PRIMARY EFL TEACHERS' ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN VIETNAM: BELIEFS AND PRACTICES

Xuan Van Ha

Master of Applied Linguistics, La Trobe University

This thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Research

Macquarie University

Faculty of Human Sciences

Department of Linguistics

October 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF CANDIDATE

I declare that this thesis entitled "Primary EFL teachers' oral corrective feedback in Vietnam: beliefs and practices" is my own work. It has not been submitted for, or as part of, any degree at any other university or institution.

To the best of my knowledge, I declare that this thesis contains no material published or written by another author except where due reference is made.

This thesis was granted approval by Macquarie University Human Research Ethics Committee on 22 March 2017, reference number: 5201700189, and conducted in accordance with the guidelines stipulated.

Xuan Van Ha
06 October 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My thesis would have never been completed without the support and guidance from many people.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Jill Murray, who has guided me thoroughly through all stages of my study. I would not have completed this thesis without her invaluable guidance and support.

My sincere thanks go to the six participants who have shared their beliefs about oral corrective feedback with me, and allowed me to observe their lessons. I also would like to thank my colleagues back home Mr Nguyen Gia Viet and Mr Tran Hai Ngoc for their help in my data collection phase.

My wholehearted gratitude also goes to my little family, my wife, my daughter and my son for their love and understanding. They have sacrificed for my absence for nearly one year, the hardest time of a young wife and two little kids. I am also grateful to other members of my extended families, and my friends who have always supported me during my thesis completion process.

Sydney, October 2017

ABSTRACT

This study explores teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms in primary schools in Vietnam. It is an interesting context to explore teacher cognition and practice because many teachers were actually trained as secondary teachers, but they are currently teaching at primary schools. The study was conducted at 6 public primary schools in a small city in Vietnam. The data consist of interviews with 6 teachers and 24 classroom observations.

The study shows that these teachers endorsed the benefits of oral corrective feedback, and they claimed to use prompts to elicit learner repair. They nominated teaching experience as the main factor shaping their beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback.

These claims were partially consistent with their classroom practices, but more incongruence was found. In accordance with their claims, these teachers normally used delayed feedback, and pronunciation errors were the most frequent feedback target. Contrary to their stated beliefs, the teachers used more reformulations than prompts, limiting learner repair. The linguistic patterns of these teachers' feedback are different from the expected standard expressions. This suggests that the teachers' problematic classroom discourse skills led to such a mismatch.

These findings can be a valuable reference for in-service Vietnamese primary EFL teachers to reflect on their own beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback. This study suggests that professional development programmes for such teachers incorporate workshops on classroom skills of corrective feedback. Further studies measuring the impact of teacher English proficiency and pedagogical skills on the effectiveness of corrective feedback are needed.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Symbol	Meaning
L1	First language
L2	Target language
CF	Corrective feedback
SLA	Second language acquisition
EFL	English as a foreign language
ESL	English as a second language

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Rationale

Corrective feedback (CF) "plays a pivotal role in the kind of scaffolding that teachers need to provide to individual learners to promote continuing L2 growth" (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013, p. 1). This important role of CF has attracted a large number of studies exploring the effectiveness of CF (e.g. S. Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; J. Russell & Spada, 2006; Saito & Lyster, 2012), the frequency of CF moves (e.g. Panova & Lyster, 2002), the distribution of CF types (e.g. Brown, 2016; Lyster & Ranta, 1997) and teachers' and learners' preferences for CF (e.g. Kaivanpanah, Alavi, & Sepehrinia, 2015; Plonsky & Mills, 2006). Research on CF preferences shows that learners in general are keen to receive feedback of all kinds including immediate and explicit feedback whilst teachers do not always show positive attitudes to oral CF and are concerned about the negative effects of feedback on students' confidence and motivation (S. Li, 2017). This mismatch may do harm to foreign language teaching and learning (V. Russell, 2009). However, what teachers claim to believe may be different from what they do in their classroom, especially for incidental aspects of teaching such as oral CF provision. Basturkmen (2012), in a review, reveals that the correspondence between teachers' stated beliefs and practices were mediated by context and constraints, and suggests that stated beliefs are likely to predict practices in cases where teachers are experienced and where planned aspects of teaching (e.g. task design, grammar teaching) are involved. She calls for further research on teachers' beliefs about incidental aspects of teaching such as oral CF. S. Li (2017) also suggests that beliefs about CF is "an independent construct that is distinct from beliefs about other aspects of language learning" (p. 143). Therefore, there appears to be a need to investigate the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices about this aspect of language teaching and learning.

There has been some research about the congruence/incongruence between teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF. However, these studies were conducted in a restricted range of contexts and yielded contradictory findings. For example, Roothooft (2014) examined the beliefs and practices of 10 EFL teachers (6 English L1 and 4 Spanish L1) teaching English at a university and a private language academy of different levels in Spain, and found an inconsistent relationship. By contrast, Kamiya (2016) found a largely consistent relationship between beliefs and practices of 4

American ESL teachers in the US. Ölmezer-Öztürk (2016) examined the CF beliefs and practices of 8 Turkish EFL teachers at a Turkish university, and found that beliefs and practices tend to match regarding the amount of oral CF but differed regarding the timing of oral CF. Karimi and Asadnia (2015) examined beliefs and practices of 5 Iranian EFL teachers about oral CF in teaching university students of elementary level and intermediate level. They found a difference in teachers' use of CF types, but no differences in teachers' focus on linguistic targets at both levels. Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2016) interviewed 37 and observed classes of 7 Iranian EFL teachers to compare teachers' views and researchers' orientation about CF, and found some differences between teachers' concerns and interpretations in experimental studies. The contradictory findings, the restricted contexts and the unclear reasons offered for the congruence or incongruence between these teachers' beliefs and practices make it impossible to chart clear progress towards any generalizable conclusion, and indicate the field is in need of more research to fill in the puzzle of oral CF. Moreover, an approach to research with reference to particular teaching and learning contexts might provide more insights into the reasons underlying the possible congruence or incongruence of the relationship.

With one exception, in Roothooft's (2014) study, what was common among these studies is that the student participants were all adults. The teacher participants were highly proficient in English: either native speakers of English or non-native speakers of English who had, or in the process of the course completion of, an MA in TESOL. One common concern by the teachers in these five recent studies was that they wanted to avoid the negative effects of oral CF on students' confidence and motivation, despite the fact that experimental research has indicated that explicit CF and prompts are more beneficial than implicit CF and recasts (S. Li, 2010; Lyster et al., 2013). These experimental studies or descriptive studies about oral CF practices have been conducted in a range of contexts. They include adult learners in different contexts or young learners in immersion or ESL contexts (e.g. Choi & Li, 2012; Sheen, 2004). Given that the amount of research in this area is relatively limited and has been conducted in a restricted range of contexts with conflicting findings, and that no clear reason underlying the mismatches between teachers' beliefs and practices has been offered, extending the research on teachers' views and practices about oral CF in underexplored contexts may help to produce a more complete picture. In particular,

primary EFL contexts remain underexplored. For this reason, the study reported in this dissertation has been undertaken in primary schools in Vietnam. Some background of the context will be provided below.

After the Sixth National Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam with the initiation of the economic reforms called "Doi Moi" in 1986, English was introduced into Vietnam tertiary education, then secondary education as an elective foreign language in gradual replacement of Russian and other languages. English was firstly introduced into some selected primary schools in big cities in 1996, but not until 2010 was it taught in primary education as a compulsory subject from the third grade (H. T. M. Nguyen, 2011). However, most existing EFL teacher training programs were trained as secondary and high school teachers. Therefore, primary school teachers recruited were either new teachers who had been trained as secondary/high school teachers or in-service secondary teachers. Recently, some universities have designed programmes for primary English teacher education, but the majority of other universities have been using one programme to train teachers for various levels. This happens as a tension between policy and practice.

In Vietnam, research on beliefs and practices of EFL teachers is scarce (Pham & Hamid, 2013), and, to my knowledge, research on teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF, in particular, has received no attention so far. Furthermore, a large number of in-service primary EFL teachers in Vietnam were considered to be not as proficient at English nor satisfactory at teaching capacity as expected by education authorities (C. D. Nguyen, 2017; H. T. M. Nguyen, 2011). In a recent study, Richards (2017) discusses the issue of teaching English through English, arguing that teachers' use of English in the classroom which requires specialized knowledge and skills is a critical indicator of non-native English teacher competence. Given that many Vietnamese primary EFL teachers were not trained for primary education, they are likely to lack this kind of competence. This indicates a need of research to explore whether oral CF in EFL teaching for young learners in Vietnam is perceived and practiced in a way that is expected and informed by research in other parts of the world.

1.2. Purpose and significance of the study

The purpose of this study is to explore what a sample group of Vietnamese teachers believe about oral corrective feedback, an important aspect of their language teaching, and what they actually do in the classroom. Specifically, the study looks at both teachers' beliefs and practices about different types of oral CF, the frequency of oral CF, the timing of giving oral CF, the linguistic targets of oral CF, the teachers' views about the role of oral CF, and factors influencing their oral CF provision. Ultimately, the study aims to look at the relationship between these teachers' beliefs and practices of oral CF.

This study attempts to provide several contributions. Firstly, it will enrich the body of existing knowledge of oral CF with reference to an emerging but unexplored context in the literature, EFL teaching for primary school students in both the characteristics of actual teachers' behaviours and their views about oral CF. It will add to the literature on teachers' beliefs about oral CF, as called for by Basturkmen (2012). Basturkmen, Loewen, and Ellis (2004) state that "inquiry into teachers' beliefs of unplanned elements of teaching needs to be based on both stated beliefs and observed behaviours" (p. 269) and it has been designed to meet those criteria, employing two sources of data. Secondly, it will contribute to the relatively sparse literature of research on the correspondence between teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF, with an attempt to look at possible contextual parameters underlying the relationship. Thirdly, this study will inform teacher development programmes for a large number of in-service teachers in Vietnam in relation to teachers' views and practices of oral CF. This is crucial because, as was mentioned above, many in-service Vietnamese primary school teachers were originally secondary-trained teachers and have not had explicit input on how to manage CF in primary school contexts. Although the study is exploratory in that it investigates only a relatively small group of teachers in one context, it may also have broader implications and applications.

1.3. Organisation of the study

The structure of the thesis consists of 6 chapters. Chapter 2 following this section will review the literature about teachers' beliefs and practices in relation to oral CF. Chapter 3 will discuss the methodology employed for the data collection and analyses. Next comes chapter 4 which will present the results of the study. Chapter 5 will discuss the

results with reference to the recent literature on oral CF. Chapter 6 will conclude the study's findings and discuss the limitations, the potential implications, and further research direction about oral CF.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will begin with the background of research on oral corrective feedback. It will then discuss the literature with reference to CF types, CF effectiveness and CF studies in different contexts. Part two of the chapter will discuss the literature on teachers' beliefs and its relationship with teachers' practices about oral CF. This chapter will end with research questions.

2.1. Oral corrective feedback in L2 classrooms

2.1.1. Research background on oral CF

In this current study, the term corrective feedback (CF) refers to teacher and peer responses to learners' erroneous second/ foreign language (L2) production (S. Li, 2013). Oral corrective feedback (oral CF) refers to CF in response to learner spoken errors.

Oral CF research originates from a number of theoretical perspectives, among which the long-standing interactionist tradition of SLA has been the most significant influence (e.g. Gass, 2013; Long & Robinson, 1998; Pica, 1994). Cognitive-interactionist theorists suggest that both positive evidence (what is acceptable) and negative evidence (what is not acceptable, mainly through corrective feedback) in the form of CF can trigger noticing of non-target output (see Gass, 2013; Long, 1996). Skill acquisition theory suggests that CF has a key role in the context of practice that leads learners to become more automatic users of L2 (e.g. Ranta & Lyster, 2007). Socio-cultural theorists also support the role of interaction and claim that CF assists learners as they go from other-regulation to self-regulation (e.g. Nassaji & Swain, 2000; Sato & Ballinger, 2012). The socio-cultural perspective views learning as a social process, interaction as an integral and inherent part of learning, and learning occurs "*in* rather than *as a result of* interaction" (Ellis, 2009, p.12). However, the interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996) views the role of interaction as facilitative in helping learners control their comprehensible input, output, noticing, intake and negative evidence. While a range of theoretical perspectives "converge to support the use of CF in L2 classrooms, different (yet not incompatible) theoretical accounts have been invoked to explain the potential effects of some CF types more than others" (Lyster et al., 2013, p. 11).

Pedagogically, research on oral CF originates from the shift towards communicative language teaching with a focus on form (Long, 1991; Long & Robinson, 1998). Oral CF has attracted attention from researchers, language educators and classroom teachers, and they have been concerned but frequently disagreed about whether, when and how to incorporate CF in classroom instruction (Ellis, 2009; Hendrickson, 1978; Hyland & Hyland, 2006). The issues that will be reviewed below are oral CF types, CF effectiveness, CF and learner's age, and teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF.

2.1.2. CF types

Some observational studies have attempted to categorize oral CF moves into different types, of which the most widely accepted categorization was coined by Lyster and Ranta (1997). Lyster and Ranta classified oral CF moves into six main types: recasts, explicit correction, elicitation, clarification requests, repetition and metalinguistic feedback. Table 2.1.2 summarizes these six types, with examples taken from Sheen (2004). A more detailed description of the taxonomy is presented in Appendix 11. Subsequently, they made a two part distinction and classified these six types into two broader terms, namely reformulations and prompts (Ranta & Lyster, 2007). On the one hand, reformulations include recasts and explicit correction which provide the correct form and may not encourage a response from the learner (uptake). On the other hand, the other four (clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition), collectively called prompts, are more likely to create a learner uptake.

Drawing on this classification and the burgeoning literature since Lyster and Ranta's (1997) seminal work, Ellis (2010) classifies CF types into two broader categories: explicit vs. implicit and input-providing vs. output-pushing. In the literature, the distinction between explicit and implicit feedback is understood in relative terms because it is difficult to classify one particular feedback type into explicit or implicit type except by comparison with another (see Lyster & Saito, 2010; Sarandi, 2016). Although CF has been extensively researched in the past few decades, the distinction between implicit and explicit CF remains in debate due to its complexity. In a recent review, Sarandi (2016) suggests that the indistinct boundaries between implicit and explicit feedback and their position on the implicit and explicit continuum are attributable to a number of variables, including linguistic features, contextual factors and learners' prior knowledge. Generally, implicit feedback refers to the correction

which is made in an unobtrusive way and the existence of error is not overtly made to learners. On the other hand, explicit feedback refers to the CF type whose corrective force is made salient to learners and learners are likely to notice the nature of their non-target language production. The input-providing and output-pushing are differentiated according to the roles that learners and teachers take while correcting errors. For input-providing feedback, the correct exemplars are ready made and provided to learners so that learners can compare them with their own non-target utterances. For output-pushing feedback, learners are encouraged to produce the correct form of their deviant production.

Table 2.1.2. CF types

CF types	Definition	Examples (Sheen, 2004)
1. Explicit correction	Alerts the learner to the error and provides the correct form.	S: And three pear (sound like beer) S2: three beer T: not beer. Pear.
2. Recast	Reformulates a student's utterance either fully or partially by replacing the error with the correct form.	T: Ok. It's good. You wanna tell us one? S: Eh…: Kaii convention T: What kind of convention? (recast) S: Kaii convention …eh… some people …
3. Clarification request	Indicates that a student's utterance was not understood and that a reformulation is needed.	S: I want practice today, today T: I'm sorry?
4. Meta-linguistic feedback	Provides technical linguistic information about a student's error without overtly providing the correct answer.	S: There are influence person who / T: Influential is an adjective (metalinguistic feedback) S: Influential person / (unintelligible) / because of his power
5. Elicitation	Directly elicits a self-correction from the student, often in the form of a wh-question.	T: In a fast food restaurant, how much do you tip? S: No money. T: What's the word? (Elicitation) S: Five...four...
6. Repetition	Repeats the student's error with emphatic stress or intonation to highlight the error.	S: Oh my God, it is too expensive, I pay only 10 dollars T: I pay? (Repetition)

2.1.3. Implicit vs. explicit CF

The boundary between implicit and explicit corrective feedback is indistinct because researchers have failed to specify the location of some CF strategies along the implicit or explicit continuum (Lyster & Saito, 2010; Sarandi, 2016). Sarandi (2016) suggested that the cause of this contradiction might be the lack of consensus about what constitutes implicitness or explicitness. For example, S. Li (2010) labelled elicitation as an implicit strategy while Ellis (2006) considered elicitation as an explicit one. Sheen (2006) differentiates explicitness from salience and argues that explicitness is associated with linguistic realization of CF whereas salience is associated with learners' perception, which is a psychological phenomenon. Ortega (2014, p. 75) defines explicitness in terms of 'perceptual salience' and 'linguistic marking' during the correction such as special intonation and added metalanguage respectively. Sarandi (2016) examines the explicitness of CF from a learners' perspective by looking at both linguistic and non-linguistic factors such as contextual and individual variables. Sarandi suggests that an identical CF strategy could be labelled implicit or explicit depending on its linguistic and non-linguistic features. For example, short recasts are more noticeable than long recasts (Sheen, 2006), recasts with a single substitution are more salient than recasts with several changes (Egi, 2007). Oliver and Mackey (2003) show that recasts are more salient and noticeable in contexts where the learners' focus was mainly on form than when they were involved in meaningful communication.

Sheen and Ellis (2011) categorise recasts as two subtypes based on their explicitness: conversational recasts and didactic recasts. A conversational recast refers to a reformulation of a student's utterance to resolve a communication breakdown, and it often takes the form of a confirmation check. A didactic recast refers to a reformulation of a student's utterance without any communication breakdown. Didactic recasts are explicit while conversational recasts are implicit. Drawing on this taxonomy of CF types, and the grouping of CF types into two broad terms 'reformations and prompts' by Ranta and Lyster (2007), CF types in the continuum of explicitness vs. implicitness can be summarised as in Table 2.1.3 below:

Table 2.1.3. Explicitness vs. Implicitness of CF types

	Implicit	Explicit
Reformulations	Conversational recasts	Didactic recasts
		Explicit correction
Prompts	Repetition	Metalinguistic feedback
	Clarification request	Elicitation

2.1.4. Effectiveness of oral CF

Although some researchers hold that oral corrective feedback is not useful (e.g. Krashen, 1982, p. 74), there is a general consensus among others that oral corrective feedback has positive effects on second language acquisition because oral CF may consolidate oral skills through contextualized practice which is facilitated by noticing target exemplars in the input (Lyster et al., 2013, p. 5). After Lyster and Ranta's (1997) influential work on the different types of corrective feedback observed in French immersion classrooms in Canada, a growing number of studies have attempted to measure the effectiveness of different types of CF on second language acquisition. The positive role of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar has been supported by several recent meta-analyses (S. Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Mackey & Goo, 2007; J. Russell & Spada, 2006). The issues emerging are: what errors to correct, who should correct errors, when to correct errors, how to correct errors.

A number of classroom studies have examined the effectiveness of different CF strategies (e.g. Saito & Lyster, 2012; Yilmaz, 2013, 2016). Recasts have been found to be the most frequently used CF type (Panova & Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004), but might not be the most effective (Lyster, 2004; Lyster et al., 2013). In contrast, some researchers found that recasts were in fact an effective CF type, especially when recasts are more explicitly used (e.g. Doughty, 2001) while many other researchers (e.g. Lyster, 1998; Sheen, 2004) found that recasts did not always facilitate learners' uptake and learning. The function of recasts was not obvious so that students might not be able to differentiate recasts from non-corrective repetition which teachers frequently used in their teaching (Lyster, 1998; Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada, 2001).

Repair following CF is one of the indicators of CF effectiveness. Some intervention studies suggest that students have more opportunities to enhance their interlanguage if they are prompted to self-correct errors from their own language repertoire than when they just receive recasts (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Ellis, 2007; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Lyster, 2004). Both Sheen (2004) and Lyster (1998) observed that follow-up repair did not occur after recasts as frequently as other CF types. Sheen (2004) argues that follow-up repair is important because it is the evidence of notice which is likely to lead to learning and acquisition. Ellis and Sheen (2006) note that the significance of repair following recasts is still in debate and the acquisitional effectiveness of recasts has been overestimated although recasts remain the most common type of feedback. In conclusion, CF is believed by the majority of researchers to be generally effective, and explicit feedback appears to be more effective than implicit feedback. However, one particular ideal feedback type for all types of students, errors and educational settings does not exist (Ammar & Spada, 2006).

2.1.5. Studies about CF and learners' age

Oral corrective feedback has been shown to play an important role in learners' L2 development. Age is generally agreed to play an important role in second language learning outcomes (e.g. Mackey & Oliver, 2002; Oliver & Azkarai, 2017), but the research on primary EFL/ESL classrooms is scarce.

Previous research shows the differences in learning and acquisition between adult and child learners. Many studies show that child learners actually tend to demonstrate slower and fewer gains than adolescent and adult learners from the same amount of L2 instruction (Marinova-Todd, Marshall, & Snow, 2000). Child learners lag behind adolescent and adult learners with respect to cognitive maturity, literacy knowledge and experience at school (Mayo & Lecumberri, 2003; Muñoz, 2006). Therefore, researchers have emphasized the need for elaborated intervention, including scaffolding, for young learners who had difficulty detecting and analysing linguistic features on their own (Lightbown, 2008). Mackey and Oliver (2002) conducted an intervention study with pre-tests and post-tests in which child ESL learners received information gap tasks in teacher-student dyads and concluded that corrective feedback led to development more quickly for child learners than for adult learners. When using the target feature incorrectly, those in the experimental group received recasts from adult native speakers,

while the control group received no corrective feedback. They found that recasts positively influenced child learners' development of English question forms even at the immediate post-test session.

Lyster and Saito (2010), in a meta-analysis study, examined how learners' age as an independent variable mediates corrective feedback effectiveness. Their analysis also showed that younger learners gained more from CF than older learners. They suggested that older learners benefited from both prompts and recasts while younger learners benefited more from prompts than recasts. Younger learners were shown to be sensitive to the effects of CF, especially when CF is pedagogically enhanced in different forms because they might have difficulties detecting and selecting linguistic features in classroom input without guided support from teachers or stronger peers (Lyster et al., 2013; Muñoz, 2008). Lyster et al. (2013) called for more research on how teachers could tailor their use of CF to match their learners' age.

As regards corrective feedback in primary school, there have been a few studies conducted in different contexts describing teachers' CF and learner uptake and repair. Lee (2007) examined the corrective feedback and learner uptake in primary English immersion classrooms in Korea. She found that recasts which were not effective at eliciting repairs were predominant forms of feedback, while elicitation which yielded the highest rates of uptake and repair was not frequently used. The negotiation of form led to student-generated repair following metalinguistic feedback. In an ESOL context (English for speakers of other languages), Choi and Li (2012) examined corrective feedback and learner uptake in primary school classrooms in New Zealand, and they found different findings from previous studies. Choi and Li found that recasts were the most frequently used CF type, followed by explicit correction. Both these CF types produced relatively high rates of uptake, which was different from the literature. This difference was attributed to the fact that a high percentage of recasts were corrective (as opposed to supportive) and many explicit correction cases were provided in the form of multiple moves including both input-providing and output-prompting moves. Choi and Li (2012) interpret their findings in connection with findings in other contexts, suggesting that learner uptake and repair rate positively corresponds with the degree of form focus. Accordingly, learner uptake and repair rate in Choi and Li's ESOL context is higher than that in Lyster and Ranta's (1997) child immersion context, but lower than other ESL or EFL context such as Korean adult ESL learners in Sheen's (2004) study.

In an EFL context, Kırkgöz, Babanoğlu, and Ağçam (2015) investigated CF types used in Turkish primary classrooms where English was taught as a foreign language and it was part of the national compulsory curriculum. The study revealed some findings that were contradictory to those in previous studies. The study found that all types of CF were employed by teachers, but explicit correction was the most frequently used with 47.52%. Meanwhile, recasts, the most frequently used in most previous studies, were only employed at 11% in this study. However, Kırkgöz et al. (2015) did not offer any interpretation or discussion for their findings.

