

Thai EFL Teachers' and Students' Beliefs About Oral Corrective Feedback

Kittiya Phisutthangkoon

Rajamangala University of Technology Srivijaya, Songkhla, Thailand

**Corresponding author:* kittiya.ph@rmutsv.ac.th

Article information	
Abstract	Understanding both teachers' and students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback (OCF) enables teachers to conduct language instruction effectively. The present study explored multiple aspects of teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF and investigated whether there were any significant differences in these beliefs. The study employed a mixed methods research design with a sample of 62 teachers and 164 students. Findings from the questionnaire and semi-structured interviews indicated that the majority of both teachers and students believed that OCF was beneficial for improving students' second language (L2) learning and speaking skills, and that OCF should be provided in a friendly manner. Pronunciation errors and the use of incorrect vocabulary should be corrected to avoid miscommunication. Teacher correction and self-correction were viewed as the most beneficial forms of correction. Delayed feedback was perceived to support students' flow of speech. Recast and explicit correction were beneficial to students. There was a significant difference in the overall scores between the teachers' beliefs ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 0.32$) and the students' beliefs ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 0.44$), $t(152.63) = -3.95$, $p < 0.001$, with an effect size of 0.55. Students' mean scores were more positive than those of teachers in many aspects, including correcting all errors, correcting grammar errors, peer correction, immediate OCF, and metalinguistic feedback.
Keywords	teachers' beliefs, students' beliefs, oral corrective feedback

APA citation:	Phisutthangkoon, K. (2025). Thai EFL teachers' and students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback. <i>PASAA Journal</i> , 71, 84–120.
----------------------	---

1. Introduction

It is important to understand the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their ways of thinking and teaching in the classroom (Richardson, 1996). This is because beliefs influence individual practices (Borg, 2001). The beliefs held by both teachers and students influence their choices and behaviors in classroom settings (Abdi & Asadi, 2015; Hall, 2017; Hu & Tian, 2012; Kuzborska, 2011; Zheng, 2009).

Several studies on oral corrective feedback (OCF) have examined either teachers' beliefs (e.g., Bao, 2019; Phipps & Borg, 2009; Yoshihara, 2012) or students' beliefs (e.g., Al-Roomy, 2015; Huisman et al., 2020; Lee & Brach, 2018; Ustaci & Ok, 2014). However, studies comparing teachers' and students' beliefs regarding language teaching and learning are limited. Unfortunately, serious issues might arise when teachers' and students' beliefs are not in agreement (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016; Schulz, 2001). It is possible that students are not willing to attend classrooms where teaching methods do not meet their expectations (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016). It is essential to examine both teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF in order to reduce the gap between those beliefs and to promote students' learning (Kim & Mostafa, 2021; Schulz, 1996, 2001).

Corrective feedback is important for language teaching and learning (Ellis, 2009). While language skills can be learned through practice, providing corrective feedback can accelerate the process of learning (Alsolami, 2019). Although corrective feedback can be categorized into two types—namely, oral corrective feedback and written corrective feedback—this study emphasized OCF, as previous studies have commonly investigated these two types separately (Ha et al., 2021). In particular, the issue of how teachers and students should deal with students' spoken errors remains contested (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016). There are still tensions over which errors to correct as well as how, when, and whether to make corrections (Ellis, 2009). Moreover, other issues—including how to implement OCF in practice and the effectiveness of OCF—need further exploration (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012).

As mentioned above, inconsistencies between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs about OCF can be harmful to students' language learning. Furthermore, comparative research between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs in many areas, including OCF, has been scarce. Studying both teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF can offer insight that could be transferred into practice. Such insight about how students believe they should be corrected and how teachers believe they should provide OCF can ultimately be used to improve students' language learning. Consequently, this study sought to explore teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF to address a gap in the existing literature. The data from this study may be useful for improving language pedagogy.

2. Literature Review

This section presents a review of the literature on teachers' beliefs, students' beliefs, and oral corrective feedback (OCF). It covers the effectiveness of OCF, the focus of error correction, OCF providers, the timing for OCF, types of OCF, and previous studies on teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF.

2.1 Teachers' Beliefs

Teachers' beliefs and understanding of teaching and learning are important for their professional development (Kuzborska, 2011). Borg (2011) defines beliefs as states that individuals think are true. They are often held implicitly, involve emotions and values, influence individuals' actions, and are difficult to change. Additionally, Borg (2001) states that beliefs refer to what could be held consciously or unconsciously by individuals to be true and involve one's emotions and feelings. Individuals' beliefs affect their thoughts and actions. In short, beliefs are what individuals hold to be true and are influential in shaping their practices.

Meanwhile, Borg (2001) defines teachers' beliefs as their pedagogic beliefs that are relevant to teaching. Teachers' beliefs play an important role in their thought processes and pedagogical practices. Teachers' beliefs regarding how language should be learned influence how they teach (Zheng, 2009), including their decisions, interactions with students, planning, and curriculum design (Abdi & Khoshmod, 2015; Alghanmi & Shukri, 2016; Kuzborska, 2011). Therefore, to understand the way teaching is implemented in the classroom, it is important to

explore teachers' beliefs (Richards et al., 2001). Understanding teachers' beliefs can lead to improve instruction (Pajares, 1992).

2.2 Students' Beliefs

Hall (2017) states that language learners have their own beliefs regarding themselves, language itself, and the process of language learning. Beliefs that students hold regarding language learning play an important role in predicting their learning outcomes (Hu & Tian, 2012). Like teachers' beliefs, students' beliefs also have an influence on their behaviors (Hall, 2017; Huisman et al., 2020; Kloosterman & Cougan, 1994).

Thus, examining students' beliefs can provide a clearer understanding of how students learn a language, including what learning strategies they use. Teachers can then use this information to plan their language instruction accordingly (Horwitz, 1999; Sadeghi & Abdi, 2015). Investigating students' beliefs can help teachers understand why students behave in the ways they do and gain a clearer picture of what happens in the classroom (Hall, 2017). As students' beliefs are likely to have a great effect on their learning processes (Huisman et al., 2020), researchers have recently focused on students' beliefs in various areas related to both language teaching and learning (e.g., Al-Roomy, 2015; Hu & Tian, 2012; Huisman et al., 2020; Lee & Brach, 2018) to improve language learning.

2.3 Oral Corrective Feedback

Feedback plays a dominant role in most theories of second language (L2) learning and teaching (Ellis, 2009; Soruç et al., 2024). Several scholars have defined corrective feedback. In the teaching context, Ur (1996) states that feedback is a comment provided to students about their performance of a given learning task in order to develop this performance. As pointed out by Li (2021), corrective feedback (CF) involves the responses of teachers and peers to learners' errors when producing a second language. Similarly, Li and Vuono (2019) state that corrective feedback is a response or a comment on the correctness or comprehensibility of students' L2 production. This implies that CF is a comment or a response given to correct errors in another speaker's L2 production.

It should be noted that corrective feedback can be classified into OCF and written corrective feedback. The former involves feedback given on students' spoken errors, whereas the latter involves written comments on students' written

errors. Due to the unique features of both types of corrective feedback and the fundamental differences between them (Ha et al., 2021; Li, 2017), earlier studies on corrective feedback have examined OCF and written corrective feedback separately (Ha et al., 2021). Therefore, this study concentrated solely on OCF.

Previous studies have demonstrated that corrective feedback positively influences L2 development (Li, 2021; Muslem et al., 2021; Nurjanah et al., 2024; Van Ha et al., 2021). Corrective feedback can enhance students' understanding of the language and their communication skills (Yüksel et al., 2021) and can promote students' motivation and language accuracy (Ellis, 2009). However, in some cultures, errors are considered something that should be prevented or avoided (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012). Additionally, more issues regarding corrective feedback—including the decision to correct errors, what types of errors that should be corrected, the methods of correction, and the timing of correction—are still debatable (Ellis, 2009). In other words, the issues of how to implement OCF in the classroom, the problems arising from using or not using OCF, and its effectiveness have been questioned for decades. Therefore, how to deal with students' spoken errors remains an open question for both teachers and learners (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016). These controversial issues have existed on both the theoretical and methodological sides (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012). In order to address the gap in the literature, this study focused on many aspects of OCF, including its effectiveness, focus, providers, timing, and types.

