<u>**CHAPTER 1**</u>: **INTRODUCTION**

This initial chapter states the problem and the rationale of the study, together with the aims, objectives and the scope of the whole paper. Above all, it is in this chapter that the research questions are identified to work as clear guidelines for the whole research.

1.1. <u>**Statement of the problem and rationale for the study**</u>

The growth of English as a global language has created a huge demand all over the world, and Vietnam is not an exception. It is obviously seen that since 1970s English learning has developed speedily with English schools "mushrooming almost everywhere" in the country (Do, 2006), and Vietnamese government has put great emphasis on English education at different levels from elementary schools to universities. Since English first entered in Vietnam, the acquisition of grammar and vocabulary was prioritized (Pham, 2005), which meant the Grammar-Translation teaching method was the main approach in the country. As a result, there have been a great number of learners who acquired the written aspect of the language, yet they often lack communicative competence as speaking and listening skills had been neglected in the class. With high demands in the globalization era, students in the country nowadays are expected to be active, skillful learners, and have a good command of English communication. As a matter of fact, the non-traditional teaching method Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) "has quickly gained popularity in Vietnam" since early 1990s (Pham, 2005), and has been widely applied in teaching and learning practices. Consequently, communicative competence in general and speaking skill in particular, have become a great concern for every English learner in Vietnam.

Speaking is undoubtedly considered as one of the most important skills in learning a foreign language (Nunan, 1989), and probably it is the most challenging competence for Vietnamese learners as they have to deal with many difficulties, such as differences in terms of linguistics features, pronunciation, or lacking of authentic materials, and opportunities to practice the language with native speakers. Therefore,

it is very significant for learners to receive guidance and support; especially feedback and correction from their teachers for the sake of learners' improvement. Without these helps, learners surely have many more challenges in studying. As a matter of fact, learners at all level of English proficiency often expect their errors to be addressed, and many of them show disappointment or resentfulness when their errors are neglected (Hugh Moss, 2000).

Since making errors while studying a foreign language is common, understandable and "evidently attached to the human being" (Trianci, Panayota & Maria, pp. 168, 2000), error treatment in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) has been researched and investigated in many studies. It goes without saying that opinions vary differently from one to another. People who believe and follow the traditional teaching methods grammar translation and audio-lingual approach argued that learner' errors need to be corrected immediately and all-inclusively as those errors are expected not to become learners' habit in the future (James, 1993). He additionally cited Brooks' argument (1960, p.58, as cited in James, 1993) that "like sin, error is to be avoided and its influence overcome, but its presence to be expected." This idea has been supported mostly by behaviorism who believe that error is "an obstacle to language learning" (Trianci, Panayota & Maria, pp168-173, 2000), and this is also noticed in Ann (1991) that for a long time, since 1970s, errors have been treated as flaws in learning, and need to corrected comprehensively.

Until the late 1970s, there was a shift from audio-lingual to communicative approach which led to a major change in learning and teaching a foreign language. Learners are allowed to use the language freely without concerning about making mistakes, and teachers are suggested to not correct learners' errors (Savignon, 1983 as cited in Ann, 1991). Trustcott's studies (1999) are well-known examples for this belief. He had conducted a detailed case study against giving oral correction for learners, and stated that there might be more obstacles that teachers and learners have to deal with than being beneficial from the error correction, namely the lack of ability to accurately identify errors, or appropriately correct errors within the context. There

are several researches that support his idea, naming in Douglas's study (2010), as Allwright (1975), Fanselow (1977) or Hendrickson (1978).

Despite these claims, however, a majority of teachers and students express a view that errors should not be neglected totally. This concern has also received support from other researchers; moreover, in their studies, Lyster, Lightbown & Spada (1999) has presented a case that support teachers' error correction and believed that learners do benefit from that. The researchers studied about the students' preferences towards teachers' error correction, and the collected data showed that students have a great desire for it. This research supports the result presented in Reiss (1981) that students believe that error correction is useful with one condition that the error correction must not be frightening.

Considering the current emphasis on learner-centered instruction in CLT method, researchers now pay more attention on learners' beliefs, attitudes and preferences towards teachers' feedback in general, and oral corrective feedback in particular. Many researchers (Cathcart & Olsen, 1976;Chenoweth,Day,Chun & Luppescu, 1982; etc) have attempted to investigate students' preferences towards different types of teacher corrective feedback, particularly in terms of oral error correction in classroom. These early findings suggested that learners have greater desirability on receiving error correction than teachers often think, and students also have widely differing views from teachers regarding methods for correcting errors in the classroom (Schulz, 2001). As a matter of fact, it is related to question whether the proficiency levels of students affect their expectations of teachers' corrective feedback. In other words, are there any similarities or differences between learners' levels of acquisition, and their preferences towards the features of language that they want to be corrected, and want their teachers to focus on? It is assumed that students' preferences will be various according to their levels of language proficiency, and their expectations may change due to the increase in their language competence (James, 1993).

Regarding to the fact that this matter has not been given much concern, it would seem worthwhile for the researcher to further investigate students' perceptions

and preferences towards different methods of teachers' oral corrective feedback in speaking skill; moreover, gain a deeper insight into the similarities or differences of students' attitudes and expectations towards the aspects that they want to receive oral corrective feedback from teachers. In order to clarify this issue, a questionnaire will be carried out. At first, the survey will examine first year mainstream students' preferences and perception of different types of teachers' oral corrective feedback in speaking skill, in the mean time the research will investigate the similar questions with mainstream third year students at the Faculty of English Language Teacher Education (FELTE). The first year students at FELTE, ULIS, VNU are taking their first steps in studying English academically, while the third year students at FELTE have been spending nearly 3 years studying English (6 semesters) at this university, and they are expected to become seniors in a few months. Therefore, the third year students are supposed to have higher level of English competence than the freshman. As a result, the collected data will allow the researcher to compare the opinions of students at different proficiency levels.

1.2. <u>Aims of the study and research questions</u>

First and foremost, the study aims at providing a review of major review about teachers' corrective feedback in general, and teachers' oral corrective feedback in CLT classrooms in particular. Secondly, this research aims to examine the preferences and perception of different types of teachers' oral corrective feedback among mainstream first year students and mainstream third year students at FELTE, ULIS, VNU. Based on the collected data, the research can provide an insight into the similarities or differences (if any) between the students at different proficiency levels and their preferences towards the aspects of language that they want to be corrected. In order to achieve these aims, the research will find answers for these following questions:

1. What are the attitudes of students toward teachers' oral error correction in English speaking lessons?
2. What are the students' preferences for particular types of teachers' oral corrective feedback methods?

3. What are the students' preferences for different error types of classroom oral error correction?

4. What are the similarities and differences in preferences and attitudes towards teachers' oral corrective feedback between the first year mainstream students and the third year mainstream students at FELTE, ULIS, VNU?

1.3. Scope of the study

Within the scope of the study and the author's limitation of time and knowledge, the research concentrates only on teachers' oral error correction in English speaking lessons. Especially, the researcher would like to investigate and compare the perception and preferences of students at different proficiency levels toward teachers' oral error correction methods. Also, the research will put focus on types of errors students want to have corrected by their teachers in English speaking lessons.

In addition, the data for the study is to be collected among first year mainstream students and third year mainstream students at the Faculty of English Language Teacher Education, Hanoi University of Languages and International Studies, Vietnam National University.

1.4. Significance of the study

Overall, the research could be considerably helpful for teachers as well as researchers working on related studies. As for teachers at FELTE, ULIS, VNU, the research, once completed, will provide important information about students' preferences and perception of different types of teachers' oral error correction; more significantly, the comparison between the students' levels of English competence and their preferences towards teachers' oral error correction will be explored. Therefore, teachers could use the information to better their ways of providing oral error corrections as well as to promote the learning and teaching process.

As for students at FELTE, ULIS, VNU, the research is expected to raise awareness of the significant role of teachers' oral error correction in enhancing learners' language competence; moreover, students can also understand about

teachers' oral error correction so that they can make the most use of it in learning English.

As for those who happen to develop an interest in the study of error correction could certainly rely on this research to find reliable and useful information for their related studies in the future.

1.5. <u>Structure of the research</u>

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Through the "Literature Review", the researcher presents the findings closely related to this study's issue, and provides background knowlegde to better understanding for the rest of the paper.

Chapter 3: All the details about "Methodology" including the sampling and participants, main data collection instrument, data collection methods and its procedures are discussed.

Chapter 4: Data analysis and discussion about the results to find out the answers to the four research questions are presented.

Chapter 5: Conclusion for the whole paper is drawn.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This second chapter sheds light on the literature of the study, specifically the background and a number of studies related to the research topic. To begin with, it will be provided with an overview of the speaking skill together with teaching and learning speaking skill in Vietnam and at FELTE, ULIS, VNU; following is the key concepts about teacher feedback, teachers' corrective feedback, the central role of corrective feedback in learning and teaching process, and teachers' oral corrective feedback. Finally, a brief review of the related studies will disclose the research gap and clarify the targets and objectives of this research.

I. Overview of speaking skill

2.1. Definition of speaking skill

As far as the researcher is concerned, speaking skill seems to have various definitions for different groups of people with different needs and purposes. According to the Oxford Dictionary of Current English (2009), speaking is "the action of conveying information or expressing ones' thoughts and feelings in spoken languages." (p.414)

According to Noah Webster (1980), speaking has a variety of meanings:

a. To tell, to say, to make known or as by speaking, to declare; to announce

b. To proclaim; to celebrate

c. To use or be able to use (a given language) in speaking

d. To address

In a narrow sense, people who know a language are referred to as "speakers of that language, as if speaking included all other types of skills, and many, if not most foreign language learners are primarily interested in learning to speak." (Ur, 2006) According to Brown (1994), Burns and Joyce (1997), speaking skill is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving and processing information. Sharing the same viewpoint, Channey (1998) added speaking is "the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal

symbols, in a variety of contexts". Based on the previous definitions, it can be understood that speaking is the process of sharing with another person, or with other people, ones' knowledge, interests, attitudes, opinions or ideas. Delivery of ideas, opinions, or feelings is an important aspect of the process of speaking which help the speaker and the listener communicate, understand each other.

