



مجلة البطانة للعلوم التربوية

ISSN: 1858- 9499

<http://ojs.abutana.edu.sd>

العدد الخامس عشر، ديسمبر، 2023، ص (241-229)



Students' Perceptions and Reflections Towards Oral Corrective Feedback Usage to Enhance Learning of English Language

(A Case Study at Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, KSA)

Dr. Minahi Abdullah Al-Qahtani

Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, PYU, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Alqahtani4617@gmail.com

Cellphone No.00966505104617

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the students' perceptions and reflections towards oral corrective feedback (OCF) in (EFL) classrooms at tertiary level preparatory year in Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Riyadh town, Kharj province; the academic years (2023-2024), and also aimed to illustrate the students' perceptions towards effective usage of (OCF) oral corrective feedback, review the effect of (OCF) usage in different types of English language skills and investigate the important role of (OCF) in enhancing students' linguistic accuracy. The study adopted descriptive and analytical quantitative research method. The tool used for data collections was the questionnaire for students to reveal the practical perceptions and reflections about (OCF). The sample consisted of (100) students which was selected systematically from the overall population of English language students. The findings indicated that the attitudes and performance of English instructors enhanced the positive perceptions of learners inside English language learning classes. Also, the practice of oral corrective feedback, the use of gestures and body language to correct students' oral mistakes by instructors enhanced learners' oral communication skills, fluency, accuracy and facilitated learning. Moreover, learners preferred implicit oral corrective feedback and that built a good rapport between instructors and their students and make them self-confident. Finally, the students preferred correcting their errors by English language instructors immediately and in a brief and relaxed manner. It was recommended that to provide orientation sessions to students would be useful for them to increase rich coexistence and cooperation with their English instructors inside classes.

Keywords: students' perception & reflection, (OCF), enhance learning English.



هدفت هذه الدراسة الي التعرف على تصورات الطلاب وافكارهم نحو التغذية الراجعة للتصحيح الشفهي في الفصول الجامعية للغة الإنجليزية كلغة اجنبية لمستوى السنة التحضيرية في مدينة الرياض، محافظة الخرج، جامعة الأمير سطاتم بن عبد العزيز للاعوام الاكاديمية (2023- 2024)، كما تهدف الدراسة لتفسير تصورات الطلاب نحو استخدام فعال للتغذية الراجعة للتصحيح الشفهي وتقييم اثر استخدام التغذية الراجعة للتصحيح الشفهي لمختلف مهارات اللغة الإنجليزية والتعرف على الدور الهام للتغذية الراجعة للتصحيح الشفهي في تعزيز الدقة اللغوية للطلاب. طريقة البحث المتبناه هي: مدخل التحليل البحث الوصفي الكمي. الأداة المستخدمة لجمع البيانات هي : الاستبيان ، ولقد أجريت مع الطلاب لكشف التصور العملي عن التغذية الراجعة للتصحيح الشفهي. تضمنت عينة الدراسة علي (100) طالب وتم اختيار العينة بمنهجية من كل مجموع طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية. إشارة الحثيات الى أن سلوك وأداء أساتذة الأنجليزي عزز الفهم الإيجابي للطلاب داخل فصول التعلم. أيضاً ممارسة التغذية الراجعة للتصحيح الشفهي واستخدام الأيماءات ولغة الجسد لتصحيح الطلاب شفها بواسطة الأساتذة حسنت مهارات التواصل الشفهية ، الطلاقة والدقة وسهلت التعلم. علاوة علي ذلك فضل الطلاب التصحيح الشفهي الضمني، وذلك انشأ علاقة وطيدة بين الطلاب والأساتذة وجعلهم واثقون من انفسهم. أخيراً يفضل الطلاب تصحيح اخطاءهم مباشرةً بعد الخطأ وبايجازوبطريقة سلسلة من قبل الأساتذة. اوصت الدراسة بعقد جلسات توعوية للطلاب لإفادتهم وزيادة التعايش والتعاون الثر مع اساتذتهم داخل الفصول.

