TEFL teachers' perceptions and practices of oral corrective feedback: a qualitative study in Vietnamese high schools

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the perceptions and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback (OCF) among eight TEFL high school teachers in Pleiku City, Vietnam. Drawing on data from semi-structured interviews and 24 classroom observations, the study reveals a predominant use of implicit feedback types, particularly recasts and clarification requests. While teachers expressed a preference for delayed correction, most feedback was delivered immediately, highlighting a discrepancy between stated beliefs and actual practices. The study further found that grammar and pronunciation errors received the most attention, while vocabulary issues were comparatively under-addressed. These findings underscore the context-dependent and nuanced nature of OCF in EFL classrooms, suggesting implications for professional development and pedagogical alignment.

Keywords: *Oral corrective feedback, High school EFL Teachers, perceptions and practices, classroom observations, Vietnamese High School Context*

1. INTRODUCTION

In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, learners frequently produce non-target-like utterances that require pedagogical intervention. Among these interventions, oral corrective feedback (OCF) stands as a key mechanism for drawing learners' attention to linguistic forms during communicative exchanges [1]. Despite longstanding debates over its effectiveness, there is broad consensus that explicit or implicit OCF can facilitate second language development by promoting noticing, self-repair, and form-function mappings [2]. However, the success of OCF depends not only on its type and timing but also on how it is perceived and enacted by teachers within the dynamics of actual classrooms.

Recent research has underscored a persistent gap between teachers' stated beliefs about feedback and their observable practices [3], [4]. While some teachers articulate strong beliefs in the benefits of delayed or explicit correction, they often rely on implicit feedback strategies such as recasts or clarification requests in practice. This belief-practice tension is further influenced by contextual variables including class size, curriculum demands, student affect, and local educational culture [5], [6]. Thus, understanding how teachers perceive and apply OCF in specific institutional settings is essential for both SLA theory and teacher professional development.

In Vietnam, English language education has undergone major reforms under initiatives such as the National Foreign Language Project 2020. Yet research into OCF remains limited, particularly in rural or less-resourced regions where institutional support, teacher training, and student readiness may differ significantly from urban or tertiary settings. Pleiku City**,** located in the Central Highlands, provides a compelling site for examining how EFL teachers navigate these challenges and make pedagogical decisions regarding OCF. Despite being the provincial capital, it retains many characteristics of a remote area, such as large class sizes and limited exposure to authentic English input outside school.

This qualitative study investigates how eight high school EFL teachers in Pleiku perceive and implement OCF. Drawing on data from semi-structured interviews and classroom observations, it explores the interplay between teacher cognition and instructional behavior. The study seeks to address the following research questions:

1. *What are EFL teachers' perceptions of OCF in language classrooms?*
2. *How are these perceptions reflected in their actual feedback practices?*

By answering these questions, the study contributes to an ongoing body of work in applied linguistics and teacher cognition, offering a

context-sensitive analysis of feedback practices in Vietnamese secondary education. It also aims to inform curriculum design, teacher training, and feedback policy, especially in educational contexts striving to balance communicative goals with accuracy-focused instruction.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Feedback

Feedback in language education encompasses a wide array of responses that guide learners toward improved performance. It includes both positive reinforcement and corrective responses [7]. Within SLA, corrective feedback (CF) is a specific subset that addresses learners' non-target-like utterances, aiming to facilitate form-focused language development. In educational contexts, feedback refers to information provided by various agents (e.g., teacher, peer, self) about learners' performance or understanding[7]. Its primary purpose is to guide learners toward improvement. Shute [8] emphasizes that feedback modifies learners' thinking or behavior to enhance learning outcomes.

Feedback supports learning not only by correcting errors but also by reinforcing correct responses and promoting deeper understanding [9]. It fosters cognitive development, aids in revising mental models [10], and enables scaffolding within the Zone of Proximal Development [11]. Additionally, effective feedback promotes self-regulation through clear performance criteria and reflective learning [12].