2.3.1 Effectiveness of OCF

Corrective feedback is vital in learners' language development. While it is true that essential language skills can be acquired through practice, corrective feedback can accelerate the language learning process and enhance understanding. Several researchers argue that corrective feedback can enhance the relationship between teachers and their students. Generally, OCF has an impact on language skills. It helps students to acknowledge their mistakes and supports self-correction (Alsolami, 2019).

When providing corrective feedback, teachers should be concerned about the frequency with which they are providing it. Overcorrection negatively impacts the learners' performance and attitude. On the other hand, providing too little feedback can interfere with their language learning. Providing an appropriate

amount of corrective feedback is still challenging (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012). Ur (1996) states that it is important to provide corrective feedback in a positive way that helps students acknowledge that mistakes are a natural part of learning a language. However, corrective feedback has been valued differently according to different theories (Ellis, 2009). Moreover, OCF can be provided in multiple ways as determined by the students' level of understanding and teachers' preferences (Alsolami, 2019; Tarigan et al., 2023). Individual teachers view the role and importance of corrective feedback differently. Their views have been shaped by different aspects, including their previous teaching and learning experiences, as well as their teacher training (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012).

2.3.2 Focus of Error Correction

The two main issues concerning the focus of error correction include a) deciding which particular errors should be addressed and b) determining whether to employ unfocused feedback, which involves pointing out all or most of the errors students make, or focused feedback, which involves addressing only a few types of students' errors (Ellis, 2009). In other words, while focused feedback refers to providing feedback on one particular language feature, unfocused feedback refers to feedback on different features or levels such as vocabulary, pronunciation, or grammar errors (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012). However, methodologists suggest teachers focus on dealing with a few errors instead of correcting all of them (Ellis, 2009; Ur, 1996).

2.3.3 OCF Providers

The issue of who provides feedback is controversial (Li, 2021). Teachers should consider students' understanding of corrective feedback, and provide clarifications when necessary (Alsolami, 2019). Hernández Méndez and Reyes Cruz (2012) classify types of feedback providers into self-correction, peer correction, and teacher correction. While self-correction can motivate students and promote classroom interaction (Alsolami, 2019), it might not be appropriate when students lack basic linguistic knowledge (Li, 2021). Although there is support for using learners' self-correction, it is not always practical for every situation. Therefore, the way to solve the problem is to encourage students to correct themselves first; if unsuccessful, the teacher can take charge and be the corrector (Ellis, 2009). Hernández Méndez and Reyes Cruz (2012) examined Mexican EFL teachers' perceptions and practices regarding OCF and found that teacher

correction was the most preferred type of correction, followed by peer correction and self-correction.

2.3.4 Timing for OCF

To enhance students' learning outcomes, teachers or others acting as correctors should provide students with corrective feedback within a specific time (Phillips, 1992). This implies that timing for corrective feedback is important for language learning (Ünsal Şakiroğlu, 2020). However, the decision to provide immediate or delayed feedback has not been sufficiently studied (Li, 2020). Whereas written corrective feedback is delayed, OCF can occur either immediately after students make a mistake or later, after they have finished their utterances (Ellis, 2009; Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012). If teachers focus on meaning and promoting fluency, they tend to prefer using delayed feedback. In contrast, if teachers are prioritizing form and promoting accuracy, they are likely to implement both immediate and delayed corrective feedback (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012). While this issue has been discussed among practitioners, it is still difficult to pinpoint the differences in effectiveness between immediate and delayed feedback (Ellis, 2009).

2.3.5 Types of OCF

There are many types of OCF strategies which teachers can use to correct errors (Ellis, 2009). When considering the use of strategies for the provision of corrective feedback, the uptake, which is learners' reactions to the corrective feedback given, should be taken into account (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012). The learners either choose to repair their mistakes or leave them unaddressed. Students who choose to repair their response correct their mistake after receiving feedback from the corrector. On the other hand, students who choose not to repair their response may realize that they have received a correction, but still do not correct their error, and they might just keep speaking (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Lyster and Ranta (1997) classify oral corrective feedback types into explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition.

2.4 Teachers' and Students' Beliefs Regarding OCF

OCF has been a focus in second language acquisition (SLA) contexts, but it has not been widely studied in foreign language settings (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012). The individual beliefs of teachers and students regarding OCF

can influence both teaching and learning (Hall, 2017; Huisman et al., 2020; Kloosterman & Cougan, 1994). Li (2017) defines beliefs regarding corrective feedback as what teachers and students hold to be true about its use and how to implement it in practice. Therefore, beliefs regarding OCF impact its effectiveness. Most importantly, having an understanding about teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF can serve as a predictor of what will happen in the classroom (Sheen, 2007).

Very few studies (e.g., Roothoof & Breeze, 2016; Sardabi et al., 2025; Tomczyk, 2013; Van Ha et al., 2021; Ye & Hu, 2025) have compared EFL teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs regarding OCF. Research on comparing teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF is necessary for improving language learning and teaching. It is noteworthy that inconsistencies between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs might be harmful to their respective practices of teaching and learning. This is because when a teacher's instruction does not satisfy or meet a student's expectations, the student might become hesitant to participate in classroom activities and their motivation to study may decline (Li, 2017; Li & Vuono, 2019; Roothoof & Breeze, 2016).

Only a few studies have focused on OCF in English as a foreign language (EFL) context. Tomczyk (2013) studied secondary school and college teachers' and students' perceptions toward OCF in Poland. The results showed that the majority of both teachers and students felt pronunciation errors should be corrected the most. However, both teachers and students preferred delayed feedback, as it would not disrupt the students' flow of communication. It was found that 81.20% of the students favored the use of explicit correction, as opposed to 46.51% of the teachers. Similarly, Sardabi et al. (2025) revealed that students preferred explicit correction for OCF. Roothoof and Breeze's (2016) study compared the attitudes of EFL teachers and students toward OCF in Spain and reported that students' preference for teacher correction exceeded the teachers' expectations. Students responded more positively to explicit types of corrective feedback than their teachers did. The student participants reported that they were likely to react positively to their teachers' immediate feedback. This is consistent with the findings of Van Ha et al. (2021), who explored Vietnamese teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF. The results showed that both teachers and students had a positive view towards the efficacy of corrective feedback and valued explicit

feedback. However, teachers preferred using delayed corrective feedback due to their concern about students' emotional states and fluency, whereas students found immediate corrective feedback useful in recognizing their errors and learning the correct form.

Ellis (2008) suggests that teachers should have an awareness of their beliefs regarding OCF. Teachers should discuss this topic with their students in order to avoid any inconsistencies between their beliefs. Ünsal Şakiroğlu (2020) also suggests that teachers' should take students' attitudes toward OCF into consideration. This implies that if teachers' and students' beliefs on this topic are made known to each other, it could help both parties reflect on their beliefs and openly discuss them with each other, helping to reduce the differences in their views. This, in turn, can lead to improved language teaching and learning. If the teachers' and students' beliefs are inconsistent with learning theories, teachers can then work to reshape their own beliefs and also the beliefs of their students in order to improve their learning. Moreover, students can also become aware of their beliefs and may be willing to reshape those that interfere with developing their English skills.

As mentioned above, very few studies have investigated teachers' and students' beliefs about OCF. It is not useful for teaching or learning when a gap exists between teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF. Conversely, teachers can benefit from understanding students' beliefs, and students may likewise benefit from being aware of teachers' beliefs (Hall, 2017). While previous research compared teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF, emphasis was placed only on types of OCF and the timing thereof. Other aspects—including focus, correctors, and the effectiveness of OCF—remain underexplored. Therefore, this study sought to address a gap in the literature by comparing EFL university teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF, focusing on the aspects of effectiveness, focus, correctors, timing, and types of OCF within the Thai EFL context.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Questions

1. What are Thai EFL university teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF?

2. Are there any significant differences between Thai EFL university teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF?

