

Exploring EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Oral Corrective Feedback Across Different Grades

¹Ulfa Dwi Fauziah, ²Erna Andriyanti

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Ulfadwi.2024@student.uny.ac.id, erna.andriyanti@uny.ac.id

Abstract. Oral corrective feedback is an essential part in learning English as a foreign language. Teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback generally underlie their practices, but some studies showed that sometimes there is a mismatch between teachers' beliefs and actual practices. Previous studies also found that students with different grades have different expectations about oral corrective feedback, making it important for teachers to understand it. Based on the previous findings, this study aimed to examine teachers' beliefs and practices of oral corrective feedback for students across different grades. This study was a qualitative study, with data collection techniques using interviews and observations. The data was analyzed using thematic analysis. The participants in this study were two early secondary school English teachers located in Yogyakarta. The findings showed that teachers have a positive belief in the importance of oral corrective feedback. Teachers' beliefs about the oral corrective feedback timing match their actual practices. However, there was a mismatch between the strategies believed by grade 7 teachers and actual practices. It showed that teachers adjusted their oral corrective feedback strategies to the real conditions. Overall, the teachers' practices produced positive uptake from students. This finding emphasized the importance of flexibility in the oral corrective feedback application according to the classroom context.

Keywords: Oral Corrective Feedback, Teachers' Beliefs, Teachers' Practices, Students' Grade

Introduction

Oral corrective feedback (OCF) is an essential aspect of English language learning. Hartono et al (2022) defined OCF as one type of feedback given by the teacher to point out mistakes made by students when speaking. Oral Corrective feedback is a response provided by the teacher when students' output is incorrect,

*Corresponding author: *Ulfa Dwi Fauziah*, Ulfadwi.2024@student.uny.ac.id

Oral corrective feedback is generally given during or after oral production, but it is possible to give during the learning of other skills such as writing. Oral corrective off-target, inappropriate, or ambiguous (Liu & Wei, 2021).

feedback is effective for improving student learning, including for improving the skills of elementary writers (Chambers Schuldt, 2019). Research has shown that in EFL classrooms, oral corrective feedback helps students in enhancing their language skills. According to Yılmaz Yakışık (2021) the existence of OCF is able to help learners obtain the target language in the classroom.

The most important aspect of OCF is strategy. The oral corrective feedback strategy refers to the method utilized by the teacher to fix students' errors. According to Zarei et al (2020), oral corrective feedback strategies can be categorized as explicit and implicit. Implicit correction is a method used by teachers to point out student errors, through subtle clues aimed at directing students to realize the inappropriate language form. While explicit correction is characterized by clear instructions regarding the existence of errors as well as the provision of language forms that match the target.

Oral corrective feedback types were originally introduced by Lyster and Ranta (1997), before finally becoming a reference for various studies. Lyster and Ranta (1997) proposed six types such as explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic clues, elicitation, and repetition. According to Tasdemir and Aslan (2018), explicit correction feedback is a clear indication that the learner has made an error or a mistake. Furthermore, recast refers to feedback where the teacher reformulates the student's inappropriate utterance, without giving the correct utterance. Clarification request indicates when the utterance is hard to understand, so the teacher can ask students to reformulate it. Then, metalinguistic clues are used when the teacher asks questions to students that encourage understanding so that they can correct errors. Elicitation is a feedback strategy when the teacher guides students to find their errors by repeating part of the utterance. Finally, repetition indicates student errors by repeating the wrong form with different intonation. The following is a classification of types of oral corrective feedback based on its strategy according to Ellis (2012):

Table 1. Classification of OCF Strategies

	Explicit	Implicit
Output-prompting	Metalinguistic clue Elicitation	Repetition Clarification requests
Input-providing	Explicit correction only	Recast

In addition to the type and strategy, time is also important to be considered. Time is a crucial factor in the effectiveness of corrective feedback (Andria, 2025; Ha et al., 2021; Zhu & Wang, 2019). According to Andria (2025) oral corrective feedback timing is commonly divided into immediate and delayed oral corrective feedback. Immediate OCF is given immediately when an error occurs, while delayed corrective feedback is given a while after the error or after the performance. The findings of various studies examining students' views on

corrective feedback timing showed that the majority of students tend to favor immediate corrective feedback (Andria, 2025). Students tend to favor immediate corrective feedback and students generally have slightly negative beliefs about delayed corrective feedback (Zhu & Wang, 2019). Furthermore, Ha et al (2021) stated that students showed that they prefer direct corrective feedback, but the teachers sometimes hesitated to give it considering the students' emotional state.