These research studies collectively suggest that oral CF plays an important role in L2 learners' development for both adult and young learners. However, research has predominantly been conducted with adult L2 learning context, while primary school children learning an L2 – a growing context globally (Butler, 2015) – have received little attention. Within a small number of research studies on young learners of different contexts, the findings were conflicting, and the patterns of feedback were different. Especially, to my knowledge, there has been only one research study conducted with primary EFL students (i.e. Kırkgöz et al., 2015), but this study was just a plain descriptive study which has not offered an explanation for its interpretation of the findings. Also, most studies of teacher CF to young learners in ESL or immersion contexts have looked at CF provision in the classroom.

My study will look at oral CF by primary EFL teachers in Vietnam, an unexplored context in the literature but similar contexts of English teaching practice can be found in most parts of the world. This will provide more insights into the literature of oral CF by looking at different aspects of CF in practice such as CF types, CF frequency, CF timing and linguistic targets of CF in the classroom in comparison with teachers' stated beliefs.

2.2. Teachers' beliefs and practices

2.2.1. Definitions of teachers' beliefs

Teachers' beliefs are defined in various ways, of which a common definition is provided by M. Borg (2001). He holds that teachers' belief is a proposition which teachers hold either consciously or unconsciously and accept it as true, and which serves as a guide to thought and behaviour (M. Borg, 2001). Teachers' beliefs have been extensively researched in English language teaching for the past few decades, and much of this

research has been conducted based on case studies (Basturkmen, 2012). In this current research, the term "teachers' beliefs" is employed as a generic term to refer to the statements that teachers make about their ideas, thoughts and knowledge that are expressed as evaluations of what should be done, what should be the case and what is preferable.

2.2.2. The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices

Teachers' beliefs can provide a basis for action (S. Borg, 2011; Fang, 1996) and affect and guide teachers' decision making (Arnett & Turnbull, 2008). S. Borg (2003, p. 38) notes that "teachers are active, thinking decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex, practically oriented, personalized, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs". With this role of teachers' beliefs, various studies have been conducted with a wish to explain the practice (Grotjahn, 1991), to understand teachers' affective and evaluative reactions (Kennedy, 1996), to explore the similarities and differences between teachers' and learners' beliefs about teaching and learning (Hu & Tian, 2012) and other motivations. Although there is a large body of research literature on teachers' beliefs, there have been only a limited number of studies on non-native speaker EFL in-service teachers' beliefs (L. Li & Walsh, 2011). Furthermore, previous studies have not led to a consensus about the relationship between teachers' stated beliefs and their classroom practices (Kamiya, 2016), especially for incidental aspects of teaching and learning such as error correction (Basturkmen, 2012). Some research studies have found the congruence between teachers' beliefs and their practices (e.g. Kamiya, 2016; Ng & Farrell, 2003) whereas others have reported the opposite findings (e.g. Farrell & Kun, 2008; Phipps & Borg, 2009; Roothooft, 2014). The congruence has been related with experienced teachers and planned aspect of teaching such as grammar teaching approach or task planning, whilst the incongruence has been associated with incidental aspects of teaching such as teacher-student responses or error correction (Basturkmen, 2012). S. Borg (2015) offers a framework for language teacher cognition research, suggesting that the relationship between teacher cognition and classroom practice is mediated by contextual factors. S. Borg (2015) claims that classroom practice is "defined by the interaction of cognitions and contextual factors. In turn, classroom experience influences cognitions unconsciously and/ or through conscious reflection" (p. 333). This framework suggests

that referring to contextual factors in the interpretation of teachers' beliefs is critical. L. Li and Walsh (2011) claim that teachers' beliefs should be seen from both teachers' stated beliefs and their classroom interaction, and Basturkmen (2012) calls for further research into teachers' beliefs about unplanned aspects of teaching such as oral CF.

2.2.3. The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF

Many studies about oral corrective feedback in the past few decades have attempted to describe different types of CF and measure their effectiveness on second language acquisition (see Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013 for a review). Recently, some researchers have turned to look at teachers' beliefs about oral CF in classroom settings (e.g. Basturkmen et al., 2004; Kamiya, 2016; Ölmezer-Öztürk, 2016; Roothooft, 2014; Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2016). The findings of these studies have been generally contradictory.

Some studies reported the congruence between teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF (Jensen, 2001; Kamiya, 2016). Kamiya (2016) looked at beliefs and practices of 4 American ESL teachers and found that his teachers' stated beliefs are in largely agreement with their practices about oral CF. All these four teachers did not use explicit correction because they suspected that this type of feedback might humiliate their learners and potentially created an uncomfortable classroom. These teachers expressed their preference for using recasts to provide correct forms for students and they used recasts as their predominant CF strategy. Some mismatches about particular aspects of oral CF have been found and are attributable to the "varying degree of proceduralization of technical knowledge" that teachers have (Kamiya, 2016, p. 127) which may rely on teachers' teaching experience (Basturkmen et al., 2004).

Other studies have reported mismatches between teachers' beliefs and practices. One influential study was published by Basturkmen et al. (2004) who combined interviews, observations, cue response scenarios and stimulated recalls to explore the beliefs and practices about oral CF of three ESL teachers in New Zealand, and found that teachers' beliefs did not match with their practices to a large extent. The discrepancies tend to occur more frequently for the teacher with one year experience, the other two experienced teachers' beliefs and practices are more congruent. Basturkmen et al. (2004) suggest that the incongruence might be attributable to the individual differences of

teachers, and the different notions of communicative language teaching. They also speculated that such discrepancies may disappear when the teachers become more experienced. However, this speculation is not supported by some recent studies; for example, Roothooft (2014) found discrepancies between beliefs and practices of teachers about oral CF occurred with both experienced and less experienced teachers. More interestingly, Kamiya (2016) observed that the mismatch was found in one of the more experienced teachers while there was a harmony between the other three teachers' beliefs and practices. Mackey, Polio, and McDonough (2004) and Polio, Gass, and Chapin (2006) reported contradictory findings about the influence of teaching experience on teachers' provision of oral CF. Mackey et al. (2004) noted the important role of teachers' experience on the use of incidental focus-on-form techniques, including oral CF, when observing that experienced teachers used more pre-emptive focus-on-form, recasts and explicit negative feedback compared to the inexperienced teachers. Pre-emptive focus on form here refers to "occasions when either the teacher or a student chose to make a specific form the topic of the discourse" (Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001, p. 407). Polio et al. (2006) compared the influence of experience of native-speaker teachers' behaviour of CF towards non-native speakers and found that although experienced teachers used marginally more recasts (35 versus 29%) but less negotiation (9% versus 11%), the difference was not significant.

Regarding the amount of oral CF, contradictory findings about the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices have also been reported in some recent studies. In Roothooft's (2014) study, the Spanish teachers of English were not aware of how much feedback they tended to give, nor what type of feedback they used in the classroom. Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2016) also observed the mismatches between their Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the amount of CF. By contrast, Ölmezer-Öztürk (2016) found that 7 out of 8 Turkish EFL teachers in her study showed consistency between their beliefs and practices about how much oral CF should be provided.

Inconsistency between teachers' beliefs and practices about CF timing is also noted. Ölmezer-Öztürk (2016) found inconsistences between Turkish adult EFL teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF regarding the timing. Four out of eight teachers claimed that they opted for the delayed feedback but they tended to provide feedback immediately after their students made an error. However, Ölmezer-Öztürk (2016) did

not offer any reasons underlying this inconsistency. A similar mismatch was found in Karimi and Asadnia's (2015, p. 58) study where teachers stated that they preferred the delayed CF forms but they were observed to "employ a variety of direct and indirect CF strategies for putting the learners on the right track exactly at the time of erroneous production on the part of the learners". Karimi and Asadnia (2015, p. 61) argued that these teachers did not follow a systematic approach to CF but they "pursue their own intuitive personal views" about CF.

Types of oral CF, an aspect receiving extensive descriptions in observational and experimental studies, have also been a focus of investigations into the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices. Ölmezer-Öztürk (2016) reported the inconsistences between teacher's beliefs and practices about oral CF types. Specifically, 3 out of 8 Turkish EFL teachers in her study showed consistency, 3 others showed inconsistency and the remaining 2 teachers showed partial consistency. Roothooft (2014) also reported inconsistency between teachers' beliefs and practices in that her teachers stated that elicitation was useful for learners, but they opted for the use of recasts in the majority of oral CF occurences. Similarly, Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2016) observed 37 Iranian EFL teachers and interviewed 7 of them to investigate teachers' concerns and researchers' orientation. The study found that although teachers understood the potential cognitive advantage of elicitation, most of whom used explicit correction and recasts to correct their students' errors. This finding is in line with Ölmezer-Öztürk's (2016) study where all teachers tend to employ input-providing type of oral CF predominantly in their classroom practice. Interestingly, teachers in Karimi and Asadnia's (2015) study stated that they would use both explicit and implicit feedback according to error type, situation and task, they yet used more explict feedback and prompts than recasts. This finding contradicts many descriptive studies about oral CF in the literature (for a review, see Lyster et al., 2013).

The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in classrooms of different proficiency levels has remained a complex phenomenon in the literature. Karimi and Asadnia (2015) looked at Iranian adult EFL classrooms of elementary and intermediate levels in private language centres. The study showed that at elementary level classes, teachers made more use of CF strategies with a combination of different types. At both levels, teachers expressed their preferences for using output-pushing CF, yet they

employed more input-providing CF (explicit correction) in their practice. Karimi and Asadnia (2015, p. 59) ascribed this to the fact that elementary students made more errors than intermediate students as well as to teachers' purpose of preventing the "fossilization of erroneous linguistic productions". By contrast, Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2016) reported that most of their teachers were concerned about the emotional state of low level students and tried to employ CF more tactfully while advanced learners have built up their self-confidence in their speaking skills so that they are less likely to be distracted by the negative reactions to negative feedback. Some studies also showed that more proficient learners benefited more from recasts and prompts than lower proficiency learners (Ammar & Spada, 2006; S. Li, 2014; Philp, 2003), and feedback is effective when learners have some knowledge about the target language item, especially when the feedback focuses on form (Lyster & Ranta, 2013).

A shared explanation for the mismatch between teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF is teachers' concern about the potentially negative effect of oral CF on learners' feelings. Although teachers may be aware of the effectiveness of different CF types such as prompts, they may opt for the use of indirect and less intrusive types of CF such as recasts to avoid interupting learners' communication or hurting their feelings (Karimi & Asadnia, 2015; Polio et al., 2006; Roothooft, 2014; Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2016). Mori (2011) argues that there was a conflict between teachers' concern to promote linguistic competence in their students and the desire to increase their student's confidence. This concern leads to teachers' choice for no CF or implicit CF such as recasts (Kamiya, 2016). Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2016, p. 12) reported that the main reason that teachers accounted for their use of recasts was that recasts "addressed learners' errors most indirectly; due to their unobtrusive nature, they did not stop learners' talking, undermine their self-confidence or otherwise threaten their motivation to communicate". This could be one of the major reasons why recasts have remained the most frequently used CF type by many teachers. Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2016) suggest that teachers need to rethink their assumptions of negative affective impact of challenging forms of CF such as prompts to incorporate them into their classroom practices, and there is a need for dialogue between teachers and researchers.

In conclusion, research on oral CF in general has been extensively conducted, but most studies have focused on the effectiveness, the frequency, the distribution of oral CF

across different contexts. Research on teachers' beliefs about oral CF has received relatively little attention, especially those investigating teachers' beliefs and comparing them with teachers' actual classroom behaviours. This small number of research on teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF has been conducted in a restricted range of contexts and yielded contradictory findings, which requires further research to complete the picture. More importantly, these studies have not offered possible reasons underlying the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices. Also, teaching EFL to young learners has emergered as a new branch of language education in East Asia, including Vietnam where teachers may not have been well trained, but research on this aspect has not been adequately conducted. Therefore, research on how teachers in an unexplored context, such as Vietnamese primary EFL education, believe and behave in relation to oral CF, a critical aspect in language instruction, is needed. The study in this context can help to provide one missing piece to complete the puzzle of oral CF research. Three research questions designed to achieve this aim are as follow:

RQ1: What are teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback in English classes at primary schools in Vietnam?

RQ2: What are teachers' actual practices of oral corrective feedback in English classes at primary schools in Vietnam?

RQ3: What is the congruence (if any) or incongruence (if any) between teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in English classes at primary schools in Vietnam? If there is any incongruence, what (if any) contextual parameters might account for them?

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology deployed to achieve the goal of this study. It will start with the justification of the methodological approach for the study, namely qualitative research methods with teacher interviews and classroom observations as two data collection tools. It will next describe the setting and the participants of the study. Data collection methods and procedures are then discussed. The chapter ends with an outline of data analysis methods.

3.1. Methodological approach

This study was based on classroom research which is likely to help researchers "identify and better understand the roles of different participants in classroom interaction, the impact that certain types of instruction may have on foreign language/ second language learning, and the factors which promote or inhibit learning" (Lightbown, 2000, p. 438). As mentioned earlier in this study, the aim of the study is to delve in-depth into teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF, a critical phenomenon of classroom language teaching. This study is also to explore the underlying reasons behind the congruence (if any) or incongruence (if any) between these teachers' beliefs and practices. Therefore, a qualitative research approach was selected to realise these aims because "the basic aim of qualitative research is to get to the bottom of what is going on in all aspects of social behaviour" (Holliday, 2010, p. 99). Qualitative research helps to understand what is actually happening in a setting (Creswell, 2014; Croker, 2009). In applied linguistics, the qualitative approach has been applied to various questions ranging from the linguistic aspects of communication to non-linguistic environment of language behaviour (Creswell, 2014). The qualitative approach can include some counting and comparing the frequency of events if the counting is not intended to produce the generalisation but is supplementary and "builds on other findings and adds to them, enabling researchers to develop new insights into their phenomena of interest" (Hannah & Lautsch, 2011, p. 16).

The two data collection methods employed in this study were chosen for different reasons. On the one hand, semi-structured interviews were employed to examine teachers' stated beliefs. On the other hand, classroom observations were employed to examine teachers' actual behaviours of oral corrective feedback. Basturkmen et al. (2004) claim that "investigations of teachers' beliefs, especially of unplanned elements

of teaching such as focus on form, need to be based on both stated beliefs and observed behaviours" (p. 243). Similarly, L. Li and Walsh (2011) argue that "by analysing teachers' stated beliefs and their interactions while teaching, it is possible to gain a fuller understanding of the complex inter-relationship between what teachers say they do and believe and how they interact with students" (p. 39). The choice of data collection methods will be further discussed and justified in Section 3.5 below.

3.2. Context

The study was set in a small city located in a small province of Vietnam. In most parts of Vietnam, English has been a compulsory subject from grade 3 of primary education since 2010. The specific policies are slightly different from place to place. In this province, English has been a compulsory subject for students from grade 3 to grade 12. Primary school students' expected outcome is equivalent to level A1 (CEFR – Common European Framework of Reference) which is divided into A1.1, A1.2 and A1.3 for grade 3, grade 4 and grade 5 respectively. Therefore, the English level of grade 5 students could be seen as elementary. All students share the same first language, Vietnamese. Classroom is the main place that students can interact in English.

As a policy, English teaching is directed to develop students' four skills (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing). However, most actual exams are in the written form aiming to assess students' ability in vocabulary, grammar and reading comprehension, focusing on language accuracy.

The number of students per class is large. Each class comprises of between 30 and 45 students, although as a policy, maximum number of students per class is 35. Some schools have one particular classroom designed for teaching English, with basic and modern facilities such as a chalkboard, a computer connected with the internet, a projector and a loudspeaker, but some others do not have one. One thing that might influence the movement, group-work organisation is the arrangement of student desks. Students sit in line facing to the teacher chalkboard, and it is difficult and time-consuming to move the desks or mingle around the classroom.

Apart from the school curriculum, many students choose to take private classes of English either at their teachers' own home or at a registered private language centre. These options are chosen by students and their families because they perceive that learning English at school is not enough, and the parents would like to improve their

children's English, especially their oral skills. This is one of the factors creating the proficiency gap among students of the same class.

3.3. Participants

The participants selected for this study consisted of 6 primary EFL teachers teaching English for grade 5 students in a small city in Vietnam. Participants self-selected by responding to a recruitment advertisement (see Appendix 4). The first 6 teachers of the fifth grade (from 6 out of 16 different primary schools located in the city) responding to the advertisement were selected. There were two reasons for including only 6 teachers in the study. Firstly, qualitative studies require researchers to obtain the richest data from each participant. Secondly, since the scope of this study is small, it was required to be completed within 9 months. Therefore, 6 teacher participants was the largest number that I could include to satisfy both the design and the feasibility of the study.

The six participants worked for public primary schools in a provincial city of Vietnam. These teachers' expected English proficiency was equivalent to level B2 (CEFR) or higher. As revealed in the interviews, these teachers did not choose to take Cambridge Tests or other internationally recognised English proficiency tests because they were not confident enough, and they considered that nationally recognised tests were easier for them. They all attended an English proficiency course organised by the provincial department of education and training before taking the tests, and they all passed.

All six teachers were female, aging from 35 to 40. A summary of teacher participants' biographies is presented in table 3.3. A more detailed description revealed in the interviews is presented in Appendix 7. In connection with teachers' education and training backgrounds, 5 of them were originally trained as junior secondary teachers. These five teachers were trained at a provincial teacher training college which aimed to train teachers for that particular province. The remaining teacher was trained as a high school teacher at a different university. All six teachers have received a number of professional development programmes during their course of service. The professional development programmes have varied in terms of form, objectives and duration. Especially since the advent of Vietnam National Project for Foreign Languages 2020 (known as Project 2020) from 2008, teachers have benefited significantly from different offline (face-to-face) and online (Internet-based) training courses.

Table 3.3. Summary of teachers' biographical details

Name (Pseudonyms)	Age (year)	Teaching experience at primary schools (year)	Teaching experience at junior secondary schools (year)	Total teaching experience (year)
Ngan	40	5	13	18
Thuy	35	6	8	14
Linh	36	13	2	15
Anh	40	17	0	17
Han	38	7	10	17
Tu	37	11	5	16
Average	37.6	9.8	6.3	16.1

As shown in table 3.3, 5 out of 6 teachers used to teach at secondary schools before teaching at primary schools, and these 5 teachers were trained for junior secondary schools. Anh was the only teacher that did not have secondary school teaching experience, but she was originally trained to be a high school teacher.

In short, all these 6 teachers were not originally trained as primary school teachers, but they were all experienced teachers. They were not confident enough to take an internationally recognised proficiency test. They started teaching primary school students with their own intuition and self-adaptation from their previous training and teaching experience. Then they were attending professional development programmes over the course of service.

3.4. Ethics procedures

Before data were collected, ethics procedures were approved by Macquarie University Human Ethics Committee. The approval was granted on 22 March 2017, with reference number being 5201700189 (See Appendix 1). The data collection procedures followed the ethics procedures strictly.

3.5. Data collection methods and procedures

3.5.1. Interviews

In qualitative research, interviewing is considered to be the most common method of data collection (Flick, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2014). Interviewing "attempts to understand the world from the subjects' points of view, to unfold the meaning of their experiences, to uncover their lived world prior to scientific explanations" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 1). Interviewing could be seen as the most suitable method to assess personal perspectives on language learning and teaching in situated contexts (Barkhuizen, Benson, & Chik, 2013). Interviewing is an effective technique to explore teachers' thinking, beliefs, and perceptions of what goes on in the language-learning classroom (McKay, 2006). In this study, in-depth interviews can help the researcher to draw out teachers' thoughts, feelings, experiences, knowledge as well as the factors influencing their thoughts about oral corrective feedback.

This study employed semi-structured interviews, a method used frequently in qualitative research in applied linguistics (Dörnyei, 2007). Semi-structured interviewing is more useful than unstructured and structured interviewing because on the one hand, it provides the interviewer a list of prepared questions, and it allows flexibility for the interviewer to follow up the interviewee's answers (Dörnyei, 2007; Heigham & Croker, 2009). This can help the interviewer gain the richest data from the interviewee by using this data-driven interviewing method with carefully designed questions beforehand at the same time. Semi-structured interviewing has been used in teachers' beliefs research about oral CF in several recent studies (e.g. Kamiya, 2016; Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2016). Semi-structured interviewing was, therefore, chosen for this study because it could help teacher participants feel that they took part in a natural conversation but with a purpose, and this allows the researcher to reach both the depth and the breath of teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback.

In this study, every semi-structured teacher interview was conducted within one week after the 4th observation session of that teacher. All teachers were interviewed individually in Vietnamese about their ideas, opinions, understanding and experiences about oral CF. The interviews were conducted in the teachers' meeting room at their school. These places were chosen because it was secure and quiet, which allowed teachers to express their thoughts more freely, and made it easy to obtain good quality

audio recordings. There were six interviews conducted with 6 teachers respectively. The interviews were conducted in Vietnamese because it was the first language of all interviewees and the interviewer, which may help the interviewees express their thoughts the best. All these interviews were audio recorded, but only extracts used for this thesis report were translated into English by the researcher.

A list of 23 questions had been carefully designed to elicit teachers' responses about their thoughts, ideas, understanding and experiences about oral corrective feedback (see Appendix 5). These questions were also to obtain information about teachers' background of learning English, teacher training qualifications and teacher development processes. Three questions were adapted from the questionnaire in Roothooft's (2014) study and four from Ölmezer-Öztürk's (2016) study, but the wording was edited because the questions for my current study was for verbal interviewing. Other questions were my own. These questions were piloted with one teacher who was not one of the six participants, and did not cause any difficulties in understanding for this teacher. However, the questions were reordered in connection with their meanings so that questions eliciting similar information could go together. Moreover, the teachers were given the opportunity to ask if they were not fully sure about what any of the questions meant.

The interview started with a scenario of error correction (see Appendix 5) designed for two purposes. First, it could help teachers familiarise with or recall their cognition about oral CF. Second, it could draw teachers' choices of CF types more easily because some teachers may use all CF types in their teaching but were not aware of technical terms such as recasts or clarification requests. Teachers' background information was elicited at the end of the interview. The interview length for each teacher participant ranged from 31 minutes and 25 seconds to 37 minutes and 20 seconds.

3.5.2. Classroom observations

The second aim of this study is to understand the practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers about oral CF. To realize this aim, teachers' classroom teaching was observed. Classroom observation is defined as "non-judgemental description of classroom events that can be analysed and given interpretation" (Gebhard, 1999, p. 35). Classroom observation can be seen as the most appropriate method for examining teachers' behaviours of providing oral CF in their classroom. Observation as a source of data is

valuable in that what the researchers witness and perceive is not affected by what the participants have said to them (Yin, 2011). Observation is considered as a "process of gathering open-ended, firsthand information by observing people and places at a research site" (Creswell, 2012, p. 213).

In this study, the researcher observed six classrooms by six teachers. Each class was observed for 4 sessions, with each session lasting 35 minutes. All the observed sessions were conducted with grade 5, the highest level of primary education in Vietnam. I chose this level to observe to maximise the probability that oral CF would be provided, as there were more teacher-learner interactions in the target language for this level than the other four lower levels. All observations were audio recorded, but only episodes of teacher error correction were transcribed. The total of audio-recording is 14 hours. The researcher adopted the role of a non-participant observer which means that "researchers are present, but do not participate in the classroom process" (Harbon & Shen, 2010, p. 277). To limit the influence of the presence of the observer on teachers' and students' behaviours, the observer sat at the back of the class. Also, the observer arranged with the teachers to explain to the students at the beginning of the class that the observer did not evaluate the class or do anything other than watching the class because he was interested in natural teacher-student interaction.

As regards recording method, three recorders were used. One sat on the teacher's table, one sat in the middle of the class, and the third one sat at the end of the class so that the teachers' voice and students' voice could be recorded at the best quality. The video was not employed because this study involved teaching at primary level where consent needs to be obtained from parents of every student. If an attempt had been made, it would have taken a long time to obtain all the necessary permission, which seemed to be impossible for a study with a total time of nine months. Also, there was danger that video recording might influence the naturalness of the class. Furthermore, the study focused on teacher correction moves, not student pair work nor group work. Therefore, audio recording could satisfy the purpose of the study. However, to supplement the audio recording, the researcher took field notes while observing. These notes helped the transcription process and the analyses of the data.

