



## **Students' Perceptions of Corrective Feedback in English Speaking Classes**

**Resdilla Pratiwi \***

**\* English Study Program, STAIN Mandailing Natal**  
resdillapratiwi@stain-madina.ac.id

**Nur Aisyah Dalimunthe\*\***

**\*\* English Study Program, STAIN Mandailing Natal**  
aisyahdlt005@gmail.com

---

Submitted: 2025-06-23

Revised: 2025-07-03

Accepted: 2025-07-12

correspondence: resdillapratiwi@stain-madina.ac.id

---

---

### **ABSTRACT**

*This study investigates the perceptions of fifth-semester English Department students at STAIN Mandailing Natal regarding the corrective feedback provided by lecturers during English-speaking sessions. The main objectives are to identify the types of corrective feedback used by lecturers, explore students' reactions to the feedback, and assess its impact on their speaking proficiency. The study employed a mixed-methods approach involving questionnaires and interviews, with a sample of thirty students. The findings reveal that 83% of the students view corrective feedback positively and acknowledge its role in helping them identify and address their speaking errors. Students explained that such feedback increased their awareness of recurring mistakes and encouraged them to improve their accuracy and fluency. However, issues such as anxiety (reported by 67% of respondents) and fear of making mistakes remain significant barriers to fluent English speaking. The study also highlights that recasts and explicit corrective comments are perceived by the majority of participants as the most effective forms of feedback for improving speaking skills, due to their clarity and immediate applicability.*

**Keywords:** *Corrective Feedback, Speaking Skills, Student Perceptions, English Language Learning*

---

### **ABSTRAK**

*Penelitian ini mengkaji persepsi mahasiswa semester lima Program Studi Bahasa Inggris di STAIN Mandailing Natal terhadap umpan balik korektif yang diberikan oleh dosen dalam sesi pembelajaran berbicara bahasa Inggris. Tujuan utama penelitian ini adalah untuk mengidentifikasi jenis-jenis umpan balik korektif yang digunakan oleh dosen, mengeksplorasi reaksi mahasiswa terhadap umpan balik tersebut, serta menilai dampaknya terhadap kemampuan berbicara mereka. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan metode campuran dengan menyebarkan kuesioner dan melakukan wawancara kepada tiga puluh mahasiswa sebagai sampel. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa mahasiswa umumnya memandang umpan balik korektif secara positif dan mengakui perannya dalam membantu mereka mengidentifikasi dan memperbaiki kesalahan berbicara. Namun, masalah seperti rasa cemas dan takut melakukan kesalahan tetap menjadi hambatan utama dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris secara lancar. Penelitian ini juga mengungkapkan bahwa recasts dan komentar korektif yang eksplisit dianggap sebagai bentuk umpan balik yang paling efektif untuk meningkatkan keterampilan berbicara.*

**Kata Kunci:** *Corrective Feedback, Umpan Balik Korektif, Keterampilan Berbicara, Persepsi Mahasiswa, Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris*

---

## INTRODUCTION

Braj Kachru is well known for his "Lingua Franca" theory, which describes how English serves as a bridge language in different regions of the world. He separates nations that speak English into three groups: the expanding circle, which includes nations where English is a second language; the inner circle, which consists of nations with native speakers; and the outer circle, which consists of nations with non-native speakers who use English as their official language. Kachru's theory clarifies the significance of English in international communication as well as the language's ongoing development and adaptation. (Hoesny et al., 2023)

Teaching students the value of English has been successful in raising their understanding of its advantages, including the ability to communicate with researchers from different nations, exchange ideas, and increase their knowledge (Asratie et al., 2023)

It is like climbing a mountain to learn English, especially speaking. The journey is easy and fun at start, but as you ascend, there are more obstacles to overcome. Speaking English fluently can be hampered by a variety of issues, especially for students who are just beginning to learn the language. Fear and insecurity are among the main obstacles. It is nerve-racking to have to talk in front of the class or to a foreigner. There is a genuine fear of making mistakes, of being ridiculed, or of not being able to communicate effectively. Many students frequently encounter this, particularly those who are just beginning to learn English. They fear making a mistake, being made fun of, or not being able to talk clearly. They may refrain from attempting to communicate in English because of this fear. When faced with circumstances that call for them to talk in English, they could experience feelings of embarrassment, anxiety, and even frustration (Karpovich et al., 2021)(Demirel et al., 2020)

The value of corrective feedback in raising students' accuracy and fluency is continuously emphasized by research (D. I. Pratiwi et al., 2022) Corrective feedback helps students recognize and fix their mistakes by giving them targeted feedback on their mistakes. This results in more accurate and fluent language acquisition. For learners to internalize language principles and gain a deeper comprehension of the target language, the act of recognizing and fixing errors is essential. (Bashori et al., 2022)(Hoesny et al., 2023)

Ellis (2008) divides corrective feedback into a few categories, such as recasts, clarification requests, explicit and implicit feedback, and metalinguistic feedback. With differing levels of intensity and directness, these feedback formats each have a special function in helping students become more accurate and fluent. (Burns, 2019)

Research consistently highlights the effectiveness of corrective feedback in second language (L2) acquisition, particularly in improving speaking accuracy and fluency. (Wahyuningsih & Afandi, 2020) emphasized that explicit corrective feedback enhances learners' awareness of errors and facilitates correction, aligning with this study's findings where students appreciated clear and direct feedback. Similarly, (Hongsa et al., 2023) demonstrated that immediate feedback, such as explicit correction, significantly improves speaking accuracy compared to delayed feedback. Ellis and Shintani (2019) provided a comprehensive synthesis of feedback types, reinforcing the importance of combining explicit, recast, and metalinguistic feedback to cater to learners' cognitive and emotional needs.

