Beliefs and Practices of Written Corrective Feedback in Spanish as a Foreign Language: A Case Study of Chines and Spanish Teachers

Xindi Li[a]*

[a] *Autonomous University of Barcelona, Bellaterra (Cerdanyola del Vallès), Barcelona, Spain.*
Email: qq598687122@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines the nature of written corrective feedback (WCF) in relation to the beliefs held by two Spanish as a Foreign Language (SFL) teachers and their actual classroom practices. The primary objectives are to explore the teachers' conceptions regarding WCF, to identify the various methods through which WCF is delivered, and to determine the extent of congruence or divergence between their beliefs and instructional behaviours. Data were collected from the written work of 21 students, alongside semi-structured interviews conducted with the two SFL teachers. The student texts were analysed using Atlas Ti 9.0, while thematic analysis was applied to the interview data. The results indicate that both teachers predominantly employ direct feedback, whereas indirect feedback is utilised far less frequently. The teachers expressed strong support for the instructional role of WCF in facilitating second language (L2) acquisition, and their classroom practices were generally consistent with their stated beliefs. The study concludes with an interpretation of the key findings in response to the research questions and a discussion of the study's limitations.

Introduction

The study of second language acquisition has significantly influenced instructional practices, particularly in the domain of writing, which remains one of the most intricate linguistic skills. Writing reflects not only linguistic competence but also the ability to structure and communicate complex ideas effectively (Hyland, 2019; Jin, 2024). According to Mathew (2021), feedback constitutes a critical component in fostering learners' accuracy and coherence, thereby supporting their overall language proficiency development. The advancement of writing proficiency depends heavily on corrective feedback (CF), which addresses linguistic errors in a targeted manner (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2021). CF is generally categorised into oral corrective feedback (OCF) and WCF. While OCF enables immediate intervention during spoken exchanges, WCF offers detailed instructor commentary that promotes sustained progress in learners' written accuracy. Through WCF, learners are guided in revising their texts, resulting in more durable improvements in writing performance (Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Zhu, 2021).

Empirical research on WCF has explored three core dimensions: feedback scope (focused versus comprehensive), feedback strategy (direct versus indirect), and feedback orientation (positive versus negative) (Hyland, 2019). Focused WCF is often preferred by learners because it targets specific error types and is cognitively more accessible (Mao, Lee, & Li, 2024). Conversely, comprehensive feedback, though broad in

scope, may overwhelm learners with lower proficiency levels, potentially hindering its instructional impact (Nguyen & Chu, 2024). However, a notable gap persists in understanding how teachers' cultural backgrounds shape their beliefs and practices concerning WCF. Pedagogical decisions are frequently shaped by instructors' underlying values, assumptions, and attitudes (Gao, Wang, & Wang, 2024; Lim & Renandya, 2020). Comparative studies indicate that educators from diverse cultural origins demonstrate differing WCF preferences, shaped by culturally informed teaching norms and expectations (Cheng & Zhang, 2021). Yet, the majority of existing research has centred on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education, with limited focus on SFL instruction within the Chinese context. This study therefore seeks to address this gap by examining the WCF beliefs and classroom practices of two SFL teachers—one a native Spanish speaker and the other a non-native Chinese instructor—teaching Sino-speaking learners. Using a qualitative research design, the study analyses student writing samples and conducts semi-structured interviews to explore how cultural and professional backgrounds influence the teachers' WCF strategies. By investigating the interplay between teacher cognition and instructional behaviour, this research offers valuable insights for enhancing WCF practices in linguistically and culturally diverse SFL learning environments.

Literature Review

Study of Teachers' Beliefs

Research into teacher cognition began in the 1970s, guided by the assumption that instructional behaviour is shaped by underlying beliefs and thought processes. This perspective increasingly influenced scholarly inquiry into how teachers make judgments, plan lessons, and make decisions during instruction (Tatto, 2019). Watson (2019) conceptualised teacher cognition as a dynamic process involving anticipatory and reflective planning, interactive decision-making, and in-situ reflection within classroom contexts. Teacher beliefs have since become a focal point in educational research, given their direct influence on pedagogical choices and practices (Thompson & Abroampa, 2019).

