



รายงานวิจัย

ความเชื่อของอาจารย์และนักศึกษาชาวไทยในบริบทที่เรียน
ภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศต่อการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วย
วาจา

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

กิตติยา พิศุทธางกูร

Kittiya Phisutthangkoon

คณะศิลปศาสตร์

Faculty of Liberal Arts

มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลศรีวิชัย

Rajamangala University of Technology Srivijaya

ประจำปี พ.ศ. 2566

(2023)

Abstract

Understanding both teachers' and students' beliefs in oral corrective feedback (OCF) enables teachers to conduct their language instruction effectively. The present study explored teachers' and students' beliefs regarding oral corrective feedback (OCF) in many aspects including the effectiveness of OCF, focus of OCF, OCF providers, timing for OCF, and types of OCF as well as investigated whether there were any significant differences between teachers and students' beliefs regarding OCF. The study employed mixed methods research. The 62 EFL teacher participants and 164 EFL student participants who were selected through a purposive sampling were required to complete the questionnaire. Six of each were voluntarily interviewed in accordance with the themes from the questionnaire. The results revealed that the majority of both teachers and students believed that OCF were beneficial for improving students' L2 learning and their speaking skills. OCF should be done kindly to prevent students from anxiety and embarrassment. Mispronounced errors and the use of wrong vocabulary were the most types of errors that both teachers and students viewed that should be necessarily corrected to avoid miscommunication. Teacher correction and self-correction were viewed as the most beneficial type of correctors for students by both teachers and students. Teachers were viewed as a knowledge transmitter; however, students believed that they could recognize their own errors better through self-correction. Both of the teachers and students also believed that delayed feedback was effective for enhancing students' speaking skills as the flow of speech was not interrupted. The majority of both teachers and students believed that recast and explicit correction were beneficial to students whereas clarification request was found to be the least preference from their views. There was a significant difference in overall scores between the teachers' beliefs ($M = 3.69$, $S.D. = .315$) and the students' beliefs ($M = 3.90$, $S.D. = .439$), $t(152.63) = -3.95$, $p < 0.001$ and the effect size (0.55). Students' mean scores were more positive than that of teachers in many aspects including correcting all errors, correcting grammar errors, using peer correction, using immediate OCF, and using metalinguistic feedback.

Keywords: teachers' beliefs, students' beliefs, oral corrective feedback, types of OCF

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Table of Contents	3
Lists of Table	5
Acknowledgement	6
Chapter 1 Introduction	7
1.1 Background to the study	7
1.2 The research questions	8
1.3 The purpose of the study	8
1.4 The significance of the study	8
Chapter 2 Literature Review	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Literature review	9
2.2.1 Teachers' beliefs.....	9
2.2.2 Students' belief.....	10
2.2.3 Oral Corrective Feedback.....	10
2.4.1 Teachers' and students' beliefs about corrective feedback.....	15
Chapter 3 Methodology	17
3.1 The research questions	17
3.2 Research Methodology.....	17
3.2.1 Methodology.....	17
3.2.2. The participants	17
3.2.4 Data collection.....	18
3.2.5 Data Analysis.....	18
Chapter 4 Findings.....	19
1. What are Thai EFL university teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs in OCF?	19

2. Are there any significant differences between Thai EFL university teachers' and students' beliefs in OCF?	19
4.1 What are Thai EFL university teachers' and students' beliefs in OCF?	19
4.1.1 The Effectiveness of OCF	19
4.1.2 Focus of Error Correction	22
4.1.3 OCF Providers	23
4.1.4 Timing for OCF	25
4.1.5 Types of OCF	26
4.2 Are There any Significant Differences between Thai EFL University Teachers' and Students' Beliefs in OCF?	27
Chapter 5 Discussion	32
5.1 Introduction	32
5.2 EFL teachers' and EFL students' beliefs in oral corrective feedback.....	33
5.2.1 The effectiveness of oral corrective feedback	33
5.2.2 Focus of error correction	34
5.2.3. Oral Corrective Feedback Provider	35
5.2.4 Timing for oral corrective feedback	35
5.2.5 Types of oral corrective feedback	36
5.3 The differences between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs regarding oral corrective feedback	37
5.4 Conclusion.....	40
5.5 Recommendations for future studies.....	41
5.6 Limitations of the study.....	41
5.7 Ethic Approval	42
Appendix A: Information Sheet for Research Participant	42
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form	45
References	47

Lists of Table

Table 1 The Results of the Participants' Beliefs regarding the Effectiveness of OCF.....	18
Table 2 The Results of the Participants' Beliefs regarding the Focus of Error Correction	20
Table 3 The Results of the Participants' Beliefs regarding the Provider of OCF	21
Table 4 The Results of the Participants' Beliefs regarding the Timing for OCF	23
Table 5 The Results of the Participants' Beliefs regarding Types of OCF	24
Table 6 The Overall Significant Differences in Scores between Teachers and Students' Beliefs regarding OCF.....	25
Table 7 The Significant Differences in Scores between Teachers' and Students' Beliefs regarding OCF in Each aspect: Effectiveness of OCF.....	25
Table 8 The Significant Differences in Scores between Teachers and Students' Beliefs regarding OCF in Each Aspect: Focus of Error Correctio.....	26
Table 9 The Significant Differences in Scores between Teachers and Students' Beliefs regarding OCF in Each aspect: OCF providers.....	27
Table 10 The Significant Differences in Scores between Teachers' and Students' Beliefs regarding OCF in Each aspect: Timing for OCF	28

Table 11 The Significant Differences in Scores between Teachers' and Students' Beliefs regarding OCF in Each Aspect: Types of OCF	28
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Acknowledgement

I was grateful to all of the EFL teacher participants and the third-year students majoring in English who agreed to participate in the research, voluntarily provided useful data, and spent their valuable time to accomplish the study successfully.

I also would like to express my gratitude to all of the experts for checking all of the instruments in this study to ensure the validity of the instruments.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family who have always supported me for everything I have done.

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Background to the study

Beliefs are an important concept to understand in regard to how teachers think and practice in the classroom (Richardson, 1996). In other words, beliefs are influential on individual practices (Borg, 2001). The beliefs held by teachers and students influence their decision making and actions in the classroom (Abdi & Asadi, 2015; Hall, 2017; Hu & Tain, 2012; Kuzborska, 2011; Zheng, 2009).

Several studies on 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., 2019; Lee & Brach, 2018, Ustaci & Ok, 2014). However, studies comparing the beliefs of teachers and students in terms of language teaching and learning are lacking. Unfortunately, serious issues might arise when there is a mismatch between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016; Schulz, 2001). It is possible that students are not willing to attend classrooms where teaching methods does not meet their expectations (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016). It is important to explore 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 speed the process of learning (Alsolami, 2019). While there are two types of corrective feedback, namely oral corrective feedback and written corrective feedback, this study focuses only on OCF, as previous studies commonly investigated these two types separately (Ha et al., 2021). This study emphasized OCF, as the issues of how teachers and students deal with students' spoken errors remains contested (Roothoof & Breeze. 2016). In this area, what, how, when and whether to correct student error is still arguable (Ellis, 2009). Moreover, other issues including how to implement OCF into practice and the effectiveness of OCF need further exploration (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012).

As mentioned above, a mismatch between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs regarding OCF can be harmful to students' language learning. Furthermore, the comparative research between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs in many areas including OCF have been scarce. Studying both teachers' and students' beliefs on OCF can provide insight which could possibly be transferred into practice. Such insight about how students believe they should be corrected and how teachers believed they should provide OCF is ultimately aimed at improving students' language learning. Consequently, the study aims to explore teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF to fill a gap in the literature. The data from this study will be useful for improving language pedagogy.

1.2 The research questions

1. What are Thai EFL university teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs in OCF?
2. Are there any significant differences between Thai EFL university teachers' and students' beliefs in OCF?

1.3 The purpose of the study

1. To study Thai EFL university teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs in OCF.
2. To investigate whether there are any significant differences between Thai EFL university teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs in OCF.

1.4 The significance of the study

This research will be beneficial to language teaching and learning. Understanding both teachers and students' beliefs provide what will happen inside the classroom as beliefs are influential to practices. Moreover, it can understand how both of them believe in order to adjust how to implement corrective feedback in the classroom to meet their satisfaction as the mismatch between teachers' and students' beliefs might be not useful for students learning as it might not meet their expectation. On the other hand, understanding teachers' beliefs can help us understand how teachers' beliefs and can be reshaped if they are not supported by the literature.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The present study investigated teachers' and students' beliefs regarding oral corrective feedback. This chapter presents the theoretical framework for the study. It is separated into two main parts. The first part is a review of teachers' and students' beliefs. The other part provides the review of the literature on oral corrective feedback which include the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback, focus of error correction, corrective feedback providers, timing for corrective feedback, types of oral corrective feedback and research on teachers' and students' beliefs about corrective feedback.

2.2 Literature review

2.2.1 Teachers' beliefs

Teachers' beliefs and understanding of teaching and learning is important for teachers' practices and their professional development (Kuzborska, 2011). The definition of beliefs has been defined by several scholars. Borg (2011) stated that "beliefs are propositions individuals consider to be true and which are often tacit, have a strong evaluative and affective component, provide a basis for action, and are resistant to change" (p. 370). Additionally, Borg (2001) stated 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 thought and actions. In short, beliefs are what individual hold true which are influential on individuals' practices. Meanwhile, she also defined teachers' beliefs as individuals' pedagogic

beliefs that are relevant to teaching. Teachers' beliefs play an important role in teachers' thought process and in their pedagogical practice. Teachers' beliefs about how language should be learned affect their teaching practices (Zheng, 2009) including making decisions and interactions with students, planning, and constructing curricular (Abdi & Khoshmod, 2015; Alghanmi & Shukri, 2016; Kuzborska, 2011). Therefore, to understand the way teaching is implemented in the classroom, it is necessary to study teachers' beliefs (Richards et al., 2001). Understanding teachers' beliefs can lead to improving instruction and enhancing their teachers' professional development (Pajares, 1992).

2.2.2 Students' belief

Hall (2017) stated that "language learners hold beliefs about themselves, about language and about language learning". (p.137). Beliefs that students hold regarding language learning play an important role in making predictions about their learning (Hu & Tian, 2012). Similar to teachers' beliefs, students' beliefs also had an influence on their actions (Hall, 2017; Huisman et al., 2020 ; Kloosterman & Cougan, 1994).

Therefore, understanding students' beliefs can provide a better understanding of how students learn language, including what learning strategies they use. Teacher 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 have a clearer understanding of what is going on in the classroom (Hall, 2017). As students' beliefs are likely to have a great effect on students' learning process (Huisman et al., 2020), researchers have recently focused on students' beliefs in various areas regarding both language teaching and learning (e.g., Hu & Tian, 2012; Huisman et al., 2020; Lee & Brach, 2018; Al-Roomy, 2015) to improve students' language learning.