Student uptake is a crucial point in providing oral corrective feedback in addition to strategy, type and timing. Zhu and Wang (2019) stated that uptake refers to the different forms of responses that students can give after receiving corrective feedback. Student uptake can be interpreted as an indicator of the success of a feedback. When the feedback given is appropriate, students will give a positive response. Conversely, if the oral corrective feedback received is not appropriate, it can cause drawbacks. When it is not appropriate, it can bring up psychological effects on students such as low self-efficacy and self-confidence, rage, and anxiety (Hartono et al., 2022).

Teachers' belief about OCF is very crucial, as it can influence them in their actual practices. According to Borg (2011), beliefs are views that a person considers to be true, are usually unconscious, contain elements of judgment and strong emotions, influence actions, and tend to be difficult to change. Teachers' beliefs influence their views and judgments, at the end impact their behavior in the classroom (Pajares, 2022). It can be summarized that teachers' beliefs can influence their teaching practices.

The practices of oral corrective feedback by teachers can be influenced by several factors. Teachers' decisions regarding oral corrective feedback are influenced by interconnected factors including student, contextual, and teacher-specific factors (Soruç et al., 2025). In this context, students are often associated with their preferences. Students' preferences related to OCF are a consideration for teachers, where these preferences can be influenced by various aspects. Yılmaz Yakışık (2021) found that gender and grade influence students' preferences for OCF, the needs of students with different grades are related to their different emotional responses and academic concerns. Students with higher grades are more anxious about mistakes and prefer to be corrected directly and given the chance to find their own errors (Yılmaz Yakışık, 2021). The teacher's selection of corrective feedback is adapted to the students' language ability and learning preferences (Yoshida, 2008 as cited in Yılmaz Yakisik (2021).

Find out teachers' beliefs regarding oral corrective feedback for students of different grades is essential, ensuring that teachers understand the needs of their students. Furthermore, sometimes teachers understand the role of feedback but their belief is not reflected in the practices. Ölmezer-Öztürk (2016) found that in the actual practice there was a mismatch in the type and timing of oral corrective feedback. These issues make it important to reveal how consistent teachers' beliefs and practices are. Oral corrective feedback that is not in line with the needs of students can prevent students from showing the expected uptake, and can even produce drawbacks. Inadequate corrections will keep students from receiving useful feedback for improvement, over-correction will harm students' cognitive and affective areas (Hartono et al., 2022). Considering this, it is important for teachers to comprehend students' needs based on their grade, so that the oral corrective provided can promote the development of students' language skills.

Appropriate teacher understanding and beliefs will maximize oral corrective feedback practices.

Previous studies have identified the real practice of oral corrective feedback in EFL classrooms (Ha et al., 2021; Soruç et al., 2024; Chambers Schuldt, 2019). These studies revealed teachers' actual practices which include the type, timing, and strategy. Some teachers' practices are in line with students' needs and expectations, but some are not. Therefore, the main factor that needs to be ensured is the teacher's beliefs, whether these beliefs are appropriate or not, after knowing the teacher's beliefs, the next step is to ensure that the beliefs are in accordance with the practices.

The gaps between beliefs and practices have been documented in a number of studies. For example Kartchava et al., (2020) stated that teachers' stated beliefs and actual practices related to timing and quantity of oral corrective feedback were not in line. Furthermore, Bao (2018) found that teachers believe elicitation and repetition as learners' preferred types, but in their practices those two types were seldom used, the perceived oral corrective feedback frequency also did not match the actual frequency. Several previous studies have analyzed possible reasons for the mismatch between teachers' beliefs and their actual practices (Kartchava et al., 2020; Bao, 2019). The findings of these research indicate a gap caused by the experience, contextual, and emotional factors of students. However, few studies have revealed the connection of teachers' beliefs and practices by considering students' grade level. The discussion of how grade affects oral corrective feedback has only been discussed from the students' perspective (grade affects the need for OCF).

