EFL Learners' Perceptions of Teachers' Corrective Feedback for Pronunciation

Ngoc Xuyen Nguyen^{#1}, Nguyen Quoc Hung Luu^{#2}

^{#1}Graduate School, Can Tho University, Vietnam

^{#2}Center for Foreign Languages, Can Tho University, Vietnam

Abstract

The existence of inconsistencies between teachers' practices and learners' preferences for feedback in pronunciation arise in a not greatly effective teaching and learning environment. The current study attempts to address this gap by examining the students' perceptions of corrective feedback (CF) and the alignments between students' preferences and teachers' practices on CF for pronunciation in an EFL context, namely Vietnamese high school education. To this end, a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview were used as the research tools to gather data. The study highlighted the students' positive perceptions about the values of teachers' CF for their pronunciation development. In addition, both teachers and students share similarities in the values of students' responsibility for error correction and segmental features as a choice of corrected errors and teachers as a source of CF. However, the mismatches between students' preferences and teachers' practices far outweighed the matches indicated a big challenge for teachers to develop problem-solving strategies. The implications for practical applications of teachers' CF strategies are also presented.

Keywords: perceptions, corrective feedback, pronunciation errors, preferences

I. INTRODUCTION

Pronunciation has become more widely acknowledged as an important competence for language learners. (Celce-Murcia, et al., 1996; Rossiter, et al., 2010). To prove the necessity of pronunciation training, (Rajadurai, 2001) clarified that mispronunciation of words is often a source of jokes, and the person who mispronounces is frequently mocked and laughed at (Rajadurai, 2001). As a result, learners' limited pronunciation will decrease their self-confidence in public speaking and negatively affect their ability in learning the other language skills. Thus, it is vital that oral proficiency, especially regarding pronunciation, should be increasingly focused in language learning. However, as opposed to expectation, students' pronunciation development is frequently given insufficient attention and overlooked in conventional classroom education since pronunciation has often been viewed as the most resistant to improve and therefore the least useful to teach (Rajadurai, 2001).

To address this problem, Horwitz (1988) suggested that teachers must be aware of students' perceptions of language teaching and learning, and the matches between students' perceptions and the realities they experienced in the classroom. This mutual understanding is especially vital during the feedback process since it is the time when the students pay closer attention to their teachers' words and behaviours. Hence, students' perceptions and the matches between teachers' feedback practices and their preferences for pronunciation should be emergently investigated.

In Vietnamese context, "the examination system in Vietnam's public education sector favours written over spoken work" (Vu, 2016). Consequently, students received less focus on pronunciation error correction. Loc and Newton (2019) proposed that it is essential to investigate students' perspectives of CF in pronunciation in the EFL context and to examine their pronunciation instructional needs. In other words, it is proved that there has been a gap between teachers' CF practices and learners' preferences that needs putting forward more effective strategies to fulfil students' needs and help teachers address their problematic feedbacks.

In accordance with facilitating the learning process and raising teachers' awareness of the significance of pronunciation correction (Horwitz, 1988; Nunan, 1987; Rajadurai, 2001; Tweedy, 2012; Loc & Newton, 2019), it is essential to conduct research about the students' perceptions and their preferences compared to teachers' CF practices for pronunciation.

Research Questions

The current research attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are learners' perceptions of their teachers' corrective feedback for pronunciation?
2. To what extent can teachers' practices of corrective feedback match with learners' preferences?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Corrective Feedback

2.1.1 Types of oral corrective feedback

In an attempt to investigate students' preferences for teachers' CF strategies for their pronunciation errors, this current research mainly focuses on the Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF). According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), OCF is distinguished with six different types of feedback which are categorized as explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition.

Explicit correction

The explicit provision of the accurate form is referred to as explicit correction. In this case, teachers first clearly indicate that the students' utterance is incorrect, identify the errors and introduce the accurate form right after.

Recasts

Recast involves "the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error". This strategy enables teachers to implicitly correct students' utterances without noticing that students have just made mistakes. The recasts that focus on one word only much more salient than those which include the grammatical or lexical change throughout a longer piece of discourse.

Clarification requests

The corrector indicates that students' utterances confuse or are misunderstood by the teachers. Moreover, in some way, their responses are not under the right form. Thus, the correction and reformulation are essential to address this problem. This is a sort of feedback that might pertain to problems with comprehension, accuracy, or both.

Metalinguistic feedback

This strategy allows teachers to provide "comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance", but the correct form is not explicitly provided to students. Their comments, information, or questions will be hints of well-formedness to elicit students' self-repair. As with metalinguistic feedback, students are motivated to come up with the correction without teachers' explicit feedback provision.

Elicitation

"Elicitation refers to at least three techniques that teachers use to directly elicit the correct form from the student". This technique implies that students have to correct their errors on their own with the assistance of teachers' guides. Teachers directly elicit a reformulation from students by three ways including asking questions, pausing to allow students to complete teacher's utterance or asking students to reformulate their utterance.

Repetition

Repetition is defined as a technique in which the teacher's repetition of the student's erroneous utterance is emphasized. In most circumstances, teachers highlight the error by means of emphatic stress.

2.1.2 The significance of Corrective Feedback in pronunciation

The value of CF in language teaching and learning has been a contentious issue in a great number of studies for years. The majority of research's findings proved that CF has made a great contribution to language learning as it assists learners in identifying and adjusting their erroneous utterances (Krashen, 1982; Long, 1996; Lee, 2007) and making progress in language learning (Agustuna, Herlina & Faridah, 2019; Lyster, 2013; Saito & Lyster, 2012). In contrast, it possibly affects students' emotion and motivation in language learning negatively (Alqahtani & Al-enzi, 2011; Dörnyei, 1994; Ellis, 2009). Besides, according to Krashen (1982) error correction is unnecessary since it is potentially detrimental and has a negative impact on the language acquisition process and may limit or hinder students' SLA. In short, Havranek (2002) claimed that the benefits of CF far outweighed any negative emotion and motivation inhibit learners may experience. Hence, the value of CF in language teaching and learning facilitates language development.

2.1.3 Learners' attitudes towards error correction and corrective feedback

Gardner (1985), examining a wide range of characteristics that are linked to individual differences, argued that whether CF can boost or inhibit the processing and development of learning a language depends on “learners’ and teachers’ attitude towards error correction and the type of CF”. However, there were inconsistencies among teachers and students regarding the attitudes towards error correction. The study by Schulz (1996) revealed that most of the learners had “a positive attitude towards error correction more than their teachers’ attitudes”. Similarly, Ancker (2000) reached the same conclusion when he conducted a survey about teachers’ and students’ perceptions about whether teachers should correct every error that students make when using English.

