TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES
TO THE IMPACT OF ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK
ON STUDENT'S SPEAKING PROFICIENCY
IN ENGLISH SPEAKING CLASSES

Le Mai Van[*]

School of Languages and Tourism, Hanoi University of Industry,
298 Cau Dien Street, Bac Tu Liem District, Hanoi

Abstract: Helping students to promote their communication skills in this globalized world is one of teachers' main concerns in English teaching. The ways that teachers give oral corrective feedback (OCF) to students' errors also have influenced students' language proficiency improvement. There has been some research on how teachers and students perceive OCF in language classrooms, but little has been conducted on teachers' and students' perceptions of the impact of OCF on students' speaking ability through the lens of sociocultural theory. This qualitative study investigates teachers' and students' perspectives regarding the impact of OCF on student's speaking proficiency in English speaking classes at the tertiary level in Vietnam. Data were gathered from five semi-structured interviews with five EFL teachers and five focus group interviews with 35 first-year students. Findings showed teachers' and students' support of the impact of OCF on helping students to notice their errors, to be more responsible for their own study, and to increase students' learning motivation and linguistic knowledge as well. On the basis of the findings, pedagogical implications are discussed.

Keywords: perspective, oral corrective feedback, impact, speaking proficiency, sociocultural theory

1. Introduction

In language education, oral corrective feedback (OCF) in speaking classes plays a pivotal role in developing students' oral ability. As such, OCF has caught the attention of many second language and language pedagogy researchers over the past few decades (Ellis, 2009; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Sheen, 2010). While there have been a number of studies on how OCF has been perceived and preferred by teachers and students in ESL and EFL contexts, limited research on this topic has been conducted in the context of teaching and learning English in Vietnam, especially in Vietnamese higher education. This study aims to explore teachers' and students' perspectives towards the impact of OCF in improving students' speaking skills.

Feedback has been viewed through the lens of cognitive theoretical perspectives such as the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1983, 1996), Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985, 1995) or Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990, 1995). This study was conducted to explore OCF from a different theoretical lens, that is from the perspective of sociocultural theory. In sociocultural theory (SCT), feedback is regarded as "an interactive process in which teachers and peers help

---

[*] Corresponding author.
 Email address: vanlm@haui.edu.vn

learners use their zone of proximal development (ZPD) to progress to the next step in their learning" (Sardareh & Saad, 2012, p. 343) and the effectiveness of corrective feedback "lies in its propensity for scaffolding interaction to construct the learner's ZPD" (Sheen, 2010, p. 170). It means that in such ZPD, learners are supported to perform a linguistic item (linguistic utterance) that they cannot handle on their own. Through such scaffolding, learners are able to notice their incorrect use of language forms and improve their language awareness.

In accordance with the globalized world, EFL teachers in Vietnam have applied various teaching approaches in English classes in order to enhance students' English capacity. More specifically, pedagogical strategies like OCF to develop students' oral ability have drawn more attention and been frequently used in the classrooms. Through OCF, students can also co-construct their knowledge and more importantly, improve their English proficiency. Theoretically, through the lens of sociocultural theory, the researcher could understand how OCF which acts as scaffold support can impact students' language ability as well as their speaking competence in tertiary level EFL classrooms in the sociocultural context of Vietnam. More specifically, ZPD and scaffolding - the key sociocultural constructs of SCT- were used as a theoretical framework to guide the data analysis and interpretation in this research.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Definitions of OCF and the Role of OCF

Recently, OCF has been paid much attention by language scholars and language researchers as it supports learners' language development (Lyster & Saiko, 2010). OCF is regarded as teachers' utterances that determined learners' errors and suitable responses to their errors (Schachter, 1991) or the strategies that teachers employ to correct students' errors in their spoken performance (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Researchers have questioned whether learner errors should be corrected and whether OCF facilitates learner language development. There are claims that OCF can negatively impact learners' feelings, and thus their subsequent language achievement (Chaudron, 1977; Truscott, 1999). Chaudron (1977) doubted the effectiveness of OCF on language development and Truscott (1999) stated that OCF should be abandoned as it could cause learners' embarrassment, frustration or demotivation. In short, these scholars argued that language can be obtained only through positive evidence, while negative evidence is inessential and even detrimental to language learning acquisition and development as it might make students hesitant and anxious in their language learning.

On the other hand, many researchers also confirmed the beneficial role of OCF in language acquisition and development. The role of OCF as a response to learners' incorrect utterances through interactions between the teacher and students, or among students is believed to be beneficial and valuable (Ellis, 2009; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster & Saiko, 2010). Through OCF, learners are able to realize the gaps between their interlanguage and target language, which is important to their language acquisition (Long, 1996). OCF helps to develop language acquisition, as it fosters a modified output (McDonough, 2005). Additionally, OCF can raise learners' sense of fulfilment and persistence and is useful to motivate students' learning (Basturkmen et al., 2004). Furthermore, Lyster and Saiko (2010) stated that "it is effective to employ corrective feedback in response to students' non-target-like production because it contributes to target language development" (p. 294).

