Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences in English Lessons: Learners' and Teachers' Perspectives

Thanh-Huong Nhac* 🆔
Hanoi Law University, VIETNAM

Abstract: The paramount objective of English language teaching and learning is to achieve language competence in communicative purposes with the minimal learners' errors. To attain that goal, corrective feedback plays an important role due to its efficiency in developing learners' English capacity. However, the correlation between language students' and teachers' views on the issues of corrective feedback including its types, methods and timing has received inadequate attention from educational scholars. This study, therefore, aimed to examine teachers' and learners' perceptions of corrective feedback at a higher education institution. The research employed the mixed method with the participation of 425 law-majored sophomores. Specifically, the statistics involved the survey questionnaires, follow-up interviews with students as well as the interview with thirteen teachers of English. The results indicated overall matches between learners' and teachers' high remarks on the necessity of oral corrective feedback in the students' English acquisition. Notably, they both highly valued the use of metalinguistic feedback, prompt feedback for grammatical and lexical errors while explicit correction and recast were preferred for phonological errors. In terms of feedback timing, students were perceived not to be negatively affected by immediate correction, yet expressed their preferences for the delayed corrective feedback, which was compatible with teachers' views. Such findings set practical pedagogical implications for language educators in the language teaching and learning process.

Keywords: *Corrective feedback, English lessons, learners, perspectives, teachers.*

Introduction

In foreign or second language (FL/L2) teaching and learning, teachers' instructions are categorized into two dimensions: meaning-focused and form-focused instructions. Both of the instructions have their own benefits in developing learners' language competence in terms of fluency and accuracy. Despite the fact that in recent years, the communicative teaching approach promotes learners' fluency, the question of how to develop learners' accuracy is still attractive to educators in FL/L2 teaching. One method to cope with this concern is to provide corrective feedback (CF) teachers' responses to learners' errors, which is considered to be a significant strategy in dealing with such a problem (Ellis, 2017).

CF, either in the oral or written form, has gained the interest of researchers and educators in the literature (Ellis, 2017; Ha & Murray, 2020; Ha & Nguyen, 2021; Lyster et al., 2013). The past two decades have noticed a large number of empirical studies focusing on the efficiency and the roles of CF in the language acquisition (Ellis, 2009). The majority of the carried studies clearly show that CF is effective and important in L2/FL teaching and learning (Brown, 2016; Ha & Murray, 2020; Li, 2010; Li & Iwashita, 2021; Lyster et al., 2013; Nhac, 2021; Pham & Iwashita, 2018; Wang & Li, 2020). However, there is still an ongoing debate on determining the most effective type of CF as its efficacy relies on a variety of elements regarding the differences in the learners' features, the ways, and the situations in which feedback is delivered (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2020). Although this issue remains controversial, it is undeniable that the congruence between teachers' perceptions and students' perceptions are essential factors in the successful provision of CF, which in turn, has a positive influence on learning outcomes (Borg, 2015). Ananda et al. (2017) state that so as to enhance the efficacy of CF provision, it is essential for teachers to build up their students' favorable CF types. It means that the closer the CF strategy to the students' views is, the more successfully the students can build and develop their language acquisition process.

In the literature, previous research in language teaching and learning indicates that teachers' and students' views on CF are not always compatible (Ha & Nguyen, 2021; Jean & Simard, 2011; Nguyen & Newton, 2019). These mismatches are

---

* **Correspondence:**
Thanh-Huong Nhac, Hanoi Law University, 87 Nguyen Chi Thanh, Dong Da, HaNoi, Vietnam. ✉ nhacthanhhuong@gmail.com

likely to lead to the counter-impact on the learners' motivation and learning outcomes (Schulz, 1996, as cited in Borg, 2003). Therefore, clarifying students' preferences as well as the teachers' perceptions of the provision of CF may ensure the success of instructional practices.

Although the last decade has seen considerable research attention regarding either the teachers' or learners' perceptions in the context of English as a second language (ESL) or English as a foreign language (EFL) education (Akiyama, 2017; Borg, 2015; Calafato, 2020; Kamiya, 2016; Kim & Mostafa, 2021), the number of studies is relatively few in comparison with those on the effectiveness of CF. Moreover, the correlation between teachers' and students' beliefs concerning CF has yet received sufficient interests from scholars. The situation is similar in Vietnam, where recently, research on such issue has attracted educators' concern, either in the context of secondary EFL context (Ha et al., 2021) or solely teachers' perceptions at colleges in the Mekong Delta (Tran & Nguyen, 2020), less research has addressed both teachers' and students' beliefs about CF at the tertiary context. The current study, therefore, aims to contribute to the common knowledge on CF by investigating the perceptions of EFL students and teachers regarding the types of oral errors to be treated, the methods and timing of giving CF in a higher institution context. The findings of the study are expected to be of great benefit to both language educators and learners in the teaching and learning process as through establishing students' favorable CF types, teachers are more likely to push their successful language acquisition (Ananda et al., 2017).

Learners' and Teachers' Perceptions of Corrective Feedback in the Literature

Providing CF to students' erroneous utterances is one of the main functions of the language teachers. Ellis et al. (2006) show that CF "can consist of (a) and an indication that an error has been committed; (b) the provision of the correct target language form; or (c) metalinguistic information about the nature of the error; or any combination of these" (Ellis et al., 2006, p.340). In the view of Lyster and Mori (2006), CF is divided into six different sub-types, including explicit correction, recast, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, elicitation and repetition. CF, which may be provided implicitly or explicitly either in writing or orally, has been considered to be of great efficiency for learners to reconstruct the correct target language (Li & Vuono, 2019). Within this research, six types of oral corrective feedback (OCF) for spoken errors (Lyster & Mori, 2006) was taken into consideration.

OCF has gained a considerable interest from researchers in language teaching and learning. The studies are examined in various aspects. Obviously, the majority of the research reveals that OCF is valuable and essential in the process of L2/FL language acquisition (Li, 2010; Lyster et al., 2013; Nassaji, 2016/ 2017). However, as mentioned above, there is some disagreement in the application of CF as its efficacy relies on a variety of elements, including the differences in the learners' features, the ways and the situations in which feedback is delivered (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2020).

