-109. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444803001903>

Borg, S. (2009). Language teacher cognition. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 163-171). Cambridge University Press.

Cheung, D., & Ng, P.-H. (2000). Science teachers' beliefs about curriculum design. *Research in Science Education*, 30(4), 357-375. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02461556>

Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating Form-Focused Instruction. *Language Learning*, 51, 1-46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.2001.tb00013.x>

Ellis, R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in L2 classroom: What we know so far. In Nassaji, H. & Kartchava, E. (Ed.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning : research, theory, applications, implications*. (1st ed., pp. 3-18). Routledge.

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

Farrell, T.S.C., & Lim, P.C.P. (2005). Conceptions of Grammar Teaching : A case study of Teachers' Beliefs and Classroom Practices. *TESL-EJ*, 9 (2), 1-13

Fu, T., & Nassaji, H. (2016). Corrective feedback, learner uptake, and feedback perception in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 159. <https://doi.org/10.14746/sslit.2016.6.1.8>

Hall, L. A. (2005). Teachers and content area reading: Attitudes, beliefs and change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(4), 403-414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.009>

Kamiya, N. 2014. The relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(3), 206-219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2014.939656>.

L. Sa'adah, J. Nurkamto & Suparno. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: Exploring the relationship between teacher's strategy and students' willingness to communicate. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(2), 240-252. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v5i2.11532>.

Li, S. (2013). The interface between feedback type, L2 proficiency, and the nature of the linguistic target. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(3), 373-396.

Llinares, A., & Lyster, R. (2014). The influence of context on patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake: a comparison of CLIL and immersion classrooms. *The Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 181-194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.889509>

Lyster, R. and L. Ranta. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19 (1), 37-66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263197001034>

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. A. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis : an Expanded Sourcebook*. Sage Publications.

Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of curriculum studies*, 19(4), 317-328.

Ölmezter-Öztürk, E. (2016). Beliefs and practices of Turkish EFL teachers regarding oral corrective feedback: a small-scale classroom research study. *The Language Learning Journal*, 47(2), 219-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1263360>

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning Up a Messy Construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307>

Quinn, P. G., & Nakata, T. (2017). The timing of oral corrective feedback. *Routledge EBooks*, 35-47. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315621432-4>

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2015). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' cognitions about corrective feedback in teaching English oral communication. *System*, 55, 111-122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.09.006>

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

S.Yu, B. Wang & T. Teo. (2018). Understanding linguistic, individual and contextual factors in oral feedback research: A review of empirical studies in L2 classrooms. *Educational Research Review*, 24, 181-192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.06.001>

Sepehrinia, S., & Mehdizadeh, M. (2016). Oral corrective feedback: teachers' concerns and researchers' orientation. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(4), 483-500. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1172328>

Tomczyk, E. (2013). Perceptions of Oral Errors and Their Corrective Feedback: Teachers vs. Students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(5). <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.5.924-931>

Unsal Sakiroglu, H. (2020). Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences of University Students in English Communication Classes. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 6(1), 172. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.v6i1.806>

Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 293-314. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01022.x>

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