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

Xindi Li[a]* ID, Marilisa Birello[b] ID

[a] PhD candidate, Department of Language, Literature and Social Sciences, School of Education, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain. Email; xindi.li@autonoma.cat

[b] Department of Language, Literature and Social Sciences, School of Education, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain. Email: marilisa.birello@uab.cat

Abstract

The study investigates the characteristics of written corrective feedback (WCF) as it relates to the beliefs of teachers of Spanish as a Foreign Language (SFL) and their actual teaching approaches. The main objective of this investigation involves understanding teacher beliefs about WCF along with identifying different WCF delivery methods while determining the match or mismatch between their beliefs and actual instructional approaches. The study uses qualitative approaches to evaluate student work and conduct semi-structured interviews to study feedback delivery methods. The study gathered written texts from a sample of 21 students and interview data from two SFL teachers. The data was analyzed within the Atlas Ti 9.0 software while applying the thematic content analysis technique. The analysis reveals direct feedback occurs as the teachers' primary choice while they employ indirect feedback relatively infrequently. The teachers strongly support that WCF serves as vital instruction for students to acquire a second language (L2) while their approach aligns with their teachings. The findings open new avenues about the research inquiries and the analysis of study boundaries in the WCF domain. The study contributes to understanding how cultural and professional backgrounds affect instructors' pedagogical choices.

Keywords: Written corrective feedback; Spanish as a foreign language; teacher beliefs and practices

Introduction

The study of second language acquisition has transformed educational methods mainly for writing instruction which stands among the most complex linguistic abilities. Writing showcases ability in linguistic competence alongside aptitude to organize complex ideas for effective communication (Hyland, 2019; Jin, 2024). According to (Binu, 2021), feedback about learners' writing skills stands as an essential element to assist them in developing better accuracy alongside coherence, while simultaneously advancing their overall proficiency level. Learning development via writing needs corrective feedback (CF), to address errors

effectively (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2021). There are two types of corrective feedback: oral corrective feedback (OCF) and written corrective feedback (WCF). The corrective nature of OCF in spoken dialogue enables teachers to provide immediate feedback, while WCF brings deep instructor feedback that generates enduring writing advancement. The WCF shows its educational merits by instructing students how to edit their work which produces enduring enhancements in their writing precision (Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Zhu, 2021).

Research-focused studies about WCF have investigated three principal dimensions namely, feedback scope (focused vs. comprehensive), feedback strategy (direct vs. indirect), and feedback orientation (positive vs. negative) (Hyland, 2019). Learners find focused WCF effective because it specifically addresses language errors while being less complex to process (Mao et al., 2024). Students with lower proficiency levels tend to become overwhelmed when provided with comprehensive feedback even though this type of feedback addresses numerous errors (Nguyen & Chu, 2024).

The current research primarily focuses on teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) without specific inquiry about Spanish as a Foreign Language (SFL) education in mainland China. Interestingly, the instructional practices of teachers are primarily influenced by belief components which include assumptions and values alongside teaching attitudes (Gao et al., 2024; Lim & Renandya, 2020). A collective analysis demonstrates teachers of different native origins exhibit different feedback preferences because their background culture influences their classroom teaching practices (Cheng & Zhang, 2021). Although a lot of research has been carried out in China about the expansion of SFL teaching during the past several decades. Additionally, to evaluate university Spanish level proficiency, national level Spanish exams were introduced such as the National Spanish Proficiency Exam for Undergraduate Students (EEE-4/8). These exams, similar to DELE (*Diplomas de Español como Lengua Extranjera* or Diploma of Spanish as a Foreign Language), certify students' Spanish proficiency levels, with EEE-4 roughly equivalent to DELE B1-B2 and EEE-8 aligned with DELE B2-C1. For this study, these certifications were used as a reference for assessing participants' Spanish proficiency.

In China, these exams evolved through two distinct historical phases from its initial development in the 1960s up to the early 21st century period according to (Han, 2021). After the establishment of China's People's Republic, the main reason for starting these exams was to build diplomatic ties with foreign nations, including Spain. In the second stage, marked by China's economic reforms and globalization, the objectives of foreign language education expanded toward fostering intercultural communication (Wei, 2023). Since 2018, the introduction of Spanish as a required subject in national high school curriculum established Spanish among the six standardized foreign languages in the university entrance examination (Ministry of Education, 2018). Spanish holds dual UN official language status globally as the fourth most spoken language so major Chinese educational centers at Beijing and Shanghai began embracing Spanish educational programs.

