

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a brief explanation of some theories that support the study, the theories related to Oral Corrective Feedback, Students' Perception, and the study of relevant research.

A. Theoretical Framework

In this section, the researcher elaborates on the theories related to the topic. It covers Oral Corrective Feedback, Speaking in the EFL Classroom Context, and Students' Perception.

1. Oral Corrective Feedback

The role of oral corrective feedback (OCF) in English Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms is vital, especially in speaking courses where learners are required to produce language spontaneously. In the EFL context, such as in Indonesia, students often have limited exposure to authentic English communication outside the classroom, which makes classroom-based feedback a critical component of their language development. OCF serves not merely as error correction but as a pedagogical tool that helps students notice, understand, and repair linguistic errors, thereby improving both accuracy and fluency (Li, 2014; Paul & Al-Mamun, 2024). Without immediate feedback, learners may continue using incorrect forms, leading to fossilized errors that hinder communicative competence.

Among the most influential frameworks in second language acquisition research, Lyster and Ranta's (1997) model of corrective feedback provides the theoretical foundation of this study. Their framework identifies six main types of oral corrective feedback, each with a distinct pedagogical function:

- a. Recast – reformulating a student's error correctly without overtly highlighting the mistake;

- b. Explicit correction – directly indicating that an utterance is incorrect and providing the correct form;
- c. Elicitation – prompting learners to self-correct by leaving pauses or asking them to reformulate their utterance;
- d. Metalinguistic feedback – offering comments or questions that guide learners to think about the nature of their error;
- e. Clarification request – signalling misunderstanding (e.g., “Pardon?”) to encourage learners to repair their utterance; and
- f. Repetition – repeating the erroneous part of a learner’s speech with adjusted intonation to draw attention to the mistake.

Beyond identifying feedback types, Lyster and Ranta (1997) also introduced the concept of learner uptake, the learner’s immediate reaction or attempt to repair following corrective feedback. This concept highlights that effective OCF is not a one-way transmission of correction but a two-way interaction where students actively process and internalize input through teacher guidance. In this process, the interactional exchange between teacher and learner becomes the core of language learning.

In this research, Lyster and Ranta's (1997) framework serves as the grand theory guiding both the design of the interview questions and the interpretation of findings. The six feedback types act as analytical indicators to understand how students perceive, evaluate, and emotionally respond to their lecturer’s corrective practices in a speaking class.

Furthermore, this framework complements Vygotsky’s (1978) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which emphasizes that learning occurs through interaction and scaffolding provided by more capable . When the lecturer uses prompts like elicitation or metalinguistic feedback, they scaffold learners’ performance and help them internalize correct forms over time. This perspective supports the notion that OCF in an EFL setting is not only cognitive, focusing on language form, but also social and affective, involving trust, confidence, and

motivation between teacher and learner.

The application of Lyster and Ranta's theory within the Indonesian EFL context aligns with several empirical studies. Gaffar et al. (2024) and Mulyani et al. (2022) observed that students in Indonesia respond positively to OCF when it is delivered with care and respect, and that supportive correction enhances learners' confidence and willingness to participate. Similarly, Azam et al. (2024) and Paul and Al-Mamun (2024) found that students in EFL contexts prefer timely and explicit feedback because it helps them understand their errors clearly. These findings reinforce the theoretical stance that OCF, when appropriately delivered, enhances both linguistic accuracy and learner engagement.

In summary, Lyster and Ranta's (1997) corrective feedback framework provides the theoretical backbone of this study. It guides the exploration of how EFL students perceive oral corrective feedback in speaking classes, whether they view it as helpful, supportive, or anxiety-inducing. The six feedback types serve as observable indicators for analyzing perception, while the concept of learner uptake connects to how students use feedback as input for improvement. Through this theoretical lens, OCF is understood not only as a method of correction but also as a collaborative and affective process that promotes learner growth, confidence, and communicative competence in EFL contexts

2. Speaking in the EFL Classroom Context

Speaking in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) refers to the ability to verbalize thoughts, considerations, and feelings in English through oral communication activities, both spontaneous and arranged. Most language experts agree that speaking is a foundational productive skill contributing to communicative competence, particularly in a globalized world where English dominates as a medium of interaction (Akhter et al., 2020). This ability rises above mechanical vocabulary and grammar use, requiring an integration of cognitive, linguistic, and sociocultural factors during

communication. Burns (2016) emphasizes that speaking involves articulation accuracy, turn-taking, talk management, and interaction strategies, enabling learners to navigate diverse communicative contexts in classroom settings.