During the process of conducting this paper, the researcher also found some different terms that mean "speaking"; for example, "speech", "oral", "oral communication", or "oral language".

In language teaching and learning, speaking skill is a crucial part together with listening, reading and writing. Nunan (2003) stated that "speaking is the productive oral skill. It consists of producing systematic verbal utterance to convey meaning." Bygate (1987) conducted researches to distinguish knowledge and skill in speaking lessons also considered speaking as a skill. He believed that knowing the distinction between those two was significant in teaching a language (in terms of speaking).

In short, there appear different concepts of speaking; therefore, in this paper, "speaking" will be used to refer to a skill related to English language teaching and learning.

2.2. Elements of speaking skill

2.2.1 Accuracy

It goes without saying that accuracy is one of the most significant criteria in evaluating ones' linguistic ability, and it also is a necessary goal for language users to achieve during the learning a new language process.

Accuracy is identified various types by different researchers with different beliefs. According to the Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistic, accuracy is the "ability to produce grammatically correct sentences, but it may not include the ability to speak or write fluently". Nevertheless, Skehan (1996) presented that accuracy refers to "how well the target language is produced in relation to the rule system of the target language". Before that, Pica (1983) had conducted an

analysis of target-like use can measure accuracy, considering both the contexts and uses of the structure in question. Omaggio (1986) stated that accuracy may include grammatical, sociolinguistic, semantic, rhetorical accuracy and some surface features like spelling and punctuation and pronunciation.

Thornbury (2000) also believed that accuracy covers more than only the grammatical feature. He stated specifically that speaking accurately means speak without or with few errors on not only grammar, but also pronunciation and vocabulary as well. He even designed a scale to assess language users' accuracy in speaking skill.

- Grammar: Students use correct words order, tenses, tense agreement, etc. Students do not leave out articles, prepositions, or difficult tenses.

- Vocabulary: Students have a range of vocabulary that corresponds to the syllabus year list and uses words you have taught.

- Pronunciation: Students speak and most people understand.

Because the focus of this study is teacher oral corrective feedback on students' performances in speaking skill; therefore it could be not fully covered if the researcher only concentrated on grammatical accuracy and left out other features; such as pronunciation, vocabulary, or linguist.

2.2.2. Fluency

In second language learning and teaching, fluency is also used as a criterion to measure one's speaking competence. According to Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistic, fluency is the ability to produce written or spoken language without causing comprehension difficulties or breakdowns in communication. Specifically, in terms of speaking, fluency is the capability of speaking with an acceptable, but not necessarily perfect command of intonation, vocabulary or grammar.

Normally, people do not have many difficulties in speaking their first language fluently. However, when it comes the second language teaching and learning, linguistics find it hard to draw an agreement about language fluency. In his study about "Second Language Oral Fluency", Yan Heyun put great efforts in reviewing literature and related studies in this field and concluded that "second language fluency is operationally defined as the ability to speak acceptable variety of SL (the language) with smooth, continuity, and coherence that can be felt by listener".

In 2000, Thornbury (2000) pointed out the criteria for assessing fluency as following:

- Lack of hesitation: Students speak smoothly, at a natural speech. They do not hesitate long and it is easy to follow what they are saying.

- Length: Students can put ideas together to form a message or an argument. They can make not only the simplest of sentence patterns but also complex ones to complete the task.

- Independence: Students are able to express their ideas in a number of ways, keep talking and ask questions, etc. to keep the conversation going.

II. Teaching and learning speaking skill

2.3. Methods of teaching speaking skill

In teaching English as a second language, there have appeared three main methods: grammar-translation (GT), audio-lingual method (ALM) and communicative language teaching (CLT).

GT method was known as the primary method in the late nineteenth century into the twentieth used to teach languages. Richards and Rodgers (1986) considered this method as the "mental discipline". It focused on grammatical analysis and translation, in other words, learners will learn the language by learning the grammar rules, and practicing translation exercises. The method has received many harsh

criticisms from linguistics and researchers. The fact is that GT method focuses on developing learners' reading proficiency in foreign language. In other words, its objectives are reading literature and doing translation in both directions, as well as increasing mental learners' capacity. Therefore, communicative skills (speaking and listening) were most likely to be neglected in the GT class. As a result, after several years of studying, students may have good knowledge of grammatical rules and translating skills, but they have troubles in delivering simple speeches fluently and naturally.

Generally, GT method has been considered as the least effective language teaching methodology (Richard & Rogers, 1986), it is still widely used in many countries, including Vietnam. In fact, this method was the first one introduced in Vietnam, and currently it has been referred as the "traditional method" in language teaching of the country.

Another main method was known as the audio-lingual method. Unlike GT method, ALM's primary objective is oral proficiency, which means learners are expected to deliver advanced conversational competence quickly, and writing is avoided at the early stages. Richard & Rodges (1986) viewed the method as "a system of structurally related elements for encoding of meaning, the elements being phonemes, morphemes, words, structures, and sentence types". After decades of popularity, ALM gradually showed the shortcomings. Many researches had pointed out that learners have little chances to actually learn the language through a process of habit formation and over learning. More importantly, ALM failed to teach language learners "long-term communicative proficiency because the language it taught was de-contextualized and had little communicative function" (An Introduction to Language Teaching Methods).

The new teaching method CLT has quickly gained popularity when it first introduced in the world. CLT aims at teaching language learners and the expected outcome is students' communicative competence. The concept of communicative competence was first brought up by Hymes in 1972 in response to Chomsky's concept of grammatical competence and continued to be developed by many other researchers.

The goal of CLT is to develop learners' 5 communicative competence: socio-cultural, discourse, linguistic, actional and strategic (Celce-Murcia et al, ibid.,p.10).

Considering the fact that the two previous methods has shown failures in teaching the language in general, and in teaching speaking skill in particular; CLT which helps learners "to communicate through interaction in the target language." (Nunan, 1991) considerably enhances students' communicative skill. In CLT classroom, learners have chances to learn the language through many activities, namely information-gaps, interactive activities, role play, etc. Besides, they are provided authentic materials, and meaningful tasks which students may need to handle in real-life situations. Consequently, they will learn the language naturally, and might make mistakes during the learning process. Teachers' feedbacks, in this case, appear to become very significant.

In Vietnam, CLT is considered the current dominant methodology and one of the most effective approaches to teach learners to speak in second language. At high school level, students' textbooks are designed to equip students 5 essential parts with 4 skills (reading, speaking, listening and writing), and language focus (pronunciation and grammar). In the Faculty of English Language Teacher Education, ULIS, VNU, this method is also employed.

III. Overview of oral corrective feedback in speaking lesson

2.4. Feedback in speaking lesson

2.4.1. Definition of feedback

Based on dissimilar criteria and standards, widely differing definitions in term of teacher feedback exist. According to Ramaprasad's theory (1983), which is used extensively in education, feedback is information about the gap between the actual level and the reference level of a system parameter, which is used to alter the gap in some way (p.4). In contrast to Ramaprasad (1983), Askew and Lodge (2000) simply define definition of feedback to include "all dialogue to support learning in both formal and informal situations" (p.1). According to Hattie and Timperley (2007),

feedback, in general, is conceptualized as information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding. Wlodkowski & Jaynes (1990) and Ur (1996) argue that teachers' feedback is kind of assessment that concern to the giving information about student's performance, the "information that students receive about the quality of their performance on a given task. Knowledge of results, comments about skills performance, and notes on a written assignments and an approving nod are forms of feedback that teachers often use with students." (Wlodkowski & Jaynes p.93). As stated by Sommer (1982), teacher feedback provides the information about what the students need to revise or change in their writing for the next draft or paper; when Winner and Butler (1994) provide an summary in their claim that:" feedback is information with which a learner can confirm, add to, overwrite, tune, or restructure information in memory, whether that information is domain knowledge, meta-cognitive knowledge, beliefs about self and tasks, or cognitive tactics and strategies" (p.5740).

Among various definitions of teacher feedback linguistics have given, some of them are apparently not convincing enough. As for the definition given by Ramaprasad (1983), feedback is expected to fulfill the gap between the student's actual level and reference level, but this definition did not mention how and in what ways feedback can do the task. The definition by Sommer (1982) and Winner and Butler (1994) shared the same point of view, yet they lacked of the significance of teacher feedback in assessment, approval and encouragement, which are obviously necessary.

The definition by Wlodkowski & Jaynes (1990) combines many criteria to define a teacher feedback more exactly and is agreed by many linguists and presented here as an "official" definition of teacher feedback.

2.4.2. Types of feedback

In Crane's study (2006), another way of sorting types of teacher feedback is given, which is displayed in the following table.

Types of Teacher Feedback

CONFIRMATIVE	Simply inform the learner the accuracy of a response
CORRECTIVE	Inform the learner that their response was incorrect with the knowledge of the correct or desired response
EXPLANATORY	Correct and include relevant information about the context of a correct response is labeled explanatory.
DIAGNOSTIC	Explain the source of the incorrect response by comparison with common mistake
ELABORATIVE	Provide related information design to enhance and extend the learner's knowledge acquisition.

Figure 1: Teacher Feedback Types classified by Crane (2006)

There are also studies sorted out types of teacher feedback by mode (Morra, 2009), which are audio (on-tape, recorded) feedback and written feedback. The term "taped commentary" was first suggested by K. Hyland (1990, 2003); on-tape comment required the teacher to record their responses on a tape cassette and to write a number on the student's paper to signal what the observation referred to (K. Hyland, 2003). About the term "written feedback", there also a number of studies about it and its effectiveness in learning process (Song 1998, Ferris & Roberts 2001, Ferris 2004). Written feedback was understood as written responses, comment or correction provided by the teacher on the students' writing.