2.1.4 The timing of corrective feedback.

Sheen and Ellis (2011) stated that it was challenging for to decide whether correcting immediately following the learner’s utterance or delaying the correction until later since the effectiveness of each type depends on which language purposes are focused. According to Hattie and Timperley (2007), immediate error correction promotes faster rates of acquisition during task acquisition, while during fluency, it can inhibit learners’ autonomy and the associated strategies of learning”. Similarly, Kulik and Kulik (1988) reported that at the task level some delay is more effective, but at the process level immediate feedback is more beneficial.

From other perspectives, teachers often distinguish between “accuracy” and “fluency” work when making choices of appropriate time for error correction. This current study mainly focuses on pronunciation, a form of “fluency” work. Teachers also appear to favour delayed correction in fluency work. According to Kavaliauskienė, Anusienė, and Kaminskienė (2009), the explanation for not providing immediate CF during communication activities was that interruption may raise stress levels and hinder communication and it can enable learners to forget what the errors they had made before.

2.1.5 Types of learners’ errors should be corrected

In the field of OCF, Ha and Murray’s study (2020) about Vietnamese EFL primary teachers’ practices on CF revealed that teachers appreciated the value of pronunciation correction than other aspects of language learning. In detail, considering which pronunciation features teachers focus on when providing CF, Buss (2013) and Couper (2016a) stated the same finding that word-level errors attracted more teachers’ attention. Besides, the tendency on delivering CF for segmental and suprasegmental errors was demonstrated in Foote (2016)

Accordingly, an argument was raised that whether teachers should attempt to correct all errors that learners make in producing sounds. In fact, error correction enables teachers to have a clear picture of the student’s treatment needs. However, if students consider all the teachers’ corrections seriously, they may become overwhelmed by the number of errors he makes and perceive his performance as a failure. As a result, they may become discouraged and hurt and their confidence might be ruined (Hendrickson, 1978). Furthermore, Ellis (2009) stated that teachers benefited from CF if they took individual differences into consideration. In other words, providing CF for individual students’ errors can enhance the effective of CF on language learning.

2.1.6 Feedback and assessment for students’ pronunciation

In order to improve learner comprehension, difficulties with feasibility and providing feedback to all teachers had to be addressed. Baker and Burri (2016) suggested their approach was strongly connected to their knowledge of the curriculum. The two kinds of assessment were developed consisting of focusing on the target feature for a given unit and cumulative assessment. The former means that “if the focal feature for a unit was word stress, the teacher would typically only give feedback on that feature of pronunciation”, while the latter is “features of pronunciation addressed in earlier units were also assessed in the current unit”. One of the drawbacks of the approach to focus on target features, suggested by Baker and Burri (2016), is that these features do not always correspond to students’ problems in producing pronunciation. Nevertheless, the teachers reviewed that they still somewhat succeeded in “supporting the students to produce more comprehensible pronunciation.”

2.2 EFL learners’ preferences for teachers’ corrective feedback

2.2.1 Preferences for classroom error correction of different types of error

In fact, most of the research investigating students’ preferences for classroom error correction of different types of error indicated that pronunciation errors, considered as the term “phonological errors”, did not receive the highest attention for correction (Katayama, 2007). Oladejo (1983) and Bang (1999) indicated that they all

appreciated the value of CF for grammatical problems. The explanation of these students' positive attitudes toward correction of grammatical errors is that they are aware of the significance of grammar in language learning and they more frequently make errors in these aspects of English.

A few studies found the students' positive attitude towards correction for pronunciation errors. Lyster (2011) and Johansson (1987) argued that phonological errors are the most problematic and need the serious intervention of teachers' CF. In accordance with this conclusion, Calsiyao (2015) stated that generally students are desirous of having their spoken errors in the classroom corrected frequently, which closely followed by grammatical errors. Briefly, it would be reasonable to assume that students do not highly appreciate teachers' CF for their pronunciation.

2.2.2 Preferences for types of error correction techniques

Students' preferences for types of error correction techniques are investigated in much research. The overview findings revealed that the students have a bias in favour of being provided explicit corrections for their pronunciation errors (Bakar & Abdullah, 2014; Lee, 2013). Several reasons were shown to convince this conclusion. First, the clarification requests were "vague and unclear" as they could not easily find out their mistakes. Moreover, their misunderstanding of teachers' intentions leads to their embarrassment and further frustration. Sometimes they thought that teachers did not listen carefully to their utterance instead of themselves figuring out their mistakes. However, Lee (2016) identified the conflict between teacher and student's choices in types of correction techniques. It was said that while teachers preferred implicit corrections because they reckoned that students could learn more and remember longer, students showed negative attitudes towards this option.

2.3 Related studies

2.3.1 Students' perceptions and preferences for teachers' corrective feedback for pronunciation

Calsiyao (2015) conducted a survey to examine the students' mindsets or attitudes toward CF in the classroom for spoken errors. The researcher used the questionnaire as the main instrumentation to collect data. The sample of study consisting of 365 students of Kalinga-Apayao State College. The findings demonstrated that the mindsets of these students showed the positive attitudes towards the value of corrections for their oral errors. Specifically, they preferred to be corrected for errors that interfere with communication, for self-correction, immediate CF. Moreover, students also supported the effectiveness of explicit and explanation for their errors. In addition, most of the students expressed their concern to learn correct pronunciation, accent and intonation.

Katayama's (2007) study examined the students' perceptions and preferences regarding error corrections in Japanese classrooms. A questionnaire survey was conducted from 249 students in Japanese classes. The results reported the same conclusion in the light of students' attitudes towards teachers' CF (Calsiyao, 2015). However, an opposite conclusion with Calsiyao (2015) found in this study was the students' favoured correction methods for pronunciation. Specifically, students rank the metalinguistic feedback as the most favorite technique while explicit correction held the least students' appreciation. This study also emphasized the attitudinal differences across genders. The results indicated that there was a significant difference between male and female in their preferences for having all errors corrected.

Another study carried out by Ustaci (2014) explored the preferences of English Language Teaching (ELT) learners in the correction of oral vocabulary and pronunciation errors. The data from the questionnaire were gathered from 213 ELT students attending the department of ELT in a Turkish university. Regarding the techniques for pronunciation correction, he revealed that while instructors were correcting oral errors related to vocabulary use, students preferred to be corrected without hurting their feelings. Moreover, they were also expected to have enough time for taking notes and they can correct their errors later individually based on the teachers' guidance. Besides, enabling and motivating the students' self-correction seem to be the most favored error correction strategies preferred.