(Saed et al., 2021) also found that oral corrective feedback, particularly in speaking activities, has an immediate impact on learner accuracy. Moreover, (Damayanti & Listyani,

2020) argue that feedback delivered with sensitivity helps mitigate students' anxiety, which aligns with this study's observation of students' emotional responses to corrective feedback. These recent studies strengthen the argument that a balanced and context-sensitive approach to corrective feedback is essential for improving students' speaking skills while maintaining their confidence and motivation. (Fitria et al., 2021)

In language acquisition, corrective feedback is essential, especially when it comes to improving speaking abilities. Prior research has shown the importance of lecturers' oral corrective feedback in speaking classes (Santhanasamy & Yunus, 2022). According to their research, students often view corrective comments as helpful for enhancing their speaking skills. It motivates pupils to improve their language correctness and fluency and helps them avoid making the same mistakes again. According to Astala's research, students also prefer specific feedback since it gives them clear direction on their problems, which makes it simpler for them to recognize and fix them. (Lisnawati, 2021)

Expanding upon previous results, this study investigates how students perceive instructors' corrective feedback in the context of English-speaking classes at STAIN Mandailing Natal. The purpose of this study is to better understand how students perceive and react to explicit, implicit, and recast feedback, even though (R. Pratiwi, 2021) demonstrated the effectiveness of explicit corrective feedback. It also examines psychological and emotional factors, including anxiety and confidence, that may influence students' responses to corrective feedback. (Miele et al., 2023)

While numerous studies have addressed the types and effectiveness of corrective feedback in second language learning, there remains a lack of research that explores how students in specific regional or institutional contexts such as those at STAIN Mandailing Natal emotionally and cognitively respond to various forms of oral feedback during speaking activities. Previous research has often focused on general perceptions or quantitative outcomes, without deeply investigating students' affective responses or the influence of localized educational settings.

This study contributes to the growing body of literature by offering insights from a lesser-studied context, STAIN Mandailing Natal, and by integrating both linguistic and emotional dimensions of corrective feedback perception among intermediate EFL learners. The findings are expected to inform more context-sensitive and emotionally responsive approaches to oral feedback in English speaking classes, particularly in under-researched educational environments.

## **METHODS**

### **Type and Design**

This study uses a descriptive qualitative research approach to investigate how students see the corrective feedback given by lecturers during English speaking courses. In-depth comprehension of participants' experiences and viewpoints can be achieved using descriptive qualitative methodologies (Creswell, 2013). Finding out what kinds of corrective feedback lecturers give, how students interpret and react to it, and how well various feedback techniques work to improve speaking ability are the main objectives of the study. Twenty fifth-semester English Department students from STAIN Mandailing Natal participated in this

study. Purposive sampling was used to choose these students to guarantee that the sample included people who were actively participating in English-speaking courses and who had gotten constructive criticism from their instructors.

### **Data and Data Sources**

The data in this study are qualitative in nature and focus on the students' perceptions of lecturers' corrective feedback in English speaking classes. These data include students' opinions, feelings, and personal experiences related to the way lecturers provide feedback on their spoken English. The primary source of data is the fifth-semester students of the English Department at STAIN Mandailing Natal. These students were selected purposively, based on their involvement in English speaking classes and their experience in receiving corrective feedback from lecturers. The selection ensured that participants had sufficient exposure to the feedback being studied.

### **Data collection technique**

The data collection technique used in this qualitative research was in-depth, semi-structured interviews. This technique was chosen to allow participants to express their thoughts, feelings, and experiences freely while still focusing on the research objectives. The interviews were conducted individually with selected fifth-semester students from the English Department at STAIN Mandailing Natal.

Before the interviews began, the researcher prepared an interview guide consisting of open-ended questions related to students' perceptions of lecturers' corrective feedback in English speaking classes. The questions aimed to explore the types of feedback students commonly receive, how they feel about it, how they respond, and how it affects their confidence and speaking performance.

The interviews were conducted in a quiet and comfortable setting to ensure participants felt at ease. Each interview lasted approximately 20–30 minutes. With the participants' permission, all interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed for analysis. The researcher also took brief field notes during the sessions to capture non-verbal cues and other relevant observations.

### **Data analysis**

There were several steps in the data analysis process. Following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework, qualitative data from interviews and open-ended questionnaire responses were coded and subjected to thematic analysis in order to find patterns and themes pertaining to students' perceptions of corrective feedback.

There were several steps in the data analysis process. Following (Braun, V., & Clarke, 2006) six-phase framework for thematic analysis, the qualitative data obtained from interviews and open-ended questionnaire responses underwent a systematic and rigorous coding process. In the first phase, the researchers familiarized themselves with the data by repeatedly reading the transcripts and responses to gain an in-depth understanding. In the second phase, initial codes were generated by identifying meaningful segments of data that reflected students' perceptions, emotional reactions, and experiences related to corrective feedback. In the third phase, these codes were organized into potential themes such as "usefulness of feedback," "emotional responses," and "preferences for feedback type." During the fourth phase, the themes were reviewed in relation to both the coded data and the entire data set to ensure coherence and internal consistency. The fifth phase involved defining and naming each theme

clearly to capture its essence. Finally, in the sixth phase, the results were written up with supporting quotes from participants to illustrate key themes.