It is widely known that besides these types of feedback presented above, there are some other related typologies of feedback as following.

- Verbal or Non-verbal feedback

Verbal and non-verbal feedback is also mentioned in Long (1996); verbal feedback which is shown in a form that is spoken or capable of being spoken concerns not only phrases used but also tone of voice. Accordingly, non-verbal feedback refers to the one made in silence with cues like facial expressions.

- Teacher and Peer-feedback

As stated by Wajnryb (1990), "feedback works in three directions: teachers to students, students to students and students to teachers."

- Oral and written feedback

Teachers' written feedback is delivered to students in the form of notes, oral feedback is done in spoken words. It should be noted that oral feedback is synonymous with verbal feedback, and it cannot be delivered in silence like the way non-verbal feedback is. For example, question mark can be shown in both teacher's face and voice.

S: I go yesterday.
T: (T turns face to the side a bit and frowns) go?
S: Oh. Yes. I went yesterday.

(Adapted from Nguyen et al., 2003)

Clearly enough, the formal one (*"turn face to the side a bit and frowns")* is non-verbal feedback and the latter ("go with rising tone) is oral. In short, oral feedback must be in utterances.

2.5. Corrective feedback

Corrective feedback (CF) in one form or another has always fascinated applied linguistics and teachers. Researchers have used various definitions of CF, and one of the first CF definitions was presented by Chauron (1977), and he considered it as "any reaction of the teacher which clearly transform, disapprovingly refer to, or demand improvement of the learner utterance" (p.31). This definition is employed very commonly by researchers. There are some synonyms often commonly used to refer to CF such as "error correction", "negative feedback", "negative evidence" or "form-

focused feedback". According to Schechter (1991), he suggested that these terms were used "respectively and interchangeably". However, in 2008, Han stated that error correction often implies an direct and obvious correction, while CF provides some clues, hints or questions for students to recognize the mistakes. This idea confirmed Loewen and Erlam (2006)'s suggestion:

CF takes the form of responses to learner utterances that contain error. The responses can consist of (a) an indication that an error has been committed, (b) provision of the correct target language form, or (c) metalinguistic information about the nature of the error, or any combination of these. (p. 340).Interestingly, in 1999, Lightbown and Spada gave CF definition as:

Any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect. This includes various responses that the learners receive. When a language learner says, 'He go to school every day', corrective feedback can be explicit, for example, 'no, you should say goes, not go' or implicit 'yes he goes to school every day', and may or may not include metalinguistic information, for example, 'Don't forget to make the verb agree with the subject'. (p. 171-172)

They also stated that no matter how we let the students know that they are using the language incorrectly, we are using CF, which have various responses from teachers. In this research paper, the researcher also holds that idea of CF as one of the key concepts.

There are also researches sorted out CF on form, whereas written CF which delivered in the form of written note, oral CF is done in spoken words. It is also necessary to distinguish different modes of oral CF. The feedback that is audio (on tape) is consider as "taped commentary". The term "taped commentary" was first suggested by K. Hyland (1990, 2003); on-tape comment required the teacher to record their responses on a tape cassette and to write a number on the student's paper to signal what the observation referred to (K. Hyland, 2003).

In short, oral CF whenever mentioned in this paper is referred to the feedback that is delivered in spoken words aims at correct mistakes to the learners in the class.

2.5.1. Roles of corrective feedback in ELT

Since making errors while studying a foreign language is common, understandable and "evidently attached to the human being" (Trianci, Panayota & Maria, pp. 168, 2000), error treatment in SLA has been researched and investigated in many studies. There are an increasing number of studies in SLA show that CF plays a very important role in L2's learners' studying process, and they have a great desire to receive their teachers' CF. L2 learners have to deal with a number of difficulties when they study a new language. Therefore it is very significant for learners to receive guidance and support; especially feedback and correction from their teachers for the sake of learners' improvement. Without these helps, learners surely have many more challenges in studying. As a matter of fact, learners at all level of English proficiency often expect their errors to be addressed, and many of them show disappointment or resentfulness when their errors are neglected (Hugh Moss, 2000). In Russell and Spada (2006)'s study, the researchers found that CF is facilitative of L2 development and it had a huge effect in students' improvement. Similarly, in their study (2007) Mackey and Goo also concluded that CF is beneficial for L2 learners. Although the provision of CF seems natural in learning and studying L2 process, the role that it plays has been debated for years, and it seems to be different from one to another.

2.5.2. Oral corrective feedback

As presented above, teacher feedback works in many directions for different purposes. However, due to the limitation of this study, the researcher only focus on the oral CF provided by teachers to students in speaking skill class only.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) had outlined six different types of oral CF, which were found commonly used in the French immersion classroom in their observational studies. In 1998, Diane also shared the same opinion that oral CF could be divided into six types, namely recasts, elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic cues, explicit correction, and repetition.

- **Recasts:**

Recasts refer to the reformulation of a student's utterance with the non-target-like feature changed to a correct form. The correction may be accompanied by accentuated word stress or intonation.

- **Elicitation**

Elicitation refers to when teachers directly elicit the correct form of an utterance from a student. The correction is often accompanied by accentuated word stress or intonation.

- **Clarification requests**

A clarification request occurs when a teacher has misunderstood or failed to understand a student's utterance. The teacher then asks for clarification in order to obtain a reformulated version of the utterance.

- **Metalinguistic cues**

Metalinguistic feedback refers to when teachers use the students' current knowledge of English grammar, lexis, etc., to try and elicit a self corrected response from the student.

- **Explicit correction**

Explicit correction refers to the explicit provision of a correct form and the clear indication of the non-target- like feature used.

- **Repetition**

Repetition refers to when the teacher repeats a student's utterance simply adjusting the intonation so as to highlight the error.

Explicit correction	St: He take the bus to go to school. T: Oh, you should say he takes. he takes the bus to go to school.
Recasts	St: He take the bus to go to school. T: He takes the bus to go to school.
Elicitation	St: He take the bus to go to school. T: He ….? T: How do we form the third person singular form in English? T: Can you correct that?
Metalinguistic feedback	St: He take the bus to go to school. T: Do we say he take? T: How do we say when it forms the third person singular form?
Clarification request	St: He take the bus to go to school. T: Pardon me?
Repetition	St: He take the bus to go to school. T: He take?

Table 01: Examples of six types of oral corrective feedback by Lyster and Ranta (1997)

2.6. Students' perception and preferences toward teachers' oral CF

Previous researches in the area of oral CF in the classroom have paid some attention on teachers and learners' perceptions on oral CF. Horwitz (1988) noted that it is necessary for teachers to understand their learners' beliefs about language learning in order to foster more effective strategies in their learning process. He stated that disappointments from mismatch between teachers' and learners' perceptions may cause bad impacts on learning and teaching processes. Schulz (1996, 2001) had

showed in his studies that students' attitudes toward grammar instruction and error correction were more favorable than their teachers' attitudes; that is, learners want more error correction. In his studies, James (1993) also investigated into the learners' preferences and expectations regarding error corrections. Plus, he raised the questions about the correlation between learners' acquisitions and preferences towards teachers' oral CF in the classroom by comparing the opinions of intermediate and advanced ELS learners. James investigated and compared the attitudes, opinions, and expectation of 147 secondary school pupils in Singapore and 500 undergraduate students of National University of Singapore from five different faculties. The result showed no big different between two groups of participants in terms of expectations and desirability of oral corrective feedback. There were two disagreements of the two groups of students on *which learner error should be corrected* and *who should correct which errors.* James concluded that the differences were either the demand for English language on the different groups of students with different acquisitions, or the focus of activities at different levels.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In the preceding chapter, the related studies on the research topic were briefly reviewed for the theoretical basis of the whole study. In this chapter, the participants, the research instrument as well as the procedure of data collection and analysis are discussed in detail.

3.1. The setting of the study

The study was conducted at the Faculty of English Teacher Education, Hanoi University of Languages and International Studies, Vietnam National University; and focuses on students at different proficiency levels about their preferences and perception toward teachers' oral corrective feedback in speaking skill.

3.1.1 Description of first-year students' English language program

Course objectives

On the completion of the course, the course participants are expected to: express themselves with some hesitation on daily common topics, such as communication, entertainment, media, etc. Moreover, students are expected to comprehend and follow teachers' lectures and instructions in English, actively involved in group work discussions, and are able to express their opinions in various ways. In terms of pronunciation, students would be able to have understandable pronunciation regard to word stress, strong and weak forms, sentences stress, and intonation. Besides, it is also noticeable that students are expected to give straightforward descriptions on a variety of subjects, provide an argument with reasonable ideas and examples, and can deliver a prepared presentation on a familiar topic, in which main points are presented with understandable and reasonable orders. (Course outline for ELT students, 2011-2012).

Course content

Students are expected to fully participate in in-class activities including three main parts. The first part is speaking activities related to weekly common topics, namely sports, money, environment prepared by teachers; students do the tasks and get feedback from the teachers. The next module is role-play, and this aims to improve students' confidence in using conversational English. Last but not least, students also need to do a pair-presentation which topics are related to the theme. This activity aims to enhance students' ability in using English academically. (Course outline for ELT students, 2011-2012).

Course materials

Students are required to study the Speaking course with "Speak out Pre Intermediate" (Student's Book) by Clare, A. & Wilson, JJ (2011) published by Pearson Longman.

3.1.2 Description of third-year students' English language program

Course objectives

On the completion of the course, the third-year students are expected to be able to deliver clear, logical, systematical descriptions and presentations on fairly complex subjects. Students are also assumed to be able to emphasize the significant points with reasonable supporting ideas and sum up with sound conclusions. Moreover, students are expected to make conversations with a good level of fluency and accuracy, and be capable of dealing with abstract expressions. At the end of the course, third-year students can discuss about complex and sensitive issues with relevant arguments while dealing with hostile questions (Course outline for ELT students, 2011-2012).