2.2. Oral corrective feedback

Oral corrective feedback (OCF) refers to teacher or peer responses to learners' erroneous spoken output in order to indicate or correct language errors [1], [13]. It can be explicit or implicit, ranging from direct correction to subtle signals like recasts or clarification requests [14]. Despite varied definitions, OCF generally aims to inform learners of their errors and promote more accurate language use [15]. In this study, OCF is defined as any technique used by teachers to respond to students' spoken errors, either by providing the correct form or guiding them to self-correct.

Table 1. Description of the seven types of oral corrective feedback (Sheen [6])

Types of OCF	Descriptions	Examples
Recasts	Recasts involve reformulating students' erroneous utterances. The reformulated utterance may correct part or all of students' utterance.	S: The cats is fat. T: are
Explicit correction	Explicit correction provides the correct form with a clear signal to students that they have made an error. The signal is often phrases such as 'You should say' and 'no'.	S: I am happy last night. T: You should say 'I was happy', not 'I am happy'.
Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation	This type of CF provides both the correct form and a metalinguistic explanation of the form.	S: I am happy last night. T: I was happy last night. You should use the past tense form of 'be' because of the adverbial phrase 'last night', which indicates the event happened in the past.
Metalinguistic clues	Metalinguistic clues are metalinguistic comments without the correct form given to encourage students to correct their own errors.	S: She finish the book yesterday. T: You need to use past tense.
Clarification requests	Clarification requests are signals that telling students there is something wrong with their utterance	S: She like reading very much. T: Pardon?
Repetition	Repetition is mimicked utterance of whole or part of the students' erroneous utterance. It is a way of trying to elicit students to provide the correct form	S: I walk home with my mother three days ago. T: I walk home with my mother three days ago?
Elicitation	Elicitation tries by repeating students' erroneous utterance up to the point where error is made so as to encourage students to give the correct form.	S: Last night, there are many apples on the table. T: Last night, there …

Two main OCF types are recasts and prompts. Recasts involve reformulating the learner's incorrect utterance without altering its meaning [16]. Prompts, including clarification requests, repetitions, and metalinguistic clues, encourage learners to notice and self-correct errors [17], [18]. Prompts are linked to deeper cognitive processing and learner autonomy[18].

Most teachers agree that correcting oral errors is essential for language development [19 [20].

While teachers may prefer to correct errors that hinder communication, students often expect correction to improve accuracy and fluency [21], [22].

OCF can be given immediately, after the learner finishes speaking (delayed), or later in the lesson (postponed) [6]. A description of the three types of timing is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Description of the three types of timing to provide OCF (Sheen [6])

Timing	Description
Immediate	Provide feedback immediately when errors are found. It may interrupt the speech of the speakers who produce the erroneous utterance.
Delayed	Provide feedback after the learner has finished speaking.
Postponed	Provide feedback later or at the end of lessons.

Studies show varied teacher preferences: some prioritize immediate correction, while others opt for delayed feedback to avoid interrupting learners [23]. Student preferences also differ depending on context [24, [25]. OCF effectiveness depends on feedback type, timing, learner proficiency, and context. Explicit feedback enhances awareness of language form, while implicit feedback, like recasts, maintains fluency but may be less noticed [1], [18].

The literature has extensively discussed the definitions, types, timing, and effects of oral corrective feedback (OCF), emphasizing its role in second language acquisition. Prior studies have also highlighted the influence of teacher beliefs on feedback practices, as well as the mismatch that may occur between stated perceptions and actual classroom behavior. However, most existing research has focused on tertiary or urban educational settings, with limited attention given to high school contexts in less urbanized regions such as Pleiku City, Vietnam. Additionally, while various OCF strategies have been explored, few studies have simultaneously examined both teacher perceptions and observed classroom practices in parallel.