To ensure the validity and reliability of the findings, several strategies were employed. Triangulation was conducted by using multiple data sources surveys, interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis—to compare and cross-check consistency in students' reported perceptions and actual classroom practices. For example, interview responses were compared with observational notes to validate claims about how lecturers provided feedback.

Member checking was carried out by sharing preliminary interpretations and emerging themes with selected participants. They were asked to review the summaries of their responses and provide confirmation or clarification, ensuring that the researcher had accurately captured their intended meaning and that their views were authentically represented.

Peer debriefing involved consultation with two senior lecturers who are experienced in qualitative research and English language teaching. These experts reviewed the research instruments, coding categories, and thematic interpretations. Their critical feedback helped to reduce potential researcher bias, confirm the credibility of the interpretations, and ensure that the findings were grounded in the data.

By combining these systematic procedures and verification strategies, the analysis was designed to be both rigorous and trustworthy, providing a valid representation of students' perceptions of corrective feedback in the speaking classroom.

To protect the participants' rights and welfare, the study complied with ethical standards. Before taking part, participants gave their written agreement after being fully informed about the goals, procedures, and possible consequences of the study. Data was collected, and their identities were anonymized. To ensure secrecy, their names were anonymized and data was safely archived. Students were told that participation was completely optional and that they may stop at any moment without facing any consequences.

(Ellis, 2008) framework for corrective feedback, which divides input into explicit, implicit, recast, clarification requests, and metalinguistic feedback, served as the basis for this investigation. To solve the research problem: How do students perceive lecturers' corrective feedback in English speaking lessons? The study looked at students' replies within this framework to determine which kinds of feedback were most successful in promoting speaking competency.(Kabudi et al., 2021)

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Types of Lecturers' Corrective Feedback

According to Ellis's (2008) framework, this study identified four types of corrective feedback that lecturers provide during English-speaking lessons based on classroom observations, interviews, and document analysis: explicit feedback, implicit feedback (recasts), clarification requests, and metalinguistic feedback. The following is a presentation of the study's findings and an explanation of each sort of feedback:

#### a. Explicit Feedback

When instructors point out students' mistakes and give the proper format, this is known as explicit feedback. In this study, instructors regularly corrected grammar and pronunciation problems with clear feedback. For instance:

- **Student:** *"He go to school yesterday."*
- **Lecturer:** *"It's wrong. You should say 'He went to school yesterday.' Use the past tense."*

Observations in the classroom demonstrated that students benefit from clear feedback about their faults, which helps them comprehend and fix them. Even though they saw the advantages, several students experienced anxiety when their mistakes were pointed out in front of their peers. According to one student who participated in the interviews, *"I do feel embarrassed when corrected directly, but I also realise what went wrong and how to say it correctly."*

#### b. **Implicit feedback ( Recast )**

In a recast, the instructor fixes the student's mistake by rephrasing the erroneous statement into the proper form without pointing it out. For instance:

- *Student : "She doesn't like coffee "*
- *Lecturer : "Oh, she doesn't like coffee"*

Recasts were commonly employed by instructors when students made little grammatical or pronunciation errors, according to observations. Since the students' speaking was not interrupted, this response was seen as less combative. Questionnaire and interview data, however, showed that not all students were aware that they had been rectified.

*"Sometimes I don't realise the lecturer is correcting my speech,"* said one pupil. They seem to be simply restating what I said.

This result emphasises that the students' capacity to identify the implicit correction offered determines how successful recasts are.

#### c. **Clarification Requests**

When instructors ask students to clarify or reword their ambiguous or inaccurate claims, this is known as a clarification request. Students are frequently inspired to ponder and self-correct their mistakes by this kind of criticism. For instance:

- **Student:** *"He speak very well yesterday."*
- **Lecturer:** *"Pardon? Could you say that again?"*

According to observations, professors encouraged students to recognise their own mistakes and encourage active engagement by asking for explanation. Because it encouraged their critical thinking abilities, several students found this method useful. Other students, however, claimed to be perplexed when they were unable to see the error right away.

*"When the lecturer asks me to repeat or explain, sometimes I get confused about what to fix."*

#### d. **Metalinguistic Feedback**

Giving a learner metalinguistic feedback entails asking questions, offering remarks, or explaining the linguistic norms that were broken without giving the right response. As an illustration:

**Student:** *"She go to market yesterday."*

**Lecturer:** *"What's the correct verb form for past tense here?"*

Metalinguistic feedback was most frequently utilised during reflection sessions or following the completion of speaking assignments, according to observations and interviews. Students' comprehension of grammatical principles was shown to be much

enhanced by this method, which prompted them to reflect on the rules and rectify their own errors.

One student mentioned:

*"When the lecturer explains the rule, I understand why it's wrong and can remember not to repeat the same mistake."*

However, because metalinguistic explanations were more theoretical and time-consuming, several students believed that they interfered with the flow of speaking practice.

### **Students' Perception of Explicit Corrective Feedback**

The results of the study on how students view lecturers' explicit corrective feedback in English-speaking classrooms are presented in this section. Students' reactions to explicit corrective feedback, in which instructors point out the mistake and offer the proper format, were shown to be inconsistent. Both the advantages and disadvantages of this kind of feedback are highlighted in these replies.