3.2 Participants

This study included 62 EFL teachers and 164 third-year EFL students majoring in English from four public universities in one province in the south of Thailand. They were chosen through purposive sampling. The students were chosen because they had already taken many English courses, which meant they had potentially experienced being corrected to some extent. Meanwhile, the teachers were chosen because they were Thai EFL university teachers who had taught English in the Thai EFL context. The teachers, on average, had approximately 18 years of teaching experience, ranging from 3 to 39 years. They had also possibly experienced giving OCF to Thai EFL students. The population was homogeneous in terms of nationality, as it was comprised of all Thai EFL teachers and students from the same context. This sample size was considered sufficiently representative to ensure confidence in the results, despite any similarities or differences in the beliefs held between the two groups (Davis, 2003).

3.3 Research Instruments

The study employed a questionnaire on teachers' and students' beliefs about OCF in relation to the following aspects: effectiveness of OCF, focus of error correction, OCF providers, timing for OCF, and types of OCF. The 62 EFL teacher participants and 164 EFL student participants were asked to complete the questionnaire. Although teachers' and students' beliefs can be explored through a purely qualitative approach, a survey was ideal for reaching a larger sample of the population (Davis, 2003). Additionally, six teacher participants and six student participants volunteered to take part in semi-structured interviews to gain in-depth data.

The questionnaire was adapted from previous questionnaires (e.g., Ha et al., 2021; Horwitz, 1985; Kartchava et al., 2020; Ünsal Şakiroğlu, 2020; Yüksel et al., 2021) and was based on the OCF literature. It consisted of 34 items, including 14 items regarding the effectiveness of OCF, five items regarding focus of OCF, six items regarding OCF providers, three items regarding timing for OCF, and six items regarding types of OCF. Both the teachers' and students' OCF questionnaires were reviewed by three experts for content validity, and their reliability was confirmed with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.79 and 0.88, respectively. Moreover, there

were 11 interview questions about their views on OCF. The interview questions were also verified for content validity by the three experts.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data from the questionnaire were analyzed using frequency analysis, means, and standard deviation to investigate the teachers' and students' beliefs. An independent samples *t*-test was employed to examine any significant differences between the teachers' beliefs and the students' beliefs regarding OCF. All the audio interviews from the semi-structured interviews were transcribed. For the qualitative aspect of this study, the data were analyzed using thematic analysis. Through coding, the data from the teachers' and students' interview responses were analyzed according to the themes from the questionnaire. To enhance the overall validity of the study, data from all instruments were triangulated.

4. Findings

RQ 1: What Are Thai EFL University Teachers' and Students' Beliefs Regarding OCF?

4.1 The Effectiveness of OCF

Table 1 reveals the findings of participants' beliefs regarding the effectiveness of OCF.

Table 1

The Results of the Participants' Beliefs Regarding the Effectiveness of OCF

Beliefs regarding the effectiveness of OCF	Subject	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. OCF is important for L2 learning.	T	0	0	8.06	38.71	53.22	4.45	0.64
	S	0	1.22	12.80	37.80	48.17	4.33	0.74
2. OCF can improve students' speaking skills.	T	0	0	9.68	33.87	56.45	4.47	0.67
	S	0	1.83	9.15	42.07	46.95	4.34	0.72
3. OCF can interfere with students' speaking skills.	T	24.19	40.32	20.97	9.68	4.84	2.31	1.10
	S	17.68	25	30.49	16.46	10.36	2.77	1.22
	T	33.87	43.55	17.74	4.84	0	1.99	0.85

4. OCF does not really work for improving students' speaking skills.	S	21.95	32.93	23.78	14.02	7.32	2.52	1.19
5. OCF can improve students' English-speaking accuracy.	T	0	0	12.90	40.32	46.77	4.34	0.70
	S	0	2.44	14.63	42.68	40.24	4.21	0.78
6. OCF can improve students' English-speaking fluency.	T	1.61	3.22	32.26	29.03	33.87	3.90	0.97
	S	0	1.83	21.95	41.46	34.76	4.10	0.80
7. Students are satisfied with being given OCF.	T	0	3.22	46.77	32.26	17.74	3.64	0.81
	S	0.61	3.66	22.56	48.78	24.39	3.93	0.82
8. OCF should be done in a friendly and kind manner.	T	0	0	4.84	6.45	88.71	4.84	0.48
	S	0	1.83	12.20	31.71	54.27	4.38	0.77
9. One on one OCF can decrease students' anxiety.	T	0	3.22	16.13	27.42	53.22	4.31	0.86
	S	0	3.66	25	32.32	39.02	4.07	0.89
10. Providing OCF in front of the classroom is appropriate.	T	6.45	17.74	40.32	29.03	6.45	3.11	0.99
	S	8.54	14.02	31.71	28.66	17.07	3.32	1.16
11. Providing OCF to all students' errors is useful to students.	T	16.13	16.13	30.64	22.58	14.51	3.03	1.28
	S	2.44	6.10	26.22	38.80	27.44	3.82	0.99
12. Providing OCF only when students' speech is not understood is beneficial to students.	T	0	1.61	22.58	38.71	37.10	4.11	0.81
	S	0.61	3.66	23.17	39.02	33.54	4.01	0.88
13. Providing OCF on the same types of students' errors	T	0	4.84	29.03	38.70	27.42	3.89	0.87
	S	0	1.83	17.07	43.29	37.80	4.17	0.77

that often occur is
beneficial to
students.

14. Correcting	T	1.61	3.22	19.35	41.94	33.87	4.03	0.90
students' errors	S	0.61	6.10	20.12	42.68	30.49	3.96	0.90
that are the focus								
of the lesson is								
beneficial to								
students.								

Note. 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree

T = teachers; S = students

From Table 1, the majority of both teachers and students (91.93% and 85.97%, respectively) agreed or strongly agreed with the belief that OCF is important for L2 learning. It was found that 90.32% of teachers and 89.02% of students agreed or strongly agreed with the belief that OCF can improve students' speaking skills. This was also supported by the data from an open-ended question. The majority of the participants agreed that OCF could enhance their speaking skills. Additionally, Teachers B, D, E, and F clearly stated that OCF could improve students' language learning. Likewise, during the interviews, all six students reported that providing OCF could improve their speaking skills. Some of the students stated that although they initially felt a bit embarrassed when receiving feedback, they were later thankful to their teachers because they could improve their speaking skills from acknowledging their errors.

Concerning the aspect of accuracy, the majority of both teachers (87.09%) and students (82.92%) agreed or strongly agreed with the belief that providing OCF can improve students' accuracy. During the interviews, all participants stated that OCF could help students speak accurately. For example, Teacher A said, "As a teacher, if we do not correct their errors, they will speak inaccurately forever." Similarly, Teacher C stated, "The advantage of OCF is to help students speak correctly." Student C said, "Through being given OCF, I can speak with correct grammar, and it increases my confidence." Students E and F mentioned that OCF could improve their speaking accuracy, as it could help them notice their grammar errors, and they would then try not to repeat the same errors.

Moreover, 95.16% of the teachers and 85.98% of the students agreed or strongly agreed with the belief that OCF should be done in a friendly way. For example, Student D stated that she felt good when she received feedback from her teachers in a friendly manner. Student E added that teachers should use a normal or calm voice when providing OCF so students do not lose confidence. All six teacher participants were aware that OCF has the potential to decrease students' confidence if the teachers do it negatively. For example, Teacher A stated that students' attitudes toward a teacher's OCF depend on the way the teacher provides them with feedback. If they realize that the teacher really wants to enhance their speaking skills, they might feel positively. On the other hand, if the teacher often points out their errors impolitely, the students might respond negatively. In fact, 80.64% of teachers and 71.22% of students agreed or strongly agreed that one-on-one OCF can decrease students' anxiety. According to the data from the interviews, all teacher participants paid attention to students' emotional states, including confidence and anxiety, when providing OCF. However, one of the teachers stated during the interview that correcting students' errors publicly might cause them to feel embarrassed.

