Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) and Writing Feedback toward Teachers' Beliefs

Masrul[1)*]; Putri Asilestari[2)]

[1,2]Universitas Pahlawan Tuanku Tambusai

[*)]Corresponding author: masrulm25@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Teachers' view influences the concepts that teachers teach in the classroom. This study examined the correlation between EFL writing feedback and oral corrective feedback (OCF) toward teachers' beliefs. Data were analyzed by the correlation test. The participants were 100 students from Malang State University (50 females and 50 males, with an average age of 19–22). The findings of this research reveal that the relationship between oral corrective feedback and writing feedback on teacher belief is significant and positive. Oral corrective feedback and writing feedback are effective in the teaching and learning. The results of this study can be used as a reference in applying OCF and writing feedback in the classroom. Teachers' beliefs are crucial and should be considered as one of the success factors for students in learning foreign languages.

Keywords: Teachers' beliefs, oral corrective feedback, and writing feedback

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, oral corrective feedback in language classes has gotten much attention. Corrective feedback (CF) refers to the replies of teachers and peers to learners' incorrect second language production (L2) (S. Li, 2018). Most research, however, focuses on teachers' activities, one of them is research by Moorhouse et al. (2022) leaving the question of how pupils perceive these tactics unanswered. Oral CF research has recently grown in popularity because of its pedagogical and theoretical importance. Because excessive feedback can obstruct learner autonomy, indirect CF (e.g., requests for explanation, elicitation, or repetition) should be favored, at least initially, over 'direct CF' (recast, explicit correction, or metalinguistic feedback).

The focus of classroom interaction, including all types of errors and error treatments, has switched from language forms to functional language within communicative contexts over time, as has the focus of classroom engagement, including all types of errors and error treatments (Brown, 2000). The issue of error handling and corrective feedback has altered substantially as the role of language's communication functions has expanded, and oral corrective feedback (OCF) in communicative circumstances has taken center stage. Carroll (2001) suggested that explicit CF is likely more effective than implicit feedback because

learners must recognize the corrective force of feedback. This argument is supported by research examining the consequences of these two types of feedback (Ellis et al., 2006). Language learners require feedback to develop their comprehension and ability to converse in the language (Nassaji, 2016). Furthermore, in contrast to the assertions in opposition to error checking, there are several explanations of how formative assessment is a component of every teaching strategy (Pawlak, 2014). Rather than looking into the values of various sorts of feedback, researchers believe it is necessary to look into the views of language teachers, as their beliefs and actions impact on the success of OCF. A recent review by Li and Vuono (2019) found that teachers' opinions and practices on OCF were more varied instead of consistent. Writing teachers who teach English as a second or foreign language (ESL or EFL) have even less space dedicated to their beliefs, views, and practices regarding written feedback (Lee, 2009). Notwithstanding a flood of research on the various kinds and roles of L2 classroom observations, there are still some gaps and their impact on student attitudes (Lee, 2008).

This locally created theory has the potential to both confirm and inform L2 writing theories. Furthermore, because of the close link between instructors' views and actions, studying the feedback beliefs of ESL/EFL language teachers can give writing scholars and teachers insight into the underlying concepts of their methods. This knowledge is important because the perspectives of ESL/EFL writing teachers may impact their students' written form, thus impacting their students' self-perceived writing effectiveness (Yu et al., 2020), level of editing and composition (Qiu et al., 2021). A better understanding of this inconsistency is something that has to be investigated. As a result, the major purpose of this study was to investigate EFL writing teachers' ideas about how to offer written feedback, as well as the alignment between those beliefs and their classroom writing practices regarding OCF.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on L2 Language Teachers' Belief