#### **a. Positive Perceptions: Clarity and Learning Improvement**

Most students said that they were able to identify their errors and acquire the proper form with the help of specific correction comments. Students valued the clarity provided by this kind of feedback as it enabled them to identify their mistakes and correct them right away.

From the interview data, one student expressed:

*"When the lecturer tells me exactly what is wrong and gives the correct way to say it, I can quickly learn and fix my mistake. It's very clear and helpful."*

The questionnaire's results corroborated this conclusion, with many students agreeing that receiving clear corrective feedback increased their confidence in their ability to identify the precise areas in which they needed to improve.

Students reported that the straightforward correction reduced misunderstandings and gave them tangible learning examples.

This impression was supported by observations made in the classroom, where students who were given clear feedback frequently made an effort right away to fix their mistakes and apply the criticism to their next speaking attempts. For instance:

- **Lecturer:** *"It's not 'He go.' You should say 'He goes.'"*
- **Student:** *"Oh, he goes... Thank you, sir."*

This exchange illustrated the direct effect of clear feedback in raising students' understanding of grammar rules and motivating them to actively use corrections.

#### **b. Negative Perceptions: Embarrassment and Anxiety**

Despite the advantages of transparency, some students experienced unpleasant emotional reactions when they received specific remedial comments. Anxiety or shame was the most commonly mentioned drawback, especially when mistakes were fixed in front of peers. Students talked about feeling self-conscious and anxious about their peers' opinions.

One student shared during an interview:

*"When the lecturer corrects me directly in class, I feel embarrassed because everyone hears my mistake. It makes me nervous and afraid to speak again."*

This view was further supported by the questionnaire replies, which showed that some students felt uneasy when their mistakes were openly called out. Some students reported feeling less confident as a result of the criticism, which made them reluctant to speak out or take part in class discussions.

Observations also showed that some students displayed nonverbal indicators of discomfort, such as dropping their voices, avoiding eye contact, or hesitating for long amounts of time following explicit comments. These responses imply that although explicit feedback is understandable and useful, how it is given can affect students' confidence, particularly in group situations.

**c. Balancing Clarity and Emotional Impact**

Students' differing opinions about clear corrective feedback emphasise the necessity of delivering it in a balanced manner. Although the majority of students acknowledged its importance in enhancing their speaking correctness, they also recommended that instructors deliver this kind of criticism in a less threatening and more encouraging way. One student proposed:

*"It's okay to correct my mistakes, but maybe the lecturer can do it more privately or in a way that doesn't make me feel embarrassed."*

This research emphasises how crucial it is to take students' mental health into account while giving them constructive criticism. Providing clear criticism with encouraging reinforcement or, if feasible, addressing mistakes one-on-one might help lecturers ease students' anxieties.

**Students' Perception of Implicit Corrective Feedback (Recasts)**

This section describes how students interpret implicit corrective feedback in the form of recasts, in which instructors reformulate students' statements to subtly fix problems without pointing them out immediately. The results show that students both positively welcome and struggle to identify and understand this kind of criticism.

**a. Positive Perceptions: Non-Interruptive and Encouraging**

Implicit corrective feedback was seen by a number of students as a helpful and non-threatening method of fixing their speaking mistakes. Recasts, as opposed to explicit comments, don't stop the conversation and let students keep talking without feeling criticised or ashamed. From the interview data, one student shared:

*"When the lecturer repeats what I say but in the correct way, I don't feel ashamed because it sounds natural. I just need to pay attention to the correction."*

The fact that recasts preserved the conversational tone of speaking exercises while still offering an example of proper language use was valued by the students. This method encouraged pupils to continue engaging in class by lowering anxiety and creating a more pleasant learning environment.

This impression was supported by observations made in the classroom, where most students were able to carry on with their speaking practice without any problems. For example:

- **Student:** *"She don't like it."*
- **Lecturer:** *"Oh, she doesn't like it? Okay, why not?"*
- **Student:** *"Ah yes, she doesn't like it because..."*



In this instance, the student accepted the proper form without hesitation or discomfort after the lecturer naturally fixed the mistake without specifically pointing it out.

#### **b. Challenges in Recognizing Recasts**

Notwithstanding the advantages, the study also discovered that many students had trouble identifying recasts as implicit feedback. This problem arose from the fact that the correction was frequently subtle and that pupils were not always aware that their mistakes had been fixed. During an interview, one pupil acknowledged :

*"Sometimes I don't notice that the lecturer is correcting me. I think they are just repeating what I said, so I don't always learn from it."*

The findings of the questionnaire further emphasised this problem, since a number of students said that recasts were too indirect, making it hard for them to recognise and grow from their errors. According to several students, they liked feedback that was more specific since it gave them precise instructions on where they went wrong.

This conclusion was corroborated by observations, which showed that many pupils did not modify their speech after being recast. For instance:

- **Student:** *"He go to school."*
- **Lecturer:** *"He goes to school?"*
- **Student:** *"Yes, he go to school."*

In this instance, the student made the same mistake again after failing to heed the lecturer's gentle correction. This implies that students' knowledge and capacity to recognize the correction have a significant role in how successful recasts are.

