Journal of Language Horizons

Scientific Quarterly Journal of Language Horizons, *Alzahra University*
Volume 8, Issue 2, Summer 2024
Research Article
pp. 99-124

Growth Mindset EFL Teachers' Oral Feedback Practices and Their Beliefs

Samane Saddat HosseiniZade[1]
Ali Mohammad Fazilatfar*[2]
Ali Akbar Jabbari[3]

Received: 2023/04/05 Accepted: 2023/12/11

Abstract

Despite the abundance of research on the link between teachers' beliefs and practices, little research has been conducted investigating the relationship between the beliefs of teachers with specific individual attributes and corrective feedback practices. Thus, this study aims to investigate whether growth mindset teachers' oral corrective feedback (OCF, henceforth) practices are aligned with their beliefs. Eight in-service growth mindset EFL teachers participated in the study. Having collected the data via two questionnaires and a set of classroom observations, MAXQDA software was used to code and quantify the data. The findings showed that growth mindset teachers' OCF beliefs and their actual OCF practices were aligned in terms of OCF timing. Regarding OCF types, female teachers' practices were aligned with their beliefs, but male teachers' beliefs were more incongruent with their practices. Teachers' beliefs and practices, however, were inconsistent regarding OCF amount and frequency, which can be due to contextual factors, such as occasional time limit. The implications and suggestions for further research are suggested.

Keywords: teacher's beliefs, oral corrective feedback, corrective feedback practices, growth mindset, teacher mindset, qualitative data analysis

[1] PhD in Applied Linguistics, Literature, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran; s_hosseinizade@yahoo.com
[2]Professor, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran; afazilatfar@yazd.ac.ir
[3] Associate Professor, Department of Language and Literature, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran; ajabbari@yazd.ac.ir

10.22051/lghor.2023.43353.1795

Introduction

Corrective feedback, as an important instructional technique (Sheen, 2011), refers to "any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance" (Chaudron, 1977, p. 31). Corrective feedback can be given via two modes of oral and written. The oral mode, called OCF, which is the focus of this study, is a type of focus-on-form (Long, 1991) technique since it tends to make learners pay attention to a linguistic form while they are trying to communicate a message in a communicative activity. Although there are theoretically diverse views toward the benefit of corrective feedback, a stockpile of research has shown its facilitative role in language learning (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Russell & Spada, 2006). Nevertheless, the effectiveness of corrective feedback is affected by a number of factors, including linguistic, contextual, and individual factors (Yu et al., 2018). Likewise, teachers' corrective feedback provision is under the influence of several variable categories such as contextual, learner, and teacher variables (Gurzynski–Weiss, 2016). Among various teacher variables, a multitude of studies have emerged exploring the impact of teachers' beliefs on their corrective feedback practices (Kaivanpanah et al., 2015; Mackey et al. 2004; Polio et al. 2006; Schulz 1996, 2001; Sepehrinia & Mehdizade, 2018; Tadayyon, 2019; Yoshida 2010; Yuksel et al., 2021), resulting in contradictory findings (Basturkmen et al., 2004). For example, the findings of Yuksel et al.'s (2021) and Kamyia's (2014) studies indicate that teachers' beliefs and their practices are consistent in terms of the OCF types while the findings of some other studies (e.g., Bao, 2019; Karimi & Asadnia, 2015; Ozturk, 2016) revealed inconsistent relationship between the two variables. However, research into teachers' beliefs toward error correction is not adequately conducted given the individual differences (Gurzynski-Weiss, 2016; Li & Vuono, 2019). One of the individual differences which influences teachers' practices is mindset (Schmit et al., 2015).

Mindsets refer to the implicit beliefs individuals hold about the malleability of others' and self attributes. Mindsets theory represents a set of

beliefs along a continuum from a fixed mindset to a growth mindset (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). People holding a growth mindset believe that intelligence, personality, abilities are malleable; therefore, they can be developed with time and effort (Plaks et al., 2009), whereas individuals who hold a fixed mindset believe that these basic human attributes are fixed and unalterable. Previous research has established that the individuals' mindset beliefs have an impact on their learning behaviors (Barcelos & Kalaja, 2011; Horwitz, 1988). Similarly, the mindset or beliefs of teachers have an impact on their feedback behaviors (Jonsson & Beach, 2012; Rissanen et al., 2019; Schmit et al., 2015).

Besides, Basturkemn (2012) called for more studies to be conducted in the area of teachers' beliefs toward unplanned aspects of language teaching, such as corrective feedback. Aiming to fill in this void in the related literature, this study is designed to investigate the concordance of teachers' stated beliefs with their actual classroom practices in providing students with OCF.

Background

Teachers' Beliefs and Corrective Feedback Practices

Considering the fact that "teachers are active, thinking decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex, practically-oriented, personalised, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs" (Borg, 2003, p. 81), researchers have switched their attention to the impact of teachers' beliefs on their oral corrective practices (Kaivanpanah et al., 2015; Mackey et al. 2004; Polio et al. 2006; Schulz 1996, 2001; Sepehrinia & Mehdizade, 2018; Tadayyon, 2019; Yoshida 2010; Yuksel et al., 2021). However, there is apparently no consensus among researchers on the link between teachers' corrective feedback beliefs and their actual practices.