Course content

Students are expected to fully participate in in-class activities including three main parts. The first part is speaking activities related to fairly complex topics prepared by teachers weekly based on the course book; students do the tasks and get feedback from the teachers. Another component part of the course is completing homework exercise with various types of tasks (writing, reading, grammar, vocabulary…) which helps students to enhance and deepen English's knowledge. Last

but not least, students are required to do a formal presentation in group of 3 or 4 students with weekly topics assigned by teachers. Students need to hand in their presentations' outlines and related references to the teacher before doing it. After the presentation, the presenters group is expected to receive questions from peers and teacher (Course outline for ELT students, 2011-2012).

Course materials

Students are required to study the Speaking course with "Inside Out Advanced" (Student's Book) by Helena Gomm & Jon Hird (2001) published by Macmilan.

3.2. Methodology

3.2.1. Participants

The participants include 50 first year students of the QH2011 course and 100 third year students of the QH2009 course, at the Faculty of English Teacher Education, Hanoi University of Languages and International Studies, Vietnam National University.

Number of courses	Number of participants
QH2009	100
QH2011	50
Total	150

Table 02: A classification of the student participants according to their courses

As for the participants from the course QH2011, they have studied at the faculty for nearly one academic year, and they are taking their first steps in studying speaking skill in the second semester, by officially learning through a variety of in-class speaking activities with particular basic topics and themes. Moreover, they are assigned by teachers two other activities, namely a role-play and a pair presentation, which aim to enhance students' ability and confidence in using conversational English and academic English respectively.

As for the participants from the course QH2009, they have studied for five academic semesters before beginning this semester 6 at the faculty. They have been training with qualified teachers and they are used to studying in an ELT class with

variety of activities from basic to fairly complex topics and issues to enhance their English. Moreover, they are required to conduct a formal presentation and at the end of this semester, they may receive questions from audience (teachers and peers), and students are expected to provide logic and reasonable answers with polite manner and appropriate English expressions to satisfy the questioners.

3.2.2. Sampling strategy

The research's sampling strategy is the use of cluster, convenience, and proportional strategies in combination. 50 first year students of the QH2011 course and 100 third year students of the QH2009 course were selected to participate in this research to complete the survey questionnaire. The researcher selected these two groups of students in a hope of obtaining comprehensive data and accurate reflection of the practice of teachers' oral feedback in speaking lessons. In addition, the number of participants made up roughly 35% of all students from each course could be considered reasonable enough.

3.2.3. Research questions:

This study aims to answers these questions that follow:

1. What are the attitudes of students toward oral error correction in English speaking lessons?

2. What are the students' preferences for particular types of teachers' oral corrective feedback methods?

3. What are the students' preferences for different types of classroom oral error correction?

4. What are the similarities and differences in preferences and attitudes towards teachers' oral corrective feedback between the first year mainstream students and the third year mainstream students at FELTE, ULIS, VNU?

3.3. Data collection methods

3.3.1. Questionnaire

3.3.1.1. Justification of the use of questionnaire

Questionnaire, as Brown (2001) defined is "any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react either by writing out their answers or selecting them among existing answers" (cited in Mackey and Gass, 2005). This instrument was singled out in this paper as it is "one of the most common methods of collecting data on attitudes and opinions from a large group of participants" which gives researchers opportunities to collect necessary data that respondents are able to reflect about themselves (Mackey and Gass, 2005). Besides, interviewing every single participant will take a lot of time and financial resources; therefore the researcher believes that it is the most suitable instrument to answer the research questions.

It goes without saying that questionnaire does have some advantages over other instruments; however it also has some drawbacks that the researcher needs to be aware and prepared when the research solely relies on this instrument. The researcher understands that questionnaire, like many other evaluation methods happen after the event; therefore respondents might not remember some important details. The best way to fix this is the respondents are given enough time to think and recall events when answering the survey. Besides, a questionnaire though mainly prepared based on related studies, however, it is possible that there are some points the respondents misinterpret or misread the questions (Low, 1999) and provide inaccurate answers. To minimize the drawbacks, the researcher needs to use simple and understandable language in the survey; moreover, before officially distributing, the questionnaire should be piloted with some volunteer ideal participants to make sure that they understand it right. However, using simple language leads to another issue is that this data collection instrument is not advisable for seeking deeply into a matter, therefore limits the research's outcome (Molser and Kalton, 1971). To decrease these weaknesses, the survey is designed with both close-ended questions and open-ended questions to seek for deeper information.

3.3.1.2. Description of the use of questionnaire

The questionnaire constructed was based on the definition of oral teacher corrective feedback, and its typologies to answer the research questions. It was designed to collect information about the respondents' past experience and their views on teachers' oral corrective feedback. It is a reference from other related studies (James, A. 1993, Katayama, A. 2006, & Katayama, A. 2007) and also has been modified and piloted to be suitable with the respondents of the study. The questionnaire was written in simple English and these questions were arranged in a logical order to ensure the complete understanding for participants. Furthermore, in every concept or definition, there also be provided example to make it clear and easy to understand, as well as to avoid possible misunderstanding and thus, the inaccuracy of the outcomes.

In the questionnaire, the first page served as a pre-face with brief introduction about the researcher, concise explanation of the research topic as well as the questionnaire's purpose. The following parts of the survey are arranged in a respective order to answer the four research questions focusing on respondents' attitudes and preferences toward teachers' oral error correction in speaking skills, following is a descriptive table of six types of teachers' oral error correction in details, and questions concerning about students' level of assessment. Next, questions about students' preferences toward teachers' oral corrective feedback are given, and the survey ended with a question about students' desire for different linguistic areas in terms of errors corrected by teachers. The survey is divided into five parts combined of both open-ended and close-ended questions.

3.4. Procedures of data collection

Broadly speaking, the process of data collection could be put into three major phases as follows.

- **Phase 1: Designing the questionnaire**

The first phase was the preparation for the data collection process, which included the designing of the questionnaire. In the meantime, an analytic model for

teacher commentary was made to prepare for the data analysis. Whatever forms the data collection instruments took, personal information of all participants was ensured to be kept confidential and anonymous for ethical reasons.

- **Phase 2: Piloting**

Piloting is conducted with three voluntary first year students and three third year students, the result of which was taken into great consideration for the formulation of the final draft. For instance, thanks to the pilot process, the pre-face of the students' questionnaire was much improved with more concise explanation and specific examples. Also, the format of the questionnaire was changed to be more suitable and simple for respondents.

- **Phase 3: Administering the questionnaire**

To collect necessary data and minimize the drawbacks of the questionnaire, the researcher will distribute the survey directly to the participants face-to-face. By doing along with the respondents, the researcher can explain any unclear point when necessary.

3.5. Data analysis methods

There will be one statistical method be employed in order to analyze the collected data, namely quantitative analysis strategy. This instrument will help to collect necessary data from the participants to answer three research questions.

3.6. Data analysis procedure

In order to analyze the collected data, the researcher follows these steps:

Data from instrument questionnaire:

In the questionnaire, there is a combination of both open-ended and close-ended questions, so basically the responses from the close-ended questions are ready to be quantified and analyzed, while the answers from the open-ended will be generated into groups from the statements given by participants. When the raw data is ready, the tables, the charts and graphs will be principally employed to analyze and compare figures.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the previous chapter, the methodology applied in this study has been clarified with descriptions and justifications of the choice of participants, the instruments and the process of data collection and analysis. In this chapter, all collected data will be analyzed and discussed to reveal the answers to each research question in turn.

4.1. Research question 1: What are the attitudes of students toward teachers' oral error correction in English speaking lessons?

The students' attitudes toward teachers' oral CF could be found through the answers for the first question in the survey, where students were asked to rank four given statements concerning their opinions about receiving teachers' oral error correction in speaking lessons from **1(strongly disagree)** to **5(strongly agree).** The data about first year students could be summarized in the table below:

Statements	*Strongly Agree*	*Agree*	*Moderate*	*Disagree*	*Strongly Disagree*	Number of responses	Mean	S.D.
	5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**			
1. I want my teacher(s) to correct all of my errors in speaking English.	26 **(52%)**	16 (32%)	4 (8%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	**50**	**4.3**	**1**
2. Teacher(s) should correct all of learners' errors in speaking English.	9 (18%)	7 (14%)	23 **(46%)**	11 (22%)	0 (0%)	**50**	**3.3**	**1**
3. Teacher(s) should correct only errors which interfere with communication.	1 (2%)	11 (22%)	27 **(54%)**	5 (10%)	6 (12%)	**50**	**2.9**	**0.9**
4. Teacher(s) shouldn't correct learners' errors at all.	3 (6%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	5 (10%)	40 **(80%)**	**50**	**1.4**	**1**

As it can be seen, freshmen have a strong need for teachers' oral CF when **90%** of respondents show their disagreement on not receiving any correction from their teachers in speaking lessons. The reason could be found at the statement *"I want my teacher(s) to correct all of my errors in speaking English"* when the number of participants said **"Disagree"** is **8%.**

32% of first year students stated that teachers should correct all of students' errors, while half of the respondents showed a mutual opinion about this idea. Besides, they are confused about having all of their errors to be corrected, or only errors that trouble communication. More than half of the respondents provided a neutral idea about this issue. In short, most of the participants are aware of their own demands for teachers' oral corrective feedback; however, they do not have any specific favor neither at being corrected all of their errors nor only errors that interfere communication.