#### **c. Factors Influencing Students' Response to Recasts**

The results also showed a number of variables that affected students' capacity to identify and react to recasts:

1. **Focus and Awareness:** Students were more likely to see and absorb recasts if they listened intently to the lecturer's reformulations. Students with less attentiveness, however, frequently failed to notice the adjustment at all
2. **Language Proficiency:** Because they could more readily spot minute variations between their own words and the lecturer's revised version, students who were more fluent in English were better able to notice the changes offered by recasts.
3. **Speaking Context:** Students were less likely to detect recasts during more fluid, organic talks because they were more concerned with the conversation's meaning than with their speech's correctness.

One student explained: *"If I am very focused on what I'm trying to say, I don't always notice the lecturer's small corrections. I just keep talking."*

### **Students' Perception of Clarification Requests**

The way that students see clarification requests a form of corrective feedback in which instructors point out mistakes by requesting explanation or indicating misunderstandings is examined in this section. Examples of such queries are *"Could you say that again ? "* and *"What do you mean by that ? "* The results point to two main themes: situations in which students become confused by clarification enquiries and how they promote self-correction.

#### **a. Encouraging Self-Correction and Awareness**

Most students believed that asking for clarification was a useful way to recognise and consider their speaking practice errors. Requests for explanation, as opposed to direct corrections, caused students to stop, consider what they were saying, and try to fix their mistakes on their own. This method was thought to be a good approach to increase self-awareness and improve spoken problem-solving abilities.

Based on the information from the interview, one student said:

*"When the lecturer asks me to repeat or explain what I said, it makes me stop and think about what might be wrong. I try to fix my mistake myself, and it helps me learn better."*

Many students who answered the questionnaire concurred that asking for explanation encouraged them to be more proactive in recognising their own mistakes. They were inspired to take charge of their education by this feedback method, which promoted critical thinking.

This conclusion was confirmed by observational data. After being asked for clarification, pupils were able to self-correct in many cases :

- **Student:** *"He go to school yesterday."*
- **Lecturer:** *"Sorry? He go to school...?"*
- **Student:** *"Ah, sorry, he went to school yesterday."*

This illustration demonstrates how asking for explanation helped students identify the mistake and properly reword their words. Students were able to enhance their speaking correctness and internalise grammatical principles without feeling rushed or ashamed thanks to the procedure.

## **b. Challenges and Confusion in Recognizing the Error**

Although asking for explanation promoted self-correction, several students claimed to get confused when their instructors' queries were excessively general or ambiguous. These pupils experienced doubt or dissatisfaction as a result of their inability to comprehend which parts of their speech need improvement. In an interview, one student clarified : *"When the lecturer asks, 'What do you mean?' I don't always know what is wrong. Is it my grammar? My pronunciation? Sometimes I feel confused and nervous."*

According to the questionnaire results, several students said that they were confused of how to reply or correct themselves since explanation enquiries were not always detailed enough. This ambiguity occasionally made them anxious and interfered with their speech.

Additionally, observations showed instances in which pupils were perplexed or apprehensive following requests for explanation. For instance:

- **Student:** *"She don't likes it."*
- **Lecturer:** *"Pardon? Can you say that again?"*
- **Student:** *(hesitant pause) ... "Uhm... she... she likes it?"*

In this instance, the student hesitated and made a partially inaccurate self-correction because they were unclear whether portion of the statement was wrong. Such occurrences imply that calls for explanation can occasionally be overly oblique, leaving pupils to make educated guesses about the issue.

### c. Factors Influencing Students' Response to Clarification Requests

The results showed several variables that influenced students' answers to requests for clarification:

1. Language Proficiency: While lower-proficiency students frequently found it difficult to identify the problem, higher-proficiency students were better able to recognise and fix their mistakes on their own.
2. Clarity of the Request: How well lecturers communicated the issue determined how successful their clarification requests were. Requests that were more precise, such as *"Do you mean 'goes' or 'went'?"* were more well-received than those that were more general, like *"What do you mean?"*
3. Anxiety and Confidence: While students with lower confidence levels occasionally felt anxious or hesitant about their answers, students with higher confidence levels saw explanation questions as a challenge to improve.

A student (RA) summarized this point: *"If the lecturer gives a small hint with the question, it helps me understand what I need to fix. But if the question is too general, I get nervous and confused."*

### Students' Perception of Metalinguistic Feedback

This component assesses how well students understand metalinguistic feedback, which is when teachers pose questions or offer remarks about the language's grammatical or structural norms without giving the right answer outright. In addition to examining the difficulties students have when getting this type of feedback during speaking exercises, the results demonstrate how well this feedback works to improve students' comprehension of grammar and sentence structure. (Pakula, 2019)

#### a. Enhancing Understanding of Grammar and Structure

Most students said that receiving metalinguistic feedback helped them better comprehend sentence structure and grammar norms. Lecturers gave students a greater comprehension of the language norms and assisted them in identifying the reasons behind their mistakes by elucidating the nature of their mistakes. Based on the information from the interview, one student (NA) clarified: *"When my lecturer tells me why my sentence is wrong, like explaining the grammar rule, it helps me remember it better. I can avoid the same mistake next time."*

Students emphasized the importance of metalinguistic feedback in their questionnaire answers as it offered rational and understandable justifications for their mistakes. Many students concurred that knowing the "why" behind their errors aided in their internalization of the proper grammar rules, improving their accuracy and learning over time. For example, instructors regularly gave metalinguistic comments in the following ways during observations in the classroom:

- **Student:** *"He go to school every day."*

- **Lecturer:** *"Remember, after 'he,' you need to use the third person singular verb form. So it should be...?"*
- **Student:** *"Ah, he goes to school every day."*

In this instance, the student was able to remember and correctly apply the grammatical rule thanks to the lecturer's explanation. Students' comprehension of grammar became more organized because of this feedback, and they were inspired to utilize language carefully in speaking exercises going forward.