2.2. Theoretical Framework

In this paper, Vygotskyian social constructivism (Vygotsky, 1978) has been used to approach the data. The sociocultural perspective looks into the roles that social relations, community, and culture play in learning and development (Rogoff, 1995). Vygotsky (1978) viewed learning as a constant movement from the current academic level to a higher level that gradually reaches the learner's capacity. This transition takes place in the zone of proximal development (ZPD) as a result of social interaction. It highlights the role of learners as active constructors in the learning process and the importance of communication between them with other people in the society (Lantolf, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978). In this perspective, learning is viewed as a constant movement from the current academic level to a higher level that gradually reaches the learner's capacity. Through ZPD, the learners are likely to reconstruct and internalize the learning, and able to obtain a skill that is beyond their current capacity through the mediation and regulation (Rogoff, 1995).

A key concept of SCT is scaffolding which is regarded as a kind of assistance for children and young people's learning and development (Rasmussen, 2001). Scaffolding always takes place in the ZPD. Within this zone, the more knowledgeable other (MKO) provides the activities and scaffolds so that the learner can complete (with support) the given tasks that they could not otherwise perform (Bransford et al., 2000; Olson & Platt, 2000). Scaffolding "facilitates a student's ability to build on prior knowledge and internalize new information" (Van der Stuyf, 2002, p. 2). Hence, it is regarded as an inter-psychological support structure that can arise from interaction with more capable others, equal or less capable peers, and even oneself (Walqui & Van Lier, 2010). In language classrooms, as scaffolded assistance is provided to learners, it supports learners' learning in social interaction and assists the subsequent internalization of new linguistic forms. That means, according to this theory, CF gives dialogically negotiated assistance to learners as they move from other regulations towards self-regulation (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994). Consequently, with teachers' OCF scaffold, students are able to realize their ill-formed utterances and then gradually learn how to use them correctly. With the assistance (scaffolding) through the ZPD, learners are assisted by objects in the environment (object-regulation) or others (other-regulation) until they can perform the tasks independently (self-regulation). Proper scaffolding support can help to increase students' responsibility (Donato, 1994), build up their independence and learning autonomy (Rassaei, 2014) as well as their learning motivation (Kim, 2009). The ability to notice the inconsistencies in students' interlanguage is suggested to be the first stage of language learning (Thorne & Tasker, 2011). It is believed that giving corrective feedback to learners' errors is likely to contribute to the transition of learners from their current level of language learning ability to the desired level of second language competence (Ellis, 2009). This could lead to an increase in responsibility which made students more autonomous, confident, and independent along with the gradual reduction of teachers' assistance in the CF process (Shahidzade, 2017).

2.3. Research on Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of the Impact of OCF on Language Teaching and Learning

Research into teachers' attitudes towards OCF suggests that teachers positively regard errors and error correction as a vital part of students' language development. It also plays a key role in the improvement of their linguistic competence (Karimi & Asadnia, 2015; Ní Aogáin, 2019; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Tesnim, 2019) and supports learners to avoid confusion with the target language (Rahimi & Zhang, 2015). However, it may cause students to have negative

feelings such as humiliation (Kamiya, 2014).

Studies showed students' positive views on the error correction (Abukhadrah, 2012; Agudo, 2012). It is also believed that error correction would not have any negative effect on students' motivation (Kavaliauskiené & Anusiené, 2012) and it played a crucial part in promoting students' linguistic development (Abukhadrah, 2012). Students regard OCF as a valuable tool for improving their language proficiency, which emphasized its importance in preventing the fossilization of oral errors (Alhaysony, 2016).

Research showed the consistencies between teachers' and students' perceptions of OCF. In general, teachers and students considered error correction as a part of language learning and held positive views on OCF as they believed it was an essential and significant part in language classrooms (Abukhadrah, 2012; Fajriah, 2018; Ní Aogáin, 2019; Roothooft & Breeze, 2016). OCF can also raise students' awareness of language use and their responsibility in error correction and language learning (Abukhadrah, 2012; Ní Aogáin, 2019). More importantly, OCF is a significant part in students' linguistic development (Abukhadrah, 2012; Fajriah, 2018).

Understanding how both teachers and students perceive OCF can help promote teachers' practice in real classrooms, hence, improve teaching quality. In Vietnam, there have been some studies on this area such as Tran and Nguyen (2018), Tran and Nguyen (2020), Ha and Murray (2023), Luu (2020), Nhac (2020), Ha and Murray (2021). With the aim of examining the strategies that teachers use to correct students' errors within an EFL context, Tran and Nguyen (2018) conducted a study in a private high school in the Mekong Delta region in Vietnam. Data were gathered from classroom observations of two teachers and 50 students. Findings showed recast and explicit correction were the commonly used OCF types. Furthermore, clarification requests, recasts and metalinguistic feedback helped students notice their errors. Among these OCF types, the metalinguistic cue was the most successful strategy for eliciting student uptake. In a similar context, Ha and Murray (2020) examined Vietnamese ELF teachers' beliefs and practices of OCF using semi-structured interviews and observations with six EFL teachers at six public primary schools. The results reported that pronunciation errors were regarded as the most essential to address. Prompts were favoured more by teachers than reformulations, however, their frequent use of didactic recasts did not match that preference. This mismatch was related to contextual factors and the impact of different beliefs on practices. At the tertiary level, Tran and Nguyen (2020) investigated teachers' perceptions of OCF and their preferences for utilizing different OCF types in EFL speaking classes in the Mekong using questionnaires with 62 EFL teachers. The study found that showed teachers' positive attitudes towards OCF and elicitation was their most favored and commonly used technique, followed by metalinguistic feedback. Luu (2020) also found both consistencies and inconsistencies between teachers' and students' preferences regarding OCF strategies at a Vietnamese university. Data were collected through observations and two parallel questionnaires with five EFL teachers and 138 students. Both groups preferred repetition and disliked elicitation. However, students also expected to receive more explicit OCF even though the teachers did not actually provide this OCF type in their OCF practices. Furthermore, the teachers mostly preferred to use clarification requests and recasts while the students did not value these OCF types at all. In a similar vein, Nhac (2022) study reported teachers' and students' positive views on OCF. They also had similar opinions and preferences regarding the necessity of OCF, error types which need to be addressed and OCF timing despite mismatches concerning OCF types.