3.6. Data analysis

3.6.1. Analysis of classroom observations

The data from classroom observations were all recorded, but only episodes of teacher CF were transcribed. This was manually transcribed verbatim. In cases the teachers and the students use their L1, translation into English was provided. A sample of transcription of one teacher's classroom teaching is provided in Appendix 10, and the convention of transcription is presented in Appendix 8. The data was read many times for sound understanding. Because of the scope of the study, only errors which received teacher feedback were noted, categorised and counted. The raw data were coded into three major categories: linguistic targets of errors made by students, types of oral CF provided by teachers, and the timing of CF. As for students' errors, they were coded into 3 main categories: grammar errors, pronunciation errors and vocabulary errors. There were a few errors for which it remained unclear whether they belonged to any of these three types such as error related to the content of a question, they were categorised as "other". NVivo 11, the latest version of this qualitative data analysis software, was used to store and organise the classroom observation data. 6 teachers were coded as six cases, and nodes of CF types and linguistic targets were created under each case. This process helped me refer to the examples of any particular CF type or its linguistic target easily.

Teachers' feedback moves were identified and categorised based on the taxonomy of Lyster and Ranta (1997). The reason for choosing this coding scheme is that it has been widely accepted and used in the literature (e.g. Ölmezer-Öztürk, 2016; Roothooft, 2014; Sheen, 2004) , which would allow me to relate my findings with those which followed this coding scheme. Teachers' oral CF moves were coded into six main types: recasts, explicit correction, elicitation, repetition, clarification requests, and meta-linguistic feedback (See Section 2.1.2. in Chapter 2 and Appendix 11 for more details about this CF coding scheme). There were 5 cases where the oral CF did not well fit into any of these six types; therefore, these CF moves were categorised as "other".

As regards feedback timing, feedback moves were classified into two types: immediate feedback and delayed feedback (Ellis, 2009). Immediate feedback occurs when the teacher stops a learner on the spot and corrects the error in the middle of the

conversation or in the middle of a student's utterance whereas delayed feedback occurs when feedback is provided after the learner's utterance. In cases where feedback is provided at the end of a learner's utterance, it is also classified as delayed feedback. This dichotomy was adopted because communication activities in my context involved a few utterances, and feedback was normally provided within student-teacher interactions. Large class size did not allow teachers to give feedback in pair work or group work activities. Thus, there was not much chance for teachers to give feedback after the completion of a communication task as designed in some of the few previous experimental studies. This timing distinction is different from a study by Quinn (2014) where immediate CF refers to both CF provided immediately when the errors are made and CF provided within 5 to 10 seconds after the errors are made. Quinn refers delayed CF to CF moves provided after the completion of a communicative activity. S. Li, Zhu, and Ellis (2016) applied similar operationalisations of immediate and delayed CF. The immediate vs delayed CF dichotomy in my current study is treated in line with Ölmezer-Öztürk (2016). Therefore, any interpretation related to CF timing should be considered in relation to how 'immediate vs delayed' is defined. The dichotomy in this current study is illustrated in the following example from my data set.

Immediate oral CF

S: the bicycle is fast fast than the /

T: /faster (Recast)

S: faster than the skateboard

Delayed oral CF

S: A taxi driver drive a taxi

T: Drives, drives a taxi (recast delayed until after the completion of the clause)

The coding results were cross-checked by my colleague, who holds a Master's degree in Education. Twenty feedback moves (10.5%) were not initially agreed by the colleague and were discussed openly with the researcher to agree on common codes and refine the definitions. This checking process helped to improve the reliability of the data analysis.

3.6.2. Analysis of interviews

The data from teacher interviews were analysed through content analysis. Interviews were transcribed verbatim in Vietnamese, were then read carefully many times and analysed manually by the researcher. Only comments used in the thesis report were translated into English by the researcher. A sample of interview with one teacher was translated into English and presented in Appendix 9. Comments with similar meanings were grouped into themes. The main themes found in the data comprised the importance of oral CF, preferences of oral CF types and the reasons for their choices, evaluations of linguistic targets for their CF, evaluations of factors influencing their beliefs and practices about CF, views on possible negative influence of oral CF on students' motivations and confidence, and views on different CF providers.

3.6.3. Comparison of interviews and classroom observations

The objectives of the current study are not just to look at the teachers' beliefs about oral CF and their actual behaviours in providing oral CF in their actual teaching. Yet the key objective of the study is to examine the congruence and/or incongruence between the teachers' beliefs and their actual classroom behaviours. Therefore, after the two data sources, interviews and classroom observations, were thematically coded, common themes emerging in both sets of data were compared. This step of data analysis was done by hand, and it is regarded as an interpretation step as guided by Creswell (2014). What these teachers said about different aspects of oral CF such as CF types, linguistic targets of CF, peer-correction and self-correction, CF frequency, and CF timing were compared with what they actually did in their observed teaching sessions respectively. For example, regarding CF types, one teacher, Anh, said that she would use repetition strategy the most frequently, but she actually did not use any repetition moves in her four observed lessons. This indicated the incongruence between Anh's beliefs and practices about the repetition strategy.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the study. It starts with a presentation of the beliefs of the six teacher participants about oral CF from the interview data. It is followed by a description of their CF provisions from the classroom observation data. Then, it presents the relationship between these teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF.

4.1. Teachers' beliefs about oral CF

4.1.1. Teachers' beliefs about the benefits of oral CF

The six teachers in this study emphasised different aspects when commenting on the benefits of oral CF, but they generally had positive evaluations. Ngan and Anh emphasized the appropriate choice of correction strategies. Anh said that if teachers could apply appropriate techniques in correcting students' errors, then error correction would be very beneficial. She associated this positive role of oral CF with her learning experiences, commenting that some of her errors were corrected by her former teacher a long time ago but she still remembered the correction incidences and the target language features. Tu stated that error correction was very important, especially correcting pronunciation errors for primary school students. Tu used her personal story to comment on the benefits of error correction on her own English pronunciation.

> I think it is very important for primary school students to pronounce English words correctly. Even myself, I now have some resistant errors because when I was a secondary school student, I mispronounced these words and the errors have existed until now. Even I have corrected myself some words but I will forget them very soon and make the same errors again as a habit. Therefore, I think that for primary school students, learning to pronounce the words correctly is the most necessary. For example, I mispronounced the word astronomer … (Tu, 22:26).

Han and Thuy said that oral CF was effective but not for all students. Han said that oral CF helped students realize their errors and would be able to produce the target-like language afterwards, but some students would make the same errors again, not all students could retain the corrected language features for long. Similarly, Thuy stated that oral CF could benefit some students, but for some other students, they would repeat

their same errors just five minutes after being corrected. She attributed this non-achievement to students' lack of attention because some students thought English was something beyond their ability and their need, which would lead to students' lack of attention in English classes. In short, these teachers evaluated the role of oral CF in relation to student individual differences, their own language learning experiences and the importance of selecting CF strategies, but showed a generally positive attitude.

As regards the amount of oral CF given to students' errors, all six teachers claimed that they would try to correct as many students' errors as they could and would only omit some errors due to time limit. Thuy and Anh also claimed to ignore the errors by those students who were weaker than other peers in order to encourage them to talk more because weak students did not have many opportunities to talk and they were normally shy and pessimistic. Thuy and Anh categorized their students into good students (who might potentially learn everything they taught) and weak students (who were very slow in understanding what they taught). These comments consolidate these teachers' positive evaluations of oral CF.

4.1.2. Teachers' preferences of oral CF types

The six teachers were asked about their CF type preferences by commenting and ranking the six CF types in a simulated CF scenario. The teachers showed their varied preferences (see Table 4.1.2 for details).

It is surprising that repetition was highly evaluated and chosen as the favourite CF type by four teachers: Ngan, Thuy, Anh and Tu. These teachers all explained that by repeating the error with a rising tone, either the student who made the error or other students, would recall the target features from their linguistic repertoire and repair the error. Both Ngan and Thuy also further commented that in case where students could not recall the target forms, they would repeat the error followed by the target form in a rising tone, students then would find it easier to repair themselves or be repaired by other peers. For example, Thuy said "If students still could not recognize their errors, I would prompt them to choose the correct answer by saying 'In Sunday or on Sunday' with a rising tone" (2:40).

Meta-linguistic feedback also attracted many comments from the teachers. Han and Linh chose meta-linguistic feedback as their most strongly preferred type. Han said that

explaining clearly the students' error would help them remember the target language feature longer, and it was important for students to understand clearly the usage of the linguistic feature. Linh further commented that if students still produced non-target-like language, she would explicitly give students the correct form "No, not in Sunday, say on Sunday". By contrast, Ngan rated meta-linguistic feedback as the fourth priority, and suggested that meta-linguistic feedback should follow students' repair to help students understand and remember that linguistic feature better. Tu and Thuy considered meta-linguistic feedback as the last choice and said they would use it at the end of a feedback move series to analyse the students' error, and Tu said meta-linguistic feedback was better used to emphasize grammatical features only.

Table 4.1.2. Teachers' beliefs about the effectiveness of CF types

(1: The most preferred; 6: The least preferred).

	Ngan	Thuy	Han	Anh	Tu	Linh
a. On Sunday (Recast)	2	5	5	4	3	5
b. Not in Sunday, say On Sunday. (Explicit correction)	6	4	2	2	4	2
c. With days, which preposition do we use? (Meta-linguistic feedback)	4	6	1	3	6	1
d. In Sunday? (Repetition)	1	1	3	1	1	4
e. Sorry? / Can you repeat that again? (Clarification request)	5	3	6	6	2	6
f. I don't go to school … (Elicitation)	3	2	4	5	5	3

Regarding the second most preferred feedback type, 3 teachers (Han, Anh and Linh) opted for the explicit correction. The remaining 3 teachers chose three different CF types, clarification requests by Tu, elicitation by Thuy and recasts by Ngan.

Interestingly, recasts, the most frequently used oral CF types in previous observational studies, were not chosen by any of these six teachers. Three teachers, Thuy, Han and Linh chose recast in the scenario as the second least preferable because of their perceptions of its low effectiveness. Anh chose it as the third least preferable and had similar explanation with Linh that recasts were not salient and not useful. Linh

commented “This technique is not feasible because students may not notice. Therefore, this technique is not effective” (7:30).

Clarification request was mentioned as the least preferred CF type by three teachers: Han, Tu and Linh. Han said that this technique was not effective because once students used the wrong preposition, they would repeat the error if required to say the sentence again. Han also believed that clarification requests should only be used in instances where she did not hear her students clearly and wanted them to repeat, not for error correction. Interestingly, Ngan felt that saying sorry and requesting students to repeat their erroneous utterances were too threatening and could easily create an uncomfortable atmosphere. Similarly, Anh stated that this technique seemed to be directed to the error maker and could discourage students from speaking in other situations.

4.1.3. Teachers’ beliefs about the linguistic targets of oral CF

All six teachers rated pronunciation errors as the most serious and worth correcting. Linh and Tu commented that pronunciation was necessary for primary school students because mispronouncing words could become a habit which would follow students for a long time. Tu said that she preferred to correct students’ ending sound errors. Thuy, Linh and Anh had the same opinion that English for primary school students was not difficult and there were not many grammar errors made by their students. Therefore, they did not have to correct grammar errors frequently. Thuy said:

> There are not many grammatical features at primary English, so students seldom make grammar errors. Grammar errors, if any, are minor errors, for example, when producing a sentence in present continuous tense, students make an error by saying “he playing football” instead of “he’s playing football”. Or students may say “what do he do?” instead of “What does he do?”. In general, there are not many grammar errors because students just follow a pattern, what they need to do is just to replace the words and speak. Students predominantly have pronunciation errors. (Thuy, 13:20)

Thuy added that pronunciation errors were the most important but she tended to correct every kind of error due to her personality of attention to details.

Han claimed that pronunciation errors were the most noticeable for her because helping students pronounce words correctly was the most important in her teaching. Han further commented that in oral speech, accuracy in terms of grammar was not serious, as long as students' speech was comprehensible. However, Han said that, in her grammar focus lesson, she would correct every students' grammar error, as is illustrated in the following extract:

> Normally I correct pronunciation errors so that students can pronounce correctly. Pronunciation error is the most serious and attracts more attention at primary school level. For a grammar lesson, students should completely understand the target points, for example, for third person singular in present simple tense, students should know how to use verbs…

On the other hand, Ngan expressed the view that although pronunciation errors were more serious than grammar errors, she tended to correct more grammar errors because they were easier to correct. She claimed that grammar errors might not hinder communication objectives in speaking as much as pronunciation errors might do. However, Ngan believed that ending sounds such as [z] or [s] were acceptable. Ngan further commented that Vietnamese students were influenced by their mother tongue when speaking English and made many errors, so she just corrected errors that she considered basic.

4.1.4. Teachers' beliefs about the timing of oral CF

With reference to the timing of oral CF, all six teachers reported that they prioritized delayed feedback. Teachers commented that immediate feedback could have negative effects on learners' affect, thinking or performance. Also, the interference for immediate feedback was considered impolite and not acceptable. Thuy and Anh, for example, stated that their intuition guided them to wait for students to finish their utterance to provide correction on their students' errors.

4.1.5. Teachers' beliefs about self-correction and peer-correction

All six teachers believed that student self-correction or peer-correction was more effective than teacher correction. Ngan, for example, said that she did not directly notify the error maker and correct his or her error, but she tended to signal the error to the

whole class and provide prompts to encourage other students to correct their peer's error. Ngan, Linh and Anh all made similar comments, stating that they preferred peer or self-correction, and would only correct their students' errors after several attempts to elicit self-correction or peer-correction met with failure. Ngan believed that students might have better techniques than their teacher in dealing with their peer's error, and peer-correction could help the error maker retain the corrected features longer. Thuy added that teacher correction might attract one student's attention while peer-correction could attract attention from many students, even the whole class. Linh also regarded self-correction as a kind of self-study.

One way to elicit student self-correction or peer-correction suggested by Tu and Han was that teacher noted students' errors during their pair work or group work and raised the errors in front of the class. Han said that she would write the sentence with the error on the board to elicit correction from other students. Han expressed her view that primary school students were very active and they would feel excited to correct their friends' errors. After a student corrected the error written on the board, she would ask the error maker to say the correct sentence again. For peer-correction, Han would pair a good student with a weak student, so that the good one would help correct the other's errors. She said:

> For example, the girl sitting next to you (the observer) is very good. She studies well and pronounces words correctly. I put her with the weak boy, and when the boy makes errors, she feels angry and will correct him (Han, 13:03).

4.1.6. Teachers' concerns about students' affective responses

The six teachers had different views about students' affective responses to teacher oral CF, but their comments indicated that their concerns did not largely influence their CF provision. Except Han, the other five teachers commented that only a few of their students liked receiving teacher correction, primarily for students with better English proficiency. Anh and Ngan stated that the appropriate choice of CF strategies was important, especially for weak students. The concepts of good students and weak students were mentioned by 3 teachers (Linh, Tu, and Anh), these teachers claimed to provide more corrective feedback for good students and provided more positive praise for shy and weak students. Han stated that her students were positive about her oral CF,

and that she never had any negative responses from her students to her CF during her 7 years of teaching at primary school. Similarly, Anh and Thuy commented that only a few of her students might have negative perceptions about teacher CF, and Thuy said her students did not care about her correction on their errors, leading her to attempting to correct any errors she encountered without being concerned about any negative responses from her students. The common comment that these teachers would try to correct as many errors as they could also indicated their positive view about students' affective response to corrective feedback.

4.1.7. Factors affecting teachers' beliefs about oral CF

There were slight differences among these six teachers' accounts of the origins of their beliefs about oral CF. The factors reported included teaching experience, language learning experience, teacher training and professional development courses.

All six teachers reported that experience was the most influential factor on their error correction practice. Ngan and Han reported that they learned to correct students' errors by themselves through their teaching practices. Han and Tu were confident about their experience of oral correction feedback. They said that teaching experience would help them master their skills of feedback provision. Both teachers claimed that they could predict their students' errors before teaching, and they reported that they would intentionally create erroneous utterances to attract their students' attention. Tu believed that teachers' intentional erroneous situations could help students deeply understand and remember the target language features. Linh and Anh also stated that their CF was shaped mainly by their teaching experience.

These teachers were experienced, with at least five years teaching at primary level. Except for Anh, five teachers were trained to teach at junior secondary schools, and they all started their career at secondary schools before transferring to teach at primary schools. Anh was trained to teach at high school, but she had been working at primary schools throughout her career. A detailed description of these teachers' educational and professional background is presented in Appendix 7. These teachers said they had to adapt themselves when starting to teach at primary schools without any initial guidance or retraining. Their professional development programmes had been provided throughout their course of service.

Other factors were also mentioned. Anh and Linh said teacher training and professional development courses marginally shaped their CF beliefs, but Ngan and Han stated that none of their sessions in their professional training was about oral CF. Ngan and Han said that they had been able to learn some techniques from their colleagues when observing their teaching. Linh said teaching videos on the Internet had some influences on her CF. Thuy, by contrast, claimed to learn about oral CF when she happened to read a teacher professional development material called "Sang kien kinh nghiem", an annual experience initiative report required for selected teachers writing about innovative teaching techniques based on their teaching experience. Thuy also mentioned that she did not have many opportunities to observe her colleagues, and even when she observed some classes, there would not be many errors nor CF because both students and teacher normally prepared well in advance for the observed lessons. Regarding language learning experience, Tu used her example of learning the word 'astronomny' to explain for the influence of her high school teacher on her error correction. Anh also said that she still remembered some of the correction her high school teacher gave her, and this influenced her positive attittudes towards corrective feedback.

4.2. Teachers' practices about oral CF

This section will present the oral CF provision of the six teachers in relation to the number of CF moves, CF types, linguistic targets of CF, and learner repair following teacher initiated CF and the timing of CF. Before these aspects are described, it should be noted that among 24 sessions observed, 21 of them were guided by student textbook which presented the targeted linguistic features clearly. The remaining 3 lessons (one by Ngan, one by Han and one by Tu) were elective lessons, which were chosen by the teachers among a number of suggested topics. These lessons were self-designed by the teachers, without being dependent on the textbook. A summary of these 24 lesson objectives is presented in Appendix 6. It should also be noted that all these six teachers mostly used English to give feedback, which might be because of the presence of the researcher as an observer. Even though these teachers were informed that the researcher observation was not to evaluate their teaching, they may have wanted to show off their skills because using English for instructions was generally encouraged in Vietnam by the educational authorities.

It should also be noted that the language use of the teachers was sometimes problematic. Of the six teachers, Thuy showed the strongest use of English in her instruction, showing quite clear and comprehensible pronunciation and good fluency. By contrast, Linh and Han showed more issues in their instructions in English than the other teachers. For example, Linh recasted her student's error of the word "heavy" by pronouncing it as [ʻhɪəvi]. Han, in an example where she gave instruction for a word guessing game, showed hesitation and inaccuracies in her spoken English. Following is one part of her instruction:

> T: Now there are three group … group 1 group 2 and group? …
>
> SS: 3
>
> T: and I have some words for you to guess the meaning of the words ok?
>
> SS: Yes
>
> T: and … if you ah … one of you in your group … and say the information about these job … and other is ah in the group guess the word … if you guess the word correct I have some ah marks for you ok?
>
> SS: Yes
>
> T: This is 10 marks ok? Maybe 100 marks
>
> (Linh, Lesson 2, 3:20)

4.2.1. Number of observed oral CF moves

Within 14 hours of classroom teaching (made up from 6 teachers x 4 lessons x 35 minutes), six teachers collectively provided a total of 191 oral CF moves. There were marked differences among the number of oral CF moves provided by individual teachers, with an average number of 31.8 moves. The detail is presented in Table 4.2.1 below:

Table 4.2.1. Number of Observed oral CF moves

Teacher participant	Ngan	Thuy	Han	Anh	Tu	Linh
Number of moves	23	37	24	44	14	49
Average	31.8					

Linh provided the largest number of CF moves with 49 moves, followed by Anh with 44 moves. Thuy provided 37 moves while Ngan and Han provided similar numbers at 23 and 24 moves respectively. Tu was the teacher who provided the fewest CF moves (14 moves).

4.2.2. Observed oral CF types

Based on Lyster and Ranta's (1997) taxonomy, the teachers' oral CF moves were categorized and counted. Almost a half of the CF moves (91/191 = 47.6%) were provided in the form of recasts. Explicit correction was the second most popular type, accounting for 15.7%. Elicitation made up 13.6%, followed by clarification requests and meta-linguistic feedback with 10% and 8.9% respectively. Repetition was the least popular type, accounting for only 2.1%. There were 4 cases across the data sets which did not perfectly fit any of the 6 types, they were then categorized as "other". The detail was presented in Table 4.2.2.

Four teachers, Thuy, Linh, Anh and Tu provided far more recasts than other CF types. Linh provided the largest number of oral CF moves (49 moves), of which 31 moves were recasts. The second largest number of feedback moves were provided by Anh, and recasts accounted for over a half (24/44 moves). Tu, on the other hand, provided the smallest amount of CF (14 moves), but 11 moves were recasts. Han provided 6 recasts and 6 clarification requests in a total of 24 moves. By contrast, Ngan opted for explicit correction as the most frequent CF type with 9 out of 23 moves.

Table 4.2.2. Observed CF types

	Recasts	Repetition	Explicit correction	Elicitation	Clarification requests	Meta-linguistic feedback	Others	Total
Ngan	5	0	9	5	2	1	1	23
Thuy	14	0	3	8	5	7	0	37
Linh	31	0	5	6	3	2	2	49
Anh	24	0	8	4	2	6	0	44
Han	6	2	5	3	6	1	1	24
Tu	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	14
Total	91	4	30	26	19	17	4	191
%	47.6	2.1	15.7	13.6	10	8.9	2.1	100%

Tu is the teacher who had the most unusual pattern of oral CF use, employing only one clarification request, two repetition feedback moves. She did not provide any feedback in the form of explicit correction, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, but she used recast feedback 11 times.

4.2.3. Observed linguistic targets of oral CF

Students' errors which received teachers' correction were classified into three main types, namely grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary. A few errors which did not belong to these three types, some of which were related to content or meaning for example, were classified as "other". As can be seen from Table 4.2.3, the correction of pronunciation errors was the most common, accounting for 39.2% of all CF, followed by the correction of grammar errors with a slightly less amount (37.7%). Almost one fifth of the errors corrected were related to the use of vocabulary, and 5.3% of the remaining errors were categorized as others.

Pronunciation was the most common linguistic targets of CF by four teachers: Thuy, Anh, Tu and Ngan. Specifically, Thuy provided 17 CF moves on pronunciation errors, but only 10 moves on grammar and 5 moves on vocabulary errors. Anh provided 22 moves on pronunciation errors, 17 moves on grammar errors but only 5 moves on vocabulary errors. Tu did not provide as many CF moves as other teachers, but most of which were about pronunciation errors, 10 out of 14 moves.

Table 4.2.3. Observed linguistic targets of oral CF

	Grammar	Pronunciation	Vocabulary	Others	Total
Ngan	6	8	7	2	23
Thuy	10	17	5	5	37
Linh	25	14	9	1	49
Anh	17	22	5	0	44
Han	12	4	6	2	24
Tu	2	10	2	0	14
Total	72	75	34	10	191
%	37.7	39.2	17.8	5.3	100%

By contrast, grammar errors were a more common target of CF by Linh and Han. Slightly over a half of Linh's CF moves (25/49) were related to grammar compared to 14 moves on pronunciation and 9 moves on vocabulary. Han corrected 12 grammar errors, 4 pronunciation errors and 6 vocabulary errors.

4.2.4. Observed self-correction and peer-correction

Correction moves by the error makers (self-correction) or by other students (peer-correction) followed by teachers' initiated correction attempts were coded, yielding a small number. Only 9 peer-correction moves were observed within 14 hours of classroom learning. Thuy's students and Han's students made 4 and 3 peer-correction moves respectively. Ngan's students and Anh's students only made 1 peer-correction move each while there was no peer-correction move in classes by Tu and Linh.

Table 4.2.4. Number of peer-correction and self-correction moves

	Ngan	Thuy	Han	Anh	Tu	Linh	Total
Peer-correction	1	4	3	1	0	0	9
Self-correction	3	3	4	2	0	8	20
Total	4	7	7	3	0	8	29

The number of self-correction moves was 20, eight of which were made by Linh's students. Han's students made 4 self-correction moves, and Ngan's students and Thuy's students made 3 moves each. There were two self-correction moves in Anh's lessons, but no self-correction was found in Tu's lessons. The detail of the number of peer-correction and self-correction moves is presented in Table 4.2.4.

4.2.5. CF timing

Most teacher CF moves were provided after students completed their utterances. Linh was an exception; she interrupted her students in between their utterances 13 times to provide feedback. Thuy and Anh did this 3 and 4 times respectively. The other three teachers did not interrupt their students, but waited for them to finish their utterances to give feedback.