The collected data about third year students could be summarized in the table below:

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Number of responses	Mean	S.D.
	5	4	3	2	1			
1. I want my teacher(s) to correct all of my errors in speaking English.	**40** (40%)	35 (35%)	15 (15%)	7 (7%)	3 (0%)	**100**	**4.1**	**1.1**
2. Teacher(s) should correct all of learners' errors in speaking English.	22 (22%)	36 **(36%)**	32 (32%)	10 (10%)	0 (0%)	**100**	**3.7**	**1**
3. Teacher(s) should correct only errors which interfere with communication.	6 (6%)	30 (30%)	35 **(35%)**	22 (22%)	7 (7%)	**100**	**3.1**	**1.1**
4. Teacher(s) shouldn't correct learners' errors at all.	4 (4%)	7 (7%)	3 (3%)	30 (30%)	56 **(56%)**	**100**	**1.8**	**1.1**

Table 04: Third year students' attitudes toward receiving the provision of teachers' oral corrective feedback

We can see that third year students also have a desire toward receiving teachers' oral errors correction in speaking English when **86%** students disagreed with the idea that teachers should not correct any of students' errors. This is supported by the fact that **75%** third year students wanted their mistakes to be corrected by their teachers.

More than a half of the respondents agreed with the idea of having teachers to correct all of their mistakes, while others provided a mutual answer. Regard to the idea of having only mistakes that interfere with communication being corrected, the respondents were being confused and could not seek a high agreement. Without doubt, third year students show a positive attitude toward teachers' oral CF in speaking skill.

4.2. Research question 2: What are the students' preferences for particular types of teachers' oral corrective feedback methods?

To respond for this question, the researcher ask participants to rank 6 types of teachers' oral CF based on level of assessment from **1** *"Not good"* to **5** *"Very good"*. The researcher also provided 6 types of teachers' oral correction with examples to help students understand clearly. The collected data about first year students could be summarized in the table below:

Teachers' oral error correction techniques in speaking skill	*Very Good*	*Good*	*Average*	*Not so good*	*Not good*	Number of responses	Mean	S.D.
	5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**			
1. Recast	3 (6%)	7 (14%)	22 **(44%)**	14 (28%)	4 (8%)	**50**	**2.8**	**1**
2. Explicit correction	8 (16%)	5 (10%)	9 (18%)	18 **(36%)**	10 (20%)	**50**	**2.7**	**1.3**
3. Repetition	10 (20%)	17 **(34%)**	12 (24%)	8 (16%)	3 (6%)	**50**	**3.5**	**1.2**
4.Clarification request	2 (4%)	14 (28%)	9 (18%)	18 **(36%)**	7 (14%)	**50**	**2.7**	**1.1**
5.Elicitation	7 (14%)	21 **(42%)**	15 (30%)	7 (14%)	0 (0%)	**50**	**3.6**	**0.9**
6. Metalinguistic cues	10 (20%)	16 **(32%)**	17 **(34%)**	7 (14%)	0 (0%)	**50**	**3.6**	**1**

Table 05: First year students' assessment toward types of teachers' oral corrective feedback

It can be seen that **elicitation** is the most favored type of teachers' oral CF ranked by freshmen **(3.6)**, and only a small number of students thought it is not really

good. Following is the **metalinguistic cues**, which teachers use the students' current knowledge of English to elicit a self-corrected response from students, is rated **3.6** with 54% of respondents chose *"Good"* or *"Very good"*; and only 14% provided a negative opinion. **Repetition technique** is also considered as a good type with more than 50% positive selection.

Explicit correction is the least favored technique **(2.7)** and more than a half of the respondents ranked it not good. **Clarification request** also received little preference from first year students when only a third of the respondents rated it is a good technique.

To understand freshmen's preferences toward teachers' oral CF better, the researcher provided two questions asked the respondents to choose *two from six types of techniques* that they want to receive more from their speaking teachers, and *two types that they wish not*. Besides, respondents were asked to state reasons for their choices. The following table is summarized from the data from first year students:

Teachers' oral errors correction techniques in speaking skill	Types that first year students wish to receive	Types that first year students wish to NOT receive
1. Recast	14	17
2. Explicit correction	16	9
3. Repetition	13	21
4.Clarification request	9	**23**
5.Elicitation	**25**	6
6. Metalinguistic cues	12	17
Total:	**89**	**92**
Response rate:	**89%**	**92%**

Table 06: First year students' preferences toward types of teachers' oral corrective feedback

Obviously, **elicitation** is chosen by **25** respondents and it is considered as the most preferred types of oral CF that students want to receive more from their speaking teachers. The most common reasons that first year students provided for their choice were time saving, clear and students are reminded of the knowledge they have learnt. Besides, there also are 6 students do not want to receive this type of oral CF, but only 3 reasons were provided when they think it is not for student-level or it seems to be quite negative. Though there are opinions that against elicitation technique, it is surely the most preferred types of teachers' oral error correction in speaking skill. **Explicit correction** also is preferred by first year students when 16 of the respondents noted

this type as their preferences, because students can recognize the mistakes and it is also easy to understand.

Metalinguistic cues is ranked as a good type of oral error correction by teachers after elicitation, however, there are only 12 students stated that they wanted to receive this kind of technique. Students think this type is detailed, clear and it is a chance for them to self-correct their own mistakes. The number students do not want to receive this type of CF (**17 students**) outnumbered these students who do want to (**12 students**); and students think it is not necessary, or it take a lot of time. In short, this type of technique is appreciated by a large amount of students; however, they think that teachers do not have enough of time to do it very often.

Repetition is also appreciated by respondents, however only 13 students want their teachers to use it more, and 21 students do not want to receive it from their teachers. Most of students provided the same reason that it is not clear, and they do not know what is wrong. But students who support this type think that it may avoid offense and "save students' faces".

Clarification request is the least preferred technique when 23 students made their choice that they do not their teachers deliver that kind of oral correction in the future. Many reasons are provided, and the most common ones are *"Students might not recognize it as a correction"* or *"It is unclear, I don't get it"*. This type of technique also is ranked as the least appreciated by the respondents (56%).

In conclusion, a large number of freshmen highly appreciate **elicitation technique**, and they also want their teachers use it more because it helps students to recall the knowledge, learn from the mistakes and self-correct their own errors. Another group of first year respondents prefer to receive **explicit correction** because it is easy to understand. Besides, **clarification request** is the least favored and preferred by more than half of first year students, they stated that they do not understand because it is unclear. **Repetition** and **metalinguistic cues** are two types of feedback that students are not willing to receive from their teachers, they think these techniques are unclear, or take lots of time. **Recast** is the type that most of students have a mutual opinion about its effect.

The collected data about third year students could be summarized in the table below:

Teachers' oral error correction techniques in speaking skill	Very Good	Good	Average	Not so good	Not good	Number of responses	Mean	S.D.
	5	4	3	2	1			
1. Recast	10 (10%)	32 (32%)	**37 (37%)**	17 (17%)	4 (4%)	**100**	**3.3**	1.0
2. Explicit correction	14 (14%)	17 (17%)	**39 (39%)**	20 (20%)	10 (10%)	**100**	**3.1**	1.2
3. Repetition	12 (12%)	25 (25%)	**28 (28%)**	**28 (28%)**	7 (7%)	**100**	**3.1**	1.2
4.Clarification request	4 (4%)	25 (25%)	**33 (33%)**	29 (29%)	9 (9%)	**100**	**2.9**	1.1
5.Elicitation	21 (21%)	**38 (38%)**	29 (29%)	9 (9%)	3 (3%)	**100**	**3.7**	1.1
6. Metalinguistic cues	17 (17%)	25 (25%)	**35 (35%)**	11 (11%)	12 (12%)	**100**	**3.3**	**1.3**

Table 07: Third year students' assessment toward types of teachers' oral corrective feedback

Clearly, **elicitation** technique is highly appreciated by the largest amount of third year students **(3.7)** and only one third of the respondents assessed it *"Average"*. **Recast** and **metalinguistic cues** are the two second favored when 42% students rated these both techniques *"Very good"* or *"Good"* in correcting students' oral mistakes. However, recast reached a higher agreement among respondents (1.0) than metalinguistic cues (1.3); only 4% students rated recast totally "Not good" when it is 12% for metalinguistic cues.

The least valued teachers' oral CF is **clarification request**. Though nearly one third (29%) of respondents highly rated it, nearly **40%** students assessed it negative. Others provided a mutual opinion about its effect in correcting students' oral errors. Following clarification request are explicit correction and repetition techniques, most of third year students rated these types of oral correction is *"Average"*.

To have a broader picture about third year students' preferences toward teachers' oral CF, the researcher has summarized the collected data for question C and D in the survey in the table below:

Teachers' oral errors correction techniques in speaking skill	Types that third year students wish to receive	Types that third year students wish to NOT receive
1. Recast	19	**38**
2. Explicit correction	22	**41**
3. Repetition	26	19
4.Clarification request	18	**37**
5.Elicitation	**55**	14
6. Metalinguistic cues	**41**	20
Total: **Response rate:**	**181** **90%**	**169** **85%**

Table 08: Third year students' preferences toward types of teachers' oral corrective feedback

Elicitation is the most preferred type of teachers' oral CF answered by **55** third year students, and students wanted it because it helps them to self-correct the errors and learn the knowledge. They think it is a friendly "reminder". However, there are also 14 students do not want to receive this type of techniques, because they said it only works with simple knowledge, or they are afraid of being embarrassed.

The next type of technique that a large amount of third year students want to receive from their teachers is **metalinguistic cues** wit **41** respondents. It is considered as *"Clear", "My chance to self-correct"* and *"It saves time"*. 20 other students said it is unnecessary and teachers can not do it with every single mistake.

Explicit correction is the least preferred type said by **41** third year students. These respondents provided reasons that by saying students are wrong, or pointing out directly the mistake is a non-friendly way of correction. Besides, students also stated reasons as *"I feel ashamed when I made mistake"* and *"My friends may laugh"*. However, there are also 22 students want to receive this type of oral error correction from their teachers in the future because they think *"It saves time"* and *"It is clear where I am wrong"*. **Recast** technique is not a very favored type of teachers' oral corrective feedback either when 38 students said they do not want their teachers to use it. They think this type of feedback is vague and not friendly. It may scare the students and they have negative feelings and peer-pressure.