This study provides a new perspective and insight into oral corrective feedback by considering how grade differences among students can influence teachers' beliefs and practices. With the increasing emphasis on student-centered learning, understanding how teachers adapt their oral corrective feedback strategies across grades is crucial to improving teacher teaching quality and students' learning quality. This study aims to reveal how teachers' oral corrective feedback beliefs and practices with students of different grades. This study focuses on the consistency between teachers' beliefs and practices, how they adapted oral corrective feedback for students, and how these practices produce uptake from students. The findings of this study are intended to provide new insights into how teachers' beliefs and students' grades can influence their oral corrective feedback practices.

Method

This study employed a qualitative method, to gain in-depth insight into oral corrective feedback beliefs and practices by teachers. To obtain rich and reliable qualitative data, this research employed two main instruments, namely semi-structured interviews and observation. Semi-structured interviews aimed to find problems more broadly, participants can be asked for their opinions and ideas (Sugiyono, 2013). Semi-structured interviews were carried out to reveal teachers' beliefs and understandings of oral corrective feedback, followed by classroom observations to check whether teachers' practices show their beliefs and understandings.

The participants of this study were two English teachers. Both teachers have different professional backgrounds. The first teacher is male, teaches seventh grade, and has relatively fresh teaching experience of one and a half years. He has completed his master's degree and is pursuing professional teacher training. Meanwhile, the second teacher is female, teaches ninth grade, and has twenty years of teaching experience. She is a bachelor's graduate and has completed professional teacher training. Participants were selected based on convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is a technique of selecting samples based on accessibility and availability (Edgar & Manz, 2017). The researcher selected grade 7 and grade 9 teachers, considering the level of readiness of the students being taught. Grade 7 students are still in the initial or adaptation period and grade 9 students are already at a fairly high level at the junior high school level. The difference in grade level was believed to provide a different understanding from the teacher.

The questions in interviews adapted from previous study, namely from Chambers Schuldt (2019). The first instrument was an interview consisting of six questions. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with both teachers, with a duration of about 15-20 minutes for each respondent. Interviews were conducted online because the researcher adjusted to the teachers' schedules and free time. The wealth of data obtained from the relatively brief interviews was still preserved. The semi-structured interview guide contained questions that focused intensely on teachers' main beliefs about oral corrective feedback, so that even with a relatively short interview time, meaningful findings could still be obtained. Follow-up questions were used whenever deeper clarification was needed.

The second instrument was classroom observation. This study used observation checklists in helping the researcher to check oral corrective feedback teachers during teaching. The aspects noted include the types of errors corrected, the feedback strategy provided (including the type, and the timing of the oral corrective feedback) and student uptake. The researcher also used an audio recorder during the observation, to make it easier in analyzing the data. After that the interview data is triangulated with classroom observation findings, providing a more comprehensive and in-depth understanding.

Thematic analysis approach was used to analyse the data from interview and observation. Thematic analysis is an exploration of themes that appear as crucial to describe phenomena (Daly et.al, 1997 as cited in Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). To ensure the trustworthiness of the data obtained, researchers conducted member checking. Member checking was conducted to confirm the accuracy of data interpretation. Through this method, this study aimed to generate a comprehensive understanding of teachers' beliefs and practices regarding oral corrective feedback in different grades.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

This section presents the result and discussion from teacher interviews and classroom observations related to teachers' oral corrective feedback beliefs and actual practices in junior high school English classrooms. The data obtained has been analyzed using thematic analysis, which aims to identify repeating patterns and to compare teachers' beliefs and actual practices.

Teachers' Beliefs of Oral Corrective Feedback

The data obtained from the interviews with the two teachers who teach at different grades showed that they have strong positive beliefs toward oral corrective feedback. This was reflected in their answers, related to the importance, the strategies they use, and the needs of students for teachers' oral corrective feedback. From the interviews, both teachers mentioned that they interpreted oral corrective feedback as a tool that facilitates students in mastering the lesson material. The first teacher defined oral corrective feedback as a method, while the second teacher viewed oral corrective feedback as information.