Every Vietnamese study reviewed stressed the importance of correcting students' oral errors in English teaching and learning in EFL contexts, and they raised the need to further investigate current practices of OCF as well as teachers' and students' perceptions and preferences in this area. However, there is a dearth of research carried out in a sociocultural context such as Vietnam's on both teachers' and students' perspectives of the impact of OCF. Therefore, this "two-sided" study seeks to occupy these gaps in the literature as it provides deep insights into teachers' and students' perspectives and experiences of the impact of OCF in EFL classes at tertiary level in Vietnam through the lens of sociocultural theory.

To achieve this aim, the following research question was formulated:

What are teachers' and students' perspectives to the impact of OCF on students' speaking proficiency?

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Setting

This study adopted a qualitative case study which aims to investigate what teachers and students perceived the role of OCF in students' learning progress, especially their speaking proficiency. In the current study, the research site selected is a public university located in the north of Vietnam. Data were collected from semi-structured interviews with five EFL teachers and focus group interviews with 35 first-year students from these five EFL teachers' classes. Descriptions of research participants will be elaborated in the next section.

3.2. Research Participants

3.2.1. Teacher Participants

Five EFL teachers participated in this study on a voluntary basis. All of them have a related Master's degree in education areas such as Applied Linguistics or English Language Teaching. Four of them earned their Master's degrees in Vietnam and one had just finished her Master's course at a university in Australia. Their English teaching experiences varied from five to 15 years. All had taken part in several professional development programs, training workshops or seminars on English teaching methodology. However, they had not attended any training courses on feedback generally or OCF in particular.

The researcher contacted the teachers who agreed to take part in the study to arrange a meeting at their most convenient time. In order to make the participants relaxed and comfortable in the interviews, a noise-proof meeting room at university was chosen as the site of the interviews. The data would be treated confidentially and all participants would be given pseudonyms (Teacher 1-5).

3.2.2. Students Participants

In this research, the student participants were English-majored students from the classes of the five EFL teachers described in the previous subsection. These students are in their second semester of a four-year Bachelor program of English Language Studies. Seven students from each of the above teachers' classes were selected to be interviewed in each focus group on a voluntary basis. More specifically, five groups of first-year students took part in the focus group interviews (so 35 students in total), each group participating in one focus group interview. The researcher contacted the students via mobile phone or email to find the most convenient time for them to join the focus group interview. The participants were asked to keep the discussion

confidential and not share its contents with anyone outside the group. Each student in focus group was also given an identification (ID) number from S1 to S7 (seven students in each group) and Ss refers to all students.

3.3. Data Collection

3.3.1. Semi-Structured Interviews

In qualitative research, interviewing is one of the frequently used methods for data collection (Creswell, 2012). The interview is the process that the researcher and participant engage in conversations which are focused on questions related to the research. Qualitative interview, as such, "capture an individual's perspectives, experiences, feelings, and stories with the guidance and facilitation of an interviewer" (Billups, 2021, p. 2). In this study, semi-structured interviews enabled the researcher to investigate perspectives, attitudes, experiences, and motivations of EFL teachers in regard to OCF, provided the EFL teachers opportunity to express their views, explain answers, give examples of their OCF practice, and describe their experiences related to OCF. During semi-structured interviews, an interview guide including open-ended questions was used with all teacher participants. Each interview lasted for approximately 30-45 minutes.

3.3.2. Focus Group Interviews

Focus group interview is a valuable tool for qualitative data collection which encourages participants to co-construct meaning of given phenomenon. This data collection method allows the researcher to achieve valuable opinions, views and experiences from the participants as the interactions among them would produce the perfect evidence (Creswell, 2012). Furthermore, when participants are gathered in groups for focus group interview, they may feel assisted by other group members. More importantly, through focus group interview, the researcher was able to get information from different perspectives at the same time. In this study, five groups of first year students from these five teachers' classes were randomly recruited to participate in focus group interviews, seven students were chosen from one participating class to form a group. Each group of students participated in one focus group interview. The focus group interviews lasted for approximately from 60 to 90 minutes each.

3.4. Data Analysis

In this study, data were analyzed through thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) which includes six stages of thematic analysis: (1) familiarizing yourself with your data, (2) generating initial codes, (3) searching for themes, (4) reviewing themes, (5) defining and naming themes, and (6) producing the report.