Among the studies conducted in this area is a qualitative study by Roothooft (2014). To collect the data, the researcher adopted observation and an open-ended questionnaire. The findings of her study revealed that teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback were not aligned with their actual practices. As another example, Bao (2019) based on observation of eight Chinese ESL teachers' actual teaching, found that teachers' beliefs and their practices

concerning OCF matched in terms of the frequency of corrective feedback, the least used feedback strategy, and the emphasis on teacher-led feedback. There were inconsistencies regarding the timing, the commonly-used corrective feedback types, and the amount of corrective feedback. Kartchava et al. (2020) also elicited data from 99 pre-service language teachers through questionnaire, interview, and observation techniques. The findings of their study demonstrated that teachers practically corrected less errors than the amount they believed they would, but they used the same corrective strategy that they reported they would use.

Teachers' Individual Differences and Their Corrective Feedback Practices

Scholars proposed various explanations for the discrepancies found in the findings of the studies on the link between teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback and their practices. For example, Basturkmen (2012) refers to the unplanned nature of the corrective feedback as the reason, and explains that teachers rely on "automatic and generally unexamined behaviours" (p. 291) while giving feedback. Zheng (2013) suggested that such a relationship is "not absolute, but conditioned by various teaching situations" (p. 339). Likewise, Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013) stated that teachers ought to consider many factors while deciding on various feedback moves.

Considering the contradictory results of prior research in this field (see review in Basturkmen, 2012) and the more inconsistent relationships found (see review in Li & Vuono, 2019), researchers switched their attention to explore the contribution of various individual variables, including teaching experience (Yuksel et al., 2021), instructional context (Tadayyon, 2019), training courses (Kartchava et al, 2020; Long, 2017), cultural background (Lyster & Mori, 2006), and so forth. There, however, have not been any studies investigating the impact of teachers' mindset beliefs on the link between teachers' beliefs and practices.

Considering that related literature lacks research on the impact of mindset beliefs on teachers' beliefs and their OCF practices, the current study makes a significant contribution to the existing related research. Thus, this study is designed to explore if the link between teachers' CF beliefs and their CF

practices is influenced by the particular mindset beliefs they hold. More specifically, this study is designed to answer the following research questions:

1. Do growth mindset teachers' OCF beliefs match their OCF practices in terms of the amount of OCF?
2. Do growth mindset teachers' OCF beliefs match their OCF practices in terms of OCF timing?
3. Do growth mindset teachers' OCF beliefs match their OCF practices in terms of OCF type?

Methodology

Participants

A total of 12 Iranian EFL teachers was chosen to participate in the study. Based on teachers' scores on *Teacher Mindset Inventory* (detailed in the instrument section), nine teachers were chosen to continue the study further, all of whom held growth mindset beliefs, but one of them did not answer the second questionnaire completely, and was excluded from the study. The remaining teachers, four females and four males, ranged in age from 26 to 37, with four to 13 years of teaching experience. Since teaching experience does not interfere with teachers' beliefs and their OCF practices (Roothooft, 2014), participants were not excluded due to their years of teaching experience. All teachers held Master degrees, except two of them who had bachelor degrees. Participating teachers majored in English-related courses, but two of them held degrees in statistics and material engineering. As previous research showed, language teacher education does not make significant difference regarding the correspondence between teachers' beliefs and practices (Karimi & Dehghani, 2016), so it was not considered as a variable in this study. Participants were all teaching students at high levels of English proficiency, ranging from pre-intermediate to advanced levels. The demographic information of the participating teachers is provided in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Demographic Information of Participating Teachers

Teachers	Age	Gender	Qualification	Experience	Levels Taught
T1	29	Female	Master of TEFL	4 years	Pre-intermediate to advanced
T2	33	Male	Master of TEFL	10 years	Upper-intermediate, Advanced
T3	26	Male	Master of material engineering	5 years	Pre-intermediate, Intermediate
T4	35	Female	Bachelor of Translation	6 years	Pre-intermediate to upper-intermediate
T5	30	Female	Bachelor of Statistics	12 years	Pre-intermediate to upper-intermediate
T6	37	Female	Master of TEFL	13 years	Intermediate to advanced
T7	28	Male	Master of TEFL	8 years	Pre-intermediate, Intermediate
T8	29	Male	Master of TEFL	6 years	Intermediate, Upper-intermediate

Instruments

Two methods were employed in the current study to collect the required data; observation of participating teachers' classes to record their actual OCF practices and two questionnaires to elicit their beliefs. The detailed information regarding each method is provided below.