4.3. The relationship between teachers' beliefs about oral CF and their practices

The interview data and the observation data were compared. The results revealed both congruence and incongruence between teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF, but more incongruence was found.

4.3.1. Congruence

Some congruence between teachers' beliefs and practices about certain respects of oral CF was noted. Firstly, regarding the timing of CF, there is partial consistency. Three teachers (Ngan, Han and Tu) believed that delayed CF was better, and they would normally wait for their students to finish their turn (in dyadic talk) or conversation (in conversational talk) to provide them with feedback. Tu commented that it was more effective to provide feedback after the students finished their talk because immediate feedback could make students feel unconfident or could influence students' current thinking and they might forget what they were talking about. In their practice, these three teachers did not use any immediate feedback, but all their feedback was provided after the error makers had finished their utterances.

The second aspect of congruence was their views on linguistic targets of oral CF. Three teachers, Thuy, Anh and Tu in the interview with the CF scenario stated that pronunciation errors were the most important, especially for primary English education, and the majority of their oral CF was on pronunciation errors. Specifically, Thuy provided 17 CF moves on pronunciation errors (out of 37 moves in total), Anh provided 22 out of 44 CF moves on pronunciation errors. Tu provided only 14 CF moves in total, but 10 of which were related to pronunciation errors. The other three teachers showed inconsistency in their beliefs and practices about linguistic targets of CF, which will be presented in the following section.

4.3.2. Incongruence

The study showed that many aspects of oral CF observed in practice were incongruent with what teachers stated in the interview. The first and most obvious incongruence was related to oral CF types. In the interviews, no teachers claimed recasts to be their favourite CF type, but in the observations, 5 teachers (except for Ngan) employed recasts the most frequently of all CF types. Particularly, Linh said that recasts were not

effective because students might not notice her feedback, but she provided 31 recasts out of her total of 49 CF moves. Anh chose recasts as the 4th priority out of six oral CF types, and she reported that she would use recasts when the errors were not serious, and also to make students feel comfortable and easy with their errors. Anh estimated that only a few students could recognize her recasts as an error correction move, other students would perceive recasts as their teachers' repetition of their correct utterances. However, within 44 CF moves, Anh used 24 recasts. Similarly, Thuy ranked recasts as her second least preferred CF type, but she provided 14 recasts out of 37 CF moves. Tu said she would prefer repetition to elicit students' self-correction, but she used 11 recasts out of her 14 CF moves.

Interestingly, 4 teachers (Tu, Thuy, Ngan, and Anh) commented that repetition was the most preferable but they did not use it frequently in their classroom teaching. Tu used 2 repetition moves, and the other three teachers did not use any repetition moves. Ngan commented that she did attempt to provide students with hints so that they could sort out the correct form, but her classroom observation showed that more reformulations (5 recasts and 9 explicit corrections) than prompts (5 elicitations, 2 clarification requests, 1 meta-linguistic feedback) occurred in her teaching practices. Han commented that meta-linguistic feedback was the most useful because it could help students to remember the corrected features longer, and recasts were just used to initially provide the correct forms. However, in Han's practices, she employed recasts and clarification requests as two predominant CF types (6 recasts and 6 clarification requests per a total of 24 CF moves) whilst only one meta-linguistic feedback move was used.

Regarding student self-correction or peer-correction, these teachers' beliefs and practices differed. As presented in Section 4.1.5, all six teachers stated that they would prefer students' self-correction or peer-correction rather than teacher correction for two reasons. These teachers considered that self-correction could help the error maker understand better and retain longer the corrected targeted linguistic features. They claimed to ask other students to repair if the error maker could not correct himself or herself. In this way, the teachers claimed that they would draw the attention from the whole class. Then, teachers' feedback was provided once students failed to correct their errors. However, in the observations, teachers tended to use reformulation feedback (recasts (47.6%) and explicit correction (15.7%)) to provide the students with the correct forms of the non-target features. Sixty six out of 191 (34.6%) of all teachers'

CF moves were prompts. These prompts produced 20 self-correction moves and 9 peer-correction moves. Linh, for example, reported that she normally provided hints for her students to correct their own errors or their friends' errors, and she would correct as the last choice, but in her 4 sessions of teaching, she provided 36 reformulation CF moves out of 49 moves in total. There were only 8 cases where her students corrected themselves, and no peer-correction was found. Ngan also had similar comments but had only 1 peer-correction and 3 self-correction moves in a total of 23 CF moves. Tu reported that, in cases where students presented their work in pairs in front of the class, she would ask other students to comment and feedback, but there was not any peer-correction or self-correction in her observed teaching.

A different way to elicit learner repair mentioned by 3 teachers is that they would intentionally create errors for students to correct, but this was not observed in their lessons. Han, Tu and Thuy claimed that they sometimes created errors in order to draw attention from students to the important grammar features or the focus of the lesson. For example, Thuy said, instead of saying "How many pens…?" she sometimes said "How much pens…?". Tu said that when students worked in pairs, she moved around and picked up errors to correct in front of the whole class. She also said sometimes her students did not make any error, but she would intentionally draw students' attention to the grammar point that she considered to be important. Tu gave an example: "I heard some of you said 'in Sunday', but what preposition should we use with days of the week? (14:40). However, in the observed lessons, these teachers did not employ any strategies of this kind. They just provided oral CF when students made errors.

The mismatch between teachers' beliefs and practices was also noted in connection with linguistic targets of CF. Three teachers showed consistency, but the other three showed inconsistency. Linh and Han believed that pronunciation was the most important for primary school students, therefore, they would prioritize to correct as many pronunciation errors as possible. Linh commented:

> I think that pronunciation error is the most important because if students pronounce the words incorrectly, the incorrectness will become a habit and follow them forever. Pronunciation errors occur the most frequently. For primary English education, there is also grammar teaching but pronunciation teaching is the most important. (Linh, 11:33)

However, in the observed teaching, Linh and Han corrected more grammar errors than pronunciation errors. Linh provided about half of her CF in relation to grammar errors (25 out of 49 errors) while only 14 pronunciation errors were corrected. Similarly, Han provided 12 CF moves on grammar errors, 4 CF moves on pronunciation errors out of a total of 24 moves. Ngan also considered that pronunciation errors were the most important and worth correcting, but she said students made so many pronunciation errors that she could not correct all, and she attributed this to students' first language transfer. In practice, Ngan had similar numbers of CF moves on grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary errors, with 6, 8 and 7 moves on each linguistic target respectively.

With regard to timing, there was some partial inconsistency. Three teachers (Thuy, Anh and Linh) commented that they preferred delayed oral feedback. Thuy said that it was not reasonable to interrupt students for feedback, but she did it twice in her observed teaching. Similarly, Anh stated that she used delayed feedback as a common sense in communication, even when she wanted to give feedback on a daily communication situation, she had to wait for her interlocutor to complete his or her utterance. Anh, however, interrupted her students' speaking and gave feedback three times. For example:

S: She never takes pictures of people / (sounds like [pelpə])

T: / People

S: people … she usually takes pictures outside in park and zoo

(Anh, Lesson 4, 37:40)

The most striking inconsistency about the timing of CF was found in Linh's beliefs and practices. Linh said it was not allowed to interfere students' speaking and provide immediate feedback, but she provided 13 immediate CF moves in a total of 49 CF moves. For example,

S: He is slow now he is /

T: / No … he is slow right?

SS: No

T: in the past … was

S: He was slow now he's fast

T: Yes, good.

(Linh, Lesson 1, 10:30)

4.4. Summary of results

In summary, this chapter presented the findings emerging from the analysis of the two sources of data: interviews and classroom observations. The analysis of the interview data showed that these teachers had different views about oral CF, but some common themes were noted. These six teachers were positive about the benefits of oral CF in learner learning. They stated preference for different CF types in their teaching, but recasts were not the first priority of any teachers. All six teachers claimed to prioritize prompts to elicit correction from students, and believed that teachers' correction attempts should be made after students had completed their utterances. These teachers nominated teaching experience as the main factor shaping their beliefs and practices of oral CF, and they did not consider possible affective responses of students as an influential factor in their CF choices.

The analysis of the classroom observation data also showed some interesting results. These teachers made a total of 191 CF moves within 14 hours of teaching. CF moves were provided in all 6 types, but recasts were the most common. There were only 20 self-correction moves and 9 peer-correction moves following teachers' initiated prompts. Teacher CF moves targeted at pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary errors in descending order.

The analysis also revealed some relationships between these teachers' beliefs about oral CF and their actual teaching behaviours. There was some partial congruence regarding CF timing and CF targets. However, more incongruence was found in other aspects of oral CF such as CF types and CF providers.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the results of the study in light of the literature about teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF. First, it discusses these six Vietnamese EFL teachers' beliefs about oral CF, followed by a discussion of their practices. Then it discusses the relationship between these teachers' beliefs about oral CF and their actual classroom behaviours.

5.1. What are these teachers' beliefs about oral CF and possible contributing factors?

5.1.1. The benefits of oral CF

With regard to the role of oral CF, all six teachers advocated its importance and believed that oral errors should be corrected most of the time. This finding is more in line with Rahimi and Zhang (2015) and Ölmezer-Öztürk (2016) than Junqueira and Kim (2013), Kamiya (2016) and Schulz (1996). S. Li (2017) speculates that teachers in studies focusing on oral CF tend to be more positive about correcting learners' errors. Another possible explanation for their belief is that all six teachers in my current study were experienced (more than 13 years of teaching experience). Rahimi and Zhang (2015) show that 90% of their experienced teachers agree or strongly agree on the importance of oral CF, while the figure for their novice teachers is 75%. It has been suggested that less experienced teachers tend to be more sensitive to the negative affective responses and self-esteem of students receiving oral CF (Vásquez & Harvey, 2010). The third possible explanation could be ascribed to teachers' language learning experience (Junqueira & Kim, 2013). All these six teachers learned English at local schools in a period in which grammar translation was the dominant teaching method, and their English proficiency was then assessed with grammar, vocabulary and reading comprehension tests with a focus on accuracy. Two teachers (Anh and Tu) referred to their learning experience 20 years ago to explain the importance of oral CF.

5.1.2. CF types

The feedback scenario elicited teachers' ratings and comments on their preferences about oral CF types, which yielded varied but interesting findings about teachers' beliefs. As presented in Section 4.1.2 and Table 4.1.2, four out of six teachers advocated

the use of repetition, stating to choose repetition as their favourite CF type. This finding is different from Ozmen and Aydin's (2015) study with Turkish student teachers and Roothooft and Breeze's (2016) study with Spanish EFL teachers of secondary schools and private language academies where repetition is negatively rated. These teachers stated that repetition would trigger repair from the error maker or from other students.

With reference to recasts, the finding that these teachers showed their doubt as to the effectiveness of recasts is contradictory to the literature. S. Li (2017), in a review article, found that the aggregated weighted mean agreement rate for recasts in four large-scale studies was 76.7%. One possible explanation for this finding could be attributable to the methodology in that teachers may not be able to notice the salience and the corrective force of recasts when the scenario is in written form. A video simulated scenario might have helped the teachers realize the corrective force of recasts more easily. Another possible explanation could be that the teachers in this current study may have highly evaluated the potential of eliciting uptake or repair of oral CF types, as all six teachers claimed that they supported student self-repair or peer-repair. These teachers may also not consider recasts as a strategy of corrective feedback.

The least preferred CF type claimed by the teachers was clarification requests. Three teachers claimed that clarification requests were not effective, but should be used when students' utterances were not clear. Interestingly, clarification requests are considered as an implicit CF type (Lyster & Saito, 2010; Sheen & Ellis, 2011), but two teachers expressed their view that clarification requests were too threatening and might discourage their students from participating in other situations. This perception could be attributed to the way Vietnamese teachers view the word "Sorry" or the request structure with "Can you please…?". In Vietnamese language and culture, saying sorry might be used for situations where there is a fault, but not normally between teachers and students in usual classroom situations.

5.1.3. Linguistic targets of oral CF

All six teachers considered pronunciation errors the most important and worth correcting. They also claimed that teaching students how to pronounce words correctly was of the greatest importance for their primary English teaching. It seems reasonable when these teachers considered pronunciation errors more important than grammar

errors because at primary level, students' L2 objectives are modest and do not include complex grammar features. They were also aware that pronunciation errors were more likely to impede communication than grammar errors. Junqueira and Kim (2013) found that, of the two adult ESL teachers in their study, one teacher claimed to provide more CF on grammar, but the other teacher said she would provide more CF on pronunciation errors. Studies employing questionnaires to elicit teachers' respondents about whether or not to correct all errors (e.g. Jean & Simard, 2011; Schulz, 1996) received low rates of agreement because of the extreme words such as "every" or "all" in the surveyed items (S. Li, 2017).

5.1.4. CF Timing

These six teachers insisted that oral CF should be provided after students had completed their utterances or dialogues. The teachers thought that immediate CF would interrupt the flow of interaction and discourage students from talking or participating in the following learning events. They associated this perception with both their teaching experience and their own intuition. This finding lends support to studies of Roothooft (2014) and Rahimi and Zhang (2015) in that teachers claimed to move away from immediate feedback to avoid its influence on communication flow and students' confidence and motivation. This finding might be attributed to teachers' backgrounds as suggested by Kartchava (2006) who found that teachers who had not attended any language acquisition course tended to be more negative towards immediate CF than who had done so.

5.1.5. Student self-correction and peer-correction

Learner repair was one of the concerns of all six teachers. They stated that they would provide prompts for students to correct their own errors or their friend's errors. Learners' self-correction or repair is essential in their L2 development (Lyster et al., 2013), and peer CF is effective in that learners not only benefit from receiving CF but also from providing CF (Sippel & Jackson, 2015). These teachers said they would provide the target forms if their elicitation attempts were met with failure. Two teachers, Tu and Han, stated that they would use the whole class correction if their students failed to correct their own errors or their friend's errors. In a survey study, Agudo (2014) found that 78.43% of 55 preservice teachers stated that self-correction was more effective than

peer-correction and teacher correction. Experienced teachers in Rahimi and Zhang's (2015) study also stated they would provide opportunities for learners to correct themselves, and would provide the explicit correction in cases where students could not correct themselves. There is not a clear explanation for this belief in the literature as teachers' stances about who should correct learners' errors have received little research (S. Li, 2017). However, Linh's comment that self-correction meant self-study and other teachers' complete approval for self-correction and peer-correction suggest that this belief may be influenced by the shift from teacher-centred to learner-centred classroom in Vietnam where learner autonomy is encouraged.

5.1.6. Learner affective responses

The interview data showed that these teachers had different ideas, but they generally had positive views about the influence of students' affective responses on their CF provision. These teachers did not consider their concerns about students' affective responses a factor that made them avoid oral CF provision. This finding is relatively different from the literature. Kamiya (2016), for example, found that his native speaking ESL teachers generally avoid humiliating students and try not to use oral CF. Some other studies also found that their teachers took affective factor into account when providing CF (e.g. Roothooft, 2014; Roothooft & Breeze, 2016; Yoshida, 2010). There are two possible reasons that could account for this difference, namely teachers' experience and teaching context. Experienced teachers seem to be more positive about explicit CF types while novice teachers tend to opt for implicit CF due to students' affective responses (Junqueira & Kim, 2013). All six teachers in this current study had more than 13 years of teaching experience. This may have helped them reflect on their oral CF provision, leading to their positive perceptions about any negative effects that oral CF may cause to their students. My context is distinct in that primary school students are likely more willing to make errors without being concerned about losing face. As influenced by the Vietnamese traditional educational stereotypes, these teachers may also see themselves as a knowledge expert and students as knowledge receivers, which leads these teachers to believe that their students are not likely to be negatively emotionally influenced by corrective feedback.

5.2. What are these teachers' practices of oral CF and possible contributing factors?

5.2.1. CF amount

On average, there were 13.6 CF moves per hour in these teachers' teaching. This frequency could be seen as medium in comparison with a synthesis of studies in the review article by Lyster et al. (2013). They compared the frequency of 12 selected descriptive studies in different contexts, with the low-frequency contexts ranging from 6 to 11 moves per hour and the high-frequency contexts ranging from 28 to 41 moves.

It is interesting that the number of teacher oral CF widely varies among different lessons. Choi and Li (2012) claim that whether an error receives feedback or not might be constrained by whether the error occurs in a focused or unfocused event or task. Choi and Li observes that errors in focused events are more likely to receive feedback than those in unfocused events. In my current study, within 24 observed lessons, 21 lessons were guided by the textbook with clear linguistic foci. Some of these 21 lessons were identical. Three remaining lessons were not guided by the textbook, but one of them had a clear linguistic focus, teaching the future simple tense in asking and answering about students' ideal future jobs. This lesson resulted in only 4 CF moves although the students made a larger number of errors. The remaining two topic based lessons, which were not guided by the textbook nor had a clear linguistic focus, did not result in any feedback. There may be two possible explanations for this finding. The first one could be due to the nature of unfocused event lessons, this will be further discussed in the next section, 5.3. The second explanation could be attributed to teacher difficulties in detecting errors and giving oral CF in unfocused spontaneous communication. Errors might be unpredictable in free communication tasks without a specific linguistic focus. Three teachers with one topic based lesson each had lower numbers of CF moves than the remaining three teachers. Although it is not possible to generalise from such a small sample, this suggests that the CF frequency may be dependent on the characteristics of the lessons observed.

5.2.2. CF types

Within 191 teacher oral CF moves, recasts were the most frequently used CF type (47.6%), followed by prompts and explicit correction (34.6% and 15.7% respectively). This finding is in line with previous research to a large extent. For example, Lyster and Ranta (1997) found that recasts accounted for 55% of all CF moves within 18.3 hours of classroom observation, prompts accounted for 38%, and the remaining 7% were explicit correction. Llinares and Lyster (2014) found similar patterns of CF distribution between three different instructional contexts. This pattern is also reflected in a recent meta-analysis by Brown (2016) who found that reformulations accounted for 66% of all CF and prompts 30%. One common account of the high frequency of recast use in the literature is that teachers rely on recasts to save time, to avoid threatening students' confidence and avoid disrupting the flow of interaction compared with other feedback types (Choi & Li, 2012; Loewen & Philp, 2006). Also, teachers may rely on recasts because recasts are less cognitive demanding (Brown, 2016).

However, what is interesting in this current study finding is the nature of recasts if looked closely at the implicitness and explicitness of these recast moves. Sheen and Ellis (2011) suggest that recasts in response to learners' errors that impede the communication are implicit (conversational recasts), whilst recasts in response to learners' errors that do not impede communication are explicit (didactic recasts). Most recasts found in my current study (87/91 moves) can be categorised as didactic recasts because teacher-student interaction involves utterances of only a few words with the meaning or focus being clear in teacher initiated utterances as illustrated in the following example:

> S: My mother was pretty (pretty sounds like [preti])
>
> T: pretty (with correction pronunciation) (recast)
>
> S: but now she's ugly (Linh, Lessons 1&2, 01:02:13)

In this example, the student told the teacher and the whole class about her family members using adjectives of opposite meanings. The student mispronounced the sound [I] into [e], but it seems that this error may not cause a communication breakdown. Therefore, the teacher' feedback in this case appears to be salient and explicit. This supports the claim by some researchers that recasts might be implicit or explicit

depending on the context, linguistic targets, length and number of changes (Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Nicholas et al., 2001; Sheen, 2004).

5.2.3. Linguistic targets

A striking finding of this current study is that pronunciation errors received the most CF (39.2% of all CF), closely followed by grammar errors (37.7%) then vocabulary errors (17.8%). This finding is contradictory to most previous studies. Brown's (2016) meta-analysis revealed that grammar errors received the greatest number of CF (43%), vocabulary errors received 28% while pronunciation errors received the lowest number (22%). This current study focused on the total moves of teacher CF, but not recorded the number of errors made with regard to different linguistic foci. Therefore, there could be no conclusion about the ratio between teacher CF and students' error number, unlike Lyster's (1998) study (feedback rates for students' errors on pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary were 70%, 56% and 80% respectively) and Choi and Li's (2012) study (84%, 94% and 70%). However, one possible explanation for this interesting finding in my study is related to its unique context. As previously noted, the linguistic foci of the observed lessons are of beginner level. Teacher-student interaction or student-student interaction consists of short exchanges of a few sentences, with each sentence consisting of a few words. The vocabulary for these interactions are simple and activities are drilled repetitively. Therefore, students are more likely to make more pronunciation errors than grammar or vocabulary errors. For example:

S1: What's her job?

S2: She's a photographer (sounds like [fəutəugrɑfər])

T: Ok. PhoTOgrapher, phoTOgrapher [fəˈtɒgrəfər])

This pronunciation error of the word "photographer" occurs frequently across the 6 teachers' classes (a total of 10 feedback moves on this error: 1 by Han, 2 by Thuy, 2 by Anh, and 5 by Tu).

For some other cases where errors occurred with third person singular in present simple tense, errors were coded as grammar, but these errors might be more phonological in nature. This could be seen as one caveat of the finding interpretation. To my knowledge,

this confusion has not been reported in the literature. There were a number of errors of this kind observed in my data; for example:

T: What does a taxi driver do

S: A taxi driver drive a taxi

T: Drives, drives a taxi

In this example, the student made an error with "drive" instead of "drives" in his utterance "A taxi driver drive a taxi". This error was probably made because this student did not know how to use this verb form in third person singular of the present simple tense. This could also be because he could not pronounce the ending sound [z] although he might be aware of that grammar feature. Vietnamese students are likely to struggle with English ending sounds because these sounds do not exist in their first language. In this study, the errors of this kind occurred several times, and most of them were classified as grammar errors.

5.2.4. Student self-correction and peer-correction

There were not many moves of students' self-correction or peer-correction following teachers' initiation in my data. There were only 20 cases where students attempted to correct their errors themselves after the teachers provided prompts for correction. This could be due to the fact that recasts and explicit correction (teacher reformulations) constituted a large number of teacher feedback (63.3%) because self-correction coded in this study comprised only those moves students made after the teachers' prompts, the students' repetition after the teachers' recasts or explicit correction was not counted. Peer-correction occurs only 9 times in the total data, and peer-correction in this study was also counted when the students provided the correct forms for their peers after the teachers' prompts. One limitation here is that peer-correction during pair work and group work activities was not recorded.

5.3. What is the congruence and/or incongruence between these teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF? What (if any) contextual parameters might account for the relationship?

5.3.1. Congruence

Some congruence was found between teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF. The first aspect of congruence was related to the timing of oral CF, involving 5 teachers (except for Linh). Ngan, Han, Tu stated that they endorsed the idea of providing feedback after their students competed their utterance or conversation, and they did this consistently throughout their observed lessons. The other two teachers, Thuy and Anh also showed partial consistency in that they claimed to prefer delayed CF and provided most of their CF after their students completed their utterances or dialogues. Only 2 out of 37 CF moves in Thuy's observed lessons and 3 out of 44 in Anh's lessons were provided in the middle of students' utterances. This finding is in line with Roothooft's (2014) study of Spanish EFL teachers of adults at a university and a private language academy, but no explanation has been offered yet. This belief could be due to the influence of advice from teacher training workshops or teacher professional development materials as suggested by teaching methodologists (e.g. Harmer, 2007); however, no teachers mentioned this explicitly in the interview. These teachers explained that interrupting students and giving feedback immediately may interrupt communication and discourage students' confidence. One teacher, Anh, stated that her priority to provide feedback after students completed their utterances or dialogues was guided by her intuition. One exception was Linh who interrupted her students and gave feedback 13 times, and 10 of them were recasts although she said correction after students' completion of their talk was better. This could be due to teacher individual differences as shown in Linh's comment that she elicited participation more frequently from students who were shy and quiet.

However, it should be noted that the concepts of timing (immediate vs delayed) in this study is not really comparable with findings of the studies by S. Li et al. (2016) and Quinn (2014), where feedback after 5 to 10 seconds from the time the errors were made was also considered as immediate. 'Immediate feedback' in this study refers to actual interruption of the student's utterance or immediate corrective response before the next turn.

The second respect of oral CF that shows partial congruence between these teachers' beliefs and practices is related to linguistic targets, involving 3 teachers: Thuy, Anh and Tu. These teachers claimed that pronunciation was the most important aspect of their teaching at primary schools, which was consistent with their practices. As discussed, this could be because of this particular context of the study where target English level for students is low (beginner), and teaching students how to pronounce the individual words correctly or producing simple and short sentences is the teachers' perceived objective of the programme. This context may guide teachers' beliefs and practices, which could lead to the consistency in their oral CF.

