

Students' Perception of Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class

Afrizal,¹ Roswati², Nurdiana³, Muhammad Faisal⁴

¹²³⁴UIN Suska Riau, Panam, Indonesia

e-mail: afrizal.msi@uin-suska.ac.id¹, roswati@uin-suska.ac.id², nurdiana@uin-suska.ac.id³,
muhammadfaisal13018@gmail.com⁴

Corresponding Email: nurdiana@uin-suska.ac.id

Received : 20-11-2025

Revised : 04-12-2025

Accepted : 06-12-2025

Publication : 31-12-2025

Al-Manar English and Arabic Journal is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)



Abstract

This study sought to examine students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback in speaking activities. Instructors used vocal corrective criticism in the classroom, particularly during speaking sessions. Offering vocal comments in the classroom facilitated students' proficient and accurate use of English. The study methodology used a quantitative descriptive approach, with data processed using SPSS version 23 and Microsoft Excel. Data was gathered via the distribution of a questionnaire to examine students' perceptions. Questionnaires were administered to 31 students in the fourth semester of the English Education Department as the study sample. The results indicated that the students achieved a score of 76% after data analysis using SPSS 23, reflecting a good view of oral corrective feedback in the speaking lesson. Another investigation revealed that the students agreed to offer oral corrective criticism during the speaking lesson.

Keywords: *Students' Perception; Oral Corrective Feedback*

INTRODUCTION

Speaking constitutes a dynamic interplay of meaning formation, involving the generation, reception, and interpretation of information.¹ Moreover, those who engage actively in communication endeavors would have enhanced ease in acquiring a second language. The context of the speech, including the participants, their collective experiences, the physical environment, and the objectives, dictates its structure and significance.²

Speaking skills are a crucial component of acquiring a second or foreign language. By acquiring verbal communication abilities, students may engage in dialogues, articulate their thoughts, and communicate information. Speaking abilities include using the whole of a student's linguistic repertoire to execute a certain speech job.³ In a speaking lesson, many types of speaking exercises assess students' speaking abilities. Examples of speaking activities that students must do in speaking class include delivering speeches, engaging in debates,

¹ Brown, H.D. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (2nd Edition)*. New York: Longman.(2001)

² Nunan, D. *Language Teaching Technology: A Textbook for Teachers*. London: Phoenix ELT (1995)

³ Harmer, J. *How to teach English: An introduction to the practice of English language teaching*. Cambridge: UK (1998)

narrating stories, and fulfilling the requirements of the speaking evaluation. In language education, speaking is an essential ability that children must acquire alongside reading, writing, and listening.⁴

Additionally, five criteria are included in evaluating speaking: grammar, vocabulary, understanding, pronunciation, and fluency.⁵ Consequently, students must be capable of generating grammatically accurate, logically coherent phrases appropriate for certain settings, while using acceptable pronunciation.

Corrective feedback is a reaction to students' verbal expressions that include linguistic errors. In the classroom, the educator plays a crucial role in providing remedial feedback to students. Moreover, spoken corrective feedback is an integral component of the instructional process, since it significantly contributes to the improvement of students' linguistic precision.⁶ Educators' tastes and perspectives on mistake correction significantly impact their instructional methods, although within limitations such as time, activity emphasis, and communication dynamics.⁷

In this context, it is imperative to offer corrective feedback on the errors made by language learners. Should language students repeatedly make errors without receiving correction, those mistakes will solidify, ultimately distorting the clarity of their English usage. The students may be under the impression that they have utilized English accurately, given that their professor refrains from offering corrections when they engage with the language. This could potentially result in misunderstandings between the speaker and the listener. Thus, the role of the English lecturer is essential in aiding language students to correct their speech errors in English. In delivering corrective feedback regarding students' speech deficiencies, it is imperative for an educator to consider the perspectives of students regarding the learning experience.

If a lecturer fails to provide feedback to students or postpones providing corrected feedback after they make a mistake, there can be consequences. It will make them less eager to learn, and they might not recognize their mistakes. Learning how a lecturer corrects students' spoken faults and provides constructive feedback is crucial to preventing those negative attitudes. Errors can be decreased and remedied without any instances of negative attitudes from the students if the lecturer and the students have the same beliefs and perceptions regarding teaching and learning. A lecturer can accomplish their goals by imparting English instruction as well.