A number of research on teachers' or learners' perceptions has been carried out in the context of ESL/ EFL teaching and learning. Most of the studies acknowledge that both learners and teachers have signified the provision of OCF as a crucial teaching method in the language teaching and education process (Alkhammash & Gulnaz, 2019; Luu, 2020; Roothooft & Breeze, 2016; Tran & Nguyen, 2020). Interestingly, students show more positive attitudes towards the importance and efficiency of OCF than teachers (Brown, 2009; Jean & Simard, 2011). However, differences in the learners' and teachers' preferences for OCF concerning types of errors to be treated, preferred types of OCF and timing for OCF are still needed to be addressed.

Regarding error types, the prominent concern is what types of oral errors (grammatical, lexical, and phonological), either all errors or only errors that affect the message should be corrected (Atma & Widiati, 2015; Calsiyao, 2015; Lee, 2013). Atma and Widiati (2015) claim that freshmen prefer to be frequently treated with the grammar errors, while second-year students prefer the errors of phonology to be addressed. Correspondingly, EFL students' in Calsiyao's study (2015) express their contrasting views towards the error-categories that require CF. Specifically, a number of students favor the teacher's CF for their erroneous utterances in the use of grammar when others prefer that of their wrong way of pronunciation. In earlier research by Lee (2013), he indicates that teachers' and learners' beliefs about the rate of CF provision are not congruent. Particularly, students like to be provided with CF for all errors they make, whereas the language instructors show their scepticism of the usefulness of this strategy.

Concerning teachers and students' perceptions about how errors should be corrected, the results of several studies are not totally consistent. Lee (2013) reveals that learners find explicit correction more preferably while teachers are more likely to provide implicit CF. Lee (2013) also indicates that explicit correction is considered to be the most favorite type of OCF and metalinguistic feedback belongs the least preferred type among ESL learners at the high level in the US. This finding is not in line with Oladejo's (1993) research in which metalinguistic feedback ranks the first position in terms of preferred CF types among ESL students in Singapore. Brown (2009) conveys a great distinction in the teachers' and learners' belief of OCF in a large-scale study. In particular, students show strong approval of focused on form instructions whereas the teachers do not favor it with the provision of explicit CF because they perceive that such instruction interfere with communicative approach. Similarly, Roothooft and Breeze (2016) state that teachers' and students' attitudes to the use of OCF are incompatible. Specifically, while the teachers are found to be reserved to provide explicit OCF, instead they prefer to use the implicit one as teachers are afraid that explicit OCR can cause students' embarrassment, thus negatively influence teaching goals and learning outcomes. Contrastingly, students express positive reactions when receiving

explicit OCF. Zhang and Rahimi (2014), Azad and Kalam (2016) share the similar findings which record that EFL students demonstrate their favor in receiving explicit OCF in the form of metalinguistic feedback and explicit corrections. In contrast, Zhu and Wang's (2019) study in the context of the Chinese EFL higher institution indicates that the learners prefer prompts which elicit their generated repairs to explicit way of error correction. In general, such studies reveal mixed findings, which suggest that there is a mismatch between students' preferences and teachers' belief for CF types. Students appear to show more constructive attitude towards explicit CF, while teachers reserve to provide this kind of CF owing to their anxiety about learners' negative reactions to CF. Nevertheless, it has not been identified whether teachers' and learners' views on the provision of CF types in Asian tertiary EFL teaching and learning environment, including Vietnamese higher education contexts are congruent or not.

In terms of the perceptions relating to the time for language instructors to provide OCF for learners' oral errors, teachers and students show different opinions on immediate and delayed ones. Davis (2003) finds that the majority of the students (86%), however, much fewer than half of the teachers report that the proper time for correcting errors should be immediately when they were committed in order to avoid learners' ill-formed utterances. Conversely, Brown (2009) reveals that teachers express their reluctance to provide immediate OCF, whereas students prefer to be corrected right after they make errors. Sharing the similar findings, later studies (Ananda et al., 2017; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014; Zhu & Wang, 2019) carried out in the tertiary context illustrate that students preferring immediate to delayed feedback believe that the former is more effective, and the latter causes them to forget their errors. On the contrary, Papangkorn (2015), and Ölmezer-Öztürk and Öztürk (2016) find that EFL students show their more favor in delayed OCF after they finish either their utterance or their speaking task, which, to some extent, seem not to cause their interruption and embarrassment. Regarding teachers' preferences, Gómez Argüelles et al. (2019) indicate that teachers in the EFL context prefer delayed CF, that is, at the end of the class for the reason that immediate CF is potentially to hurt their students' feelings.

Overall, despite carried out in different contexts, most of the studies show that there remains an inconsistency between language learners' and instructors' attitudes towards OCF concerning CF types and timing. In addition, the study in the higher education context in Vietnam is limited. As a result, this current study is conducted to address a thorough knowledge of teachers' and students' perceptions on OCF in a tertiary context.

Methodology

Research Design

The current study applied both quantitative and qualitative research method with the use of the researcher-made survey questionnaire and interviews to explore the views of EFL students and instructors of English at a higher education institution on the provision of OCF in English lessons. For students, the questionnaires were answered with the support of Google form active link sent via email, together with a request to participate in the follow-up interviews over the zoom meeting or Microsoft teams one week later. The teachers were interviewed to clarify for their beliefs. To partly clarify their perceptions and their actual practices, in-class teacher-student interaction was also employed. The raw data collected was screened before encoding with IBM SPSS program for the treatment.

Participants

The study population consisted of two sets of the respondents with the total number of 438 participants, including 425 students and thirteen teachers from a tertiary context in Vietnam by stratified sampling method (p = 92 %; r = ±8 %).