4.3. Research question 3: What are the students' preferences for different error types of classroom oral error correction?

In order to answer this question, the research asked students to rate the frequency of having different types of errors corrected orally by their teachers from 1 as they *"Never"* want their teachers to correct it and 5 as *"Always"*. The data collected from first year students could be summarized in the table below:

Types of errors	*Never*	*Rarely*	*Sometimes*	*Often*	*Always*	Number of responses	Mean	S.D.
	1	2	3	4	5			
Grammar errors	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	11 (22%)	**25 (50%)**	12 (24%)	**50**	3.9	0.8
Pronunciation errors	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (8%)	8 (16%)	**38 (76%)**	**50**	**4.7**	**0.6**
Vocabulary usages	6 (12%)	5 (10%)	7 (14%)	12 (24%)	**20 (40%)**	**50**	**3.7**	**1.4**
Inappropriate expressions	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	8 (16%)	**24 (48%)**	16 (32%)	**50**	**4.1**	0.8
Structure of discourse	0 (0%)	17 (34%)	**18 (36%)**	5 (10%)	10 (20%)	**50**	3.2	1.1

Table 09: First year students' preferences toward having different types of errors being corrected

Pronunciation errors have the highest demand (4.7) in being corrected by teachers. Surprisingly, none of the respondents chose *"Never"* or *"Rarely"* options. This type of error also got the highest agreement among students. Following is errors which contain **inappropriate expressions** (4.1), and only 4% "Rarely" want to receive oral CF from their teachers for this type of error. **Errors in grammar** (3.9) are also quite needed in being corrected by English teachers with roughly 24% students "Always" and 50% students "Often" want to receive their teachers' CF.

Structure of discourse (3.2) is not the type of errors that first year students pay lots of concern. It only is rated fairly wanted by this group of students.

The collected data about third year students could be summarized in the table below:

Types of errors	*Never*	*Rarely*	*Sometimes*	*Often*	*Always*	Number of responses	Mean	S.D.
	1	2	3	4	5			
Grammar errors	0 (0%)	19 (19%)	**47 (47%)**	25 (25%)	9 (9%)	**100**	**3.3**	**0.9**
Pronunciation errors	0 (0%)	7 (7%)	20 (20%)	30 (30%)	**43 (43%)**	**100**	**4.1**	**1**

Vocabulary usages	6 (6%)	14 (14%)	28 (28%)	34 **(34%)**	18 (18%)	**100**	**3.5**	**1.2**
Inappropriate expressions	0 (0%)	14 (14%)	26 (26%)	26 (26%)	**34 (34%)**	**100**	**3.8**	**1.1**
Structure of discourse	3 (3%)	17 (17%)	14 (14%)	31 (31%)	**35 (35%)**	**100**	**3.8**	**1.2**

Table 10: Third year students' preferences toward having different types of errors being corrected

As it is presented in the table above, **pronunciation** is type of errors that most of third year students *very often* want to have teachers to correct their errors (4.1). **Inappropriate expressions** and **structure of discourse** are the two following types of errors that students want their teachers to orally correct in speaking lessons (3.8). Roughly more than 60% of students think that they *"Always"* or *"Often"* want to receive their teachers' oral CF for these types of errors, especially structure of discourse or how to organize your ideas. These types also got very high agreement among third year students and it could be understood that these types of errors are what third year students concern the most.

Errors in grammar are the least wanted when only one third of respondents often want to have their errors being corrected by their teachers.

4.4. Research question 4: What are the similarities and differences in preferences and attitudes towards teachers' oral corrective feedback between the first year mainstream students and the third year mainstream students at FELTE, ULIS, VNU?

From the collected data, it is obvious that both these groups of students at FELTE, ULIS, VNU share many things in common. Both of the groups have a positive attitude toward teachers' oral CF. Besides, when they are asked about frequency of having different types of errors being corrected by their teachers, both two groups of students chose *"Always", "Sometimes"* and *"Often"*. There are a very small number of students said *"Rarely"* or *"Never"*.

To be specific, the detail comparison is presented in table below:

Statements	Mean		S.D	
	First year students	**Third year students**	**First year students**	**Third year students**
1. I want my teacher(s) to correct all of my errors in speaking English.	**4.3**	**4.1**	**1**	**1.1**

2. Teacher(s) should correct all of learners' errors in speaking English.	**3.3**	**3.7**	**1**	**1**
3. Teacher(s) should correct only errors which interfere with communication.	**2.9**	**3.1**	**0.9**	**1.1**
4. Teacher(s) shouldn't correct learners' errors at all.	**1.4**	**1.8**	**1**	**1.1**

Table 11: A comparison of participants toward the provision of teachers' oral corrective feedback

As can be seen, both two groups of students have a strong desire toward having their oral errors being corrected in speaking lessons when a majority number of participants want their teachers to correct all of their errors. This finding claims many previous researches about students' favor of teachers' error correction, which conducted by many well-known researchers, such as Cathcart and Olsen (1976), Chenoweth, Day, Chun, and Luppescu (1983), James (1993) and Katayama (2006).

Two groups of students also have mutual ideas about should teachers correct all of learners' errors, or only errors which interfere with communication in speaking English. There is only one thing can be affirmed that students do want their teachers to correct their mistakes.

When it comes to preferences toward teachers' oral CF, surprisingly, the collected data from two groups of respondents share many opinions in common. Following is a summarized comparison table about the two groups of students:

Students assessments' of teachers' oral error correction techniques	Mean		S.D	
	First year students	**Third year students**	**First year students**	**Third year students**
1. Recast	2.8	3.3	1	1.0
2. Explicit correction	2.7	3.1	1.3	1.2
3. Repetition	3.5	3.1	1.2	1.2
4.Clarification request	2.7	2.9	1.1	1.1
5.Elicitation	3.6	3.7	0.9	1.1
6. Metalinguistic cues	3.6	3.3	1	1.3

Table 12: A comparison of participants' assessments of teachers' oral corrective feedback

Types of teachers' oral corrective feedback	WISH TO RECEIVE		WISH NOT TO	
	First year students	Third year students	First year students	Third year students
1. Recast	14 (14%)	19 (9.5%)	17 (17%)	**38 (19%)_**
2. Explicit correction	**16 (16%)**	22 (11%)	9 (9%)	**41 (20.5%)**
3. Repetition	13 (13%)	26 (13%)	21 (21%)	19 (9.5%)
4.Clarification request	9 (9%)	18 (9%)	**23 (23%)**	**37 (18.5%)**
5.Elicitation	**25 (25%)**	**55 (22.5%)**	6 (6%)	14 (7%)
6. Metalinguistic cues	12 (12%)	**41 (20.5%)**	17 (17%)	20 (10%)

Table 13: A comparison of participants' preferences toward types of teachers' oral corrective feedback
*Total does not add to 100% due to response rate.

It is easy to see that both groups of students highly appreciated **elicitation method**. Also, a large number of the two groups of students wanted their teachers to use more this type of oral corrective feedback because they think it is clear, easy to understand, students are reminded of the knowledge and they can self-correct their mistakes. In the other hands, **clarification request** is also considered the least valued and preferred by both two groups students. They think this type of technique is unfriendly, unclear and unnecessary. Some students also think it might make students feel bad about their performances.

There are also differences when **explicit correction** is the technique third year students do not want their teachers to use more in the future the most (20.5%) , they think it makes students feel uncomfortable, confused, and it is not friendly; while only 9% freshman share the same opinion. Explicit correction is the method which teachers address students' errors directly then provide the correct responses. From the collected data, we can see that this type of corrective feedback could be somehow inappropriate for students at higher level of language proficiency. They have been learning the language for a certain time, and stressing the errors directly may hurt students' feeling. For students at lower level of language ability, they are somehow still new for the language, and in contrast, a large number of first year respondents find this type of feedback is easy to understand.

Finally, the summarized data about the types of errors students want their teachers to focus on is presented as following:

Types of errors	Mean		S.D	
	First year students	Third year students	First year students	Third year students
Grammar errors	3.9	**3.3**	0.8	**0.9**
Pronunciation errors	**4.7**	**4.1**	**0.6**	1
Vocabulary usages	**3.7**	**3.5**	**1.4**	1.2
Inappropriate expressions	**4.1**	**3.8**	0.8	**1.1**
Structure of discourse	3.2	**3.8**	1.1	**1.2**

Table 14: A comparison of participants' preferences toward having different types of errors being corrected

It is interesting to notice that **pronunciation errors** and **inappropriate expressions** are the types of mistakes that both two groups of students want their teachers to focus on more in speaking lessons, and they also get very high agreement among the participants. Without doubt, it is impossible to study a new language without getting to know about the language's pronunciation and accurate expressions. Therefore, it is understandable when these types of error are what students want more of their teachers' attention.

Besides, first year students seem to concern more about **grammar errors** because a large number of respondents thought it is important having these grammatical errors being corrected by their teachers; while this type is the least wanted for the others. With the seniors, the **structures of discourse errors** are much more appealing. It could be explained that students at lower language proficiency (freshmen) have different priorities in learning English compared with third year students. They are taking their first steps in studying English academically; therefore they still need to concentrate on mastering grammatical aspect of the language. While the third year students have been studying English at the faculty for almost three years, their levels of English have been improved a lot, and now they may have more important targets to achieve. Moreover, if we take a closer look on the two course contents, we can realize the different courses' objectives. When the first year students' focuses are on making understandable conversations in English about daily and familiar topics, the main parts of third year students course are about making logical,

relevant and reasonable arguments, and also prepared a formal presentation about fairly complex topics which requires students' ability in arranging ideas and opinions.