Beliefs are key to knowing how instructors impact their work because teachers are crucial to understanding their teaching methods and classroom judgments. Teachers' attitudes have piqued researchers' interest because of teachers' valuable input in improving English language teaching and learning. Teachers' concepts in the classroom are heavily influenced by their views. Teachers must be aware of this link to build and implement their new curriculum. Teachers' point of view contributes to what teachers accomplish in the classroom and their attitudes and students' opinions. According to research in the field of L2 language teachers' cognitive abilities, L2 vocabulary instructors are considered active intellectuals with their viewpoints on language learning and a diversity of teaching methodologies. Teachers' views

may stem from their own prior learning experiences, or they may serve as a filter for incoming material, and this may have an impact on their real-world language teaching techniques (Ya et al., 2022), besides being influenced by practices in the classroom (Ifinedo et al., 2020).

EFL Writing Teachers' and Their Students' Beliefs about Writing Feedback

Bernat & Gvozdenko (2005) argued that the views, beliefs, and attitudes that learners bring to the learning scenario are key components in the learning process. Learners have strong views about the nature of language, how it is acquired, the effectiveness of learning tactics, the presence of aptitude, and their expectations for success and teaching methods. Recognizing these ideas and their implications for language learning and teaching, as well as learners' expectations and techniques, can aid teachers in developing syllabi and teaching methods.

Teachers' cognitive processes, instructional tactics, and learning to teach require understanding their beliefs. Teacher beliefs are essential issues in teacher education because they help teachers develop their views and values (Flores, 2020). Li (2012) claimed that beliefs significantly influence language acquisition. It helps people make sense of their surroundings by influencing how new information is processed and accepted or rejected. Beliefs represent memories and influence how people perceive events. Teachers' perspectives influence how teachers plan lessons, make decisions and behave in the classroom more than their knowledge. The beliefs of teachers have an impact on how they engage with their students.

According to previous research, teachers and students had similar attitudes and views on evaluation; according to research which evaluated teachers of English as a Foreign Language provide feedback on the student's expectations and perceptions. Schulz (2001) discovered that the majority of participants, including Columbian EFL students and teachers (93 % and 98 %, respectively), agreed that students sought written feedback from their teachers when they made mistakes in writing. Montgomery & Baker (2007) discovered that students' assessments of the quantity of microscopic and macroeconomic writing CF they received mirrored the self-evaluation of their English learning professors. Others said there were conflicts between professors and students over how much and what kind of feedback students should get (Diab, 2005).

There has been little research on the attitudes and behaviors of ESL/EFL composition instructors in evaluation. As per Lee (2009), institutional restrictions Lee (2009) may be a plausible factor in ten significant inconsistent views and reported behaviors across two sets of EFL writing teachers in Hong Kong's secondary schools. These inconsistencies were visible on topics including the foundations of effective writing, suitable and efficient methods for failure feedback, the number of revisions required, and responsibility for repair. Although interviewed

by the researchers, most teachers blamed the inconsistencies in their feedback views and practices on a strategy mandating English-based panels to report inaccuracies. In a similar study, Montgomery & Baker (2007) observed significant disparities between teachers' self-reported views through students' work and genuine remarks on local and global topics. Researchers also discovered that both instructors and students must consider corrective comments similarly. In the survey, the majority stated that they provided significantly more opinions on international concerns and far fewer on regional matters.

Critique of Studies on ESL/EFL Writing Teachers' Beliefs and Practices

Each possible explanation for the recently identified imbalance of beliefs, preconceptions, and practices is that English as a Second Language/English as a Foreign Language (ESL/EFL) writing instructors appear to lack prescriptive consciousness of how to implement their newly purchased research-based technical data. However, little is recognized about how ESL/EFL impacts learning and gives insight into technological knowledge into action understanding. Almost nothing is known about the factors that influence the attitudes and behaviors of ESL/EFL writing teachers studies on the perception of L2 vocabulary educators suggest that knowledge could be useful a significant role (Basturkmen et al., 2004). Given that reasoning, one could query if English-learning instructors are qualified in Montgomery & Baker's (2007). Despite the awareness of the concepts of educational consequences supported by L2 writing scholars, study participants who were "finally admitted into the TESOL masters programme" learned how to make written comments. This interpretation is supported by Lee's (2008) discovery that for continued use of mistake reporting by certain EFL/ESL teachers. Prasetyo et al. (2021) discovered that teachers claimed educational ideas had little to do with how they divided students for instruction. In addition, in EFL studies, self-described communicative teachers are no more capable of creating actual communication in their classrooms than other traditional professors (Farrell & Kennedy, 2020).