The first type involved in thirteen instructors of English with nine female ones and four male ones. Their qualifications were persuasive with two doctors (PhDs) and eleven masters. Among thirteen instructors, the majority had a long-established teaching career, particularly six participants with over ten - year teaching experience, four respondents between five and ten years of teaching and three instructors with two and five years of teaching.

The second set of respondents were 425 students. Interestingly, the participants belonged to different English frequency levels, including 312 students of B1 level and 113 students of B2 level, in which male students accounted for 147, equivalent to 34.6 percent, while female respondents were 278, which was 65.4 percent. Interestingly, the participants were at different academic levels, namely 108 freshmen (25.4%), 204 sophomores (48%), 113 juniors (26.6%). As glimpsed from these figures, the majority of the respondents came from lower academic levels.

Data Collection Instrument

Survey Questionnaires

The study utilized researcher-made the questionnaire for students which was developed from the one applied in Ha et al. (2021). The thirty-nine items for students were designed based on factual and behavioral questions (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). The content of the questionnaire was evaluated by three experts on educational assessment. The content of the survey questionnaire was finalized after being piloted with a group of fifty students to validate their strengths and

weaknesses. The final version met the acceptable Cronbach's alpha values i.e., 0.82 < α < 0.90, reliable (Cronbach, 1951).

The questionnaire was made of two sections. The section I collected the demographic information of the participants. The section II consisted of thirty-nine items which required students to mark on the five- point level Likert scale, namely 1) strongly disagree, 2) agree, 3) neutral, 4) agree, and 5) strongly agree. Within the scope of this study, the questionnaires seek the learners' perceptions on (1) the functions of OCF (Q1 – Q6), (2) categories of errors to be corrected (Q7 – Q13), (3) OCF types (Q14-A32) and (4) timing of OCF (Q33 – Q39).

Semi-structured Interviews

Interview questions were made up for both teachers and learners. For students, follow-up interviews aimed to further interpret the quantitative results from the survey questionnaires. For teachers, open-ended questions were asked to clarify their perceptions of OCF concerning the necessity of OCF, preferences for OCF types depending on errors types, and timing for providing OCF, their drawbacks and benefits in each specific scenario. The two sets of questions in the interview were constructed and expanded following the in-depth analysis and scrutiny of OCF previous studies (Ha et al., 2021; Roothooft & Breeze, 2016; Tran & Nguyen, 2020).

Data Collection

After piloting and finalizing the survey questionnaire, the researcher made contact with academic advisors of different English classes at L Law University to clarify the aims of the study as well as to obtain their consent for the students to be the participants of the study in the first semester of the school year 2021–2022. Due to the COVID 19 pandemic, as soon as accepted, the survey questionnaire in the Google-doc form was delivered to students via their email addresses. The participants were required to finish the questionnaire within the following week after receiving the email. In order to get more details of the students' perceptions on OCF, the researcher also called for their willingness to participate in the following interview via Zoom meeting or Microsoft teams. Their agreement for later interview was included in the responding answers to the survey questionnaire.

The teachers' views on OCF were elicited through individual interview to seek their perspectives of the necessity of OCF in English teaching and learning and types of errors needed to be addressed in the English lessons. Next, teachers were provided with six scenarios for providing OCF depending on different types of errors to give the opinion. With regard to the time for providing CF, the teachers were required to express their voice on the advantages and disadvantages of the OCF timing: (1) immediately when a student's erroneous utterance is made, (2) after a student's utterance has finished, (3) after a student's speaking activity has finished, and (4) at the end of the lesson. Subsequently, the interviewees were requested to clarify their views.

Each interview conducted in English took from 10 to 12 minutes. As mentioned earlier, the interviews were carried out through either the Zoom meetings or Microsoft teams, which were all recorded for later analysis.

Notably, with the permission of six out of thirteen instructors of English, the researcher was allowed to record the English class for teacher-student interaction. One thing to be noted is that before class recording, teachers had the idea of researcher's purpose of carrying out the study on teacher-learner interaction, not specifically about teachers' OCF so as not to bias their natural performance in the provision of OCF. Moreover, at the time of collecting the data, English classes were taught via Microsoft teams, thus the researcher became a non-participation observer by joining the team without disturbing or interfering with both teachers and students' performance. The class team was recorded quite naturally for later discussion and interview with teachers if necessary.

Data Analysis

The data collected underwent a careful data screening process to obtain the targeted number, which included 425 students as the study population in the view of learning aspect. After that the encoding data was treated for data analysis. IBM SPSS program was used to analyze the quantitative data with descriptive statistics. Descriptive mean was employed to address 39 items to clarify learners' favorable choice relating to the provision of OCF including the necessity of OCF, categories of errors to be addressed, OCF types and timing for OCF, along with Likert scales, specifically (1.0-1.79) very low, (1.8-2.59) low, (2.6-3.39) neutral, (3.4-4.19) high, and (4.2-5.0) very high.

For interview questions, statistics were transcribed to address the collected data for different themes to find out the match and mismatch between learners' and teachers' perspectives. One thing noted is that data from semi-structured interviews were utilized to support the researcher in interpreting and explaining the result obtained from the students' survey questionnaires as well as to clarify teachers' views on providing OCF. As the information from this form of data collection was considered qualitative, it was to be provided in the form of quotations or sayings.

The presentation of data followed the convergent mixed-method design. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed separately. The results from the analysis of both datasets were compared and interpreted to check whether the results supported or contradicted each other.

Results

Learners' and Teachers' Perspectives towards OCF

When investigating the teachers and learners' attitudes towards OCF, both of them claimed that OCF was very important for students' English learning. Specifically, students highly recognized the necessity of OCF (M=4.33; SD=.686), in particular, sharing the point that OCF was useful for their English acquisition (M=4.20; SD=.728) and helped them not to commit errors again (M=3.79; SD=.857). Concerning their feelings when being corrected, the majority of students agreed that OCF did not make them get annoyed (M=3.79; SD=.875). However, there were students who felt confused when the teacher provided OCF (M=2.15; SD=727).