Initial investigations into teacher beliefs centred on defining and categorising belief systems, alongside exploring their implications for classroom behaviour. Zhang et al. (2020) argued that understanding teacher beliefs is critical, as these beliefs fundamentally shape instructional decisions. Tajeddin & Bolouri (2023) introduced the notion of "practical wisdom" as a key construct for professional development, highlighting its relevance in guiding teachers' pedagogical reasoning. These early studies laid the conceptual foundation for more targeted analyses of belief-practice relationships in educational settings. Since 2000, research has evolved to consider how teacher beliefs translate into concrete teaching practices. Barcelos (2024) noted that such beliefs are context-sensitive and influenced by both individual dispositions and broader cultural frameworks. The diversity of belief systems among educators presents challenges for establishing universally applicable definitions, necessitating contextually grounded methodologies. Researchers have increasingly emphasised the significance of examining how beliefs affect instructional decisions, particularly in multilingual and culturally diverse learning environments (Gao et al., 2024).

WCF in Foreign Language Writing

WCF plays a crucial instructional role in facilitating second language acquisition through written language correction. As defined by Nassaji & Kartchava (2021), it constitutes any teacher feedback aimed at signalling recognition of learner errors. When applied to student compositions, this form of feedback identifies grammatical or syntactic inaccuracies while enhancing textual coherence and clarity. It may be provided directly, involving explicit corrections by the instructor, or indirectly, where errors are indicated without offering the corrected form (Nguyen & Chu, 2024). Research in this area has identified two principal strategies: one that targets selected error types, and another that addresses all errors regardless of type. According to Karim & Nassaji (2020), the appropriateness of these strategies depends on the learners' proficiency level and instructional aims. Focused feedback, which addresses specific error categories, has been shown to be especially beneficial for learners with limited language competence. Despite these findings, studies remain divided on the effectiveness of this approach. Lim & Renandya (2020) have raised concerns that it may diminish student motivation and yield inconsistent learning outcomes. However, recent investigations by Sun & QI (2022), Guo (2023), and Liao & Zhang (2022) suggest that the use of this feedback leads to measurable improvements in writing accuracy and quality across both short-term and long-term contexts.

Teachers' Beliefs and Practices in WCF

Scholarly investigations characterise the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their instructional practices as multifaceted and, at times, incongruent. While Kazmi, Yousaf, & Habib (2021) found that educator beliefs often align with their classroom practices, other studies suggest a disconnect between the two. Such inconsistencies are frequently attributed to contextual constraints, including limited instructional time, rigid curriculum demands, and the need to cater to individual learner differences (Viswanathan, 2019). Within the WCF context, the methods teachers employ for delivering feedback are closely linked to their underlying beliefs. Contemporary research conducted across diverse educational settings has highlighted

correlations between belief systems and feedback implementation, while also identifying the influence of professional experience, pedagogical training, and cultural background on these dynamics (Hidayah, Suparno, & Haryati, 2021; Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019). Differences in WCF practices between native and non-native instructors are often rooted in their distinct linguistic and cultural frameworks, underscoring the importance of analysing teaching beliefs and practices within specific contextual frameworks.

Native and Non-Native Teacher Evaluations: Feedback Practices, Influencing Factors, and Pedagogical Implications

Academic investigations into the evaluative practices of native and non-native language instructors have gained considerable traction. Research suggests that native teachers tend to exhibit greater tolerance toward linguistic errors compared to their non-native counterparts, thereby influencing the nature and delivery of their feedback (Krogager Andersen, 2021). Marked differences have been observed between native and non-native English as a Foreign Language educators in terms of their conceptualisations regarding the purpose and scope of written CF. The efficacy and implementation of feedback strategies are significantly influenced by contextual and institutional factors. As noted by Zou (2022), constraints such as rigid standardised assessment frameworks and limited instructional time frequently hinder the application of specific feedback approaches. Therefore, a comprehensive evaluation of native and non-native educators' practices necessitates careful consideration of their respective teaching contexts. This study explores the relationship between the beliefs and classroom practices of two Spanish as a Foreign Language instructors in their provision of written instruction to Sino-speaking learners. Employing a qualitative methodology, the research seeks to generate an in-depth understanding of how linguistic and cultural variables shape pedagogical decisions. In light of the preceding discussion, this study is guided by the following three research questions:

1. What are the beliefs of the Chinese and Spanish teachers regarding written corrective feedback (WCF) in the context of Spanish as a Foreign Language (SFL)?
2. What specific types of WCF do the two teachers provide, and how do their feedback strategies reflect their beliefs?
3. What specific types of WCF do the two teachers provide, and how do their feedback strategies reflect their beliefs?