2.2.3 Oral Corrective Feedback

Feedback plays a dominant role in most theories of second language (L2) learning and teaching (Ellis, 2009). Several scholars have defined corrective feedback. In the teaching context, Ur (1996) stated 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) refers to responses from teachers and peers to learners' errors in second language production. Similarly, Li and Vuono (2019) stated that corrective feedback is a response or a comment on the correctness or comprehensibility of students' L2 production. This implies that it 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 refers to feedback given to students' spoken errors; on the other hand, while the latter involves written comments on students' written errors. Due to the unique features of these two types of corrective feedback and the fundamental differences between them (Ha et al., 2021; Li, 2017), previous research on corrective feedback has studied OCF

and written corrective feedback separately (Ha et al., 2021). This study, therefore, focuses only on OCF.

Previous studies have showed that corrective feedback had a positive impact on L2 development (Li, 2021; Muslem et al., 2021; Van Ha et.al; 2021). Corrective feedback can improve students' understanding of the language and their ability to communicate (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 “whether to correct errors, what errors to correct, how to correct them and when to correct them” (Ellis, 2009, p. 3) are still debatable. In other words, the issues of how to implement OCF in the classroom, the problems of using or not using OCF, and the effectiveness of it have been questioned for decades. Therefore, how to deal with students' spoken errors has still been a question for both teachers and learners (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016). These controversial issues have existed in both theoretical and methodological sides (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012). In order to fill the gap in the literature, many aspects of OCF including its effectiveness, focus, providers, time and types of OCF (Ellis, 2009; Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012; Sakiroglu, 2020; Yüksel et al., 2021) were the focus of this study.

2.2.3.1 The effectiveness of oral corrective feedback

Corrective feedback plays the important role in the language learning process (Alsolami, 2019). The question of when and how to implement CF in the classroom has been interested by practitioners (Li, 2021). Although several forms of feedback have been used, oral corrective feedback is commonly used in language teaching. It helps both teachers and students to focus on highlighting their errors and correcting them. It is true that essential language skills can be learned through practice, corrective feedback can fasten the process of language learning and provide a better understanding of many concepts of a language. Several researchers viewed that corrective feedback promote a good relationship between teachers and students. Generally, oral corrective feedback has an impact on language skills. It helps students to acknowledge their mistakes and support self-correction (Alsolami, 2019).

When providing corrective feedback, teachers should concern about the frequency of providing corrective feedback. Overcorrection can have a negative effect on learners' both performance and attitude. On the other hand, providing little feedback can interfere with their language learning.

Providing appropriate amount of CF is still challenging (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012). Ur (1996) stated that it is important to provide corrective feedback in a positive way in which students become aware that it is natural to make mistakes and it is a process of language learning. Teachers give them feedback in order to help them improving their learning and try to help them correct their mistakes. However, CF feedback has been valued

differently according to different theories (Ellis, 2009). For the audio-lingualism, negative assessment should be avoided. It refers to punishment and can hinder students' learning whereas positive assessment promotes learning. Similarly, in humanistic methodologies, assessment "should be positive and non-judgmental." (Ur, 1996, p.243).

On the other hand, for cognitive code learning, it suggests that mistakes cannot be avoided and must be always corrected to prevent them not to happen again. However, in communicative approach, "not all mistakes need to be corrected: the main aim of language learning is to receive and convey meaningful messages, and correction should be focused on mistakes that interfere with this aim, not on inaccuracies of usage" (Ur, 1996, p. 244). However, oral corrective feedback can be done in different ways depending on students' level of understanding and teachers' preferences (Alsolami, 2019). Individual teachers viewed the role and importance of corrective feedback differently. Their views have been shaped through different aspect including their previous teaching and learning experience, and their teaching training. This issue is still debatable among scholars (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012).

2.3.3.2 Focus of error correction

The two main issues concerning the focus of error correction include a) deciding which "specific errors should be corrected" (p.6) and b) whether to employ unfocused feedback which relates to pointing out all or most of the errors students made or focused feedback which relates to paying attention to 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 different features or levels such as vocabulary, pronunciation, or grammar errors (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012). However, methodologists suggested teachers to focus on dealing with a few errors instead of correcting all of them (Ellis, 2009; Ur, 1996).

Hernández Méndez and Cruz (2012), Mackey, Gass and McDonough (2000), and Yoshida (2008) classified types of errors as follows:

- ☐ Morphosyntactic error: using word order, tense, conjugation and particles incorrectly.
- ☐ Phonological error: mispronouncing words including the vocabulary, stress and intonation.
- ☐ Lexical error: using the vocabulary inappropriately, code switching into their L1 due to their lack of vocabulary knowledge.
- ☐ Semantic and pragmatic error: students' utterances are not understood although there are no errors regarding grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation.

Yüksel, et al.'s study (2021) investigated the consistence between EFL university teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in Turkey. The results showed that teachers stated beliefs were congruent with their practices in terms of the focus on correcting grammatical errors and vocabulary errors and there was an incongruence between their

beliefs in correcting pronunciation errors and their practices. Bao's (2019) study of teachers' beliefs and practices regarding oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese class revealed that teachers corrected phonological errors the most.

2.3.3.3 Oral corrective feedback provider

The issue of who to provide feedback is controversial (Li, 2021). Alsolami (2019) pointed out that correction should be conducted in a systematic way in which students have time to self-correct their mistakes. Self-correction can motivate students and promote classroom interaction whereas students often need feedback from the teachers. The self-correction might not be appropriate when students lack of basic linguistic knowledge (Li, 2021). On the other hand, teachers should be aware of students' understandings and provide clarifications when needed. In other words, teachers should be aware of students' understandings and provide clarifications when needed (Alsolami, 2019). Hernández Méndez and Cruz (2012) classified types of feedback providers as follows.

- Self-correction: learners correct their errors. It will be effective when students realize they are making errors and self-correct them. It is face-saving and promotes their autonomous learning.
- Peer correction: one learner corrects another learner. The advantages of this type include learner cooperate face to face with each other in language learning; teachers acknowledge what students' current abilities are; students are less depending on teachers; it keeps students' mistakes privately which can promote student self-confidence.
- Teacher correction: teachers are correctors. He or she know the problem and how to solve them. Teachers can simply correct their errors to help them understand them.

Teachers are encouraged to let students self-correct their errors which seems to mainly based on western educational ideology. Some CF strategies allow students to self-correct their errors by e.g., teachers might just repeat their incorrect utterances. However, students expect their teachers to correct their mistakes and if they can correct their mistakes if only, they have sufficient linguistic knowledge. Although there are supportive ideas for using learners' self-correction, it is not always successful for every situation. Therefore, the way to solve the problem is to encourage self-correction first. If it does not work, the teacher can take charge of being a corrector (Ellis, 2009). Hernández Méndez and Cruz's (2012) study of EFL Mexican teachers' perception and practices about oral corrective feedback revealed that the teachers had positive attitude towards OCF. Teachers' correction was the most preferable type of correction, followed by peer correction and self-correction.

2.3.3.4 Timing for Corrective feedback

To ensure the positive impact on students' learning process, teachers or correctors should provide students' corrective feedback within a specific time (Phillips, 1992). This implied that timing for corrective feedback is important for language learning (Sakiroglu, 2020). However, this aspect has not been sufficiently studied whether to provide immediate feedback or delayed feedback (Li, 2020). Written corrective feedback is always obviously delayed whereas oral corrective feedback can occur either immediately after students are making mistakes or later after they finish their utterances (Ellis, 2009; Hernández Méndez & Cruz, 2012). This issue has been discussed among practitioners as it is still difficult to pinpoint the effectiveness of immediate and delayed feedback (Ellis, 2009).

If the teachers focus on meaning and promote fluency, they prefer using delayed feedback. On the other hand, if the teachers focus on form and promote accuracy, they rather implement both immediate and delayed corrective feedback (Hernández Méndez & Cruz, 2012). Using the delayed feedback allows students to focus more on form and ease their burden from focusing on form and meaning concurrently (Li, 2020). Sakiroglu's (2020) study of university students' preference on oral corrective feedback in communicative classes revealed that the majority of students preferred to be corrected at the end of the speech with kind and friendly manners. On the other hand, Lee's (2013) study of teachers' and ESL advanced students' corrective feedback found that students reported that they preferred the immediate feedback during the middle of their conversation and during interaction between teacher and students. Additionally, Li, Zhu and Ellis's (2016) study of the effectiveness of immediate and delayed CF in facilitating L2 development and learning outcome in EFL Chinese middle school revealed that immediate feedback showed more advantage than delayed feedback; however, only for learners' explicit knowledge not implicit knowledge.

2.3.3.5 Types of Oral Corrective feedback

There are many types of CF strategy which teachers can use to correct errors (Ellis, 2009). When considering the strategies to provide feedback, the uptake which is "it is the learner's response to CF received." (Hernández Méndez and Cruz, 2012, p. 66) should be taken into account. The learners have to choose to repair their mistakes or not. For to repair, students correct their mistake after receiving feedback from the corrector, on the other hand, not to repair students may realize that they receive the correction but still do not correct their errors or might keep speaking (Hernández Méndez & Cruz, 2012; Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Lyster and Ranta (1997) classified types of corrective feedback as follows.

- ☐ Explicit correction: the correct form is clearly pointed out and the corrector clearly states that students used the incorrect form.
- ☐ Recast: students' incorrect form or utterance were immediately reformed into the correct one.

- Clarification request: when students are required to make a clarification of their utterance. (e.g., What? and can you say it again?). The corrector signal that he/she does not understand the speakers' utterance.
- Metalinguistic feedback: The corrector provides information or comment that is related to errors without providing the correct form. (e.g., You need a noun.)
- Elicitation: The corrector tried to elicit the correct form from the students by using a technique such as pause and let student complete the sentence.
- Repetition: The corrector repeats the students' incorrect utterance.

Bao's (2019) study of teachers' beliefs and practices in oral corrective feedback in China showed that the participants used various types of corrective feedback; however, recasts and explicit correction were employed the most. On the other hand, Yüksel et al.'s (2021) study of EFL Turkey teachers' beliefs and practice about oral corrective feedback revealed that recast was used the most followed by elicitation. However, recast was considered the least effective type of corrective feedback in terms of student uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

2.4.1 Teachers' and students' beliefs about corrective feedback.

Oral Corrective feedback (OCF) had been the focus in the second language acquisition contexts; however, it has received less attention in the foreign language setting (Hernández Méndez & Reyes Cruz, 2012). Individual beliefs including teachers' and students' beliefs are influential on their practices (Hall, 2017; Huisman et al., 2019; Kloosterman & Cougan, 1994). Li (2017) defined beliefs regarding corrective feedback as "the attitudes, views, opinions, or stances learners and teachers' hold about the utility of CF in second language (L2) learning and teaching and how it should be implemented in the classroom." (p. 143). In short, it involves their beliefs regarding the use of corrective feedback. Beliefs regarding oral corrective feedback affect the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback. Most importantly, understanding their beliefs can predict what will happen in the classroom (Sheen, 2007).