Introduction

Corrective feedback is the main concern of form-focused instructions as it emphasizes accuracy in pronunciation, grammar, tone of voice and other aspects of language learning (Spada & Lightbown, 1993). It is true because Sheen and Ellis; regard oral corrective feedback (OCF) refers to the response that learners receive about their linguistic errors made in their oral or written production in a second language (Sheen and Ellis, 2011). The oral corrective feedback represented a cornerstone in teaching and learning because educationalists are interested in, when, and how to utilize (OCF) in classroom

230 Dr. Minahi Abdullah Al-Qahtani, Students' Perceptions and Reflections Towards Oral Corrective Feedback Usage to Enhance Learning of English Language



instruction; scholars such as (Krashen 1981& Gass 1997) are divided over whether the negative evidence afforded by oral (OCF) about what is 'incorrect' in the target language is necessary for (L2) development, or whether exposure to positive evidence about what is correct is sufficient by itself. According to Nassaji and Kartchava (2021) "Corrective feedback is a vital pedagogical tool in language learning". It is important to address the perceptions and reflections of Saudi students at the preparatory year at Prince Sattam University (KSA) towards the oral corrective feedback.

The Statement of the Problem

The practices of Saudi Arabian students learning of English as a foreign language needed more amendments in different fields of teaching and learning. Therefore, it was very essential to enhance the views of students' perceptions and reflections towards the procedures of oral corrective feedback which would help them develop and reinforce their learning proficiency.

The Questions of the Study

The Questions of the study were;

- 1) what were the Saudi students' perceptions towards the oral corrective feedback?
- 2) what were the effects of using (OCF) in different types of language skills?

The Objectives of the Study

The study aimed to illustrate the students' perceptions towards effective usage of (OCF) oral corrective feedback and review the effect of (OCF) usage in different types of language skills in learning English.

The Significant of the Study

The study would provide suitable solutions which were relevant and helpful to those who were working in the field of education in general and especially teachers of (EFL) teaching. The findings would also benefit those who were interested in the field of language study.



The Limits of the Study

The study was limited to the English language teaching and education. The subjects of the study were students at Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, preparatory year programme, in the academic years (2023-2024).

Literature Review & Previous Studies

Second language learners are liable to face many difficulties which lead to different errors. Lado (1957) compared first and second languages to identify potential difficulties in learning the second language, which might lead to learner error.

Long (1991) defined the term corrective feedback as a “linguistic form or a combination of forms.

Russell and Spada's (2006) definition of corrective feedback which was "the term corrective feedback referred]to any feedback provided to a learner, from any source, that contained evidence of learner error of language form" (p.134).

Alsolami (2019) stated that corrective feedback was an important element in the language learning process. Therefore, the issue of corrective feedback in language classrooms had been investigated by numerous scholars who believed that the strategy could effectively be used to improve the language skills of students. Brookhart (2008: 47) also explained to instructors the time, place and how to give individual or group oral feedback. They needed to speak to the student at a time and a place in which the student was ready and willing to hear what they had to say. Individual oral feedback ranged more broadly than any other type of feedback, from the very formal and structured (student–teacher conferences) to the very informal (a few whispered words as you pass a student’s seat). Group oral feedback—for example, speaking to a whole class about a common misconception—could also be helpful.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) mentioned six types of corrective feedback: recast, explicit feedback, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, elicitation and repetition.



Nassaji and Kartchava (2021:187) mentioned that in reference to corrective feedback features which included some procedures to attain learning and realize competency in language learning. Such as opportunities to receive comprehensible input, chances to focus on language form in the context of meaning, and conversational space to apply emergent language abilities to produce comprehensible linguistic output. When learners produced language output during communication within and beyond the language classroom, it opened up the possibility for them to receive corrective feedback (CF) from a communication partner about the language they had produced.

According to Sackstein, (2017:9) the rationale for teaching students to provide peer feedback stems from the fact that it was very useful in many ways such as feedback empowers students to be experts, building independence, developing self-advocacy and fosters growth.