In the first stage, all data from teacher semi-structured interviews and five student focus group interviews were transcribed and analyzed relevantly at the same time. In the second stage, the researcher first made a list of codes based on the transcripts and then tried to reduce the number of codes by looking for similar codes and redundant ones. From the data that were initially analyzed, the initial codes formed were: influence of OCF, strengths of OCF, challenges of OCF, satisfaction of OCF, expectations of OCF, factors that affect OCF, language improvement, change in responsibility, etc. In the third stage, repeated codes from teachers' semi-structured interviews and the student focus group interviews were then categorized into prominent themes. The following themes emerged from the coding process: awareness of language, transfer of responsibility, students' learning motivation, language development. Stage 4 involved reviewing, labelling and refining the newly arranged categories and sub-

categories related to the impact of OCF. They were: language awareness, responsibility transfer, students' learning motivation, linguistic language development. In the fifth stage, all the key themes were defined and named. The majored themes were the perceptions for the following: cognitive language awareness, responsibility transfer, learning motivation and linguistic language development. The last stage involved producing the report that would be brief, accurate and rational to describe the common occurrence of the determined themes (Awareness of language use, responsibility transfer, learning motivation, linguistic language development).

4. Research Findings

Themes emerged from data analysis were: *awareness of language use*, *responsibility transfer*, *learning motivation*, and *linguistic knowledge development*.

4.1. Awareness of Language Use

All five participating teachers confirmed that there was an increase in students' cognitive consciousness of their errors as the result of teachers' error correction. They claimed that error correction could make students notice their errors and gradually become more aware of the errors during their speaking performance. This view was reflected by T1's response:

> I must say, teacher's support in correcting errors make students be more careful of their use of language. For example, after being corrected pronunciation errors, students become more aware of the way to pronounce that word and whenever they wonder the pronunciation of a new word, they may check the pronunciation by looking it up in the dictionary or asking their teachers or friends for confirmation of the right pronunciation. (Teacher 1-Interview)

It could be noted from Teacher 1's view that error correction would be useful for error recognition and it helped students pay more attention to their linguistic use such as grammatical structures, the choice of vocabulary and pronunciation in their oral production. That showed a sign of students' language awareness in learning process. In addition to that, Teacher 2 confirmed that the implementation of OCF in speaking classes would show students their language weaknesses and "when students become more linguistically aware of the importance of using correct language, the number of their ill-formed utterances would be reduced" (Teacher 2-Interview).

Data from student focus group interviews also revealed that in most cases, students did not recognize that they were committing errors until teachers pointed out the errors, corrected or let them self-correct or peer-correct. They claimed that they highly valued their teachers' feedback on their oral production because teacher's error correction would make them pay more attention to their oral utterances, notice the errors and be careful of language use.

> Usually, we do not recognize that we are making a mistake. Maybe it is because we are too concentrated on what we are saying. Teacher's correction would make us pay more attention to oral errors when we are speaking. We also pay more attention to our peers' performance. We think more about what we are going to say before we say it. When we avail of accurate linguistic items, we could become more aware of our language use and those of our peers (Teacher 1-Ss-Focus group interview) (Teacher 2-S3, S7-Focus group interview).

Students believed that teachers' error correction would help reduce the occurrence of errors as it raised students' consciousness of their oral utterances. More importantly, it drew students' awareness of accurate linguistic use and their peers' speaking performance.

Absolutely, OCF has not only affected positively their use of oral language, but also influenced students' general learning outcomes.

4.2. Responsibility Transfer

There was the same perspective shared among all five teachers that they could witness the increase in students' responsibility in their learning in general and in the process of error treatment in particular. Teacher 4 claimed that:

> When I repeat the wrong parts of the utterances or give students clues or signals to figure out the answer themselves, it means they have to think over to have the right versions of the erroneous utterances. When students can correct themselves, they are not dependent on teachers' support any more. (Teacher 4-Interview).

In this extract, the teacher mentioned that students could be offered the opportunities to find the well-formed utterances with the prompts provided. That meant teachers gradually reduced their assistance, which led to the transfer of responsibility from teachers to students in the process of error treatment. Furthermore, students would be more proactive by figuring out the corrections themselves. Hence, their learning independence could be constantly improved. More importantly, recognizing their language weaknesses, students might set their new goals for their learning. They would look for any English courses or programs to achieve their learning objectives. Consequently, they can make decision on their own for the learning outcomes to fulfill that gap.

Sharing the same view with their teachers, some students from focus groups agreed that the transfer of responsibility from teachers to students in the error treatment process would increase their duties in English learning and their correction in particular. Such a finding initially resonated among student participants from five focus groups as one student said:

> Usually, I always wait for my teachers to give the correct answers to my errors. However, I appreciate the elicitation from teachers to help me give my own answers for the erroneous utterances. Maybe it is not the right version of the utterance but it is a chance for me to practice with language. Sometimes, the teachers ask me to correct my fellows' errors. By this way, I feel a bit nervous but more responsible for the correction and try to figure out the errors. (Teacher 4-S3-Focus group interview).

This excerpt eloquently illustrated that there was a shift in responsibility from teachers to students as students were encouraged to reflect their own linguistic forms through teachers' prompting techniques. Students began to engage more in mediating their own language use rather than relying on the teachers. Teachers continuously supported students until they could achieve the new knowledge. The teachers then gradually removed their support and transferred the level of control to students. Hence, students became progressively independent in their correction in particular and in their English learning in general. More importantly, some students shared the same view on the development of self-determination in learning "we became decision-makers in their study, more responsible for their learning plans and objectives as we were able to take ownership and implement the procedures of their study" (Teacher 5-S1, S4-Focus group interview).