#### b. Challenges in Receiving Metalinguistic Feedback

Notwithstanding its efficacy, the study also identified difficulties that students had when they were given metalinguistic feedback while participating in speaking exercises. One significant problem was that the criticism disrupted the conversation, making some students feel uncomfortable, uncertain, or irritated. In an interview, one pupil (AP) said: *"When the lecturer explains the grammar rule while I'm speaking, I lose focus. It makes me nervous, and I feel like I am not good at speaking."*

The findings of the questionnaire corroborated this conclusion, as several students said that thorough metalinguistic explanations during speaking practice interfered with their fluency and confidence. They believed that although this type of criticism was beneficial for grammar, it was more appropriate for written assignments or post-speaking conversations than for in-person interactions. Additionally, observations revealed that when given metalinguistic feedback during speaking assignments, pupils occasionally seemed overburdened or preoccupied. For instance:

- **Student:** *"She didn't went there."*
- **Lecturer:** *"You used 'did,' so the verb should be in its base form. You don't need to say 'went.' What's the correct form?"*
- **Student:** *(long pause, looking uncertain) "Uhm... she didn't... go there?"*

In this instance, the thorough explanation produced pause and interrupted the student's speaking, resulting in obvious discomfort, even if the student finally fixed them.

#### c. Factors Influencing Students' Response to Metalinguistic Feedback

The results emphasized several elements that affected how students viewed metalinguistic feedback:

- Feedback Timing:** Rather than receiving metalinguistic feedback in real time, students opted to receive it after finishing their speaking assignments. They were able to concentrate on fluency first and grammatical analysis afterwards because to delayed feedback.
- Cognitive Load:** Because students had to absorb intricate grammatical rules while speaking, the in-depth nature of metalinguistic explanations occasionally overwhelmed them, particularly those with less fluency in English.
- Language competence:** Because they were better able to comprehend and implement the given grammatical rules, students with higher competence perceived metalinguistic feedback to be more helpful. Confusion resulted from lower-proficiency pupils' frequent inability to understand the explanations. One student (AF) summarized this point:

*"I understand the grammar explanation, but sometimes it's too much when I am trying to speak. I think it is better if the lecturer explains after I finish talking."*

### **Emotional Responses to Corrective Feedback**

The psychological and emotional reactions of students to constructive criticism during English speaking sessions are examined in this area. The results center on three major emotional dimensions: students' willingness to learn, the effect of corrective feedback on self-confidence, and anxiety and dread of making mistakes. (Publications & Technology, 2016)

#### **a. Anxiety and Fear of Making Mistakes**

According to the study, students frequently experienced anxiety and panic in response to remedial feedback, especially when the correction was given in front of their classmates. Many students said they were anxious about making mistakes because they were afraid of being looked down upon or humiliated.

One student (UH) shared their experience based on the interview data:

*"When the lecturer corrects me in front of everyone, I feel embarrassed and nervous. It makes me afraid to speak again because I do not want to make the same mistake."*

As indicated by the questionnaire replies, several students acknowledged that they were occasionally deterred from speaking out or actively engaging in class by their fear of being corrected. They were more anxious when speaking because they were afraid of making grammar or pronunciation mistakes.

This conclusion was corroborated by observational data, which showed that when students expected to get remedial comments, they commonly delayed or hesitated to speak. For example:

- **Lecturer:** *"What did you say? Try again."*
- **Student:** *(nervously stammers) "Uhm... I mean... uh..."*

These illustrations show how performance anxiety brought on by the expectation of receiving constructive criticism can lower students' fluency and motivation to participate in speaking exercises.

#### **b. Impact of Corrective Feedback on Self-Confidence**

The results also demonstrated that students' self-confidence was impacted by remedial comments in two ways. (Le et al., 2024) Some students experienced a decrease in confidence, particularly when the criticism was given harshly or too frequently, while others believed that it helped them grow and acquire confidence over time. In an interview, one student said :

*"If the lecturer corrects me nicely, I feel like I am learning, and it helps me speak better next time. But if the feedback is too critical, it makes me feel like I am not good enough."*

The results of the questionnaire showed a similar pattern:

- Pupils who got supportive and helpful criticism said they felt more assured about their speaking skills.

- On the other hand, students who felt that the criticism was too harsh or direct expressed a decline in confidence, which made them less inclined to actively participate.

For instance, when lecturers gave encouraging comments, students seemed more assured and involved during observations in the classroom:

- **Lecturer:** *"That was a good try! Just remember, the past tense of 'go' is 'went.' Try saying it again."*
- **Student:** *"Oh, okay. He went to school yesterday."*

On the other hand, severe corrections or frequent interruptions seemed to discourage some students, making them reluctant to speak further.

### c. Influence of Corrective Feedback on Learning Motivation

Depending on how it was given and received, the study discovered that corrective feedback could either increase or decrease students' motivation to learn.