Beliefs about Corrective Feedback

Lyster et al. (2013) provided a comprehensive summary of oral corrective feedback studies, covering forms, frequencies, preferences, and theoretical considerations, before discussing OCF efficacy, language goals, learners' age, and peer characteristics. Researchers concluded that language teachers in the classroom must make decisions based on the techniques accessible to them. This suggests that, in the end, the use of corrective feedback is influenced by the teaching philosophies of the individual teacher.

In the context of a literature review, Bao (2019) looked at the relationship between OCF professors in China and investigated teachers' beliefs and practices, while Dong (2012) looked

into the beliefs and practices of two Chinese Foreign Language teachers at a US institution. The Olmezer-Ozturk (2019) researched an EFL school environment in Turkey, with eight teachers participating in an intense English curriculum. The views and practices of ten EFL Spanish teachers at both primary and secondary schools were explored by Roothooft's (2014) study in the Spanish environment.

The above remarks are about oral CF. However, there are similar variations of opinion when it comes to writing CF, as evidenced by the discussion between Truscott and Ferris. Truscott (1996) made the strong claim that correcting learners' errors in a written composition may enable them to eliminate the errors in a subsequent draft but has no effect on grammatical accuracy in a new piece of writing, echoing the views of teachers who subscribe to process theories of writing (i.e., it does not result in acquisition). Ecker et al., (2022) refuted this assertion, claiming that it was impossible to discount corrections in general since the quality of the correction was dependent on the quality of the correction. In other words, it would work for acquisition if the correction was evident and constant. Truscott retaliated by claiming Ferris had failed to present any evidence to support the claim.

The most notable research examining the relationship between teachers' attitudes and behaviors towards OCF is Dong (2012) and Bao (2019), focus on the ideal supplier of corrective feedback. Both teachers in Dong's study agreed that self-correction is preferable but that teacher correction is also preferred. In Bao's study, six out of eight teachers stated that teachers should offer OCF and use a similar technique throughout their sessions. In the study by Basturkmen et al. (2004), one teacher said that she would provide feedback after the oral activity but that she did it during the activity. Half of the teachers in Olmezer-Ozturk's (2019) study were consistent regarding the timing, while the other half reported and performed differently.

Given that there is no longitudinal study of EFL writing feedback and oral corrective feedback toward teachers' beliefs, according to EFL writing academics, teachers should do a critical self-inquiry into their writing feedback techniques; this study was to report EFL writing feedback and oral corrective feedback toward teachers' beliefs. The following are research questions; Is there a relationship between oral corrective feedback and writing feedback on teachers' beliefs? And how do writing feedback and oral corrective feedback affect teachers' beliefs?

METHOD

The correlation test, one of the statistical tests used to identify the close association between independent and dependent variables, was performed to analyze the data utilized in this study. In the correlation test, the determination of the strength or weakness of a relationship

is assessed based on a value closer to 1 or -1. Closer to 0 means the relationship between the two variables is weak. There are several tests for the correlation test, including Pearson, Kendal's, and Spearman's. In this study, the Pearson Correlation test was used.

Following the correlation test, the analysis of variance (ANOVA), one of the statistical analysis approaches for inference statistics, was also conducted. In ANOVA, the hypothesis compares the mean of several populations represented by multiple sample groups.