Students' Attitudes Towards Oral Errors

Most language-teaching professionals realized that students' learning potential increases when attitudes were positive and motivation runs high (Gardner, 1985)

Because attitudes were the filter through which all learning occurs. When students with positive attitudes experienced success, these attitudes were reinforced; whereas students with negative attitudes might fail to progress and become even more negative in their language learning attitudes. Because attitudes could be modified by experience, effective language teaching strategies could encourage students to be more positive toward the language they were learning (Mantle-Bromley, 1995)

Like teachers, learners also differed in their attitudes toward error correction. For some, no adverse affective effect was likely unless the corrections were delivered in a very aggressive or unfair manner; for others, there was a serious danger that correction would produce embarrassment, anger, inhibition, feelings of inferiority, and a generally negative attitude toward the class, the teacher, and possibly toward English (Truscott, 1999)



To make correction effective and avoid harmful side effects, the teacher had to see each student as a unique puzzle, asking how that student would respond to correction in its many possible forms, varying, for instance, in the type of error corrected, the frequency of correction, the explicitness of correction, the amount and type of accompanying explanation, and the forcefulness of the correction (ibid).

Previous Studies

AL-Naqbi (2009) indicated that the teachers used a variety of the different corrective feedback strategies identified by Lyster and Ranta (1997). The results showed that students of different proficiency levels preferred certain patterns of error correction.

Firwana (2010) revealed that different error correction strategies had different cognitive, affective, and behavioral impacts on different students. The study recommended that both (EFL) teachers and learners developed more positive attitudes toward oral errors and their correction.

Haifaa and Emma, (2013) The results demonstrate that metalinguistic information and recasts were beneficial for learning of English modals and learners' preference for recast was more than that for metalinguistic information feedback.

Sa'dah et. al, (2018) concluded that teacher's oral corrective feedback strategy did not disturb the interaction between the teacher and students in the class.

Saeb, (2017) revealed significant differences between teachers' and students' perceptions about the amounts and types of (CF) and also about different types of errors to be corrected. Contrary to their teachers, students in this study were found to be seeking large amounts of explicit corrective feedback provided by the teacher. As for the pedagogical implications, 'meta-correction' is suggested as a solution to the problem of conflicting (CF) perceptions of students and teachers and to improve and enhance error correction practices within Iranian (EFL) context.

Nguyen et.al (2021) 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).

Methodology

The research method adopted was descriptive and analytical. (100) Students responded to a questionnaire as a data gathering tool to show their perceptions and reflections towards oral corrective feedback procedures implemented by English language instructors to reveal the practices of teaching English inside the classrooms. It was believed that the questionnaire was a suitable data gathering tool that could be used to obtain adequate results from the respondents. The questionnaire reflected the real perceptions of classes at preparatory year programme, at Sattam bin Abdulaziz University.

Reliability Statistics of the Questionnaire

N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
32	0.996

Validity Statistics of the Questionnaire

N of items	Cronbach's Alpha
32	0.998

Data Analysis and Discussion

The data would be analysed and discussed in forms of tabulations and discussions.

Weights of Responses on Likert Scale

Category	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Symbol	SA	A	NS	D	SD
Weight	5	4	3	2	1



The Importance of Oral Corrective Feedback to Learn the Skills of English Language

Statements	SA		A		NS		D		SD	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	40	40%	45	45%	4	4%	6	6%	5	5%
2	25	25%	60	60%	5	5%	6	6%	4	4%
3	45	45%	40	40%	3	3%	7	7%	5	5%
4	40	40%	35	35%	4	4%	15	15%	6	6%
5	40	40%	30	30%	10	10%	18	18%	2	2%
6	19	19%	35	35%	31	31%	11	11%	4	4%

In the first axis, hundred participants answered six statements about the importance of oral corrective feedback to learn the skills of English Language giving the following 600 views:- 209 answers responded strongly agree which represented 34.8%, 245 answers responded agree which represented 40.8%, 57 answers responded not sure which represented 9.5%, 63 answers responded disagree which represented 10.5%, and 26 answers responded strongly disagree which represented 4.4%.

The above results coincided with Firwana (2010) and Nguyen and et al., (2021) in the light of developing and highlighting more positive attitudes toward oral errors and their correction.