4.2 Focus of Error Correction

Table 2 reveals the findings of participants' beliefs regarding the focus of error correction.

Table 2

The Results of the Participants' Beliefs Regarding the Focus of Error Correction

Beliefs	Subject	1	2	3	4	5	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
regarding the		(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)		
focus of error								
correction								
15. Correcting	T	0	1.61	6.45	27.42	64.52	4.55	0.69
students'	S	0	0.61	6.71	31.10	61.58	4.54	0.65
mispronounced								
words is								
beneficial to								
students.								
16. Correcting	T	0	3.22	9.68	40.32	46.77	4.31	0.78
students'	S	1.83	3.05	8.54	33.54	53.05	4.33	0.89

mispronounced
stress is
beneficial to
students.

17. Correcting	T	0	6.45	8.06	43.35	41.94	4.21	0.85
students'	S	1.83	1.83	12.80	32.32	51.22	4.29	0.89

mispronounced
intonation is
beneficial to
students.

18. Correcting	T	0	1.61	4.84	37.10	56.45	4.48	0.67
students' errors	S	0	1.95	8.54	24.39	65.24	4.53	0.73

when they use
the wrong
vocabulary is
beneficial to
students.

19. Correcting	T	1.61	1.61	19.35	43.55	33.87	4.06	0.86
students' errors	S	1.22	1.22	11.58	26.22	59.76	4.42	0.84

when they use
incorrect
grammatical
utterances is
beneficial to
them.

Note. 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree

T = teachers; S = students

According to Table 2, most teachers (91.94%) and students (92.68%) believed that correcting students' mispronounced words is beneficial to students. In the interviews, Teachers A and C expressed the belief that if students mispronounced words, their message could not be understood. Similarly, Students D and E agreed that mispronunciation should be corrected because it might cause miscommunication.

Moreover, in this study, 93.55% of the teachers and 89.63% of the students agreed or strongly agreed with the belief that correcting students' errors when they use incorrect vocabulary is beneficial to students. Teacher E stated that word choice should be the main consideration when providing feedback. Likewise, Students C and E believed that teachers should provide correction when students' word usage errors affect understanding.

4.3 OCF Providers

Table 3 presents the findings of participants' beliefs regarding OCF providers.

Table 3

The Results of the Participants' Beliefs Regarding OCF Providers

Beliefs regarding OCF Providers	Subject	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
20. Teachers should correct students' speaking errors.	T	0	1.61	20.97	38.71	38.71	4.14	0.81
	S	0.61	1.83	14.63	43.29	39.63	4.20	0.80
21. Peer- correction should be encouraged in the classroom.	T	3.22	11.29	30.64	27.42	27.42	3.64	1.10
	S	0.61	3.66	20.73	40.85	34.15	4.04	0.87
22. Self- correction is beneficial to students.	T	0	0	19.35	35.48	45.16	4.26	0.77
	S	0.61	4.27	16.46	36.58	42.07	4.15	0.90
23. Self- correction and peer correction are more beneficial to	T	8.06	16.13	43.55	20.97	11.29	3.11	1.07
	S	4.88	12.20	32.32	32.32	18.29	3.47	1.08

students than
teachers'
correction.

24. Anybody	T	27.42	16.13	27.42	17.74	11.29	2.69	1.35
can correct	S	6.09	12.19	24.39	28.66	28.66	3.62	1.20

students'
errors.

25. Nobody	T	69.35	19.35	6.45	1.61	1.61	1.50	0.94
should correct	S	50	12.20	15.24	10.36	12.19	2.22	1.46

students'
errors.

Note. 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree

T = teachers; S = students

As shown in Table 3, 77.42% of the teachers and 82.92% of the students believed that teachers should be the ones to correct students' speaking errors. This was in line with the interview data, where three of the teacher participants agreed that due to their experience and knowledge, teachers should mainly be the ones to provide students with corrective feedback. Teacher B added, "Students trust us for correcting errors." The students all strongly believed that teachers should be the corrector of their errors. Students A, B, D, and E pointed out that teachers were reliable correctors.

Moreover, the majority of teachers (80.64%) and the students (78.65%) agreed or strongly agreed with the belief that self-correction is beneficial to students. Student F stated that he liked to self-correct his errors because it allowed him to think first and become aware of such errors.

4.4 Timing for OCF

Table 4 reveals the findings of participants' beliefs regarding the timing for OCF.

Table 4

The Results of the Participants' Beliefs Regarding the Timing for OCF

Beliefs regarding the timing for OCF	Subject	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
26. Students' errors should be corrected at the end of their speech.	T	0	4.84	22.58	32.26	40.32	4.08	0.91
	S	1.22	4.27	21.95	33.59	39.02	4.05	0.94
27. Students' errors should be corrected after the lesson.	T	0	8.06	30.64	35.48	25.81	3.79	0.93
	S	3.66	6.10	28.05	35.98	26.22	3.75	1.03
28. Students' errors should be corrected immediately after errors have been made.	T	30.65	9.68	29.03	25.81	3.22	2.64	1.30
	S	14.02	12.80	23.17	26.22	23.78	3.33	1.34

Note. 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree

T = teachers; S = students

As shown in Table 4, a majority of both teachers (72.58%) and students (72.61%) believed that students' errors should be corrected at the end of their speech. Most teachers believed that corrective feedback should be given once students finish their speaking; otherwise, it might interrupt their speech. Teacher B said that he used to correct students' errors immediately. However, he then realized that his students could lose their confidence, and it could interrupt their

flow of speech. Likewise, Teacher D insisted that her students might feel embarrassed if they were corrected immediately. Students D and F felt that interrupting students' speech could decrease confidence and cause anxiety.

4.5 Types of OCF

Table 5 reveals the findings of participants' beliefs regarding types of OCF.

Table 5

The Results of the Participants' Beliefs Regarding Types of OCF

Beliefs regarding types of OCF	Subject	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
29. Recast is beneficial to students.	T	0	4.84	12.90	37.10	45.16	4.22	0.86
	S	0	0	11.58	33.54	54.88	4.43	0.69
30. Repetition is beneficial to students.	T	4.83	12.90	27.42	30.64	24.19	3.56	1.14
	S	7.93	7.32	22.56	31.10	31.10	3.70	1.21
31. Clarification request is beneficial to students.	T	16.13	19.35	24.19	25.81	14.52	3.03	1.30
	S	7.32	10.98	23.17	29.27	29.27	3.62	1.22
32. Metalinguistic feedback is beneficial to students.	T	12.90	8.06	24.19	46.77	8.06	3.29	1.15
	S	4.88	7.93	18.29	34.15	34.76	3.86	1.13
33. Elicitation is beneficial to students.	T	4.84	3.22	32.26	50	14.52	3.76	0.74
	S	3.66	3.66	26.22	35.66	31.10	3.86	1.02
34. Explicit correction is beneficial to students.	T	4.84	14.52	17.74	38.71	24.19	3.63	1.15
	S	2.43	3.66	20.73	26.83	46.34	4.11	1.02

Note. 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree

T = teachers; S = students

As illustrated in Table 5, 82.26% of the teachers and 88.42% of students believed that recast is beneficial to students. Teachers A, C, and D held the view

that recast should be used for providing OCF. Teachers A and C agreed that teachers could simply give students the correct form, so they would know they had made errors. Teacher D also added that using recast could help students feel less embarrassed because the teacher does not point out their errors. Student E agreed that she was satisfied with her teachers using recast because they did not conspicuously mention her errors but simply informed her of the correct form.