Throughout the oral corrective feedback process, the professor actively participated in activities that evaluated students and enabled the rectification of their errors. The evaluation is categorized into two types: informal assessment and formal assessment.⁸ An informal assessment consists of providing comments to students, such as Examples include phrases such as "excellent job," "commendable work," and "did you articulate 'can' or 'can't'?" Alternatively, "I believe you intended to convey 'you broke the glass, not you break the glass,' or perhaps adding a smiley to some homework." Formal evaluation, via activities or processes, is explicitly crafted to access a reservoir of skills and knowledge. Consequently, the researcher examines this spoken corrective feedback in relation to the category of informal

⁴ Dedy Wahyudi, et.al .*Using Pecha Kucha Presentation in Teaching English Speaking: A Pre-Experimental Study on Islamic Senior High School Students*. Journal of Al Manar: English and Arabic Journal of Uin Suska Riau Vol.15 No.1 <https://ejournal.uin-suska.ac.id/index.php/almanar/article/view/28550/10214> (2024)

⁵ Brown, H. D. *Language Assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. New York: Pearson/Longman (2004)

⁶ Ellis, R. (2009). *Corrective Feedback and Lecturer Development*. L2 Journal 1 No. 1 3- 18.

⁷ Yoshida, M. (2008). Exploring Ideas for a Mathematics Teacher Educator's Contribution to Lesson Study. In D. Tirosh, & T. Wood (Eds.), *Tools and Process in Mathematics Teacher Education* (pp. 85-106). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

⁸ Ibid.

evaluation.

Oral corrective feedback is crucial in language instruction, particularly in the training of speaking skills. Feedback is crucial in teaching speaking as it helps avoid fossilization in students.⁹

Consequently, the groundbreaking idea of this study was the use of spoken corrective feedback as a foundation for improvement. The instructor offers criticism to students to rectify their speech inaccuracies. Feedback is to enhance students' speaking abilities and rectify their errors for future performances.

The aforementioned explanation indicates that students' reactions and impressions about spoken mistake correction from their instructor are essential. In a previous study, researchers found that most students expected their lecturer to provide corrective feedback on verbal mistakes, as they believed it would aid their acquisition of English. The majority of students anticipate their instructor providing spoken mistake correction, since it will facilitate their acquisition of English. In the absence of spoken mistake correction feedback from the instructor, students will persist in making English language errors, adversely affecting their learning of the language. The research question was, "How are the students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback given in speaking class activities?"

Method

This study used quantitative research. It was a descriptive quantitative research design. The descriptive research design serves as a framework for describing a population, situation, or phenomenon by addressing questions related to what, where, when, and how, while excluding questions about why.¹⁰ The primary objective of this design is to get a more profound understanding of a group or phenomenon. The quantitative technique quantifies the data acquired, while the survey method gathers information on a variable from a population, enabling a questionnaire to collect data from survey respondents.

In addition, the quantitative approach is defined as a research method that explains phenomena by collecting numerical data and analyzing it using mathematical and statistical techniques. This approach is systematic and involves testing theories by examining the relationship between variables, intending to produce objective, valid, and reliable results.¹¹ Moreover, survey research is used to address organizational behavior issues, including the development of human resource policies. Surveys may be administered to ascertain factors like views, perceptions, attitudes, accomplishments, and motivation.¹²

Data Analysis

This research used quantitative data analysis methodologies to examine the acquired data. To ascertain students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback in speaking classes, questionnaire responses were analyzed descriptively (frequency and mean) using SPSS and Microsoft Excel, depending on the number of students who responded to each item.

⁹ Mendez, E. H., Arguelles, L. G., & Castro, A. B. (2010). Oral Corrective Feedback: Someways to Go About it. *EFL International*, 254-270

¹⁰ Cresswell, J. W. Research Design: *Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications (2003)

¹¹ Creswell, J. W. *Educational Research*. Boston: Pearson Education (2012)

¹² Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta (2015)

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

P = Percentage; F = Frequency; N = Total number of Students

The researcher used a method derived from the Likert scale to calculate the frequency and percentage of students' perceptions.¹³ The researcher provided several ratings of responses to the questionnaire.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

This section delineates the findings derived from the data analyzed by the researchers. This study addressed a singular topic, using data obtained from a questionnaire to examine, "What are the students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback in speaking class?" The result of the questionnaire was shown as below:

Table I.
The result score of students' perception of oral corrective feedback

No	Student Id	Score
1	stud1	76
2	stud2	60
3	stud3	69
4	stud4	61
5	stud5	57
6	stud6	65
7	stud7	62
8	stud8	60
9	stud9	69
10	stud10	60
11	stud11	61
12	stud12	58
13	stud13	64
14	stud14	60
15	stud15	65
16	stud16	64
17	stud17	68
18	stud18	65
19	stud19	62
20	stud20	71
21	stud21	68
22	stud22	63
23	stud23	65
24	stud24	67
25	stud25	65
26	stud26	62

¹³Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education* (8th ed.). London: Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539>

27	stud27	67
28	stud28	68
29	stud29	70
30	stud30	69
31	stud31	62
Total		2003
Mean		64,6129

According to the table above, there were 31 respondents. The students' perception of oral corrective feedback was found the total score 2003, and the mean score is 64,61. The frequency distribution of students' perceptions was obtained by using SPSS as follows:

Table II.
The frequency distribution of students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 57	1	3.2	3.2	3.2
58	1	3.2	3.2	6.5
60	4	12.9	12.9	19.4
61	2	6.5	6.5	25.8
62	4	12.9	12.9	38.7
63	1	3.2	3.2	41.9
64	2	6.5	6.5	48.4
65	5	16.1	16.1	64.5
67	2	6.5	6.5	71.0
68	3	9.7	9.7	80.6
69	3	9.7	9.7	90.3
70	1	3.2	3.2	93.5
71	1	3.2	3.2	96.8
76	1	3.2	3.2	100.0
Total	31	100.0	100.0	

The data presented in the table above can be expressed in the following manner: The frequency for interval 57 was 1 student (3.2%), for interval 58 was 1 student (3.2%), for interval 60 was 4 students (12.9%), for interval 61 was 2 students (6.5%), for interval 62 was 4 students (12.9%), and for interval 63 was 1 student (3.2%).

The frequency for interval 64 was recorded at 2 students (6.5%), interval 65 at 5 students (16.1%), interval 67 at 2 students (6.5%), interval 68 at 3 students (9.7%), interval 69 at 3 students (9.7%), interval 70 at 1 student (3.2%), interval 71 at 1 student (3.2%), and interval 76 at 1 student (3.2%).

Table III.
The recapitulation of Students' perception toward oral corrective feedback

The table above presents a summary of students' perceptions regarding the oral

No item	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	16	51.6	14	45.2	1	3.2	0	0	0	0	31	100
2	9	29	16	51.6	6	19.4	0	0	0	0	31	100
3	13	41.9	11	35.5	7	22.6	0	0	0	0	31	100
4	10	32.2	12	38.7	9	29	0	0	0	0	31	100
5	17	54.8	13	41.9	1	3.2	0	0	0	0	31	100
6	0	0	3	9.7	10	32.3	12	38.7	6	19.4	31	100
7	5	16.1	11	35.5	10	32.3	5	16.1	0	0	31	100
8	5	16.1	18	58.8	5	16.1	3	9.7	0	0	31	100
9	0	0	5	16.1	8	25.8	16	51.6	2	6.5	31	100
10	14	45.2	12	38.7	4	12.9	1	3.2	0	0	31	100
11	16	51.6	13	41.9	1	3.2	1	3.2	0	0	31	100
12	0	0	0	0	3	9.7	14	45.2	14	45.2	31	100
13	2	6.5	8	25.8	7	22.6	14	45.2	0	0	31	100
14	18	58.1	8	25.8	4	12.9	1	3.2	0	0	31	100
15	22	71	7	22.6	2	6.5	0	0	0	0	31	100
16	17	54.8	13	41.9	1	3.2	0	0	0	0	31	100
17	18	58.1	6	19.4	6	19.4	1	3.2	0		31	100
TOTAL	182		170		85		68		22		31	100

corrective feedback questionnaire, based on responses from 31 participants. In response to the first statement, I favor receiving corrective feedback from my lecturer for each error I commit; 16 students, representing 51.6%, indicated strong agreement. In response to the second statement, I favor instances where my lecturer provides corrective feedback solely on significant errors made; 16 students, representing 51.6%, indicated agreement. Regarding the third statement, I favor receiving corrective feedback from my lecturer in a private setting; 13 students, representing 41.9%, indicated that they strongly agree.

In response to the 4th statement, 12 students (38.7%) expressed agreement with the preference for corrective feedback from the lecturer during class. In response to the 5th statement, I favor immediate corrective feedback from my lecturer regarding my oral errors; 17 students, representing 54.8%, indicated Strongly Agree. In response to the 6th statement, I prefer that my lecturer provide corrective feedback on my oral errors after class; 12 students, representing 38.7%, indicated disagreement. In response to the 7th statement, I expressed a preference for individual correction by my lecturer; 11 students, representing 35.5%,

indicated agreement. In response to the 8th statement, I express a preference for correction when the entire class commits the same error as I do; 18 students, representing 58.8%, indicated "agree."

The 9th statement indicates confusion regarding the lecturer's corrective feedback on oral errors, with 16 students (51.6%) expressing disagreement. The 10th statement indicates that I feel reassured when my lecturer offers corrective feedback on my oral errors; 12 students, representing 38.7%, expressed agreement with this sentiment. Among 11 statements, I feel comfortable receiving corrective feedback on my oral errors from my lecturer; 16 students, representing 51.6%, indicated Strongly Agree. The 12th statement indicates that the individual experiences negative emotions, such as guilt or anger, in response to their lecturer's correction of errors. Fourteen students, representing 45.2%, expressed disagreement or strong disagreement. I am concerned about committing oral errors in language class for the 13th statement. Fourteen students, representing 45.2%, indicated "Disagree." The 14th statement elicited frustration due to a lack of understanding regarding the lecturer's corrections, with 18 students (58.1%) indicating Strongly Agree. For the 5th statement, I want lecturers to correct my errors in speaking English; there were 22 (71%) of students who revealed Strongly Agree. For the 16th statement, oral feedback provided is necessary and helpful; there were 17 (54.8%) students who revealed Strongly Agree. For the 17th statement, I feel I have learned a lot from oral correction; there were 18 (58.1%) students who revealed they strongly agree. The results are presented as follows:

Table IV.
The recapitulation of Students' perception of oral corrective feedback

No	Category	value	total
1	strongly agree	5	910
2	Agree	4	680
3	Neutral	3	255
4	Disagree	2	136
5	Strong disagree	1	22
Total			2003

The ideal total score of the whole item is $5 \times 17 \times 31 = 2,635$ (if all of the respondents answer "strongly agree" for all items). However, the total score acquired from the questionnaire was 2.003. To find out how students' perception of oral corrective feedback is, to point out the formula to analyze the percentage of the data as follows:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

$$P = \frac{2.003}{2.635} \times 100\%$$

$$P = 76\%$$

Based on the classification table provided above, it could be concluded that the students' perception of oral corrective feedback in the speaking class at the English Department of the 4th semester in UIN Suska Riau was positive because the percentage obtained from the formula was 76%, which was in the positive category. Thus, the research problem was answered.

Discussion

The concluding section of this research report offered an analysis of the findings. The findings indicate a favorable perspective regarding the use of oral corrective feedback in speaking classes, reflected in a score of 76%. The data reveal a favorable outcome, as the average for each indicator exceeds 3.00, thereby addressing the research inquiry regarding students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback in speaking classes. Furthermore, it unequivocally illustrated that the implementation of oral corrective feedback in speaking classes significantly enhances students' speaking competencies.

The results were substantiated by the assertion that oral corrective feedback constitutes a teacher's verbal response to students' inaccuracies in speaking performance, frequently emphasizing aspects such as pronunciation, vocabulary, language structures, communication abilities, conceptualization, and organization.¹⁴ The educator addresses the students' mistakes through the provision of verbal feedback. This response indicates that the students' expressions in the target language exhibit inaccuracies in certain respects. It may involve an adjustment to their pronunciation, grammar, or even the structural elements of their expression. The students exhibit a pronounced eagerness for frequent and regular correction, as they are keenly aware of the importance of addressing their mistakes rather than allowing them to persist unacknowledged. Oral corrective feedback serves as a mechanism to address and rectify students' inaccuracies in the application of the target language, especially concerning their spoken errors.¹⁵

CONCLUSION

This study was undertaken to explore the students' perceptions regarding oral corrective feedback within the context of speaking classes. The analysis of the data gathered from the distributed questionnaire revealed that students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback fell within the positive range, with a notable 76% indicating favorable views. The students reached a consensus to offer oral corrective feedback during their speaking class activities. It is my aspiration that this feedback will assist the students in rectifying their mistakes and attaining profound understanding, which can prove to be exceedingly advantageous for their academic journey.

REFERENCES

- Annie, T. (2011). Exploring Students' Perception of and Reaction to Feedback in School-Based Assessment. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 7(2), 107-127.
- Brown, H.D. (2001) *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (2nd Edition)*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. New York: Pearson/Longman.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education* (8th ed.). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539>
- Cresswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications
- Dedy Wahyudi, et.al (2024) *Using Pecha Kucha Presentation in Teaching English Speaking: A Pre-Experimental Study on Islamic Senior High School Students*. *Journal of Al*

¹⁴ Annie, T. *Exploring Students' Perception of and Reaction to Feedback in School-Based Assessment*. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 7(2), 107-127 (2011)

¹⁵ Lyster, et.al. *Counterpoint Piece: The Case For Variety In Corrective Feedback Research*. *Studies in Second Language* (2013)

- Manar: English and Arabic Journal of Uin Suska Riau Vol.15 No.1
<https://ejournal.uin-suska.ac.id/index.php/almanar/article/view/28550/10214>
- Ellis, R. (2009). *Corrective Feedback and Lecturer Development*. L2 Journal 1 No. 1 3- 18.
- Harmer, J. (1998) *How to teach English: An introduction to the practice of English language teaching*. Cambridge: UK.
- Lyster, et.al. (2013). *Counterpoint Piece: The Case For Variety In Corrective Feedback Research*. Studies in Second Language
- Nunan, D. (1995) *Language Teaching Technology: A Textbook for Teachers*. London: Phoenix ELT.
- Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Yoshida, M. (2008). Exploring Ideas for a Mathematics Teacher Educator's Contribution to Lesson Study. In D. Tirosh, & T. Wood (Eds.), *Tools and Process in Mathematics Teacher Education* (pp. 85-106). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.