In the Vietnamese context, previous studies have revealed a notable gap between EFL teachers' beliefs and their classroom practices, particularly in speaking assessment and oral corrective feedback (OCF). Nguyen and Tran [26] highlighted limited assessment literacy and the underuse of techniques like oral portfolios and self-assessment. Similarly, Phan and Truong [27] found inconsistencies between teachers' beliefs in positive feedback and their real-time classroom practices. Studies by Ha [4], Tran and Nguyen [28], and Le, M. V. and Le, T. H. T. [29] consistently reported that while teachers preferred implicit or student-centered OCF strategies, they often defaulted to explicit corrections due to classroom constraints and cultural considerations. These findings point to the influence of situational and cultural factors on OCF practices and emphasize the need for context-sensitive teacher training. However, research on OCF in Vietnamese high school settings remains scarce, especially in less-researched regions.

To address this gap, the present study adopts a qualitative approach to investigate how high school EFL teachers in Pleiku City conceptualize and implement oral corrective feedback in their classrooms. The following section outlines the research design, participants, and data collection procedures used to examine the relationship between perception and practice.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research design

This study employed a qualitative case study design to explore the interplay between teachers' perceptions and their actual practices of oral corrective feedback (OCF) in Vietnamese EFL classrooms. Classroom research offers valuable insights into participant roles, instructional effects, and learning conditions [30]. A qualitative approach was chosen for its strength in capturing complex classroom behaviors and uncovering the reasons behind alignment or mismatch between teachers' beliefs and practices [31], [32].

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and classroom observations. Thirteen-question interviews elicited teachers' stated perceptions of OCF, while twenty-four observed lessons documented their actual feedback practices. This dual-method design enabled a deeper understanding of how teachers conceptualize and implement OCF in real-time contexts [33].

3.2. Research context and participants

This study was conducted at two large public high schools in Pleiku City, Gia Lai Province, located in Vietnam's Central Highlands. Despite

being the administrative center of the province, Pleiku retains many features of a mountainous region, including large class sizes**,** limited student exposure to English outside the classroom, and constraints on pedagogical resources. The two schools - Nguyen Chi Thanh and Hoang Hoa Tham- were selected to represent varying student demographics and institutional resources. Nguyen Chi Thanh is situated near a semi-rural area and serves many ethnic minority students, while Hoang Hoa Tham is centrally located and benefits from better facilities and a more socio-economically diverse student body. The two schools thereby represent both semi-rural and urban educational environments, offering a useful basis for contextual comparison.

Eight female EFL teachers participated in the study, four from each school. All held bachelor's degrees in English language teaching and had completed professional development under Vietnam's National Foreign Language Project 2020. Their teaching experience ranged from 7 to 26 years (M = 16 years). Teachers were purposively selected based on availability and willingness to participate. Table 1 presents a summary of their demographic information.

Table 3. Participant Demographics

Teachers (Coding)	Age (year)	Teaching experience at high schools (year)	Total teaching experience (year)
TN1	40	18	18
TN2	37	11	14
TN3	36	13	14
TN4	35	13	13
TH1	45	21	21
TH2	50	20	26
TH3	38	15	15
TH4	30	7	7
Average	**38.9**	**14.75**	**16**

3.3. Data collection and procedure

The study employed two main data collection methods: semi-structured interviews and classroom observations.

Interviews were conducted in Vietnamese to facilitate rich and accurate expression. Each teacher participated in a 45-minute individual interview, guided by a protocol covering three aspects: (1) beliefs about the role and types of OCF, (2) preferred timing of feedback, and (3) contextual factors influencing feedback delivery. Interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and later translated into English for analysis.

A total of 24 classroom sessions (3 per teacher, each lasting 45 minutes) were observed to capture real-time OCF practices. Grade 10 classes were selected due to their balance of linguistic maturity and curricular focus on communication. The researcher maintained a non-participant observer role to preserve natural classroom dynamics. Audio recordings were made using multiple strategically placed devices, and detailed field notes were taken to document teacher-student interactions, error types, and feedback moves.