5.3.2. Incongruence

There was more incongruence than congruence between these teachers' beliefs and practices about different aspects of oral CF.

Preferred feedback type

One interesting incongruence found in the two sets of data (interviews and observations) is that all six teachers did not consider recasts as their preferred oral CF type, but except for Ngan, these teachers employed recasts as the most frequent CF type in their observed classes. Firstly, this could be due to the method of eliciting teachers' views about recasts where the scenario was in written form which might not fully reveal the corrective function of recast in the scenario. Experimental studies claim recasts to be less effective than other CF types because recasts are not salient and may not be able to draw learners' attention (see S. Li, 2010; Lyster et al., 2013 for reviews). Secondly, these teachers may consider corrective feedback only as explicit correction or prompts. Linh, for example, commented that recasts were not a feasible CF type because they were not salient, and thus not effective, but she employed them in 63% of her 49 CF moves. This shows a big gap between Linh's stated beliefs and her classroom behaviours. The explanation could lie behind her particular linguistic patterns of recasts and her stated beliefs about other CF types. Linh claimed to use meta-linguistic feedback the most followed by explicit correction. In her practice, however, out of her 31 recasts, 29 were didactic and explicit. The other teachers also used recasts in similar ways, focusing on language accuracy rather than supporting communication. These recasts might have been used to

save time because of the large class size, but they were treated in a way that is similar to explicit correction.

Also related to CF type, the teachers approved of the effectiveness of prompts rather than recasts, but CF in the 4 forms of prompts accounted for only 34.6%. These teachers' beliefs can be interpreted as "good" beliefs, as it is suggested in the literature that prompts are generally more effective than recasts (e.g. S. Li, 2010), but they may not be able to apply them to their practices. These findings indicate the gap between beliefs and practices, lending partial support to the assertion by Ölmezer-Öztürk (2016) that "teachers' feedback practices are inherently unplanned" (p. 8), and teachers are even not aware of the amount and types of CF they provide for their students (Roothooft, 2014). However, if we look closely at the linguistic patterns of these teachers' CF provision, previous literature may be challenged. Specifically, these teachers' recasts are mostly partial and didactic recasts which are more explicit, they are even not much different from explicit correction. Suggested prompts in the descriptive literature (e.g. Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Sheen, 2004) such as "I'm sorry?" (Clarification request), "What do you mean by X?" (Clarification request), "Can you say it in another way?" (Elicitation) were not normally used, but short imperative forms such as "again", "read again" were employed. For example,

S1: I fly an airplane and I take everyone to everywhere …what's my job

S2: Pilot [ˈpi lət]

T: read again *(Clarification request)*

S2: pilot [ˈpaılət]

In another example, Linh showed her weakness in language use when eliciting students' repair in an unusual way as shown below:

S: She was small. Now she is turn big

T: Right? Yes?

SS: No

T: Who can make again (*Elicitation*)

These two examples of prompts do not necessarily mean that these teachers provided wrong correction because these prompts are salient with clear corrective functions. However, these examples show that these teachers' classroom language use is probably in question, which might be the reason underlying the fact that these teachers opted for recasts instead of prompts in other situations because recasts were less cognitive demanding.

Given that these instructions are simple, these teachers' low English proficiency may not be the reason of the mismatch. Richards (2017) suggests that English language proficiency in general is different from English language use in the classroom. These examples of my study may suggest that although these teachers were aware of the effectiveness of oral CF, especially prompts, they could not employ them in their CF provision because they were not used to using expected standard prompts. This could be due to the fact that these teachers were not formally trained to practically provide feedback as revealed in their interviews. These teachers' practical skills of using various linguistic patterns to provide CF in the classroom may be questioned. This may lend support to Richards's (2017) claim for teaching English through English in that for non-native English language teachers, qualified English proficiency is not enough but teacher's discourse skills, as part of teacher pedagogy, are critical in their teaching performance.

Learner repair

Another incongruence was noted in these teachers' beliefs and practices about learner repair. All six teachers stated that student self-correction and peer-correction could draw students' attention to errors and help students remember the linguistic foci longer, thus more effective than teacher correction. This was claimed to be the priority in their feedback provision. However, there were only 20 self-correction moves and 9 peer-correction moves after 66 teacher prompts (44%). This rate is relatively low compared to the rate of learner repair in Choi and Li's (2012) study. However, what should be noted here is that teachers provided 63.3% of reformulation feedback out of 191 CF moves, resulting in fewer opportunities for students to think of their errors and self-repair. This finding may again indicate that teachers may not be able to do what they want to do. These teachers wanted to provide prompts after their students' errors to

elicit their self-repair or peer-repair, but they failed to do that and used more didactic recasts to provide students with the correct forms.

Two teachers (Han and Tu) said that their teaching experience could help them anticipate most their students' errors before the lesson, and they would sometimes intentionally create important errors and present them in front of the whole class for students to correct them. However, this kind of feedback did not occur in their observed classes.

Linguistic targets

The next incongruence noted is related to linguistic targets of oral CF. All six teachers said that errors related to pronunciation were the most frequently corrected, but Linh and Han corrected more grammar errors. However, Han said in the interview that for a lesson where grammar was the focus, she would try her best to make all students understand the use of that grammar point clearly. This was reflected in her practices in that 7 out of her 12 correction moves on students' grammar errors were related to students' use of third person singular in present simple tense when describing jobs. Therefore, the nature of the observed lessons may be the reason for this incongruence. This can be also noted in Linh's observation data. Specifically, in the first two lessons, Linh instructed students to describe the two pictures using adjectives of opposite meaning. For example, "He was slow now he's fast", and students were normally confused about the use of past and present form of "be". In the next two lessons, students made errors in comparative sentences as illustrated in this extract:

S: The tree is … old than the flower

T: older

One explanation for this finding could be based on Choi and Li's (2012) suggestion that focused events (i.e. an event revolving around a linguistic target) receive more CF than unfocused events. All four lessons by Linh in this study consisted of mostly focused events, and the linguistic foci seem more complicated than those in the other observed lessons (e.g. third person singular) (see Appendix 6 for a description of observed lessons' foci).

5.4. Summary of the discussion

This chapter has discussed the findings in relation to the literature on teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF. Firstly, it discussed the beliefs of the six participants about the benefits, types, linguistic targets, timing, sources of oral CF. It also discussed the affective responses that students might have towards teachers' oral CF. These teachers' beliefs are, to a large extent, different from those reported in the literature, especially their beliefs about the possible regative effects and the linguistic foci of oral CF.

In practice, these teachers provided 191 CF moves within 14 hours of teaching. This number is average compared with the results of a synthesis of 12 descriptive studies by Lyster et al. (2013). The teachers' use of CF types in general is not too different from the literature, but the language use in giving CF is sometimes problematic. These teachers provided more CF to pronunciation errors than to grammar or vocabulary errors, which is probably due to the context.

The chapter has also discussed the relationship between beliefs and practices about oral CF of these teachers. Some congruence was found in relation to the linguistic targets and the timing of oral CF, whereas the incongruence was related to CF types and CF providers. These congruence and incongruence are largely due to the context of teaching, the teachers' educational and professional backgrounds.

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION

6.1. Conclusion

This study provided several insights into a sample of six Vietnamese primary EFL teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF. While these teachers' beliefs and practices were congruent in some respects, more incongruence was found. The congruence and incongruence were interpreted in relation to the contextual parameters of the study.

It is interesting that pronunciation was the most frequent target of these teachers' CF, with 39.2% out of 191 CF moves. In the interviews, all six teachers also stated that pronunciation was the most important for students and pronunciation errrors were more worth correcting. This congruence was due to the teaching context where word pronunciation was one of the most important teaching objectives, and students tended to make more pronunciation errors than grammar or vocabulary errors.

One more aspect of congruence was related to the timing of teacher CF. These teachers stated that CF should be provided after students had finished their utterances, and interrupting students to provide CF should be avoided. These teachers stated that interrupting students may influence students' confidence and discourage their future participation.

All six teachers started teaching at primary level without any initial guidance or support. They all claimed to adapt themselves based on a number of factors, but nominated teaching experience as the most important factor shaping their beliefs and practices about oral CF. Basturkmen et al. (2004) speculated that teaching experience could help close the gap between teachers' beliefs and practices about incidental aspects of teaching such as oral CF. However, this is not the case in my study. These six teachers had more than 14 years of teaching experience (both primary and secondary level), but their beliefs and practices about various aspects of oral CF were still inconsistent.

These teachers gave a positive evaluation of prompts, and claimed to use prompts in their classroom to open opportunities for students to repair, but they used more recasts (didactic, explicit recasts) instead. These teachers' stated beliefs are in accordance with implications in experimental studies and suggestions of teaching methodologists, indicating that these teachers knew what they should do in giving students feedback on their spoken errors. However, the 'non-standard' expressions used in these teachers'

prompts (e.g. again, read again), the predominance of partial and didactic recasts, and the fact that the expected standard linguistic patterns of CF moves are simple (e.g. can you say it again?) may indicate that it is in fact teachers' problematic classroom discourse skills that influence their actual feedback provision, leading to the mismatch between teachers' beliefs and practices.

The fact that these teachers claimed not to consider learner affective responses an important factor influencing their CF provision, and their negative evaluation of recasts may challenge the common interpretation. Recasts have been found to be the most frequently used in the literature of different contexts, and the most common explanation is that teachers use recasts to avoid humiliating students, avoid discouraging students' confidence and motivation, and to save time. However, no teachers in this current study rated recasts as their favourite CF type, and no teachers claimed not to provide CF to avoid students' affective responses. This suggests that teachers' beliefs and practices of oral CF are at least partially contextually dependent. Any claim or generalisation about teacher preferences of oral CF types need to be made with clear reference to the context in which CF is operationalised.

No teachers stated preference for recasts, but recasts were found to be a major CF type by these teachers in their 14 hours of teaching (47.6%). What is worth noticing is that the majority of recasts used were partial, didactic and explicit. Recasts were used to reformulate pronunciation errors and grammar errors in a very similar way with explicit correction. This might mean that recasts were used in this study because they were less cognitive demanding than prompts and meta-linguistic feedback.

Although the study consisted of only 6 participants, it is important because a large number of EFL teachers in Vietnam share similar educational and professional backgrounds with these teachers who, in fact, could be considered as distinct in the literature. Also, the findings of this study suggest directions for further research with promising implications as discussed in Section 6.4.

6.2. Limitations

This study has some limitations that should be considered. As it was exploratory research carried out to inform the development of a subsequent doctoral study, the scope was necessarily limited. Firstly, there was no video recording of the classroom

observations because the context required a long and complicated ethics application procedure which was not feasible to undertake in the timeframe of the study. This limited me from looking at paralinguistic signals, one oral CF type suggested by Ellis (2009). Also, the lack of video recording limited me from examining errors made during student pair work or group work. Secondly, the small scope and the required depth of the study allowed me to include only a sample of 6 teacher participants. Such small sample might have constrained the findings of the study due to the teacher individual differences. Thirdly, the study did not incorporate stimulated recalls as a data collection method which could help explore the decision making of teachers in providing oral CF. Finally, there were no tests on teacher proficiency nor teacher classroom instruction skills which might have lent stronger support to the conclusions of this study.

6.3. Implications and recommendation of applications

Despite the small sample of participants, this exploratory study may have important potential implications because there are a large number of primary EFL teachers with similar educational and professional backgrounds in the place where this study was conducted and other places in Vietnam. The results of this study are important for in-service teacher professional development programmes, teacher training courses at universities and teacher competence assessment in Vietnam.

The first and foremost area of application is teacher professional development programmes for in-service primary EFL teachers in the province where the study was conducted. The possibility that teachers could not put their beliefs into practice about oral CF because of their problematic classroom discourse skills suggests that professional development programmes for current primary EFL teachers need to incorporate workshops on classroom oral CF provision techniques or instructions, focusing on both various techniques of prompts and recasts. Theoretical sessions on the effectiveness of different types of CF may also be helpful to raise teachers' awareness about oral CF because some teachers may consider oral CF as explicit correction. Workshops of this kind will help current teachers reflect on their beliefs and practices about oral CF, which may shape or reshape the beliefs of some teachers because teachers' beliefs about oral CF are changeable.

The findings of this study may be a good source of reference for current teachers of the context where it was conducted as well as other similar contexts. Teachers may reflect on their own beliefs and practices about oral CF, which may help them adapt their classroom use of oral CF in a way that is more diverse and beneficial.

The results of this study may also be helpful for current teacher training programmes at universities in Vietnam. Course designers may need to reconsider whether the adequate amount of input about oral CF has been incorporated into their programmes. It is suggested that oral CF input should be explicitly and practically oriented.

Finally, the findings of this study may contribute to the development of the framework of assessing English teacher competence in Vietnam, a heated issue for a decade but remaining unsolved. The findings that the six teachers did use *non-standard* patterns of prompts and most of their recasts were didactic imply that their English instructions in giving oral CF were problematic. This might ultimately have an influence on learner uptake and learner language development. This raises the question of whether education to improve current teacher English proficiency is more important than their pedagogical skills, particularly their skills of using English in the classroom. The greatest effort of Vietnam National 2020 Project has been to improve teachers' English proficiency, but teacher pedagogical competence might have not received adequate attention. The results of this study may suggest that classroom discourse skills could be given more attention in the assessment of English teachers in Vietnam. This lends support to a recent argument by Richards (2017) in that the way the competence of non-native English teachers in the world, especially those in Asian countries, is assessed may need to be reconsidered, and a new framework of assessing teachers may be needed. Further studies may be needed to confirm and develop these initial suggestions, as discussed in the following section.

6.4. Recommendation for further research

As discussed above about the implications and limitations of this study, there is a need of further research. At the very least, a PhD-scoped study is needed to explore to what extent classroom instruction skills mediate the relationship between Vietnamese primary EFL teachers' beliefs and practices about oral CF. The possible findings may lend more support to the suggestion of refining the framework of assessing non-native

English teacher competence in Vietnam and other similar contexts. Current assessment frameworks generally have an assumption that teachers of better English proficiency outperform their weaker counterparts, but do not always give due attention to classroom language. Specifically, a large-scale experimental study is needed to examine the influence of three parameters: teacher proficiency levels, teacher discourse skills and CF patterns on the effectiveness of oral CF via learner uptake, production tests and comprehension tests, and how teacher English proficiency interrelates with teacher performance in terms of giving CF. If this study is conducted, it will have potential contribution to the literature on CF effectiveness because previous research has been done with an assumption that classroom teachers were competent at both English proficiency and classroom discourse skills.

This current study is limited to the exploration of oral CF due to its small scope and the depth of the study. Other important aspects of classroom teaching related to classroom discourse skills of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers, such as instruction to organise learning activities, teachers' use of questions, or teachers' code-switching, are also in need of further research.

REFERENCES

Agudo, J. d. D. M. (2014). Beliefs in learning to teach: EFL student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. *Utrecht Studies in Language and Communication, 27*, 209-228.

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all?: Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(04), 543-574.

Arnett, K., & Turnbull, M. (2008). Teacher beliefs in second and foreign language teaching: A state-of-the-art review. In H. J. Sisken (Ed.), *From thought to action: Exploring beliefs and outcomes in the foreign language program* (pp. 9-28). Boston, USA: Thomson Heinle.

Barkhuizen, G. P., Benson, P., & Chik, A. (2013). *Narrative inquiry in language teaching and learning research*. New York: Routledge.

Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *System, 40*(2), 282-295.

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.

Borg, M. (2001). Teachers' beliefs. *ELT journal, 55*(2), 186-187.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching, 36*(02), 81-109.

Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System, 39*(3), 370-380.

Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language teaching research, 20*(4), 436-458.

Butler, Y. G. (2015). English language education among young learners in East Asia: A review of current research (2004–2014). *Language Teaching, 48*(3), 303-342.

Choi, S.-Y., & Li, S. (2012). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in a child ESOL classroom. *RELC Journal, 43*(3), 331-351.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

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

Croker, R. A. (2009). An introduction to qualitative research. In R. A. Croker & J. Heigham (Eds.), *Qualitative research in applied linguistics* (pp. 3-24). Berlin: Springer.

Dörnyei, Z. n. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics : quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206-257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Egi, T. (2007). Interpreting recasts as linguistic evidence: The roles of linguistic target, length, and degree of change. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 29*(04), 511-537.

Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focussed instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA Review, 19*(1), 18-41.

Ellis, R. (2007). The differential effects of corrective feedback on two grammatical structures. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 339-360). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal, 1*(1), 3-18.

Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(02), 335-349.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Preemptive focus on form in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(3), 407-432.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(2), 339.

Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(04), 575-600.

Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational research, 38*(1), 47-65.

Farrell, T. S., & Kun, S. T. K. (2008). Language policy, language teachers' beliefs, and classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(3), 381-403.

Flick, U. (2007). *Designing qualitative research*. London: SAGE.

Gass, S. M. (2013). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. London, UK: Routledge.

Gebhard, J. G. (1999). *Language teaching awareness: a guide to exploring beliefs and practices.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grotjahn, R. (1991). The research programme subjective theories. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*(02), 187-214.

Hannah, D. R., & Lautsch, B. A. (2011). Counting in qualitative research: Why to conduct it, when to avoid it, and when to closet it. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 20*(1), 14-22.

Harbon, L., & Shen, H. (2010). Researching Language Classrooms. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 274-285). London: Continuum.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow, UK: Pearson.

Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (Eds.). (2009). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: a practical introduction.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *The Modern Language Journal, 62*(8), 387-398.

Holliday, A. (2010). Analysing qualitative data. In B. P. a. A. Phakiti (Ed.), *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 98-110). London: Continuum.

Hu, B., & Tian, L. (2012). Do teachers and students share similar beliefs about teaching and learning strategies? *System, 40*(2), 237-254.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. New York, USA: Cambridge university press.

Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). Grammar teaching and learning in L2: necessary, but boring? *Foreign Language Annals, 44*(3), 467-494.

Jensen, M. T. r. s. (2001). *Corrective feedback to spoken errors in adult ESL classrooms.* Monash University, Faculty of Education.

Junqueira, L., & Kim, Y. (2013). Exploring the relationship between training, beliefs, and teachers' corrective feedback practices: A case study of a novice and an experienced ESL teacher. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 69*(2), 181-206.

Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & Sepehrinia, S. (2015). Preferences for interactional feedback: differences between learners and teachers. *The Language Learning Journal, 43*(1), 74-93.

Kamiya, N. (2016). The relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 10*(3), 206-219.

Karimi, M. N., & Asadnia, F. (2015). EFL teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback and their feedback-providing practices across learners' proficiency levels. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 34*(2), 39-68.

Kartchava, E. (2006). *Corrective feedback: novice ESL teachers' beliefs and practices*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis) Concordia University, Canada.

Kennedy, J. (1996). The role of teacher beliefs and attitudes in teacher behaviour. In G. T. Sachs, M. N. Brock, & R. Lo (Eds.), *Directions in second language teacher education* (pp. 107-122). Hongkong: City University of Hongkong.

Kırkgöz, Y., Babanoğlu, M. P., & Ağçam, R. (2015). Corrective Feedback in Primary EFL Classrooms in Turkey. *American International Journal of Social Science, 4*(3), 90-101.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. New York: SAGE.

Lee, J. (2007). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in English immersion classrooms at the primary level in Korea. *English Teaching, 62*(4), 311–334.

Li, L., & Walsh, S. (2011). 'Seeing is believing': looking at EFL teachers' beliefs through classroom interaction. *Classroom discourse, 2*(1), 39-57.

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language learning, 60*(2), 309-365.

Li, S. (2013). Oral corrective feedback. *ELT journal, 68*(2), 196-198.

Li, S. (2014). The interface between feedback type, L2 proficiency, and the nature of the linguistic target. *Language teaching research, 18*(3), 373-396.

Li, S. (2017). Teacher and learner beliefs about corrective feedback. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Milton: Taylor & Francis.

Li, S., Zhu, Y., & Ellis, R. (2016). The effects of the timing of corrective feedback on the acquisition of a new linguistic structure. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*(1), 276-295.

Lightbown, P. M. (2000). Anniversary article: Classroom SLA research and second language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 431-462.

Lightbown, P. M. (2008). Easy as pie? Children learning languages. *Concordia Working Papers in Applied Linguistics, 1*, 5-29.

Llinares, A., & Lyster, R. (2014). The influence of context on patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake: A comparison of CLIL and immersion classrooms. *The Language Learning Journal, 42*(2), 181-194.

Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult English L2 classroom: Characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(4), 536-556.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. De Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic press

Long, M. H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15-41). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20*(01), 51-81.

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(03), 399-432.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(01), 37-66.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (2013). Counterpoint piece: The case for variety in corrective feedback research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 35*(01), 167-184.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-anaylsis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(02), 265-302.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46*(1), 1-40.

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

Mackey, A., & Oliver, R. (2002). Interactional feedback and children's L2 development. *System, 30*(4), 459-477.

Mackey, A., Polio, C., & McDonough, K. (2004). The relationship between experience, education and teachers' use of incidental focus-on-form techniques. *Language teaching research, 8*(3), 301-327.

Marinova-Todd, S. H., Marshall, D. B., & Snow, C. E. (2000). Three misconceptions about age and L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(1), 9-34.

Mayo, M. d. P. G., & Lecumberri, M. L. G. (2003). *Age and the acquisition of English as a foreign language* (Vol. 4). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

McKay, S. (2006). *Researching second language classrooms*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd ed. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mori, R. (2011). Teacher cognition in corrective feedback in Japan. *System, 39*(4), 451-467.

Muñoz, C. (2006). The effects of age on foreign language learning: The BAF project. In C. Munoz (Ed.), *Age and the rate of foreign language learning* (Vol. 19, pp. 1-40). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Muñoz, C. (2008). Symmetries and asymmetries of age effects in naturalistic and instructed L2 learning. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(4), 578-596.

Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness, 9*(1), 34-51.

Ng, E., & Farrell, T. (2003). Do teachers' beliefs of grammar teaching match their classroom practices? A Singapore case study. In D. Deterding, L. E. Ling, & A. Brown (Eds.), *English in Singapore: Research on grammar* (pp. 128-137). Singapore: McGraw Hill.

Nguyen, C. D. (2017). Creating spaces for constructing practice and identity: innovations of teachers of English language to young learners in Vietnam. *Research Papers in Education, 32*(1), 56-70.

Nguyen, H. T. M. (2011). Primary English language education policy in Vietnam: Insights from implementation. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 12*(2), 225-249.

Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language learning, 51*(4), 719-758.

Oliver, R., & Azkarai, A. (2017). Review of Child Second Language Acquisition (SLA): Examining Theories and Research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 37*, 1-15.

Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2003). Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal, 87*(4), 519-533.

Ölmezer-Öztürk, E. (2016). Beliefs and practices of Turkish EFL teachers regarding oral corrective feedback: a small-scale classroom research study. *The Language Learning Journal, 44*, 1-10.

Ortega, L. (2014). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London, UK: Routledge.

Ozmen, K. S., & Aydin, H. U. (2015). Examining Student Teachers' Beliefs about Oral Corrective Feedback: Insights from a Teacher Education Program in Turkey. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(12), 141-164.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 573-595.

Pham, L. N. K., & Hamid, M. O. (2013). Beginning EFL teachers' beliefs about quality questions and their questioning practices. *Teacher Development, 17*(2), 246-264.

Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on "noticing the gap". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*(01), 99-126.

Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System, 37*(3), 380-390.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on Negotiation: What Does It Reveal About Second-Language Learning Conditions, Processes, and Outcomes? *Language learning, 44*(3), 493-527.

Plonsky, L., & Mills, S. V. (2006). An exploratory study of differing perceptions of error correction between a teacher and students: Bridging the gap. *Applied Language Learning, 16*(1), 55-74.

Polio, C., Gass, S., & Chapin, L. (2006). Using stimulated recall to investigate native speaker perceptions in native-nonnative speaker interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(02), 237-267.

Quinn, P. (2014). *Delayed versus immediate corrective feedback on orally produced passive errors in English.* (PhD), University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

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.

Ranta, L., & Lyster, R. (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral language abilities: The awareness-practice-feedback sequence. In R. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a Second Language: Perspectives from Applied Linguistics and Cognitive Psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2017). Teaching English through English: Proficiency, Pedagogy and Performance. *RELC Journal, 48*(1), 7-30.