Participants

The participants in this study were 100 students from Malang State University (50 females and 50 males with an average age of 19-22). Before collecting the data, the students were informed of the research objective, that they could withdraw from the study without giving a reason, and that the study data could be used for research or publishing, all in accordance with ethical laws. Everyone agreed and signed the consent form after the discussion.

Data Collection

The writing gathered consisted of two sets of information: one on students' personal beliefs and one on students' professional practice. The first was the student learning log and reflection journal entries, which she used throughout the semester to further student understanding of the views. The goal of comparing and contrasting student procedures with written feedback before and after peer assessment training at the start of the writing class and after peer review training at the end of the writing class was to compare and contrast student practices with written feedback before and after peer review training. Although the lecturer's comments on these two themes were not identical in content, students did pose the same questions on the assistance sheets the lecturers handed to the students.

Writing Class

This composition program was created to assist students in improving their essay-writing abilities. For 18 weeks, the group met several times a week, with four one-month writing periods in between. Students must consider, draft, discuss, modify, communicate their views to the class, and provide verbal and written critiques of their classmates' work during each writing cycle. They needed to obtain credible research and quote it in their one-page essays to support their claims. The writing lecturers/researchers provided input on students' second and third versions of each issue to prevent affecting student assessors' comments on the original draft and writers' perceptions of their classmates' views. Students were given two 2-hour peer assessment training sessions in class and two 20-minute teacher-student conferences with each student after class during the second and third writing periods to enable them to deliver the revision-oriented critique.

Quantitative Analysis Procedure

According to Van Ha & Murray (2021), five features of error correction, a task was constructed for the study to collect data on the teachers' beliefs. Participants were given ten hypothetical error repair snippets and asked to classify them according to the Roy Lyster & Leila Ranta (1997) classification system. This belief exercise aimed to align the teachers' beliefs with their observations of their activities. The raters carefully read each sentence in the lecturer's writing or researcher's comments, attempting to discover the guiding concepts. Specificity, understanding students' intentions, detecting difficulties, clarifying problems, and giving ideas were five guiding concepts in the reflection journal and the learning log.

The writing of lecturers' or researchers' remarks was frequently in the form of a series of words, with one identifying a problem and the rest explaining or providing particular answers. The two independent raters and the writing lecturers/researchers coded three randomly chosen remarks for the initial coding, and the results were compared. However, if there had been a disagreement, the outcome would have been the one that both raters agreed on, similar to how coding was used in the reflection diary and learning log. Lecturers were reporters and interpreters of the conclusions based on such rigorous data analysis, in addition to being informants and data analysts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics is a preliminary data analysis technique to provide an overview of measured variables. Analysis in descriptive statistics can be in the data central tendency (Mean, Mode, and Median) and data distribution (standard deviation and variance). The average and standard deviation of all variables in the study are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of research variables

No	Items	mean	SD
1	Effectiveness	2.94	1.23
2	Grammar	2.95	1.19
3	Provider	2.99	1.22
4	Time	3.05	1.17
5	Recasts	2.96	1.16
6	Elicitations	3.07	1.17
7	Clarification Request	3.05	1.20
8	Metalinguistic Feedback	2.96	1.18

9	repetition	3.01	1.15
10	Explicit Correction	3.11	1.24
11	Specificity	2.94	1.23
12	Intention	2.95	1.19
13	Identifying Problems	2.92	1.16
14	Explaining Problem	3.05	1.17
15	Making Suggestions	2.96	1.16
16	Explication	3.07	1.17

Table 1 describes the mean and standard deviation of all variables in this study. The highest mean is found in the Explicit Correction variable (M=3.11), with the number of students whose scores exceeded the average of 51 out of 100 respondents. While the lowest mean is in the Identifying Problems variable (M=2.92), with the number of students whose scores exceeding the average also 51 out of 100 respondents.