Therefore, the study aimed to establish research connections through investigating the use of SFL, and teachers' perceptions about WCF delivery to Sino-speaking students. The study analyzed the teaching practices of a native Spanish instructor and a non-native Chinese educator. The study investigated teacher cognition together with instructional practices to advance knowledge of WCF within SFL classrooms which produces beneficial results for teaching effectiveness in linguistic and culturally diverse learning environments. This paper attempted to establish a link between SFL instructors' beliefs and their practices when delivering written instruction to Sino-speaking students.

In order to pursue a detailed understanding about the influence of lingua-cultural variables on educational choices by teachers, the study framed the following 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) How do teachers' feedback strategies reflect their beliefs, and what specific types of WCF are provided in this process? These questions are based on the premise that the increasing amount of academic work has failed to establish necessary understanding between cultural backgrounds of teachers and how these elements influence their teaching practices regarding WCF beliefs. It is hoped that this study would open new avenues towards understanding the teachers' beliefs about WCF and also how these beliefs are affected by their teaching strategies and practices.

Literature Review

Study of Teachers' Beliefs

Studies about teachers' beliefs and what they think began in the 1970s and the hypothesis that "what teachers think strongly informs and conditions what they do" began to shape research discussions regarding

teacher judgments together with decision-making and lesson planning (Tatto, 2019). (Watson, 2019) explains teachers' thinking as a series of proactive and post-active planning steps alongside interactive decisions and reflections occurring within classroom environments. Educational studies have identified teacher beliefs as their central subject because these beliefs create direct impacts on instructional practices (Mumuni & Abroampa, 2019). These studies on teacher beliefs initially focused on describing and categorizing teachers' beliefs along with studying their educational practice impacts. (Zhang et al., 2020), for instance, stressed that teachers' beliefs need understanding because they determine their teaching choices; likewise, (Tajeddin & Bolouri, 2023) presented the wisdom as an essential concept for teacher improvement. The early investigation of teacher beliefs provided fundamental knowledge that researchers used to develop more specific studies within educational environments.

The analysis of teachers' beliefs progressed after 2000 to incorporate their practical instructional methods. According to (Barcelos, 2024), beliefs maintained by teachers show individual components and adapt to specific educational contexts as well as cultural distinctiveness within educational systems. Diverse teacher beliefs create difficulties in developing universal belief definitions within research so investigators must carefully ground their approaches to study each case. Scientists have shown the vital importance of studying belief effects on teaching choices particularly in environments that utilize multiple languages (Zhang et al., 2020).

WCF in Foreign Language Writing

The WCF research field has developed two different feedback strategies that involve targeting specific error types and providing feedback for every error committed. This field functions as a vital teaching approach to help students acquire a second language through written corrective feedback. According to (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2021), WRF represents any communication from teachers which shows their recognition of student errors. The application of WCF to written texts means identifying structural mistakes alongside offers better clarity and measured flow constructs. Feedback can be delivered directly through teacher-provided correction or indirectly through actions that highlight errors but exclude explicit correction (Nguyen & Chu, 2024). (Karim & Nassaji, 2020) indicated that educators need to pick their feedback approach based on students' knowledge levels and their educational objectives. Focused feedback stands as the most effective instructional method for lower proficiency level language students.

Multiple studies demonstrate conflictive findings regarding the performance outcome of WCF. The usefulness of WCF has drawn scrutiny from (Lim & Renandya, 2020) because the strategy can reduce student motivation and deliver inconsistent positive results. The latest research shows WCF delivers advantageous impacts across brief as well as lasting time periods. Research by (Sun & QI, 2022) along with (Guo, 2023) and (Liao & Zhang, 2022) found that WCF implementation produced better writing accuracy and quality at various time intervals.