"In my opinion, oral corrective feedback is information receive as result of respond information that has been send previously, and in the term of education feedback is a method use by educators to help student understand the lesson". (Grade 7 teacher)

"Oral corrective feedback is information that teacher or another speaker including another learner give to learner on how well they are doing, either to help learner to improve specific point or to help when they are learning". (Grade 9 teacher)

The teachers also explained their opinion on the importance of teachers' oral corrective feedback for students. Both teachers agreed that oral corrective feedback is important for students' language development and learning awareness. Regarding the importance, the grade 7 teacher focused on the function, while the grade 9 teacher emphasized the reflective and motivational aspects of oral corrective feedback.

"In my opinion feedback is important in English learning because as a teacher we can directly provide direction to students, this is very useful for improving students' understanding, and it also can provide constructive direction for students when they make a mistake". (Grade 7 teacher)

"As a result they are aware of their progress and become active and contributors to their learning". (Grade 9 teacher)

In the interview session, both teachers mentioned oral corrective feedback types they used most often. Both had slightly different views. The grade 7 more often used recasts, prompts, and sometimes explicit feedback. The aim was to make students realize the errors in their speech, but the teacher also wants to give students the opportunity to correct errors independently. Furthermore, the grade 7 teacher provided delayed oral corrective feedback more often, the teacher ensured that students completed the utterance first before giving response or feedback.

"I use the model of recast and then explicit correction, and the last is prompts".

" I usually give students delayed oral corrective feedback, I think it's better to wait them finishing their utterances first".
(Grade 7 teacher)

The grade 9 teachers tend to use a variety of feedback types, such as repetition, elicitation, metalinguistics, clarification requests, and explicit feedback. This variation is adjusted to the students' level of readiness in receiving and responding to correction. Grade 9 teachers believed that students need a variety of types of OCF, especially implicit correction. The grade 9 teacher also prefers to give immediate oral corrective feedback, she mentioned

"I often give oral corrective feedback immediately. I want to make sure that students know where their error is". (Grade 9 teacher)

Teachers believed that they understood their students' needs for oral corrective feedback well enough. Grade 7 teachers believed that the students need explicit correction because students have curiosity about mistakes. According to the teacher, students tended to be curious about the parts of errors. Meanwhile, grade 9 teachers believed that students need more diverse oral corrective feedback strategies such as explicit, metalinguistic, and clarification requests. It is because students with higher grade levels need more reflection.

"I think students in grade 7 usually tend to choose explicit corrections, because they are curious about their own mistakes". (Grade 7 teacher)

"I think there are 3 types of oral corrective feedback that students in grade 9 seek from the teacher. There are explicit correction, metalinguistic, and clarification requests". (Grade 9 teacher)

Teachers also follow up on the oral corrective feedback that has been given, ensuring that the OCF is useful. Follow up carried out by giving similar examples, ensuring that students do not make mistakes on the same parts. Teachers mentioned that the way they follow up on OCF depends on how students respond. The following table gives an overview related to the results of the interview.

"I ask students to repeat the correct answer that has been given, and then they have to repeat several times and then i give a problem that quite similar with the problem that they have faced before". (Grade 7 teacher)

"follow up oral corrective feedback given to students by monitoring their responses, any effort given by students is a form of learning process". (Grade 9 teacher)

Table 2. Teachers' Beliefs from Interview

Aspect	Teacher Grade 7	Teacher Grade 9
The meaning of OCF	Feedback on learning outcomes; assisting student understanding	Methods to help students master the material
The importance of OCF	Important to give direct guidance to students	Important for skill development, self-awareness, and student engagement

Aspect	Teacher Grade 7	Teacher Grade 9
Types of oral OCF provided	Recast, prompt, sometimes explicit	Elicitation, metalinguistic, explicit, clarification requests
Follow up OCF	Using repetition	Depending on students response
Timing of OCF	Delayed OCF	Immediate OCF
Students needs of OCF	Explicit correction	Explicit, metalinguistic, and clarification requests

Teachers' Practices of Oral Corrective Feedback

The observation findings showed that both teachers actively provide OCF to students in the English learning process. However, in practice both have different strategies. The grade 7 teacher tended to use more explicit correction. For example, when the student said “*I never drinks soda*”, the teacher corrected “*Just drink, without s*”. The example was a form of explicit correction when the teacher gives the correct form. However, this contradicts the interview statement. The grade 7 teacher stated that he avoided explicit correction, but in practice, it was dominated by explicit correction. Related to the timing, the observation and interview results showed consistency, the teacher dominantly provided delayed oral corrective feedback.