In Katayama's study (2007) about 249 JSL learners' attitudes and preferences toward teachers' oral CF, the author also found out that most of respondents wanted their grammatical errors to be corrected by teachers as always (mean 4.55/5). Besides, the author also provided a possible explanation that in Japanese program at university, grammar is one of the most significant fundamentals of the curriculum. Teachers expect their students to perform well at grammatical aspects, and the lectures also stress on grammar. That could somehow explain the situation here in this study when grammar errors are more concerned by freshman. In Vietnam, at secondary school and high school levels, teaching grammar is still considered more important than other skills, because students need to prepare for the exams (which are mostly paper-tests). More importantly, students also need to pass a paper-exam to enter universities and college, which obviously make them become more test-oriented. After 7 years studying English that way, it could be hard for them to change their studying styles immediately. In contrast, third year students have been studying at the university for 6 semesters, they have been getting used to learning English in more communicative and interactive ways, therefore they may have different priorities with freshman.

Finally, the findings of this research are somehow similar to that of James' study (1993) about the learners' preferences and expectations regarding error corrections. James raised the questions about the correlation between learners' acquisitions and preferences towards teachers' oral CF in the classroom by comparing the opinions of intermediate and advanced ELS learners. James compared the attitudes, opinions, and expectation of 147 secondary school pupils in Singapore and 500 undergraduate students of National University of Singapore from five different faculties. The result showed no big different between two groups of participants in terms of expectations and desirability of oral CF. There was also a disagreement of the two groups of students on which learner error should be corrected. Most of secondary school pupils found grammatical errors were a problem, while students at university level found that organization of ideas was more significant. James concluded that the

differences were either the demand for English language on the different groups of students with different acquisitions, or the focus of activities at different levels.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Previous chapters have thoroughly elaborated on the introduction, the literature, the implementation and the results of the research. Finally, this concluding chapter will summarize and evaluate the outcomes of the whole paper by summing the findings, limitations, contributions of the research as well as putting forward several suggestions for further studies.

5.1. Summary of findings of the study

On the whole, this research paper performs as a fairly comprehensive study on the perception and preferences of students at different proficiency levels toward

teacher oral corrective feedback in speaking skill at the Faculty of English Language Teacher Education, Hanoi University of Languages and International Studies, Vietnam National University. Through exhaustive analysis and discussion of data collected from questionnaire, significant findings concerning the research questions were revealed as follows:

Initially, the study reveals that almost students of both courses have positive attitudes toward and a strong demand for receiving teachers' oral correction in speaking skill. A majority of students showed their disagreement on the idea of not having their errors corrected by teachers in speaking lessons. Moreover, only a very small number of students stated that they "Rarely" or "Never" want their errors to be corrected by their teachers in speaking lessons. The findings confirm many studies in the same fields about students' desire for teachers' feedback in general and oral teachers' corrective feedback in particular.

Secondly, the study finds that elicitation technique is highly appreciated and the most favored type of teachers' oral error correction rated by both groups of students. They find this technique is easy to understand, also it helps students to self-recall their knowledge and therefore they will remember the mistakes much longer. For third year students, they also prefer to receive metalinguilistic cues because it is understandable and they have chances to self-correct the mistakes; while first year students prefer explicit correction because it helps students to recognize the mistakes. The lowest appreciated and preferred rated by both group of students is clarification request which is considered unfriendly, unclear and unnecessary. Some learners think it makes students feel bad about their performances.

Finally, the study also reveals that two groups of students share some certain opinions about having different types of errors being corrected orally by their teachers in common. It is noticeable that pronunciation errors and inappropriate expressions are two type of mistake that both groups of students concern the most and they want their teachers to focus on correcting these mistakes more in speaking lessons. Besides, first year students specifically have a strong favor toward grammar mistakes, while this type of error is the least concerned to the tertiary level. The seniors specially prefer having the structures of discourse errors to be corrected by their teachers. This could

be understood when we take a look at the differences between two groups of students. Freshmen are those who just finished 7 years at high school, and still somehow being influenced by high school-studying-styles, therefore they concern more about grammatical aspects of the language, which is considered as the most significant component in teaching and learning English curriculum at high school level. On the other hands, third year students have been studying at the university for almost 6 semesters, they are getting used to studying English as a second language under the light of CLT method, which focuses on developing students' 5 communicative competences. Grammar is no longer the most important aspect of the language that they need to master, they now pay more attention to other communicative competences as well, which including discourse competence.

Besides, students' level of proficiency also matter. It is clearly seen that when the first year students' focuses are on making understandable conversations in English about daily and familiar topics, the main parts of third year students course are about making logical, relevant and reasonable arguments, and also prepared a formal presentation about fairly complex topics which requires students' ability in arranging ideas and opinions. Therefore, it is probably that first year students are more concerned about grammatical errors and less with structure of discourse (which obviously is not their focus); while seniors are more worried about organization of ideas (which is their main course objective).

5.2. Limitations of the study

Despite considerable efforts of the researcher, certain limitations could be detected in this study due to time constraint and other unexpected factors.

Firstly, questionnaire is employed in this research solely as the main collecting data instrument; therefore it is impossible to fully understand all of the aspects that may affect students' perception and preferences toward teachers' oral corrective feedback, such as surrounding context, teachers' characteristics in giving oral corrective feedback, etc.

Secondly, though the survey can help the researcher to collect the necessary data to answer the four research questions; however, there is still a need to have teachers and students interview to fulfill the gaps that the questionnaire can not cover. Despite the aforementioned shortcomings, the researcher's flexibility, serious work and justified data collection and research methodology had well retained the validity and reliability of the results. Besides, because of some objective matters of the participants so the research could not have the most accurate and reliable result.

Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that these above shortcomings should always be taken into consideration when further related studies are conducted in the future.

5.3. Suggestion for further studies

Since the paper placed its focus on students' perception and preferences at different levels of proficiency toward teacher oral corrective feedback in speaking skill in a broad context, other researchers may wish to know more about the context surrounding, the speaking teachers' characteristics as well as the perception of teachers toward of these types of feedback. This may require more effort in observing lessons, designing questionnaires and also interviews with teachers and students.

Furthermore, others research should focus on how teachers' oral corrective feedback influences on students' revision and mistakes self-correction ability, which is considered as the most important fields in researching the process of learning of the students. Expectedly, the results of such studies would be extremely helpful in encouraging teachers to take more time in studying different types of feedback and see which specific types could be more suitable for some certain groups of students.

Finally, others studies should take more time in researching, especially the result of each small period on the whole of the learning process that would find the others problems and suggest some ways to solve. This development is likely to help future studies in learning and teaching speaking skill in Vietnam.

5.4. Contributions of the study

Although generalizations can not be claimed based on only data gathered from two groups of students, the contribution of the study still maybe noteworthy for ELS educators, teachers and researchers who have interests in this field:

Overall, the research could be considerably helpful for ESL students, speaking teachers as well as researchers working on the related studies.

As for speaking teachers, the study explores students' perception and references at different levels of proficiency toward teachers' oral corrective feedback in speaking skill, therefore teachers can understand more about students' needs at different levels of English language, so that they may have suitable methods in giving students' oral errors correction.

As for students, they may find it helpful and informative to have a better understanding about teachers' feedback in general, and teachers' oral corrective feedback in speaking skills in particular.

Finally, with regards to researchers who are interested in conducting a research in the same field, this paper would provide them a reliable source of preferences.

REFERENCE

Allwright, R. L. (1975). Problems in the study of the language teacher's treatment of learner error. In M. K. Burt & H. C. Dulay (Eds.), On TESOL '75: *New directions in second language learning, teaching and bilingual education*. Washington, D.C.: TESOL Inc.

Ann, R. (1991). *Errors: Windows to mind.* College ESL, VOL.1, NO.2, December 1991.

Askew, S. & Lodge, C. (2000). Gifts, ping-pong and loops-linking feedback and learning

Brookhart, S, M. Presented February 27, 2008. *International Perspectives on Student Assessment.* University of Calgary Lecture Series, from: **www.ucalgary.ca/~cwebber/ASAS/Feedback_Feb_27_2008.ppt**

Brown, G.A. & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the Spoken Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. San Francisco: Prentice Hall Regents.

Burns, A. and Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on Speaking. Sydney*: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.

Bygate, M. (1987). Language teaching: *A scheme for teacher education,speaking*.

Carless, D., Joughin, G,. & Liu, N. *How assessment supports learning: Learning-oriented assessment in action.* (P.01-32). Hong Kong University Press, 2006.

Cathcart R L. & Olsen, J. E. (1972). Teachers' and students' preferences for error correction of classroom conversation errors. *In J. F. Fanselow & R H. Crymes (Eds.), On TESOL '76 (pp. 41-53). WaShington, DC: TESOL.*

Chaney, A.L., T.L. Burke, *Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1998.

Chaudron, C. (1977). *A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors*. Language Learning, *27, 29-46*

Chenoweth, N. A., Day, R. R., Chun A. E., & Luppescu, S. (1983). *Attitudes and preferences of ESL students to error correction*. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6(1), 79-87.

Chun, A. E., Day, R R, Chenoweth, N. A. & Luppescu, S. (1982).*Errors, interaction and correction: A study of native-nonnative conversations. TESOL Quarterly, 16,537-547.*

Crane, H. (2008). *Feedback in the context of spoken language: Student's feedback on learning.* Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 73, pp.397-398. Retrieved March 11, 2010

Do, H.T. (2006). The *Role of English in Vietnam's Foreign Language Policy: A Brief History*. Paper presented at 19th Annual EA Education Conference.

Fanselow, J. (1977). *The treatment of error in oral work.* Foreign Language Annals, 10, 583-593.

Ferris D.R. (1995b). *Teaching ESL Composition Students to Become Independent Self-editors.* TESOL Journal, 8, 41-62.

Ferris, D. (2007). *Preparing teachers to respond to student writing.* Journal of Second Language Writing, 16, 165-193.

Ferris, D. 2002. *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. The University of Michigan Press: Michigan.

Ferris, D. 2004. *The "grammar correction" debates in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (And what do we do in the meantime...?)*. Journal of second language writing 13: 49-62.

