CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter briefly explains some theories that support the study. The theories are related to the Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) and students' perception.

A. Theoretical Framework

1. Oral Corrective Feedback

Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) refers to the responses provided by teachers or peers to learners' spoken errors, including mispronunciation. In second language acquisition, OCF plays an essential role in guiding learners toward more accurate and intelligible speech, making it a key component in the development of speaking skills and pronunciation accuracy. Lyster and Ranta (1997) identify several types of OCF commonly used in language classrooms, such as explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, elicitation, and metalinguistic feedback. Each type offers different levels of explicitness and encourages learners to notice and repair their pronunciation errors in distinct ways.

Previous research indicates that OCF, when delivered constructively, can support learners in recognizing and correcting their pronunciation mistakes. However, the effectiveness of OCF is influenced by how students perceive and react to the feedback, as psychological and social factors often shape learners' responses (Sheen, 2011). Some students may view feedback as helpful and motivating, while others may find it discouraging or disruptive, which ultimately affects how well they internalize the correction.

In addition to addressing linguistic accuracy, OCF also contributes to enhancing students' motivation and self-confidence in speaking the target language (Sari et al., 2022). This underscores the importance of understanding learners' perceptions of OCF, as their interpretations influence both the emotional and cognitive dimensions of pronunciation learning. Therefore, exploring students' views on oral corrective feedback is crucial for informing more effective teaching practices, particularly in the area of pronunciation instruction.

In research on second language learning, oral corrective feedback (OCF), or teachers' or classmates' responses to pronunciation errors, has been shown to significantly influence students' pronunciation development (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013). According to their comprehensive review, teachers generally use various types of feedback, including explicit correction, repetition, elicitation, requests for clarification, and metalinguistic feedback, each of which triggers different levels of awareness and acceptance in learners (Lyster et al., 2013). The authors argue that the frequency and effectiveness of each type of feedback depend on various contextual and individual factors of the learners, such as their age, linguistic targets, and classroom dynamics (Lyster et al., 2013).

In addition, experimental research has provided evidence that different types of feedback can produce different learning outcomes in pronunciation. For example, Saito and Lyster (2011) conducted a classroom intervention with Japanese learners of English that focused on the /ɹ/ sound; they found that form-focused instruction combined with explicit corrective feedback resulted in significant improvements in accurate production by learners. These findings suggest that feedback highlighting problematic pronunciation, combined with practice, can be highly beneficial (Saito & Lyster, 2011). Furthermore, learner engagement with feedback is crucial: Saeli, Rahmati, and Dalman (2021) found that positive cognitive, behavioral, and affective engagement with pronunciation feedback significantly mediated the benefits of OCF. This suggests that learners' perceptions and emotional engagement in the feedback process are important factors in how effectively they can improve their pronunciation.

Overall, the literature indicates that oral corrective feedback plays a pivotal role in shaping learners' pronunciation accuracy, with explicit correction and focused instructional feedback generally producing stronger learning outcomes when compared to more implicit techniques. However, research also shows that learners' engagement and emotional responses significantly mediate the effectiveness of such feedback, suggesting that pronunciation improvement is not solely a linguistic process but also an affective one. Considering that much of the existing evidence comes from adult or university learners, while the senior high

school context particularly in Indonesia remains underexplored, it becomes essential to investigate how younger learners perceive different forms of corrective feedback in their English classrooms. Understanding these perceptions will help teachers adapt their feedback practices to support students' pronunciation development better, making this study both timely and highly relevant for improving English language teaching at the secondary level.

2. The Type of Oral Corrective Feedback in EFL Classroom

There are several types of OCF in the EFL classroom during the students' pronunciation learning. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), OCF commonly used in language classrooms consisted of: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Each type plays a different role in addressing students' errors, particularly in pronunciation, which is essential for effective communication in a second language, as explained in some points below.

1. Explicit Correction

    It plays a key role in pronunciation learning because it provides learners with the correct form immediately and directly. When teachers clearly state that an utterance is incorrect and supply the accurate pronunciation, students receive unambiguous guidance that helps them understand and repair their errors.

2. Recasts

    It serves a different function by offering the correct form implicitly. Instead of pointing out the error, the teacher reformulates the learner's utterance in its accurate version. This approach models the correct pronunciation naturally, although learners may not always notice that a correction has been made.

3. Clarification Requests

    It encourages learners to reflect on their own speech by signaling that an utterance was unclear or incorrect. Through prompts such as "Sorry?" or "What did you say?", teachers give students the opportunity to identify and correct the mispronunciation independently, fostering greater self-monitoring.