Roothooft, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System, 46*, 65-79.

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

Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133-164). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Russell, V. (2009). Corrective feedback, over a decade of research since Lyster and Ranta (1997): Where do we stand today? *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 6*(1), 21-31.

Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2012). Investigating the pedagogical potential of recasts for L2 vowel acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(2), 387-398.

Sarandi, H. (2016). Oral Corrective Feedback: A Question of Classification and Application. *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(1), 235-246.

Sato, M. (2011). Constitution of form-orientation: Contributions of context and explicit knowledge to learning from recasts. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 14*(1), 1-28.

Sato, M., & Ballinger, S. (2012). Raising language awareness in peer interaction: a cross-context, cross-methodology examination. *Language Awareness, 21*(1-2), 157-179.

Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*(3), 343-364.

Sepehrinia, S., & Mehdizadeh, M. (2016). Oral corrective feedback: teachers' concerns and researchers' orientation. *The Language Learning Journal*, 1-18.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language teaching research, 8*(3), 263-300.

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language teaching research, 10*(4), 361-392.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback, language aptitude, and learner attitudes on the acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 301-322). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 593-610). New York, USA: Routledge.

Sippel, L., & Jackson, C. N. (2015). Teacher vs. Peer Oral Corrective Feedback in the German Language Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 48*(4), 688-705.

Vásquez, C., & Harvey, J. (2010). Raising teachers' awareness about corrective feedback through research replication. *Language teaching research, 14*(4), 421-443.

Yilmaz, Y. (2013). The relative effectiveness of mixed, explicit and implicit feedback in the acquisition of English articles. *System, 41*(3), 691-705.

Yilmaz, Y. (2016). The role of exposure condition in the effectiveness of explicit correction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 38*(01), 65-96.

Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York: Guilford Press.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research : design and methods* (Fifth edition. ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(2), 293-314.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1
Ethics Approval

MACQUARIE University

Xuan Ha <xuan.ha@students.mq.edu.au>

RE: HS Ethics Application - Approved (5201700189)(Con/Met)

1 message

FHS Ethics <fhs.ethics@mq.edu.au> Wed, Mar 22, 2017 at 4:17 PM
To: Jill Murray <jill.murray@mq.edu.au>
Cc: Xuan Ha <xuan.ha@students.mq.edu.au>

Dear Dr Murray,

Re: "Vietnamese EFL teachers' oral corrective feedback to primary learners: beliefs and practices."" (5201700189)

Thank you very much for your response. Your response has addressed the issues raised by the Faculty of Human Sciences Human Research Ethics Sub-Committee and approval has been granted, effective 22nd March 2017. This email constitutes ethical approval only.

This research meets the requirements of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). The National Statement is available at the following web site:

https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/book/national-statement-ethical-conduct-human-research

The following personnel are authorised to conduct this research:

Dr Jill Murray

Mr Viet Nguyen

Mr Xuan Van Ha

Please note the following standard requirements of approval:

1. The approval of this project is conditional upon your continuing compliance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007).

2. Approval will be for a period of five (5) years subject to the provision of annual reports.

Progress Report 1 Due: 22nd March 2018

Progress Report 2 Due: 22nd March 2019

Progress Report 3 Due: 22nd March 2020

Progress Report 4 Due: 22nd March 2021

Final Report Due: 22nd March 2022

NB. If you complete the work earlier than you had planned you must submit a Final Report as soon as the work is completed. If the project has been discontinued or not commenced for any reason, you are also required to submit a Final Report for the project.

Progress reports and Final Reports are available at the following website:

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/current_research_staff/human_research_ethics/resources

3. If the project has run for more than five (5) years you cannot renew approval for the project. You will need to complete and submit a Final Report and submit a new application for the project. (The five year limit on renewal of approvals allows the Sub-Committee to fully re-review research in an environment where legislation, guidelines and requirements are continually changing, for example, new child protection and privacy laws).

4. All amendments to the project must be reviewed and approved by the Sub-Committee before implementation. Please complete and submit a Request for Amendment Form available at the following website:

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/current_research_staff/human_research_ethics/managing_approved_research_projects

5. Please notify the Sub-Committee immediately in the event of any adverse effects on participants or of any unforeseen events that affect the continued ethical acceptability of the project.

6. At all times you are responsible for the ethical conduct of your research in accordance with the guidelines established by the University. This information is available at the following websites:

http://www.mq.edu.au/policy

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/current_research_staff/human_research_ethics/managing_approved_research_projects

If you will be applying for or have applied for internal or external funding for the above project it is your responsibility to provide the Macquarie University's Research Grants Management Assistant with a copy of this email as soon as possible. Internal and External funding agencies will not be informed that you have approval for your project and funds will not be released until the Research Grants Management Assistant has received a copy of this email.

If you need to provide a hard copy letter of approval to an external organisation as evidence that you have approval, please do not hesitate to contact the Ethics Secretariat at the address below.

Please retain a copy of this email as this is your official notification of ethics approval.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Naomi Sweller

Chair

Faculty of Human Sciences

Human Research Ethics Sub-Committee

FHS Ethics

Faculty of Human Sciences Ethics

C5C-17 Wallys Walk L3

Macquarie University, NSW 2109, Australia

T: +61 2 9850 4197 | http://www.research.mq.edu.au/

Ethics Forms and Templates

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/current_research_staff/human_research_ethics/resources

The Faculty of Human Sciences acknowledges the traditional custodians of the Macquarie University Land, the Wattamattageal clan of the Darug nation, whose cultures and customs have nurtured and continue to nurture this land since the Dreamtime. We pay our respects to Elders past, present and future.

Appendix 2

Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Human Sciences
MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY NSW 2109
Phone: +61 (0)2 9850 8740
Fax: +61 (0) 2 9850 9199
Email: jill.murray@mq.edu.au

Chief Investigator's / Supervisor's Name & Title: Jill Murray

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM

Name of Project: **Teachers' beliefs and practices regarding oral corrective feedback in EFL primary classrooms in Vietnam**

You are invited to participate in a study entitled *Primary EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in Vietnam*. The purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback and their actual practices in the classrooms in order to inform the teacher development programmes and classroom teaching techniques in the specific context of English education at Vietnamese primary schools.

The study is being conducted by Mr Xuan Ha (email: xuan.ha@students.mq.edu.au) to meet the requirements of his MRes degree under the supervision of Dr Jill Murray (email: jill.murray@mq.edu.au) of the Faculty of Human Sciences.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to be involved in an interview whose purpose is to collect data about your beliefs about English language teaching. You will also be asked to be observed four teaching sessions at a grade 5 class. All the interviews and the teaching will be audio-recorded for data transcriptions and analyses. The interview will take between 30 minutes and 1 hour.

Any information or personal details gathered in the course of the study are confidential, except as required by law. No individual will be identified in any publication of the results. Quotes from your responses to the questionnaire will be used in the thesis or resulting publications but they will always be de-identified. Only the researcher and his supervisor (Mr Xuan Ha and Dr Jill Murray) will have access to the data. A summary of

the results of the study can be made available to you on request if you contact Xuan Ha at the email given above.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary: you are not obliged to participate and if you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without having to give a reason and without consequences.

I, *(participant's name*) have read and understand the information above and any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research, knowing that I can withdraw from further participation in the research at any time without consequences. I have been given a copy of this form to keep.

Participant's Name:_____

(Block letters)

Participant's Signature: _____ Date:_____

Investigator's Name:_____

(Block letters)

Investigator's Signature: _____ __ Date:_____

The ethical aspects of this study have been approved by the Macquarie University Human Research Ethics Committee. If you have any complaints or reservations about any ethical aspect of your participation in this research, you may contact the Committee through the Director, Research Ethics & Integrity (telephone (02) 9850 7854; email ethics@mq.edu.au). Any complaint you make will be treated in confidence and investigated, and you will be informed of the outcome.

Vietnamese version (Bản tiếng Việt)

Phụ lục 2

Phân khoa Ngôn ngữ học
Khoa khoa học nhân văn
ĐẠI HỌC MACQUARIE, NSW 2109
Điện thoại: +61 (0)2 9850 8740
Fax: +61 (0) 2 9850 9199
Email: jill.murray@mq.edu.au

Người hướng dẫn – Họ tên và chức danh: Tiến sĩ Jill Murray

BẢN THÔNG TIN VÀ XÁC NHẬN ĐỒNG THUẬN

CỦA NGƯỜI THAM GIA NGHIÊN CỨU

Tên đề tài: *"Niềm tin và thực tiễn giảng dạy của giáo viên tiếng Anh tiểu học ở Việt Nam".*

Quý thầy/ cô được mời tham gia nghiên cứu về niềm tin và thực tiễn giảng dạy tiếng Anh ở cấp tiểu học ở Việt Nam. Mục đích của nghiên cứu này là tìm hiểu mối quan hệ giữa niềm tin và thực tiễn giáo viên ở trong lớp học, qua đó, nhằm đề xuất giải pháp cho các chương trình đào tạo giáo viên, các khóa bồi dưỡng nghiệp vụ cho giáo viên cũng như thực tiễn giảng dạy tiếng Anh tiểu học ở Việt Nam.

Người thực hiện đề tài này là ông Hà Văn Xuân (email: xuan.ha@students.mq.edu.au) dưới sự hướng dẫn của Tiến sĩ Jill Murray (email: jill.murray@mq.edu.vn), Khoa Khoa học nhân văn – Trường Đại học Macquarie.

Nếu đồng ý tham gia vào nghiên cứu này, quý thầy/ cô sẽ được yêu cầu tham gia 1 cuộc phỏng vấn kéo dài từ 30 phút đến 1 giờ. Mục đích của cuộc phỏng vấn là nhằm thu thập thông tin về niềm tin, quan điểm giảng dạy của của quý thầy/ cô. Thầy/ cô cũng được yêu cầu giảng dạy 4 tiết ở lớp 5 để nghiên cứu viên dự giờ lớp học. Cả cuộc phỏng vấn và 4 tiết dự giờ sẽ được ghi âm, nhằm phục vụ cho việc phiên âm và phân tích dữ liệu cho nghiên cứu.

Bất kỳ thông tin cá nhân nào thu thập được sẽ được đảm bảo riêng tư tuyệt đối trừ khi pháp luật yêu cầu. Trong các ấn phẩm có liên quan tới nghiên cứu này, các cá nhân đều không được nhận diện. Các trích dẫn trong các câu trả lời trong bảng hỏi có thể được sử dụng trong luận văn hoặc các ấn phẩm có liên quan nhưng sẽ được để khuyết danh. Chỉ có tác giả và giảng viên hướng dẫn được quyền sử dụng số liệu. Nếu quý thầy/ cô muốn có thông tin tóm tắt về kết quả nghiên cứu, xin vui lòng liên hệ ông Hà Văn Xuân theo địa chỉ email đã cung cấp ở trên.

Sự tham gia của quý thầy/ cô là hoàn toàn tự nguyện: quý thầy/ cô không bắt buộc phải tham gia và nếu có tham gia, quý thầy/ cô có thể rút khỏi nghiên cứu bất cứ khi nào mà không cần phải giải thích nguyên nhân hay phải chịu hậu quả nào.

Tôi, *(tên người tham gia)* _____ đã đọc và hiểu những thông tin ở trên và tất cả những câu hỏi của tôi đều được trả lời thỏa đáng. Tôi đồng ý tham gia vào nghiên cứu này và hiểu rằng tôi có thể rút khỏi nghiên cứu này bất cứ khi nào tôi muốn. Tôi đã giữ một bản của tài liệu này.

Tên người tham gia: _____–
(Chữ viết hoa)

Chữ ký người tham gia: _____Ngày: _____
(Chữ viết hoa)

Chữ ký người thực hiện nghiên cứu: _____Ngày: _____

Tiêu chuẩn đạo đức của nghiên cứu này đã được Hội đồng thẩm định các nghiên cứu về con người Trường Đại học Macquarie chấp thuận. Nếu quý thầy/ cô có bất kỳ thắc mắc hay lưu tâm gì về mặt đạo đức khi tham gia nghiên cứu này xin vui lòng liên lạc với Hội đồng (theo số điện thoại: +61298507854 hoặc địa chỉ email: ethics@mq.edu.au). Mọi băn khoăn của quý thầy/ cô sẽ được lưu ý riêng tư và quý thầy cô sẽ nhận được phúc đáp về những băn khoăn của mình.

Appendix 3

Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Human Sciences
MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY NSW 2109
Phone: +61 (0)2 9850 8740
Fax: +61 (0) 2 9850 9199
Email: jill.murray@mq.edu.au

CORRESPONDENCE TO PRINCIPAL OF PRIMARY SCHOOL

Dear *(name of Principal)* ,

I am conducting a project entitled *Primary EFL Teachers' beliefs and practices in Vietnam* for my Master of Research program at Macquarie University, and I am contacting you to ask for your assistance in recruiting participants for my study.

The English teachers at your school are potential participants, and so I am writing to ask for your permission to conduct my research at your school with the participation of one English teacher of grade 5. Accordingly, I wish you can allow me to interview one teacher and observe this teacher teaching 4 sessions of grade 5 English classes. If you allow me to conduct my study at your school, I will ask for consent from your teacher.

Your help and support would be very much appreciated, and I thank you in advance for your consideration.
I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Xuan Ha

Vietnamese version (Bản tiếng Việt)

Phụ lục 3

Phân khoa Ngôn ngữ học
Khoa khoa học nhân văn
ĐẠI HỌC MACQUARIE NSW 2109
Điện thoại: +61 (0)2 9850 8740
Fax: +61 (0) 2 9850 9199

Email: jill.murray@mq.edu.au

THƯ GỬI HIỆU TRƯỞNG TRƯỜNG TIỂU HỌC

Kính gửi ông/ bà _____ ,

Tôi đang thực hiện nghiên cứu có tên *"Niềm tin và thực tiễn giảng dạy của giáo viên tiếng Anh tiểu học ở Việt Nam"* cho luận văn của chương trình thạc sỹ nghiên cứu tại Đại học Macquarie. Chúng tôi gửi thư này đến quý ông/ bà với mong muốn ông/ bà nhận lời hỗ trợ chúng tôi tìm người tham gia nghiên cứu trên.

Do các giáo viên tiếng Anh tiểu học và học sinh lớp 5 của trường ông/ bà là những người phù hợp để tham gia vào nghiên cứu của chúng tôi, tôi viết thư này kính mong ông/ bà cho phép tôi được tiến hành nghiên cứu của mình tại trường của ông. Chúng tôi mong ông cho phép chúng tôi phỏng vấn 01 giáo viên tiếng Anh lớp 5 và dự giờ 4 tiết dạy tiếng Anh của giáo viên này.

Chúng tôi viết thư này để xin phép ông/ bà tạo điệu kiện cho chúng tôi được tiến hành nghiên cứu tại trường của ông/ bà với sự tham gia của 01 giáo viên tiếng Anh lớp 5.

Chúng tôi trân trọng cảm ơn sự xem xét, tạo điều kiện của ông/ bà để chúng tôi có thể hoàn thành nghiên cứu của mình.

Rất mong sớm nhận được hồi âm từ phía ông/ bà!

Trân trọng!

Hà Văn Xuân

Appendix 4

Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Human Sciences
MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY NSW 2109
Phone: +61 (0)2 9850 8740
Fax: +61 (0) 2 9850 9199
Email: jill.murray@mq.edu.au
Chief investigator's / Supervisor's name & Title: Dr Jill Murray

ADVERTISEMENT OF PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT

Dear English teachers,

If you are a teacher of English of grade 5, you are warmly invited to participate in my study entitled *Primary EFL Teachers' beliefs and practices.* The purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their actual practices in the classrooms in order to contribute to the knowledge of this field and inform the teacher development programmes and classroom teaching techniques in the specific context of English education at Vietnamese primary schools. The study is being conducted by Mr Xuan Ha (email: xuan.ha@students.mq.edu.au) to meet the requirements of MRes degree under the supervision of Dr Jill Murray (email: jill.murray@mq.edu.au) of the Faculty of Human Sciences.

Your participation will make a significant contribution to research in this field.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to take part in an interview whose purpose is to collect data about your beliefs about your English language teaching. You will also be asked to be observed during four teaching sessions at a grade 5 class. All the interviews and the teaching sessions will be audio-recorded for data transcriptions and analyses. The interview will take between 30 minutes and 1 hour.

We will not be asking you anything sensitive, and the information gathered from you is absolutely anonymous. You will be free to withdraw from all or any parts of the study or questionnaire without any explanation and consequences.

If you are willing to participate in this study or have any further questions, please contact Xuan Ha at xuan.ha@students.mq.edu.au.

Sincere thanks.

Xuan Ha

Vietnamese version (Bản tiếng Việt)

Phụ lục 4

Phân khoa Ngôn ngữ học
Khoa khoa học nhân văn
ĐẠI HỌC MACQUARIE NSW 2109
Điện thoại: +61 (0)2 9850 8740

Fax: +61 (0) 2 9850 9199

Email: jill.murray@mq.edu.au

Người hướng dẫn – Họ tên và chức danh: Tiến sĩ Jill Murray

THÔNG TIN TUYỂN DỤNG NGƯỜI THAM GIA NGHIÊN CỨU

Kính gửi các giáo viên tiếng Anh!

Nếu quý thầy/ cô là giáo viên tiếng Anh đang dạy lớp 5 ở trường tiểu học ở Hà Tĩnh, tôi rất vui mừng được mời thầy/ cô tham gia nghiên cứu của tôi có tên *Niềm tin và thực tiễn giảng dạy của giáo viên tiếng Anh tiểu học ở Việt Nam.* Mục đích của nghiên cứu này là tìm hiểu mối quan hệ giữa niềm tin và thực tiễn giáo viên trong việc giảng dạy tiếng Anh, qua đó, nhằm đề xuất giải pháp cho các chương trình đào tạo giáo viên, các khóa bồi dưỡng nghiệp vụ cho giáo viên cũng như thực tiễn giảng dạy tiếng Anh tiểu học ở Việt Nam. Đề tài này do ông Hà Văn Xuân (email: xuan.ha@students.mq.edu.au) thực hiện theo yêu cầu luận văn của chương trình thạc sĩ nghiên cứu, dưới sự hướng dẫn của Tiến sĩ Jill Murray (email: jill.murray@mq.edu.au), Khoa Khoa học nhân văn – Trường Đại học Macquarie.

Sự tham gia của các thầy/ cô sẽ đóng góp có ý nghĩa cho những nghiên cứu trong lĩnh vực này.

Nếu đồng ý tham gia vào nghiên cứu, quý thầy/ cô sẽ được mời tham gia một cuộc phỏng vấn về niềm tiên, quan điểm của thầy cô đối với việc giảng dạy tiếng Anh ở lớp 5. Các thông tin cơ bản về tuổi, kinh nghiệm giảng dạy, quá trình thầy cô được đào tạo và bồi dưỡng nghiệp vụ cũng được thu thập để phục vụ nghiên cứu. Cuộc phỏng vấn này có thể kéo dài từ 30 phút đến 1 giờ. Thầy/ cô cũng sẽ được yêu cầu cho nghiên cứu viên dự giờ 4 tiết dạy tiếng Anh lớp 5.

Chúng tôi đảm bảo không có thông tin nào trong cuộc phỏng vấn mang tính nhạy cảm, tất cả các thông tin thu thập từ phía quý thầy/ cô đều đảm bảo tuyệt đối bí mật và khuyết danh. Quý thầy/ cô có thể rút khỏi nghiên cứu bất cứ khi nào mà không cần phải giải thích nguyên nhân hay phải chịu hậu quả nào.

Nếu quý thầy/ cố đồng ý tham gia nghiên cứu này hoặc có bất kỳ thắc mắc nào xin vui lòng liên hệ ông Hà Văn Xuân (email: xuan.ha@students.mq.edu.au).

Trân trọng cảm ơn!

Hà Văn Xuân

Appendix 5

Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Human Sciences
MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY NSW 2109
Phone: +61 (0)2 9850 8740
Fax: +61 (0) 2 9850 9199

Email: jill.murray@mq.edu.au

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR TEACHERS

This interview has been designed to gather data for a research study. The purpose of this interview is to collect data about your beliefs on oral corrective feedback you give to your students when they make erroneous utterances. Your answers will be used for research only. There is no right or wrong answer to the questions. Please answer the questions as honestly as possible. Thank you very much for your support.

Concept clarifications

Oral corrective feedback (Oral CF): Teachers' responses to students' spoken errors in the classroom; errors may relate to grammatical forms, meanings, pronunciations, or any other language aspects.

Teachers' beliefs: This term is used as a generic term to refer to the statements that teachers make about their ideas, thoughts and knowledge that are expressed as evaluations of what should be done, what should be the case and what is preferable.

Part 1. Content interview questions

1. Imagine that your student has made the following error. How do you give oral CF on this error? Can you please number them from one to six in order of your preference: from the one you prefer most to the one you prefer least?

Student: 'I don't go to school in Sunday'.
You say:
(a) 'on Sunday'
(b) 'not in Sunday, say on Sunday'

(c) ‘with days, which preposition do we use?’ (in Vietnamese or in English?)

(d) ‘In Sunday (with a rising intonation)’

(e) ‘Sorry?’ or ‘Can you repeat that again?’

(f) ‘I don’t go to school ...? (you omit the erroneous part of the sentence and repeat the sentence with a rising intonation).

2. Can you comment in more details about the six types of feedback above?

3. How often do you correct your students’ errors?

4. When do you prefer to give oral CF? (immediately after your student makes an error (immediate feedback) or waiting for the student to finish his/her utterance (delayed feedback)).

5. How do you give oral CF to your students’ errors? Do you correct them on your own or do you expect your student to self-correct them?

6. How often do you use peer-correction? (letting students correct each other) what do you think about this technique?

7. Do you give different kinds of feedback to different students? If yes, what do you do and why?

8. What types of errors (e.g. grammar, spelling, pronunciation, meaning, word choice, etc.) can oral CF benefit the most? Why?

9. Are there any situations where you do not give oral CF to your students’ errors? Why not?

10. Do you think it is necessary to give feedback to all kinds of errors? If not, what types of errors do you think should be focused on? Why?

11. Do you find it easy or difficult to give your students feedback on their oral errors? Why?

12. What is the most important factor or criterion you take into account when correcting your students’ spoken errors? What are the factors that inform your corrective decisions? How does this (these) factor(s) affect your correction?

13. Can you comment on the influence of your education and professional development programme on your beliefs about oral CF?

14. Do you think the way you manage feedback is the same as your colleagues? Have their practices impacted at all on the way you manage feedback?

15. Do you find it difficult to give feedback in English?

16. Are there any situations to use English in the classroom that you would like to improve? Why?

17. Would you like to attend professional development programmes on oral corrective feedback if these were available? What would you expect to gain? Why?

18. Do you think your students expect to get feedback on their oral errors?

19. How do you think your students feel when you give them feedback on their oral errors?

20. Do you think students' emotional reaction is also important? If yes, to what extent and why? Have you ever decided not to correct a learner because correction might hurt his/her feelings?

21. Do you believe that oral CF is useful in your teaching? Why/Why not?

22. Do you think your students benefit from your feedback on their oral errors? Why (not)?

23. Can you recall any of the recent situations where you provided students oral CF? Can you comment on how they helped your students and your lesson?

Part 2. Personal and professional background

1. What is your name? How old are you?

2. How long have you been teaching English at primary school? Have you ever taught English at any other level (rather than primary level)?

3. Please tell me about your educational background regarding your English learning, your training to be a teacher, the professional development programmes, your self-professional development, etc.

Vietnamese Version (Bản tiếng Việt)

Phụ lục 5

Phân khoa Ngôn ngữ học
Khoa Khoa học nhân văn
Trường Đại học Macquarie NSW 2109
ĐT: +61 (0)2 9850 8740
Fax: +61 (0) 2 9850 9199

Email: jill.murray@mq.edu.au

CÂU HỎI PHỎNG VẤN DÀNH CHO GIÁO VIÊN

Cuộc phỏng vấn này được thiết kế để thu thập dữ liệu cho một nghiên cứu về niềm tin, quan điểm và hiểu biết của thầy/ cô về việc giảng dạy tiếng Anh ở trường tiểu học. Thông tin trong cuộc phỏng vấn này chỉ dùng cho mục đích nghiên cứu, do vậy, các câu trả lời sẽ không được đánh giá là sai hay đúng.