Questionnaires

Teacher Mindset Inventory. This questionnaire was constructed to measure teachers' mindset beliefs in the present study. It consists of two

separate parts, namely the Implicit Theory of Intelligence (*ITI*) (Dweck, 2000, 2006) and the Implicit Theory of Giftedness (*ITG*) (Dweck, 2000, 2006; Kussisto et al., 2017), both of which were used in the current study to measure teachers' attitudes toward the nature of intelligence and giftedness, respectively. Both instruments consist of four statements scored using a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 6 (*strongly disagree*). The calculated mean scores were considered as the teacher mindset scores. The items of *ITI* (e.g. 'You have a certain amount of intelligence, and you really can't do much to change it') and *ITG* ('You have a certain amount of giftedness, and you really can't do much to change it') were designed to elicit teacher mindsets on malleability of intelligence and giftedness, respectively. The mean score of 1.0 to 3.0 on the scale indicates a fixed mindset; the mean score of 3.1 to 3.9 is an indicator of a mixed mindset; and finally, the mean scores ranging from 4.0 to 6.0 show a growth mindset (Rissanen et al., 2019). The reported internal reliability of *the implicit theory of intelligence* and *the implicit theory of giftedness* in the previous research were 0.90 and 0.95, respectively (Zhang et al., 2020), indicating very highly reliability indices (Cohen et al., 2017).

Questionnaire on Oral Feedback. The. *Questionnaire on Oral Feedback* (Roothooft, 2014) was applied to explore teachers' beliefs regarding corrective feedback. This questionnaire incorporated all the aspects of OCF which were the focus of this study. However, using open-ended questionnaire lets teachers express their beliefs in more details (Dornyei, 2007). The questionnaire consists of 11 open-ended questions aiming to measure teachers' beliefs toward OCF, including the feedback frequency, the kinds of errors to be corrected, and types of feedback. For instance, the questionnaire items regarding feedback types, based on Lyster and Ranta's (1997) typology, are provided in the following excerpt from the questionnaire:

Teacher: What did you do last weekend?

Student: I watch a film with my friends.

a) Teacher: No, not watch, watched.

b) Teacher: You watched a film. That's interesting.

c) Teacher: I'm sorry?

d) Teacher: You need to use the past tense.

e) Teacher: Last weekend I … (pausing)? (rising intonation)

f) Teacher: I WATCH a film? (stressing the mistake, with rising intonation)

Teacher participants were accordingly asked to state which feedback type they think their learners might rather get, which feedback types they think is the most effective ones, and which ones they employ more in their classroom. They were further required to estimate what percentage of students' errors they tend to correct. Since the questionnaire was piloted in the previous study (Roothooft, 2014), it was not piloted again in the current study. All of the participants completed all the questions. They wrote a considerable number of words in response to each question: on average, the word counts were between six to 99 per question, with a mean length of 24 words per question across the five questionnaires. The information collected out of the questionnaire was analyzed qualitatively.

Structured Observation. In the current study, a structured observation was adopted to collect data on teachers' actual feedback practices. The specific researcher role adopted in the current study was a complete observer because the researcher was interested to observe the data as they were occurring naturally, and there was no need neither to manipulate the situation nor to pose any questions for the subjects (Adler & Adler, 1994). During the observation sessions, neither the teacher nor the students were informed that the observer is a researcher.

The researcher participated in two sessions of each teacher's class to observe and take notes of their teaching in general and their actual OCF practices in particular. Obtaining permission of the institutes' managers, the classes were also audio recorded to be used to analyze the data in detail. The teachers' classes were all approximately at the same level, that is intermediate level of English proficiency. In Table 2., detailed information about the observed classes is provided.

Table 2

Detailed information about the observed classes

Teachers	Observed class	Class level	The observed teaching topics	Class size
T1	Two parallel classes of 1:20 Total: 2 h 40 minutes	Intermediate & Upper-intermediate	Pronunciation, grammar, speaking, listening, vocabulary	11-13
T2	Two parallel classes of 1:25 Total: 2 h 50 minutes	Upper-intermediate	Grammar, listening, vocabulary, conversation	10-12
T3	Two subsequent classes of 1:30 Total: 3 hours	Pre-intermediate	Grammar, reading, speaking, vocabulary, listening	14
T4	Two subsequent classes of 1:30 Total: 3 hours	Pre-intermediate	Grammar, vocabulary, listening, reading	14-17
T5	Two subsequent classes of 1:20 Total: 2 h 40 minutes	Upper-intermediate	Grammar, listening, speaking, pronunciation	10-7
T6	Two subsequent classes of 1:30 Total: 3 hours	Intermediate	Grammar, vocabulary, speaking, listening	7-6
T7	Two subsequent classes of 1:30 Total: 3 hours	Intermediate	Reading, grammar, pronunciation	11
T8	Two parallel classes of 1:30 Total: 3 hours	Upper-intermediate	Grammar, vocabulary, speaking, listening	12-13

Procedure

Firstly, teacher-participants were asked to answer the items of the *Teacher Mindset Inventory* to measure their mindset scores. Those teachers whose mean scores on the *Teacher Mindset Inventory* resided between 4 to 6 were asked to continue the study because they all held growth mindset beliefs. The teachers whose mindset scores were not in the mentioned range were excluded since

their scores did not differ much significantly from the scores of growth mindset teachers. Having obtained the required permission, two sessions of each teacher participants' classes at intermediate level of language proficiency were observed. The whole observation process took place covertly until the last observation session of each teacher's class when the researcher introduced herself and asked the teacher to save a couple of minutes to complete the required questionnaires related to the study.