However, very few studies (e.g., Roothoof & Breeze, 2016; Tomczyk, 2013; Van Ha et. al, 2021) focused on a comparison between EFL teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs regarding OCF. Research on a comparison between teachers' and students' beliefs regarding OCF are necessary for improving language teaching and learning. It is worth noting that the inconsistency between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs might be harmful to their practices. This is because when teacher instruction might not meet students' expectation and satisfaction, students become hesitant to participate in classroom activities and their motivation to study declines (Li, 2017; Li & Vuono, 2019; Roothoof & Breeze, 2016). The aspects of OCF should receive much more attention in language teaching in terms of comparison between teachers' beliefs and practices in various aspects (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016).

Previously, studies on a comparison between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs on OCF were conducted in ESL or other languages (e.g., Yoshida, 2008; Lee, 2013). Later, a few more studies focused on this aspect in the EFL contexts. Tomczyk (2013) studied the secondary school or college teachers' and students' perceptions toward OCF in Poland. The results showed that the majority of both teachers and students viewed that pronunciation errors should be corrected the most. Both teachers and students preferred the delayed feedback as it would not disrupt the students' flow of communication. It was found that 81.20 % of the students preferred using explicit correction whereas 46.51 % of teachers agreed so. However, most of the teachers preferred using gestures and repetition technique. Roothoof and Breeze's (2016) explored the comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes toward OCF in Spain and found that students preferred to be corrected by teachers more than the teachers thought. Students felt more positive about explicit types of corrective feedback such as metalinguistic feedback than their teachers did. The student participants reported that they were likely to react positively to their teachers' immediate feedback. This is in line with the findings of Van Ha et al. (2021) who investigated Vietnamese teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs regarding OCF. The findings revealed that both teacher participants and student participants had a positive view towards the efficacy of corrective feedback and valued explicit feedback type. However, teachers preferred using delay corrective feedback due to their concern on students' emotional state and their fluency whereas students valued immediate corrective feedback because it helped them recognize their errors and learn the correct form.

Ellis (2008) suggested that teachers should have an awareness of students' beliefs and have a discussion with students in order to avoid the mismatch between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs. Sakiroglu (2020) suggested that teachers should take students' attitude toward oral corrective feedback into consideration. This implies that being aware of teachers' and students' belief in this aspect could help both teachers and students reflect on their beliefs and openly discuss with each other in order to reduce the gap between their beliefs which in turn leads to the improvement of language teaching and learning. If the teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs do not align with learning theories, the teacher can reshape their own beliefs and also their students' beliefs in order to improve their English learning. Moreover, the students can also become aware of their beliefs and possibly are willing to reshape their beliefs that interfere with their developing English skills.

As mentioned above, there have been a very few studies focusing on exploring teachers' and students' attitudes regarding OCF (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016). The mismatch between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs are not beneficial for language teaching and learning. Therefore, it would be very helpful for teachers to understand students' beliefs and for students to be aware of teachers' beliefs (Hall, 2017). While previous research studied a comparison between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs regarding oral corrective feedback, they put an emphasis only on types of oral corrective feedback and timing of oral corrective feedback. Several aspects including focus of OCF, correctors of OCF and the effectiveness of

OCF have not been sufficiently investigated. Therefore, this study aimed to fill the gap in the literature by studying the comparison between EFL university teachers' and students' beliefs regarding oral corrective feedback in many aspects including the effectiveness of OCF, focus of OCF, OCF provider, time of correction and types of OCF particularly in the Thai EFL context in which studies on oral corrective feedback are understudied.

Chapter 3 Methodology

This chapter presents the research questions and research design. The data collection and data analysis are described elaborately.

3.1 The research questions

The purpose of the study was to explore teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs on oral corrective feedback in many aspects. This study sought to answer the following research questions.

1. What are Thai EFL university teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs in OCF?
2. Are there any significant differences between Thai EFL university teachers' and students' beliefs in OCF?

3.2 Research Methodology

3.2.1 Methodology

The study employed a mixed method study to investigate teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs on oral corrective feedback (OCF). Quantitative data and qualitative data were collected through the open and close questionnaire and the semi-structured interview to gain the in-depth data. This study involved 62 EFL teachers and 164 EFL third year students studying in major related to English selected by a purposive sampling. Furthermore, the six EFL teacher participants and six EFL student participants were voluntarily interviewed through the semi-structured interview.

3.2.2. The participants

This study included 62 EFL teachers and 164 third year EFL students majoring in English. They were chosen by a purposive sampling. The students were chosen because they already taken many English courses, which means they have potentially experienced being corrected to some extent. Meanwhile, the teachers were chosen because they are Thai EFL university teachers who have taught English in the Thai EFL context. They have also possibly experienced giving OCF to Thai EFL students. The nature of the population is homogenous in

terms of nationality, as it is comprised of all Thai EFL teachers and students from the same context. This is a sufficient size and can be representative to ensure confidence in any results despite any similarities and differences in the beliefs shown among the two groups (Davis, 2003).

3.2.3. Research Instruments

The study employed a questionnaire regarding teachers' and students' beliefs on OCF in regard 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 required to complete the questionnaire. Although the teachers' and students' beliefs could be explored through a qualitative approach, it would be useful to use a survey to explore a larger group 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 other previous questionnaires (e.g., Ha et al., 2021; Horwitz, 1985; Kartchava et al., 2020; Şakiroğlu, 2020; Yüksel et al., 2021) and was based on the literatures regarding OCF. 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. The instruments including the teachers' and the students' beliefs in OCF questionnaire were verified by three experts for content validity with the Cronbach coefficient of 0.79 and 0.88 respectively. Moreover, there were eleven interview questions regarding their views on OCF. The interview questions were also verified for content validity by the experts.

3.2.4 Data collection

The questionnaires regarding student's beliefs on oral corrective feedback were distributed to 62 EFL Universities teachers and 164 EFL universities students. Six voluntary students were interviewed through a semi-structured interview with an audio recording. Each interview was last approximately for one hour.

3.2.5 Data Analysis

The data from the questionnaire were analyzed based on frequency analysis, means and standard deviation to investigate the teachers' and students' beliefs. The independent samples t-test was employed to study any significant differences between the teachers' beliefs and the students' beliefs in OCF. All the audio interviews from the semi-structured interviews were transcribed. In relation to the qualitative aspect of this study, thematic analysis was employed to analyze the data in this study. Through coding, the data from the teachers' and students' interview responses were analyzed based on the themes from the questionnaire. The data from all the instruments were triangulated to ensure the overall validity of the study.

Chapter 4 Findings

This chapter presents the findings for both the qualitative and quantitative data to highlight teachers' and students' beliefs in oral corrective feedback. The first section shows the quantitative data from the questionnaires regarding teachers' and students' beliefs in oral corrective feedback through the tables and the second section presents the qualitative data from the semi-structured interview and opened questions in different themes to answer the research questions.

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

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

4.1 What are Thai EFL university teachers' and students' beliefs in OCF?

4.1.1 The Effectiveness of OCF

The following table 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 (%)	□	S.D.
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	24.1 9	40.32	20.97	9.68	4.84	2.31	1.10
	S	17.6 8	25	30.49	16.46	10.36	2.77	1.22
4. OCF does not really work for improving students' speaking skills.	T	33.8 7	43.55	17.74	4.84	0	1.99	0.85
	S	21.9 5	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
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 friendly and kindly.	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	16.1 3	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 student's errors that are often occurred is beneficial to students.	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

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

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) either agreed or strongly agreed with the belief that OCF is important for L2 learning. Then, 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, all six students reported that providing OCF could improve their speaking skills during the interviews. 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 of them stated that OCF could help students speak accurately. For example, Teacher A said that "as a teacher if we do not correct their errors, they will speak inaccurately forever." Similarly, Teacher C stated that "the advantage of OCF is to help students speak correctly." For the students, Student C stated that "through being given OCF, I can speak with correct grammar and it increases my confidence." Student 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.

Apart from this, 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 normal or calm voice when providing OCF so students would not lose confidence. Meanwhile, all six teacher participants were aware that OCF has the potential to decrease students' confidence if the teachers did it negatively. For example, Teacher A stated that how students felt towards teacher's OCF depended on how the teacher provided them feedback. If they realized that the teachers really wanted to enhance their speaking skills, they might feel positive. On the other hand, if the teachers often

impolitely pointed out their errors, 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 of the teacher participants paid attention to students' emotional states including confidence and anxiety when providing OCF. One of the teachers stated during the interview that correcting students' errors publicly might cause them feel embarrassed.

4.1.2 Focus of Error Correction

The following table revealed 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

The following table illustrates the findings of participants' beliefs regarding the focus of error correction.

Beliefs regarding the focus of error correction	Subject	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	□	S.D.
15. Correcting students' mispronounced words is beneficial to students.	T	0	1.61	6.45	27.42	64.52	4.55	0.69
	S	0	0.61	6.71	31.10	61.58	4.54	0.65
16. Correcting students' mispronounced stress is beneficial to students.	T	0	3.22	9.68	40.32	46.77	4.31	0.78
	S	1.83	3.05	8.54	33.54	53.05	4.33	0.89
17. Correcting students' mispronounced intonation is beneficial to students.	T	0	6.45	8.06	43.35	41.94	4.21	0.85
	S	1.83	1.83	12.80	32.32	51.22	4.29	0.89
18. Correcting students' errors when they use the wrong vocabulary is beneficial to students.	T	0	1.61	4.84	37.10	56.45	4.48	0.67
	S	0	19.51	8.54	24.39	65.24	4.53	0.73
	T	1.61	1.61	19.35	43.55	33.87	4.06	0.86

19. Correcting students' errors when they use wrong grammar utterances is beneficial to students.	S	1.22	1.22	11.58	26.22	59.76	4.42	0.84
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	------	------	-------	-------	-------	------	------

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

T= teachers; S= students

According to Table 2, the majority of both teachers (91.94%) and students (92.68%) believed that correcting students' mispronounced words is beneficial to students. From the interview, Teachers A and C held the view that if students mispronounced the words, their message could not be understandable. Similarly, Students D and E agreed that the mispronunciation of words should necessarily 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 the wrong 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 misused vocabulary and it affected understanding.