3.4. Data analysis

Data analysis followed an iterative, thematic coding procedure. Interview transcripts were coded inductively and deductively, using categories from OCF literature (Sheen [6]) and emerging themes from the data. Observational data were analyzed for interpretation of three perspectives: (1) Types of OCF (e.g., recast, elicitation, clarification request); (2) Timing (immediate vs. delayed); and (3) Linguistic targets (grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary). The feedback typology proposed by Sheen [6] was used as the main analytic framework for classifying OCF instances. NVivo software facilitated systematic coding and cross-case comparisons.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Teachers' Perceptions of Oral Corrective Feedback

4.1.1. Benefits of Oral Corrective Feedback

All eight teachers acknowledged the importance of oral corrective feedback in supporting students' language development. They agreed that timely feedback not only improves linguistic accuracy but also enhances learner

confidence and classroom engagement. However, the emphasis varied by school context. Teachers at TN High School, where students often face limited exposure to English, highlighted OCF's motivational value and its role in raising learners' awareness. As TN1 noted, "*When students realize their mistakes, they don't just fix them – they understand them,*" while TN4 emphasized that "*when students see that you care… they care more too*." In contrast, teachers at TH High School, where learning conditions are generally more favorable, focused on the long-term cognitive benefits of OCF, such as preventing fossilization and reinforcing correct usage. TH1 reflected, "*There are things I remember clearly just because my teacher corrected me*," and TH3 added, "*Some errors stay with you forever if no one corrects them early*." Despite these contextual differences, all teachers viewed OCF as a crucial pedagogical tool, adaptable to learners' emotional and linguistic needs, reinforcing prior research on its transformative potential in EFL classrooms.

4.1.2. Preference for oral corrective feedback types

The eight teachers expressed varied preferences for oral corrective feedback (OCF) types, influenced by their teaching contexts and student needs. Repetition was the most consistently favored across both TN and TH High Schools for its subtle and effective nature.

Table 4. Teachers' perceptions about the effectiveness of CF types (1: most preferred; 6: least preferred)

	TN1	**TN2**	**TN3**	**TN4**	**TH1**	**TH2**	**TH3**	**TH4**
a. She go to London last year. (Recast)	3	3	5	5	4	2	5	4
b. Not "go", say "went". (Explicit correction)	4	5	2	4	2	6	2	3
c. What is the past tense of "go"? (Meta-linguistic feedback)	6	2	1	6	3	4	1	5
d. Go to London last year? (Repetition)	1	1	3	1	1	1	4	2
e. Sorry? / Can you repeat that again? (Clarification request)	2	6	6	3	6	5	6	1
*f. She **...** to London last year. (Elicitation)*	5	4	4	2	5	3	3	6

TN teachers generally preferred indirect feedback like clarification requests and repetition, aiming to build student confidence and encourage self-correction, especially in a semi-rural setting with lower English exposure. In contrast, TH teachers, working in an urban, better-resourced environment, were more open to explicit correction and meta-linguistic feedback, valuing their clarity and efficiency. These differences reflect context-sensitive approaches, shaped by factors such as student proficiency, confidence, and learning environment.

4.1.3. The timing of OCF

Both TN and TH teachers expressed a preference for delayed oral corrective feedback (OCF), though their underlying reasons differed. TN teachers - generally younger and less experienced - prioritized emotional support, aiming to protect students' confidence and avoid disrupting their speaking flow. TN1 remarked, *"If I interrupt them in the middle, it might embarrass them or make them hesitant to speak again*," while TN2 shared, "*I believe that correction should not disrupt students' thinking. I often jot down their mistakes and address them later."* Similarly, TH2 commented, "*Immediate correction may cause students to lose face. I often let them finish and then gently point out their errors*," and TH1 explained, "*Students in our context tend to be shy. If we correct them too early, they may become silent*."