Xin thầy/ cô vui lòng trả lời một cách thành thật nhất có thể.

Xin chân thành cảm ơn sự giúp đỡ của thầy/ cô.

Khái niệm

Phản hồi hiệu chỉnh dạng nói (Oral CF): Sự phản hồi của giáo viên tới các lỗi sai trong ngôn ngữ nói của học sinh trong lớp học; lỗi có thể liên quan đến ngữ pháp, ngữ nghĩa, ngữ âm hoặc bất kỳ khía cạnh nào khác của ngôn ngữ.

Niềm tin của giáo viên: Khái niệm này được dùng như một khái niệm tổng quát để chỉ những nhận định của giáo viên về ý tưởng, suy nghĩ, kiến thức, quan điểm, niềm tin mà được thể hiện dưới các dạng thức đánh giá điều gì nên và không nên.

CÂU HỎI PHỎNG VẤN

1. Hãy tưởng tượng một học sinh đã mắc lỗi như tình huống sau. Thầy/ cô sửa lỗi này cho học sinh như thế nào? Thầy/ cô có thể xếp các cách sửa lỗi này theo thứ tự ưu tiên, từ cách thầy/ cô thích dùng nhất (1) đến cách thầy cô ít dùng nhất (6)?

> Student: 'I don't go to school in Sunday'.
> You say:
> (a) 'on Sunday'/I don't go to school on Sunday
> (b) 'not in Sunday, say on Sunday'
> (c) 'with days, which preposition do we use?' (bằng tiếng Việt hay bằng tiếng Anh?)
> (d) 'On Sunday? (Lên giọng cuối câu)'
> (e) 'Sorry?' or 'Can you repeat that again?'
> (f) 'I don't go to school ...? (bỏ trống phần lỗi của học sinh và nhắc lại câu với giọng cao ở cuối câu).

2. Thầy cô làm ơn cho nhận xét chi tiết về 6 cách sửa lỗi trên được không?

3. Thầy/ cô có thường xuyên sửa lỗi cho học sinh của mình không? Mức độ thường xuyên như thế nào?

4. Thầy cô thường muốn đưa ra nhận xét của mình khi nào? (Ngay sau khi học sinh mắc lỗi, hay chờ cho học sinh nói xong mới sửa?)

5. Thầy/ cô sửa lỗi cho học sinh theo cách nào? Thầy/ cô trực tiếp sửa cho học sinh, để cho học sinh tự sửa, hay để cho học sinh sửa lỗi cho nhau?

6. Thầy/ cô có thường xuyên để cho học sinh sửa lỗi cho nhau không? Thầy/ cô nghĩ như thế nào về kỹ thuật này?

7. Thầy/ cô có sử dụng các cách/ loại sửa lỗi, nhận xét khác nhau cho các học sinh khác nhau không? Nếu có, thầy/ cô làm gì? Tại sao?

8. Các loại lỗi nào (ví dụ: ngữ pháp, ngữ âm, ngữ nghĩa, sự lựa chọn từ ngữ, vvv…) nên được sửa thông qua phương pháp phản hồi hiệu chỉnh nhất? Tại sao?

9. Có khi nào thầy/ cô không đưa ra phản hồi hiệu chỉnh khi học sinh của mình mắc lỗi không? Tại sao không?

10. Thầy/ cô có cho rằng tất cả các loại lỗi sai của học sinh trên lớp học đều phải được sửa? Tại sao?

Nếu không, thể loại lỗi nào cần được để ý nhiều hơn? Tại sao?

11. Thầy/ cô cảm thấy khó hay dễ khi sửa lỗi cho học sinh? Tại sao?

12. Điều gì/ yếu tố gì quan trọng nhất mà thầy cô phải xem xét khi sửa lỗi cho học sinh? Những yếu tố gì ảnh hưởng đến quyết định sửa lỗi cho học sinh của thầy cô? (Những) yếu tố này ảnh hưởng đến việc sửa lỗi của thầy cô như thế nào?

13. Thầy cô có thể nhận xét về sự ảnh hưởng của các yếu tố sau đây đến niềm tin/ quan điểm của thầy cô về việc sửa lỗi cho học sinh được không?

- Quá trình thầy cô được học tiếng Anh

- Quá trình được đào tạo thành giáo viên

- Các chương trình/ khóa học bồi dưỡng nghiệp vụ thường xuyên

14. Thầy/ cô có cho rằng phương pháp sửa lỗi của thầy cô giống với các đồng nghiệp khác trong trường và ngoài trường không? Việc sửa lỗi của họ có ảnh hưởng gì đến phương pháp sửa lỗi của thầy/ cô không?

15. Thầy/ cô có gặp khó khăn khi sửa lỗi cho học sinh bằng tiếng Anh không?

16. Có khía cạnh nào về việc sử dụng tiếng Anh trong lớp học, đặc biệt là khi chữa lỗi cho học sinh, mà thầy/ cô muốn cải thiện không? Vì sao?

17. Thầy cô có mong muốn tham gia các khóa bồi dưỡng về phản hồi hiệu chỉnh dạng nói nếu có cơ hội hay không? Nếu có, thầy/ cô mong muộn nhận được điều gì? Vì sao?

18. Thầy/ cô có cho rằng học sinh mong muốn được sửa lỗi không?

19. Thầy/ cô nghĩ học sinh sẽ cảm thấy thế nào khi thầy cô sửa lỗi cho học sinh?

20. Thầy/ cô có nghĩ rằng phản ứng về tâm lý/ cảm xúc của học sinh là quan trọng? Nếu có, quan trọng như thế nào, tại sao? Thầy/ cô đã bao giờ quyết định không sửa lỗi cho học sinh vì cho rằng việc sửa lỗi đó sẽ ảnh hưởng đến tâm lý/ cảm xúc của học sinh chưa?

21 Thầy/ cô có tin rằng phản hồi hiệu chỉnh rất có ích trong việc giảng dạy không? Tại sao/ tại sao không?

22. Thầy/ cô có nghĩ rằng học sinh của mình sẽ được hưởng lợi từ việc sửa lỗi của thầy/ cô trên lớp học hay không? Tại sao (không)?

23. Thầy/ cô có thể nhớ lại một vài tình huống sửa lỗi gần đây không? Thầy/ cô có thể cho biết việc sửa lỗi như thế sẽ giúp ích như thế nào cho học sinh?

Phần 2. Thông tin cá nhân và lịch sử nghề nghiệp

1. Thầy/ cô tên gì? Thầy/ cô bao nhiêu tuổi?

2. Thầy/ cô đã dạy tiếng Anh cấp tiểu học được bao lâu? Đã bao giờ thầy/ cô dạy tiếng Anh cho các cấp độ khác chưa?

3. Thầy/ cô làm ơn cho tôi biết về trình độ học vấn, bằng cấp, chứng chỉ và các khóa đào tạo nghiệp vụ cũng như việc bồi dưỡng nghiệp vụ sư phạm của mình.

Appendix 6

LESSON DESCRIPTION

This section briefly describes the six classes observed and the 24 observed lessons' foci.

All six classes used the same textbook. It was called Let's Go 3

Nakata, R., Frazier, K., Hoskins, B. (2007). *Let's Go 3* (3rd Eds). Oxford University Press.

There were 24 lessons observed. 21 of them were based on the textbook. Some of them were repeated among teachers. 2 lessons were designed based on a particular topic, about which students talked in pairs or groups without any particular linguistic structure. The remaining one lesson was also topic based, but this one had a clear linguistic focus (Tu's lesson).

All schools had similar classroom where desks were arranged in lines and fixed. It was difficult for students to move around the classroom.

1. Ms Ngan

Class: 5D

Number of students: 42

This school is located in the centre of the city. This is one of the two oldest schools located in one of the two most populous wards of the city. This school is perceived to be one of the two best schools of the city in terms of quality of students and teachers, as well as teaching facilities. There was three English teachers at this school.

Due to the large population of the area, student number per class is big, with this class having 42 students. Students of this school might have the most opportunities to take extra classes of English out of their schools. They were perceived to be more active and better at English in general than students from other schools.

Ngan's classroom has internet connection, and she used her personal computer.

Lesson 1

Date: 10th April 2017

Time: 8:10

Textbook: None

Lesson title: Family

This is a topic based lesson. Teachers organised students to talk in groups about their family. Then individual group presented their work orally in front of the class.

Note: There was no specific linguistic focus of the lesson. There were some errors but no teacher oral CF was provided.

Lesson 2

Date: 11th April 2017

Time: 8:05

Textbook: Let's go 3, p. 64

Lesson title: Unit 8. Let's Talk (Sports)

In this lesson, students reviewed some words about sports. They then learned how to ask and answer about the sport they prefer. For example:

S1: Which sport do you like more?

S2: I like soccer more.

Lesson 3

Date: 12th April 2017

Time: 8:05

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 72

Lesson title: Units 7-8. Listen and review

In this lesson, students learned English listening skill at a 'Listening' room. This room was designed to learn English and IT. It consisted of individual computer with earphones for every student. Students sat in their own cabin.

Students listen and answer the questions in the textbook.

Lesson 4

Date: 13th April 2017

Time: 8:10

Textbook: Let's go 3, p. 66

Lesson title: Unit 8. Let's learn

In this lesson, students learned the adjectives related to a person's appearances and used them to compare the different appearance features of a person now and the past.

E.g. He was small. Now he is big.

2. Ms Thuy

Class: 5A

Thuy's school is located in a new and small ward of the city. It is perceived to be a poorer and lower in quality of teaching and learning compared to other schools in the city. This is just because this area has just been recently become a ward of the city, before this was a commune of another district. Students here did not have many opportunities to take extra classes in language centres like students in schools which were closer to the city centre. There was two English teacher at this school.

Thuy taught this class in a language learning room, designed for students to learn English, with basic traditional and modern facilities such as a chalkboard, a computer, a projector, and loudspeakers.

The number of students of this class was only 29, smaller than in other schools.

This class learned English in one lesson of 35 minutes at a time. 4 lessons were taught separately during the week.

Lesson 1

Date: 3rd April 2017

Time: 2:15

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 60

Lesson title: Unit 7. Let's learn more A&B

In this lesson, students learned words describing jobs, and learned how to say sentences such as:

A photographer takes pictures

Lesson 2

Date: 4th April 2017

Time: 7:30

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 61.

Lesson title: Unit 7. Let's learn more C

In this lesson, students learned how to ask and answer about a person's job.

E.g. What does a salesclerk do? A salesclerk sells things

Lesson 3

Date: 10th April

Time: 3:50

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 61

Lesson title: Unit 7. Let's learn more D

In this lesson, students learned how to add places to a sentence describing a person's job

E.g. A mechanic fixes cars in a garage. A salesclerk sells things in a store

Lesson 4

Date: 11th April, 2017

Time: 9:50

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 62

Let's title: Unit 7. Let's build A

In this lesson, students played games describing and guessing jobs

E.g.

S1: I'm working in a store. I sell things. What's my job?

S2: You are a salesclerk

3. Ms Linh

Class: 5B

Linh's school is located near the city centre, but it is not considered to be a top school in the city. The classroom is old-fashioned, and very narrow. The number of students in this class is very large, 40 students. There are 16 primary schools in the city, this school is perceived to be a school of average quality. Ms Linh was the only English teacher at this school, which made her work overloaded.

Linh's classes were observed the last among six teachers. Linh's class did two lessons successively. After the first two lessons to be observed, Linh was sick and she took two weeks off. Therefore, the last two lessons were observed 3 weeks later from the first two lessons.

Linh used a loudspeaker with microphone attached to her pocket. Some other teachers in her school also used this kind of technology in teaching.

Lessons 1-2

Date: 19th April 2017

Time: 9:15

Textbook: Let's Go 3, P. 66

Lesson title: Unit 8. Let's learn A&B

These two lessons, students learned the adjectives related to a person's appearances and used them to compare the different appearance features of a person now and the past.

E.g. He was small. Now he is big.

Lessons 3-4

Date: 10th May 2017

Time: 9:15

Textbook: Let's Go 3, P. 70

Lesson title: Unit 8. Let's build A&B

In these two lessons, students learned the comparative forms of adjectives to describe two things. Then, they learned to ask and answer using comparative forms. Teachers used flashcards to teach words and build sentences.

E.g. The car is smaller than the truck. The truck is bigger than the car

Which one is bigger, the car or the truck?

The truck is bigger than the car

4. Ms Anh

Class 5A

Anh's school is located in the centre of the city. This is one of the two oldest schools located in one of the two most populous wards of the city. This school is perceived to be one of the two best schools of the city in terms of quality of students and teachers, as well as teaching facilities. There was two English teachers at this school. Students had opportunities to take extra classes of English out of their schools.

However, the number of students per class is very large, 43 students. Students of this school are seen to be more active and better than other schools.

Anh's classroom had a computer, a projector, and loudspeakers.

This class learned two lessons successively without any break time.

Lessons 1-2

Date: 4th April

Time: 9:15

Textbook: Let's Go 3, P. 61

Lesson title: Unit 7. Let's learn more C & D

In these lessons, students learned how to ask and answer about someone's job. The vocabulary had been taught in previous lessons. The students practiced asking and answering:

What does a salesclerk do? A salesclerk sells things

Then, students learned how to describe the places of someone's job.

For example: A mechanic fixes cars in a garage. A salesclerk sells things in a store

These phrases of places were new to most students.

Lessons 3-4

Date: 10th April 2017

Time: 2:15

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 62-63

Lesson title: Unit 7. Let's Build A & Let's Read

Students played games in pairs, describing and guessing jobs of each other. For example,

S1: I'm working in a store. I sell things. What's my job?

S2: You are a salesclerk

Then, students read and answered information about a person named Maya in a short text in the textbook.

Guided questions: What does Maya do? Does she ever work outside? Is she taking a picture of a tree?

5. Ms Han

Class: 5A

Student number: 34

Ha's school was located near the city centre, but it was perceived as a school of average quality of teaching and learning. Han taught English in a normal classroom with only basic facilities, there were no internet connection, no computer nor projector. Han had to prepare handmade visual aids for her lesson. There was only one English teacher at this school. This made Han's work overloaded.

One noticeable thing which was negative about this school was that the lighting system looked old-fashioned, and the classroom did not look bright enough.

Lesson 1

Date: 5th April 2017

Time: 3:55

Textbook: None

Lesson topic: Birthday party

Teacher organised students to prepare birthday gifts to three students in the classroom, then representatives of different groups of students said 'happy birthday wishes' with their presents to the three nominated students.

Notes: There was no specific linguistic focus. Students made a number of errors, but there was no teacher oral CF.

Lesson 2

Date: 12th April 2017

Time: 9:50

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 60

Lesson title: Unit 7. Let's learn more A & B

In this lesson, students learned words describing jobs, and learned how to say sentences such as:

A photographer takes pictures

Lesson 3

Date: 12th April 2017

Time: 14:50

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 61

Lesson title: Unit 7. Let's learn more C

In these lessons, students learned how to ask and answer about someone's job. The vocabulary had been taught in previous lessons. The students practiced asking and answering:

What does a salesclerk do? A salesclerk sells things

Lesson 4

Date: 13th April 2017

Time: 7:30

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 62

Lesson title: Unit 7. Let's build A

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 62

Students played games in pairs, describing and guessing jobs of each other. For example,

S1: I'm working in a store. I sell things. What's my job?

S2: You are a salesclerk

6. Ms Tu

Class: 5A

Number of students: 37

This school was located in the city centre. It was perceived to be a good school, just after the two older schools in the city centre. It could be seen as the third best schools in the city. Students of this school had opportunities to take extra classes of English out of their schools. Also, students were seen to be active and better at English than many other schools.

Tu taught this class in a normal room with basic facilities. There were no computer, projector or internet in this room.

Lesson 1

Date: 5th April 2017

Time: 9:30

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 58-59

Lesson title: Let's learn

In this lesson, students learned words about jobs, learned how to ask and answer about a person's job. For example,

S1: What's his/her job?

S2: He's/She's a veterinarian

Lesson 2

Date: 7th April 2017

Time: 8:30

Textbook: None

Lesson title: Future job

In this lesson, teachers organised learning activities around the topic of students' future jobs. The linguistic focus is the future form "will". Students asked and answered about their future jobs. For example:

S1: What will you be in the futre?

S2: I'll be an astronaut

Lesson 3

Date: 17th April 2017

Time: 3:10 17

Textbook: Let's go 3, p. 63

Lesson title: Unit 7. Let's read

In this lesson, students read and answered information about a person named Maya in a short text in the textbook.

Guided questions:

What does Maya do? Does she ever work outside? Is she taking a picture of a tree?

Lesson 4

Date: 19th April 2017

Time: 7:55

Textbook: Let’s go 3, p. 64

Lesson title: Unit 8. Let’s talk (Sports)

In this lesson, students reviewed some words about sports. They then learned how to ask and answer about the sport they prefer. For example:

S1: Which sport do you like more?

S2: I like soccer more.

Appendix 7

TEACHER PARTICIPANTS' BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

1. Ngan

Ngan is 40 years old. She was trained to be secondary English teacher at Ha Tinh teacher training college, she graduated in 1998. She taught English for a lower secondary school between 1998 and 2012. Then she changed her job and taught English for a primary school. She applied for the change so that she could move to a school near her house.

Ngan said the teaching methods at primary school was very different from that in secondary school. She said she had her advantages by nature in that she was a flexible and she could adapt to new working environment quickly. She said other people found it difficult to change. She took Ms Nguyet from her school for an example.

Ngan said she had to self-study and self-adapt to new teaching environment without any initial training or guidelines. After starting teaching at primary school, she had opportunities to attend professional development programme every year. Group seminars among teachers of a group of schools were held every month.

She took the English proficiency test by Cambridge English to get an FCE certificate, but then she obtained Premilinary English certificate (B1). After that, she attended a proficiency course and took the 'in-house' test organized by a Vietnamese University and she passed the required level (equivalent to B2).

Ngan said the Department of Education and Training of Ha Tinh province organized professional development course every summar. This summer, they were trained about task based teaching. "that means leave vocabulary to the end of the lesson in a similary way as put a swimming kid in a pool, the kid will do anything himself/ herself, after that he or she can swim".

Ngan said the moment she just moved to teaching at primary level, it was like a big milestone in her life. It was very different. But now she felt like teaching at primary level than teaching secondary school students. She did not want to come back to teach at secondary level anymore. She said teaching at primary level was more fun, students liked her, teaching style was more lively and interesting. She said it was boring to teach at secondary level.

2. Thuy

Thuy was 35 years old. She graduated at a provincial teacher training college which trained teachers for lower secondary schools. She graduated and started teaching at a lower secondary school in 2003 (till 2011). She moved to teaching at primary school in 2011 in order to teach at a nearby place to her house.

Thuy said at first, she had to self-study and self-adpapt to the new teaching methods and environment. She said there was a big difference between teaching at primary school and secondary school. She said she had to be more active, organizing more learning activities at primary schools. By contrast, at secondary level, she said it was simple, her lessons always followed PPP model (presentation, practice, post-practice?). She said it was simple partly because she taught at a rural school where the requirement was lower.

At primary school, Thuy said it really depended on the lesson, for some lessons, she just taught words only.

Thuy said she took the test and passed it (B2 level), but it was an 'in-house' test, i.e. a test organized by a national university or testing organization and the test was just recognized within Vietnam only. She said she did not dare to take international test (e.g. Cambridge English, or IELTS)

3. Linh

Linh was 36 years old. She graduated at a provincial teacher training college in 2002. She started her teaching career at a lower secondary school for 2 years, then she moved to teach at a primary school for 7 years. She moved to another school (which was her current school) for 2 years. She moved to the 4th school (primary) for 2 years. Then she came back with the primary school (the second one) and had been teaching there for two years now. In short, she moved around but taught a lower secondary school for 2 years, and taught at 3 different primary schools for 11 years.

She said the teaching methods at primary school was very different from that at secondary school. At secondary school, teaching grammar was predominant, and the job was easier for teachers. But teaching at primary school, it was harder in terms of classroom management and error correction. She said it was more difficult to teach at primary level.

Linh took the prociency test and passed it in 2014, but her certificate was issued by a Vietnamese university which was not internationally recgonised.

4. Anh

Anh was 40 years old.

Anh was the only teacher who graduated from a university with a bachelor degree in teaching English for upper secondary school in 2000. She started teaching at a primary in 2000 just after her graduation. She moved to her current school in 2004. She was also the only teacher that did not have any teaching experience at secondary level.

She took an international English proficiency test but just got B1 level. After that she attended a course (organized and supported financially by the department of education and training of Ha Tinh province), and took the national test and she passed the level equivalent to B2.

She said sessions on oral CF might be needed for novice teachers, but experienced teachers could deal with CF by themselves.

5. Han

Han was 38 years old. She graduated from a provincial teacher training college with an associate degree. Her course was provided by a university, in conjunction with a teacher training college. She started her career at a secondary schoo and taught there for 10 years. She moved to teach at primary school so that she could work at a school near her house. She had been teaching there for 7 years now.

She said teaching at secondary school was doing more with knowledge, teaching more grammar and vocabulary. When she moved to primary level, she said she could adapt quite well because her style was young and flexible. She said her style was suitable for teaching at primary schools.

She emphasized that there was a big difference between teaching at primary level and secondary level. At primary level, she had to create a variety of learning activities, she had to be more active, but the English knowledge was easier, simpler.

She said she attended professional development course every summar, it was something like a habit now, but mostly about changing the textbooks.

She took an internationally English proficiency course for FCE level, but she got preliminary level certificate (B1). Then, she attended a course and took the national test and passed it.

She said there was only one teacher passed the international test that she took, with the minimum score of 60. She got only 48 points.

She said reading test was too hard, the text was too long, she could not understand the text. She said she would fail immediately if she took the internaitonl test now (Cambridge English Test)

6. Tu

Tu was 37 years old. She graduated from a provincial teacher training college. She was trained to be lower secondary school teacher. She started her career at a lower secondary school and taught there for 10 years (2001-2011). She moved to teach at primary level in 2011 because it was closer to her house. She was teaching at this primary school at the moment of data collection.

She attended a course to upgrade to bachelor's degree for in-service teacher and graduated in 2004. She said when she moved to primary school, there was only a small number of English teacher at primary level. She basically followed the method of teaching at secondary level. There were sometimes professional development courses.

She said teaching methods at primary level was different from that at secondary level. She took an example: when she just moved to teach English at primary school, she wrote the word 'hello' on the board and students said the two letters 'l' in the word 'hello' were two sticks. They did not know the handwritten 'l' because they were taught to write it differently in Vienamese. Therefore, the handwriting style also needed to be changed. During the process of teaching, she had to adapt gradually to suit the young students.

She said that grammar was emphasized at secondary level, but communicative approach was required at primary level. When she taught at secondary school, she used the 'old' textbook and teaching grammar was predominant.

She attended several courses to improve her English proficiency. She took the national test and passed it with a level equivalent to B2.

Appendix 8

THE CONVENTION OF TRANSCRIPTION

Symbol	Meaning
T	Teacher
S	Student
SS	Students
S1	Student 1
S2	Student 2
[]	Pronunciation
/	Interrupted speech
?	Rising intonation
( )	Extra information
…	Pause
CAPITAL	Emphasis

Appendix 9

TRANSCRIPTION OF AN INTERVIEW

Teacher: Ms Thuy (T)

Interviewer: Researcher (X)

Time: 10:10 – 10:42

Date: 14 April 2017

Place: Teacher meeting room, Ms Thuy's school

X: This is a scenario of teacher corrective feedback for primary school students. Please read it carefully and order the feedback types in the order of your preferences. Please comment on each feedback type. You can ask me any questions if you are not sure about the content of the scenario as well as the content of any questions.

The scenario:

Imagine that your student has made the following error. How do you give oral CF on this error? Can you please number them from one to six in order of your preferences: from the one you prefer most to the one you prefer least?

Student: 'I don't go to school in Sunday'.

You say:

(a) 'on Sunday'

(b) 'not in Sunday, say on Sunday'

(c) 'with days, which preposition do we use?' (in Vietnamese or in English?)

(d) 'In Sunday (with a rising intonation)'

(e) 'Sorry?' or 'Can you repeat that again?'

(f) 'I don't go to school ...? (You omit the erroneous part of the sentence and repeat the sentence with a rising intonation and a pause at the missing information).