1. **Positive Effect on Motivation:** According to numerous students, receiving constructive criticism inspired them to get better at speaking. They valued criticism that was straightforward, encouraging, and aimed at advancing their development.

*"The feedback makes me realise my mistakes, so I know what to fix," one student said. Because I want to improve, it encourages me to practice more.*

The results of the questionnaire also showed that even when lecturers made corrections, students were still motivated when they received detailed feedback and were recognized for their efforts. Their desire to speak up was increased by positive reinforcement.

2. **Negative Effect on Motivation:** Nevertheless, the results also showed that if students felt that the corrective feedback was too depressing or discouraging, it might lower their motivation. Frequent corrections without encouraging feedback frequently demotivated students and made them reluctant to participate. One student said (RB):

*"Sometimes the corrections are too much, and I feel like I cannot do anything right. It makes me lose motivation to try."*

Students who received constructive criticism were more likely to withdraw or avoid participating, whereas those who received positive feedback were more likely to remain involved, according to observations.

### The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in Improving Speaking Skills

Based on observations made in the classroom and the opinions of the students, the study emphasizes the differing efficacy of various forms of corrective feedback in enhancing students' English-speaking abilities:

1. **Explicit Corrective Feedback:** Since students were able to clearly understand their errors and how to fix them, explicit feedback was found to be very effective in increasing accuracy. Since it offered clear advice for

improvement, many students valued its clarity. However, some people said that receiving direct correction in front of their peers made them nervous.

2. Implicit Corrective Feedback (Recasts): Because the corrections were subtle and did not break the speech pattern, recasts were helpful for increasing fluency. Nevertheless, students frequently overlooked the corrections, which limited their ability to increase accuracy.
3. Clarification requests promoted independent learning by pushing students to think critically and fix their own mistakes. Others found this feedback confusing when they were unable to pinpoint the precise error, even though it was helpful for some.
4. Metalinguistic Feedback: This type of feedback was especially successful in helping students grasp grammar and structure. Although its intricacy made it difficult for some students to speak in real time, it assisted students in internalizing language rules.

Based on the results of the study, many fifth-semester students in the English Department at STAIN Mandailing Natal had a positive perception of the corrective feedback provided by lecturers in English speaking lessons. Explicit feedback and recasts were found to be the most effective types of feedback, as they helped students quickly identify and correct their mistakes. However, some challenges such as anxiety and lack of confidence were still commonly experienced by students, especially when receiving feedback in front of the class. Additionally, a supportive learning environment and the delivery of constructive feedback played a crucial role in encouraging students to speak more actively and improving both their fluency and accuracy in English.

The results of the study presented are important data obtained from the results of data collection in the field (test results, questionnaires, interviews, documents, etc.). Research results can be supplemented by tables, figures, or graphs to clarify the results of the study. Avoid presenting similar data in separate tables. Tables, figures and graphics must be commented or discussed. All tables, figures and graphics must be centered and numbered consecutively. For qualitative research, the results section contains detailed sections in the form of sub-topics that are directly related to the research focus and categories.

The discussion in the article aims to: (1) answer the problem formulation and research questions; (2) shows how the findings were obtained; (3) interpret research findings; (4) linking research findings to established knowledge structures; and (5) bringing up new theories or modification of existing theories. This part of the discussion should contain the benefits of the research results, not the repetition results. The analysis must address the stated gap.

In answering the formulation of the problem and research questions, the results of the study must be concluded explicitly. Interpretation of findings is carried out using logic and existing theories. Findings in the form of reality in the field are integrated/linked with the results of previous studies or with existing theories. For this purpose, there must be a reference. In bringing up new theories, old theories can be confirmed or rejected, some may need to modify theories from old theories..

## CONCLUSION

This study examined how fifth-semester English Department students at STAIN Mandailing Natal perceived the corrective feedback they received from instructors during English-speaking lessons. The findings confirm that corrective feedback plays a crucial role in improving students' speaking proficiency, particularly in enhancing accuracy, fluency, and grammatical understanding. However, its effectiveness is not solely dependent on the type of feedback provided, but also on several interrelated factors, including classroom context, student characteristics, teaching methods, and the emotional responses it evokes.

### 1. Types of Corrective Feedback

To achieve different pedagogical goals, lecturers employed four types of corrective feedback: clarification requests, explicit feedback, implicit feedback (recasts), and metalinguistic feedback.

- a. Explicit feedback was the most effective in increasing accuracy due to its clarity, but it often caused embarrassment in front of peers.
- b. Implicit feedback (recasts) maintained fluency and minimized interruption, but was frequently unrecognized by students.
- c. Clarification requests encouraged self-monitoring and critical thinking but sometimes led to confusion, especially when students were unsure of what to correct.
- d. Metalinguistic feedback deepened students' understanding of grammar rules but was harder to apply spontaneously during real-time speaking.

Importantly, the choice and delivery of feedback were also shaped by the classroom atmosphere (e.g., group size, time pressure, formality of setting) and teaching style (e.g., direct vs. indirect correction preferences), which in turn influenced how students received and acted upon the feedback.

### 2. Student Perceptions

Students generally viewed corrective feedback positively and acknowledged its role in facilitating learning and personal growth. However, their preferences varied based on individual learner traits, such as language proficiency, confidence levels, and sensitivity to public correction.