Across both schools, teachers often delayed feedback to preserve classroom rapport and reduce learner anxiety. However, TH teachers, who were more experienced, also emphasized that delayed feedback aligns with cultural norms, such as saving face and maintaining group harmony. While TN teachers tended to avoid immediate correction altogether, TH teachers applied it more flexibly depending on the situation. Despite these nuances, both groups recognized delayed OCF as a culturally appropriate strategy that fosters fluency, student comfort, and a positive classroom atmosphere.

4.1.4. The linguistic target of OCF

All teachers acknowledged the importance of correcting pronunciation errors but emphasized that such correction should be integrated with grammar and vocabulary feedback, especially in the high school context. They believed that effective communication depends not only on clear pronunciation but also on accurate grammar and appropriate word use. Both TN and TH teachers advocated a balanced, selective approach - correcting pronunciation primarily when it impedes understanding, while also addressing structural and lexical issues to meet academic and real-world demands.

TN2 explained: "*Many of my students can pronounce individual words well after practice, but they still make grammatical mistakes that confuse the listener. So I try to correct both-pronunciation and structure-especially when they speak in longer sentences.*" This view was echoed by TN4, who noted: "*I always correct mispronounced words if they affect understanding, but I also help them fix grammar because exams and presentations require both accuracy and fluency.*" In the more competitive urban setting, TH teachers placed a stronger emphasis on combining phonological precision with syntactic and lexical accuracy. As TH3 remarked, *"If they mispronounce 'worked' as 'work', it's both a pronunciation and grammar issue*." Similarly, TH2 added, "*It's not enough to say the words clearly- they need to use the right words in the right way*." Overall, teachers across both contexts supported a holistic view of corrective feedback, aimed at improving students' overall communicative competence.

4.2 Teachers' practices of oral corrective feedback

4.2.1. Frequency of oral corrective feedback moves

The frequency of OCF moves can been seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Frequency of OCF moves

Teacher participant	TN1	TN2	TN3	TN4	TH1	TH2	TH3	TH4
Number of moves	21	12	29	22	26	32	32	25
Group Average	21.0				28.75			
Overall Average	24.875							

As shown in Table 5, during 18 hours of observation, eight teachers gave a total of 199 oral corrective feedback (OCF) moves, averaging about 25 each. Teachers at TH High School provided more frequent and consistent feedback (115 moves total, averaging 28.75 by each teacher) than those at TN High School (84 moves total, averaging 21 per teacher). TH teachers' higher and steadier feedback rates suggest stronger emphasis on form-focused instruction and greater confidence or learner responsiveness. In contrast, TN teachers showed wider variation, reflecting differences in teaching styles, classroom dynamics, or professional development. Overall, these results highlight how feedback practices differ by school context and underscore the importance of context-sensitive teacher training.

4.2.2. Oral corrective feedback types

Table 6 reveals the types of OCF deployed by teachers in both schools.

Table 6. OCF types deployed by teachers in both schools

OCF types	TN1	TN2	TN3	TN4	TN total	TH1	TH2	TH3	TH4	TH total	Overall total	%
Recasts	12	8	16	7	**43**	8	14	18	12	**52**	**95**	47.7%
Repetition	1	1	0	0	**2**	0	1	1	0	**2**	**4**	2.0%
Explicit Correction	4	1	4	3	**12**	5	5	4	5	**19**	**31**	15.6%
Elicitation	1	2	5	3	**11**	5	5	3	3	**16**	**27**	13.6%
Clarification Requests	2	0	2	4	**8**	2	2	5	3	**12**	**20**	10.1%
Metalinguistic Feedback	1	0	0	5	**6**	6	3	1	2	**12**	**18**	9.0%
Others	0	0	2	0	**2**	0	2	0	0	**2**	**4**	2.0%
Total	21	12	29	22	**84**	26	32	32	25	**115**	**199**	100%

Among the 199 oral corrective feedback moves observed, recasts were the most common, making up nearly half (47.7%), followed by explicit correction (15.5%) and elicitation (13.6%). Clarification requests and metalinguistic feedback accounted for smaller portions (10.1% and 9.0%), while repetition was rarely used (2.0%). A few moves (2.0%) did not fit into standard categories.