Speaking requires linguistic competence, which includes mastering grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. These elements form the premise for precise and contextually appropriate communication (Lightbown & Spada, 2021). In EFL contexts, limited exposure to authentic language use often hampers this development, necessitating instructional strategies that adjust precision and fluency. Swain's (1985) Output Theory underscores the significance of language production in identifying linguistic gaps and refining output, especially in situations where speaking proficiency lags behind writing abilities (Li & Lu, 2023).

Furthermore, the speaking process in EFL happens in two fundamental types of functions, spoken interaction and spoken production. Spoken interaction means the learners' ability to hold dialogue, arrange meaning, and respond appropriately in communication exchanges. At the same time, spoken production is the capacity to allow coherent expression of thoughts in monologic formats like oral presentations or narrating (Antunes, 2022). To balance linguistic precision against fluency, appropriateness, and confidence, especially in settings where English is not the primary or second language, the dimensions require learners to be able to not only speak correct but also appropriate English.

Speaking abilities are commonly the most challenging due to participants' mental highlights and environmental factors such as language anxiety, fear of errors, lack of vocabulary, and lack of exposure to reasonable language (Haji & Jejo, 2020). The result showed that students would remain silent for fear of negative evaluation or lack of motivation due to teacher-centered learning. The very restricted use of English in classrooms, as well as the prevalence of reading and writing assignments, denies learners opportunities to develop oral abilities. As a result, students may find it challenging to

communicate effectively in English in real-life situations, even after years of formal education.

The speaking process in EFL classrooms operates through two primary functions:

a. Spoken Interaction

Learners engage in dialogues, negotiate meaning, and respond appropriately in exchanges (Antunes, 2022). This dynamic process relies on real-time comprehension and adaptability.

b. Spoken Production

Learners articulate coherent thoughts in monologic formats like presentations or storytelling (Burns, 2019)

Balancing linguistic precision, fluency, and sociocultural appropriateness remains challenging in contexts where English is neither a primary nor secondary language (Haji & Jejo, 2020). EFL learners face multifaceted barriers, including Psychological Factors, Environmental Factors, and Linguistic Gaps (Lundahl, 2014; Zhang, 2021). These challenges often result in prolonged silence during classroom interactions, even among learners with years of formal education (Haji & Jejo, 2020). To help ease these difficulties, modern strategies of EFL speaking instruction focus on sociocultural theories that support a framework and collaborative learning. By conducting significant tasks (such as combining work, games, songs, and role-plays), learners can continuously develop validity and competence in speaking (Lundahl, 2014). These practices are consistent with the view that language learning is socially mediated and that speaking itself emerges through collaboration with more capable peers or a teacher in an environment conducive to learning. Speech-enabled corrective feedback tools have emerged as effective aids, providing immediate pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary guidance.

Such technologies create blended learning environments that combine traditional instruction with personalized feedback (Wu & Chen, 2024).

The attitude of learners toward the foreign language is a key focus of this research, as speaking ability constitutes the primary content of the English foreign language setting, where learners connect with their language. EFL learners are dynamic participants when using language; they need to convey their thoughts, respond to conversational signals, and negotiate meaning during intelligently practiced classroom activities. Separated from their capability in using English as a means of communication, their speaking performances uncover their mental preparedness, strategic acts, and social knowledge.

3. Students' Perception

Students' perception refers to the ways learners interpret and make sense of their learning experiences, including their interactions with teachers and the feedback they receive. Jumiaty and Kuswoyo (2023) describe it as students' interpretation of the teaching process and its relevance to their competence, shaped by their attitudes, feelings, and expectations. This perspective highlights that students are active participants who process and respond to learning experiences rather than passive recipients. In the context of oral corrective feedback (OCF), their perceptions influence how they receive, interpret, and respond to teachers' corrections during speaking activities.