The Comprehensiveness of Using Oral Corrective Feedback to Learn Skills of English Language

Statements	SA		A		NS		D		SD	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
7	26	26%	41	41%	17	17%	9	9%	7	7%
8	31	31%	42	42%	12	12%	10	10%	5	5%
9	30	30%	43	43%	11	11%	9	9%	7	7%
10	41	41%	39	39%	5	5%	7	7%	8	8%
11	30	30%	26	26%	20	20%	13	13%	11	11%
12	25	25%	37	37%	12	12%	14	14%	12	12%



In the second axis, hundred participants answered six statements about the comprehensiveness of using of oral corrective feedback to learn the skills of English Language giving the following 600 views:- 183 answers responded strongly agree which represented 30.6%, 228 answers responded agree which represented 38.0%, 77 answers responded not sure which represented 12.8%, 62 answers responded disagree which represented 10.3%, and 50 answers responded strongly disagree which represented 8.3%.

It was revealed that Al-Nuqbi (2009) study was in match with the present results for the previous study indicated that the teachers used a variety of the different corrective feedback strategies identified by Lyster and Ranta (1997).

Students' Views about the Use of Oral Corrective Feedback Types to Learn Skills of English Language

Statements	SA		A		NS		D		SD	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13	27	27%	35	35%	7	7%	18	18%	13	13%
14	28	28%	36	36%	18	18%	8	8%	10	10%
15	20	20%	27	27%	20	20%	16	16%	17	17%
16	30	30%	20	20%	9	9%	20	20%	21	21%
17	22	22%	20	20%	11	11%	19	19%	28	28%
18	20	20%	30	30%	9	9%	25	25%	16	16%
19	27	27%	26	26%	8	8%	20	20%	19	19%
20	25	25%	19	19%	10	10%	21	21%	25	25%
21	24	24%	23	23%	11	11%	16	16%	26	26%
22	26	26%	21	21%	12	12%	17	17%	24	24%
23	23	23%	20	20%	7	7%	25	25%	25	25%

In the third axis, hundred participants answered eleven statements to show the students' views about the use of oral corrective feedback types to learn the skills of English Language giving the following 1100 views:- 272 answers responded strongly agree which represented 24.7%, 277 answers responded agree which represented 25.2%, 122 answers responded not sure



which represented 11.1%, 205 answers responded disagree which represented 18.6%, and 224 answers responded strongly disagree which represented 20.4%.

The above results proved what was Nassaji and Kartchava (2021:187) mentioned about different types of (OCF) which produced comprehensible linguistic output.

Place, Time, and Manner of Using Oral Corrective Feedback to Learn Skills of English Language

Statements	SA		A		NS		D		SD	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
24	41	41%	40	40%	5	5%	7	7%	6	6%
25	34	34%	35	35%	8	8%	13	13%	10	10%
26	25	25%	20	20%	11	11%	21	21%	23	23%
27	24	24%	26	26%	15	15%	20	20%	15	15%
28	38	38%	34	34%	11	11%	12	12%	5	5%
29	10	10%	17	17%	13	13%	25	25%	35	35%
30	11	11%	9	9%	10	10%	40	40%	30	30%
31	34	34%	33	33%	7	7%	15	15%	11	11%
32	36	36%	35	35%	13	13%	8	8%	9	9%

In the fourth axis, hundred participants answered nine statements to show place, time, and manner of using oral corrective feedback to learn the skills of English Language giving the following 900 views:- 253 answers responded strongly agree which represented 28.1%, 249 answers responded agree which represented 27.7%, 93 answers responded not sure which represented 10.3%, 161 answers responded disagree which represented 17.9%, and 144 answers responded strongly disagree which represented 16.0%.

The above mentioned statements by the respondents in this study revealed that there were signal of similarities in what was Brookhart (2008: 47) explained to the instructors the time, place and how to give individual or group oral feedback.