4.2.3. The timing of OCF

The timing of OCF can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. The timing of OCF

Feedback Type	TN1	TN2	TN3	TN4	TN Total	TH1	TH2	TH3	TH4	TH Total	Overall total
Immediate Feedback	16	8	20	14	**58**	21	21	18	16	**76**	**134**
% Immediate	76.2%	66.7%	69.0%	63.6%	**69.0%**	80.8%	65.6%	56.3%	64.0%	**66.1%**	**67.34%**
Delayed Feedback	5	4	9	8	**26**	5	11	14	9	**39**	**65**
% Delayed	23.8%	33.3%	31.0%	36.4%	**31.0%**	19.2%	34.4%	43.8%	36.0%	**33.9%**	**32.66%**
Total OCF Moves	21	12	29	22	**84**	26	32	32	25	**115**	**199**

Out of 199 oral corrective feedback (OCF) moves observed, about two-thirds (67.34%) were given immediately during students' speech, while one-third (32.66%) were delayed until after speaking. Teachers at both TN and TH schools generally preferred immediate feedback, with TN showing 69% and TH 66.1% immediate corrections. However, individual teachers varied, such as TN3 and TH3, who balanced immediate and delayed feedback to support both fluency and accuracy. Overall, immediate feedback was favored for its real-time effectiveness, though delayed feedback was also valued for encouraging reflection.

4.2.4 Linguistic target of oral corrective feedback

Linguistic features of OCF can been seen in Table 8.

Table 8: Linguistic features of OCF

Linguistic Features	TN1	TN2	TN3	TN4	TH1	TH2	TH3	TH4	Total
Grammar	2	6	8	8	16	15	15	10	**80**
Pronunciation	11	5	13	10	5	12	9	8	**73**
Vocabulary	5	1	7	2	2	5	7	5	**34**
Others	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	**10**
Total	21	12	29	22	26	32	32	25	**199**

Students' errors receiving corrective feedback were mainly classified into grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary, with grammar errors corrected most often overall. Teachers at TN showed a relatively balanced focus but emphasized pronunciation slightly more, reflecting support for spoken accuracy. In contrast, TH teachers prioritized grammar slightly more while still addressing pronunciation frequently, aligning with exam-driven, British English-influenced norms. Feedback practices varied by teacher and context, influenced by beliefs, classroom goals, and learners' needs. Overall, corrective feedback in both schools aimed to improve accuracy, fluency, and communicative confidence in spoken English.

A key finding is the mismatch between beliefs and practices, especially regarding timing and type. Although teachers endorsed delayed and interactive feedback in interviews, classroom behavior favored immediate and implicit correction. This inconsistency reflects what Borg [34] describes as contextual filtering - where institutional, cultural, and affective factors mediate teacher decisions. For instance, large class sizes and exam-oriented curricula constrained the use of feedback types requiring extended learner engagement. Moreover, concern over student face loss -a well-documented feature in Vietnamese classrooms (Nguyen & Tran [26]., Le, M. V. and Le, T. H. T. [29] appeared to discourage explicit correction despite teachers' awareness of its benefits.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Interview data indicated that teachers at both TN and TH schools valued oral corrective feedback (OCF), especially for improving students' pronunciation, intelligibility, and confidence. They preferred delayed feedback and prompts to support fluency and learner autonomy. These perceptions were shaped largely by teaching experience, as none had formal OCF training.