Pearson Correlation

Correlation analysis is a statistical method used by researchers to determine the close relationship between variables in research. The results of the correlation test with the Pearson method are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Pearson correlation test results between variables

No	Items	r				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Effectiveness		0.998**	0.996**	0.998**	0.998**
2	Grammar	0.998**		0.999**	0.999**	1,000**
3	Provider	0.996**	0.999**		0.998**	0.998**
4	time	0.998**	0.999**	0.998**		0.999**
5	Type Correction	0.998**	1,000**	0.998**	0.999**	
	**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					

Table 2 shows that the variables measured in the study have a significant correlation. The Effectiveness variable has a fairly strong relationship with all variables in the study, including Grammar, Provider, Time, and Type Correction indicated by r > 0.90.

Table 3. Pearson correlation test results between variables

No	Items	R						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Type Correction		0.999**	1,000**	0.997**	1,000**	1,000**	0.998**
2	Recasts	0.999**		0.999**	0.995**	0.999**	0.999**	0.996**
3	Elicitations	1,000**	0.999**		0.996**	1,000**	0.999**	0.997**
4	Clarification_Request	0.997**	0.995**	0.996**		0.996**	0.996**	0.994**
5	Metalinguistic_Feedback	1,000**	0.999**	1,000**	0.996**		0.999**	0.997**
6	Repetition	1,000**	0.999**	0.999**	0.996**	0.999**		0.997**

| 7 | Explicit_Correction | 0.998** | 0.996** | 0.997** | 0.994** | 0.997** | 0.997** |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3. shows the close relationship between the Type Correction variable and indicators ranging from Recasts to Explicit Correction. The result shows that the Type Correction variable significantly correlates with all indicators (r > 0.90 for all indicators). This indicates that the Type Correction variable has a fairly strong relationship with all variables in the study, namely Recasts, Elicitations, Clarification Requests, Metalinguistic Feedback, Repetition, and Explicit Corrections.

Table 4. Pearson correlation test results between variables

No	Items	R					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Specificity		0.998**	0.999**	0.998**	0.999**	0.998**
2	Intention	0.998**		0.999**	0.999**	0.999**	0.999**
3	Identifying Problems	0.999**	0.999**		0.999**	0.999**	0.999**
4	Explaining Problem	0.998**	0.999**	0.999**		0.999**	0.999**
5	Making Suggestions	0.999**	0.999**	0.999**	0.999**		0.999**
6	Explication	0.998**	0.999**	0.999**	0.999**	0.999**	

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 illustrates the close relationship between the variables measured in this study. The specificity variable is strongly correlated with all variables (r > 0.90) in the study, including Intention, Identifying Problems, Explaining Problems, Making Suggestions, and Explication.

Two-Way ANOVA Test

ANOVA stands for "analysis of variance," a comparative test used to test the difference in the mean of data for more than two groups. There are two types of ANOVA: one-factor variance (one-way ANOVA) and two-factor analysis of variance (two-way ANOVA). Two-way ANOVA compares the mean difference between the divided groups on two independent variables (factors). The results of the Two-way ANOVA test in this study are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA test results

Source	OCF				Writing Feedback			
	Mean Square	F	Sig.	R-Sq	Mean Square	F	Sig.	R-Sq
Corrected Model	66.42	174.25	0.000	0.727	66.22	170.36	0.000	0.723
Intercept	1,533.08	4,021.66	0.000		1,504.03	3,869.36	0.000	
Factor 1	198.57	520.91	0.000		198.14	509.74	0.000	

Factor 2	0.47	1.23	0.270	0.32	0.82	0.367
1*2	0.00	0.00	0.954	0.00	0.00	0.946
Error	0.38			0.39		

The corrected Model value shows the effect of all independent variables (Factor 1, Factor 2, and Interaction of Factor 1 with Factor 2 or "Factor 1*Factor 2") together on the dependent variable (OCF). Table 5 shows the p-value of 0.000, meaning that all independent variables (Factor 1, Factor 2, and Interaction of Factor 1 with Factor 2 or "Factor 1*Factor 2") have a significant influence on OCF. The corrected Model value on Writing Feedback is also significant (p=0.000), so it can be concluded that all independent variables (Factor 1, Factor 2, and Interaction of Factor 1 with Factor 2 or "Factor 1*Factor 2") together have a significant influence to the Writing Test.