4.1.3 OCF Providers

The following table 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 (%)	□	S.D.
20. Teachers should be the one to 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 to use 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
	T	0	0	19.35	35.48	45.16	4.26	0.77

22. Self- correction is beneficial to students.	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 students than teachers' correction.	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
24. Anybody can correct students' errors.	T	27.42	16.13	27.42	17.74	11.29	2.69	1.35
	S	6.09	12.19	24.39	28.66	28.66	3.62	1.20
25. Nobody should correct students' errors.	T	69.35	19.35	6.45	1.61	1.61	1.50	0.94
	S	50	12.20	15.24	10.36	12.19	2.22	1.46

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 one to correct students' speaking errors. This was supported by the data from the interviews, where three of the teacher participants agreed that due to their experience and knowledge, teachers should mainly be the one to provide students with corrective feedback. Teacher B added that "students trust us for correcting errors." For the students, they 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 became aware of such errors.

4.1.4 Timing for OCF

The following table 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 (%)	\bar{x}	S.D.
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 at the end of the class.	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, both teachers and students believed that students' errors should be corrected at the end of their speech at 72.58 % and 72.61 % respectively. Most teachers believed that students' errors should be corrected when they finished 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 could feel embarrassed when they were corrected immediately. For students, Student D and F felt that interrupting students' speech could decrease confidence and cause them anxiety.

4.1.5 Types of OCF

The following table 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 (%)	□	S.D.
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 them.	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, 88.26% 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 made errors. Teacher D also added that using recast could help students feel less embarrassed because the teacher did not point out their errors. For the students, 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 possibly be more beneficial for them because they were still unaware of what errors they made even though the teacher reformed their sentences. Likewise, Students A, C, D, and E stated that the use of explicit correction not only helped them know what errors they made explicitly but it also let them know how to speak accurately.

4.2 Are There any Significant Differences between Thai EFL University Teachers' and Students' Beliefs in OCF?

The following table reveals the findings of the significant differences in scores between the teachers' and the students' beliefs in OCF.

Table 6

The Overall Significant Differences in Scores between Teachers and Students' Beliefs regarding OCF

Group	Beliefs regarding OCF						
	n	\bar{x}	S.D.	df	t	p	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 (\bar{x} = 3.69, S.D. = 0.32) and the students' beliefs (\bar{x} = 3.90, S.D. = 0.44) regarding OCF, $t(152.63) = -3.95$, $p < 0.001$ with the effect size = 0.55. The magnitude of the difference between two groups was medium.

Table 7

The Significant Differences in Scores between Teachers' and Students' Beliefs regarding OCF in Each aspect: Effectiveness of OCF

	Teacher			\bar{x}	Student		df	t	p	Effect size
	\bar{x}	Level	S.D.		Level	S.D.				
The effectiveness of OCF										
1. OCF is important for L2 language learning.	4.45	Strongly Agree	0.64	4.33	Strongly Agree	0.74	224	1.142	.254	0.17
2. OCF can improve students' speaking skills.	4.47	Agree	0.67	4.34	Strongly Agree	0.72	224	1.196	.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	.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	.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	.176	0.22
7. Students are satisfied with being given OCF.	3.64	Agree	0.81	3.93	Agree	0.82	224	-2.314	.022	0.36
8. OCF should be done friendly and kindly.	4.84	Strongly Agree	0.48	4.38	Strongly Agree	0.77	173.55	5.275	.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	.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	.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	.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	.784	.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	.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	.513	.609	0.08
Total	3.74	Agree	.376	3.85	Agree	.477	138.43	-1.819	.071	0.26

The results revealed no significant differences between teachers' and students' beliefs regarding the effectiveness of OCF, $t(138.43) = -1.819$, $p = .071$. However, it is worth noting that there was a significant difference between teachers' belief ($M = 3.03$, $S.D. = 1.28$) and students' belief ($M = 3.82$, $S.D. = 0.99$) that providing OCF to all students' errors is useful to students, $t(89.758) = -4.363$, $p = .001$ with the effect size = 0.69. The students seemed to be more agreeable to correcting all errors than the teachers. This showed that Thai EFL students really wanted to speak accurately. During the interview, one of the students also said that those who speak accurately looked smart. On the other hand, while some of the teachers agreed that all

errors should be corrected to help students not to repeat the same errors, other teachers viewed that it could interfere with their language learning and increase students' anxiety.

Table 8

The Significant Differences in Scores between Teachers and Students' Beliefs regarding OCF in Each Aspect: Focus of Error Correction

	Teacher			Student			df	t	p	Effect size
	\bar{X}	Level	S.D.	\bar{X}	Level	S.D.				
Focus of error correction										
15. Correcting students' mispronounced words is beneficial to students.	4.55	Strongly Agree	0.69	4.54	Strongly Agree	0.65	224	.120	.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	-.177	.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	-.631	.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	-.438	.662	0.07
19. Correcting students' errors when they use wrong grammar utterances is beneficial to students.	4.60	Agree	0.86	4.42	Strongly Agree	0.84	224	-2.830	.005	0.21
Total	4.32	Strongly Agree	0.63	4.42	Strongly Agree	0.68	224	-1.001	.318	0.15

As shown in Table 8, while there were no significant differences in overall means between teachers' beliefs (\bar{X} =4.32, S.D. =0.63) and students' beliefs (\bar{X} =4.42, S.D.=0.84) regarding the focus of error correction, $t(224) = -1.001$, $p = .318$, the results showed that there was a significant difference between the teachers' belief (\bar{X} =4.06, S.D. =0.86) and the student's belief (\bar{X} =4.42, S.D. =0.84) regarding the belief that students' errors should be corrected when they use the wrong grammar utterances, $t(224) = 2.830$, $p = .005$ with the effect size 0.22. The students' mean score was higher than that of the teachers. The findings from the interview

showed that students also held the belief that using language accurately, particularly with correct grammar, made them look educated.

Table 9

The Significant Differences in Scores between Teachers and Students' Beliefs regarding OCF in Each aspect: OCF providers

	Teacher			Student			df	t	p	Effect size
	□	Level	S.D.	□	Level	S.D.				
OCF providers										
20. Teachers should be the one who correct students' speaking errors.	4.14	Agree	0.81	4.20	Agree	0.80	224	-.419	.676	0.07
21. Peer-correction should be encouraged to use in the classroom.	3.64	Agree	1.10	4.04	Agree	0.87	224	-2.555	.012	0.40
22. Self-correction is beneficial to students.	4.26	Strongly Agree	0.77	4.15	Agree	0.90	224	.825	.410	0.13
23. Self-correction and peer correction is more beneficial to students than teachers' correction.	3.11	Neither agree nor disagree	1.07	3.47	Agree	1.08	224	-2.224	.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	.001	0.73
25. Nobody should correct students' errors.	1.50	Strongly Agree	0.94	2.22	Disagree	1.46	170.48	-4.407	.001	0.59
Total	3.22	Neither agree nor disagree	0.47	3.62	Agree	0.68	157.452	-4.875	.001	0.68

According to Table 9, there was a significant difference in mean scores between the teachers' beliefs (\bar{x} = 3.22, S.D. = 0.47) and the students' beliefs (\bar{x} = 3.62, S.D. = 0.68) regarding OCF providers, $t(157.452) = -4.875$, $p = 0.001$ with the effect size = 0.68. Interestingly, there was also a significant difference in mean scores found between teachers' beliefs (\bar{x} = 3.11, S.D. = 1.07) and students' beliefs (\bar{x} = 3.47, S.D. = 1.08) that self-correction and peer correction is more beneficial to students than teachers' correction, $t(224) = 2.830$, $p = .027$. During the interviews, Teachers B, C, and D pointed out that with knowledge and experience in teaching English, the teacher should mainly be the one to provide students with feedback. This implies that teachers still tend not to believe that self-correction and peer correction were more effective than their correction.

Table 10

The Significant Differences in Scores between Teachers' and Students' Beliefs regarding OCF in Each aspect: Timing for OCF

	Teacher			Student			df	t	p	Effect size
	\bar{X}	Level	S.D.	\bar{X}	Level	S.D.				
Timing for OCF										
26. Students' errors should be corrected at the end of their speech.	4.08	Agree	0.91	4.05	Agree	0.94	224	.228	.820	0.03
27. Students' errors should be corrected at the end of the class.	3.79	Agree	0.93	3.75	Agree	1.03	224	.270	.788	0.04
28. Students' errors should be corrected immediately after errors have been made.	2.64	Neither agree nor disagree	1.30	3.33	Neither agree nor disagree	1.34	224	-3.449	.001	0.52
Total	3.50	Agree	0.47	3.71	Agree	.713	166.146	-2.497	.013	0.35

Table 10 showed that there was a significant difference between the teachers' beliefs (\bar{X} = 3.50, S.D.= .470) and the students' beliefs (\bar{X} = 3.71, S.D. = .713) regarding the timing for OCF, $t(166.146) = -2.497$, $p = .013$ with the effect size = 0.35. The findings also revealed a significant difference between the teachers' beliefs (\bar{X} = 2.64, S.D. = 1.30) and the students' beliefs (\bar{X} = 3.33, S.D. = 1.34) that students' errors should be corrected immediately after errors have been made ($t(224) = -3.449$, $p = .001$) with the effect size = 0.52). According to the data from the interviews, most teachers were concerned more about students' emotional states and the flow of the speech, whereas one of the students expressed that it also 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 gave a presentation, the teacher should correct her errors later.

Table 11

The Significant Differences in Scores between Teachers' and Students' Beliefs regarding OCF in Each Aspect: Types of OCF

	Teacher			Student			df	t	p	Effect size
	\bar{X}	Level	S.D.	\bar{X}	Level	S.D.				
Types of OCF										
29. Recast is beneficial to students.	4.22	Strongly Agree	0.86	4.43	Strongly Agree	0.69	224	-1.874	.062	0.27

30. Repetition is beneficial to students.	3.56	Agree	1.14	3.70	Agree	1.21	224	-.770	.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	.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	.001	0.50
33. Elicitation is beneficial to students.	3.76	Agree	0.74	3.86	Agree	1.02	150.79	-.876	.383	0.11
34. Explicit correction is beneficial to students.	3.63	Agree	1.15	4.11	Agree	1.02	224	-3.061	.002	0.44
Total	3.58	Agree	0.63	3.93	Agree	0.72	224	-3.373	0.001	0.52

Table 11 demonstrated a significant difference between teachers' beliefs (\bar{x} = 3.58, S.D. = 0.63) and the students' beliefs (\bar{x} = 3.93, S.D. = 0.72) regarding the types of OCF, $t(224) = -3.373$, $p = 0.001$ with the effect size = 0.52. Importantly, there was a significant difference between the teachers' beliefs (\bar{x} = 3.29, S.D. = 1.15) and the students' beliefs (\bar{x} = 3.86, S.D. = 1.13) that metalinguistic feedback is beneficial to students, $t(224) = -3.365$, $p = 0.001$ with the effect size = 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 that metalinguistic worked for him because he was able to think of his errors through the hints and he could then be able to self-correct his errors. In this way, he could recognize his errors better.