However, classroom observations revealed a preference for immediate feedback (67.34%) and recasts (47.7%), particularly didactic and explicit types, despite teachers not identifying them as preferred strategies. Prompts and repetition were mentioned in interviews but used rarely, often

limited to simple phrases. Still, alignments were observed: teachers who prioritized grammar or pronunciation in interviews (e.g., TH1, TH3, TN3) reflected these preferences in their feedback focus. Those favoring delayed correction (e.g., TN3, TH3) also used it more often.

Discrepancies, such as the dominance of recasts and frequent immediate feedback, suggest contextual constraints (e.g., time, classroom management, lack of training) influenced practices. Differences between TN and TH schools further point to the role of institutional culture in shaping OCF delivery.

Despite the study's small scale, its findings hold significant implications for teacher training and assessment in Vietnam. The observed gap between teachers' perceptions and their classroom practices suggests a need for professional development programs that specifically address oral corrective feedback (OCF) techniques, including both prompt-based and recast-based approaches. These programs should help teachers refine their understanding of OCF beyond explicit correction. The results also highlight the importance of integrating practical OCF instruction into university curricula and revisiting frameworks for assessing English teacher competence. The limited use of varied OCF types and reliance on non-standard prompts indicate that classroom discourse skills should be emphasized in teacher evaluations. These insights may inform not only local professional development but also broader educational reforms in similar EFL contexts, supporting a more balanced focus on both linguistic and pedagogical competence in English teaching.

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declare no competing interests.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Ellis, "Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development", *L2 Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3-18, 2009.

[2] H. Nassaji. "Anniversary article: Interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: A synthesis and analysis of current research", *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 535–562, 2016.

[3] S. Li, A. Vuono, "Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System", *System*, no. 84, pp. 93–109, 2019.

[4] V. X. Ha, "Primary EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of oral corrective feedback in Vietnam", *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 483–501. 2021.

[5] S. Borg, *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*, London: Continuum, 2006.

[6] Y. Sheen, *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*, Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer, 2011.

[7] J. Hattie, H. Timperley, "The Power of Feedback", *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 81-112, 2007.

[8] V. J. Shute, "Focus on Formative Feedback", *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 78, no.1, pp. 153-189*,* 2008.

[9] J. Hattie, S. Clarke. *Visible learning: Feedback*. Routledge, 2029.

[10] B. Carey, *How we learn: The surprising truth about when, where, and why it happens*. Random House, 2014.

[11] K. Shabani, "Group dynamic assessment of L2 learners' writing abilities," *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research,* vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 129-149, 2018.

[12] D. Nicol, D. Macfarlane-Dick, "Formative Assessment and Self-Regulated Learning: A Model and Seven Principles of Good Feedback Practice", *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 199–218, 2006.

[13] P. M. Lightbown, N. Spada, *How Languages are Learned,* 4th ed. Oxford University Press, 2013.

[14] S. Carroll, M. Swain, "Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalization," *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 357-386, 1993.

[15] S. Loewen. "The role of feedback", in *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* S. Gass and A. Macke, Eds. Routledge, 2012, pp. 24-40.

[16] M. H. Long. *Problems in SLA*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. Borg, 2007.

[17] A. Ammar, N. Spada, "One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning," *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 543-574, 2006.

[18] R. Lyster, K. Saito, M. Sato, "Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms," *Language Teaching*, no. 46, pp. 1- 40, 2013.

[19] E. Tomczyk, "Perceptions of Oral Errors and Their Corrective Feedback: Teachers vs. Students," *Language Teaching Research.* 2013.

[20] Y. Kirkgoz, M. P. Babanoglu, R. Agcam, "Corrective Feedback in Primary EFL Classrooms in Turkey", *American International Journal of Social Science,* vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 90-101, 2015.

[21] S. S. Firwana, "Perceptions of teachers and students towards oral corrective feedback in the EFL classroom in Gaza governorate," M.A. thesis, The Islamic University of Gaza, 2010.