Detailed Students' Views about the Four Axes

Category	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Frequency	917	999	349	491	444
Percentage	28.7%	31.2%	10.9%	15.3%	13.9%

In details, hundred participants answered thirty- two statements to show their opinions about using oral corrective feedback to learn the skills of English Language giving the following 3200 views:- 917 answers responded strongly agree which represented 28.7%, 999 answers responded agree which represented 31.2%, 349 answers responded not sure which represented 10.9%, 491 answers responded disagree which represented 15.3%, and 444 answers responded strongly disagree which represented 13.9%.

Compiled Students' Views about the Four Axes

Category	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree
Frequency	1916	349	935
Percentage	59.9%	10.9%	29.2%

This table showed that hundred participants answered thirty- two statements to show their opinions about using oral corrective feedback to learn the skills of English Language giving the following 3200 views: - 1916 answers responded agree which represented 59.9%, 349 answers responded not sure which represented 10.9%, while 935 answers responded disagree which represented 29.2%.

Findings

The attitudes and performance of instructors enhanced the positive perceptions of learners inside English language learning classes because the use of consolidated oral corrective feedback reinforced students learning standards in English language. Also, the practice of oral corrective feedback by instructors enhanced learners' oral communication skills, fluency and accuracy so, (OCF) kept learners informed about the subject and improved academic level. Moreover, the researcher found learners preferred implicit oral corrective

239 Dr. Minahi Abdullah Al-Qahtani, Students' Perceptions and Reflections Towards Oral Corrective Feedback Usage to Enhance Learning of English Language



feedback and that built a good rapport between instructors and their students and make them self-confident. Furthermore, the use of gestures and body language to correct students' oral mistakes facilitated learning. Moreover, the students preferred correcting their errors by English language instructors immediately and in a brief and relaxed manner.

Recommendations

To provide orientation sessions to students would be useful for them to increase vivid coexistence and cooperation with their English instructors inside classes which was highly recommended.

References

- AL-Naqbi, S., S.** (2009). Investigating the Types and Effect of Oral Corrective Feedback Given to Students in Fujairah. Unpublished MA Thesis, American University of Sharjah.
- Alsolami, R.** (2019). Effect of Oral Corrective Feedback on Language Skills. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 9, No. 6, pp. 672-677, June 2019.
- Brookhart. M., S.** (2008). How to Give Effective Feedback to your Students: ASCD.
- Firwana, S., S., S.** (2010). Impact of Palestinian EFL Teachers' Attitudes Toward Oral Errors on their Students' Attitudes and Choice of Error Treatment Strategies. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Boston College Lynch School of Education.
- Gardner, R., C.** (1985). Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gass, S., M.** (1997). Input, Interaction, and the Second Language Learner. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Haifa, F. & Emma, M.** (2014). Oral Corrective Feedback and Learning of English Modals. Procedia- Social and Behavioural Sciences.136 (2014) 322-329.
- Krashen, S.** (1981). Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Lado, R.** (1957). Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.



- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L.** (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19 (1), 37-66.
- Mantle-Bromley, C.** (1995). Positive attitudes and realistic beliefs: links to proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79 (3), 372-86.
- Nassaji, H. & kartschava, E.** (2021). *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching*: Cambridge University Press
- Nguyen, X., N. & Luu, H., Q., N.** (2021). EFL Learners' Perceptions of Teachers' Corrective Feedback for Pronunciation. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies*. Volume: 4 Issue: 4.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N.** (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research. In J. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 131-164). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Sa'adah, L., Nurkamto, J. & Suparno, S.** (2018). Oral Corrective Feedback: Exploring the Relationship between Teacher's Strategy and Students' Willingness to Communicate. *Studies in English Language and Education*. 5(2), 240-252, (2018).
- Sackstein, S.** (2017). *Peer feedback in the classroom: empowering students to be experts*: Virginia, USA: ASCD.
- Saeb, F.** (2017). Students' and Teachers' Perceptions and Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback: Do They Match?. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*. Vol. 6 No. 4; July 2017.
- Sheen, Y., and Ellis, R.** (2011). "Corrective feedback in the language teaching," in *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, ed. E. Hinkel (New York, NY: Routledge), 593-610.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P.** (1993). Instruction and the Development of Questions in L2 Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, (2), 205-224.
- Truscott, J.** (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55, 437-456.