4.3. Learning Motivation

All teachers believed OCF could have both positive and negative influence on students' learning motivation. They asserted that students' motivation could rely much on the way teachers give feedback. Their perspectives towards the effects of OCF on students' motivation

were illustrated in the following excerpt:

> I think my students are likely motivated by the way I give feedback to their errors, I always try to support my students' errors in a way that minimizes their embarrassment, enhance their willingness to receive feedback and participate in speaking activities. I am happy to see how my students are inspired in their learning through their responses to feedback and their learning progress. (Teacher 2-Interview)

In the above data, Teacher 2 suggested that the positive effects of error correction would foster students' learning motivation. When students were provided adequate feedback in their speaking classes, they could learn new things, speak English correctly and use English in a better way. Gradually, students found more inspiration in their language learning. Furthermore, the negative effect of OCF on students' motivation was mentioned by teacher 3 as "it can hurt students' feelings, especially shy and low ability students" (Teacher 3-Interview). More specifically, she stated that OCF may make students feel negative and unwilling to participate in the learning process. She also raised more concern on the reduction of students' frustration and demotivation through teachers' OCF.

All teachers also regarded linguistic confidence as a feature engaged students' motivation. The more confidence that the linguistic achievement brought to students, the more motivation in learning that they attained. This can be seen in what Teacher 4 said:

> When students pronounce words correctly, use accurate grammatical items, and adequate word choice, they could feel more motivated and confident in learning. They would participate more in the lessons and be willing to provide comments and feedback. Therefore, their learning styles would be changed and they seem to be more active in their learning (Teacher 4-Interview).

Despite the fact that sometimes error correction brought them the feeling of anxiety, a majority of students revealed that their learning benefited much from teachers' OCF. The following excerpt reflected their positive views in this regard:

> At first, I feel shy and a little demotivated. However, I gradually get used to teacher' OCF and becoming more willing to receive, response and participate in the lessons. I become more competent in linguistic items when I speak something. To some extent, the sense of confidence positively does affect the speaking, especially the fluency. Pointing out and giving feedback on our friends' ill-formed utterances help us to practice more on the linguistic items and have chance to exchange knowledge. Yes, the feeling was so good (Teacher 4-S4, S5-Focus group interview).

This piece of data showed that although teacher's OCF actually brought them with the sense of knowledge fulfillment and self-efficacy in language learning, OCF sometimes made students feel anxious. The data also reflected the willingness of receiving, responding to feedback from the students and their participations in the lessons. The more competent at using language they were, the more confident they were in their speaking skills. Importantly, it expressed the inspiration of learning that students could gain when they achieved new knowledge and shared this with each other.

4.4. Linguistic Knowledge Development

The same perspective shared by all five participating EFL teachers in their interviews confirmed that linguistic awareness and students' concern on language use would have positive effect on students' speaking outcomes and their overall linguistic development. Teacher 1 offered the following explanation for this view:

OCF is beneficial to students' oral errors in speaking lessons as speaking skill relates to a variety of aspects such as pronunciation, grammatical items, lexical use, ideas, speaking strategies, etc. With teachers' support in correcting errors, students would gradually avail of grammatical structures, word choice and pronunciation correctly so that their oral utterances would be much better. Without error correction, students cannot fulfill their lack of linguistic knowledge. (Teacher 1-Interview)

According to the above excerpt, Teacher 1 mentioned the possibility that students could achieve knowledge from teachers' error correction and produce oral speech with accurate linguistic items. The development of students' linguistic knowledge would lead to the increase of students' speaking competency and overall language development. Definitely, OCF had the facilitating role on students' learning as "If errors are not treated, students may repeat the same errors and might not develop their linguistic competence" (Teacher 5-Interview). Similarly, Teacher 3 emphasized that "students with adequate knowledge could produce accurate utterances and better speaking production" (Teacher 3-Interview). In general, teachers all confirmed the role of OCF in promoting students' speaking ability and language proficiency.

A majority of student participants further reiterated this sense of increased linguistic knowledge shared among teachers:

We really need OCF as it helps us avail of English linguistics items in a right way in our speaking. Teachers show our inaccurate utterances and then, instruct us to correct target language form. When we can use linguistic items well, we can speak English correctly. (Teacher 4-Ss-Focus group interview)

The above data showed the benefit of OCF in students' language development. Students strongly believed that OCF gave them sufficient and appropriate support to enhance their linguistic forms and speaking skills as well. In alike manner, some of the students showed their agreement on this issue:

Well, we can fulfill our lack of linguistic knowledge with teachers' assistance. Furthermore, it is possible for us to get to know new grammatical structures or lexical usage. New linguistic knowledge can make our English much better. Importantly, this will increase speaking' accuracy and fluency. (Teacher 1-S3, S5, S6-Focus group interview), (Teacher 3-S1, S4-Focus group interview)

These students stressed that they could achieve new knowledge with teacher's error correction, gain more experience in their speaking and constantly master their English oral skills. That was to speak English accurately and fluently. Apart from the increase of speaking ability, students also believed that "with the help from teachers, they could gradually fill the linguistic gap and be gradually competent at their English proficiency". (Teacher 4-Ss-Focus group interview)

5. Discussion

Data showed the shared agreement of both teachers and students on the increase of students' consciousness of their oral utterances and language use due to teachers' OCF. Without OCF, errors might be unnoticed by students and they repeated their deviant forms in their next speaking practices. Relevant support from teachers could facilitate students' error recognition and enhance their language awareness. In fact, OCF could students to notice the gap between the correct and incorrect form of the target language. This finding was also in line with some current studies (Abukhadrah, 2012; Ní Aogáin, 2019). Students in Abukhadrah's (2012) study

believed that OCF improved their awareness in their target language, especially when teachers asked them to correct the errors on their own. It also provided learners with guidelines to avoid making errors in the future. On the other hand, all the teachers considered OCF as an effective strategy to raise students' language awareness and ability to correct themselves and subsequent language development.