Meanwhile, the observation results indicated that the grade 9 teacher used a more varied oral corrective feedback, this was consistent with the statement in the interview. In actual practice, the grade 9 teacher used elicitation, clarification requests, repetition, and explicit correction. For example a clarification request, a student said “*He is chubby cheeks*”, the teacher immediately responded with “*He is or he has?*”. Then when the student said “*She has a big eye*”, the teacher responded with “*Only one eye?*”. The teacher also dominantly used immediate oral corrective feedback. Overall the practice of oral corrective feedback conducted by both teachers produced positive student responses. The conclusion of the interview can be seen in the following table. The following gave an overview related to the results of the observation.

Table 3. Teachers' Practices from Observation

Types of Dominant Oral Corrective Feedback in Practices	Error Context	Students' Uptake
Grade 7 Teacher		
Explicit correction, recast, prompt	Grammar, pronunciation	Positive uptake (Students correct the error)
Example: S: “This food very delicious” T: “Kurang <i>is</i> ...”		
S: “We life in Indonesia” T: “Not life, but live”		
S: “Ron cleaning...” T: “Kurang to be, seharusnya is cleaning”		

Grade 9 Teacher

Elicitation, clarification request, repetition, explicit

Grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation

Positive uptake
(Students correct the error)

Example:

S: “She always use glasses”

T: “Use?” “Wears”

S: “He is chubby cheeks”

T: “He is or he has?”

S: He look handsome

T: He look?

Discussion

Consistency Between Teachers’ Beliefs and Classroom Practices

As noted previously, an extensive body of studies has examined both teachers' and students' beliefs in oral corrective feedback, but few studies have connected them to teachers' actual practices, especially those that relate to student-grade elements. This study addresses that issue by examining both teachers' beliefs and actual practices of oral corrective feedback. Interview and observation findings indicated that teachers positively believe in the importance of oral corrective feedback, and consider it as a learning tool. This finding is aligned with previous studies on the belief in the importance of oral corrective feedback (Ha et al., 2023; Zhu & wang, 2019; Uludag, 2024). Furthermore, results showed that there is a significant difference between the teacher's stated beliefs and observed practices in the classroom.

In the interview, the grade 7 teacher stated that he more often gave implicit oral corrective feedback. However, the observation data show that the grade 7 teacher tends to use explicit oral corrective feedback. This mismatch reflects what was mentioned by Nassaji et al., (2023) that there is a significant difference between teachers' statements and their classroom practice, both in the type and quantity of oral corrective feedback. Uludag (2024) also mentioned that teachers' beliefs were not fully reflected in classroom practice, as teachers tended to respond to only a limited number of errors and provide limited feedback during the observed learning process. It shows that teachers adjust their oral corrective feedback practice approach according to the classroom situation. This condition can be caused by several factors, one of which is contextual factors (Kartchava et al., 2020). Although there is a discrepancy between the types mentioned in the interviews and those used in actual practice, in terms of time, the grade 7 teacher considered delayed feedback, a similar finding to the previous study (Soruç et al., 2024; Ha et al., 2021). Grade 7 teachers prefer to finish students' utterances before responding. According to Ha et al (2021) Teachers argued that oral corrective feedback should be given after students have finished utterances, as it can impact students' emotional condition and inhibit their participation in learning.

In contrast, the grade 9 teacher shows a strong consistency between her beliefs and practices. The teacher stated that she provided various oral corrective feedback strategies, and gave oral corrective feedback directly. The statement is consistent with the actual facts found during the observation. This shows that the teacher has a planned understanding and practice. According to Soruç et al., (2024)

teachers' appropriate oral corrective feedback practices can be influenced by teachers' years of experience and contextual factors. The grade 9 teacher provided immediate oral corrective feedback more often. This contradicts studies that found that although students preferred immediate oral corrective feedback, teachers preferred to provide delayed feedback, taking into account students' emotions (Soruç et al., 2024; Ha et al., 2021). Ha et al (2021) found that students consider immediate oral corrective feedback to be better, because delayed corrective feedback allows them to forget what they said and their speech errors.