Method

Context and Participants

Context

Research conducted in China has examined the progressive development of SFL instruction over recent decades. According to Han (2021), the evolution of Chinese SFL education can be categorised into two principal historical phases, beginning with its inception during the 1960s and continuing into the early years of the 21st century. Following the establishment of the People's Republic of China, the initial impetus for incorporating SFL into educational programmes was rooted in strengthening diplomatic relations with international partners. As Spanish holds the status of a United Nations official language and ranks as the fourth most widely spoken language globally, key academic institutions in Beijing and Shanghai began integrating Spanish into their curricular frameworks.

The second developmental phase coincided with China's era of economic liberalisation and increasing global engagement, during which foreign language education shifted towards promoting intercultural communication (Wei, 2023). A significant policy change occurred in 2018 when Spanish was officially introduced as a mandatory subject within the national high school curriculum. This policy recognised Spanish as one of the six standardised foreign languages permitted for selection in the national university entrance examination. To assess undergraduate Spanish proficiency at the university level, two national qualification tests were established: the National Spanish Proficiency Examinations for Undergraduate Students (EEE-4 and EEE-8). These assessments were modelled on the DELE (Diploma of Spanish as a Foreign Language) and serve as benchmarks for determining linguistic competence. Specifically, EEE-4 corresponds approximately to the B1–B2 levels of the DELE framework, while EEE-8 aligns with DELE levels B2–C1. For the purposes of this study, these certification standards were employed to evaluate participants' proficiency in Spanish.

Participants

This study involved two volunteer instructors, comprising one native Spanish speaker and one native Chinese speaker. The first participant, referred to as Teacher Q, possesses five years of experience in teaching Spanish at a Chinese university. She completed her Spanish language education entirely in China and subsequently obtained formal pedagogical training under the supervision of Teacher M at the University of Barcelona, where she pursued a master's degree in Teaching SFL. In addition, she has accumulated two years of teaching experience specifically focused on instructing Chinese-speaking learners of Spanish.

The student sample comprised 21 university volunteers, including 14 female and 7 male participants. For data collection, students were instructed to compose two written texts in Spanish. A survey was also administered to evaluate the students' Spanish language proficiency, their perceptions of writing courses in Spanish, and their attitudes towards receiving written feedback on assignments. According to the survey results, 61.9% of participants held the EEE-4 certification, while 52.38% had achieved B2-level qualifications and 14.29% had reached C1-level certification. A small proportion (4.76%) had registered for the designated proficiency examinations and were awaiting their results. Overall, the participants demonstrated solid proficiency in Spanish, encompassing grammar and vocabulary competence, strong reading and listening comprehension, and effective writing capabilities.

Procedure and Data Collection Instruments

Data were gathered over a two-month period through a combination of interviews and written assignments. The initial phase of the research concentrated on collecting and analysing student texts that had been corrected by the two instructors. These writing tasks provided insight into students' capabilities by revealing what they understood, what they were able to accomplish, and whether they could recall and apply knowledge in written form. Furthermore, the corrected texts offered indirect evidence regarding the evaluators' perspectives and their criteria for assessing effective writing (Said & Mouzrati, 2018).

To facilitate this process, a writing assignment was developed based on the typologies used in both the EEE-8 and DELE examinations. Students were instructed to produce two letters, each reflecting a distinct register. The first letter required informal language, while the second necessitated a formal tone, with a minimum word count of 220 for each text. The task was distributed via email, and students were allotted 15 days to complete and return their submissions. Upon receiving the completed texts, the instructor assigned identification numbers and forwarded them to the two instructors for correction. After the revisions were completed, the full data set for the study was assembled. In total, each teacher assessed 42 written texts, resulting in 84 corrected samples comprising the primary data corpus.

Research interviews played a significant role in the data collection process, as they are widely employed in both qualitative and quantitative investigations. Their inherent flexibility makes them particularly suitable for writing-related research by allowing the collection of nuanced perspectives on attitudes towards writing, instructional approaches, learning strategies, and theoretical frameworks (Said & Mouzrati, 2018). The analysis of the two teachers' instructional beliefs was based on two written, semi-structured interview protocols. These instruments were designed to gather detailed information concerning pedagogical strategies and error correction practices prior to the evaluation of student texts.

Data Analysis

The analytical phase involved a detailed examination of the WCF types and the content derived from the interview data. A comparative analysis between the interview responses and the corrected student texts allowed the researchers to identify areas of alignment and divergence between the beliefs held by the Spanish instructors and the practical approaches employed by the Chinese educators.