Teachers' Beliefs and Practices in WCF

Research describes the relationship between educator beliefs and instructional actions as complex and often counter to one another. Research by (Kazmi et al., 2021) demonstrates that teacher beliefs commonly reflect their classroom teaching methods, but some studies indicate opposite findings. Teachers' beliefs often fail to translate into classroom actions due to contextual limitations identified by (Viswanathan, 2019) which include time restrictions and curriculum requirements and individual student specificity. The way teachers deliver feedback strategies depends directly on their beliefs within the WCF domain. Recent studies through multiple research settings have discovered connections between teacher beliefs and their feedback implementation practices while uncovering how experience and training levels alongside cultural norms impact these relationships (Hidayah et al., 2021; Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019). Teacher approaches to WCF differ between native and non-native instructors because their cultural and linguistic foundations differ. Researchers must analyze teachers' beliefs and practices through contextual analysis because of this important discovery.

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

Academic research into native and non-native teacher evaluations has become increasingly popular. Language errors receive more tolerance from native teachers than non-native teachers according to (Krogager Andersen, 2021) therefore affecting their methods of feedback delivery. The substantial divergences between native and non-native English as Foreign Language (EFL) teachers concerning their views about written CF purposes and extent. Multiple environmental conditions determine the impact of feedback practices and

capabilities. (Zou, 2022) state that educational restrictions including standardized testing schedules together with time constraints limit the execution of particular feedback methodologies. All evaluations of native and non-native instructors require detailed examination of their particular teaching environments.

Methodology

Research Design

The study utilized a qualitative research design, with a thematic content analysis of the data collected from primary sources in this type of design, themes are captured with respect to the research questions to seek their answers (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In the current context, the thematic analysis facilitated identifying and comparing beliefs and practices related to the teaching of Spanish writing and WCF, as well as determining whether there are differences between the beliefs and practices of the sampled teachers due to their diverse cultural and educational backgrounds.

Sampling

The sample comprised two bilingual teachers who spoke and wrote Chinese and Spanish fluently. The first informant, a Chinese native (Teacher Q), brings five years of expertise in Spanish teaching at a Chinese university. Her education in Spanish and formal teachers training took place entirely in China. The second informant, a Spanish native (Teacher M), studied her master's program in Teaching Spanish as a Foreign Language (TSFL) at the University of Barcelona, and possessed two years of instructing Spanish to Chinese-speaking students. The sample also included 21 university students consisting of 14 females and 7 males, who participated in a survey that aimed to figure out their Spanish fluency level and their opinions regarding Spanish writing classes as well as their thoughts on receiving feedback on written assignments. Of the surveyed students, 61.9% held EEE-4 Spanish proficiency certification; 52.38% who had passed B2 level; (according to the CEFR); 14.29% who had C1 level certification. Only a small group consisting of 4.76% had enrolled in one of the specified language exams and were awaiting their outcome. All the participants demonstrated proficient Spanish skills including vocabulary and grammar knowledge together with strong abilities in both written and oral comprehension and fluent writing abilities.

Data Collection Instruments and Procedure

The data were collected over a two-month period through written texts and semi-structured interviews. The first part of the research focused on collecting and analyzing the written texts. A writing task was designed following the typology of the EEE-8 and DELE exams, requiring students to write two texts in Spanish that adhered to specific criteria like students' Spanish fluency level and their opinions regarding Spanish writing classes as well as their thoughts on receiving feedback on written assignments. These written tasks required students to create two letters using different registers as the first part featured an informal example while the second part demanded a formal correspondence of at least 220 words each. Students received the writing task by email which they needed to finish within 15 days before returning it to the instructor. The teacher received the completed assignments after which they were numbered then sent for correction work by the two teachers. After receiving the corrected texts, the data corpus for the research was finalized. Each teacher thus corrected all 42 texts and gave their feedbacks, resulting in a total of 84 corrected texts constituting the data set for this study. Through these writing tasks, information was obtained about students' skills, revealing what they know, what they can do, or whether they are able to recall information in writing. These tasks also indirectly provided information about the evaluators' behavior and their judgments regarding good writing (Said & Mouzrati, 2018).

The semi-structured interviews served as a major data collection tool to analyze two teachers' educational beliefs. The interview protocol concentrated on obtaining information regarding teaching strategies and correction methods for texts before the text correction phase. In such types of research involving native-foreign language dichotomy, in both quantitative and qualitative studies, interviews prove a useful instrument for their flexibility and researchers' ability to collect valuable insights about writing-related attitudes and teaching practices and learning approaches and theoretical choice decisions (Said & Mouzrati, 2018).