Adaptation of OCF to Students

Observations show that both teachers, consciously or unconsciously, try to adjust their oral corrective feedback strategies according to students' development. The grade 7 teacher claims to use implicit oral corrective feedback but uses explicit oral corrective feedback more often. Teachers give explicit correction more often to early second language learners, while in higher grades the frequency decreases (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). This strategy allowed teachers to point out students' mistakes and guide students to correct their errors. This was because of the teacher's awareness of the students' needs and readiness, as younger students need more targeted feedback.

The ninth-grade teachers' oral corrective feedback techniques are diverse and reflective, providing students with opportunities to realize and correct their errors independently. This is in line with Yılmaz Yakışık (2021) that higher-level students like OCF strategies that guide them to correct their errors. For example, oral corrective feedback elicitation and clarification requests that encourage deeper processing of language forms. This is consistent with Long's (1996) Interaction Hypothesis, which stresses the importance of negotiation of language meaning in supporting language acquisition. It can be concluded that the higher the grade level and the readiness of the students, the more the type of oral corrective feedback that encourages self-improvement is needed.

Although both teachers used various oral corrective feedback strategies, there is a dominant type of oral corrective feedback that reflects the reality in each classroom. Most types of oral corrective feedback suggested by Lyster and Ranta (1997) are used by teachers in actual practice. The observation results show that the grade 7 teacher used more explicit correction. For example, when students said "*I never drink soda*", the teacher responded with "*Just drink, without s...*", in addition, students said "*We live in Indonesia*", the teacher responded with "*Not life, but live*". All the feedback given by the teacher makes students immediately correct their wrong utterances. The grade 7 teacher prefers explicit correction because of considering grade 7 students' limited English proficiency, their readiness, and need for clearer guidance. While the grade 9 teacher uses elicitation and clarification techniques more often, which encourages students' independence and ability to self-monitor. For example, when students say "*He is chubby cheeks*", the teacher responds with "*He is or he has?*", leading students to review their utterances and improve them.

The patterns of each teacher's oral corrective feedback strategies emphasize the importance of teacher flexibility and responsiveness. Effective oral corrective

feedback practice is not only determined by theoretical preferences, but also by the teacher's ability to adjust strategies directly based on student readiness and learning objectives. The findings show that although at the beginning of the class, the oral corrective feedback provided was dominated by explicit correction, but increasingly to the upper level the use of explicit correction was reduced and combined with implicit correction. This is in accordance with Ha et al., (2021) who stated that students have a positive view of explicit oral corrective feedback, but teachers tend to consider it less positive due to concerns about students' affective responses to the feedback.

Students' Uptake and Feedback Effectiveness

In both classes with different grades and different oral corrective feedback strategies, overall students show positive uptake. The oral corrective feedback received helped them to improve their speech. The uptake of the students is the main indicator of the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback. The responses given by students indicate progress in learning. In both classes, oral corrective feedback (OCF) resulted in successful reformulation, which shows that although the type of oral corrective feedback used was different, it could be considered appropriate for the student's proficiency level. According to (Lyster et al., 2013) learners can benefit equally from different types of corrective feedback given intensively on the target feature, as long as they are given the opportunity to directly correct the error.

The grade 7 teacher predominantly gives delayed oral corrective feedback in their practice. This contradicts Ha et al (2021) finding that delayed oral corrective feedback is less noticed by students. Observations show that even though the feedback is delayed, students are still able to use it to improve their utterances. However, the form of feedback tends to be always explicit. This shows that if the feedback is delayed, students tend to be less able to analyze their wrong utterances. However, the form of feedback tends to always be explicit. However, the teacher ensures that by following up the corrective feedback she gives by repeating until students can detect their own mistakes. On the other hand, grade 9 teachers are consistent with direct oral corrective feedback. Regardless of the type and strategy of feedback used, teachers still use direct feedback, ensuring errors are highlighted as soon as they occur. The strategy is successful in making students realize and correct errors before continuing their utterances. However, in line with Ha et al (2021) that the effects of direct feedback must still be considered. Therefore, more supervision and awareness is needed by teachers.