Analysis of the data collected from the follow-up interviews, all students agreed that OCF was very necessary for their English learning as teachers' OCF helped to improve their language accuracy, thus, enhancing their English proficiency. Students also explained that they did not feel embarrassed, in contrast, they expected to be provided OCF more often. Student 5 said that:

> I always want my teacher to correct my errors, which can help me know what I am wrong and I can avoid committing the same errors next time. Also, I can learn a lot when my teacher gives OCF to my peers' errors. In general, I find OCF useful for my English learning.

All of the interviewed teachers expressed their positive attitudes towards OCF. They all believed that OCF was an indispensable part of teaching EFL/ ESL as it was one of the teachers' main tasks. Some even viewed learners' errors were integral and necessary for their English competence development. For example, teacher A claimed:

> No one can deny the role of teachers' OCF in the process of teaching and learning. Making errors is considered normal when doing something, thus learning is not an exception. The teacher's role is to provide OCF to help students realize and correct errors, which proves to be beneficial for their English acquisition.

Categories of Errors to be Addressed

In terms of students' error types to be addressed in English lessons, teachers and students shared the similar viewpoints.

Table 1. Students' Perceptions of Errors to be Corrected

Items	Types of errors to be corrected	N	Mean	SD
7.	I expect my teacher to give correction to my pronunciation errors	425	4.28	.845
8.	I expect my teacher to give correction to my grammatical errors	425	3.88	1.63
9.	I expect my teacher to give correction to my lexical errors	425	4.09	.622
10.	I expect my teacher to give correction to the errors related to the focus of the lessons only	425	3.21	.801
11.	I expect my teacher to give correction to the errors that change the meaning of the message	425	4.38	.613
12.	I expect my teacher to give correction to all of the errors I commit	425	2.43	.574
13.	Teachers should give correction to not only errors made by the whole class, but also individual's errors.	425	4.27	.646

As glimpsed from table 1, items 7 to 11 and item 13 received a high rate of agreement of the students. Relating to linguistic errors, many of the students expressed their desire for their pronunciation errors to be corrected (M=4.28; SD=.845). Following this tendency, lexical and grammatical errors needed to be addressed receiving the high mean with 4.09 and 3.28, respectively. Mean scores also reinforced the item 11 that students preferred OCF for errors affecting or changing the meaning of the message (M=4.38; SD= .613). Besides, they highly believed that teachers should not only correct errors made by the whole class but also individual's one (M=427; SD= .646). Students, however, showed their low personal standpoint when expressing that they expected their teachers to give correction to all of the errors (M=2.43; SD=.574).

Followed-up interviews revealed the reasons for students' agreement on error types needed correction. The majority of the participants confirmed the functions of linguistic and meaning of their utterances in developing their English language accuracy, later on proficiency. Student 2 and 9 had similar opinions:

> I, as many of other friends, were taught to focus on grammar-oriented exams during high-school learning, therefore I am quite confident about my grammar, my vocabulary. However, I am not good at pronunciation. I want my teachers to help me to improve my pronunciation.

> I have a wide range of vocabulary thanks to practising vocabulary exercises at junior and senior secondary school but I still meet difficulty in using words in sentences. In other words, I have problems in collocation. Therefore, I prefer my teachers to correct my lexical errors.

Specific reasons or explanation for their choices might be different, yet, they all agreed that teachers should not give correction for all errors, but for errors causing misunderstanding or belonging to the focus of the lessons due to the constraint of time and class size.

Sharing the similar viewpoints, data from teachers' interviews showed that OCF was necessary, however, about 50%-70% of language learners' erroneous utterance ought to be provided with CF, focusing on main errors or errors influencing communicative purposes. Regarding linguistic errors, teachers had different opinions. Specifically, lexical errors should be paid more attention than pronunciation errors. For example:

> Pronunciation accuracy requires effort from learners. Learners, themselves, have to practice pronunciation everyday outside the classroom. The reason comes from the fact that if we spend time correcting pronunciation errors, it may not leave enough time for other activities. (Teacher B)

> It is unadvisable to correct every error as it may demotivate students, which will adversely affect their learning results. (Teacher D)

The teachers also stressed that addressing which erroneous utterance also depended on each situation, for example, in the lessons that students made a lot errors, teachers could choose the errors made by the whole class instead of the individual's one. Similarly, in English class there were not so huge numbers of errors, individual's ones should be given correction for students.

Types of OCF

Considering types of OCF, survey students expressed their perceptions of OCF depending types of errors.

As regards grammatical errors, the respondents gave very high remark on the provision of metalinguistic feedback (M=4.13; SD=.621), followed by recast and elicitation which achieved the same mean (M=3.99). Repeating the erroneous utterance with rising intonation for students to correct themselves also received the strong agreement with the mean of 3.98. The statistics also indicated that students would prefer to be provided with explicit correction (M=3.76; SD=.802) rather than clarification request (M=3.20; SD=.723). Such perceptions were affirmed in the follow-up interview data. In particular, two third of interviewees stated that metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition created the chance for them to recognize their own errors and self- correct, which might bring a better effect than teachers' explicit correction. Clarification requests were surely not their preference as they caused their confusion. To be more specific, such clarified questions as "Can you say it again" or "Can you repeat?" makes students confused about their utterances. Actually, they did not know whether their utterance was incorrect or the teachers just asked them to repeat it.

From teachers' point of view, eleven in thirteen teachers had similar preference of the use of metalinguistic feedback and repetition when providing OCF for students' grammatical errors as such kinds of OCF provided students with opportunity for self-correction.

> I prefer to provide students with some clues or comments explicitly relating to their errors instead of giving explicit correction. With the use of corrective techniques, students are able to understand and realize their errors, which generates their self-repair. It proves to be useful not only for error makers but their peers. (Teacher K)

> I usually repeat students' grammatical erroneous utterances in rising intonation to attract their attention to their errors. In my case, students often notice that there was wrong form in their utterance. As a result, they could correct their own errors. In other situations, their friends are likely to help them. (Teacher P)

Some teachers admitted that actually, they did not fully pay attention to their ways of correction all the time. Sometimes they gave their OCF types unconsciously with the use of OCF recast type. All of the teachers reported that they often used recast by reformulating the whole or the part of their students' utterances as the main OCF in their English class as favorite types because they were not time-consuming, and students could recognize their errors, generating their uptakes.