The questionnaires were sent by the most convenient means or ways to each teacher and to the teachers who agreed to participate in the study. As it was mentioned earlier, *Teacher Mindset Inventory* was the questionnaire used to measure teachers' mindset beliefs. Participating teachers' beliefs toward OCF were elicited using the *Questionnaire on Oral Feedback*.

The recordings of the observed classes were transcribed. All the transcription documents, alongside the teachers' completed questionnaires on beliefs about OCF were transferred into the MAXQDA software (version 2020) for the purpose of qualitative analysis. To analyze the data qualitatively, all the students' turns with a spoken error were specified. Likewise, all the teachers' turns which contained a correction were determined. Then, learners' spoken errors were categorized as being either a grammatical error, a pronunciation error, a lexical error, or a multiple error (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Lyster and Ranta's (1997) categorization was used to make it possible to compare the findings of this study with the findings of previous observational studies in the same field. The corrective feedbacks that the teachers provided to the learners were then coded according to the typology of OCF proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), which consists of the following six types:

1. Explicit correction: The teacher explicitly provides the correct form.
2. Recast: The teacher reformulates all or part of the student's utterance, minus the error.
3. Clarification request: The teacher indicates to students that either the utterance is misunderstood by teacher or it is ill formed.
4. Metalinguistic feedback: The teacher provides the student with

some comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the utterance, without explicitly giving the correct form.

5. Elicitation: The teacher uses some techniques to directly eliciting the correct form from the student.
6. Repetition: The teacher repeats the student's erroneous utterance, with adjusted intonation to highlight the error.

The teachers' feedback move was coded as 'other' if it did not fit into any of the Lyster and Ranta's (1997) typology. As an example of this code is the following excerpt from the data of the current study:

Teacher*: If it was, I'm not get used to, it was false. You have to say, I don't get used to because of get, because get is a main verb. Okay, but, be used to when you want to make it negative. you put not after be,*

Student*: because in be used to we say that uh, now it's familiar [pronunciation error], but it is*

Teacher*: okay. [I want to say it's not (in Persian)] familiar (emphasizing the mispronounced syllable) [for me (in Persian)]*

The other code theme was coding the corrective feedback moves based on timing of their provision (Ellis, 2009; Varnosfadrani, 2006). That is, the OCF moves were coded as either immediate feedback (teachers' giving feedback as soon as the error is produced) or delayed feedback (teachers' postponing feedback provision until the student finishes his/her utterance) (Ellis, 2009). Examples of coded segments regarding OCF timing are provided below:

Delayed feedback	Teacher: *Yasaman, what do you do?*
	Student*: Sometimes I, I left home or sometimes I shout at all of them,*
	Teacher*: hmmm, I leave home.*
	Student*: yeah*
Immediate	Teacher*: Okay, number three*
feedback	Student: *Teenagers use smart phones and laptops. B: things have very changed from past to the present.*
	Teacher*: Have changed a lot.*
	Student: *Yes, number four, A: what changes have you made in your life?*

To ensure coding reliability, a second coder, a Ph.D. candidate in TEFL, coded 25 % of the data, which revealed 91% of intercoder agreement in the segmentation and coding the segments. The controversial codings were resolved through discussion.

Findings

Teachers' OCF Practices

Table 3 depicts the total number of learners' turns containing an error as well as the total number of feedback moves observed, which are also broken down into various feedback types. The feedback moves the teachers applied in the observed classes were well classified based on Lyster and Ranta's (1997) typology, except for few cases which were classified as "other." The "other" category included repeating the correct form, highlighting the correction using learners' L1, making a joke using the corrected form of an error, speaking in student' L1 and telling a word in English. Some similarities can be mentioned among teachers in terms of the rate of correction and the types of feedback used. As Table 3 shows, the participating teachers' rates of correction ranges from 17% to 67.4%, with an average rate of 47.3%.

Regarding the types of feedback used, recast, which dedicated the average use of 76% of all feedback moves to itself, was the single most common feedback type all the participating teachers preferred to use the most in the observed classes. Each teacher's most frequently used feedback type is shown in bold in Table 3. As Table 3. shows, explicit correction was the second most frequently used feedback type. Other feedback types (repetition, metalinguistic feedback, and clarification request), except for "other" and "elicitation", which comprised 6% and 5% of all feedback moves respectively, were rarely observed. Metalinguistic feedback and clarification request were the least common feedback types. All in all, it appears that teachers in this study preferred to recast students on their errors more than using any other feedback types.