Ferris, D. R. (1995). *Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms*. TESOL Quarterly, 29, 33–53.

Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). *Error feedback in L2 writing classes. How explicit does it need to be?* Journal of Second Language Writing, *10.* 161-184

Florez, M. A. C. (1999). *Improving adult English language learners' speaking skills*. Washington, DC: Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED435204)

Han, Z.H. (2008, November). *Error correction: Towards a differential approach.* The Fourth QCC Colloquium on Second Language Acquisition. New York, New York. Video

Hattie, J.A. & Timperley, H. (2007). *The power of feedback*. Review of Educational Research, 77, 81-112.

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). *Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice.* Modern Language Journal, 62, 387-398.

Horwitz, E.K. (1988). *The Beliefs about Language Learning of Beginning University Foreign Language Students*. The Modern Language Journal, *72, 283-294.*

Hugh,M. (2000) *The correction of students' oral errors*

Hyland, K. (1990). *Providing productive feedback*. ELT Journal, 44(4), 279-285.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

James, A.O. (1993). *Error Correction in ESL : Learners' Preferences.* TESL Canada Journal, VOL.10,NO.2, Spring 1993.

Katayama, A. (2006). *Perceptions of JFL students toward correction of oral errors.*   In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi, & M. Swanson (Eds.) JALT2005 Conference Proceedings . Tokyo: JALT.

Katayama, A. (2007). *Learners' perceptions toward oral error correction.*   In K. Bradford-Watts (Ed.), JALT2006 Conference Proceedings . Tokyo: JALT

Lightbown P. M. & Spada, N. (1999). *How Languages are Learned* (Revised Edition)

Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thomson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., and Chen, X. (2009*). The modern language Journal*,93,1, 91-104.

Long, M.(1996).*The role of linguistic environment in second language*

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). *Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms.* Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19, 37-66.

Lyster, R., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *A response to Truscott's 'What's wrong with oral grammar correction'.* Canadian Modern Language Review, 55(4), 457-467.

Mackey, A. , & Goo,   J.   (2007). *Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey   (Ed.), Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies*   (pp. 407 – 452). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McCargar, D. F. (1993). *Teacher and student role expectations: Cross-cultural differences and implications*. The Modern Language Journal, 77(2), 192-207

Morra, A.I. (2009). *The Effect of Audio and Written Teacher Responses on EFL Student Revision.* Journal of College Reading and Learning, v39n2 pp.69-82 Spr 2009.

Nguyen, B., et al. (2003). BA Upgrade: *English Language Teaching Methodology*. Hanoi: NXB Van Hoa-Thong Tin

Noah Webster, *Websterís New Twentieth Century Dictionary,* 2nd Edition, (New York: William Collins Publishers, 1980), p.1980

Nunan, D. (1989). Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom, *Cambridge University Press*

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. (2003). The Impact of English as a Global Language on Educational Policies and Practices in the Asia-Pacific Region. *TESOL Quarterly, 37(4), 589-613.*

Omaggio, Alice C. (1986). Teaching *language in context: Proficiency-oriented instruction*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle. 479pp.

Oxford dictionary of Current English (2009). Oxford: Oxford University

Oxford University Press. Retrieved March 18, 2010. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pham, H.H, (2005). *"Imported" Communicative Language Teaching Implication For Local Teachers*. *English Teaching Forum, Volume 4, number 4.*

Pica, T. (1988). *Interactive adjustments as an outcome of NS-NNS negotiated interaction.* Language Learning 38, 45-73.

Reiss, M. (1981). *Helping the unsuccessful leaners*. *Modern Language Journal, Vol. 65,pp. 121-128*

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description and Analysis.* Cambridge: CUP.

Roger, Jenny. 2001. *In Adults Learning*; Burkingham: Open University Press (Online). *Retrived on June, 23,2010.*

Russell, J. , & Spada, N.(2006). *The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research* . In J.Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.*), Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133 – 164). Amsterdam :Benjamins .

Schachter, J. (1991). *Corrective feedback in historical perspective.* Second Language Research,7, 89-102.

Schulz, R. A. (2001). *Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback:*USA: Colombia. The Modern Language Journal, *85, 244-258.*

Skehan, P. (1996). A *framework for the implementation of task-based instruction.* Applied Linguistics. 17(1):38-62.

Sommers, N. (1982). *Responding to student writing*. College Composition and Communication, 33, 148-156.

Song, M. J. 1998. *Relationship between types of written feedback and development of English writing skills.* English Teaching 53: 135-156

Thornbury, S. (2000). *Accuracy, fluency and complexity*. English Teaching Professional,pp.16, 3-6.

Trianci,M, Panayota, M & Maria', J.C.L. (1999-2000).*The errors in the Second Language Acquisition.* Encuentro. Revista de investigación e innovación en la clase de idiomas, 11.

Truscott, J. (1999). *What's wrong with oral grammar correction*. Canadian Modern Language.Review, 55(4), 437-457.

Tunstall, P. & Gipps, C. (1996). *Teacher feedback to young children in formative assessment: A typology.* British Educational Research Association. 22 (4), 384-404.

Ur, P. (2006*). A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and theory* (13 thEd.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wajnryb, R. (1990). *Assessment for learning (AfL): Oral and written feedback*. Retrieved February 25,2010
http://nationalstrategies.standards.dcsf.gov.uk/primary/primaryframework/assessment/dafl/fol/page002

Winne, P.H., & Butler, D.L.(1994). *Student cognition in learning from teaching. In T.Husen & T. Postlewaite (Eds).* International encyclopedia of education (2nd.ed., pp. 5738-5745). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Wlodkowski, R.J., & Jaynes, J.H. (1990). *Eager to learn: Helping children become motivated and love learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

APPENDIX

A Comparison between Students at Different Proficiency Levels about their Preferences for and Perception of Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Skill at FELTE, ULIS, VNU.

Hello, I am Bui Minh Phuong from group 08E3 of the ULIS, VNU. I am doing a research to investigate the perception and preferences of students at different proficiency levels of English in FELTE, ULIS, VNU toward teachers' oral corrective feedback in speaking skill; and this survey is designed to collect the necessary data for the research. Please provide your answers sincerely; otherwise the investigation would not be successful.

All of the data will be used for research purpose. Thank you for taking the time to fill this form out thoughtfully. Your answers will help me finish my research.

Personal Information

Full name (Optional):………………………………….

Class:…………..………………………………………..

A. **The following questions concern teachers' correction of spoken errors in speaking lessons. For each statement, make your choice based on your learning experience.**

For example:

If you **strongly disagree** with a statement, please write **1**.

If you **strongly agree** with a statement, please write **5**.

1: Strongly disagree   2: Disagree   3: Medium   4: Agree   5: Strongly agree

No	Statements	Rate
01	I want my teacher(s) to correct all of my errors in English.	
02	Teacher(s) should correct all of learners' errors in English speaking.	
03	Teacher(s) should correct only errors which interfere with communication.	
04	Teacher(s) shouldn't correct learners' errors at all.	

B. **There is a variety of teachers' methods in correcting students' oral errors or mistakes. The following 1-6 are examples of correction techniques. They are sometimes used in combination; however, please rate them as individual methods here.**

For example:

If you think a method is **No good**, please write 1.

If you think a method is **Very good**, please write 5.

1: No good   2: Not really good   3: Average   4: Good   5: Very good

Type	Teachers' oral errors correction methods	Rate
	Teacher(s) present the correct response or part of the response.	

Recast **01**	*Example:* T: Where did you go yesterday? S: I *go* to the park. T: You *went* to the park. Or: T: You *went*	
Explicit correction **02**	Teacher(s) point out/stress the error(s) and provide the correct response. *Example:* T: Where did you go yesterday? S: I *go* to the park. T: Oh, *go* is wrong. You should say: *I went.* I *went* to the park yesterday.	
Repetition **03**	Teacher(s) repeat student's utterance simply adjusting the intonation so as to highlight the error. *Example:* T: Where did you go yesterday? S: I *go* to the park. T: You *go*…?	
Clarification request **04**	Teacher(s) ask Ss to say the sentence again. *Example:* T: Where did you go yesterday? S: I *go* to the park. T: Pardon me? Or: T: Could you please say that again.	
Elicitation **05**	Teachers directly elicit the correct form of an utterance from a student, which may help Ss to self-notice the error(s) and self-correct it. *Example:* T: Where did you go yesterday? S: I *go* to the park. T: You…? T: How do we talk about what we did in the past? T: Can you correct that?	

Metalinguistic cues **06**	Teacher(s) use the students' current knowledge of English grammar, lexis, etc., to try and elicit a self corrected response from the student. *Example:* T: Where did you go yesterday? S: I go to the park. T: ***Go*** is the present tense. You need to use the past tense here.	

C. Which <u>TWO</u> of the teachers' oral errors correction methods in PART B would you <u>wish to receive</u> from your speaking teacher in the future? Please write down TWO types with the equivalent numbers and state the reason(s) for your selection (You can use Vietnamese).

Type name number	Reasons for your selection

D. Which <u>TWO</u> of the teachers' oral errors correction methods in PART B would you <u>wish to NOT receive</u> from your speaking teacher in the future? Please write down TWO types with the equivalent numbers and state the reason(s) for your selection. (You can use Vietnamese).

Types number/name	Reasons for your selection

E. <u>How often</u> do you want to have your errors corrected by your speaking teacher(s)?

For example:

If you prefer **<u>"never"</u>,** please write 1. If you prefer **<u>"always"</u>,** please write 5.

1. Never   2. Rarely   3. Often   4. Usually   5. Always

No	Types/Areas of Errors	Rate
01	Grammar errors	
02	Pronunciation errors (including: intonation, stress…)	
03	Vocabulary (or word phrases) usages	
04	Inappropriate expressions (Ex: Vietnamese English)	
05	Structure of discourse (Ex: How to organize your ideas/ opinions…)	

-The end-