Analysis of WCF Types

During the analysis of the corrected texts, ATLAS.Ti 9.0 software was employed. For this purpose, all 84 student submissions, including the revisions provided by both teachers, were uploaded into the software. The 42 texts evaluated by Teacher Q were compiled into one project, whereas the remaining 42 texts corrected by María were organised into a separate project. Categories were established in accordance with Ellis (2009), accompanied by illustrative examples drawn from the data collected in this study:

1. Direct Feedback (DF): This form of feedback occurs when the teacher directly intervenes in the student's writing by correcting the identified errors. Within the analysis, three principal types of direct feedback were recognised:

Deleting the Incorrect Part and Writing the Correct Version.

Example 1

Student: (in spanish) …*algunas personas mayores lavan su ropa en el río para ahorrar electricidad de la lavadora.*

Teacher: …*algunas personas mayores lavan su ropa en el río para ahorrar electricidad en ~~de~~ la lavadora.*

Example 2

Student: (in spanish)*Y mucha gente tomaba el sol y jugaba voleibol en la playa.*

Teacher: ***Había** y mucha gente **tomando** tomaba el sol y **jugando** jugaba voleibol en la playa.*

Inserting words directly (e.g., adding an article when the student has omitted it).

Example 3

Student: *Las tareas de universida*

Teacher: *Las tareas de **la** universidad*

Example 4

Student: *Incluso pequeñas partículas negras flotan en el aire.*

Teacher: *Incluso **hay** pequeñas partículas negras que flotan en el aire.*

Directly deleting a word/phrase or part of it.

Example 5

Student: *la conciencia de clasificación de la bausura*

Teacher: *la conciencia de clasificación de la basura*

1. Indirect Feedback (IF): This form of feedback takes place when the teacher offers an overall evaluation along with suggestions for enhancing the student's future writing, typically presented at the conclusion of the text.

Example 6

Feedback: The overall composition of the first essay is fairly coherent, demonstrating accurate word selection and appropriate tense usage across the various sections. The second essay adheres to a generally conventional structure. Nonetheless, several concerns remain evident:
   1. The verb-object combinations do not conform to standard Spanish usage and appear to be significantly influenced by Chinese linguistic patterns.
   2. The sentence constructions are repetitive, exhibiting limited structural variation.
   3. The logical progression in the second essay requires further refinement, as the linkage between ideas lacks sufficient coherence.

   1) Metalinguistic Feedback (MF): This occurs when the teacher uses codes to mark errors in or alongside the text. In the collected data, MF mainly appears in the form of suggestions and/or comments regarding specific errors.

Example 7

Student: *… las condiciones climáticas aquí son muy adedcuadas para la vida de los árboles*

Teacher: *… las condiciones climáticas aquí son muy adedcuadas para la vida de los árboles*
(VE= Vocabulary Error)

   2) Reformulation: This occurs when the teacher modifies the text by rewriting either an entire sentence or a portion of it.

Example 8

Student: *Hacía mucho tiempo que no nos veíamos.*

Teacher: *Llevamos mucho tiempo sin vernos.*

Example 9

Student: *Fui muy alegre que recibiera tu carta.*

Teacher: *¡Qué alegría recibir tu carta!*

Analysis of Interviews

Qualitative research methods are characterised by their diversity, intricacy, and depth (Holloway & Todres, 2003). Among these, thematic analysis is recognised as a fundamental analytical technique, valued for its adaptability and capacity to yield comprehensive and nuanced interpretations of qualitative data. Holloway & Todres (2003) delineate six sequential phases of thematic analysis, which were employed in this study to examine the interview responses of the two participating teachers.

Phases of Thematic Analysis (adapted from Braun & Clarke (2006)).

Phases

   1. Familiarising Yourself with the Collected Data

2. Generating Initial Codes
3. Searching for Themes
4. Reviewing Themes
5. Defining and Naming Themes
6. Producing the Report

The analysis offers valuable insights into the teachers' views on L2 writing, their instructional experiences, and their attitudes towards WCF. The examples presented below illustrate the second phase of the interview analysis, during which preliminary codes were generated as part of the coding process.

Example 10

Table 1 presents the findings from the interviews, offering critical insights into the instructional beliefs of both native Spanish teachers and non-native SFL instructors. The native teacher places strong emphasis on formal training and linguistic competence, shaping a favourable view of native speakers' advantages in language instruction. Conversely, the non-native teacher considers writing to be a crucial tool for assessing learners' language proficiency. These educators demonstrate distinct pedagogical values, shaped by their respective cultural and linguistic backgrounds, which influence their feedback strategies and lesson planning for Sino-speaking learners. According to Braun & Clarke (2006), a theme highlights a significant aspect of the data in relation to the research questions, thereby contributing to answering them. During the second phase of analysis, themes were systematically identified to structure the interview content and extract relevant information, thereby deepening understanding of the teachers' beliefs. In this research, thematic analysis facilitated the identification and comparison of beliefs and practices concerning the teaching of Spanish writing and WCF. Furthermore, it allowed for the exploration of whether variations exist between the beliefs and instructional approaches of the two teachers, considering their differing cultural and educational backgrounds.