The intercept is the value of the change in the dependent variable without the need to be influenced by the existence of the independent variable, meaning that without the influence of the independent variable, the dependent variable can change its value. Table 5 shows that the intercept values for the OCF and Writing Feedback variables are both 0.000. So, it can be concluded that without the influence of the independent variable, the OCF and Writing feedback scores experienced a significant change.

The influence of Factor 1 (Belief and Practice) on the OCF variable can be seen from the p-value (0.000), meaning that belief and practice factors significantly affect the OCF value. The same conclusion was also obtained on the variable Writing Feedback, with a p-value of 0.000; it can be concluded that belief and practice factors significantly influence writing feedback.

As for the influence of Factor 2, the effectiveness factor (Low and High) has no significant effect on the OCF value (p=0.270). The same conclusion was also obtained on the variable Writing Feedback. The effectiveness factor (Low and High) has no significant influence on writing feedback (p=0.367).

Factors 1 and 2 have no significant effect on the OCF variable (p=0.954). Similar conclusions were also obtained for the writing feedback variable; factor 1 and factor 2 together do not significantly affect the Writing Feedback variable (p=0.946). In addition, the model error value obtained for OCF is 0.38, and Writing Feedback is 0.39. The smaller the error, the better the model can be.

Tukey Test

Tukey's test is often called the honestly significant difference test. This test was

introduced by JW Tukey (1953). An alternative to the comparison test without a plan, which is to test all combinations of the treatment mean pairs, the HSD test can be used. The HSD test is simple because it only requires a single HSD value to be used as a comparison. If the difference between the two treatment mean values is greater than the HSD value, the two treatments are declared different. The results of the Tukey test in this research can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. Tukey test results

Multiple Comparison

Dependent Variable: OCF

Tukey HSD

(I) Type	(J) Type	Mean Difference (IJ)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Belief A	Belief B	2.03506 *	.12553	.000	1.7098	2.3603
	Practice A	-.09336	.11320	.843	-.3867	.2000
	Practice B	1,93147 *	.12646	.000	1.6038	2.2591
Belief B	Belief A	-2.03506 *	.12553	.000	-2.3603	-1.7098
	Practice A	-2.12842 *	.12510	.000	-2.4526	-1.8042
	Practice B	-.10359	.13721	.874	-.4591	.2520
Practice A	Belief A	.09336	.11320	.843	-.2000	.3867
	Belief B	2.12842 *	.12510	.000	1.8042	2.4526
	Practice B	2,02483 *	.12603	.000	1.6983	2.3514
Practice B	Belief A	-1.93147 *	.12646	.000	-2.2591	-1.6038
	Belief B	.10359	.13721	.874	-.2520	.4591
	Practice A	-2.02483 *	.12603	.000	-2.3514	-1.6983

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The difference in the average number for OCF in Belief A and Belief B types is 2,035, with a difference ranging from 0.709 (Lower Bound) and 2.360 (Upper Bound). The mean difference is significant (p=0.000). Furthermore, the average number for OCF in Belief A and Practice A types is 0.093, with a range of differences between -0.200 (Lower Bound) and 0.386 (Upper Bound); however, the difference is not significant (p=0.843). Then, the average score for OCF in Belief A and Practice B types is -1.931, with a range of differences between -2.259 (Lower Bound) and -1.603 (Upper Bound), and the difference in the average is significant (p=0.000).

The Relationship between Oral Corrective Feedback and Writing Feedback on Teachers' Beliefs

This study examined the relationship between oral corrective feedback and writing feedback on teachers' beliefs. From this research, teachers can find out how much the influence and the relationship between oral corrective feedback and writing feedback affect teachers' beliefs.