Concerning phonological errors, students expressed their most preference for teachers' provision of explicit correction (M=4.26; SD=.814); followed by recast (M=4.16; SD=.728). They also highly approved of teachers' use of metalinguistic clue with some comments for their wrong pronunciation (M=3.41; SD=.904). Most of the students who were interviewed explained there were many problems in their pronunciation as they focused on studying for grammar-oriented tests at secondary and high schools.

> I am not confident in my pronunciation. I don't know how to speak out with correct pronunciation and stress. Thus, for phonological errors, I prefer my teacher to show me explicitly what I am wrong and provide me with correct way of pronunciation. (Student 15)

> Pronouncing correctly is a difficult task. It's not the same as grammatical errors, I cannot correct by myself. I think the best way is providing explicit correction for phonological errors. (Student 12)

In the view of the teachers, the majority of the teachers expressed the high perspectives when they agreed to clearly and directly inform students that their pronunciation was problematic and provide them with the exact way to pronounce.

Explicit correction is the most useful way to reformulate learners' errors for phonological errors. (Teacher K)

Giving students the correct form by reformulating the erroneous part is a suitable way for correcting phonological errors, especially during the talk and it is time-saving. However, sometimes providing the correct form in the form of recasts could lead to the misunderstandings among students because they did not know whether it was the correct form or another way to pronounce that word. Despite this, recasts, together with explicit correction were at my priority of usage for phonological errors. (Teacher H)

Addressing lexical errors, students generally had high perceptions for different types of OCF, which mean ranges from 3.71 to 4.40. In particular, recast and metalinguistic feedback were still at the highest preferences (M=4.40; SD=.626; M=4.20; SD=.728). Elicitation and repetition received the next positions with the M=4.02; SD=.955; and M=3.89; SD=.651, respectively. In the same scenario, clarification requests in the form of questions as "What did you say?/ Or can you say it again?" received the lowest level of approval (M=2.54; SD=.814) whereas explicit correction was preferred much more (M=3.77; SD=.859) by students.

These perspectives were affirmed from the results of the follow-up interviews. A large number of the students confirmed that the usage of words in sentences were important for conveying meaning. They met difficulties in using collocation in both English speaking and writing skills. Therefore, teachers' OCF was very important although their choice and explanation were not the same.

I want my teachers to correct my lexical errors by providing explicit correction because many words have more than one meaning and I do not know how different they are. (Student 9)

I want my teacher to give me clues, for example, eliciting me or providing some comments so that I can realize and correct my own errors. By that way, I can remember it in a longer time. (Student 16)

Explaining for the low viewpoints on clarification request OCF type, student 4 claimed:

Sometimes, my teacher uses such questions as "Sorry, can you repeat" or "Can you say that again" to attract me and my friends to recognize errors, but it is not useful. I notice that most of the time, we just repeat our sentences again without knowing that we are making errors.

From teachers' perspectives, for lexical errors, they advocated of using metalinguistic feedback to help learners recognize and correct their errors. Such use of OCF also depended on different factors including students' English proficiency and time allowance. The teachers also gave further explanation

For students at higher level, I am interested in applying elicitation or metalinguistic feedback for their erroneous utterance because they are able to self- correct. For students at lower level of English proficiency, explicit correction is preferred. (Teacher F)

Sometimes, a combination of types of OCF are utilized. If I find such kinds of prompts are not useful, explicit correction is used instead. (Teacher N)

Timing for OCF

Table 2 reveals the students' viewpoints on timing for the teachers' implementation of OCF in the English classroom.

Table 2. Students' Perceptions of Timing for OCF

Items	Timing for OCF	N	Mean	SD
33.	I expect my teacher to provide OCF immediately when I commit an error SEP SEP SEP	425	3.34	.749
34.	I expect my teacher to provide OCF after my erroneous utterance has been completed	425	3.15	.862
35.	I expect my teacher to provide oral CF after the speaking activity ends	425	4.28	.634
36.	I expect my teacher to provide oral CF at the end of the class	425	3.80	.961
37.	In case I commit an error causing my teachers' or peers' misunderstanding, my teacher should provide OCF immediately.	425	4.00	.889
38.	In case I commit an error concerning the grammar or vocabulary focus of the lesson, my teacher should provide OCF immediately.	425	3.76	.658
39.	In case I commit a minor error which is NOT important, my teacher should provide OCF later.	425	4.46	.502

As illustrated, the students found it more preferably to be given delayed OCF than immediate OCF. Specifically, students had high perspectives when confirming that they wanted their teachers to provide OCF after the speaking activity ends (M=4.28; SD=.634); at the end of the class (M=3.80; SD=.961) or after their erroneous utterance were completed (M=3.34;

SD=.749). The provision of OCF as soon as the learners made errors were not highly approved (M=3.15; SD=.862). However, in case of errors interfering with the teachers' or peers' understanding, or errors relating to the focus of the lesson, students preferred to be provided CF immediately, (M=4.00; SD=.889) and (M=3.76; SD=.658, respectively). They highly claimed to delay OCF or even without correction for minor or unimportant errors. (M=4.46; SD=.502).

The interview of the students supported the statistics of survey questionnaires of their high remark on delayed OCF as they could help them recognize, remember and avoid committing errors.

> While I am speaking, if my teacher corrects, I could just repeat teachers' reformulation unconsciously and forget it immediately. In the situation, the teacher's usage of OCF eliciting my self-correction, I may focus on error and thus forget what I am going to talk later. (Student 12)

> I do not like to be corrected spontaneously not because of my embarrassment but because of the fact that the teacher's immediate correction may cause my distraction of speaking task. (Student 18)

Interestingly, the interviews indicated that either immediate or delayed OCF also depended on types of errors.