T: (read and think for a few minutes)… It depends on different cases where I would prioritise a different feedback type. However, I would often choose 'd' for my feedback. I would raise my voice "In Sunday?" and students would recognize their error (2:28).

Because the student's answer was "In Sunday" so that I would raise my voice as a question "In Sunday?".

If the teacher raises her voice, students will recognize the 'repetition' as the erroneous part and will recall that it should be "On Sunday".

If students still could not recognize their errors, I would suggest them with the correct form and I raise my voice "In Sunday or On Sunday?", then students would recognize the error. That is the way I often apply in my error correction. (2:40)

For a different situation, for example, a student mispronounces a word, I will ask that student to repeat. It depends on the error, I will find a suitable way to provide feedback (3:06)

X: Why do you choose (d) as your most preferred way to give feedback?

T: Because I want students to recognize their errors before I correct them. In that way, students can recognize the errors and correct the errors themselves before their teacher corrects them. If students can not correct themselves, I will provide the answer.

X: What is the second priority?

T: I would use the option (f) because my first priority was to elicit students to recognize and correct their errors, then I would explain more about the error.

X: What is your third priority?

T: Next comes (e), "sorry, can you repeat that again?". This was to get students to repeat the ill-formed utterance and other students would recognize this student's error. Other students would wonder why the teacher asked that student to repeat. (4:26)

X: What is the fourth priority?

T: 'b', I would provide the correct answer directly 'not in Sunday' say 'on Sunday'. If students couldnot correct their errors, I would correct them.

In cases where the errors are not the focus of the lesson, I will correct directly to save time.

X: What is the fifth priority?

T: I would say the correct answer directly as option ‘a’ (“I go to school on Sunday/on Sunday”), to tell students the answer directly.

And the last preference would be ‘c’, this was the last explanation, ‘not in Sunday, say on Sunday’.

X: Would you use English or Vietnamese?

T: It depends on the students. For good students, I would use English, for weak students, I would use Vietnamese. For example, for this class, class 5A, I would use English because every student could understand my English. But for weaker students, I may use Vietnamese.

X: How often do you give students corrective feedback? (6:28)

T: Yes, very often. I am very thorough, I pay attention to details. I often correct most student errors. I am the kind of person that normally goes into details of everything, I sometimes know that an error does not relate to the lesson, but I still correct it.

X: When do you often provide feedback for students? (6:58)

T: If it is a conversation, I will wait for students to finish their utterances, then provide the feedback. When I ask, students answer, I can correct immediately. But sometimes, I forget.

X: Do you interrupt students and provide the corrective feedback if they make an error?

T: No, I often correct after student’s completion of their utterance.

X: Why so?

T: My principle is that feedback should be provided after students have finished their talk (7:24). When a student is talking, it’s not good to stop him or her.

X: Do you prefer to provide feedback for students or let them correct their own errors, or get other students to correct their friend’s errors? (7:39)

T: Normally I would like to let the student who makes the error correct himself or herself. Once I am in a hurry, I will provide the correct anwer to save time.

X: What do you think of getting students to provide feedback to each other?

T: Of course it is better than teacher correction. That is the way to help students to remember longer. If I correct directly, some students may pay attention to the error. Even when students pay attention, they may not retain the correction as long as when they correct thelves (8:28).

X: Do you correct student errors differently for different students? If yes, how?

T: Yes. For good students, I only need to raise my voice, then they will recognize their errors.

Sometimes I pretend to say a wrong sentence for students to correct my errors. For example, I can say "How much pens?" instead of "How many pens?".

For good students, they make mistakes because they just slip their tongue, but they may know the correct lanague but they still make mistakes. Therefore, for good students, I just need to raise my voice and they will understand.

For weak students, I have to notify the error directly. That is the actual error. For good students, they may know but they slip their tongues. (This teacher assumes that some of her students who are good at English may know all the targeted language features) (9:36)

X: What types of errors do you correct the most frequently? Grammar, pronunciation or vocabulary errors?

T: As I said, I am very thorough so I correct every error, almost every error.

X: Why?

T: (laughing) That is my nature. In my daily life, I also correct people's errors (laughing) (10:13).

X: Are there any other reasons?

T: I just simply think that correcting students' errors so that they will not commit the errors again.

X: Do you omit errors in any cases?

T: Normally I do not omit errors. I only omit some errors when I am under the pressure of time. Or for very weak students, for example, if I know that a student is so weak that he or she can not remember what I correct him/her, I will omit his/ her errors.

Or for a very weak student but that student makes an acceptable error, I will skip the error because I think for such a weak student, that he or she can talk out a sentence is his/her good attempt.

If a good student makes an error, I will correct immediately.

X: What is the difference between good students and bad students?

T: That's a big gap. For some good students, I can speak English for the whole day, and they can understand everything.

X: Why is there such a big gap in the same class?

T: It depends on student's cognitive ability. Some students can remember the new words just after reading them once. Some students can not say correctly one word although they practice it for the whole lesson. Sometimes a weak student sits with a good student, the good student reads a word and the other one reads it again and again, but he can not read it correctly. (11:55)

It is because of the big gap in students' cognitive ability. Some students have not actively spoken out even one sentence for two years. If I asked him/her to stand up and say a sentence, he/she can't because he/she is not able to understand my teaching. It is really difficult.

There is also one more reason for this gap, being the support of their families. Some students take many extra classes, so that they go to this class just because they have to. They actually have known everything I teach for other students.

X: Is the second reason the major?

T: Probably it is about 70%. It also depends on students' aptitude. I know that some students take 6 or 7 extra lessons a week, but they still can not improve, but some students just need to take one or two extra lessons per week, and they improve a lot. That is because of students' aptitude.

X: What type of errors do you think is the most important and worth correcting? (13:18)

T: I prioritise pronunciation, how to pronounce a word. The errors about intonation or stress are less prioritized.

There are not many grammatical features at primary English, so students seldom make grammar errors. Grammar errors, if any, are minor errors, for example, when producing a sentence in present continuous tense, students make an error by saying ‘he playing football’ and miss ‘is’. Or students may say ‘what do he do?’ instead of ‘What does he do?’. In general, there are not many grammar errors because students just follow a pattern, what they need to do is just to replace the words and speak. Students predominantly have pronunciation errors

X: Do you find it difficult to correct students’ errors?

T: It is not difficult to correct their errors, but assuring that the error makers can avoid the errors in the following incidences is difficult. Students can understand the errors when I correct them, but they may repeat the same errors after 5 minutes because once students have a bad habit, it will reactivate the errors repeatedly.

X: What influences the most to your oral CF?

T: At the moment of correcting student errors, I do not think about anything. I just correct any errors I recognize. Actually I do not think about whether students are emotionally affected or not. I only think that I need to correct their errors so that they will not make the same errors again.

Primary school students do not normally feel embarrassed, whether they get 1 point or 10 out of ten points does not matter to them. Therefore, there is little influence on affective feelings.

Secondary school students are more vulnerable to the negative sides of CF, primary school students are not.

Sometimes students recognize their errors then they laugh, everyone laughs. (16:44)

X: How has your CF provision been shaped?

(from teacher training course, from language learning experience, or influence from the way your colleagues do with CF?)

T: Initially, I actually just corrected whenever and whatever students make errors, I just gave the correct forms (16:56)

Then I happened to read a "Sang kien kinh nghiem" (a teacher professional development material written by a teacher) about how to correct errors, I applied what I read in this paper into my teaching.

I don't have many opportunities to attend colleagues' lessons although a teacher is required to observe their colleague's teaching once every week, but in fact, we can not do that. We only observe some 'model lessons' in special occasions. In these model lessons, students do not normally make errors because the teacher has asked students to prepare the lessons carefully before class. Students make more errors in normal lessons. (17:36).

X: Have you ever attended a professional development programme or workshop about error correction?

T: No, there have never been any sessions on CF. I just only happened to read a paper about CF.

X: Do you have any difficulties in using English to provide oral CF?

T: It is ok for me. (19:07)

I am only afraid that some students can not understand my English. It is ok for me to use English in classes. It's normal, not difficult. English for primary school is not complicated. It's more difficult to use English in secondary school level because there are many complicated grammar errors. At primary level, most errors are phonological errors, and these errors are easy to correct.

X: Do you think your students want you to correct their errors? (20:00)

T: I think that students do not really care.

X: What do you think how your students will feel when you correct their errors?

T: It depends on individual students. Those students who like English subject, they like being corrected. For other students, they don't care whether I correct their errors or not. In short, most students do not care. About 10% of students like being corrected. (20:55)

X: What do you think about the benefits of oral CF?

T: It really depends on individual students. Some students benefit a lot. Some students will make the same errors after 5 minutes of being corrected. It is because students do

not pay attention. These inattentive students think that English is something beyond their mind, they do not pay attention and do not care. Sometimes, students just do their exercises just to respond to teachers. So when I call them on to talk, they just do the task as something they have to. After a student finishes his/her turn, he/she thinks I will not calls their names again, so they do not care to volunteer to say anything.

The good students like to show off their English skills.

Students just try their best when they compete in a game, a two team game. They are very “aggressive” (always want to be the winner) (23:44)

Students do not show their enthusiasm in individual activities because there is not competition, no race. Sometimes students just do not want to volunteer, but I like to ask those who do not volunteer because the voluntary students have already known the answer. I need to ask the non-voluntary students so that they will remember something once they stand up and participate in the task. Therefore, some students do not volunteer because they know I will ask them. (24:15)

X: Do you use English or Vietnamese in your teaching?

T: It depends on who I teach. For example, for students who do not understand my English, I will use Vietnamese. For this class, class 5A, I use English because I know they understand my instruction for sure.

In general I use English for commands. When explaining a sentence or something, I will use Vietnamese. Other commands such as asking students to stand up, to sit down, or to repeat, I always use English because students are used to it. (25:00)

X. Do you think that the department of education and training of the city or the province should incorporate sessions on teacher oral CF in professional development programmes?

T: I think it is still necessary, but now teachers are concerned about other apsects.

Of course the error correction in class is necessary because we have never had any training on this topic. However, at this time, we prefer other aspects such as innovations in teaching. In short, teachers now want to receive the input such as test questions. Designing tests is the heaviest workload now. We would like the department of education and training gives us a website or a software that could support our test

designing because test designing is very difficult. There are no sources about listening tests, pictures, therefore, we would like to have input of this kind than training on teaching methods.

For example, Mr Nam organized courses about task-based teaching, we also wanted to explore this but …. This kind of courses normally receive complaints. (26:57).

Teachers are now lazy to attend professional development courses, they do not like. If they are required to attend, they prefer other aspects.

X: What is the most recent situation where you provided CF, and how did you do that? (27:20)

T: There are too many of them, I can not remember. As my nature, I correct errors frequently, I just correct all of my student errors that I recognize. (28:37)

X: Have you ever taught at a secondary school?

T: Yes, I used to teach at a junior secondary school. That is Binh An school in Loc Ha district. I taught there from 2003 to 2011, then I moved here to be close to my house.

X: What university did you graduate from?

T: I went to Ha Tinh teacher training college, K7.

X: Did you received any training or prepration courses before moving to teach at primary school?

T: No, I just adapted myself.

X: What is the difference between teaching at primary school and secondary school?

T: Very different. Teaching at primary school requires me to be more active, more flexible, to organize more learning activities. At secondary school, I actually taught at a rural school, so everything was simple. I just followed PPP model (presentation, practice, production). When moving to primary school, it depends on each individual lesson, sometimes I just taught only some new words.

X: Have you every taken a B2 test?

T: Yes I did. I did an ‘in-house’ test (a test organized and recognized within Vietnam only).

It’s too hard to take an international B2 test (this refers to Cambridge English Test, or IELTS test). I’m not confident enough to take an international test.

Appendix 10

TRANSCRIPTION OF OBSERVATION DATA OF ONE TEACHER

Teacher: Ms Thuy

Ms Thuy's school and class description:

Class: 5A

Thuy's school is located in a new and small ward of the city. It is perceived to be a poorer and lower in quality of teaching and learning compared to other schools in the city. This is just because this area has just been recently become a ward of the city, before this was a commune of another district. Students here did not have many opportunities to take extra classes in language centers like students in schools which were closer to the city centers. There were two English teachers at this school.

Thuy taught this class in a language learning room, designed for students to learn English, with basic traditional and modern facilities such as a chalkboard, a computer, a projector, and loudspeakers.

The number of students of this class was only 29, smaller than in other schools.

This class learned English in one lesson of 35 minutes at a time. 4 lessons were taught separately during the week.

Lesson 1

Date: 3rd April 2017

Time: 2:15 pm – 2:50 pm

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 60

Lesson title: Unit 7. Let's learn more A&B

In this lesson, students learned words describing jobs, and learned how to say sentences such as:

A photographer takes pictures

0-5.48 Warm up game (students are divided into 2 groups, they student takes turn to go to the board and write words they know/learn about jobs within 2 minutes or so). There is no CF for this activity

7:20

S: Photographer (sounds like [fətəgrəfər])

T: (repeat the word to the whole class with a rising tone) [fətəgrəfər]? Now the whole class, fətəgrəfər?

SS: No

T: No, how to pronounce it?

SS: /fəˈtɒg.rə.fər/. (with correct pronunciation)

T: Yes, it's /fəˈtɒg.rə.fər/ (with correct pronunciation)

9:54

When students said the words aloud in chorus, there were some errors of pronunciation, but there was no CF.

13:40 – 15:20

Students practiced in pairs, asking and answering about jobs (e.g. A: What does a fisherman do? B: A fisherman catches fish). There were some errors but no CF was provided.

16:39

Teacher checked students work by calling them up and getting them to say the words. Then teacher commented that "among these students, only Linh chi pronounced correctly (in Vietnamese)

Trong số các bạn này, chỉ có bạn Linh Chi là phát âm đúng. Khi các bạn mô tả ai đó làm việc gì, thì tất cả các động từ phải có đuôi "s" hoặc "es". Các bạn nghe lại đĩa nhé. "Remember, you need to pronounce correctly". 17.35

18.55

A student stands up and says the sentences again, one student says one sentence

S: A factory worker make thing

T: A factory?

S: A factory worker make ahh makes things

T: Makes, ok

23.20

T: What does a salesclerk do?

S: A salesclerk sell thing

T: (laugh) Yeah, a salesclerk sells things (says slowly with a stress on ‘sells’ and ‘things’

32.25

S: A veterinarian helps a ah animals

T: again, again, speak again, say again

S: A veterinarian helps animals (pronouncing as [vetərɪn**ei**riən] instead of [vetərɪˈneriən])

T: A veterinarian helps animals. Is it correct? (asking the whole class)

SS: Yes

33.15

S: A pilot fly an airplane

T: A pilot flIES (stressed and slowly) an airplane. Is that correct B (group B)?

SS: Yes

35.00

S: A taxi driver drive a taxi

T: driveS (stressed). Bạn này nói đúng mà thiếu mất cái gì các bạn?

SS: “s”

T: So the correct answer is?

SS: A taxi driver drives a taxi (in chorus)

37.00 (in a recap activity)

S: A taxi driver drive a taxi

T: Drives, drives a taxi

37.20

T: What does a fisherman do?

S: A fisherman catch fish (there is an error with 'catches' but no CF)

T: Good

Lesson 2

Date: 4th April 2017

Time: 7:30

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 61.

Lesson title: Unit 7. Let's learn more C

In this lesson, students learned how to ask and answer about a person's job.

E.g. What does a salesclerk do? A salesclerk sells things

5.35

S: A mechanic fix car

T: A mechanic fixes …?

SS and T: cars

6.00

S: A photographer take pictures

T: A photographer takes pictures

7.50

S: He's a veterinarian

T: He or she?

S: She/ She's….

T: Ok, number 6, what's he's job?

20.11

S1: What doe (not pronouncing [z] sound) a pho pho ta photographer do?

S2: A photographer takes pictures

(There is an error pronouncing [z] and some difficulties pronouncing 'photographer', but there is not CF. Students then continue making some of these errors, but there is still no CF for [z] sound in 'does'.)

25.34

S1: What does a baseball player do?

S2: A baseball player plays do

T: play …?

S2: Play…

T: plays baseball

S2: baseball

26.15

S1: What does a veterinarian do?

S2: ...

T: Bạn hỏi cái gì thì trả lời cái đó (just answer what he asks)

S2: What does a taxi driver do?

T: (laughs, other students laugh) now Anh, Minh asked "what does a veterinarian do?", you answer that question

S2: A veterinarian help animal (no [s] after help and animal)

T: Good

35.55

S1: What does your father do?

S2: My father is a teacher

S1: What does a teacher do?

S2: I don't know

T: Whole class, answer my question. What does his father do? What is his father's job?

S3: He is a teacher

T: What does a teacher do?

S3: He's a teacher teaches students

T: Very good

39.00

S1: What does you father do?

S2: He is a teacher

S1: what does a teacher do?

S2: A teacher teaches students

S1: My mother is a teacher

S2: What does a teacher do?

S1: I'm not sure

T: (laugh) Các bạn có nhận xét gì về đoạn hội thoại của bạn Anh với bạn Minh (Do you have any comments about the conversation between Anh and Minh?)

S3: Đoạn đầu bạn Minh nói là 'what does 'you' father do?' (At first, Minh said "what does you father do)

T: You, sai chữ 'your' đúng không ạ. Nhưng mà cô nói về phần nội dung (Is the word "your" wrong?), but I want to talk about the content)

S4: Hai bạn nói giống nhau (two students said the same thing)

T: À đúng rồi, bị rập khuôn quá đúng không ạ? (Ahh yes, they were too repetitive)

Minh asked Anh 'What does a teacher do?', Anh said 'A teacher teaches students'. But Anh asked Minh "What does a teacher do?", Minh said "I'm not sure". (laugh)

Lesson 3

Date: 10th April

Time: 3:50

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 61

Lesson title: Unit 7. Let's learn more D

In this lesson, students learned how to add places to a sentence describing a person's job

E.g. A mechanic fixes cars in a garage. A salesclerk sells things in a store

Until 5.30, warming up activities, no CF

6.00

S: A dancer dance

T: Dance? Dance? Dances

8.45

T: What does an astronomer do?

S1: An astronomer go to space

T: An astronomer …? Goes…?

S2: An astronomer watch many stars and planets in on … ah on the sky

T: on the sky, good

16.40

S1 (Hoa): A mechanic fix (no es sound) cars in the garage (mispronouncing the word garage)

T: (turn to another student for another sentence), Huy Cong please.

S2: (Huy Cong): A salesclerk sells things in a store

T: good, now Hoa, say it again. A mechanic fixes cars in a garage (with stress on fixes, cars, garage)

S1 (Hoa): A mechanic fixes cars in the garage

T: Now say it again a mechanic fixes car in the garage (with stress)

S1 (Hoa): A mechanic fixes (a bit slow) cars in the garage (mispronouncing the word garage)

T: In a garage

S1 (Hoa): In a garage

T: Ok

20.50

S: A veterinarian / (mispronouncing this word) help

T: /A veterinarian (pronouncing slowly and clearly, overlap)

S: A veterinarian helps animals in the zoo

29.30

S: A pilot flies and airport (says slowly)

SS and T: (laugh)

T: flies an airport? (rising tone)

S: (laugh) A pilot flies an airplane in an airport

T: Good. A pilot flies airplanes (stressing airplanes with 'z' sound) in an airport

30.25

S: A veterinarian hip (other students laugh) ah help animals in a clinic

T: Good. A veterinarian helps animals in a clinic

Lesson 4

Date: 11th April, 2017

Time: 9:50

Textbook: Let's Go 3, p. 62

Let's title: Unit 7. Let's build A

In this lesson, students played games describing and guessing jobs

E.g.

S1: I'm working in a store. I sell things. What's my job?

S2: You are a salesclerk

9.09

S1: She's a police officer

T: She?

S2: He's a police officer

9.50

S: A police officer catches... thief (mispronouncing thief into thip)

T: Good. A police officer catches thief (with stress on thief)

18.15

S: A postal …. Driver

T: A postal driver

19.49

S: An architect (mispronouncing into [tʃ] sound)

T: An architect

20.18

S: A vet (with not clear ending sound)

T: A vet (with very clear ending sound)

34.50

S: I have some tools. I fixes (with iz sound)….

T: I fix

S: I fix some cars. What's my job?

Appendix 11

CF TYPES

This section briefly outlines the six widely accepted types of feedback, using a classification system which was originally developed by Lyster and Ranta (1997).

Recast

Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 46) defined recast as teacher's reformulation of student's utterance either fully or partially by replacing the error with the correct form. For example,

> T: Ok. It's good. You wanna tell us one?
> S: Eh…: Kaii convention
> T: What kind of convention? (recast)
> S: Kaii convention …eh… some people … (Sheen, 2004, p. 278)

Recast serves two functions: interactional function and feedback function. As for the former function, it acknowledges the content of the preceding utterance, therefore, it can increase or maintain the positive affect. As for the latter one, it provides an alternative model of target like language which is used to attract students' notice on this corrected form. Recast is generally considered to be the most frequently used type of CF strategy (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Sarandi, 2016). Recasts have been considered to be implicit by some researchers (e.g. Long, 1996) while others have shown that recasts can be explicit regarding their salience depending on their contexts and characteristics such as linguistic targets, length, number of changes made to the original utterance (Nicholas et al., 2001; Sato, 2011; Sheen, 2004). Sheen and Ellis (2011) categorised recasts into two types in accordance with their explicitness degree: conversational recasts (implicit) and didactic recasts (explicit). Conversational recast refers to the correction that consists of a reformulation of a student utterance in order to resolve a communication breakdown, and these recasts often take the form of confirmation checks. Didactic recast refers to the correction in the form of a reformulation of a student utterance although there is no communication breakdown.

Explicit correction

Explicit correction is defined as teacher's alerting the learner to the error and provision of the correct form (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). For example,

> S: And three pear (sound like beer)
> S2: three beer
> T: not beer. Pear. (Sheen, 2004, p.278)

For adult classes, teachers tend to provide additional metalinguistic explanation to the correct form as shown in the following example,

> S: There was a fox. Fox was hungry
>
> T: The fox. You should use the definite article 'the' because you've already mentioned 'fox'. (Sheen, 2007, p. 307)

Explicit correction provides learners with opportunity to notice the gap between their interlanguage and the correct model of target language, but it may discourage learners to produce acceptable output (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Clarification requests

Clarification requests refer to teacher's indication to students that their utterance has been misunderstood by the teacher or that their utterance is not in the target form and that a repetition or a reformulation is needed. Clarification requests refer to errors either in comprehensibility or accuracy, or both. A clarification request includes phrases such as "Excuse me" or "What do you mean by *X*?". This strategy is effective in that it encourages learners to provide modified input oriented to the target form by making use of their linguistic repertoire. For example,

> S: I want practice today, today
> T: I'm sorry? (Sheen, 2004, p. 278)

Metalinguistic feedback

Metalinguistic feedback contains technical information about learners' erroneous utterance in the form of questions, comments or explanation without overtly providing the correct form to learners. Metalinguistic feedback attempts to elicit the information from the student. Metalinguistic information generally provides either grammatical

metalanguage that refers to the nature of the error or a word definition in the case of lexical errors. For example,

S: there are influence person who /

T: Influential is an adjective (metalinguistic feedback)

S: Influential person / (unintelligible) / because of his power

(Sheen, 2004, p. 278)

Elicitation

Elicitation refers to techniques that teachers use to elicit the correct form from the student. Elicitation is generally found to be helpful because it promotes self-correction strategies (Lyster et al., 2013). Teachers tend to employ elicitation strategy in three different ways: request for reformulations of a deviant utterance such as 'Can you say it in another way?', the use of questions such as 'How do you say X in English?', and the use of strategic pauses to allow a learner to complete an utterance such as 'Is it a...?". For example,

T: In a fast food restaurant, how much do you tip?

S: No money.

T: What's the word? (Elicitation)

S: Five...four... (Sheen, 2004, p. 278)

Repetition

Repetition occurs when the teacher repeats the student's ill-formed utterance without any change. Teachers tend to adjust their intonation so as to signal the error. This strategy is generally considered to be implicit (Panova & Lyster, 2002; Ranta & Lyster, 2007; Sheen & Ellis, 2011). For example,

S: Oh my God, it is too expensive, I pay only 10 dollars

T: I pay? (Repetition) (Sheen, 2004, p. 279)

These six types of feedback do not always occur independently, but in many cases, more than one type of CF are used at the same time. This is sometimes called multiple feedback.