Table 1: *Data Extraction from Interview.*

Extract from Interview Data	Analysis
…*decidí cursar el Máster de Español como Segunda Lengua, porque al ser nativa* (una nativa que lee mucho y se expresa muy bien, por cierto) *sabía que este tipo de enseñanza se ajustaba a mi perfil…* (M) "*I decided to pursue the Master's in Spanish as a Second Language because, as a native speaker* (a native who reads a lot and expresses herself very well, by the way), *I knew this type of teaching suited my profile…*" (author's translation)	1. Specific training. 2. Positive evaluation of being a native teacher.
西班牙语写作是从整体上检验学生西班牙语语言水平和衡量学生西班牙语语言能力的重要手段. (Q) "*Spanish writing is an essential means to comprehensively assess students' Spanish language proficiency and measure their Spanish language skills.*" (author's translation)	1. The importance of writing in L2. 2. Writing reflects the student's level of competence in Spanish.

Findings

What are the beliefs of the Chinese and Spanish teachers regarding WCF in the context of SFL?

The first research question explores the beliefs held by SFL instructors concerning WCF. Thematic analysis of the interview data with the two teachers reveals that both hold favourable attitudes toward the use of WCF. For instance, when María was asked to share her perspective on WCF, she expressed the following response:

"Of course, it is very important, and the teacher should also add a comment and suggestion, motivating the student (even if the text is not particularly good) to keep improving and writing." (M) (author's translation)

In other words, for M, the act of offering feedback is deemed essential. Through the process of correction, she seeks to cultivate a constructive attitude in students towards their mistakes, encouraging them to perceive errors as opportunities for growth. In contrast, Q expressed the following views concerning WCF:

"Teacher feedback should be constructive and helpful for student learning; that is, the role of WCF from teachers is like that of a guide in the students' learning process." (author's translation)

Regarding the methods of delivering WCF, M explained that she generally corrects all errors within a text, including elements that appear unusual or awkward to her. In contrast, Q identified four specific aspects

that she considers essential for correction. These differing approaches reflect two distinct feedback strategies: M employs an unfocused feedback method, whereas Q adopts a focused feedback approach.

Q's final correction category, "basic knowledge", refers to the broader educational context in which Chinese students study Spanish. According to her, learning Spanish entails not only acquiring linguistic competence but also engaging with the cultural, historical, literary, and geographical knowledge of Spain or Latin America. As a result, Chinese instructors, such as Q, also address content-related inaccuracies during the correction process.

What specific types of WCF do the two teachers provide, and how do their feedback strategies reflect their beliefs?

In summarising the types of WCF provided by the teachers, it is evident that M offered a total of 1,574 instances of WCF. As detailed in the Table 2, M predominantly employed direct feedback (DF), which constituted 93.84% of the total feedback provided. Reformulation made up 3.24% of the instances, while metalinguistic feedback (MF) accounted for 2.92%. Notably, M did not utilise any form of indirect feedback (IF) throughout the text correction process. With respect to the categories of WCF provided by Q, the analysis identified 554 instances in total. As indicated in Table 2, DF emerged as the predominant type, representing 67.33% of all feedback delivered. IF accounted for 2.53%, whereas MF and reformulation constituted 26.35% and 3.79%, respectively.

Table 2: *Distribution of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) Types.*

Type of WCF	FD	FI	FM	Reformulation	Total
Number	1 477	0	46	51	1574
Percentage	93,84%	0	2,92%	3,24%	100%

Based on the analysis presented in Table 3, it may be concluded that both teachers tend to rely heavily on direct correction of student errors within their written work. The key distinction between the two lies in their application of MF and reformulation, with M exhibiting significantly lower usage of these feedback types than Q. Notably, MF accounts for 26.35% of Q's feedback, compared to only 2.92% in M's case. Furthermore, M did not employ IF at all, whereas Q incorporated it into her corrective strategy.