Based on the findings, 62.90% of the teachers and 73.17% of the students believed that explicit correction is beneficial to students. Teachers A, B, C, and F agreed that for students with low English proficiency, using explicit correction might be more beneficial for them because they were still unaware of what errors they made even though the teacher reformulated their sentences. Likewise, Students A, C, D, and E stated that the use of explicit correction helped them to clearly see which errors they had made, and also let them know how to speak accurately.

RQ 2: Are There Any Significant Differences Between Thai EFL University Teachers' and Students' Beliefs Regarding OCF?

Table 6 reveals the findings of the significant differences in scores between the teachers' and the students' beliefs regarding OCF.

Table 6

The Overall Significant Differences in Scores Between Teachers' and Students' Beliefs Regarding OCF

Group	Beliefs regarding OCF						
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Effect size
Teachers	62	3.69	0.32	152.63	-3.95	<0.001	0.55
Students	164	3.90	0.44				

As shown in Table 6, there was a significant difference in overall scores between the teachers' beliefs ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 0.32$) and the students' beliefs ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 0.44$) regarding OCF, $t(152.63) = -3.95$, $p < 0.001$, with an effect size of 0.55. The magnitude of the difference between the two groups was medium.

Table 7

The Significant Differences in Scores Between Teachers' and Students' Beliefs Regarding the Effectiveness of OCF

Item	Teacher			Student			df	t	p	Effect size
	M	Level	SD	M	Level	SD				
1. OCF is important for L2 language learning.	4.45	Strongly Agree	0.64	4.33	Strongly Agree	0.74	224	1.142	0.254	0.17
2. OCF can improve students' speaking skills.	4.47	Agree	0.67	4.34	Strongly Agree	0.72	224	1.196	0.233	0.19
3. OCF can interfere with students' speaking skills.	2.31	Disagree	1.10	2.77	Neither agree nor disagree	1.22	224	-2.607	0.10	0.3
4. OCF does not really work for improving students' speaking skills.	1.99	Disagree	0.85	2.52	Disagree	1.19	154.01	-4.100	0.001	0.51
5. OCF can improve students' English-speaking accuracy.	4.34	Strongly Agree	0.70	4.21	Strongly Agree	0.78	224	1.162	0.246	0.18
6. OCF can improve students' English-speaking fluency.	3.90	Agree	0.97	4.10	Agree	0.80	93.84	-1.364	0.176	0.22
7. Students are satisfied with being given OCF.	3.64	Agree	0.81	3.93	Agree	0.82	224	-2.314	0.022	0.36
8. OCF should be done in a friendly and kind manner.	4.84	Strongly Agree	0.48	4.38	Strongly Agree	0.77	173.55	5.275	0.001	0.72
9. One on one OCF can decrease students' anxiety.	4.31	Strongly Agree	0.86	4.07	Agree	0.89	224	1.825	0.069	0.27
10. Providing OCF in front of the classroom is appropriate.	3.11	Neither agree nor disagree	0.99	3.32	Neither agree nor disagree	1.16	128.05	-1.312	0.192	0.19
11. Providing oral corrective feedback to all students' errors is useful to students.	3.03	Neither agree nor disagree	1.28	3.82	Agree	0.99	89.758	-4.363	0.001	0.69
12. Providing oral corrective feedback only when students' speech is not understood is beneficial to students.	4.11	Agree	0.81	4.01	Agree	0.88	224	0.784	0.434	0.12
13. Providing oral corrective feedback on the same types of student's errors is beneficial to students.	3.89	Agree	0.87	4.17	Agree	0.77	224	-2.378	0.018	0.34
14. Correcting students' errors that are the focus of the lesson is beneficial to students.	4.03	Agree	0.90	3.96	Agree	0.90	224	0.513	0.609	0.08
Total	3.74	Agree	0.38	3.85	Agree	0.48	138.43	-1.819	0.071	0.26

The results revealed no significant differences between teachers' ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 0.38$) and students' beliefs ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.48$) regarding the effectiveness

of OCF, $t(138.43) = -1.819$, $p = 0.071$. However, it is worth noting that there was a significant difference between teachers' belief ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.28$) and students' belief ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 0.99$) that providing OCF to all students' errors is useful to students, $t(89.758) = -4.363$, $p = 0.001$, with an effect size of 0.69. The students seemed to express more agreement that correcting all errors is beneficial to students than the teachers did. This may indicate that the Thai EFL students were highly motivated to speak accurately. Moreover, during the interview, one of the students said that students who speak accurately look smart. On the other hand, while some teachers viewed that it is important to correct every error to help students avoid repeating the same errors, others believed it could interfere with their language learning and increase students' anxiety.

Table 8

The Significant Differences in Scores Between Teachers and Students' Beliefs Regarding the Focus of Error Correction

Item	Teacher			Student			df	t	p	Effect size
	M	Level	SD	M	Level	SD				
15. Correcting students' mispronounced words is beneficial to students.	4.55	Strongly Agree	0.69	4.54	Strongly Agree	0.65	224	0.120	0.905	0.01
16. Correcting students' mispronounced stress is beneficial to students.	4.31	Strongly Agree	0.78	4.33	Strongly Agree	0.89	224	-0.177	0.860	0.02
17. Correcting students' mispronounced intonation is beneficial to students.	4.21	Strongly Agree	0.85	4.29	Strongly Agree	0.89	224	-0.631	0.528	0.09
18. Correcting students' errors when they use the wrong vocabulary is beneficial to students.	4.48	Strongly Agree	0.67	4.53	Strongly Agree	0.73	224	-0.438	0.662	0.07
19. Correcting students' errors when they produce grammatically incorrect utterances is beneficial to students.	4.06	Agree	0.86	4.42	Strongly Agree	0.84	224	-2.830	0.005	0.21
Total	4.32	Strongly Agree	0.63	4.42	Strongly Agree	0.68	224	-1.001	0.318	0.15

While there were no significant differences in the overall means between teachers' beliefs ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.63$) and students' beliefs ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 0.68$) regarding the focus of error correction, $t(224) = -1.001$, $p = 0.318$, the results showed a significant difference between teachers' beliefs ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.86$)

and the students' beliefs ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 0.84$) regarding the belief that students' errors should be corrected when they produce grammatically incorrect utterances, $t(224) = 2.830$, $p = 0.005$, with an effect size of 0.21. The students' mean score was higher than that of the teachers. The findings from the interview showed that students also believed that using language accurately, particularly with correct grammar, made them appear educated.

Table 9

The Significant Differences in Scores Between Teachers and Students' Beliefs Regarding the OCF Providers

Item	Teacher			Student			df	t	p	Effect size
	M	Level	SD	M	Level	SD				
20. Teachers should be the ones who correct students' speaking errors.	4.14	Agree	0.81	4.20	Agree	0.80	224	-0.419	0.676	0.07
21. Peer-correction should be encouraged in the classroom.	3.64	Agree	1.10	4.04	Agree	0.87	224	-2.555	0.012	0.40
22. Self-correction is beneficial to students.	4.26	Strongly Agree	0.77	4.15	Agree	0.90	224	0.825	0.410	0.13
23. Self-correction and peer correction are more beneficial to students than teachers' correction.	3.11	Neither agree nor disagree	1.07	3.47	Agree	1.08	224	-2.224	0.027	0.33
24. Anybody can correct students' errors.	2.69	Neither agree nor disagree	1.35	3.62	Agree	1.20	224	-4.992	0.001	0.73
25. Nobody should correct students' errors.	1.50	Strongly Agree	0.94	2.22	Disagree	1.46	170.48	-4.407	0.001	0.59
Total	3.22	Neither agree nor disagree	0.47	3.62	Agree	0.68	157.452	-4.875	0.001	0.68

As shown in Table 9, there was a significant difference in the mean scores between the teachers' beliefs ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 0.47$) and the students' beliefs ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 0.68$) regarding OCF providers, $t(157.452) = -4.875$, $p = 0.001$, with an effect size of 0.68. Interestingly, there was also a significant difference in the mean scores found between teachers' beliefs ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 1.07$) and students' beliefs ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 1.08$) regarding the belief that self-correction

and peer correction are more beneficial to students than teachers' correction, $t(224) = -2.224$, $p = 0.027$. During the interviews, Teachers B, C, and D expressed the view that the teacher should mainly be the one to provide students with feedback due to having knowledge and experience in teaching English. This implies that teachers still tend not to believe that self-correction and peer correction are more effective than teacher correction.