Chapter 5 Discussion

5.1 Introduction

This study aims to study Thai EFL university teachers' beliefs and Thai EFL university students' beliefs in oral corrective feedback and to investigate whether there are any significantly difference between their beliefs. The participants of the study were 62 EFL university teachers and 164 third year EFL university students majoring related to English. All of the participants were asked to complete the questionnaire related to their belief regarding oral corrective feedback. Six of each were voluntarily interviewed in order to gain more in-depth data relevant to the themes from the questionnaire. In this chapter, the key findings are discussed following the research questions and the key themes presented in the findings chapter.

5.2 EFL teachers' and EFL students' beliefs in oral corrective feedback.

5.2.1 The effectiveness of oral corrective feedback

The majority of both teachers and students believed that oral corrective feedback is important for improving students' speaking skills and L2 learning. Most of teacher and student participants viewed that OCF can promote students' speaking accuracy. Likewise, only small number of them thought that OCF can interfere with speaking skills. According to the quantitative data, none of the teachers believed that OCF are not effective for improving students' speaking skills. Feedback plays an important role in most theories of second language (L2) learning and teaching and language learning process (Alsolami, 2019; Ellis, 2009). Corrective feedback can improve students' understanding the language and their ability to communicate (Yüksel et al., 2021). Corrective feedback can fasten the process of language learning and provide a better understanding of many concepts of a language (Alsolami, 2019). This is in accordance with the results of Muslem et. al's (2021) study which showed that the Indonesian EFL students had a positive perception toward teachers' oral corrective feedback in speaking classes. Their students acknowledged their errors and avoided to repeat the same errors which resulted in reducing fossilization. The findings also revealed that OCF had a positive impact on student's speaking skills. This is aligned with the findings of Van Ha et. al 's (2021) that both of the Vietnamese EFL teachers and students had a positive view towards the efficacy of OFC.

From both quantitative and qualitative data, the majority of teachers and students pointed out the benefit of providing OCF on enhancing students' speaking accuracy. Many of them viewed that OCF could help them become aware of their errors which could help them later speak English accurately. Ellis (2003) stated that OCF can promote students' language accuracy. It helps students to acknowledge their mistakes and support self-correction (Alsolami, 2019).

While over 85 % of both teachers and students agreed or strongly agreed that OCF should be done friendly and kindly. Ur (1996) stated that it is important to provide corrective feedback in a positive way in which students become aware that it is natural to make mistakes and it is a process of language learning. Over 70 % of both of them believed that one on one OCF can reduce students' anxiety. Over 60 % of the students believed that providing OCF in front of the classroom is appropriate whereas only around 35.45 % of the teachers believed so. According to the data from the interviews, all of the teacher participants paid attention to students' emotional state including confidence and anxiety when providing OCF. One of the participants stated during the interview that correcting students' errors in front of the public might cause them feel embarrassed. However, some of the students stated in the interview 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 mistakes. This is in line with the findings reported in Sakiroglu's (2020) study. Their Turkish university student participants stated that although they felt frightened

when their teachers provided them OCF, they still need correction from teachers for their language improvement. However, 22% of their participants stated in the self-report that they wanted their teachers to correct their errors nicely and friendly. This is also consistent with the findings reported in Roothoof and Breeze's study (2016) that teachers rather concerned on students' negative reaction or feeling towards their correction whereas students were willing to receive feedback from their teachers. Muslem et al. (2021) stated that teachers should be more careful when providing OCF to students in front of the public to prevent them from feeling embarrassed and disappointed. Corrective feedback should be done positively and kindly.

5.2.2 Focus of error correction

The majority of both teachers and students believed that correcting students' mispronounced word is beneficial to students. Other aspects related to pronunciation including stress and intonation were also important to be corrected from teachers' and students' views. Oral corrective feedback can fasten the process of language learning as well as pronunciation (Alsolami, 2019). This is in line with the findings of Sakiroglu (2020) that the student participants specifically stated that they would like their teachers to correct their pronunciation errors. Similarly, Muslem's (2021) study revealed that all of their student participants agreed that pronunciation errors should necessarily be corrected. Their students' pronunciation improved after receiving oral corrective feedback. Compared to grammar errors, their participant viewed that using utterances with wrong tense might still be understandable; however, mispronunciation could cause misunderstanding. This is supported by the results of Tomczyk's (2013) study that pronunciation errors was the most important type of errors that both of their teachers and students preferred to be corrected.

Over 89 % of both teachers and students also believed that correcting the use of wrong vocabulary is beneficial to students. Ustaci and Ok (2014) pointed out that vocabulary and pronunciation was the important component of language learning. The correct use of vocabulary and pronunciation is the primary goal for English teachers. The findings of their study showed that 73.8% of the ELT Turkish university preferred with the correction strategies that their teacher correct their vocabulary errors instantly if they misused words and 70.9% of them agreed and strongly agreed with the correction strategy that their teachers should warn them to verify the usage of their word choice again.

5.2.3. Oral Corrective Feedback Provider

In this study, the majority of both teachers and students believed that teachers should be the one who correct students speaking errors. From the qualitative data, some participants pointed out that it should be their teachers who provided them OCF due to their knowledge, experience and expertise. In Thailand, teachers played the dominant role including knowledge transmitter as well as teacher centered approach have been rooted in Thai culture for several years (Stone, 2017). In the same vein, Tomczyk's (2013) study also revealed that their student participants viewed that their teachers should be an OCF provider due to their competence and authority. Similarly, the results reported in Van Ha et al. (2021) showed that their students participants viewed that OCF was teachers' responsibility. Sakiroglu's (2020) study showed that 76.5 % of the students viewed that their teachers should be the one who provided OFC to them. Muslem's (2021) study revealed that teachers' oral corrective feedback can promote students' speaking skills. However, Ahangari (2014) argued that although teachers' OCF seem to be students' preference because it is faster, more accurate and effective, it does not promote students' independence and might affect their emotional state.

Moreover, the majority of teachers and students in this study agreed or strongly agreed that self-correction is beneficial to students. Tomczyk (2013) stated that self-correction can engage students in their language learning. It occurs when students react to teachers' feedback, or when teachers provide them hints rather than the correct forms and they have to reform the sentences by themselves. This is supported by the findings of Ustaci and Ok's (2014) study that the majority of their students preferred the use of self-correction if their teachers provided them enough time. Promoting self-correction can help enhance students' confidence and their evaluation on their own performance. Students seems to remember their errors better and tends not to repeat the same mistakes. It raises teachers' awareness of students' knowledge and ability (Ahangari, 2014). OCF might not be effective if students did not recognize their own errors (Ustaci & Ok, 2014). Although there are supportive ideas for using learners' self-correction, it is not always successful for every situation. Therefore, the way to solve the problem is to encourage self-correction first. If it does not work, the teacher can take charge of being a corrector (Ellis, 2009).

While over 70 % of students believed in using peer-correction, only 54.84 % of the teachers believe that it is beneficial to students. Peer-correction encourages students' cooperation and engagement and feedback from peer is likely to be more honest and allowed students to make decision (Ahangari, 2014). In this study, some of the students stated that they felt relieved to receive OCF from their friends. On the other hand, some of the teacher participants were not certain whether their peer could provide OCF to students correctly. This showed that teacher concerned more on accuracy rather than students' engagement in the classroom lesson.

5.2.4 Timing for oral corrective feedback

The findings of this study revealed that the majority of both teachers and students believed that students' errors should be corrected after students finishing their speech. On the other

hand, only a very small proportion of teachers believed that students' errors should be corrected immediately after errors have been made whereas around half of the students agreed with this belief. This is in aligned with the findings reported in Tomczyk's (2013) study that 98.02% of their teachers and over 50 % of students favoured the delayed feedback. This was because it would not interrupt the flow of their speech whereas immediate feedback caused them to forget what they were going to say. This is similar to the findings of this study, the teacher and student participants stated that interrupting students' speech increased their anxiety and decreased their confidence. In the same vein, the findings reported in Muslem et al.'s (2021) study showed that 78 % of their students preferred to be corrected by their teachers after finishing their turn. Furthermore, 37% of them were anxious after receiving OCF. Their study suggested that while the students pointed out that the teachers could provide OCF immediately, so students could realize their errors instantly, it should be done carefully and appropriately to prevent them from being nervous and embarrassed. Similarly, the results of Sakiroglu's (2020) study revealed that most of their EFL Turkish university student participants preferred to be corrected at the end of their speech whereas 17.6 % of them preferred to be corrected during the talk. This is in line with the results of Ha et al.'s (2021) study which revealed that teachers were aware of the disadvantages of immediate feedback as it might have a negative impact on students' emotional state as well as their classroom participation in the future.

Apart from this, over 60 % of both teachers and students in this study believed that OCF should be done at the end of the class. This is in line with the study of Ustaci and Ok's (2014) which showed that 71.4 % of students would like to have their teachers noted down their errors and corrected them at the end of the class. Their students clearly showed their preference on the delayed feedback.

5.2.5 Types of oral corrective feedback

According to the findings of this study, the majority of teachers and students believed that recast is beneficial to students the most. This is in line with other previous studies (Bao, 2019; Yüksel et al.; 2021) which showed that recast was employed by teachers the most. Likewise, the results of Roothoof and Breeze's (2016) study showed that the majority of their students rated recast as quite good. This is possibly because when the teachers used this type of OCF, they do not obviously correct students' errors. Therefore, the students do not feel anxious or embarrassed. However, Lyster and Ranta (1997) pointed out that recast seemed to be the least effective OCF in terms of students' uptake. This is supported by the findings reported in Muslem et al.'s (2021) study which showed that some of the students did not like recast because sometimes they did not realize that they made errors and they continued repeating the same errors. Similarly, the findings from Ha et al.'s (2021) study showed that although all of their teacher participants accepted that recast was quick and easy for teacher to employ, they did not ensure whether students noticed their errors.

In this study, over 70% of students believed that explicit correction was beneficial to students whereas over 60% of teachers agreed with this belief. In line with the findings from Ha et al.'s (2021), the teacher participants explained that they wanted to correct students' errors as well as show them the correct form. They had a desire to correct students' errors explicitly so students could notice their errors. Both of their teachers and student participants favoured explicit correction as it clearly allowed students to recognize their errors at the same time they could learn the correct forms. This showed that both of the teachers and students in this study paid highly attention to the accuracy of the language.

Moreover, the least type of oral corrective feedback that were rated by both teachers and students that were beneficial to students was clarification request. These findings of this study showed that the student participant confessed that when her teacher used clarification request, she might repeat the same sentence as she did not understand that her teacher wanted her to correct errors. The teacher participants also agreed that if the teachers did not inform students' errors saliently enough, they still did not recognize their errors. This is consistent with the findings of Ha et al.'s (2021) study that their student participants expressed that they did not like clarification request because they did not even realize that their teacher wanted them to self-correct their errors and it also caused them confused and worried. This suggests that the teachers should educate students types of OCF at the beginning; therefore, they could provide OCF more effectively.