2.3.2 Teachers' practices and the alignments between students' preferences and teachers' practices

Couper (2019) researched on teachers' cognitions of CF regarding their beliefs, attitudes and practices on pronunciation. The data collected from 19 semi-structured interviews and 6 classroom observations. Participants involved in this study including Second Language teachers in New Zealand. The findings reported that teachers tended to correct, they often focused on word stress, syllables, and the length of stressed vowels, and the errors of adding or omitting sounds also attracted teachers' error corrections. Additionally, they often allowed students

to perform their self-correction since they stated that this technique could encourage students' autonomy and responsibilities for error corrections. Finally, although teachers revealed that they had strong senses of the delayed CF, immediate feedback were used more frequently.

Hassan & Arslan (2008) compared Iraqi learners' preferences of corrective feedback in oral communication with those of their teachers. The data were gathered from a questionnaire including 36 items and delivered to 100 EFL learners and 52 EFL teachers and the interview from 10 teachers and 10 learners. The findings indicated that both teachers and students generally had positive views concerning CF and supported the immediate CF, and students' responsibility for correction. However, the differences shown in terms of types of techniques to deliver CF. While teachers preferred no specific technique as CF was used flexibly depending on the level of students, students' most preferable ones were elicitation and repetition. The researcher also revealed that learners' preferences for peer feedback in terms of gender were different, but they have the same tendency of favor for types of CF, time for delivering CF and responsibilities for error correction.

III. THE STUDY

3.1 Research design

The current study is designed as a descriptive research with a blend of quantitative and qualitative methods. In this research, questionnaires and semi-structured interviews are utilized to elicit information on students' perceptions and preferences for teachers' practices on delivering CF. The questionnaires in the form of a five-point Likert scale are administered to students. Then, semi-structured interviews are conducted to learn more about students' perceptions about the effectiveness of CF in their pronunciation development, their concerns with teachers' practices and their preferences of teachers' CF. Students are interviewed in-person, and the interviews are recorded and transcribed for analysis.

3.2 Participants

The participants for the questionnaires are 97 EFL students, with 34 males (35,1%) and 63 females (64,9%) from grade 10 to 12 selected on the basis of convenience sampling to collect data of their multidimensional perspectives on preference for teachers' CF practices for pronunciation (Fraenkel et al., 2012). After completing the questionnaires, semi-structured interviews were also conducted with 7 student participants in order to elicit in-depth information regarding their views and preferences of teachers' CF. All participants were interviewed face to face with six questions relevant to the two research questions.

3.3 Research instruments

As mentioned in the previous section, to generate data for answering the research questions, the two instruments including questionnaire and interview are utilized to collect data.

The questionnaire was conducted with a view of investigating the ELF learners' perceptions of teachers' CF for their pronunciation, and students' preferences matched with teachers' feedback practices. It was adapted from the students' perceptions of OCF conducted by Katayama (2007). There were 28 questions on the three-section questionnaire. In the first section, students were asked to provide their demographic information. The second section is the students' concerns about teachers' practices and the effectiveness of CF for pronunciation. The third section concentrates on learners' preferences for teachers' CF for pronunciation.

After the questionnaire had been carried out, the semi-structured interview was administered with 7 random participants. The participants were expected to reveal their concerns about teachers' practices on delivering CF and the effectiveness of CF for their pronunciation development, and their preferences for teachers' CF. Besides, students were supposed to share their experience whether they could get better achievements when their preferences matched with teachers' CF.

3.6 Data analysis

Since this current study utilized two research instruments including questionnaire and semi-structured interview, the data from each instrument were analysed in different ways. In detail, the quantitative data from the questionnaire were statistically analysed using the software SPSS for data analysis. In cases of qualitative data gained from the interview, the thematic analysis was employed to analyse them. The findings regarding students' preferences for teachers' CF were compared with the teachers' practices presented in the previous chapter since the common characteristics of teachers' practices gained from various learning environment, EFL learning context (Ha & Murray, 2020; Hassan & Arslan, 2008; Haryanto, 2015; Katayama, 2007), ESL learning

context (Couper, 2019; Ustaci, 2014; Calsiyao, 2015) illustrated the reliable sources to investigate the similarities and differences between students' preferences and teachers' practices on CF for pronunciation.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings regarding students' perceptions and preferences for teachers' CF for pronunciation and the extent to which their preferences match with teachers' practices. The findings revealed that most of students appreciated and benefited CF for their pronunciation development. It also presented the matches between students' preferences and teachers' practices with regard to students' responsibility for error correction and segmental features as a choice of corrected errors and teachers as a source of CF.

4.1 EFL learners' perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback practices for pronunciation

4.1.1 Students' attitudes towards teachers' corrective feedback for pronunciation

This section presents the results from the Descriptive Statistic Test and One Sample T-test on students' attitudes towards teachers' CF for pronunciation. Table I shows the total mean score of students' attitudes towards teachers' CF for pronunciation

TABLE I
THE TOTAL MEAN SCORE OF STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS TEACHERS' CF FOR PRONUNCIATION

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Students' attitudes	97	2.80	5.00	3.79	.46

The data from Table I and the result from T-Test showed that the overall mean score of the participants' attitude towards the teachers' CF ($M=3.79$; $SD=.46$) which was considered as a high level based on Key to understand the averages (Oxford, 1990). It can be concluded that participants' attitude towards the teachers' CF for pronunciation is high. In detail, Table II presents the mean score of each items in students' attitudes towards teachers' CF for pronunciation.

TABLE II
STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS TEACHERS' CF FOR PRONUNCIATION

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Students welcome both negative and positive feedback.	97	3.00	5.00	4.37	.58
2. Students only welcome negative feedback when provided with clear explanation.	97	1.00	5.00	3.47	1.08
3. Teachers' CF does not lose students' motivation and hide language development.	97	1.00	5.00	4.21	.71
4. Students do not feel angry or bothered when receiving CF.	97	1.00	5.00	4.27	.73
5. Students rely on teachers' CF	97	1.00	5.00	2.64	.94

From the Table II, it can be seen that the majority of students agreed that they did not feel angry or bored with teachers' CF for their pronunciation ($M=4.27$; $SD=.73$); it also didn't lose students' motivation to learn English or hide their language development ($M=4.21$; $SD=.71$). Besides, they warmly welcome both negative and positive feedback from teachers ($M=4.37$; $SD=.58$). Nevertheless, the results in Table II revealed that students' reliance on teachers' CF suggested an inconsistency in the responses. The maximum score relying on teachers' CF is at very high ($Max=5.00$), and the minimum score is at very low ($Min=1.00$), while the means core is at medium level ($M=2.64$; $SD=.94$). It suggested that not many students rely on teachers' CF. They also take teachers' CF into their consideration when they revise their pronunciation.