Table 3: *Distribution of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) Types.*

Type of WCF	FD	FI	FM	Reformulation	Total
Number	373	14	146	21	554
Percentage	67,33%	2,53%	26,35%	3,79%	100%

An additional point of divergence is Q's provision of general end-of-text evaluations in fourteen cases. These evaluations do not address specific errors but offer summarised reflections or guidance, such as commentary on the student's overall writing ability or areas requiring improvement. These remarks are intended to encourage self-assessment, a component absent from M's feedback. Conversely, M includes positive WCF, which is not observed in Q's corrections. For instance, as illustrated in Example 11, M acknowledged the correct use of the pronoun "soy yo" by the student, affirming its appropriateness and justifying her approval. This instance of affirmative feedback exemplifies a supportive approach that is not mirrored in Q's annotations.

Example 11

Student's Sentence: *Tan sanos y vigorosos ellos, que a menudo creo que soy yo mucho más vieja que ellos*.

Teacher's Comment: Although in Spanish the pronoun is not necessary (because it can be identified through the verb), in this case, it is necessary because you are emphasizing: *soy YO mucho más vieja que ellos*. (I *am much older than them.* Emphasizing *I* with *"soy YO"*) (M) (author's translation)

What specific types of WCF do the two teachers provide, and how do their feedback strategies reflect their beliefs?

In response to Question 3, the comparative analysis of the corrected student texts and interview data suggests a strong alignment between the teachers' expressed beliefs regarding WCF and their actual instructional practices. As shown in Table 5, the cross-referencing of the teachers' stated views from the interviews with their actions during the correction process confirms this consistency. Both instructors appear to hold similar perspectives on the function of feedback, particularly in its role in supporting student improvement in writing. Nevertheless, a notable divergence is observed in their methods: M often included suggested alternatives—such as substitute words or phrases—when correcting student work, a practice that is absent in Q's feedback.

Discussion

The first research question explored the beliefs of teachers concerning WCF. Findings suggest that both instructors perceive feedback as a crucial element in facilitating students' acquisition of L2 writing skills.

Pedagogical feedback may be categorised as either positive or negative. Within educational theory, positive feedback is viewed as essential for sustaining student motivation and engagement in the learning process (Yunus, 2020). Conversely, negative feedback serves to highlight errors, supply correct linguistic forms, or offer metalinguistic explanations (Adzhar & Sazalli, 2024). The data reveal that M not only addresses errors but also incorporates affirmative comments aimed at encouraging students to continue making progress. In contrast, Q's approach primarily focuses on the correction of errors, with limited use of positive reinforcement. This variation may be attributed to cultural and national factors, which are often interlinked and significantly shape pedagogical beliefs (Mao et al., 2024). Bao (2019) posits that traditional Chinese educational paradigms influence local teachers' perspectives, assigning them the role of knowledge transmitters and monitors of student learning. Within this framework, the reduction of errors is interpreted as a key marker of educational advancement. Nonetheless, other researchers advocate for a more supportive stance toward student errors, suggesting that such an approach fosters learner motivation and enhances classroom outcomes (Bima, Sunendar, & Darmawangsa, 2024).

In response to the second research question, which investigates the types of WCF adopted by the teachers, the study confirms that DF is the predominant method utilised by both, whereas IF appears only minimally. This outcome corroborates the findings of Nguyen & Chu (2024), who reported that learners respond more positively and effectively to DF than to IF in the context of L2 writing. A notable strategy employed by M involves offering alternative lexical or syntactic choices, thereby broadening students' linguistic repertoires. This technique aligns with DF principles, as it not only rectifies errors but also instructs learners on potential linguistic improvements (Wulf, 2021). Interestingly, M sometimes offers alternative suggestions even when students' responses are correct, aiming to introduce more appropriate expressions or expand vocabulary. Although these instances are categorised as DF due to the inclusion of correct forms, they also prompt reflection typical of IF. This hybrid nature warrants further research for clearer classification.

The third research question considered similarities and differences between the beliefs and instructional practices of the Spanish and Chinese teachers. Results demonstrate that the beliefs of both educators align closely with their classroom practices. This outcome supports the conclusion of Esmaeeli & Sadeghi (2020), who found congruence between belief and practice among adult English language instructors. Nevertheless, other studies have documented mismatches. For instance, Mao & Crosthwaite (2019) reported inconsistencies between Spanish English teachers' stated views and their actual classroom practices. Likewise, research on L2 instruction in Chinese contexts has revealed disparities in belief-practice alignment, with contributing factors including professional experience, academic training, and perceptions of student capabilities (Goldouz & Baleghizadeh, 2021). A key point of divergence concerns the teachers' orientations toward WCF. The Spanish instructor views feedback as a motivational tool designed to inspire continued learner engagement, whereas the Chinese teacher regards it as a directive mechanism aimed at minimising error frequency. This distinction likely reflects underlying cultural differences embedded within each educational system.