4. Metalinguistic Feedback

It contributes to a deeper understanding by providing information about why the pronunciation is incorrect. Teachers may offer phonetic cues, articulatory explanations, or brief rules related to the sound. This type of feedback helps students understand the nature of their error rather than simply imitating a corrected form.

5. Elicitation

It promotes active learner participation by prompting students to supply the correction themselves. Teachers may ask direct questions, leave a sentence unfinished, or otherwise encourage learners to produce the correct pronunciation, which strengthens learner engagement and self-correction skills.

6. Repetition

It highlights an error by repeating the learner's incorrect pronunciation with changed intonation. This draws attention to the problematic sound, signaling that something needs to be fixed, and gives students the chance to self-repair. In this study, it was implemented as teacher-led "repeat after me" exercises after explicit correction. Both approaches aim to reinforce accurate pronunciation through repeated practice, linking theory to classroom application.

The concept of uptake is central to this framework, as it reflects whether students respond to the feedback by successfully correcting their errors. Uptake demonstrates how effectively each type of OCF supports learners' awareness and improvement, and different feedback types may lead to different levels of success depending on learner readiness and context.

Students' perceptions of each feedback type also influence how effectively they respond to pronunciation correction. Some students prefer direct, explicit correction, while others feel more comfortable with less direct forms of feedback. These preferences shape how feedback contributes to their motivation, confidence, and overall pronunciation development, highlighting the need for teachers to consider learners' emotional and cognitive responses.

In this study, Lyster and Ranta's framework provides an essential foundation for examining how different types of oral corrective feedback shape senior high school students' perceptions of pronunciation correction. By using this model, the research can identify which feedback strategies students perceive as effective, how they respond to various forms of correction, and what implications these perceptions have for improving pronunciation instruction in the EFL classroom.

3. Students' Perception

Perception, in psychological terms, refers to the process by which individuals select, organize, and interpret sensory information to form meaningful representations of their environment (Goldstein, 2014). In educational research, students' perception is defined as learners' interpretation and evaluation of classroom experiences, instructional practices, and pedagogical input, influenced by cognitive, emotional, and experiential factors (Brown, 2007; Loewen & Sato, 2018). It is inherently subjective, encompassing not only what learners notice but also how they feel about it, how they assess its usefulness, and how they respond behaviorally (Loewen & Sato, 2018).

In the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), students' perceptions are crucial because they affect motivation, willingness to communicate, cognitive engagement, and uptake of instructional input (Amirian et al., 2018; Zhou, 2018). When learners perceive an instructional practice as helpful and supportive, they are more likely to engage actively; conversely, if it is perceived as confusing or threatening, they may withdraw or avoid participation (Amirian et al., 2018; Loewen & Sato, 2018).

Specifically, in the context of corrective feedback, particularly oral corrective feedback (OCF), students' perceptions play a crucial role in mediating learning outcomes. These perceptions determine whether learners notice the feedback, consider it valuable, integrate it into their understanding, and ultimately use it to enhance their speaking performance (Li, 2018). Therefore, it is important to understand learners' cognitive, emotional, and behavioral reactions to OCF in order to create feedback strategies that are both effective and tailored to students' needs.

Perception can generally be categorized into positive and negative types (Solso, 2007; Schunk, Pintrich, & Meece, 2014).

1) Positive Perception

Positive perception occurs when individuals evaluate an object, event, or experience favorably, aligning with their expectations. It is influenced by prior knowledge, satisfaction, and past experiences, which contribute to a constructive and supportive viewpoint (Ormrod, 2020).

2) Negative Perception

Negative perception arises when individuals assess an object or experience unfavorably. This type of perception is often associated with dissatisfaction, limited knowledge, or insufficient experience, which can result in confusion, apprehension, or avoidance behaviors (Schunk et al., 2014; Ormrod, 2020).

Based on these definitions, students' perception in this study is conceptualized as the cognitive and emotional process through which learners interpret, evaluate, and respond to their teacher's oral corrective feedback on English mispronunciation. This perception affects how students understand corrections, how comfortable they feel when being corrected, and how they act upon feedback during pronunciation learning. Through their experiences with different types of OCF, students form personal judgments regarding the clarity, usefulness, and emotional impact of feedback, which in turn influences their motivation, confidence, and ability to produce and retain accurate pronunciation in English.