This result is in line with most of the study mention in chapter two of the current study Calsiyao (2015), Katayama's (2007) and Hassan and Arslan (2008). The majority of students agreed that they welcome teachers' and did not feel angry with teachers' CF. Also, they did not lose their motivation and hide language development due to teachers' CF. Moreover, the mean score of the statement "I want teachers to correct my errors" was up to 4.16 indicated that students appreciated the teachers as a main source of CF. It seems possible

that these results are due to other unreliable source as peer correction. Katayama (2007) found an overwhelming majority of students favored teachers' CF compared to peer-correction. They believed that their peers were "incapable of proving accurate CF for their errors".

4.1.2 Students' concerns about teachers' corrective feedback for pronunciation

4.1.2.1 Students' concerns about teachers' practices

The questionnaire of three items regarding students' concerns about teachers' practices. The mean score of each items are presented in Table III.

TABLE III
STUDENTS' CONCERNS ABOUT TEACHERS' PRACTICES

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
6. Teachers as a main source of CF	97	3.00	5.00	4.36	.60
7. Teachers' CF for not only shy or low motivation learners	97	1.00	5.00	4.15	.80
8. Teachers' CF methods should depend on students' level of English proficiency	97	3.00	5.00	4.03	.60

It can be seen from table III that most students truly appreciate the teachers' CF for pronunciation as a main source of CF (M=4.36); they should not correct pronunciation for only shy or low motivation learners (M=4.15) and in terms of CF methods, teachers' CF delivery should be based on learners' levels of English proficiency (M=4.03). It is obvious from the findings that students' preferences corresponded with teachers' practices in terms of sources of CF. In the present study, learners believed that they appreciated their teachers' CF as the main source of CF. This finding was in line with Katayama (2007), Ok and Ustacı (2013), and Hassan and Arslan (2008).

In addition to the concerns with assistance from teachers' CF practices for pronunciation. The findings from interview revealed that students concerned about the teachers' attitudes, professional knowledge and strategies to deliver CF. Regarding of teachers' attitudes, 5 out of 7 participants agreed that teachers' negative attitudes such as criticizing and laughing at students' mistakes which students were believed to mastered before, or using unfriendly words when they figured out the students' mistakes made them hurt and lost motivation to learn English. For example:

Some teachers correct my mistakes but laugh at and criticize me. These bad words can hurt me. (Participant 1)

The negative attitude of teachers and the words they use to deliver CF also partly affect my learning motivation. (Participant 3)

The teachers' negative words can make me quite self-deprecating and embarrassed in public. (Participant 5)

In terms of teachers' professional knowledge, more than half of participants thought that they really concerned about teachers' knowledge. Sometimes, they were not sure about the teachers' mistakes corrections since teachers also made mistake when speaking. Thus, they had to check them again via dictionary or some websites. For example, they said:

There are some teachers who make me feel distrustful of their knowledge because sometimes they pronounce words wrong. (Participant 2)

Sometimes the teacher's pronunciation is not correct, which makes me confused. (Participant 6)

Furthermore, most students might be dissatisfied with teachers' ignorance or providing unclear explanations for their mistakes. Their opinion was illustrated as below:

She often ignores the mistakes, for example, when reading a word, even if it is wrong, the teacher does not correct it. (Participant 2)

Teachers do not explain or provide vague explanation. (Participant 7)

More importantly, students still concerned with the teachers' negative attitudes while delivering CF. This result that teachers' negative attitudes leading to losing students' motivation and doing harm to their feelings was consistent with those of other studies (Alqahtani & Al-enzi, 2011; Dörnyei, 1994; Ellis, 2009). They stated that CF had the potential to harm learners' feelings since it produced language anxiety and has a detrimental impact on students' self-esteem and motivation. The teachers' ignorance or vague error correction also make a significant disappointment to learners. These findings further support the idea of Calsiyao (2015) that because students expected to improve their current English proficiency. Besides that, the quality of error correction was also considered by students. In some cases, teachers did not produce accurate sounds or did not distinguish the differences among English accent. Consequently, students suspected in teachers' correction. This results were consistent with Calsiyao's (2015) findings.

Furthermore, with regard to participants' perceptions and preferences of the frequency of teachers' practices on CF for the features of pronunciation, the findings from interview showed that most of participants, stress, vowel and consonant sounds, ending sounds attracted more teachers' attention in terms of errors correction. They revealed that the frequency of these aspects was at sometimes level, and intonation and accents are sometimes or never corrected. For example:

Regarding of stress, vowel and consonant sounds, ending sounds, teachers sometimes corrected the mistakes... About the accents of the native speakers, I find them almost never corrected. (Participant 1)

The reason for this inclination was that the tasks related to these aspects always presented in the tests, especially in the national high school examination. A participants said: *"These features of pronunciation are always assessed through the test, so to help us get better score, teachers tend to focus more on these aspects"*. Besides, the time-saving for the more important aspects of English is also shown in a participant's comment: *"Teachers will save time as much as possible in 45 minutes. They usually just tell us that we are wrong in some cases, but sometimes they do not correct the mistakes"*

Nevertheless, the words that were mostly repeated in participant's responses when they are asked to talk about their preferences connected to more frequency in all these aspects, especially in terms of intonation and accents. They stated that besides the benefits regarding of achieving better academic results, students hoped to have native-like accent and their voices were not affected by mother tongue. Students thought that these improvements in pronunciation would gain their confidence when performing their utterances in front of the class or communicating with foreign speakers. For example, a participant revealed that: *"I would like to speak English like a foreigner and I will speak more fluently when speaking in public or giving a presentation. I can be more confident and not be shy because of wrong pronunciation"*

Briefly, the findings demonstrated that most students wished to receive CF for stress, vowels and consonants and ending sounds more often rather than intonation and accents. In comparison, Couper (2019) also found that teachers tended to correct phoneme and word level errors. Teachers also supported that beside focusing on word stress, syllables, the length of stressed vowels, and the errors of adding or omitting sounds also attracted their error corrections.