Table 3

Amount and types of OCF Provided by the Participating Teachers*

Teacher	Ss' turns with error	Ts' turns with feedback	% of errors corrected	Recast	Clarification request	MF	Elicitation	Repetition	Explicit correction	Other
T 1	106	53	50	48(90%)	2(4%)	0	0	0	2(4%)	1(2%)
T 2	101	33	32.7	30(91%)	0	0	1(3%)	0	2(6%)	0
T 3	39	18	46.15	15(83.3%)	0	0	0	0	0	3(16.7%)
T 4	95	64	67.4	45(70%)	0	0	4(6%)	0	12(19%)	3 (5%)
T 5	50	21	42	7(34%)	0	1(5%)	4(19%)	3(14%)	3(14%)	3 (14%)
T 6	140	72	51.4	54(75%)	2(2.8%)	0	2(2.8%)	0	11 (15.4%)	3 (4%)
T7	28	16	57.14	11(68.75%)	0	0	2(12.5)	0	0	3(18.75)
T8	41	7	17	5(71.4)	0	0	0	0	2(28.6)	0
Total	600	284	47.3	215(76%)	4(1.5%)	1(0.5%)	13(5%)	3(1%)	32 (11.3%)	16 (6%)

***** OCF stands for oral corrective feedback

Teachers' beliefs about OCF

All participating teachers stated that OCF is important because it helps students understand their mistakes and thus, they try not to repeat the mistake again. The only exception was T1 who did not clearly specify the importance of OCF, instead she emphasized that giving corrective feedback is a teacher responsibility. Besides considering corrective feedback as important, almost all teachers believed that their students also expected to get corrective feedback on their oral errors. For example, T5 pinpointed that students sometimes complained to her about not getting corrective feedback on their oral errors. She specified that students "feel like that: if you won't mention my mistakes, so who would do that?". She further acknowledged that "The more I correct them, the more careful they will be while speaking, and the number of their mistakes will be less and less."

Regarding the corrector, almost all teachers reported that they prioritized self-correction. As some examples, consider the following extracts from the data:

It's usually a self-correct. In this level there is a good fluency in English for them and they know most grammars or vocabularies. So I'm usually patient about it and let them to analyze it by themselves. (T5)

Self-correction is my first choice. (T1)

I encourage them to correct their mistakes themselves. If they can't, I'll help them to know their mistakes and correct them. (T6)

Teacher feedback prevents any potential fossilization. (T8)

As for the time of correction, most of the teacher participants stated that they gave students corrective feedback after the speaking activity finishes. They also pointed to some mediating factors, particularly learners' proficiency level, nature of the mistake, and the class time, which can affect the time they choose to correct the error. As an example, T1 explained that:

I give feedback on some mistakes during the speaking activity. As you know, some mistakes are because of some emotional factors such as stress, and I prefer to correct them after the speaking activity. I don't like stop the students while they are enjoying speaking the language. (T1)

As for students' preferences for the teachers' beliefs about the type of corrective feedback, almost all of the teachers in our study agreed that students prefer input providing corrective feedback because they are less challenging. Particularly, T2 and T8 stated their beliefs that students would rather recast. Both T4 and T6 believed that students prefer metalinguistic feedback. T1 as well as T6 considered explicit correction as the method which students might prefer. In the same vein, T3 stated that error correction should be "short, brief, and straightforward" for students to appreciate it. In contrast, only T5 and T7 opted prompts as the methods students prefer. T5 explained that "students enjoy learning how to analyze the sentences." Similarly, T7 stated that students' "self-correction clears out their misunderstanding, and consequently, they gain confidence, and feel a sense of achievement."

As for teachers' views of the feelings of students when they receive feedback, all teachers agreed that students expect to be corrected on their errors, as illustrated in the following excerpts:

Totally positive. Actually, they look forward to it and they'll find you a

precise teacher. I've had a number of students, complaining why some teachers don't mention their speaking problems. They feel like: "If you won't mention my mistakes, so who would do that?" you know. Sometimes I doubted it and I've thought it may seem picky, but no. They always encourage me to do it. The more I correct them, the more careful they will be while speaking, and the number of mistakes will be less and less. (T5)

They usually like to know their problems. (T4)

Apart from T1 and T8 who believed in the effectiveness of implicit methods of giving feedback, the teachers' opinions about the most effective feedback type were similar in making students to correct the error through using elicitation because it helps students to recognize the error and correct the error themselves. Some of the teachers, specifically T3, T4, T6, and T7 added other methods which prompt students to self-correct the error.

Overall, teachers' answers to the items of the questionnaire suggest that they believe in the importance and effectiveness of giving corrective feedback on language learning. They also recognize that students expect to be corrected on the errors they make. Students' personality and some emotional factors, such as stress when teachers pinpointed, are considered in teachers' providing students with corrective feedback.

A Comparison of Teachers' Stated Beliefs and Their Actual OCF Practices. As Table 4 displays, teachers' beliefs about the amount of OCF and their actual practices do not match perfectly. Only one of the eight teachers was able to estimate the overall number of errors based on her beliefs to correct when compared to the classroom observation. Other seven teachers' estimated correction rates were higher than what was observed in their actual classes (see Table 5). Several incongruities were also found between teachers' estimates and their actual correction rates for different error types. Vocabulary errors were the only error type for which estimates and actual practices of most of the female teacher participants, except for T6, matched (see Table 5).