[22] L. Ming-chu, W. Hung-chun, "Perception Differences of EFL Teachers and Students in Grammar Instruction and Error Correction," *English Teaching & Learning*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 101-146, 2009.

[23] E. M. Hernández, C. Reyes, "Teachers' Perceptions About Oral Corrective Feedback and Their Practice in EFL Classrooms," *Profile Issues in Teachers` Professional Development*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp 63-75, 2012.

[24] Y. A. Amdor, "Learner Attitudes toward Error Correction in a Beginners English Class," *Revista Communicaión*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 18-28, 2008.

[25] E. Olmezer-Ozturk, "Beliefs and practices of Turkish EFL teachers regarding oral corrective feedback: a small-scale classroom research study," *The Language Learning Journal,* no. 44*,* pp. 1-10, 2016.

[26] T. C. Nguyen, K. N. Tran, "EFL teachers' perceptions of speaking assessments: A case in Vietnam," *Journal of Asia TEFL*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp 488–502, 2018.

[27] T. T. H. Phan, V. Truong, **"**Positive oral feedback: EFL high school teachers' perceptions and practices in Vietnam," *International Journal of Language and Linguistics,* vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 123-134, 2018.

[28] K. N. Tran, T. C. Nguyen, "Vietnamese teachers' perspectives on oral corrective feedback in EFL classrooms," *The Asian EFL Journal,* vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 102-124, 2020.

[29] Le, M. V., & Le, T. H. T., "Teachers' Perspectives and Actual Practices of OCF Types in English-speaking Classes," *Vietnam Social Sciences,* vol. 212, no. 6, pp. 85-101, 2022.

[30] P. M. Lightbown, "Classroom SLA research and second language teaching," *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 431-462, 2000.

[31] J. W. Creswell, *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches,* 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE, 2014.

[32] A. Holliday. *Doing and writing qualitative research*. SAGE Publications, 2010.

[33] H. Basturkmen, S. Loewen, R. Ellis, "Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices," *Applied Linguistics,* vol. 25, no. 2, 243–272, 2004.

[34] S. Borg, "Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do," *Language Teaching*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 81-109, 2003.

Nhận thức và thực tế sửa lỗi nói của giáo viên tiếng Anh: nghiên cứu định tính tại trường phổ thông ở Việt Nam

TÓM TẮT

Bài báo này nghiên cứu nhận thức và thực tiễn giảng dạy về phản hồi sửa lỗi nói (OCF) trong lớp học của tám giáo viên tiếng Anh như một ngoại ngữ (TEFL) tại Thành phố Pleiku, Việt Nam. Dựa trên dữ liệu từ các cuộc phỏng vấn bán cấu trúc và 24 lượt quan sát lớp học, nghiên cứu cho thấy việc sử dụng chủ yếu các loại phản hồi ngầm, đặc biệt là sửa lại và yêu cầu làm rõ. Mặc dù các giáo viên bày tỏ sự ưa thích việc sửa lỗi trễ, nhưng hầu hết phản hồi được đưa ra ngay lập tức, cho thấy sự khác biệt giữa nhận thức và thực tiễn áp dụng trong lớp học. Nghiên cứu cũng cho thấy lỗi ngữ pháp và phát âm nhận được nhiều sự chú ý nhất, trong khi các vấn đề về từ vựng lại ít được quan tâm hơn. Những phát hiện này nhấn mạnh tính chất phụ thuộc vào ngữ cảnh và sự tinh tế của OCF trong lớp học tiếng Anh như một ngoại ngữ, từ đó đề xuất những hàm ý cho việc phát triển chuyên môn và sự điều chỉnh phương pháp sư phạm.

Từ khóa: *phản hồi sửa lỗi nói, giáo viên tiếng Anh như ngoại ngữ, nhận thức và thực tiễn, quan sát lớp học, bối cảnh trung học phổ thông tại Việt N*