4.1.2.2 Students' concerns about the effectiveness of teachers' corrective feedback for their pronunciation

Items from 9 to 14 were designed to examine the students' perceptions about the effectiveness of teachers' CF for their pronunciation. The result was shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV
THE TOTAL MEAN SCORE OF STUDENTS' CONCERNS ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHERS' CF

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The effectiveness of teachers' CF	97	3.17	5.00	4.24	.45

It can be seen from Table IV that the mean score of participants' agreement degree is highly above the average level ($M=4.24$, $SD=.45$). It could be interpreted that most students appreciated the effectiveness of teachers' CF. Specifically, Table IV showed that participants expressed that teachers' CF was useful for their development of pronunciation ($M=4.40$) and they could learn from the errors that teachers corrected. Besides, the necessity of teachers' CF for pronunciation is also appreciated ($M=4.38$). They show negative attitudes towards statement

that teachers' CF could inhibit their participation in class. Although they rated the last element, the teachers' CF enabling the effects on uplifting their self-esteem if it was provided with suitable methods, as the least favor in the list, they still have positive attitudes towards them ($M=3.78$).

TABLE V
STUDENTS' CONCERNS ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHERS' CF

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
9. CF for my pronunciation is necessary in the classroom.	97	2.00	5.00	4.34	.66
10. Teachers' CF inhibits my participation in class.	97	2.00	5.00	4.30	.66
11. I can learn from the errors that teachers corrected	97	3.00	5.00	4.38	.57
12. Teachers' CF stimulates my pronunciation learning and boosts my confidence in public speaking.	97	2.00	5.00	4.25	.66
13. Teachers' CF on my pronunciation is useful for my development of pronunciation.	97	3.00	5.00	4.40	.59
14. Teachers' CF may have uplifting effects on my self-esteem if it is provided with suitable methods.	97	2.00	5.00	3.78	.78

Agree with the results from the questionnaire, the findings from interview revealed that all students appreciated the effectiveness of teachers' CF. They believed that teachers' CF help them to pronounce words accurately. For example:

I think teachers' CF is very effective to the development of my pronunciation... It helps me pronounce words and sentences accurately. (Participant 1)

Teachers' CF helps me to pronounce accurately and I am also more confident in speaking in front of the class. (Participant 7)

Some students perceived they can improve their speaking and listening skills and are more successful in communication. They said that:

I think that thanks to the teacher's help, I can listen, write the words more easily ... and when I talk I can speak more confidently. (Participant 1)

I can speak better. Besides, regarding communicating with foreigners, I have become more confident and I can understand what people say and people also understand what I say. (Participant 2)

Besides, better performance in the test was one of the effectiveness of teachers' CF that most students shared in common. For instance:

I can revise from mistakes, achieve better results in speaking tests.... It also helps me to perform better in the test, especially in the phonetic parts of the tests. (Participant 5)

It helps me perform better in listening or pronunciation tests. (Participant 7)

Another benefit of teachers' CF for pronunciation from participant 7's perspective was that thanks to pronouncing words accurately, he could gain more respect for her efforts to learn the language from others. Moreover, when communicating with native speakers, he also felt that their language is highly respected. He said: "Other people can understand that we are educated and knowledgeable. Simultaneously, foreigners will also feel respected for their language"

In terms of CF's effectiveness, the consistent finding from both questionnaire and interview showed that they appreciated it to their pronunciation development. Most students expressed that they could improve their speaking and listening skills and are more successful in communication as well as test performance because they could produce accurate sounds. The interesting finding was that they could gain more respect for their efforts;

especially, when communicating with native speakers, they also felt that their language is highly respected. More importantly, they could avoid the repeated errors in the future. These results also accord with our earlier observations by Calsiyao, 2015).

In regard to investigating the differences between genders on their perceptions about CF, the Independent-Samples T-Test was run to calculate whether the differences existed. The finding was shown in table VI

TABLE VI

MALE AND FEMALE PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS' CF PRACTICES FOR PRONUNCIATION

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Students' perceptions	Male	34	4.01	.39	.07
	Female	63	4.10	.34	.04

As can be seen from Table VI, both male and female participants' perceptions of teachers' CF practices for pronunciation was highly rated (Male: $M=4.01$; $SD=.39$; Female: $M=4.10$; $SD=.34$). The results indicated that there was no significant difference in participants' perceptions of teachers' CF practices for pronunciation between male and female students ($p=.30$). Generally, both male and female participants appreciated the teachers' CF practices for pronunciation.

This results corroborate the findings of Hassan and Arslan (2008) and Rassaei (2013). This notable finding was that no difference was noted in terms of genders regarding the effectiveness of CF and favoured CF strategies. However, Hassan and Arslan confirmed differences from the learners' preferences for peer feedback, Katayama (2007) explored that female students were more supportive in terms of correcting correct all the errors, and males were more accepting in the light of the argument that teachers ignored students' errors. Zarei (2011) asserted that the females had higher tendency toward error correction than the males.

4.2 The matches between EFL learners' preferences and teachers' corrective feedback for pronunciation

4.2.1 Technical aspects of teachers' corrective feedback practices on students' pronunciation

4.2.1.1 Which errors teachers should correct

A Descriptive Statistics Test was run to measure the mean score of students' preferences for which errors teachers should correct. The results are demonstrated in Table VII

TABLE VII

STUDENTS' PREFERENCES FOR WHICH ERRORS TEACHERS SHOULD CORRECT

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
15. All the errors that learners make in pronunciation	97	2.00	5.00	3.85	.86
16. Only the errors that interfere with communication.	97	1.00	5.00	2.67	.98
17. Errors made by individual student.	97	2.00	5.00	3.77	.77
18. General errors made by the whole class	97	2.00	5.00	4.00	.65

The findings from Descriptive Statistics Test and Paired Sample T-Test proved that students preferred being corrected for all the errors they make ($M1=3.85$). Only about a half of students appreciated the role of pronunciation in communication more than one in academic performance such as phonetic assignments or phonetic parts involved in written tests ($M2=2.67$). In relation to students' preferences for errors made by individual and general errors made by the whole class, the results from Descriptive Statistics Test and Paired-sample revealed that participants inclined teachers' CF on general errors made by the whole class rather than ones made by individual students.