Data Analysis

The data analysis stage included examination of both written corrective feedback types and interview content from the gathered data. A comparison between interview outcomes and corrected text data enabled researchers to observe various aspects which matched and diverged between Spanish teacher beliefs and Chinese teacher practices. During the analysis of the corrected texts, ATLAS.Ti 9.0 software was used. For

this purpose, all the 84 student texts, along with the corrections made by the two teachers, were input into the software. Specifically, 42 texts reviewed by Teacher Q were grouped into one project, while the other 42 texts corrected by Teacher M were grouped into a separate project. These texts were examined in two stages (Ellis 2009), supported by examples: first, Direct Feedback (DF), which occurs when the teacher intervenes in the student's text and directly corrects their errors; second, Indirect Feedback (IF), which occurs when the teacher provides general evaluation and suggestions for improvement for the students' future writing at the end of the text.

During the second phase of data analysis, the interview transcripts were systematically organized to extract the desired information and gain insights into the teachers' beliefs. This process involved a qualitative approach, diverse, complex, and nuanced (Holloway & Todres, 2003), leading to searching themes and analyzing them. Specifically, this procedure required six phases of data analysis (adapted from (Braun & Clarke, 2006)): (1) Familiarizing yourself with the collected data (2) Generating initial codes (3) Searching for themes (4) Reviewing themes (5) Defining and naming themes, and (6) Producing the report. This type of qualitative analysis proves a flexible and useful research tool that has the potential to provide a rich, detailed, yet complex description of data.

Results

With the application of ATLAS.Ti 9.0 software, all 42 student texts were examined by both teachers, accounting to 84 corrected texts. These texts were input into the software. The 42 texts reviewed by teacher Q were grouped into one project, while the other 42 texts corrected by Teacher M were grouped into a separate project. These texts were examined at two levels, as recommended by (Ellis, 2009) (1) Direct Feedback (DF): This occurs when the teacher intervenes in the student's text and directly corrects their errors; Indirect Feedback (IF): This occurs when the teacher provides general evaluation and suggestions for improvement for the students' future writing at the end of the text.

Direct Feedback (DF) (with examples). During the DF stage, the following three main forms of feedback were identified:

Deleting the incorrect part and writing the correct version.

Student: (in Spanish) …*algunas personas mayores lavan su ropa en el río para ahorrar electricidad de la lavadora.* [Some elderly people wash their clothes in the river to save electricity from the washing machine].
Teacher: …*algunas personas mayores lavan su ropa en el río para ahorrar electricidad en **de** la lavadora.* [Some elderly people wash their clothes in the river to save electricity **on** the washing machine].
Student: *Y mucha gente tomaba el sol y jugaba voleibol en la playa.* [And many people were sunbathing and playing volleyball on the beach].
Teacher: *Había y mucha gente **tomando** tomaba el sol y **jugando** jugaba voleibol en la playa.* [There were lots of people sunbathing and playing volleyball on the beach].

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

Student: *Las tareas de Universidad* [University assignments].
Teacher: *Las tareas de **la** Universidad* [The University assignments].
Student: *Incluso pequeñas partículas negras flotan en el aire.* [Even small black particles float in the air].
Teacher: *Incluso **hay** pequeñas partículas negras que flotan en el aire.* [There are even tiny black particles floating in the air].

Directly deleting a word/phrase or part of it

Student: *la conciencia de clasificación de la bausura*
Teacher: *la conciencia de clasificación de la **basura***
[the awareness of garbage classification].

Indirect Feedback (IF) (with examples). During the IF stage the teacher provides general evaluation and suggestions for improvement for the students' future writing at the end of the text. It was reported that the overall writing of the first essay was relatively smooth, with accurate word choices and appropriate use of tenses in each section. The second essay followed a relatively standard structure. However, the following issues remained:

1. The pairing of verbs with their objects does not align with Spanish language conventions and is heavily influenced by Chinese.

2.   Sentence structures are monotonous and lack variety.
3.   The logical flow of the second essay needs further improvement, as the connection between ideas is not cohesive enough.