> When my erroneous utterance changes the message of my speech, teachers can provide correction immediately. (Student 5)

> When I make complicated errors, I would like my teacher to leave the errors for correction at the end of my talk so that I can take note and understand it deeply. However, if errors affecting communicative purposes, I want to be corrected at the end of my sentence or utterance because meaning is very important, which can cause the misunderstanding to others. (Student 27)

Considering teachers' interview, the data were in the same line with students' view. Most of the teachers believed that OCF should be provided at the end of students' speaking task or at the end of the lesson as immediate intervention could negatively affect students' feeling, which in turns demotivated students.

> Giving immediate OCF while they are speaking can interrupt students' flow of speaking. That is the reason why I usually leave the correction at the end of students' task or at the end of the lesson. (Teacher D)

> Frankly speaking, I do not limit my way of correction either immediate or delayed type as it depends on types of activities, English level of students or time restraint. If students are at a higher level, when they speak fluently, I often note down their mistakes and provide OCF after their speaking. In case students are at low level and their speaking is not fluent enough, I can give immediate explicit correction or using recast technique to provide correct formulation. (Teacher H)

> Personally, I often delay my correction for learners' errors, yet actually, whether the teacher is successful or not in providing OCF depends on a number of factors. The teachers should take into consideration when deciding to use types of OCF and timing for OCF. (Teacher L)

The aim of the study is to explore the views of learners and teachers on OCF provision in English class other than the actual practices of OCF. Therefore, classroom observation was not used as the data collection instrument of this study. However, as mentioned earlier, six out of thirteen instructors of English taking part in the interview expressed their consent in allowing the researcher to record their English periods for teacher-student interaction. Interestingly, the data analysis of the recordings in six lessons revealed encouraging results of the actual practices of OCF in English class.

Table 3. Distribution of Total Corrective Feedback Types (n= 116)

			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Meta-linguistic feedback	Valid	No CF	35	30.1	30.1	30.1
Recast	Valid	No CF	23	19.8	19.8	19.8
Repetition	Valid	No CF	21	18.1	18.1	18.1
Elicitation	Valid	No CF	16	13.7	13.7	13.7
Explicit correction	Valid	No CF	14	12.1	12.1	12.1

As displayed in Table 3, of the six types of feedback, meta-linguistic feedback accounting for 30.1% of the total number of teachers' turns containing feedback was at the highest frequent usage. The other feedback types were distributed in decreasing frequency as follows: recast (19.8%), repetition (18.1%), elicitation (13.7%), explicit correction (12.1%) and clarification requests (6.2%). Thus, meta-linguistic feedback and recasts together make up for nearly 50% of the feedback moves in the database, leaving a half opportunity for the use of other corrective techniques. Among other types of feedback, clarification requests stood on the last rank with only 6%.

Table 4. Distribution of Repairs (n=69) across Feedback Types and Error Types.

Feedback types	Error types		
	Grammatical (n=24)	Phonological (n=25)	Lexical (n=20)
Recast	5 (20.8%)	10 (40%)	3 (15%)
Explicit correction	3 (12.5%)	15 (60%)	8 (40%)
Negotiation	16 (66.7%)	0	9 (45%)

As illustrated in Table 4, there was a clear distinction in the number of error categories including grammatical, phonological, lexical. It can be seen that most grammatical repairs followed from negotiation (66.7%), three times more frequently than from recast (20.8%) and approximately five times more frequently than from explicit correction (12.5%). 60% and 40% of phonological repairs follow from explicit correction and recast, respectively. Interestingly, none of phonological repairs follow from negotiation. For lexical errors, there is not much distinction in the number of repairs followed after the use of explicit correction or negotiation techniques (meta- linguistic, elicitation, clarification requests), which account for 40% and 45%, respectively. Such statistics were in the same line with teachers' views.

It is noticeable that the timing for OCF also decided the types of OCF. In particular, when the teachers gave immediate OCF for students' errors, they often used recast and repetition, whereas delayed OCF was utilized, explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback and elicitation were preferred in actual practice.

Discussion

Overall, both teachers and students expressed their perceptions towards OCF positively by approving of the importance and efficiency of OCF in students' language learning process. This finding is in line with previous research (Ha et al., 2021; Kim & Mostafa, 2021; Li, 2017; Roothooft & Breeze, 2016; Ünsal Şakiroğlu, 2020; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014) although the level of approval is not totally the same due to the difference in teaching, learning contexts.

Specifically, Roothooft and Breeze's study (2016) was carried out in the ESL context, in which the priority of teaching focus was to enhance learners' communicative competence instead of the accurate usage of language for written exam purposes. Although a high number of teachers in Roothooft and Breeze's study (2016) showed their fully positive attitude to OCF, many of them were reluctant to provide OCF owing to their worry about the possible damage to learners' self-confidence and fluency. On the contrary, the teaching context in Ha et al. 's study (2021) was secondary schools where teaching and learning was exam-oriented. Therefore, language accuracy was at the priority, teachers were surely to have high perspectives of OCF. The teaching context in this current study was the mixture between communicative and exam-oriented classes at the tertiary context, in which both accuracy and fluency were focused. Students were evaluated not only by their summative and formative assessment but also by their English competence as the prerequisite requirement before their graduation from the university. Teachers and students had high remarks on OCF, despite still paying attention to the ways of providing OCF in order to promote students' fluency. Explanation and comments from the interviews were in the same line with previous studies in Vietnamese context (Ha & Murray, 2021; Ha et al., 2021) in which providing OCF for students' errors was considered as an indispensable function of a language teacher. Concerning the relationship between teachers' experience and their perceptions, noviced and experienced teachers with from two to fifteen years of teaching showed little dissimilarities in theirs towards OCF. This finding contrasted with Kim and Mostafa's study (2021), Ha and Murray (2021) which illustrated that more experienced teachers had more positive attitudes towards OCF.