The findings were inconsistent with teachers' practices. Teachers recently tend to use selective CF, which refers to feedback for errors that interfere communication in the current study (Ellis, 2009). A possible explanation for preferences in providing individual errors might be that when teachers took the individual differences into

consideration, they could figure out problems of each students to addressed. It was obvious to enhance the effectiveness of CF.

4.2.1.2 How teachers assess student's pronunciation

A Descriptive Statistics Test was calculated to measure the mean score of students' preferences for teachers' assessment for their pronunciation, which were assessed by giving CF on the target feature for a given unit or using cumulative assessment. The results are demonstrated in Table VIII

TABLE VIII
STUDENTS' PREFERENCES FOR TEACHERS' ASSESSMENT FOR THEIR PRONUNCIATION.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teachers give CF on the target feature for a given unit	97	1.00	5.00	3.23	.90
Teachers use cumulative assessment	97	2.00	5.00	4.04	.63

The statistics from Table 4.7 show that cumulative assessment ($M=4.04$; $SD=.63$) was more favorable than teachers' CF on the target feature for a given unit ($M=3.23$; $SD=.90$). Concerning the feedback assessment for students, the results of current study demonstrated that students opted for cumulative assessment. In contrast, teachers adopted feedback on targeted features. They believed that they could achieve at least a certain level of success in promoting the students to produce more comprehensible pronunciation (Baker & Burri, 2016).

4.2.1.3 When teachers provide corrective feedback for pronunciation

The appropriate time for error correction in students' preferences was revealed in Table IX after being calculated by a Descriptive Statistics Test.

TABLE IX
STUDENTS' PREFERENCES OF APPROPRIATE TIME FOR ERROR CORRECTIONS

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Immediate CF	97	2.00	5.00	3.74	.93
Delayed CF	97	1.00	5.00	3.63	1.03

As shown in Table IX, participants' preferences for appropriate time for CF delivery were different, which the immediate CF was more favorable than delayed CF. However, to make certain the findings, a Paired-sample T-test was run to assess on the students' preferences of appropriate time for CF delivery whether students prefer intermediate or delayed CF. The result indicated that difference between the two mean scores ($M1=3.74$), ($M2=3.63$) was not statistically significant ($t=.763$; $p=.45$). It could be interpreted that participants preferred immediate CF the same as delayed CF.

Interestingly but expectedly, the findings from the interview indicated different opinions about the appropriate time for teachers' CF provision. All participants shared the similarities that delayed CF would bring more advantages than the mediated CF. The participants emphasized that with delayed CF, they were not interrupted with what they were talking and had motivation to perform their whole utterances. For example, they said:

I won't be interrupt what I'm talking about and won't lose my interest while I'm talking... I am excited enough to deliver my full utterances. (Participant 3)

Delayed feedback doesn't interrupt my performance. (Participant 6)

In addition, participants added they would have more time to take note mistakes which enabled them intake mistakes corrections in long-term memory. As a below participant indicated that:

I have more time to revise my mistakes, keep them in mind longer and avoid repeating the same mistakes. (Participant 4)

In addition, participants also revealed the reasons for their disagreement with immediate CF. Besides the disadvantages including that Immediate CF interrupted students' thinking, could forget what to say next, lost motivation to perform their utterances, they did not think they were respected enough. For example:

I am not respected enough because teachers do not focus on my ideas, but the mistakes. (Participant 2)

Teachers do not respect me enough. (Participant 4)

In contrast to these findings, however, no evidence of preferences for delayed CF was detected in both students' preferences of Calsiyao (2015) and teachers' practices of Couper (2019) and in comparative study of Hassan and Arslan (2008) about learners' and teachers' preferences for CF. The two most common explanations for this choice was that delayed feedback might be easily forgotten and they did not want to interrupt students' utterances due to concerning learners' confidence.

4.2.2 Teachers' corrective feedback types in use

This cluster, teachers' CF types in use, was designed to examine to what extent students preferred teachers' CF types in use including six methods. The result of Descriptive Statistic Test is illustrated in the Table X

TABLE X
THE TOTAL MEAN SCORE OF STUDENTS' PREFERENCES OF TEACHERS' CF TYPES IN USE

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Students' preferences for types of CF	97	2.33	5.00	3.45	.48

Table X demonstrates that students' preferences concerning the delivery methods of teachers' CF was at medium level. A One-Sample t-Test was calculated to check whether students' preferences of teachers CF types in use ($M=3.45$; $SD=.48$) are at medium level or high level ($M=3.6$). The results showed that the difference between the sample mean score ($M=3.45$; $SD=.48$) and the test value of (3.6) was not statistically significant ($t=-3.194$, $p=.00$). Therefore, students' preferences teachers CF types in use was just at medium level.

The mean score of students' preferences for each types of CF was calculated by a Descriptive Statistic Test. The result is presented in the Table XI

TABLE XI
STUDENTS' PREFERENCES FOR EACH TYPES OF CF

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Recast	97	1.00	5.00	3.81	.80
Explicit correction	97	2.00	5.00	4.16	.66
Metalinguistic feedback	97	1.00	5.00	2.41	1.00
Elicitation	97	1.00	5.00	3.14	.95
Clarification request	97	1.00	5.00	3.64	.84
Repetition	97	1.00	5.00	3.49	1.00

It can be seen from Table XI that among the six delivery methods of teachers' CF for pronunciation, the participants revealed a highest level of preference for explicit correction, with an average mean score ($M=4.16$, $SD=.66$), followed by recast ($M=3.81$; $SD=.80$), clarification request ($M=3.64$; $SD=.84$), repetition ($M=3.49$; $SD=1.00$), elicitation ($M=3.14$; $SD=.95$) and metalinguistic feedback ($M=2.41$; $SD=1.00$).

The findings of interviewed share the remarkable similarities with ones of questionnaire. The preferences for explicit correction was most highly rated with the agreement from three participants, followed by recast with two participants and metalinguistic feedback and clarification request are respectively considered as the most favored CF method of the rest two participants. Explaining for this phenomenon, students supported with various positive aspects of using explicit correction including grasping the rules of pronunciation and allowing the corrections for prior knowledge to get into long-term memory easily. For example:

This method enable students easily find out the mistakes, where the mistakes are and how to correct them. Then, I can learn faster and more easily. (Participant 3)

Participant 7 supported this method but with a different perspective: "... I think regarding of pronunciation, explicit correction allows me easily find out and correct the mistakes thanks to the teachers' help. Every language has it own rules, so it is difficult for me to have the exact self-correction..."