Table 4

Estimated Versus Observed Rates of OCF

Teachers	Total nr of errors		Pronunciation errors		Vocabulary errors		Grammar errors	
	estimated	observed	estimated	observed	estimated	observed	estimated	observed
T1	85-92	50	100	65.32	100	100	85-95	17.5
T2	50	32.7	70	30.43	20	50	80	26.31
T3	80	46.15	70	40	80	75	90	41.66
T4	90	67.4	90	66.66	90	80	100	68.42
T5	80	42	100	100	90	75	80	29.72
T6	50	51.4	80	80.7	40	100	30	18.33
T7	90	57.14	100	75	100	66.66	100	38.46
T8	90	17	50	33.33	85	12.5	95	20

Table 5

Relationship Between Estimated (E) And Observed (O) Correction Rates

Teachers	Total nr of errors	Pronunciation errors	Vocabulary errors	Grammar errors
T1	E > O	E > O	E = O	E > O
T2	E > O	E > O	E < O	E > O
T3	E > O	E > O	E = O	E > O
T4	E > O	E > O	E = O	E > O
T5	E > O	E = O	E = O	E > O
T6	E = O	E = O	E < O	E = O
T7	E > O	E = O	E > O	E > O
T8	E > O	E > O	E > O	E > O

Teacher participants were also asked to express their beliefs about their preferred method of correcting students' errors. All female teachers' expressed beliefs, matched their practices (see Table 6). Despite emphasizing on prompt as an effective CF technique, almost all of the male teachers most frequently recast students on the occurred errors, and they did not give the students much opportunity to think about the error. Among the male participants, only T3 focused on the importance of variation and time limitation in his decisions about CF provision. As Table 6 depicts, he tends to apply a variety of CF types. On the other hand, female teacher participants' beliefs and practices were consistent and all of them pointed to the application of recast as

their frequently used CF technique. For example, T1 who believed in the effectiveness of implicit correction techniques and in the importance of keeping "affective filters" low, mostly applied recast as she reported. T4 also, who reported to use explicit correction on pronunciation errors, used that technique more frequently than other techniques since pronunciation errors were the most frequent error type in her classes observed. T5 was also aware of using recast, elicitation, and repetition, but she was also observed using explicit correction and other techniques. Among the many techniques which T6 reported to use, only repetition was not identified in her classes observed. Congruity between the reported CF types and the teachers' practices are indicated in bold in Table 6, from which it can be concluded that five of the eight teachers (four females, one male) were to some extent aware of their actual corrective feedback practices, and the other three teachers, who were all males, were not.

Table 6

Reported and Observed Ways of Giving OCF

Teachers	Reported OCF types used	Observed OCF types used
T1	**recast**	Mostly **recast,** rarely clarification request, explicit correction, and other techniques
T2	**Recast,** repetition	Mostly **recast**, rarely explicit correction and elicitation
T3	Clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and rarely repetition	Mostly recast and other techniques, rarely elicitation
T4	Usually elicitation and repetition, and **explicit correction** for pronunciation errors	Mostly recast and **explicit correction**, rarely elicitation and other techniques
T5	**Recast**, **elicitation**, and **repetition**	Mostly **recast**, **elicitation**, but also **repetition** and other techniques, rarely metalinguistic feedback

T6	**Recast**, **explicit correction**, repetition, and elicitation	Mostly **recast** and **explicit correction,** rarely clarification request, elicitation, and other techniques
T7	elicitation, repetition	Mostly recast, rarely elicitation and other techniques
T8	Clarification request, metalinguistic feedback	Mostly recast, rarely explicit correction

Correspondence was also found between teachers' stated beliefs about OCF and their actual practices when they were asked to report on the preferred timing of OCF. In line with their stated beliefs, all teacher participants were observed to give mostly delayed feedback on students' errors, except for T6 and T8 (see Table 7). T6, who mostly postponed her corrective feedback in the observed classes, made her stated beliefs conditional on the proficiency level of the students, as she stated: "It depends. For higher levels, I prefer to give feedback during activities, but for lower levels, I try not to interrupt them and give them feedback after the activity". However, she did not clearly specify whether she categorizes intermediate level students as having a high or a low level of proficiency. Similarly, T8 stated that his decision on the timing of CF depended on the types of the mistake as he explained that he corrected obvious mistakes immediately, and more complicated errors afterwards. However, he did not clarify what he meant exactly by obvious mistakes and complicated errors.