In terms of errors types to be addressed, the teachers and students' perceptions matched with each other in which they both approved of giving OCF for different types of errors concerning linguistics unit (Atma & Widiati, 2015; Calsiyao, 2015) and communicative purposes (Lee, 2013). In teachers' view, feedback is necessary but correcting too much could cause embarrassment among students which in turns demotivated them. This current study shares the similar findings with the previous research (Li, 2017; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). Comparing teachers' and students' attitudes, this study indicated the concurrence between both types of respondents, which does not align with Lee (2013). Lee (2013) revealed that teachers' and learners' preferences for the types and frequency of CF are not congruent. Specifically, students liked to be provided with CF for all of their errors, whereas the teachers did not.

Concerning feedback types, there was both congruence and incongruence between the teachers' and students' beliefs. For grammatical and lexical errors, both teachers and students favored explicit OCF in the form of metalinguistic feedback as they fully acknowledged the efficiency of this CF type. This finding is in line with previous studies (Azad & Kalam, 2016; Ha et al., 2021; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014; Zhu & Wang, 2019); yet contrasted with Lee's (2013), in which meta-linguistic feedback belonged to the least preferred type among ESL learners at the high level in the United States. Teachers' explanations of language rules received a strong value and desire from both students and teachers for the reason that such explanations were necessary for students' language accuracy improvement. This fact proved to be an essential component of assessing students' English competence (Ha & Murray, 2020, 2021). It may also be contributed to the grounds for the teachers' and students' favorable choice for explicit corrections, which led to students' recognition of their errors, at the same time, to be provided with the correct forms. Likewise, concerning the implicit CF, both students

and teachers showed their preferences for elicitation and repetition, which share the similar findings with Zhu and Wang's (2019) study. All participants in the view of teachers and learners explained that they greatly valued the application of CF types generating self-correction or peer-correction as it could promote learners' deeper understanding, thus in turns resulting in their language reformulation. Clarification requests were not highly preferred as they were supposed to cause misunderstanding as students were unlikely to recognize if teachers required them to repeat what they spoke or their utterance was erroneous. For phonological errors, both teachers and students showed high approval of explicit correction and recast as they were useful and time-saving. This finding was supported by their comment that there is no other useful way for phonological errors rather than explicit correction.

In general, the teachers and students' views were compatible in this current study as they had the tendency to prefer explicit OCF in the name of metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction and prompts types in the form of elicitation and repetition. This finding was different with that of the previous studies (Kamiya, 2016; Roothooft & Breeze, 2016). In Roothooft and Breeze's (2016) study, the teachers were found to be reserved to provide explicit OCF while students expressed positive attitudes to receiving explicit OCF. Teachers' period of involvement in teaching practice (Zhang & Rahimi, 2014), together with exam-oriented learning and teaching purposes (Ha & Murray, 2020, 2021) may be contributed to the findings that the teachers expressed their perspectives of OCF in general, and explicit CF in particular, positively. Similarly, this preference might be greatly influenced by the traditional Vietnamese teaching method in which teachers play the role of knowledge provider, decision maker as well as the controller of the learning environment while students serve as passive receivers of knowledge (Ha & Murray, 2020; Ha & Nguyen, 2021). Therefore, students tend to lean on the teachers' provisions of the correct forms of language explicitly instead of implicitly.

The results regarding the teachers' and students' favorable views on the proper time for CF provision reveals the congruence between theirs. Both teachers and students preferred to receive feedback after they finished their speaking activity or at the end of the lesson. If the error was serious, students were expected to be corrected at the end of the utterance. This finding is consistent with studies by Papangkorn (2015); Ölmezer-Öztürk and Öztürk (2016) in which students show more favor in delayed OCF either at the end of the utterance or at the end of their speaking task. However, this current study is not in line with previous research (Ananda et al., 2017; Ha et al., 2021; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014; Zhu & Wang, 2019) in the sense that learners preferred to receive OCF as soon as they made errors. Regarding teachers' preferences, this finding aligns with other research (Brown, 2009; Gómez Argüelles et al., 2019; Ha et al., 2021) that EFL teachers expressed their preference of giving delayed OCF, that is at the end of the class for the reason that immediate CF was potentially to hurt their students' feelings. As the majority of the interviewed students commented that although they were not bothered about the potential undesirable impacts of immediate CF, they preferred being corrected after they finished their speaking task. It is explained by the fact that middle-interruption might lead to the disrupt in their flow of talk, they would forget what they were speaking. Moreover, when teachers gave correction at the end of their speaking task, either implicitly or explicitly, they could take note of and remember the correct form, reducing the ability of committing it again. The teachers shared the similar viewpoints as correcting students' errors immediately could cause student's interruption, in other cases, leading to their demotivation. This assumption may have been built throughout their teaching practice affected by the popular teaching practice guides (Harmer, 2007). Ellis (2017) indicates that there remains the contradictory issue in teaching and learning pedagogy concerning standpoint on the appropriate time for CF provision between SLA researchers and L2 methodologists. Additionally, Ellis proclaims that it is advisable for L2 methodologists to modify and adapt their teaching guides with reference to updated SLA research findings.

Conclusion

Overall, the present study supports the findings in previous studies that both teachers and learners have positive attitudes towards the importance of OCF in English teaching and learning (Ha et al., 2021; Kim & Mostafa, 2021; Li, 2017; Roothooft & Breeze, 2016; Ünsal Şakiroğlu, 2020; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). With reference to distinctive aspects of CF including error categories to be addressed, OCF types and timing for OCF, the current findings share both the dissimilarities and the similarities in comparison with other research in different contexts. Both teachers and learners highly value of metalinguistic feedback in eliciting learners' self-repairs for grammatical and lexical errors but explicit correction and recasts for phonological errors, the study reveals the congruence in the teachers' and learners' view of delayed OCF, which is not in the same line with other research (Ananda et al., 2017; Ha et al., 2021; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014; Zhu & Wang, 2019). Interestingly, the choice of OCF also depends on timing for OCF in the sense that recast and repetition are used for immediate OCF while delayed OCF in the form of metalinguistic feedback, elicitation is used at the highest rank.