Furthermore, participants 2 appreciated metalinguistic feedback due her responsibility for self-correction which helped her restore the corrections in long-term memory. She said *“I can self-revise my mistakes and correct them, so I can remember them longer and next time I can avoid the same mistakes”* In contrast, the rest participants show the high disagreement with this method. They believed that they appreciated the responsibility for self-correction through this method, but when making speeches in public, if they could not figure out the answers while teachers were waiting for their responses, they would be really nervous. As participant 1 expressed her thought *“Although this method stimulates the students’ responsibilities for self-correction which enables their efforts to find the right answer, when they cannot correct by themselves, they will feel a bit scared and confused”*. Moreover, participants 6 suggested a drawback of metalinguistic feedback *“Those who have a higher level of English will absorb better than average students, so it will be more difficult to find errors as well as how to read correctly”*

It can be seen that most favorite CF types was explicit correction. This finding was in line with Calsiyao (2015), Bakar and Abdullah (2014), and Lee (2013). Also, one of students’ most highly favored types of CF was recast. It is encouraging to compare this finding with that found by Haryanto (2015), Couper (2019), and Ha and Murray (2020), who revealed that recast had positive effects in SLA. In contrast to earlier findings of Katayama (2007), however, metalinguistic feedback drew the most students’ attention. This inconsistent result may be explained by a number of different factors. In the current study, students stated that they could grasped the rules of pronunciation and allowing the corrections for prior knowledge to get into long-term memory more easily thanks to teachers’ clearly accurate correction. Moreover, explicit correction enabled them to save time and avoid being scared and embarrassed in front of their classmates when they could not deliver correct pronunciation. Besides, although students supported the responsibility for self-correction in metalinguistic feedback, it was difficult for them to have the exact self-correction since every language has its own rules of pronunciation. Meanwhile, Lyster (2001) indicated the positive aspects of metalinguistic feedback was that self-correction facilitated by this technique was more effective than does a teachers’ recast or explicit correction due to “learners’ attention to correct-incorrect matches” (cited in Katayama, 2007).

Furthermore, Independent-sample T-test was run to assess whether there are differences between male and female participants in terms of the most favored, explicit correction ($M = 4.16$) and the least favored types of CF, metalinguistic feedback ($M = 2.41$). The findings showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of males ($M = 4.12$; $SD = .54$) and females ($M = 4.19$; $SD = .72$); ($p = .605$) in terms of preference for explicit correction and between the scores of males ($M = 2.53$; $SD = .96$) and females ($M = 2.35$; $SD = 1.02$); ($p = .399$) in terms of preference for metalinguistic feedback (Table XII). This result corroborates the findings of Hassan and Arslan (2008) and Rassaei (2013). This notable finding was that no difference was noted in terms of genders regarding the favored CF strategies. However, the findings conflict with the results of previous research by Katayama’s (2007) and Zarei (2011). Katayama explored that female students were more supportive in terms of correcting correct all the errors, and males were more accepting in the light of the argument that teachers ignored students’ errors. Meanwhile, Zarei (2011) asserted that the females had higher tendency toward error correction than the males.

TABLE XII

MALE AND FEMALE PREFERENCES OF THE MOST FAVORED AND THE LEAST FAVORED TYPES OF CF

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Students’ preferences of explicit correction	Male	34	4.12	.54	.09
	Female	63	4.19	.72	.09
Students’ preferences of metalinguistic feedback	Male	34	2.53	.96	.16
	Female	63	2.35	1.01	.13

V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

The findings of this study provide insights into students’ perceptions and preferences for teachers’ CF and the extent to which their preferences match with teachers’ practices. Briefly, the results of this study draw the following conclusions. First, the participants had high perceptions of teachers’ CF. They had the positive

attitudes towards the value of corrections for their pronunciation. Although some of students still concerned with the teachers' negative attitudes, teachers' ignorance or vague error correction and the quality of error correction when teachers corrected their error, CF actually helped students make progress in pronunciation performance presented though listening and speaking skills and test performance. It also enabled them to gain their confidence in public speaking and motivation in language learning.

Furthermore, both teachers and students share similarities in the values of students' responsibility for error correction and segmental features as a choice of corrected errors and teachers as a source of CF. However, a large number of evidence demonstrated the inconsistencies between teachers' practice on CF provision and students' preferences. In terms of types of corrected errors, while students preferred to be corrected the errors made by the whole class, teachers support the effectiveness of correcting errors made by individual students. Besides, although teachers' were in favour of correcting the errors interfering students' communication, students did not think it is sufficient and supported to be corrected all the errors they made. CF assessment is another aspect that illustrated the conflicts in teachers' practices and students' preferences. Students thought that they could benefit from cumulative assessment, but teachers most of the time focused on the target feature for a given unit. Furthermore, regarding CF strategies, teachers mainly used recast or chose the CF types depending on learners' proficiency levels in English or classroom activities. However, students in this study highly appreciated most of CF types including recast, explicit correction and clarification requests, the most preferable one was explicit correction. An interesting finding showed in this study was the students' preferences on timing for CF. Most of studies revealed that teachers frequently corrected immediately after students made mistakes. However, the findings in the current research were completely different. While the results from questionnaire proved the students' preferential equality between immediate and delayed CF, in-depth interview data found the incline on delayed CF. Finally, there is no considerable differences between male and female students from their perceptions about value of CF and preferences for CF types.

5.2 Implications

The findings of the current study hold pedagogical implications for EFL teachers and learners. Most immediately, this study may have a practical use for high schools in Mekong delta. Specifically, it may be useful for teachers in their provision of feedback regarding students' pronunciation skills, thus potentially improving these students' pronunciation performance.

The matches in this study were found based on comparing students' preferences with the common teachers' practices investigated by a number of researchers around the world. Therefore, the findings in this current research can be applied in various learning contexts.

Overall, students had positive perspectives about the values of CF for pronunciation. Especially, as the findings indicated the necessity of CF for students' pronunciation presented through students' preferences for error correction for all errors they made and the errors made by the whole class, it is essential to keep deliver CF for students' errors. Beside that, teachers should promote more opportunities for them to self correct their errors which is believed to enhance their responsibility for error correction and capability of intake into long-term memory.

The present study demonstrated that, EFL teachers and learners have their own preferences for CF. These findings regarding students' preferences may encourage teachers to continue seeking effective ways to provide CF to their students. In detail, teachers should promote error correction for suprasegmental features, especially in terms of intonation and pronunciation as apart from achieving better academic results, students hoped to have a native-like accent, gain their confidence when speaking in public and their voices were not affected by mother tongue.