It can be concluded that when students get the chance to fix errors, learners more actively process and reproduce the correct form which leads to more positive learning outcomes. Kim and Mostafa (2021) found that students showed the highest level of uptake when the type of oral corrective feedback they received matched their beliefs or preferences. This suggests that when the feedback matches what they find helpful, they are more likely to respond positively. These findings emphasize the importance of teachers' ability to understand the needs and characteristics of students at different grade levels, as their preferences and readiness for various types of feedback may vary. By understanding the variations, teachers and training programs can develop corrective oral feedback approaches that are more responsive and appropriate to students' cognitive and emotional

development. This will allow teachers to implement effective feedback strategies for each grade level.

Conclusion

This study explored the beliefs and actual practices of two English teachers who teach at different grade levels, regarding oral corrective feedback. The findings showed that both teachers have a strong belief in the positive impact or benefits of oral corrective feedback on students' skill development. However, only the grade 9 teacher showed a strong alignment between her beliefs and actual practice. While the grade 7 teacher showed a slight difference between his beliefs and actual practice.

In the end, despite the discrepancy between teachers' beliefs and actual practices, each teacher's oral corrective feedback strategy was able to make students show positive uptake, in the form of the ability to respond and correct their errors after receiving feedback. This indicated that the oral corrective feedback strategies used by each teacher were effective and in accordance with the students' developmental level. Thus, this study demonstrates the dynamic relationship between teachers' beliefs, practices, and students' grade. Although beliefs play an important role, the effectiveness of teachers' oral corrective feedback strongly depends on the strategies they adapt to the learning context.

The results of this study are expected to contribute both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, these findings enrich the understanding of the dynamic relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices of oral corrective feedback, especially when feedback is applied at different grade levels. Practically, these findings emphasize the importance of pedagogical flexibility in choosing oral corrective feedback that is appropriate for students' development and grade levels. This study also highlights the importance of further training for teachers. Training that not only addresses the types of oral corrective feedback, but also strategies to adapt it to classroom conditions flexibly and professionally.

References

- Andria, M. (2025). Timing of corrective feedback in mobile instant messaging: An exploratory study of L2 modern greek learners' perceptions. *System*, 131(March), 103591. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103591>
- Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes: Teachers' beliefs versus their practices. *System*, 82, 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.004>
- Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, 39(3), 370–380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.009>
- Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Pearson Education ESL.
- Chambers Schuldt, L. (2019). Feedback in action: Examining teachers' oral feedback to elementary writers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 83, 64–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.03.020>
- Edgar, T. W., & Manz, D. O. (2017). Exploratory Study. *Research Methods for Cyber Security*, 95–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-805349-2.00004-2>

- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 80–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690600500107>
- Hartono, D., Basthomi, Y., Widiastuti, O., & Prastiyowati, S. (2022). The impacts of teacher's oral corrective feedback to students' psychological domain: a study on EFL speech production. *Cogent Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2152619>
- Kartchava, E., Gatbonton, E., Ammar, A., & Trofimovich, P. (2020). Oral corrective feedback: Pre-service English as a second language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(2), 220–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818787546>
- Kim, Y., & Mostafa, T. (2021). Teachers' and students' beliefs and perspectives about corrective feedback. *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, May, 561–580. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789.027>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365>
- Nassaji, H., Bozorgian, H., & Golbabazadeh, E. (2023). Teachers' stated cognition and its relationship with oral corrective feedback practices in EFL classrooms. *System*, 113(August 2022), 102993. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.102993>
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, E. (2019). Beliefs and practices of Turkish EFL teachers regarding oral corrective feedback: a small-scale classroom research study. *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>
- Soruç, A., Yuksel, D., McKinley, J., & Grimshaw, T. (2024). Factors influencing EFL teachers' provision of oral corrective feedback: the role of teaching experience. *Language Learning Journal*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2024.2338346>
- Sugiyono, D. (2013). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan tindakan*. Penerbit Alfabeta.
- Yılmaz Yakışık, B. (2021). EFL learners' preferences and emotions about oral corrective feedback Indonesian. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 2021. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21093>
- Zarei, M., Ahour, T., & Seifoori, Z. (2020). Impacts of implicit, explicit, and emergent feedback strategies on EFL learners' motivation, attitude and perception. *Cogent Education*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1727130>
- Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: a large-scale survey.

Language Awareness, 28(2), 139–161.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755>