5.3 The differences between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs regarding oral corrective feedback

According to the results, there are significant differences between teachers' beliefs and students' beliefs regarding oral corrective feedback. In terms of the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback, although overall no significant differences were found in this aspect, there is a significant difference between their scores in the item related to the belief that providing oral corrective feedback to all students' errors is beneficial to students. The student participants seemed to be more agree on correcting all errors than teachers' participants. This showed that Thai EFL students really paid attention to speaking correctly. One of the student participants also said that those who speak accurately looked smart. Another participant emphasized that to be able to speak accurately can boost her confidence. On the other hand, while some of the teachers agreed that all errors should be corrected to help students not to repeat the same mistakes, other teachers viewed that it could interfere with their language learning and increase anxiety. The findings of this study are consistent with the findings reported in Lee's (2013) study which conducted the study with ESL teachers and students regarding corrective feedback preference. The results revealed that their teacher participants did not agree to correct all of students' errors. Sakroglu (2020) stated that teachers should consider carefully which types of errors should be corrected because not all of errors need to be corrected.

Furthermore, in this study most of both teachers and students also believed that correcting students only when their sentences are not understandable are beneficial to students. This is

similar to the findings of Muslem's (2021) study that while 78% of their students wished their teachers to correct all of their errors, 55% of them also agreed when their teachers provide OCF when their errors affected communication. This showed that while students wanted their teachers to correct all of their errors, errors that interfered with communication should be primarily corrected. This implies that teachers do not need to correct every single error student made.

For communicative approach, Ur (1996) stated that it is not necessary to correct all mistakes because the important goal of language learning is to be able to communicate meaningful messages. Correction can be given to errors that only impact understanding. In contrast, for cognitive code learning, it suggests that mistakes cannot be avoided and must be always corrected to prevent them not to happen again. On the other hand, Hernández Méndez and Reyes Cruz (2012) argued that overcorrection can have a negative effect on learners' both performance and attitude. Likewise, Van et al.'s (2021) study revealed that their EFL Vietnamese teachers reported that the amount of correction for students' errors also depended on various aspects including the lesson focus, the students' English proficiency, teaching activities, time and class size. Overcorrection could interfere with students' emotional state. On the other hand, their student participants stated that they wished their teacher could correct their errors as much as possible to improve their speaking accuracy.

Concerning the aspect of focus of error correction, the percentage of students who strongly agreed or agree with the item that correcting students' errors when they use wrong grammar utterances is beneficial to students were higher than that of teachers' ones. In this aspect, it is possibly because grammar translation methods have been used in EFL context including in Thailand for decades (Al-Maamari, 2021). The findings from the interview showed that students also held the belief that using language accurately particularly with correct grammar make them look educated. Speaking competence consists of both accuracy and fluency. To speak accurately, speakers have to conform to the target language norm including grammar rules (Wang, 2014). Similarly, the results of Muslem's (2021) study showed that students particularly with a low level of English proficiency viewed that grammar errors need to be corrected. One of their participants emphasized that without correct grammar, his utterances became meaningless. It also possibly affected other aspects including pronunciation, vocabulary and their speaking performance. In this study, the student participants might want their teachers to pay highly attention to grammar errors to enhance their accuracy whereas the teachers might only focus on errors that interfered with communication or caused misunderstanding. They probably were more careful not to correct all errors as they took students' emotional state into consideration. It also depended on the focus on their lesson. If the teachers focused on fluency, they possibly corrected less on grammar than students' expectation. However, overall, the findings showed that high proportion of both teachers and students believed that correcting grammar errors was essential for improving students' speaking skills. This is supported by Tomczyk's (2013) study which revealed that grammar

errors were one of the most essential errors needed to be corrected rated by both teachers and students in his study.

Regarding the OCF provider, in this study, the percentage of students who agreed or strongly agreed that peer correction and self-correction is more beneficial than teachers' correction were higher than that of teacher ones. This is supported by the findings of Ahangari's (2014) study that students' pronunciation improved through the use of self-correction more than the use of peer correction and teacher correction. Moreover, the group of students with the use of peer correction outperformed the group of students with teacher correction. This is suggested that teachers should take an advantage of self-correction and peer-correction more by educating students how to use these techniques appropriately and accurately in order to improve students' speaking skills.

In terms of timing for correcting errors, while the majority of both teachers and students believed that students' errors should be corrected at the end of the speech. However, half of the students still believed that correcting errors immediately was beneficial to students whereas only a very small percentage of the teachers believed so. This is in line with the findings of Ha et al.'s (2021) which showed that the majority of their students preferred their errors to be corrected instantly; therefore, they would not forget what errors they made. In this way, it would be helpful if the teachers pointed out their errors immediately. However, complicated errors could be corrected later after they finished their speech.

Furthermore, there was a significant difference between teachers' beliefs and students' belief regarding type of oral corrective feedback. The students rated more positive on the use of metalinguistic feedback than the teachers. In this study, from the interview data, one of the teacher participants reported that students still did not know what errors they made when the teacher provided sort of hints for OCF. She did not believe that metalinguistic feedback was effective for her students. On the other hand, the students stated in the interview that he believed that metalinguistic worked for him because it allowed him to think of his errors and could self-correct them. In this way, they could recognize his errors which resulted in not repeating the same errors. The mismatch between teachers' and students' beliefs needed to be filled to reduce students' frustration and disappointment in order to improve their speaking skills and their language learning process.

5.4 Conclusion

This study provides useful data for teachers, instructors and students to understand both teachers' and students' beliefs regarding many aspects of OCF. Regarding the effectiveness of OCF, the findings of this study showed that both teachers and students believed that OCF was beneficial for improving speaking skills, particularly that of 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 be OCF providers, teacher correction was still seen as reliable and self-correction was thought to positively affect their recognition of errors. However, the students also viewed 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 anxiety as well as to enhance the flow of speech. This was also reflected in their view 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, the teachers should take other aspects including the focus of the lesson and students' learning styles into consideration.

There was also a gap between teachers' and students' beliefs found in this study. The students held the view that all errors should be corrected whereas their teachers did not believe so. This showed that teachers realized that correcting all errors could affect their flow of speech and cause students to feel anxious by striving to speak as accurately as possible. Such student beliefs should be reshaped so they could speak more fluently and freely. Moreover, a larger proportion of the students favored self-correction and peer correction than that of teacher correction. Teachers who are aware of this may choose to employ more peer-correction use in the classroom as students felt comfortable with a peer-corrector. In this way, students can also be engaged in the classroom lesson 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 through the giving of hints. The students viewed that this can help them think on their own, which leads them to being able to remember their errors better. This study can provide both teachers and students with useful data to understand both teachers' and students' beliefs and the mismatch between them. The comparison between their beliefs can also help to reduce the gap that exists between those beliefs. Ultimately, this favors efforts toward meeting student's learning expectation. Moreover, having an awareness of teachers' and students' beliefs that are not effective for OCF and did not support language learning is particularly necessary. Those are beliefs that need to be reshaped to enhance students' speaking skills as well as teachers' professional growth. It is worth noting that the time when OCF is provided, the type of OCF to focus on, and who provides OCF, depends on the situations, activity, the focus of the lesson, individual learning style, and students' English ability. Keeping in mind will enable practitioners to not harm the students emotional state, and enable them to improve their language learning and English-speaking skills.

5.5 Recommendations for future studies

This study provides a better understanding of both 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 will be consistent with their practices. Also, the factors affecting the transferring of their beliefs to practices are another aspect to be explored. This can provide more useful data relevant to the use of OCF for improving EFL instruction.

5.6 Limitations of the study

The population of this study came from universities in only one area in Thailand. It would be better if the researcher could have recruited more participants from different areas. However,


the sample of this study was selected through a purposive sampling and the sample size was calculated by using Krejcie and Morgan's formula, and was large enough to generalize the results.

5.7 Ethic Approval

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

Appendix A: Information Sheet for Research Participant

AF 04-10/1.0

 <p>Nakhon Si Thammarat Rajabhat University Research Ethics Committee</p>	<p>ข้อมูลคำอธิบายสำหรับอาสาสมัครของโครงการวิจัย (Information Sheet for Research Participant)</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ชื่อโครงการวิจัย การศึกษาความเชื่อเรื่องการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจาของอาจารย์และนักศึกษาในบริบทการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษใน
ฐานภาษาต่างประเทศ

ผู้สนับสนุนการวิจัย ทุนวิจัยส่วนตัว

ผู้ทำวิจัย

ชื่อ นางสาวกิตติยา พิศุทธางกูร
ที่อยู่ 2/5 คณะศิลปศาสตร์ ถนนราชดำเนินนอก ตำบลบ่อยาย อำเภอเมือง จังสงขลา 90000
เบอร์โทรศัพท์ 074-324-346 , 099-852-3599
(ที่ทำงานและมือถือ)

เรียน ผู้เข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยทุกท่าน

ท่านได้รับเชิญให้เข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยนี้เนื่องจากท่านเป็นนักศึกษาระดับชั้นปีที่ 3 หลักสูตรสาขาวิชาที่เกี่ยวข้องกับภาษาอังกฤษ หรืออาจารย์ผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ ก่อนที่ท่านจะตัดสินใจเข้าร่วมในการศึกษาวิจัยดังกล่าว ขอให้ท่านอ่านเอกสารฉบับนี้ อย่างถี่ถ้วน เพื่อให้ท่านได้ทราบถึงเหตุผลและรายละเอียดของการศึกษาวิจัยในครั้งนี้ หากท่านมีข้อสงสัยใดๆ เพิ่มเติม กรุณาซักถามจากทีมงาน ของผู้ทำวิจัย หรือผู้ร่วมทำวิจัยซึ่งจะเป็นผู้สามารถตอบคำถามและให้ความกระจ่างแก่ท่านได้

ท่านสามารถขอคำแนะนำในการเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยนี้จากครอบครัว เพื่อน หรือญาติของท่านได้ ท่านมีเวลาอย่างเพียงพอในการตัดสินใจโดยอิสระ ถ้าท่านตัดสินใจแล้วว่า จะเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยนี้ ขอให้ท่านลงนามในเอกสารแสดงความยินยอมของโครงการวิจัยนี้