Besides, students preferred to receive CF after they completed their performance. It can be implied that teachers should not interrupt students' utterances due to promoting students' fluency in speaking. It also allows students to take note to avoid repeating the same mistakes in the future.

In addition, considering students' concerns about teachers' negative attitudes, quality of CF and ignorance or delivery vague error correction, teachers need to tolerance with students' errors since making errors is a signal of the process in which the learning is occurring and it also indicated the students' progress in language learning (Hendrickson, 1978).

Finally, the findings of this study strengthened evidence for the matches and mismatches among teachers' practices for CF provision and students' preferences. Also, students stated the benefits of the correspondences could enable progress in pronunciation and gained their motivation to learn English. Therefore, teachers should have a closer look on students' expectations to balance their teaching strategies.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Ngoc Xuyen Nguyen is an English teacher at Centre for Foreign Languages, Can Tho University, Vietnam. She completed a bachelor's degree of English in Education in 2018. She is currently an MA student at Can Tho University. She is interested in doing research on the methods, techniques of improving teaching and learning quality.

Nguyen Quoc Hung Luu is a director of Centre for Foreign Languages, Can Tho University. His research interests include pedagogism, English language teaching, professional development, English integration, teaching English to young learners.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agustuna, N. E., Herlina, R., & Faridah, D. (2019). Corrective Feedback on Pronunciation Errors: Teacher's Perception and EFL High School Students' Self-Reflection. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 3(3), 311-327.
- [2] Ancker, W. (2000). Errors and corrective feedback: Updated theory and classroom practice. *English Teaching Forum*, 8(4), 20-25.
- [3] Bakar, Z. A., & Abdullah, M. R. T. L. (2014). Undergraduate L2 Learners' Perception and Preferences towards Error Correction Type on Pronunciation Errors: An Exploratory Study. *Advances in Educational Technologies*, 93.
- [4] Baker, A. A., & Burri, M. (2016). Feedback on second language pronunciation: A case study of EAP teachers' beliefs and practices. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(6), 1-19.
- [5] Bang, Y. J. (1999). Reactions of EFL Students to Oral Error Correction. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 3, 39-51.
- [6] Buss, L. (2012, August). Pronunciation from the perspective of pre-service EFL teachers: An analysis of internship reports. In *Proceedings of the 4th Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching conference* (pp. 255-264).
- [7] Calsiyao, I. S. (2015). Corrective feedback in classroom oral errors among Kalinga-Apayao State College students. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 3(1), 394-400.
- [8] Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D., & Goodwin, J. (1996). *Teaching pronunciation: Reference for teachers of English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [9] Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Couper, G. (2019). Teachers' cognitions of corrective feedback on pronunciation: Their beliefs, perceptions and practices. *System*, 84, 41-52.
- [11] Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, Volume 1(2009), pp. 3-18.
- [12] Foote, J. A., Trofimovich, P., Collins, L., & Urzúa, F. S. (2016). Pronunciation teaching practices in communicative second language classes. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44(2), 181-196.
- [13] Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Humanities. Gardner (1985),
- [14] Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2020). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 1362168820931897.
- [15] Haryanto, E. (2015). Teachers' corrective Feedback on Students' pronunciation at The Daffodils English Course Kampung Inggris Pare Indonesia. *Linguists: Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 2(2).
- [16] Hassan, A. W., & Arslan, F. Y. (2018). A Comparative Study on Iraqi EFL Teachers' and Learners' Preferences of Corrective Feedback in Oral Communication. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(3), 765-785.

-
- [17] Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. Review of Educational Research March 2007, Vol. 77, No. 1, pp. 81–112
 - [18] Havranek, G., & Cesnik, H. (2001). Factors affecting the success of corrective feedback. *EUROSLA yearbook*, 1(1), 99-122.
 - [19] Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *The modern language journal*, 62(8), 387-398.
 - [20] Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The Beliefs about Language Learning of Beginning University Foreign Language Students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72(3), 283–294.
 - [21] Johansson, S. (1978). Native reactions to errors produced by Swedish learners of English. *Gothenburg Studies in English*, 44.
 - [22] Katayama, A. (2007). Learners' perceptions toward oral error correction. In K. Bradford-Watts, 284–299.
 - [23] Krashen, S. D. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. Vol. 1. p. 985). London: Longman
 - [24] Kulik, J. A., & Kulik, C. L. C. (1988). Timing of feedback and verbal learning. *Review of educational research*, 58(1), 79-97.
 - [25] Lee, E. J. E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41(2), 217-230.
 - [26] Lee, E. J. E. (2016). Reducing international graduate students' language anxiety through oral pronunciation corrections. *System*, 56, 78-95.
 - [27] Nguyen, L. T., & Newton, J. (2019, September). Corrective feedback in pronunciation teaching: A Vietnamese perspective. In *Annual Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference* (p. 201).
 - [28] Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*, 2(1), 39-52.
 - [29] Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.
 - [30] Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language teaching*, 46(1), 1-40.
 - [31] Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: The learner's view. Singapore. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
 - [32] Ok, S., & Ustaci, H. (2013). Preferences of ELT Students on the Strategies Instructors Use in the Correction of Oral Grammar Errors. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(8), 244–254.
 - [33] Oladejo, James A. 1993. Error Correction in ESL: Learners' Preferences. *TESL Canada Journal* 10(2):71-89.
 - [34] Rossiter, M. J., Derwing, T. M., Manimtim, L. G., & Thomson, R. I. (2010, June). Oral Fluency: The Neglected Component in the Communicative Classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66(4), 583-606.
 - [35] Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2012). Effects of form- focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of Japanese learners of English. *Language learning*, 62(2), 595-633.
 - [36] Rassaei, E. (2013). Corrective feedback, learners' perceptions, and second language development. *System*, 41(2), 472-483.
 - [37] 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.
 - [38] Tweedy, L. (2012). Discovering factors that influence English pronunciation of native Vietnamese speakers (Doctoral dissertation, Hamline University).
 - [39] Ustaci, H. Y., & Ok, S. (2014). Preferences of ELT Learners in the Correction of Oral Vocabulary and Pronunciation Errors. *Higher Education Studies*, 4(2), 29-41.
 - [40] Vu, H. Y. (2016). Exploring English pronunciation teaching in Vietnam: time for a new approach?
 - [41] Zarei, Nahid. The relationship between age and corrective feedback in oral communication. *Online Journal of ICT for Language Learning*. 5th ed. 2011.
-