Perception, in psychological terms, involves interpreting sensory experiences into meaningful understanding. Lindsay and Norman (1977) define it as the process through which individuals organize sensations to construct an understanding of the world, while Elliot (2004) emphasizes the role of recognition and expectation in shaping meaning. Desmita (2009) further explains that perception allows individuals to use prior knowledge to interpret information from their surroundings. These definitions suggest that perception is a subjective process—different learners may experience the same teaching event yet interpret it differently, which explains why students' responses to

feedback vary widely.

Building on modern learning theories, Schunk and Meece (2012) view students as self-regulated agents who set goals, monitor their progress, and engage in activities that they believe will lead to success. This framework suggests that how students perceive feedback—whether they see it as supportive or discouraging—directly affects their motivation and engagement in the learning process. Therefore, understanding students' perceptions of OCF helps identify not only how they process feedback cognitively but also how they emotionally and behaviorally respond to it in speaking classes.

Perception also involves evaluative judgments. Hong (2003) points out that individuals form perceptions based on their prior experiences, influencing whether they view certain teaching methods positively or negatively. Similarly, Sidhu (2003) explains that students' perceptions reflect their judgments about classroom learning processes and can lead to constructive feedback for teachers. Erin and Maharani (2018) describe perception as a psychological process involving selection, interpretation, and response, meaning that perception develops through both mental and emotional engagement with learning experiences.

In the context of oral corrective feedback, the effectiveness of feedback depends largely on how students perceive it. When feedback is seen as constructive and supportive, students are more willing to internalize it and improve (Azam et al., 2024). Conversely, when feedback is perceived as criticism, it can provoke anxiety or resistance that hinders learning. Perception can thus be categorized into two types: positive and negative. Positive perception arises when learners find feedback helpful, relevant, and motivating, while negative perception emerges from dissatisfaction or misunderstanding of the purpose of feedback (Solso et al., 2007).

Perception can also be analyzed through three dimensions: cognitive, conative, and affective (Walgito, 2010). The cognitive dimension involves

learners' knowledge and beliefs about feedback; the conative dimension concerns their behavioural responses and willingness to act upon it; and the affective dimension relates to emotional reactions, such as feeling encouraged or anxious. Together, these dimensions provide a comprehensive framework for examining how students process oral corrective feedback in language learning.

Walgito (2010) also explains the stages of perception, beginning with the reception of stimuli, followed by physiological and psychological processing, and ending in behavioral responses. This model helps explain how students move from receiving oral feedback to interpreting it and finally responding to it—whether through correction, reflection, or adjustment in performance. Such understanding is essential in this study, which examines students' perceptions of OCF in a Public Speaking course, where feedback plays a central role in developing communicative competence.

Individual and contextual factors further influence perception. Arifin, Fuady and Kuswarno (2017) categorizes internal factors—such as motivation, interest, prior experience, and emotional state—and external factors—such as classroom environment and teaching methods—as key determinants. Similarly, Davis (1989) emphasizes perceived usefulness and ease of use as external variables influencing how individuals evaluate a system or process. These insights are relevant in understanding how EFL students evaluate oral feedback: if they find it useful and easy to understand, they are more likely to perceive it positively and apply it effectively.

Differences in cultural background and learning experience also shape perceptions. Paul and Al-Mamun (2024) found that students' preferences for feedback types vary; some benefit from explicit corrections, while others respond better to implicit ones. Likewise, Gaffar et al. (2024) observed that learners who perceive classroom feedback as supportive are more willing to take risks in speaking and show greater improvement. These findings suggest that teachers' ability to foster a positive feedback culture is essential in EFL contexts

like Indonesia, where students may view speaking errors as high-stakes risks.

Finally, perception develops over time. Li (2014) notes that as learners gain proficiency, they often shift from preferring direct correction to valuing delayed or reflective feedback that promotes self-correction. This developmental view is crucial for teachers, as it implies that feedback strategies should evolve alongside students' linguistic maturity.