The study results show that the relationship between oral corrective feedback and writing feedback on teachers' beliefs has a significant relationship. The efficacy variable has a r > 0.90 for all variables, as indicated by the test results between variables, showing strong

associations with all variables (grammar, provider, time, and type correction). In addition, for all indicators, the type correction variable also has a value of $r > 0.90$, suggesting that the Type Correction variable is strongly linked to all of the other variables in the study, including Recasts, Elicitations, Clarification Requests, Metalinguistic Feedback, Repetition, and Explicit Corrections. The specificity also strongly correlates with all variables ($r > 0.90$), including intention, identifying problems, explaining problems, making suggestions, and explaining. The results of this study are supported by Nassaji (2016), that language learners need feedback to improve their understanding and conversational skills in a language. In addition, these beliefs may be a result of teachers' earlier learning experiences, or they may serve as a filter for incoming information and can have an impact on their real language classroom methods, as well as be influenced by classroom procedures.

The Effect of Writing Feedback and Oral Corrective Feedback toward Teachers' Beliefs

According to the study results, it shows that writing feedback and oral corrective feedback on teachers' beliefs have a significant effect. Teacher beliefs are essential issues in teacher education because they help teachers develop their views and values. Similarly, Zheng (2009) argued that teachers' beliefs are important concepts in understanding teachers' cognitive processes, teaching strategies, and learning to teach. Meanwhile, Li (2012) asserted that beliefs play an important role in language learning.

This can be seen from the corrected model value, showing the significant effect of all independent variables (Factor 1, Factor 2) on the dependent variable (OCF) (p=0.00). The corrected model value for writing feedback also concluded that all the independent variables (Factor 1, Factor 2) significantly influence writing feedback (p=0.00). The intercept values for the OCF and Writing Feedback variables are both 0.000. It was concluded that without the influence of the independent variable, the OCF and writing feedback values experienced a significant change. The results of this study are supported by Carroll (2001), who suggested that explicit CF is likely more effective than implicit feedback because learners must recognize the corrective force of feedback. This argument is supported by research investigating the consequences of these two types of feedback (Ellis et al., 2006).

Meanwhile, Factor 1 (Belief and Practice) impacts the OCF and writing feedback variables (p=0.000). This suggests that beliefs and practices have a big influence on OCF values and feedback writing.

However, Factor 2, namely the value of effectiveness (Low and High), has no impact on the OCF variable (p=0.270). For the variable "Writing Feedback," a similar outcome was reached.

The effectiveness component (Low and High) has no significant influence on writing feedback, as evidenced by the p-value of 0.367. When factor 1 and factor 2 are combined, they do not affect the OCF variable (p=0.954). The writing feedback variable shows similar results (p=0.946), meaning that when components 1 and 2 are combined, they do not affect the Writing Feedback variable.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that the relationship between oral corrective feedback and writing feedback on teacher belief has a significant and positive relationship. Oral corrective feedback and writing feedback are effective in the teaching and learning process, as evidenced by thorough, precise, and satisfactory research results. The findings of this study can be used as a reference in the application of OCF and writing feedback in the classroom. While teachers' beliefs are important and should be considered as one of the success factors for students in learning foreign languages.

This study has a wide range of implications for language learning and instruction. However, it also has some flaws, some of which could be addressed in future research. This study should include a larger number of participants and a broader component.

REFERENCES

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

Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, *25*(2), 243–272. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.243

Bernat, E., & Gvozdenko, I. (2005). Beliefs about Language Learning: Current Knowledge, Pedagogical Implications, and New Research Directions. *Tesl-Ej*, *9*(1), 1–21.