Table 10

The Significant Differences in Scores Between Teachers' and Students' Beliefs Regarding Timing for OCF

Item	Teacher			Student			df	t	p	Effect size
	M	Level	SD	M	Level	SD				
26. Students' errors should be corrected at the end of their speech.	4.08	Agree	0.91	4.05	Agree	0.94	224	0.228	0.820	0.03
27. Students' errors should be corrected after the lesson.	3.79	Agree	0.93	3.75	Agree	1.03	224	0.270	0.788	0.04
28. Students' errors should be corrected immediately after they have been made.	2.64	Neither agree nor disagree	1.30	3.33	Neither agree nor disagree	1.34	224	-3.449	0.001	0.52
Total	3.50	Agree	0.47	3.71	Agree	0.71	166.146	-2.497	0.013	0.35

Table 10 shows that there was a significant difference between the teachers' beliefs ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 0.47$) and the students' beliefs ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 0.71$) regarding the timing for OCF, $t(166.146) = -2.497$, $p = 0.013$, with an effect size of 0.35. The findings also revealed a significant difference between the teachers' beliefs ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 1.30$) and the students' beliefs ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.34$) that students' errors should be corrected immediately after errors have been made, $t(224) = -3.449$, $p = 0.001$, with an effect size of 0.52). According to the interview data, most teachers were concerned that immediate correction might affect students' emotional states and the flow of their speech, whereas one student expressed that the appropriateness depends on the situation. For example, Student D said that when she talked to teachers informally, her teachers could correct her errors immediately so she could recognize them. On the other hand, if she was giving a presentation, the teacher should correct her errors later.

Table 11

The Significant Differences in Scores Between Teachers' and Students' Beliefs Regarding the Types of OCF

Item	Teacher			Student			df	t	p	Effect size
	M	Level	SD	M	Level	SD				
29. Recast is beneficial to students.	4.22	Strongly Agree	0.86	4.43	Strongly Agree	0.69	224	-1.874	0.062	0.27
30. Repetition is beneficial to students.	3.56	Agree	1.14	3.70	Agree	1.21	224	-0.770	0.442	0.12
31. Clarification request is beneficial to students.	3.03	Neither agree nor disagree	1.30	3.62	Agree	1.22	224	-3.180	0.002	0.47
32. Metalinguistic feedback is beneficial to students.	3.29	Neither agree nor disagree	1.15	3.86	Agree	1.13	224	-3.365	0.001	0.50
33. Elicitation is beneficial to students.	3.76	Agree	0.74	3.86	Agree	1.02	150.79	-0.876	0.383	0.11
34. Explicit correction is beneficial to students.	3.63	Agree	1.15	4.11	Agree	1.02	224	-3.061	0.002	0.44
Total	3.58	Agree	0.63	3.93	Agree	0.72	224	-3.373	0.001	0.52

Table 11 illustrates a significant difference between teachers' beliefs ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 0.63$) and the students' beliefs ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 0.72$) regarding the types of OCF, $t(224) = -3.373$, $p = 0.001$, with an effect size of 0.52. Importantly, there was a significant difference between the teachers' beliefs ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 1.15$) and the students' beliefs ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 1.13$) that metalinguistic feedback is beneficial to students, $t(224) = -3.365$, $p = 0.001$, with an effect size of 0.50. From the interview data, one of the teacher participants reported that students still did not know what errors they made when the teacher provided different sorts of hints for OCF. She therefore did not believe that metalinguistic feedback was effective for her students. On the other hand, one of the students stated that he believed metalinguistic feedback worked for him because he was able to think about his errors through the hints, which allowed him to self-correct his errors. In this way, he could recognize his errors better.

5. Discussion

This section discusses the results of the study regarding several aspects related to the findings, including the effectiveness of OCF, the focus of error correction, OCF providers, timing for OCF, types of OCF, and the significant differences between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs regarding OCF.

Regarding the effectiveness of OCF, the majority of both teachers and students believed that OCF could improve students' speaking skills. This is in agreement with the findings of Ünsal Şakiroğlu (2020), which reported that although the students felt frightened when their teachers provided them with OCF, they still felt they needed to receive correction from the teacher for their language to improve. Feedback plays an important role in most theories associated with the L2 learning process (Alsolami, 2019; Ellis, 2009). It can improve students' understanding of the language and their ability to communicate (Yüksel et al., 2021). Likewise, Nurjanah et al.'s (2024) study revealed that the student participants believed that OCF could enhance their English-speaking proficiency. It can hasten the process of language learning and provide a better understanding of many of the concepts within a language (Alsolami, 2019). The results of this study were consistent with those of previous studies (Muslem et al., 2021; Van Ha et al., 2021).

In addition, the results showed that most of the teacher and student participants held the view that OCF could increase students' speaking accuracy through noticing and recognizing grammar errors. This aligns with the findings reported in Muslem et al.'s (2021) study, which revealed that the use of OCF, helped students acknowledge their errors, reduce fossilization, and avoid repeating the same errors. Ellis (2009) states that OCF can promote students' language accuracy. It helps students to recognize their errors (Alsolami, 2019).

Apart from this, the results revealed that most teacher and student participants believed that OCF should be provided in a kind and friendly manner to prevent students from feeling anxious and to increase students' confidence in speaking English. The findings revealed that the majority of the teacher and student participants agreed that one-on-one OCF can reduce student anxiety. This indicates that the participants of this study had an awareness of students' emotional states. This is supported by the study of Soruç et al. (2024), which reported that students' emotions influenced the way teachers provided feedback. Ur (1996) emphasizes that it is important to provide corrective feedback in a positive way in which students become aware that making mistakes is natural, and that corrective feedback plays a key role in learning a language.

Among the various aspects of error correction, mispronunciation was one of the error types that most teachers and students believed should be corrected to avoid miscommunication. This is consistent with previous studies (e.g., Muslem, 2021; Tarigan et al., 2023; Tomczyk, 2013; Ustaci & Ok, 2014; Ünsal Şakiroğlu, 2020).

As for who should act as the corrector in instances of OCF, teacher correction received the highest ratings from the majority of both teachers and students. In Thailand, teachers have played a dominant role as transmitters of knowledge, and the teacher-centered approach has been rooted in Thai culture for many years (Stone, 2017). In the same vein, Tomczyk's (2013) study reported that their student participants felt that their teachers should act as OCF correctors due to their competence and authority. Similarly, the results reported in Van Ha et al. (2021) revealed that the students were of the opinion that OCF was the teachers' responsibility. This is consistent with the findings reported in Muslem (2021) and Ünsal Şakiroğlu (2020). However, Ahangari (2014) argues that although teacher correction tends to be preferred by students because it is faster and more accurate for addressing errors, it does not promote students' independence and might affect their emotional state. Apart from this, both teachers and students held the view that self-correction is beneficial to students. Likewise, Tomczyk (2013) states that self-correction can engage students in their language learning. This occurs when students react to their teachers' feedback, or when teachers provide them with hints rather than the correct forms. Thus, they must reform the sentences by themselves. This is in accordance with findings reported in Ustaci and Ok's (2014) study. Promoting self-correction can help enhance students' confidence and their evaluation of their own performance. Students seem to remember their errors better and tend not to repeat the same mistakes (Ahangari, 2014). However, OCF might not be effective if students do not recognize their own errors (Ustaci & Ok, 2014).