Limitations

Due to constraint time, the current study has several limitations. The first limitation concerns the limited sample population – teachers and learners of English at a higher education institution. In order to ensure the overall assessment of teachers and learners' perspectives towards OCF in the tertiary contexts, it is suggested to carry out the further research in larger scale with the participants from different background, educational settings. Secondly, this research has not focused to clarify the differences and similarities between students' attitudes at different level of English proficiency,

thus the investigation should be done to find out the congruence among distinctive language competence to ensure the overall findings.

References

Akiyama, Y. (2017). Learner beliefs and corrective feedback in telecollaboration: A longitudinal investigation. *System, 64*, 58–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.12.007

Alkhammash, R., & Gulnaz, F. (2019). Oral corrective feedback techniques: An investigation of the EFL teachers' beliefs and practices at Taif university. *Arab World English Journal*, *10*(2), 40 -54. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.4

Ananda, D. R., Febriyanti, E. R., Yamin, M., & Mu'in, F. (2017). Students' preferences toward oral corrective feedback in speaking class at English department of Lambung Mangkurat university academic year 2015/2016. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 7*(3), 176-186. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0703.03

Atma, N., & Widiati, U. (2015). EFL students' preferences for corrective feedback in speaking instruction across speaking course levels. *Bahasa dan Seni: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Pengajarannya*, *43*(2), 183-195. https://bit.ly/3lCRabN

Azad, M., & Kalam, A. (2016). Bangladeshi EFL learners' perceptions and preferences for oral corrective feedback. *ASA University Review*, *10*(2), 75-84. https://bit.ly/3wJOI8y

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

Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice.* Bloomsbury Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903

Brown, A. V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *Modern Language Journal, 93*(1), 46–60. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00827.x

Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: Ameta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research, 20*(4), 436–458. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814563200

Calafato, R. (2020). Evaluating teacher multilingualism across contexts and multiple languages: Validation and insights. *Heliyon 6*(8), e04471. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04471

Calsiyao, I. S. (2015). Corrective feedback in classroom oral errors among Kalinga-Apayao State College students. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, *3*(1), 394-400.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*(3), 297-334. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02310555

Davis, A. (2003). Teachers' and students' beliefs regarding aspects of language learning. *Evaluation & Research in Education, 17*(4), 207–222. https://doi.org/10/1080/09500790308660303

Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration and processing* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01252.x

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal, 1*(1), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.5070/l2v1i1.9054

Ellis, R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in L2 classrooms: What we know so far. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 3–18). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315621432-2

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(2), 339–358. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060141

Gómez Argüelles, L., Hernández Méndez, E., & Perales Escudero, M. D. (2019). EFL teachers' attitudes towards oral corrective feedback: A case study. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 21*(1), 107-120. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v21n1.69508

Ha, X. V., Murray, J., & 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/10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.2.4

Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2020). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL Teachers. *Language Teaching Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820931897

Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2021). The impact of a professional development program on EFL teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. *System, 96*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102405

Ha, X. V., & Nguyen, L. T. (2021). Targets and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: Are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned? *Frontiers in Psychology, 12,* 697160. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697160

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed). Pearson.

Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). Grammar teaching and learning in L2: Necessary, but boring? *Foreign Language Annals, 44*(3), 467–494. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2011.01143.x

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

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. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789.027

Lee, E. J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, *4*(1), 217-230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.022

Li, H., & Iwashita, N. (2021). The role of recasts and negotiated prompts in an FL learning context in China with non-English major university students. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(2), 209-233. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819839727

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

Li, S. (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. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315621432-11

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

Luu, T. H. (2020). Match and mismatches between EFL teachers' and students' preferences for corrective feedback in English speaking classes at a Vietnamese university. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies, 36*(1), 142-155. https://doi.org/10.25073/2525-2445/vnufs.4505

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

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46*(1), 1- 40. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365

Nassaji, H. (2016). Interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: A synthesis and analysis of current research. *Language Teaching Research, 20*(4), 535–562. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816644940

Nassaji, H. (2017). The effectiveness of extensive versus intensive recasts for learning L2 grammar. *Modern Language Journal, 101*(2), 353–368. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12378

Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2020). Corrective feedback and good language teachers. In C. Griffiths & Z. Tajeddin (Eds.), *Lessons from Good Language Teachers* (pp. 151–163). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108774390.015

Nguyen, L. T., & Newton, J. (2019). Corrective feedback in pronunciation teaching: A Vietnamese perspective. In J. Levis, C. Nagle, & E. Todey (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 10th Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference* (pp. 201–212). Iowa State University.

Nhac, H. T. (2021). Effects of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral accuracy in English speaking lessons. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 20*(10), 313-330. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.10.17

Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error correction in ESL: Learner's preferences. *TESL Canada Journal, 10*(2), 71–89. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v10i2.619

Ölmezer-Öztürk, E., & Öztürk, G. (2016). İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği sınıflarda düzeltici sözlü dönütlerin türleri ve zamanlaması üzerine öğrenci görüşleri [Types and timing of oral corrective feedback in EFL classrooms:

Voices from students]. *NOVITAS ROYAL: Research on Youth and Language, 10*(2), 113-133. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1167213.pdf

Papangkorn, P. (2015). SSRUIC students" attitude and preference toward error corrections. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *197*, 1841-1846. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.244

Pham, N. L., & Iwashita, N. (2018). Using corrective feedback on writing to enhance Vietnamese learners' autonomy. In A. Burns, & J. Siegel (Eds.)*, International perspectives on teaching the four skills in ELT: Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing.* Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63444-9_15

Roothooft, 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

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

Tran, K. N., & Nguyen, T. C. (2020). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes: A case at colleges in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 5*(2), 18-31. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejfl.v5i2.3322

Ünsal Şakiroğlu, H. (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://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.v6i1.806

Wang, W., & Li, S. (2020). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in American ESL and Chinese EFL classrooms: A comparative study. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 34*(1), 35-50. http://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1767124

Zhang, L. J., & Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes. *System, 42*, 429–439. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.01.012

Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: A large-scale survey. *Language Awareness, 28*(2), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755