Conclusion

The findings of this study indicate that SLF teachers hold shared beliefs regarding the value and necessity of WCF in facilitating L2 acquisition among learners. The analysis demonstrates that DF is the most prevalently employed form of feedback, whereas IF is the least utilised. Although the general categories of WCF used by both teachers show similarities, variations exist in terms of their perceptions regarding which specific errors warrant correction. This research enhances understanding of how SLF teachers, particularly those operating within differing cultural frameworks, rationalise their use of WCF and illustrates the significant influence of teacher beliefs on instructional practices. While the beliefs and behaviours of the two teachers examined here appear largely aligned, it is acknowledged that such consistency may not always be observed. Consequently, further investigation is necessary to examine these dynamics in broader and more diverse educational contexts. However, certain limitations must be acknowledged. The small sample size restricts the generalisability of the findings. Furthermore, reliance on a single interview per participant limits the capacity to fully validate the teachers' expressed beliefs after comparison with the textual data. Lastly, this study focuses solely on teachers' perspectives and practices, omitting learners' views on the feedback received, which represents an important area for future exploration.

References

Adzhar, N. B., & Sazalli, N. A. H. (2024). Written Corrective Feedback in the ESL Classroom: A Systematic Analysis of Teachers' Beliefs, Students' Perceptions, and Preferences. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development, 13*(1), 1263-1289. doi: https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i1/20719

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

82, 140-150. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.004

Barcelos, A. M. F. (2024). The relationship between beliefs and practice in language teaching education. *Educational Role of Language Journal, 1*(11), 93-104. doi: https://doi.org/10.36534/erlj.2024.01.08

Bima, A. J. A., Sunendar, D., & Darmawangsa, D. (2024). The Effects of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on French Writing Skills: A Comparative Study. *International Journal of Education, 17*(1), 79-88. doi: https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v17i1.59427

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. doi: https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Cheng, X., & Zhang, L. J. (2021). Sustaining University English as a Foreign Language Learners' Writing Performance through Provision of Comprehensive Written Corrective Feedback. *Sustainability, 13*(15), 8192. doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/su13158192

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal: An Open Access Refereed Journal for World Language Educators, 1*(1), 3-18. doi: https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054

Esmaeeli, M., & Sadeghi, K. (2020). The Effect of Direct Versus Indirect Focused Written Corrective Feedback on Developing EFL Learners' Written and Oral Skills. *Language Related Research, 11*(5), 89-124. doi: https://doi.org/10.29252/LRR.11.5.124

Gao, Y., Wang, Q., & Wang, X. (2024). Exploring EFL university teachers' beliefs in integrating ChatGPT and other large language models in language education: a study in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 44*(1), 29-44. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2024.2305173

Goldouz, E., & Baleghizadeh, S. (2021). Exploring Tensions Between Novice and Experienced EFL Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback Beliefs and Practices. *Language Related Research, 12*(3), 347-376. doi: https://doi.org/10.29252/LRR.12.3.12

Guo, T. (2023). The Impact of Written Corrective Feedback on Enhancing Second Language Writing Skills: A Comprehensive Review. *International Journal of Education and Humanities, 3*(3), 280-287. doi: https://doi.org/10.58557/(ijeh).v3i3.132

Han, F. (2021). Analysis of Spanish Teaching Mode under Internet. In *2021 4th International Conference on Information Systems and Computer Aided Education* (pp. 938-942). Association for Computing Machinery. doi: https://doi.org/10.1145/3482632.3483055

Hidayah, N., Suparno, S., & Haryati, S. (2021). EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices in Using Teacher Written Corrective Feedback on Students' Writing. *English Education, 10*(1), 1-12. doi: https://doi.org/10.20961/ee.v10i1.53294

Holloway, I., & Todres, L. (2003). The Status of Method: Flexibility, Consistency and Coherence. *Qualitative Research, 3*(3), 345-357. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794103033004

Hyland, K. (2019). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://ueaeprints.uea.ac.uk/id/eprint/69309

Jin, Z. (2024). A Study on the Influence of Language Environment on English Writing Ability in Universities-Based on the Theory of Second Language Acquisition. *Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media, 64*, 35-46. doi: https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/64/20240957

Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. *Language Teaching Research, 24*(4), 519-539. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469