Another aspect of OCF that this study examined was timing. Most of the teachers and students agreed that students' errors should be corrected at the end of their speech. This is to avoid interrupting the students' flow of speech or causing them anxiety. This finding aligns with the results of previous studies (e.g., Muslem et al., 2021; Tomczyk, 2013; Ünsal Şakiroğlu, 2020; Van Ha et al., 2021).

Additionally, it should be emphasized that most of the teacher and student participants agreed that recast is beneficial to students. This is in harmony with other previous studies (e.g., Bao, 2019; Nurjanah et al. 2024; Yüksel et al., 2021). Likewise, the results of Roothoof and Breeze's (2016) study showed that the majority of their students were rather satisfied with recast. This is possibly because when the teachers used this type of OCF, they did not conspicuously correct students' errors. Therefore, the students did not feel anxious or embarrassed. However, Muslem et al.'s (2021) study showed that some students did not like recast because they did not realize that they made errors and so continued repeating the same errors. Likewise, Ha et al. (2021) found that although all of their teacher participants realized that recast was quick and easy to employ, they were not sure whether students noticed their errors.

Although the findings showed similarities between teachers' and students' beliefs regarding many aspects of OCF, it was also found that there were significant differences between their beliefs in several aspects, which is similar to the findings of Ye and Hu's (2025) study. In this study, the findings showed that more students believed all errors should be corrected than did the teachers. This is in line with Lee (2013) and Muslem (2021). Likewise, Van Ha et al. (2021) revealed that although the student participants stated that they wished their teacher would correct their errors as much as possible to improve their speaking accuracy, the teachers reported that the amount of correction for students' errors depended on various factors, including the lesson focus, students' English proficiency, teaching activities, time, and class size. Correcting all errors could also interfere with students' emotional states. Similarly, Ünsal Şakiroğlu (2020) states that teachers should carefully consider which types of errors should be dealt with because not all errors need to be corrected.

The results also indicated a significant difference between teachers' and students' beliefs regarding the focus on grammatical errors. Muslem (2021) similarly showed that students, particularly those with a low level of English proficiency, held the view that grammar errors need to be corrected. This suggests that accuracy was possibly the focus due to the influence of the Grammar Translation Method, which has been used in Thailand's EFL context for decades (Al-Maamari, 2021). In this study, the student participants might have wanted their teachers to pay greater attention to grammatical errors to enhance their accuracy,

whereas the teachers might have focused only on errors that interfered with communication or caused misunderstanding. It also depended on the focus of the lesson. If the teachers focused on fluency, they possibly corrected fewer grammar errors than the students expected.

Regarding who should provide OCF, this study revealed a significant difference in mean scores between teachers' and students' beliefs about whether self-correction and peer correction are more beneficial to students than teacher correction. Students were more likely to agree with this belief than teachers were. Hernández Méndez and Reyes Cruz (2012) state that self-correction is face-saving and promotes autonomous learning. This is supported by Ahangari (2014), who found that students' pronunciation improved through the use of self-correction more than through peer correction or teacher correction. Moreover, the group of students using peer correction outperformed the group using teacher correction.

In addition, while the majority of both teacher and student participants preferred the use of delayed feedback, the results also showed a significant difference in scores between teachers' and students' beliefs regarding providing immediate feedback. While the teachers were rather concerned about students' emotional state, the students wanted to learn what errors they made immediately so they could recognize them. Similarly, Van Ha et al.'s (2021) study showed that the majority of their student participants preferred to have their errors corrected instantly, so they would not forget what errors they made. It is clear that accuracy was an aspect of concern to the students.

Lastly, there was a significant difference between teachers' and students' beliefs regarding the types of OCF. The students rated the use of metalinguistic feedback more positively than did the teachers. While teachers believed that these students probably did not notice their errors through the hints provided, the students felt that allowing them to reflect on their errors might help them recognize those errors better. As previously mentioned, the findings revealed significant differences between teachers' and students' beliefs among many aspects of OCF. Ünsal Şakiroğlu (2020) argues that teachers should take students' views toward OCF into consideration. It is possible that students are not willing to attend classrooms where teachers' teaching does not align with their expectations (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016). Understanding both teachers' and students' beliefs

can improve the effectiveness of OCF and language teaching (Van Ha et al., 2021). Ellis (2008) suggested that teachers should be aware of their students' beliefs and discuss these beliefs with them in order to avoid any mismatch between teachers' and students' expectations. It is worth noting that incongruencies between teachers' and students' beliefs need to be addressed to reduce students' frustration and disappointment. This is in the interest of improving their speaking skills and their language learning processes overall (Schulz, 2001).

6. Limitations and Future Research

The population of this study came from one province that included four public universities in the south of Thailand. It would have been ideal if the researcher could have recruited more participants from different areas. However, participants were chosen through purposive sampling, and after the sample size was calculated using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) formula, it was considered large enough to generalize the results.

This study provides a better understanding of EFL university teachers' and students' beliefs regarding many aspects of OCF and also addresses a gap in the literature. However, further research should investigate both teachers' and students' beliefs and practices to explore whether their beliefs are consistent with their practices. Additionally, the factors affecting the transfer of their beliefs into practice should also be examined. This can provide additional useful data regarding the use of OCF for improving EFL instruction.

7. Conclusion

This study provides useful data for instructors and students to understand both teachers' and students' beliefs regarding many aspects of OCF. Regarding the effectiveness of OCF, the results of this study showed that both teachers and students believed that OCF was beneficial for improving speaking skills, particularly for speaking with accuracy. The teachers and students showed an awareness of students' emotional state, evidenced by their belief that OCF should be provided in a friendly manner.

For the focus of error correction, pronunciation and vocabulary were rated as the most important errors to be corrected by both teachers and students, since these types of errors could cause misunderstanding. Concerning their views on

who should provide OCF, teacher correction was seen as reliable and self-correction was thought to positively affect their recognition of errors. However, the students also believed that immediate feedback could be given to help them notice their errors instantly.

However, the teachers and students believed that using delayed feedback could prevent students from feeling anxious and enhance the flow of speech. This was also reflected in their views on the types of OCF. They believed that the use of recast was beneficial to students as it did not conspicuously point out students' errors, which in turn could reduce their anxiety. However, when providing OCF, teachers should consider other factors, such as the focus of the lesson and students' learning styles.

A gap between teachers' and students' beliefs was also found in this study. The students held the view that all errors should be corrected, whereas their teachers did not believe so. This suggests that the teachers realized that correcting all errors could affect students' flow of speech and cause them to feel anxious when striving to speak as accurately as possible. Such student beliefs should be reshaped so they can feel permitted to speak more fluently and freely. Moreover, a larger proportion of the students favored self-correction and peer correction over teacher correction. Teachers who are aware of this may choose to employ more peer correction in the classroom as students tend to feel comfortable with a peer corrector. In this way, students can also be welcomed to engage in classroom lessons more effectively.

Furthermore, more students than teachers held the belief that metalinguistic feedback was beneficial to students. This suggests that teachers should provide them enough time to self-correct their errors by giving hints. The students believed that this could help them think on their own, which helped them remember their errors. This study can provide useful data for understanding teachers' and students' beliefs and the mismatches between them. The comparisons between their beliefs can also help to narrow the gap that exists between those beliefs. Ultimately, this favors efforts toward meeting students' learning expectations. Moreover, it is necessary to have an awareness of teachers' and students' beliefs that are not conducive to OCF and do not support language learning. These beliefs need to be reshaped to enhance students' speaking skills

as well as teachers' professional growth. It is worth noting that the timing of OCF, the appropriate type of OCF to employ, and who should provide it are contingent on the situation, activity, focus of the lesson, individual learning styles, and students' English abilities. Keeping this in mind will enable practitioners to avoid harming students' emotional states and help them improve their language learning and English-speaking skills.

8. About the Author

Kittiya Phisutthangkoon is an English Lecturer at Rajamangala University of Technology Srivijaya, Songkhla, Thailand. Her research interests are teaching speaking, teaching English as a foreign language, communication strategies, and English for specific purposes.

9. Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to all of the EFL teacher participants and the third-year students majoring in English who agreed to participate in the research and voluntarily provided useful data.

10. Ethical Approval

Ethical approval for this study was granted by Nakhon Si Thammarat Rajabhat University Research Ethics Committee (REC 077/66).

11. References

- Abdi, M., & Khoshmod, S. (2015). Pre-task planning time and EFL learners' written performance with a focus on gender. *Journal of Global Academic Institue Education & Social Sciences* 1(1), 16–21.
- Ahangari, S. (2014). The effect of self, peer and teacher correction on the pronunciation improvement of Iranian EFL learners. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 5(1), 81–88.
<https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.5n.1p.81>
- Al-Maamari, A. A. A. H. (2021). An overview of grammar translation method's effect on EFL teaching and learning. *IJET (Indonesian Journal of English Teaching)*, 10(1), 26–35. <https://doi.org/10.15642/ijet2.2021.10.1.26-35>
- Al-Roomy, M. (2015). Evaluating Saudi university students' beliefs about learning English. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5(1), 22–31.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v5n1p22>

- Alghanmi, B., & Shukri, N. (2016). The relationship between teachers' beliefs of grammar instruction and classroom practices in the Saudi context. *English Language Teaching*, 9(7), 70–86. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n7p70>
- Alsolami, R. (2019). Effect of oral corrective feedback on language skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(6), 672–677. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0906.09>
- 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, 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. (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>
- Davis, A. (2003). Teachers' and students' beliefs regarding aspects of language learning. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 17(4), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500790308668303>
- Ellis, R. (2008). Learner beliefs and language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 10(4), 7–25. https://usnpendbing.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/december_2008_ebook.pdf#page=7
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054>
- Ha, X. V., Murray, J. C., & Riazi, A. M. (2021). High school EFL students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: The role of gender, motivation and extraversion. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 11(2), 235–264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550>
- Hall, G. (2017). *Exploring English language teaching: Language in action*. Routledge.
- Hernández Méndez, E., & Reyes Cruz, M. d. R. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 14(2), 63–75.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1985). Using student beliefs about language learning and teaching in the foreign language methods course. *Foreign Language Annals*, 18(4), 333–340. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1985.tb01811.x>

- Horwitz, E. K. (1999). Cultural and situational influences on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: A review of BALLI studies. *System*, 27(4), 557–576. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(99\)00050-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00050-0)
- Hu, B., & Tian, L. (2012). Do teachers and students share similar beliefs about teaching and learning strategies? *System*, 40(2), 237–254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.04.001>
- Huisman, B., Saab, N., Van Driel, J., & Van Den Broek, P. (2020). A questionnaire to assess students' beliefs about peer-feedback. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 57(3), 328–333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2019.1630294>
- 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. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 561–580). Cambridge University Press.
- Kloosterman, P., & Cougan, M. C. (1994). Students' beliefs about learning school mathematics. *The Elementary School Journal*, 94(4), 375–388. <https://doi.org/10.1086/46177u>
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 30(3), 607–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- Kuzborska, I. (2011). Links between teachers' beliefs and practices and research on reading. *Reading in a foreign language*, 23(1), 102–128. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/66660>
- Lee, E. J. E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41(2), 217–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.022>
- Lee, S. J., & Branch, R. M. (2018). Students' beliefs about teaching and learning and their perceptions of student-centred learning environments. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55(5), 585–593. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2017.1285716>

- Li, S. (2017). Student and teacher beliefs and attitudes about oral corrective feedback. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 143–157). Routledge.
- Li, S. (2020). What is the ideal time to provide corrective feedback? Replication of Li, Zhu & Ellis (2016) and Arroyo & Yilmaz (2018). *Language Teaching*, 53(1), 96–108. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144481800040X>
- Li, S. (2021). Oral corrective feedback. In H. Mohebbi (Ed.), *Research Questions in Language Education and Applied Linguistics: A Reference Guide* (pp. 353–357). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79143-8>–
- 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>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Muslem, A., Zulfikar, T., Astila, I., Heriansyah, H., & Marhaban, S. (2021). Students' perception of oral corrective feedback in speaking classes. *English Education Journal*, 8(3), 275–291. <https://jurnal.usk.ac.id/EEJ/article/view/8918/7066>
- Nurjanah, L., Rahmaningtyas, H., & Yaniafari, R. P. (2024). Examining students' oral corrective feedback preferences for improving speaking proficiency. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 11(1), 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v11i1.29020>
- 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/10.3102/0034654306200330>
- Phillips, E. M. (1992). The effects of language anxiety on students' oral test performance and attitudes. *The Modern Language Journal*, 76(1), 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.2307/329894>
- Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, 37(3), 380–390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.03.2002>
- Richards, J. C., Gallo, P. B., & Renandya, W. A. (2001). Exploring teachers' beliefs and the processes of change. *PAC journal*, 1(1), 41–58. https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/34523319/Teacher_Beliefs_and_the

[_processes_of_change_-_Richards_Gallo_Renandya_2001-libre.pdf?1408898502](#)

- Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (Vol. 2, pp. 102–119). Macmillan.
- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, 25(4), 318–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580>
- Sadeghi, K., & Abdi, H. (2015). A comparison of EFL teachers and students' beliefs about language learning. *MEXTESO Journal*, 39(1), 1–14. <https://www.mextesol.net/journal/public/files/0d83ed8ed9fa6ead155215e59d8b99e7.pdf>
- Sardabi, N., Ghajarieh, A., Atar Sharghi, N., & Rahmani, L. (2025). Perceptions on oral corrective feedback: The case of Iranian EFL teachers and students in face-to-face and virtual learning contexts. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 19(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v19i1.8905>
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 343–364. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1996.tb01247.x>
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA - Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 244–258. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00107>
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *Tesol Quarterly*, 41(2), 255–283. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x>
- Soruç, A., Yuksel, D., McKinley, J., & Grimshaw, T. (2024). Factors influencing EFL teachers' provision of oral corrective feedback: The role of teaching experience. *The Language Learning Journal*, 53(1), 98–113. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2024.2338346>
- Stone, G. (2017). Implementation of critical literacy for English writing classes in the Thai context. *The New English Teacher*, 11(2), 65–65.
- Tarigan, K. E., Stevani, M., Ginting, F. Y. A., Prayuda, M. S., Sari, D. W., & Lumbanraja, B. (2023). Oral corrective feedback and error analysis:

- Indonesian teachers' beliefs to improve speaking skill. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(6), 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n6p140>
- Tomczyk, E. (2013). Perceptions of oral errors and their corrective feedback: Teachers vs. students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(5), 924–931. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.5.924-931>
- Ünsal Şakiroğlu, H. Ü. (2020). Oral corrective feedback preferences of university students in English communication classes. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 6(1), 172–178. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1234492.pdf>
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge university press Cambridge.
- Ustaci, H. Y., & Ok, S. (2014). Preferences of ELT Learners in the Correction of Oral Vocabulary and Pronunciation Errors. *Higher Education Studies*, 4(2), 29–41. <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v4n2p29>
- Van Ha, X., Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: A teaching and learning perspective. *Heliyon*, 7(7), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550>
- Ye, X., & Hu, G. (2025). Student and teacher beliefs about oral corrective feedback in junior secondary English classrooms. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 63(2), 1477–1505. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2023-0153>
- Yoshihara, R. (2012). ESL teachers' teaching beliefs and practices: A case study of three teachers in an ESL program in Hawaii. *The Journal of Humanities and Sciences*, 18(1), 41–61. <https://www.bus.nihon-u.ac.jp/wp-content/themes/nichidai/assets/img/unique/laboratory/kiyo/reiko.yoshihara.pdf>
- Yüksel, D., Soruç, A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in university EFL classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 362–382. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12336>
- Zheng, H. (2009). A review of research on EFL pre-service teachers' beliefs and practices. *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, 4(1), 73–81. <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.1579>