Table 7

Reported Versus Observed Timing of OCF

Teachers	Reported OCF timing	Observed OCF timing
T1	For some mistakes, immediate, but **mostly delayed**	73% delayed
T2	**Delayed**	65% delayed
T3	**Mostly delayed**, rarely and only on important and common mistakes immediate	88% delayed
T4	It depends. **Mostly delayed**	56% delayed

T5	Depends on the activity, but **mostly delayed**	95% delayed
T6	Depends on the level, immediate for higher level students and delayed for lower level students	68% delayed
T7	**Delayed**	93% delayed
T8	Immediate feedback on obvious mistakes and delayed feedback on complicated errors	86% delayed

Discussion

The study was intended to explore whether teachers' stated beliefs on OCF and their actual in-class practices correspond. Much in line with some previous studies (Kartchava et al., 2020; Roothooft, 2014) and in contrast to some other research (Bao, 2019; Ozturk, 2019; Tadayyon, 2019; Yuksel et al., 2021), the findings of this study indicate that teachers' beliefs toward the amount of OCF did not correspond to their actual feedback practices. This finding provides supportive evidence for the mediating role of some factors, such as teaching context in teachers' amount of OCF (Fu & Nassaji, 2016; Milla & Mayo, 2014), and it provides evidence for the facilitative role of corrective feedback in language learning (Bitchener et al., 2005; Ellis et. al., 2006; Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Russell & Spada, 2006), which is endorsed by growth mindset teachers regardless of their gender.

Contrary to the findings of previous studies (Bao, 2019; Ozturk, 2019; Tadayyon, 2019), and in line with the Rothooft's (2014) study, it was found in this study that teachers' beliefs and their in-class practices regarding the timing of feedback provision are aligned as teachers reported that they preferred delayed feedback, which was also observed more frequently in their feedback practices. This finding can be due to individual factors (Rahimi & Zhang, 2015), particularly teachers' mindset beliefs in this study as well as their considerations for learners' feeling when they receive feedback (Kamiya, 2016; Kaivanpanah et al., 2015), however, due to the little amount of research on the timing of feedback (e.g., Rolin-Ianziti, 2006; Vilcek, 2014), the finding on this aspect of corrective feedback is not generalizable yet (Vilcek, 2014).

Much in line with prior research on the congruity between teachers' beliefs about feedback types and their actual instructional practices (kartchava

et al., 2020), and contrary to some previous studies (Bao, 2019; Roothooft, 2014; Tadayyon, 2019), it was found in this study that the beliefs of all the growth mindset female teachers about feedback types were aligned with their practices, which was not the case for the male participants. This finding not only indicates that growth mindset teachers are aware of the feedback types they apply in their classes, but also it provides further evidence to the relationship between gender and teachers' feedback practices (Gurzynski-Weiss, 2016; Nosek et al., 2002).

Considering the correspondence between teachers' beliefs and practices and the impact of teacher mindset on their feedback practices, proved in prior research (author, Manuscript under review), the findings of this study indicate that growth mindset teachers argue for the importance of corrective feedback in language learning and they are often aware of the feedback strategies they apply. Therefore, it is suggested that teachers be empowered with growth mindset beliefs by participating in specific training courses which are designed to boost mindset beliefs. The finding of this study, indicating the potential role of gender on the in/congruency between teachers' stated beliefs and practices, builds on the controversies found in the previous research in the field and it further establishes the "highly individualistic basis" (Ozturk, 2019, p. 8) of teachers' corrective feedback practices. Thus, more studies are called for to explore the contribution of teachers' individual attributes in their feedback practices.

Conclusion

The current study, conducted in an EFL context, explored the correspondence between growth mindset teachers' beliefs about OCF and their actual OCF practices. The findings indicate that growth mindset in-service EFL teachers' beliefs about the amount of OCF did not match their practices, however, their practices were aligned with their beliefs in terms of timing and to some extent the types of OCF. It was also found that male teachers' beliefs about CF types did not match their practices, which further highlights the role of gender in teachers' beliefs and practices, and can be the subject of future

studies. It can be claimed that growth mindset teachers are aware of the way they provide students with corrective feedback, and the divergence between their beliefs and practices can be due to contextual factors (Tadayyon, 2019) which teachers need to consider while giving OCF (Lyster, Saito, Sato, 2013), or some learners' factors, such as anxiety and stress, as teachers in this study mentioned, since teachers care for their students' emotional well-being (Roothooft, 2014). The teachers in this study also pinpointed frequency of errors and time limitation as two important factors which can influence their OCF provision. Moreover, this study supports further evidence for the belief that the link between teachers' beliefs about CF and their practices is affected by teachers' individual attributes, such as gender (Gurzynski-Weiss, 2016; Nosek et al., 2002) and mindset beliefs.

Considering that this study highlights the role of teachers' mindsets on the link between their beliefs and practices, and the fact that little research has been conducted exploring growth mindset teachers' instructional practices, and even, to the authors' knowledge, no study on teachers' oral feedback practices, this study can be considered as a valuable one in its own kind. The studies investigating the role of mindset on teachers' feedback practices can be beneficial to both the teachers who value OCF effectiveness and the stakeholders who value teachers' empowerment. Teacher trainers can use the findings of this study as it provides evidence for the actual practices of growth mindset teachers and designing and running growth mindset pedagogical training courses for teachers.

References

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 377–392). Sage Publications

Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes: Teachers' beliefs versus their practices. *System*, *82*(3), 140-150.

Barcelos, A. M. F., & Kalaja, P. (2011). Beliefs about SLA revisited. *System*, *39*(3), 281-416.

Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *System*, *40*(2), 282-295. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.05.001

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.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *14*(3), 191–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, *36*(2), 81–109. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903

Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language learning*, *27*(1), 29-46. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1977.tb00290.x

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2017). *Research Methods in Education* (8th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539

Dweck, C. S. (2000). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development.* Psychology Press.

Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, *95*(2), 256–273.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, *1*(1), 3-18. https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054

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. http://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060141

Gurzynski–Weiss, L. (2016). Factors influencing Spanish instructors' in-class feedback decisions. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*(1), 255-275. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12314

Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The modern language journal*, *72*(3), 283-294.

Jonsson, A. C., & Beach, D. (2012). Predicting the use of praise among pre-service teachers: The influence of implicit theories of intelligence, social comparison and stereotype acceptance. *Education Inquiry*, *3*(2), 259-281. https://doi.org/10.3402/edui.v3i2.22033

Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S.M., & Sepehrinia, S. (2015). Preferences for interactional feedback: Differences between learners and teachers. *The Language Learning Journal*, *43*(1), 74–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2012.705571

Kamiya, N. (2016). The relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *10*(3), 206-219. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2014.939656

Karimi, M. N. & Dehghani, A. (2016). EFL teachers' beliefs/practices correspondence in reading instruction: does language teacher education make a difference? *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, *11*(1), 35-48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/22040552.2016.1187648

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%2F1362168818787546

Kuusisto, E., Laine, S., & Tirri, K. (2017). How do school children and adolescents perceive the nature of talent development? A case study from Finland. *Education Research International, 2017*, Article ID 4162957. https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/4162957

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language learning*, *60*(2), 309-365. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x

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

Long, A. Y. (2017). Investigating the relationship between instructor research training and pronunciation-related instruction and oral corrective feedback. In L. Gurzynski-Weiss (Ed.), *Expanding individual difference research in the interaction approach: Investigating learners, instructors, and researchers* (pp. 201–223). John Benjamins.

Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). John

Benjamins.

Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *28*(2), 269-300. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060128

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

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis [special issue]. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(02), https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520

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

Mackey, A., Polio, C., & McDonough, K. (2004). The relationship between experience, education and teachers' use of incidental focus-on-form techniques. *Language Teaching Research*, *8*(3), 301-327. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168804lr147oa

Nosek, B. A., Greenwald, A. G., and Banaji, M. R. (2002). Harvesting implicit group attitudes and beliefs from a demonstration web site. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *6*(1), 101–115. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.6.1.101

Ozturk, E. (2019). Beliefs and practices of Turkish EFL teachers regarding oral corrective feedback: a small-scale classroom research study. *The Language Learning Journal*, *47*(2), 219-228. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1263360

Plaks, J. E., Levy, S. R., & Dweck, C. S. (2009). Lay theories of personality: Cornerstones of meaning in social cognition. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *3*(6), 1069-1081. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2009.00222.x

Polio, C., Gass, S., & Chapin, L. (2006). Using stimulated recall to investigate native speaker perceptions in native-nonnative speaker interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *28*(2), 237-267. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060116

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

Rissanen, I., Kuusisto, E., Tuominen, M., & Tirri, K. (2019). In search of a growth mindset pedagogy: A case study of one teacher's classroom practices in a Finnish

elementary school. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *77*(2019), 204-213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.10.002

Rolin-Ianziti, J. (2006, October 27). Teacher corrective practices in the foreign language classroom: the effect of timing. In *Social Change in the 21st Century Conference 2006*, Queensland University of Technology. https://eprints.qut.edu.au/6898/

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

Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.). *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp, 133-164). John Benjamins

Schmidt, J. A., Shumow, L., & Kackar-Cam, H. (2015). Exploring teacher effects for mindset intervention outcomes in seventh-grade science classes. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, *10*(2), 17-32.

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. (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

Sepehrinia, S., & Mehdizadeh, M. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: teachers' concerns and researchers' orientation. *The Language Learning Journal*, *46*(4), 483-500.

Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*. Springer.

Tadayyon, M. (2019). *A comparison of Iran's EFL and New Zealand's ESL teachers' stated beliefs about oral corrective feedback and their actual classroom practices* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Auckland University of Technology.

Varnosfadrani, A. D. (2006). *A comparison of the effect of implicit/explicit and immediate/delayed corrective feedback on learners' performance in tailor-made test* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Auckland

Vilček, I. (2014). *Oral Corrective Feedback in EFL: Teachers Techniques and Learners Attitude* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek

Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the

Japanese language classroom? *The modern language Journal*, *94*(2), 293-314. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01022.x

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

Yuksel, D., Soruç, A., & McKinley, J. (2021). The relationship between university EFL teachers' oral feedback beliefs and practices and the impact of individual differences. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral-2021.0051

Zhang, J., Kuusisto, E., & Tirri, K. (2020). Same mindset, different pedagogical strategies: A case study comparing Chinese and Finnish teachers. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *19*(2), 248-262. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.19.2.15

Zheng, H. (2013). The dynamic interactive relationship between Chinese secondary school EFL teachers' beliefs and practice. *The Language Learning Journal*, *41*(2), 192-204. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2013.790133