เหตุผลความเป็นมา

เนื่องจากการศึกษาว่าด้วยความเชื่อของอาจารย์และนักศึกษามีผลต่อการเรียนการสอนของอาจารย์และนักศึกษา ดังนั้นงานวิจัยนี้จึง ได้ทำการศึกษาความเชื่อของอาจารย์และนักศึกษามีต่อการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจาซึ่งจะส่งผลต่อการเรียนรู้และพัฒนาความทักษะด้าน ภาษาอังกฤษของผู้เรียนและการจัดกิจกรรมการเรียนการสอนของอาจารย์ การศึกษาความเชื่อของอาจารย์และนักศึกษาด้านนี้จะเป็น ประโยชน์ต่อการพัฒนาการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษต่อไป

วัตถุประสงค์ของการศึกษา

วัตถุประสงค์หลักจากการศึกษาในครั้งนี้คือศึกษาความเชื่อเรื่องการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจาของอาจารย์และนักศึกษามหาวิทยาลัย การเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ จำนวนผู้เข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัย เป็นอาจารย์จำนวน 62 คน และเป็นนักศึกษาจำนวน 164 คน

วิธีการที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการวิจัย

การศึกษานี้เป็นงานวิจัยแบบผสมผสาน ซึ่งได้ข้อมูลเชิงปริมาณและคุณภาพจากการตอบแบบสอบถามที่เกี่ยวกับความเชื่อของ อาจารย์และนักศึกษามีต่อการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจา และจากการสัมภาษณ์ที่เกี่ยวกับความเชื่อของอาจารย์และนักศึกษามีต่อการให้ ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจา โดยหลังจากท่านให้ความยินยอมที่จะเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยนี้ ผู้วิจัยจะขอให้ท่านตอบแบบสอบถามที่เกี่ยวข้องกับ ทำการศึกษาความเชื่อของท่านที่มีต่อการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจา ซึ่งต้องการอาสาสมัครที่เป็นอาจารย์ชาวไทยผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะ ภาษาต่างประเทศ ซึ่งมีประสบการณ์การสอนภาษาอังกฤษมาแล้วอย่างน้อย 1 ปี จำนวน 62 คน หรือเป็นนักศึกษาระดับชั้นปีที่ 3 ระดับปริญญาตรี ซึ่งเรียนในสาขาวิชาเอกที่เกี่ยวข้องกับภาษาอังกฤษ อายุไม่น้อยกว่า 18 ปี และมีเกรดเฉลี่ยสะสม ไม่น้อยกว่า 2.00 จำนวน 164 คน ซึ่งจะใช้เวลาในการตอบแบบสอบถามประมาณ 30 นาที และขอรับสมัครอาสาสมัครเข้าร่วมสัมภาษณ์ที่เกี่ยวกับความเชื่อของท่านที่ เกี่ยวข้องกับการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจา โดยเป็นอาจารย์ จำนวน 6 ท่าน และเป็นนักศึกษา จำนวน 6 คน โดยต้องเป็นผู้ที่เคยตอบ แบบสอบถามข้างต้น คำถามในการสัมภาษณ์จะเกี่ยวข้องกับความเชื่อเรื่องการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจาเพิ่มเติมจากหัวข้อในแบบสอบถาม เช่น เรื่องความเชื่อของอาจารย์และนักศึกษามีต่อการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจาในประเด็นต่างๆ ได้แก่ ประสิทธิภาพของการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับ ด้วยวาจา ประเด็นที่ควรให้ความสำคัญในการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจา ผู้ที่ควรให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจา เวลาในการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วย วาจา และกลวิธีที่เหมาะสมในการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจา เป็นต้น โดยอาสาสมัครที่ยินยอมเข้าร่วมสัมภาษณ์ สามารถติดต่อผู้วิจัยได้ใน รายละเอียดที่ให้ไว้ในเอกสารนี้ โดยการสัมภาษณ์จะเป็นการสัมภาษณ์ทางระบบ Zoom ออนไลน์ และสัมภาษณ์โดยผู้วิจัยตัวต่อตัว ท่าน สามารถนัดเวลาสัมภาษณ์ในเวลาที่ท่านสะดวก ตั้งแต่เวลา 9.00 – 18.00 น. ตั้งแต่วันจันทร์ - อาทิตย์ ซึ่งการสัมภาษณ์จะใช้เวลาคนละไม่ เกิน 1 ชั่วโมง

โดยตลอดระยะเวลาที่ท่านอยู่ในโครงการวิจัย คือ 1 ปี และมาพบผู้วิจัยหรือผู้ร่วมทำวิจัยทั้งสิ้น 1-2 ครั้ง

ความรับผิดชอบของอาสาสมัครผู้เข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัย

เพื่อให้งานวิจัยนี้ประสบความสำเร็จ ผู้ทำวิจัยใคร่ขอความความร่วมมือจากท่าน โดยจะขอให้ท่านปฏิบัติตามคำแนะนำของผู้ทำวิจัยอย่างเคร่งครัด รวมทั้งแจ้งอาการผิดปกติต่าง ๆ ที่เกิดขึ้นกับท่านระหว่างที่ท่านเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยให้ผู้ทำวิจัยได้รับทราบ

ความเสี่ยงที่อาจได้รับ

ในการเข้าร่วมงานวิจัยครั้งนี้อาสาสมัครอาจมีความเสี่ยงเล็กน้อยที่ไม่มากกว่าความเสี่ยงในชีวิตประจำวัน เนื่องจากท่านจะต้องเสียเวลามาตอบแบบสอบถามและในบางท่านจะต้องเสียสละเวลาเข้าร่วมสัมภาษณ์ แต่การเข้าร่วมงานหรือไม่เข้าร่วมงานวิจัยนี้จะไม่ส่งผลกระทบต่อผลการเรียน

กรุณาแจ้งผู้ทำวิจัยในกรณีที่ท่านประสบปัญหาความไม่สะดวกในการเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัย ขอให้ท่านรายงานให้ผู้ทำวิจัยทราบโดยเร็ว

ความเสี่ยงที่ไม่ทราบแน่นอน

ท่านอาจเกิดอาการอึดอัดใจ หรือความไม่สบาย นอกเหนือจากที่ได้แสดงในเอกสารฉบับนี้ ซึ่งอาการข้างเคียงเหล่านี้เป็นอาการที่ไม่เคยพบมาก่อน เพื่อความปลอดภัยของท่าน ควรแจ้งผู้ทำวิจัยให้ทราบทันทีเมื่อเกิดอาการผิดปกติใด ๆ เกิดขึ้น

หากท่านมีข้อสงสัยใดๆ เกี่ยวกับความเสี่ยงที่อาจได้รับจากการเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัย ท่านสามารถสอบถามจากผู้ทำวิจัยได้ตลอดเวลา

หากมีการค้นพบข้อมูลใหม่ ๆ ที่อาจมีผลต่อความปลอดภัยของท่านในระหว่างที่ท่านเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัย ผู้ทำวิจัยจะแจ้งให้ท่านทราบทันที เพื่อให้ท่านตัดสินใจว่าจะอยู่ในโครงการวิจัยต่อไปหรือจะขอถอนตัวออกจากโครงการวิจัย

ประโยชน์ที่อาจได้รับ

ท่านจะได้รับประโยชน์จากงานวิจัยครั้งนี้ คือท่านจะได้ตระหนักถึงความเชื่อของตัวเองที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจาเนื่องจากความเชื่อของท่านส่งผลต่อการเรียนหรือการสอนของท่าน เพื่อที่ท่านจะได้นำข้อมูลที่นำไปพัฒนาการเรียนหรือการสอนภาษาอังกฤษของตนให้มีประสิทธิภาพยิ่งขึ้น

อันตรายที่อาจเกิดขึ้นจากการเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยและความรับผิดชอบของผู้ทำวิจัย/ผู้สนับสนุนการวิจัย

หากพบอันตรายที่เกิดขึ้นจากการวิจัย ท่านจะได้รับการดูแลอย่างเหมาะสมทันที และท่านปฏิบัติตามคำแนะนำของทีมผู้ทำวิจัยแล้ว ผู้ทำวิจัย/ผู้สนับสนุนการวิจัยยินดีจะรับผิดชอบค่าใช้จ่าย และการลงนามในเอกสารให้ความยินยอม ไม่ได้หมายความว่าท่านได้ละสิทธิ์ทางกฎหมายตามปกติที่ท่านพึงมีในอันตรายที่เกิดขึ้นอันเนื่องจากการวิจัย

ในกรณีที่ท่านได้รับอันตรายใด ๆ หรือต้องการข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมที่เกี่ยวข้องกับโครงการวิจัย ท่านสามารถติดต่อกับผู้ทำวิจัยคือ ดร. กิตติยา พิสุทธิธำรงกูร เบอร์โทรศัพท์ 099-852-3599 e-mail: Kittiya.ph@rmutsv.ac.th ได้ตลอด 24 ชั่วโมง

ค่าตอบแทนสำหรับผู้เข้าร่วมวิจัย (ถ้ามี)

ท่านจะไม่ได้รับเงินค่าตอบแทนจากการเข้าร่วมในการวิจัย แต่ท่านจะได้เงินชดเชยการสูญเสียรายได้ หรือความไม่สะดวก ไม่สบายในการมาพบนักวิจัยทุกครั้ง ในกรณีที่ท่านเข้าร่วมการสัมภาษณ์ ครั้งละ 200 บาท รวมทั้งหมด 200 บาท จำนวน 1 ครั้ง

การเข้าร่วมและการสิ้นสุดการเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัย

การเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยครั้งนี้เป็นไปโดยความสมัครใจ หากท่านไม่สมัครใจจะเข้าร่วมการศึกษาแล้ว ท่านสามารถถอนตัวได้ตลอดเวลา การขอถอนตัวออกจากโครงการวิจัยจะไม่มีผลต่อท่านแต่อย่างใด

ผู้ที่วิจัยอาจถอนตัวจากการเข้าร่วมการวิจัย เพื่อเหตุผลด้านความปลอดภัยของท่าน หรือเมื่อผู้สนับสนุนการวิจัยยุติการดำเนินงานวิจัย หรือ ในกรณีที่ท่านไม่สามารถปฏิบัติตามคำแนะนำของผู้วิจัย

การปกป้องรักษาข้อมูลความลับของอาสาสมัคร

ข้อมูลที่จะนำไปสู่การเปิดเผยตัวท่าน จะได้รับการปกปิดและจะไม่เปิดเผยแก่สาธารณชน ในกรณีที่ผลการวิจัยได้รับการตีพิมพ์ ชื่อ และที่อยู่ของท่านจะต้องได้รับการปกปิดอยู่เสมอ โดยจะใช้เฉพาะรหัสประจำโครงการวิจัยของท่าน ทั้งนี้ ข้อมูลของท่านจะถูกจัดเก็บ 4 ปี สถานที่เก็บในไฟล์คอมพิวเตอร์ที่มีรหัส และจะทำลายภายใน 4 ปี