Carroll, S. E. (2001). *Input and Evidence:The raw material of second languange acquisition*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Diab, R. L. (2005). Teachers' and Students' Beliefs About Responding to ESL Writing: A Case Study. *TESL Canada Journal*, *23*(1), 28. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v23i1.76

Dong, Z. (2012). *CORE View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk*. *2*(2), 35–43.

Ecker, U. K. H., Lewandowsky, S., Cook, J., Schmid, P., Fazio, L. K., Brashier, N., Kendeou, P., Vraga, E. K., & Amazeen, M. A. (2022). The psychological drivers of misinformation belief and its resistance to correction. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, *1*(1), 13–29. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-021-00006-y

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. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060141

Farrell, T. S. C., & Kennedy, J. (2020). " My Personal Teaching Principle Is'' Safe, Fun, and Clear'": Reflections of a TESOL Teacher." *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *8*(2), 83–96. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33474/j-reall.v4i2.20096

Flores, M. A. (2020). Feeling like a student but thinking like a teacher: A study of the development of professional identity in initial teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *46*(2), 145–158. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1724659

Ifinedo, E., Rikala, J., & Hämäläinen, T. (2020). Factors affecting Nigerian teacher educators' technology integration: Considering characteristics, knowledge constructs, ICT practices and beliefs. *Computers & Education*, *146*, 103760. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103760

Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*(2), 69–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.10.001

Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal*, *63*(1), 13–22. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn010

Li, S. (2018). Corrective feedback in L2 speech production. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1–9.

Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System*, *84*, 93–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006

Li, X. (2012). Utilizing fairview as a bilingual Response to Intervention (RTI): Comprehensive curriculum review with supporting data. *The Role of Teachers' Beliefs in the Language Teaching-Learning Process. Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(7), 1317–1329. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.7.1317-1329

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

Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *16*(2), 82–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002

Moorhouse, B. L., Walsh, S., Li, Y., & Wong, L. L. C. (2022). Assisting and mediating interaction during synchronous online language lessons: Teachers' professional practices. *TESOL Quarterly*, *56*(3), 934–960.

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

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

Pawlak, M. (2014). *Second Language Learning and Teaching Error Correction in the Foreign Language Classroom*. https://doi.org/gg10.1007/978-3-642-38436-3

Prasetyo, T., Rachmadtullah, R., Samsudin, A., & Aliyyah, R. R. (2021). General Teachers' Experience of the Brain's Natural Learning Systems-Based Instructional Approach in Inclusive Classroom. *International Journal of Instruction*, *14*(3), 95–116.

Qiu, M., Glass, Z., Chen, J., Haas, M., Jin, X., Zhao, X., Rui, X., Ye, Z., Li, Y., & Zhang, F. (2021). Lipid nanoparticle-mediated codelivery of Cas9 mRNA and single-guide RNA achieves liver-specific in vivo genome editing of Angptl3. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *118*(10), e2020401118.

Roothooft, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System*, *46*(1), 65–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.012

Roy Lyster, & Leila Ranta. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(01), 37–66. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034

Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *Modern Language Journal*, *85*(2), 244–258. https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00107

Terrell, T. D., & Brown, H. D. (2000). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. In *Language* (Vol. 57, Issue 3). https://doi.org/10.2307/414380

Truscott, J. (1999). *What ' s Wrong with Oral Grammar Correction*. *4*, 1999. https://doi.org/10.3138/CMLR.55.4.437

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

Ya, T. U., Yun, L. I. N., Haoran, Z. H. A., Zhang, J., Yu, W., Guan, G. U. I., & Shiwen, M. A. O. (2022). Large-scale real-world radio signal recognition with deep learning. *Chinese Journal of Aeronautics*, *35*(9), 35–48. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cja.2021.08.016

Yu, S., Xu, H., Jiang, L., & Chan, I. K. I. (2020). Understanding Macau novice secondary teachers' beliefs and practices of EFL writing instruction: A complexity theory perspective. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *48*, 100728. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100728

Zheng, H. (2009). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research*, *38*(1), 47–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/0013188960380104