Additionally, another type of feedback noticed was Metalinguistic Feedback (MF), which occurs when the teacher uses codes to mark errors in or alongside the text or provides a reformulation. In the collected data, MF mainly appears in the form of suggestions and/or comments regarding specific errors.

Student: … *las condiciones climáticas aquí son muy adedcuadas para la vida de los árboles*
Teacher: … *las condiciones climáticas aquí son muy **adecuadas** para la vida de los árboles*
[The weather conditions here are very suitable]. (VE= Vocabulary Error; ***adecuadas***)

Reformulation is also seen when the teacher intervenes in the text by rewriting an entire sentence or part of a sentence.

Student: *Hacía mucho tiempo que no nos veíamos.* [It's been a long time since we last saw each other].
Teacher: *Llevamos mucho tiempo sin vernos.* [We haven't seen each other for a long time].
Student: *Fui muy alegre que recibiera tu carta.* [I was very glad to receive your letter].
Teacher: *¡Qué alegría recibir tu carta!* [What a joy to receive your letter!]

Likewise, the interview analysis provided insights into teachers' perspectives on L2 writing, experiences in teaching practices, and opinions on WCF. Table 1 presents two examples extracted from the interview transcripts.

Table 1: *Extraction from Interview transcripts*

Teachers' Perspective	Meaning & 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…"	1. Specific training was received by the teacher 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."	1. The teacher understands the importance of writing in L2 2. Writing reflects the students' level of competence in Spanish

Table 1 provides a glimpse of the beliefs and perspectives of native Spanish teachers and non-native SFL teachers, as reflected in their teaching practices. Through emphasis on formal training along with linguistic competence, the native teacher builds up positive perceptions about a native speaker's advantages. However, writing stands out as an essential language assessment tool for the non-native teacher who uses it to evaluate student proficiency. The teachers bring diverse instructional values which stem from their linguistic and cultural foundations to influence how they give feedback and arrange their lessons for Sino-speaking students.

In the second phase of this study, the two research questions were analyzed. The first question states: *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)?* This question addresses the beliefs of SFL teachers regarding WCF. Through the thematic analysis of the interview transcripts, it was observed that both have a positive view of WCF. For example, when Teacher M was asked about her opinion on WCF, she responded: *"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."* (author's translation) In other words, for Teacher M, the process of providing teachers' feedback is very necessary. Through corrections, the teacher aims to foster a positive attitude in students toward errors, viewing them as opportunities for improvement.

On the other hand, Teacher Q, had the following thoughts regarding 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 ways of providing WCF, while Teacher M states that she is accustomed to correcting all the errors in the text, including points that seem odd to her, Teacher Q would identify key aspects to be corrected. These differing perspectives on WCF from the two teachers, in fact, represent two different types of feedback they adopt: the first is unfocused feedback, and the

second is focused feedback.

Teacher Q also emphasized on imparting "basic knowledge" of the language to the learners. This means that when Chinese students learn Spanish, they are not only learning the language but also studying the history, literature, and geography of Spain or Latin America. Therefore, Chinese teachers ought to correct content-related errors as well.

The second research question states: *How do teachers' feedback strategies reflect their beliefs, and what specific types of WCF are provided in this process?* While summarizing the types of WCF provided by the two teachers in this study, it was found that Teacher M gave a total of 1,574 instances of WCF. As shown in Table 2, Teacher M provided students with a high percentage of direct feedback (DF), accounting for 93.84% of all feedback given; reformulation (REF) represents 3.24%, and metalinguistic feedback (MF) accounts for 2.92%. The teacher did not use indirect feedback (IF) at any point during the text correction process.

Table 2: *Types of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) of Teacher M*

Type of WCF	DF	IF	MF	REF	Total
Frequency	1 477	0	46	51	1574
Percentage	93.84%	0	2.92%	3.24%	100%

Regarding the types of WCF provided by Teacher Q, the analysis results show a total of 554 instances of WCF. Table 2 presents the frequency of direct feedback (DF) being the highest, accounting for 67.33% of the total. Indirect feedback (IF) represents 2.53% of all feedback, while metalinguistic feedback (MF) and reformulation (REF) account for 26.35% and 3.79%, respectively.