Kazmi, M. A., Yousaf, A., & Habib, R. (2021). Exploring the Relationship between Instructional Practice and Pedagogic Beliefs of University Teachers. *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences, 9*(3), 122-132. doi: https://doi.org/10.21015/vtess.v9i3.657

Krogager Andersen, L. (2021). Three perspectives on the role of teacher beliefs in the language classroom. *Apples: Journal of Applied Language Studies, 15*(2), 71-92. doi: https://doi.org/10.47862/apples.103078

Liao, Y., & Zhang, W. (2022). Corrective feedback, individual differences in working memory, and L2 development. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 811748. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.811748

Lim, S. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in Writing Instruction: A Meta-Analysis. *Tesl-Ej, 24*(3), n3. Retrieved from https://tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume24/ej95/ej95a3

Mao, S. S., & Crosthwaite, P. (2019). Investigating written corrective feedback:(Mis) alignment of teachers' beliefs and practice. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 45*, 46-60. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.05.004

Mao, Z., Lee, I., & Li, S. (2024). Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Writing: A Synthesis of Naturalistic Classroom Studies. *Language Teaching, 57*(4), 449-477. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000393

Mathew, B. P. (2021). Effects of Strategy-Based Instruction on Low Proficiency Omani ESL Learners' Acquisition of Writing Skills. *English Language Teaching, 14*(6), 36-42. doi: https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n6p36

Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2021). *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. Cambridge University Press. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789

Nguyen, H. M., & Chu, T. A. (2024). Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Writing: A Review of Research. *Reflections, 31*(2), 858-870. doi: https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v31i2.275269

Said, K., & Mouzrati, A. E. (2018). Investigating Teacher Written Corrective Feedback as a Formative Assessment Tool. *Arab World English Journal, 9*(4), 232-241. doi: https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no4.17

Sun, H., & QI, W. (2022). Effects of Written Corrective Feedback on College EFL Students' Writing Accuracy and Linguistic Knowledge Acquisition. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 45*(3), 445-461. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/CJAL-2022-0310

Tajeddin, Z., & Bolouri, M. (2023). Decision Making in English Language Teaching: Unpacking Novice Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly, 33*, 115-131. doi: https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2023.33.06

Tatto, M. T. (2019). The Influence of Teacher Education on Teacher Beliefs. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford University Press. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.747

Thompson, M., & Abroampa, W. K. (2019). A Multi-Case Study of Instructional Decision-Making Processes of Teachers in Kindergarten Classrooms in the Cape Coast Metropolis. *Research Journal of Education, 5*(6), 91-98. doi: https://doi.org/10.32861/rje.56.91.98

Viswanathan, U. (2019). Understanding the Relationship Between Second Language Teacher Beliefs and Their Instructional Practices: A Case Study of Core French Teachers. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 22*(1), 26-59. doi: https://doi.org/10.7202/1060905ar

Watson, S. (2019). Revisiting Teacher Decision Making in the Mathematics Classroom: A Multidisciplinary Approach. In *Eleventh Congress of the European Society for Research in Mathematics Education*. Freudenthal Group; Freudenthal Institute; ERME. Retrieved from https://hal.science/hal-02430233v1

Wei, X. (2023). The Situation, Policies, and Development of Foreign Language Education in Contemporary China. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Research, 7*(8), 135-143. doi: https://doi.org/10.26689/jcer.v7i8.5225

Wulf, D. J. (2021). When Written Corrective Feedback Is Ineffective in Second-Language Grammar Acquisition. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 11*(4), 577-592. doi: https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2021.114044

Yunus, W. N. M. W. M. (2020). Written Corrective Feedback in English Compositions: Teachers' Practices and Students' Expectations. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal, 3*(2), 95-107. doi: https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v3i2.2255

Zhang, X., Kubota, K., Kubota, M., & Li, K. (2020). Designing blended learning environments with thinking tool strategies: examining a Chinese teacher's decision-making and beliefs. *Interactive Learning Environments, 29*(2), 301-314. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1848874

Zhu, A. (2021). Language Acquisition and Anxiety: Writing Anxiety Impedes Better Learning. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research, 4*(3), 427-431. doi: https://doi.org/10.6918/IJOSSER.202103_4(3).0064

Zou, B. (2022). An Investigation of the Relationship Between Shanghai Preschool Teachers' Developmentally Appropriate Beliefs and Practices. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Seminar on Education Research and Social Science (ISERSS 2021)* (pp. 110-113). Atlantis Press. doi: https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220107.020