The results from the findings indicated both teachers and students confirmed the transfer of responsibility from teachers to students in the process of error correction. They asserted that OCF could enhance students' ability of controlling their English learning, especially their error treatment. This view seemed to be consistent with the result derived from Abukhadrah's (2012) and Ní Aogáin's (2019) studies. Ní Aogáin (2019) found that all six teacher participants in the CF treatment groups claimed that students became more independent in their learning process and had begun to take responsibilities for their erroneous linguistic utterances rather than relying on the teachers. Similarly, teachers and students from Abukhadrah's (2012) study also agreed that OCF would make students more independent and responsible for their learning.

The results from the data analysis also revealed that all EFL teachers and the students strongly agreed that error correction did play a key role in enhancing students' motivation in English learning, even though teachers found sometimes OCF could make students feel confused and lessen their participation in language classrooms. This view was in line with current studies (Abukhadrah, 2012; Kavaliauskiené & Anusiené, 2012). For instance, in Abukhadrah's (2012) study, while teachers provided mixed responses to the possibility of raising students' anxiety of OCF, the majority of students stated that anxiety mainly depended on learners' beliefs and believed that OCF did not necessarily raise anxiety. Similarly, error correction was not expected to have influence on learners' motivation or their willingness to perfect language skills (Kavaliauskiené & Anusiené, 2012). This finding partly supported Roothooft and Breeze's (2016) research, which revealed that while the teachers thought OCF could lead to students' inhibition or demotivation, a majority of students felt happy and grateful with teachers' OCF support. When they spoke something wrong, teachers' feedback made them to notice their errors and encouraged them to use language accurately. It seemed that all participant students felt comfortable with teachers' error treatment, which showed the sense of satisfaction and the increased learning motivation. The reason for it might be the confidence of accurate language implementation that resulted from the increase of linguistic competence with the support of OCF.

It could be noted from the data analysis that the consciousness of making errors and appropriate error treatment encouraged students in their language use. When students understood that making errors was a part of process, and that their teachers tried to help them learn target forms, they were likely to take risks and build up confidence through practice. Constantly, students' linguistic gaps could be fulfilled. This would lead to the improvement in accuracy and fluency of students' speaking performances. Obviously, both teachers and students in this study could witness the significance of OCF and all of them supported the role of OCF in students' language learning and development. This concurred with the findings of some current research (Abukhadrah, 2012; Fajriah, 2018; Tesnim, 2019). For example, in Fajriah's (2018) study, teachers indicated that giving corrective feedback was a vital part of language learning since it could contribute to the development of students' second language acquisition. Consequently, students expected to receive corrective feedback from teacher as it helped them to speak English properly. Similarly, in Abukhadrah's (2012) study, the vast majority of students and teachers indicated that OCF was effective for improving and learning

the target language. Students also showed that OCF promoted both accuracy and fluency of the target language. Furthermore, findings from Tesnim (2019) indicated that learners' accuracy and fluency could be promoted by teachers' OCF provision. Teachers made students successful in learning the language through instructing them to use appropriate vocabulary or linguistic structure.

Theoretically, from SCT perspectives, the study showed teachers and students' views on the impact of OCF in speaking classrooms. Firstly, both teachers and students stressed that error correction did raise the language awareness, which could be the first step for their cognitive development and language improvement. This result was similar to the findings in Thorne and Tasker's (2011) research. They indicated that a student's ability to notice discrepancies in their interlanguage was the first crucial stage of language learning. As stated by Vygotsky (1978), the influence of the cultural-historical context on education was crucial not because it was where students were scaffolded, but, rather, it encouraged them to develop greater awareness of themselves, their language, their role in the world order. More specifically, the ZPD refers to new forms of awareness that takes place in on learning. It could be inferred that, through corrective feedback provided by the teacher or their peers, students may notice that there was something wrong with the utterance or the expression that they just provided. If students do not get feedback on their oral production, they may not be able to enhance their language skills. Feedback definitely encourages students to have a close and critical look on their language performance and ultimately, enhance error correction.