- a. While many appreciated explicit feedback for its straightforwardness, some found it emotionally distressing.
- b. Recasts were preferred for their subtlety, but their impact depended on the student's attentiveness and language awareness.
- c. Clarification requests fostered self-correction but required higher cognitive engagement, which some students struggled with.
- d. Metalinguistic feedback was seen as valuable by more analytically inclined students but could overwhelm those less confident in grammar.

### 3. Emotional and Psychological Responses

Corrective feedback triggered a range of emotional responses that either enhanced or hindered students' engagement.

- a. Positive feedback experiences (e.g., constructive tone, encouragement) boosted motivation and self-confidence.
- b. Negative experiences, such as feeling singled out or unclear about what was wrong, led to anxiety, reduced participation, and fear of speaking. The study found that students' psychological traits, including self-esteem, resilience, and prior learning experiences,



significantly influenced how they interpreted and responded to feedback. This underscores the need for lecturers to deliver feedback sensitively and strategically, tailoring their approach to suit both the cognitive and emotional needs of diverse learners.

### Feedback Effectiveness and Pedagogical Implications

The findings demonstrate that no single type of feedback guarantees success across all learners or contexts. A more holistic and adaptive feedback strategy is required—one that blends different feedback types with an awareness of students' psychological states, class dynamics, and teaching methods. Effective feedback in speaking classes should not only target linguistic accuracy but also support emotional safety, student autonomy, and long-term confidence in language use.

### REFERENCES

- Asratie, M. G., Wale, B. D., & Aylet, Y. T. (2023). Effects of using educational technology tools to enhance EFL students' speaking performance. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11562-y>
- Bashori, M., van Hout, R., Strik, H., & Cucchiari, C. (2022). Web-based language learning and speaking anxiety. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1770293>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Burns, A. (2019). Concepts for Teaching Speaking in the English Language Classroom1. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.61587/mmit.uz.vi.31>
- Damayanti, M. E., & Listyani, L. (2020). An Analysis Of Students' Speaking Anxiety In Academic Speaking Class. *ELTR Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.37147/eltr.v4i2.70>
- Demirel, M. V., Türkel, A., & Aydın, İ. S. (2020). Speaking self-efficacy beliefs of Turkish university students. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v15i3.4905>
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition (2nd ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- Fitria, A., Dwimaulidianti, A., & Sapitri, S. N. M. (2021). The Implementation of Cake Application in Learning English Speaking Skills. *International Conference on Education of Suryakancana*.
- Hoesny, M. U., Setyosari, P., Praherdhiono, H., & Suryati, N. (2023). The Correlation of Speaking Self-Efficacy, Speaking Proficiency and Gender in ESP Context. *Pegem Egitim ve Ogretim Dergisi*. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.13.02.23>
- Hongsa, N., Wathawatthana, P., & Yonwilad, W. (2023). The Effects of TikTok Application on the Improvement of EFL Students' English-Speaking Skills. *World Journal of English Language*. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n7p77>
- Kabudi, T., Pappas, I., & Olsen, D. H. (2021). AI-enabled adaptive learning systems: A systematic mapping of the literature. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 2(December 2020), 100017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100017>
- Karpovich, I., Sheredekina, O., Krepkai, T., & Voronova, L. (2021). The use of monologue speaking tasks to improve first-year students' english-speaking skills. *Education Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11060298>
- Le, T. T., Pham, T. T., Nguyen, A. T., Phuong, H. Y., Huynh, T. A. T., & Nguyen, H. T. (2024).

- "Becoming a trilingual learner may be harder than I thought!": Difficulties encountered by Vietnamese French-major students when studying English as a foreign language. *Ampersand*, 12(August 2023), 100168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2024.100168>
- Lisnawati, I. (2021). Speaking learning based on multimedia. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.147>
- Miele, C., Maquigneau, A., Joyal, C. C., Bertsch, I., Gangi, O., Gonthier, H., Rawlinson, C., Vigourt-Oudart, S., Symphorien, E., Heasman, A., Letourneau, E., Moncany, A. H., & Lacambre, M. (2023). International guidelines for the prevention of sexual violence: A systematic review and perspective of WHO, UN Women, UNESCO, and UNICEF's publications. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 146(September). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2023.106497>
- Pakula, H.-M. (2019). Teaching speaking. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201903011691>
- Pratiwi, D. I., Ubaedillah, U., Puspitasari, A., & Arifianto, T. (2022). Flipped Classroom in Online Speaking Class at Indonesian University Context. *International Journal of Instruction*. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.15238a>
- Pratiwi, R. (2021). Pelatihan Metode Pembelajaran Fun English Games Using Application bagi Guru Bahasa Inggris Mas Nu Batahan. *Jurnal Abdimas Adpi Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.47841/jsoshum.v2i2.149>
- Publications, S., & Technology, E. (2016). *Proceedings of International Research Clinic & Scientific Publications of Educational Technology*. 2010, 775–781.
- Saed, H. A., Haider, A. S., Al-Salman, S., & Hussein, R. F. (2021). The use of YouTube in developing the speaking skills of Jordanian EFL university students. *Heliyon*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07543>
- Santhanasamy, C., & Yunus, M. M. (2022). A systematic review of flipped learning approach in improving speaking skills. In *European Journal of Educational Research*. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.11.1.127>
- Wahyuningsih, S., & Afandi, M. (2020). Investigating English speaking problems: Implications for speaking curriculum development in Indonesia. *European Journal of Educational Research*. <https://doi.org/10.12973/EU-JER.9.3.967>