4. English Mispronunciation

English mispronunciation is a significant issue in EFL learning because inaccurate production of sounds, stress, or intonation can hinder communication and reduce learners' confidence when speaking English (Gilakjani, 2016). Mispronunciation commonly emerges in contexts where English is not used daily, as learners often rely on their first-language sound system, lack exposure to authentic pronunciation models, and receive limited pronunciation-focused instruction in the classroom. These conditions make mispronunciation a persistent challenge that affects learners' overall oral proficiency.

Mispronunciation occurs when learners produce speech that deviates from standard English pronunciation norms. These deviations may include segmental errors, such as incorrect vowel or consonant articulation, and suprasegmental errors, such as misplaced stress or inappropriate intonation patterns. Such difficulties typically arise from limited phonological awareness, entrenched incorrect habits, or insufficient corrective guidance from teachers. Without timely and consistent support, these errors may become fossilized, making them increasingly resistant to change (Derwing & Munro, 2022).

Although mispronunciation significantly affects learners' intelligibility, it is often underprioritized in EFL classrooms. Teachers may focus more on grammar and vocabulary due to time constraints, curricular demands, or a lack of specialized knowledge in pronunciation pedagogy. However, recent research emphasizes the need for deliberate pronunciation instruction, particularly through oral corrective feedback (OCF) to help learners understand and correct their pronunciation errors (Lyster & Saito, 2010). When learners do not receive this support, opportunities to improve spoken accuracy are lost.

Effective OCF is essential for addressing mispronunciation because it draws learners' attention to their errors and provides guidance for producing the correct forms. This process aligns with Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis, which states that learners must consciously notice their linguistic errors before they can modify their interlanguage. By offering clear and timely feedback, teachers help students understand the gap between their incorrect output and the target pronunciation, enabling them too self-correct more successfully.

In conclusion, English mispronunciation is a key obstacle to effective communication for EFL learners. To address this challenge, teachers must prioritize pronunciation instruction and integrate consistent oral corrective feedback that helps students build awareness and accuracy. Strengthening pedagogical practices in this area can support learners in achieving clearer, more confident spoken English and ultimately enhance their overall communicative competence.

B. Study of Relevant Research

Several relevant studies have been conducted regarding oral corrective feedback in pronunciation learning. First, Agustuna et al. (2019) conducted a qualitative case study that explored students' self-reflection on oral corrective feedback related to pronunciation errors in an EFL classroom. Using classroom observations, interviews, and questionnaires from eleventh-grade students, the researchers found that learners were generally aware of their own pronunciation mistakes and understand the value of receiving corrective feedback from their teacher. The feedback not only helped them identify inaccurate pronunciation but also increased their motivation to improve and strengthened their self-awareness during speaking activities. The study highlights that when corrective feedback is delivered constructively, students perceive it as a helpful tool for improving both their pronunciation accuracy and their confidence in using English orally.

Second, Sari et al. (2022) examined university students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback in relation to the improvement of their speaking performance. Employing a quantitative descriptive approach supported by questionnaires and interviews, the study revealed that students viewed oral corrective feedback as highly beneficial for identifying errors in pronunciation, grammar, and fluency. The participants emphasized the importance of receiving feedback that is clear, respectful, and supportive, noting that such feedback helps them better understand their mistakes and encourages them to participate more actively in speaking activities. The findings suggest that the clarity and manner of delivering corrective feedback significantly influence how positively students respond to it in higher education settings.

Third, Wardani et al. (2023) investigated first-semester students' perceptions and preferences regarding lecturer feedback in an EFL speaking course at a private university. Through questionnaires and interviews, the study found overwhelmingly positive attitudes toward lecturer feedback, with more than half of the participants stating that corrective feedback played an essential role in fostering self-reflection and building confidence. Students also reported that feedback helped enrich their speaking skills by guiding them toward more accurate and effective

language use. The study underscores the importance of consistent and supportive feedback, as students perceived it as a crucial component of their speaking development and overall oral communication proficiency.

Taken together, these studies provide consistent evidence that students generally view OCF positively and benefit from it when it is delivered clearly, constructively, and with sensitivity to learners' emotional needs. The studies emphasize the importance of feedback in developing pronunciation, motivation, confidence, and speaking skills. Despite the valuable insights provided by earlier studies, there remains a gap in understanding how senior high school students who are at a critical stage of language development perceive oral corrective feedback specifically targeting mispronunciation. Existing studies have been conducted mostly in higher education settings and have centered on broader speaking skills, leaving limited evidence on how adolescents in Indonesian EFL classrooms respond to pronunciation-oriented correction. This gap is important because senior high school learners may experience corrective feedback differently from university students due to differences in proficiency, anxiety levels, learning environment, and confidence in speaking