Findings showed that teachers and students' views on error correction could raise students' responsibility as teachers gradually removed their assistance. It might enhance the students' self-control of their linguistic capacities within their ZPD zones. This transfer level of control from teachers to students mirrored handover feature of scaffolding which clearly showed the increase of students' role as their language capacity and confidence improved significantly. From a sociocultural perspective, scaffolding feedback provided within students' ZPD zones could help students move from dependence on the teacher to independence and autonomous performance. In language teaching process, teachers gave continuous support to students and when they removed their assistance gradually, there was an increase in students' ability to take control of their own process. When students had more control in their own learning, there was a shift of responsibility from teachers to them (Donato, 1994). Broadly speaking, in an educational context, the teachers modeled the desired learning strategy or tasks then constantly transferred responsibility to students. The increasing responsibility of students in their learning highlighted the positive outcomes of teachers' assistance in correcting students' oral errors, which made them gradually competent, confident in their speaking performances and subsequently self-improved their English learning. The finding also mirrored the argument of Shahidzade's (2017) who maintained that relevant scaffolding/ assistance from teachers made students autonomous and independent in their language learning.

The finding showed the overall positive attitudes of both teachers and students towards the impact of OCF on students' motivation. Teachers and students believed that the relevance of teachers' OCF played a vital role in motivating students' language learning. That meant, from sociocultural perspective, appropriate linguistic scaffolds provided by more capable others within students' ZPD could support students to maintain or even increase their learning motivation. Importantly, different students might have different ZPDS in using the same structure and the same student might have different ZPDS in using different structures. As such, teachers should give support at different levels so that students would obtain enough motivation

to continue their learning (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994).

The perspective of linguistic development can also be supported by concepts of sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978). More specifically, in the process of error correction, students were provided with feedback from more knowledgeable others (MKOs), ultimately, they became internalized the linguistic rules or principles and can figure out the right forms of the utterances. This can reflect the transformation of students' knowledge when they had appropriated the experts' instructions, consequently, they were able to understand the new concepts and skills, organize their thoughts, and control their actions (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994). More importantly, the development of students' language proficiency occurred in ZPD which involves the level of potential development of the learners (Ellis, 2009). That was, within ZPD, the learners could do with the assistance of others (teachers or peers) what they did not do before. With the gradual removal of teachers' support, students then became competent in their English learning, which led to the improvement of their speaking competence. The role of OCF in students' language development made the researcher view it as a psychological tool which was beneficial to mediate students' language learning process and promote students' language proficiency as well.

6. Conclusion

This study focused on teachers' and students' perceptions of how OCF influences on language teaching and learning process. Four aspects were found about the impact of error correction in language classes. They were: awareness of language use, responsibility transfer, learning motivation, linguistic knowledge development. The results from students' focus group interviews also reported that students were not aware of error correction much in their English lessons. Since the more consciousness of OCF students have, the more benefit they can receive from OCF, it is also teachers' responsibility to raise students' awareness of the purpose, necessity and importance of OCF which help them to have positive views on OCF and willingness to get engaged in the process of OCF. More importantly, as students have different levels of English proficiency, teachers should give relevant support in order to maintain students' English learning motivation. Theoretically, Vygotskian sociocultural perspective which views cognitive processes as socially and culturally mediated activities that ultimately become internalized, served as a useful framework for a deeper understanding of teachers' OCF provision as well as the position of teachers and students (as MKOs) in social interactions in the classrooms.

References

Abukhadrah, Q. A. (2012). *Arab male students' preferences for oral corrective feedback: A case study* [Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University]. OhioLINK.

Alhaysony, M. (2016). Saudi EFL preparatory year students' perceptions about corrective feedback in oral communication. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(12), 47-61. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n12p47

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*(4), 465-483. https://doi.org/10.2307/328585

Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, *25*(2), 243-272.

Billups, F. D. (2021). *Qualitative data collection tools: Design, development, and applications*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience & school*. National Academy Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning*, *27*(1), 29-46. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1977.tb00290.x

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Pearson

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33-56). Ablex.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, *1*(1), 3-18. https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054

Fajriah, Y. N. (2018). Corrective feedback as perceived by an EFL teacher and student in speaking classroom. *EEAL Journal*, *1*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.31980/eeal%20journal.v1i1.42.g19

Kamiya, N. (2014). The relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *10*(3), 206-219. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2014.939656

Karimi, M. N., & Asadnia, F. (2015). EFL teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback and their feedback-providing practices across learners' proficiency levels. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, *7*(2), 39-68. https://doi.org/10.22099/jtls.2015.3582

Kavaliauskiené, G., & Anusiené, L. (2012). Case study: Learner attitudes towards the correction of mistakes. *Social Technologies*, *2*(1), 88-101.

Kim, T. Y. (2009). The sociocultural interface between ideal self and ought to self: A case study of two Korean students' ESL motivation. In Z. Dornyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and L2 self* (pp. 274-294). Multilingual Matters.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 1-26). Oxford University Press.

Long, M. (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of research. *TESOL Quarterly*, *17*(3), 359-382. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586253

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Academic Press.

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

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(1), 37-66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034

Lyster, R., & Saiko, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 265-302. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520

Martínez, J. d. D. (2012). Investigating Spanish EFL students' beliefs and preferences regarding the effectiveness of corrective feedback. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *2*(19), 121-131.

McDonough, K. (2005). Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners' responses on ESL question development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *27*(1), 79-103. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050047

Ní Aogáin, S. (2019). *Teachers' and students' perspectives of corrective feedback on the grammatical accuracy of immersion students' second language* [Doctoral dissertation, Dublin City University]. http://doras.dcu.ie/22827/1/5.12.2018%20Final%20Copy.pdf

Nhac, T. H. (2022). Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences in English Lessons: Learners' and Teachers' Perspectives. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *11*(3), 1643-1655.