In summary, students' perception is a central concept in this study because it shapes how learners interpret and respond to oral corrective feedback in their Public Speaking class. Understanding perception helps explain the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral mechanisms that influence how feedback affects learning. By exploring students' perceptions, this study aims to reveal how OCF contributes to their language development and how teachers can refine their feedback practices to create a more effective, supportive learning environment.

B. Study of Relevant Research

Many recent studies have examined students' perspectives on oral corrective feedback (OCF) in foreign language learning contexts, offering valuable insights into how learners perceive and respond to teacher feedback. Roothoof and Breeze (2016) investigated the beliefs and preferences of adult EFL learners in Spain and found that most students preferred frequent corrective feedback, particularly on pronunciation. However, reactions to individual correction varied: some learners found it motivating, while others felt embarrassed. This finding suggests that OCF practices must consider learners' emotional responses and individual preferences.

A more recent study by Paul and Al-Mamun (2023) explored Bangladeshi students' perceptions of OCF in improving their English-speaking skills. Their findings revealed that students preferred feedback that addressed both form and content errors. They also favored a balanced approach—teachers

providing immediate correction for major errors and allowing self- or peer correction for minor mistakes. This study emphasized that context-sensitive feedback aligned with students' goals enhances learning effectiveness.

Azam et al. (2024) conducted an in-depth investigation in Malaysian classrooms and found that students preferred recasts and clarification requests over explicit correction, particularly in public speaking activities. Cultural factors were found to influence these preferences, as learners from collectivist cultures tended to value "face-saving" feedback strategies that reduced embarrassment during communication.

In the Indonesian context, Gaffar et al. (2024) examined how oral corrective feedback strengthened the performance of professional EFL students. They discovered that students' perceptions changed significantly when teachers shifted from an error-focused to a developmental feedback approach. Initially, students felt anxious about receiving feedback, but as teachers emphasized improvement over criticism, learners became more receptive and even began to seek feedback actively. This finding highlighted the importance of teacher sensitivity and feedback framing in shaping positive student perceptions.

Zhang and Zhang (2023) analyzed Chinese university students' responses to different types of oral corrective feedback. Their mixed-methods study revealed that students valued explicit correction for pronunciation but preferred implicit feedback such as recasts for grammar errors. More proficient learners showed a stronger appreciation for metalinguistic feedback compared to beginners, suggesting that preferences evolve with proficiency. The study emphasized the need to adapt feedback strategies to students' developmental levels to maximize learning outcomes.

In the European context, Moreno-López et al. (2022) conducted a large-scale longitudinal study across Spain, France, and Germany involving 215 students. Their results showed that learners' perceptions of feedback varied according to instructional settings: students in communicative, task-based

environments preferred delayed feedback, while those in form-focused classrooms favored immediate correction. This finding underscored that effective OCF must align with the broader pedagogical approach and classroom interaction style.

Ho (2015) examined students' perceptions of computer-mediated versus face-to-face feedback. While students appreciated the privacy and reduced anxiety of digital feedback platforms, they still valued the personalized guidance and emotional connection of in-person feedback. This study indicates that technological tools can complement—but not replace—traditional feedback methods, especially in cultures where interpersonal communication is central to learning.

Across these studies, researchers collectively demonstrate that students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback are multifaceted and influenced by various factors, including cultural background, language proficiency, instructional context, and feedback delivery method. However, despite these valuable findings, several gaps remain. Most previous studies have been conducted in general EFL or grammar-based contexts, with limited attention to oral corrective feedback in public speaking courses, where feedback often involves not only linguistic accuracy but also communication performance and confidence. Moreover, while prior research highlights cultural influences on feedback perception, few studies have examined how Indonesian EFL learners, particularly in higher education, emotionally and behaviorally respond to oral feedback during performance-based tasks.

Therefore, this study seeks to address these gaps by investigating Indonesian university students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback in a Public Speaking course, focusing on how they experience, interpret, and respond to feedback in a real classroom setting. By exploring these perspectives, the study aims to contribute a deeper understanding to the field of EFL pedagogy and provide practical insights for improving feedback strategies that support

learners' communicative competence.