หากท่านขอยกเลิกการให้คำยินยอมหลังจากที่ท่านได้เข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยแล้ว ข้อมูลส่วนตัวของท่านจะไม่ถูกบันทึกเพิ่มเติม อย่างไรก็ตามข้อมูลอื่น ๆ ของท่านอาจถูกนำมาใช้เพื่อประเมินผลการวิจัย และท่านจะไม่สามารถกลับมาเข้าร่วมในโครงการนี้ได้อีก ทั้งนี้ เนื่องจากข้อมูลของท่านที่จำเป็นสำหรับใช้เพื่อการวิจัยไม่ได้ถูกบันทึก

สิทธิของผู้เข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัย

ในฐานะที่ท่านเป็นผู้เข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัย ท่านจะมีสิทธิ์ดังต่อไปนี้

1. ท่านจะได้รับทราบถึงลักษณะและวัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัยในครั้งนี้
2. ท่านจะได้รับการอธิบายเกี่ยวกับระเบียบวิธีการของการวิจัย รวมทั้งเครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการวิจัยครั้งนี้
3. ท่านจะได้รับการอธิบายถึงความเสี่ยงและความไม่สบายที่จะได้รับจากการวิจัย
4. ท่านจะได้รับทราบแนวทางในการรักษา ในกรณีที่พบโรคแทรกซ้อนภายหลังการเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัย
5. ท่านจะมีโอกาสได้ซักถามเกี่ยวกับงานวิจัยหรือขั้นตอนที่เกี่ยวข้องกับงานวิจัย
6. ท่านจะได้รับทราบว่าการยินยอมเข้าร่วมใน โครงการวิจัยนี้ ท่านสามารถขอถอนตัวจากโครงการเมื่อไรก็ได้ โดยผู้เข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยสามารถขอถอนตัวจากโครงการโดยไม่ได้รับผลกระทบใด ๆ ทั้งสิ้น
7. ท่านจะได้รับเอกสารข้อมูลคำอธิบายสำหรับผู้เข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยและสำเนาเอกสารใบยินยอมที่มีทั้งลายเซ็นและวันที่
8. ท่านมีสิทธิ์ในการตัดสินใจว่าจะเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยหรือไม่ก็ได้ โดยปราศจากการใช้สิทธิพลบังคับข่มขู่ หรือการหลอกลวง

หากท่านไม่ได้รับการชดเชยอันควรต่อการบาดเจ็บหรืออันตรายที่เกิดขึ้นโดยตรงจากการวิจัย หรือท่านไม่ได้รับการปฏิบัติตามที่ปรากฏในเอกสารข้อมูลคำอธิบายสำหรับผู้เข้าร่วมในการวิจัย ท่านสามารถร้องเรียนได้ที่ คณะกรรมการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในคน มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏนครศรีธรรมราช หมายเลขโทรศัพท์ 075377742 โทรสาร 075377742 ในเวลาราชการ

ขอขอบคุณในการร่วมมือของท่านมา ณ ที่นี้

Appendix B: Informed Consent Form

AF 05-10/1.0

 <p>Nakhon Si Thammarat Rajabhat University Research Ethics Committee</p>	หนังสือแสดงความยินยอมเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัย (Informed Consent Form)
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------

การวิจัยเรื่อง การศึกษาความเชื่อเรื่องการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยวาจาของอาจารย์และนักศึกษาในบริบทการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

วันที่ให้คำยินยอม วันที่.....เดือน.....พ.ศ.....

ข้าพเจ้า นาย/นาง/นางสาว.....ที่อยู่.....
.....ได้อ่านรายละเอียดจากเอกสารข้อมูลสำหรับผู้เข้าร่วม

โครงการวิจัยวิจัยที่แนบมาฉบับวันที่..... และข้าพเจ้ายินยอมเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยโดยสมัครใจ

ข้าพเจ้าได้รับสำเนาเอกสารแสดงความยินยอมเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยที่ข้าพเจ้าได้ลงนาม และ วันที่ พร้อมด้วยเอกสารข้อมูลสำหรับผู้เข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัย ทั้งนี้ก่อนที่จะลงนามในใบยินยอมให้ทำการวิจัยนี้ ข้าพเจ้าได้รับการอธิบายจากผู้วิจัยถึงวัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัย ระยะเวลาของการทำวิจัย วิธีการวิจัย อันตราย หรืออาการที่อาจเกิดขึ้นจากการวิจัย รวมทั้งประโยชน์ที่จะเกิดขึ้นจากการวิจัย ข้าพเจ้ามีเวลาและโอกาสเพียงพอในการซักถามข้อสงสัยจนมีความเข้าใจอย่างดีแล้ว โดยผู้วิจัยได้ตอบคำถามต่าง ๆ ด้วยความเต็มใจไม่ปิดบังซ่อนเร้นจนข้าพเจ้าพอใจ

ข้าพเจ้ารับทราบจากผู้วิจัยว่าหากเกิดอันตรายใด ๆ จากการวิจัยดังกล่าว ข้าพเจ้าจะได้รับการดูแลโดยไม่เสียค่าใช้จ่าย หากเกิดอันตรายใด ๆ ผู้วิจัยจะเป็นผู้รับผิดชอบค่าเสียหายจากอันตรายที่ได้รับจากการเข้าร่วมวิจัยนี้

ข้าพเจ้ามีสิทธิที่จะบอกเลิกเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยเมื่อใดก็ได้ โดยไม่จำเป็นต้องแจ้งเหตุผล และการบอกเลิกการเข้าร่วมการวิจัยนี้ จะไม่มีผลต่อสิทธิอื่น ๆ ที่ข้าพเจ้าจะพึงได้รับต่อไป

ผู้วิจัยรับรองว่าจะเก็บข้อมูลส่วนตัวของข้าพเจ้าเป็นความลับ และจะเปิดเผยได้เฉพาะเมื่อได้รับการยินยอมจากข้าพเจ้าเท่านั้น บุคคลอื่นในนามของผู้สนับสนุนการวิจัย คณะกรรมการพิจารณาจริยธรรมการวิจัยในคน อาจได้รับอนุญาตให้เข้ามาตรวจสอบและประมวลข้อมูลของข้าพเจ้า ทั้งนี้จะต้องกระทำไปเพื่อวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อตรวจสอบความถูกต้องของข้อมูลเท่านั้น โดยการตกลงที่จะเข้าร่วมการศึกษานี้ข้าพเจ้าได้ให้คำยินยอมที่จะให้มีการตรวจสอบข้อมูลประวัติของข้าพเจ้าได้

ผู้วิจัยรับรองว่าจะไม่มีการเก็บข้อมูลใด ๆ เพิ่มเติม หลังจากข้าพเจ้าขอยกเลิกการเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยและต้องการให้ทำลายเอกสารและ/หรือ ตัวอย่างที่ใช้ตรวจสอบทั้งหมดที่สามารถสืบค้นถึงตัวข้าพเจ้าได้

ข้าพเจ้าเข้าใจว่า ข้าพเจ้ามีสิทธิที่จะตรวจสอบหรือแก้ไขข้อมูลส่วนตัวของข้าพเจ้าและสามารถยกเลิกการให้สิทธิในการใช้ข้อมูลส่วนตัวของข้าพเจ้าได้ โดยต้องแจ้งให้ผู้วิจัยรับทราบ

ข้าพเจ้าได้ตระหนักว่าข้อมูลในการวิจัยรวมถึงข้อมูลของข้าพเจ้าที่ไม่มีการเปิดเผยชื่อ จะผ่านกระบวนการต่าง ๆ เช่น การเก็บข้อมูล การบันทึกข้อมูลในแบบบันทึกและในคอมพิวเตอร์ การตรวจสอบ การวิเคราะห์ และการรายงานข้อมูลเพื่อวัตถุประสงค์ทางวิชาการ เท่านั้น

ข้าพเจ้าได้อ่านข้อความข้างต้นและมีความเข้าใจดีทุกประการแล้ว ยินดีเข้าร่วมในการวิจัยด้วยความเต็มใจ จึงได้ลงนามในเอกสารแสดงความยินยอมนี้

.....ลงนามผู้ให้ความยินยอม

(.....) ชื่อผู้ยินยอมตัวบรรจง

วันที่เดือน.....พ.ศ.....

ข้าพเจ้าได้อธิบายถึงวัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัย วิธีการวิจัย อันตราย หรืออาการไม่พึงประสงค์หรือความเสี่ยงที่อาจเกิดขึ้นจากการวิจัย รวมทั้งประโยชน์ที่จะเกิดขึ้นจากการวิจัยอย่างละเอียด ให้ผู้เข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัยตามนามข้างต้นได้ทราบและมีความเข้าใจดีแล้ว พร้อมลงนามลงในเอกสารแสดงความยินยอมด้วยความเต็มใจ

.....ลงนามผู้ทำวิจัย

(นางสาวกิตติยา พิศุทธางกูร) ชื่อผู้ทำวิจัย ตัวบรรจง

วันที่เดือน.....พ.ศ. 2566

.....ลงนามพยาน

(.....) ชื่อพยาน ตัวบรรจง

วันที่เดือน.....พ.ศ. 2566

References

- Abdi, H., & Asadi, B. (2015). A synopsis of researches on teachers and students' beliefs about language learning. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 3, 104-114. <https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijSELL/v3-i4/14.pdf>
- Abdi, M., & Khoshmod, S. (2015). Pre-task planning time and EFL learners' written performance with a focus on gender. *Journal of Global Academic Institute 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. (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., & Cruz, M. d. R. R. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 14(2), 63–75.
- 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>
- 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.
- 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.
- 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>
- Li, S., Zhu, Y., & Ellis, R. (2016). The effects of the timing of corrective feedback on the acquisition of a new linguistic structure. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(1), 276–295.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feed-back and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19 (1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Melketo, T. A. (2012). Exploring tensions between English teachers' beliefs and practices in teaching writing. *The International HETL Review*, 2(11), 98–114. <https://www.hetl.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/HETLReviewVolume2Article11.pdf>
- 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>
- 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.2009.03.002>
- 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>
- Sakiroglu, 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>
- 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>
- Stone, G. (2017). Implementation of critical literacy for English writing classes in the Thai context. *The New English Teacher*, 11(2), 65–65.
<http://www.assumptionjournal.au.edu/index.php/newEnglishTeacher/article/view/2633>
- 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>
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching* (Vol. 1). 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>
- Wang, Z. (2014). Developing accuracy and fluency in spoken English of Chinese EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 110–118. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n2p110>
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 78–93. <https://doi.org/10.2167/la429.0>
- 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://api.repository.cam.ac.uk/server/api/core/bitstreams/f23aa2f6-ffb5-44f8-972e-1f7f0511374b/content>