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

Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2023). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, *27*(1), 137-167.

Olson, J., & Platt, J. (2000). *The instructional cycle: Teaching children and adolescents with special needs*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2015). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' cognitions about corrective feedback in teaching English oral communication. *System*, 55, 111-122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.09.006

Rasmussen, J. (2001). The importance of communication in teaching: A systems-theory approach to the scaffolding metaphor. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *33*(5), 569-582. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270110034369

Rassaei, E. (2014). Scaffolded feedback, recasts, and L2 development: A sociocultural perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*(1), 417-431. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12060.x

Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided participation, apprenticeship. In J. V. Wertsch, P. del RiO & A. Alvarez (Eds.), *Sociocultural studies of mind* (pp. 139-164). Cambridge University Press.

Roothooft, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, *25*(4), 318-335. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580

Sardareh, S. A., & Saad, M. R. M. (2012). A sociocultural perspective on assessment for learning: The case of a Malaysian primary school ESL context. *Procedia - Social and Behaviorial Sciences*, 66, 343-353.

Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research*, *7*(2), 89-102. https://doi.org/10.1177/026765839100700202

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129-158.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In S. Richard (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 1-63). Second Language Learning & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i.

Shahidzade, F. (2017). Students' attitudes towards the use of regulated learning and corrective feedback in dialogic interactions in EFL classes. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, *7*(4), 341-350.

Sheen, Y. (2010). Introduction: The role of oral and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 169-179. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990489

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Book & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H. G Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford University Press.

Tesnim, O. (2019). Tunisian EFL teachers' beliefs and perceptions about oral corrective feedback. *Communication and Linguistic Studies*, *5*(2), 45-53. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.cls.20190502.12

Thorne, S., & Tasker, T. (2011). Sociocultural and cultural-historical theories of language development. In J. Simpson (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 487-500). Routledge.

Tran, K. N., & Nguyen, T. C. (2020). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes: A case at colleges in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *5*(2), 18-30. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejfl.v5i2.3322

Tran, T. B. P., & Nguyen, B. H. (2018). Teacher corrective feedback on students' speaking performance and their uptake in EFL classes. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *3*(3), 110-131. http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1321246

Truscott, J. (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction?. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *55*(4), 437-456. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.55.4.437

Van der Stuyf, R. R. (2002). Scaffolding as a teaching strategy. *Adolescent learning and development*, *52*(3), 5-18.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Walqui, A., & Van Lier, L. (2010). *Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent English language learners: A pedagogy of promise*. WesrEd.

Appendix 1

Interview Guide – Teachers

1. Have you ever considered to OCF provision? How crucial is OCF while teaching speaking in English?
2. To what extent does OCF improve your students' English learning process?
3. To what extent does OCF hinder students' English learning process?
4. What factors do you take into consideration when giving OCF?
5. How satisfied are you with the way you give OCF in your English classes?

Appendix 2

Focus Group Interview Guide – Students

1. To what extent is OCF important in your oral learning process?
2. How was your feeling with teachers' OCF provision? (Comfortable, uncomfortable, satisfied, unsatisfied, etc). Can you explain in more detail?
3. Are you satisfied with your teacher's OCF provision? Can you explain in detail?
4. What might be influential factors in the process of OCF?
5. How can OCF encourage and hinder your speaking learning? Can you clarify your answer?

QUAN ĐIỂM CỦA GIÁO VIÊN VÀ SINH VIÊN VỀ ẢNH HƯỞNG CỦA SỬA LỖI NÓI ĐỐI VỚI NĂNG LỰC NÓI CỦA SINH VIÊN TRONG LỚP HỌC NÓI TIẾNG ANH

Lê Mai Vân

Trường Ngoại ngữ - Du lịch, Trường Đại học Công nghiệp Hà Nội,
298 Cầu Diễn, quận Bắc Từ Liêm, Hà Nội

Tóm tắt: Hỗ trợ sinh viên nâng cao kỹ năng giao tiếp trong thế giới toàn cầu hóa là một trong những mối quan tâm của giáo viên. Cách giáo viên sửa lỗi cũng ảnh hưởng tới sự phát triển về năng lực ngôn ngữ của sinh viên. Đã có một số nghiên cứu về quan điểm của giáo viên và sinh viên về sửa lỗi nói, nhưng rất ít nghiên cứu về cả quan điểm của giáo viên và sinh viên về ảnh hưởng của sửa lỗi nói đối với khả năng nói của sinh viên dưới góc nhìn của thuyết văn hóa xã hội. Nghiên cứu định tính này nhằm tìm hiểu quan điểm của giáo viên và sinh viên về ảnh hưởng của sửa lỗi nói trong lớp học nói bậc đại học ở Việt Nam. Số liệu thu thập từ 05 phỏng vấn bán cấu trúc với giáo viên và 05 phỏng vấn nhóm với 35 sinh viên năm thứ nhất. Kết quả cho thấy sửa lỗi nói giúp sinh viên phát hiện ra lỗi và có trách nhiệm hơn với việc học, tăng động lực học và mở rộng kiến thức về ngôn ngữ. Từ đó, nghiên cứu cũng đưa ra những gợi ý cho việc sửa lỗi nói của giáo viên.

Từ khóa: quan điểm, sửa lỗi nói, ảnh hưởng, năng lực nói, thuyết văn hóa xã hội