Table 3: *Types of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) of Teacher Q*

Type of WCF	DF	IF	MF	REF	Total
Frequency	373	14	146	21	554
Percentage	67.33%	2.53%	26.35%	3.79%	100%

The frequency of both teachers reveal that they are more accustomed to directly correcting the errors made by students when working with texts. The difference lies in the fact that, among all the feedback provided, the percentage of MF and REF used by Teacher M is lower than that of Teacher Q, particularly in the case of MF (26.35% for Q compared to 2.92% for Teacher M. Moreover, Teacher M does not provide IF, whereas Teacher Q does. Additionally, an interesting observation is that Teacher Q gives general evaluations at the end of fourteen texts. These evaluations do not target specific errors but are summaries or suggestions, such as the student's writing level, directions for improvement, etc., aimed at giving students space for self-reflection—something that does not appear in M's corrections.

Another interesting observation came to the light was that Teacher M provided positive WCF, which Teacher Q did not, marking another difference in the feedback provided by the two teachers as seen in this example:

Student: *Tan sanos y vigorosos ellos, que a menudo creo que **soy yo** mucho más vieja que ellos*. [They are so healthy and vigorous that I often think I am much older than **they** are].

Teacher (M): Although in Spanish the pronoun ***them*** 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"*) (author's translation)

In the above example, the phrase written by the student is correct, but Teacher M underlined "*soy yo*" in the sentence, affirming that the use of the pronoun was correct and explained her reasoning. This is a method of positive feedback, but it was not found anywhere in Teacher Q's feedback.

Regarding the question of how these feedback strategies reflect their beliefs, the comparison of the collected data from the corrected texts and the interview transcripts clearly makes evident that the stated beliefs of both teachers about WCF are fully aligned with their practices. In general, both teachers share similar beliefs about feedback; for example, both provide suggestions to help students improve their writing. However, the difference lies in that Teacher M provides alternative words or phrases when making corrections, which do not appear in Teacher Q's corrections.

Discussion

This study has addressed the beliefs of L2 teachers about WCF in both native and non-native scenarios. While assessing the data with respect to the first research question of this study, it was evident that both teachers believed their feedback played a very important role in students' process of learning to write in L2. Both teachers believed that feedback could be either positive or negative. In pedagogical theory, positive feedback is considered important because it encourages students to remain motivated to learn (Yunus, 2020). Negative feedback, on the other hand, can indicate that an error has been made, and therefore the correct form in the target language must be provided, or metalinguistic information about the errors should be offered (Adzhar & Sazalli, 2024). It was observed that Teacher M not only corrected errors in the text but also provided positive feedback to "motivate students to continue improving." However, most of Teacher Q's actions simply focused on correcting errors.

One possible reason for this phenomenon is that, as previously mentioned, culture and nationality are inextricably linked (Mao et al., 2024), suggesting that nationality can significantly influence teachers' beliefs. (Bao, 2019) argues that the beliefs of Chinese teachers are affected by traditional Chinese educational frameworks, in which teachers play a fundamental role in knowledge transmission and overseeing the learning process. This framework considers the reduction of errors by students as an important indicator of progress in learning (Hu, 2002). However, some researchers believe that teachers should adopt a positive attitude toward errors during the teaching process to motivate their students and achieve better results in the classroom (Bima et al., 2024).

Regarding the second question about the types of WCF provided by the teachers, this study reveals that DF is the most frequently used type by both teachers, while IF is the least used. This result aligns with (Nguyen & Chu, 2024) findings, which observed that students accept DF more consistently and effectively than indirect types of feedback in learning to write in L2. In Teacher M's feedback, one noteworthy approach is her provision of alternative words or phrases, allowing students to acquire more linguistic knowledge. This method can be considered DF, as it not only corrects errors in the text but also guides students on how to address their errors (Wulf, 2021). Teacher M even provides alternatives when the student's writing is correct, possibly because she considers these alternatives more appropriate and aims to expand the student's lexical range.

However, providing alternatives for correct parts can encourage students to think about more options for L2 learning. In this sense, because IF encourages students to reflect on linguistic forms while DF directly provides correct forms, this type of feedback represents a blend of both DF and IF. In this study, these were categorized as DF since the appropriate form is provided. However, the fact that students need to choose one of the alternatives prompts reflection on the suggestions to select the most suitable option. It is advisable to conduct further research in this area to define it more precisely.

Concerning the aspect related to the differences and similarities between the beliefs and practices of the Spanish and Chinese teachers, the results show that the beliefs and practices of the two teachers in this study are consistent. This finding aligns with the conclusions of (Esmaeeli & Sadeghi, 2020) that teachers' beliefs and practices are consistent in adult English teaching. However, some studies have reported inconsistencies between teachers' beliefs and their actual practices. (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019) observed English teachers in Spain and found that their beliefs about CF were not consistent with their classroom practices. Other studies on L2 learning among Chinese students have also shown that not all teachers' beliefs and practices are consistent. Factors such as teaching experience, teachers' educational backgrounds, and their understanding of students' skills are possible reasons for these inconsistencies (Goldouz & Baleghizadeh, 2021).

Last, but not the least, a significant difference lies in the attitudes of the two teachers toward WCF. The Spanish teacher (Teacher M) believes that feedback should be used to motivate students to continue learning, while the Chinese teacher (Teacher Q) believes that feedback should act as a "guide" in the learning process to help reduce the occurrence of errors. A possible reason for this difference is the cultural distinction between the two teachers within different educational contexts.

Conclusion

This study finds that SFL teachers share common beliefs about the importance of providing WCF and its necessity for L2 learning among students. The results reveal that DF is the most frequently used type of feedback, while IF is the least provided. In general, the types of WCF offered by the two teachers are similar,

but they differ in terms of which errors should be corrected. This study contributes to a better understanding of why SFL teachers, especially those from different cultural contexts, provide WCF in the ways they do and emphasizes the crucial impact of teachers' beliefs on their teaching practices. Although the beliefs of the two teachers in this study are generally consistent with their practices, it is noted that not all cases can achieve such consistency. Further research is recommended to explore this topic in greater depth.

This study faced a few limitations. First, the small sample size of teachers does not allow the results to be generalized. Additionally, the use of a single interview does not adequately confirm the details of teachers' beliefs about WCF after analyzing the text data. Finally, only teachers' beliefs and practices are studied, while students' opinions about teacher feedback are not considered. Future studies can take up these missing scenarios to get a better picture of the issues under study.

References:

Adzhar, N., & Sazalli, N. (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. http://dx.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. 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. 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. https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v17i1.59427

Binu, P. (2021). Effects of Strategy-Based Instruction on Low Proficiency Omani ESL Learnersâ€™ Acquisition of Writing Skills. *English Language Teaching*, *14*(6), 1-36. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n6p36

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3 (2), 77-101. *Online im Internet*, 1-42. 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. 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). 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. 189-124), 5(*11*, پژوهش های زبان شناختی. http://dx.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. 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. http://dx.doi.org/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. https://doi.org/10.58557/(ijeh).v3i3.132

Han, F. (2021). Analysis of Spanish Teaching Mode under Internet. 2021 4th International Conference on Information Systems and Computer Aided Education, 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. 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. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794103033004

Hyland, K. (2019). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press. https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=6DCdDwAAQBAJ

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. http://dx.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. 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. 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*(2). 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. 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. https://hdl.handle.net/10497/22307

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. 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*, 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000393

Ministry of Education, P. R. C. (2018). Spanish Subject Standards for General High Schools. Beijing: People's Education Press. https://www.amazon.com/Spanish-Curriculum-Standards-Ministry-Education/dp/7107346784

Mumuni, T., & 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*. http://dx.doi.org/10.32861/rje.56.91.98

Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2021). *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching*. Cambridge University Press. 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. 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. https://dx.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. http://dx.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. http://dx.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*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.747

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). https://doi.org/10.7202/1060905ar

Watson, S. (2019). Revisiting teacher decision making in the mathematics classroom: A multidisciplinary approach. Eleventh Congress of the European Society for Research in Mathematics Education, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327764541

Wei, X. (2023). The Situation, Policies, and Development of Foreign Language Education in Contemporary China. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Research* *7*(8). 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. http://dx.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. http://dx.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. 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. 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. 4th International Seminar on Education Research and Social Science (ISERSS 2021), https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220107.020