

Investigating Students' Attitudes on Oral Corrective Feedback: Small-scale Survey in Academic Speaking Class

Muti'ah^{a,1*}, Vanya Maulidia Azizah^{a,2}

^{a,b} Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

^{1*}mutiiaah@student.uns.ac.id; ²vanyamlidazzh2013@student.uns.ac.id

* Corresponding Author



Received 25 December 2023; accepted 2 June 2024; published 31 June 2024

ABSTRACT

Due to the essentiality of oral presentation, giving corrective feedback was gaining potential discussion, especially in oral language. Thus, this study investigated the attitudes of graduate students within the English department at a university in Central Java, Indonesia, towards teachers' oral corrective feedback (OCF) during academic speaking presentations. Utilizing a quantitative descriptive survey design, a 6-item questionnaire developed by Ur (1999) was administered using probability sampling ($n = 23$). This research explored preferences among students regarding explicit and implicit OCF, peer criticism, and meta-linguistic feedback. Results indicated a predominant preference (73.9%) for explicit OCF, reflecting a strong tendency toward direct and honest correction from teachers. While implicit OCF obtained positive responses, students exhibited reluctance towards peer criticism and expressed a preference for teacher feedback. However, there was notable enthusiasm (69.6%) for meta-linguistic OCF, which highlighted students' receptiveness to linguistic nuances and novel perspectives. These findings underscored the significance of understanding students' preferences in OCF contexts, emphasizing the value placed on explicit teacher correction and the appreciation for meta-linguistic insights within academic speaking classes.

KEYWORDS

Academic Speaking
Oral Corrective
Feedback (OCF)
Presentation
Students Attitudes

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license



1. Introduction

Oral presentation has become essential in both industry and university education. The success of academic and professional careers depends on this (Gedamu & Gezahegn, 2022). The oral presentation, which includes debates, role plays, thesis/dissertation mock and viva, projects, seminars, and small group and individual presentations, is one of the most important aspects of the curriculum (Zivkovic, 2014). It has also happened in the educational curriculum in Indonesia. Most Indonesian university students have done oral presentations in their academics. Seven elements were established for the development of oral presentation competency: tasks, behaviour modelling, practice opportunities, learning objectives, feedback timing and intensity, peer assessment, and self-assessment. Combined with these findings, we can say that one of the seven guidelines for enhancing this competency is feedback-giving (Ginkel et al., 2015).

In order to acquire complicated behaviours, like mastering oral presentations, feedback and assessment are crucial components of the learning cycle. Feedback can have numerous effects depending on its form and delivery method, even though it is one of the primary factors influencing learning and achievement (De Grez, 2009; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Nassaji et al., 2023). The feedback on the appropriateness or correctness of learners'

production or comprehension of a second language is referred to as corrective feedback (CF) (Li & Vuono 2019). When language learners engage in conversation both within and outside of the classroom, they increase their chances of receiving corrective feedback (CF) regarding their language production from a communication partner (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2021). Corrective feedback (CF) can be effectively integrated into communicative language learning environments to improve linguistic correctness as well as encourage a deeper understanding and application of language skills. This can ultimately increase the overall competency of second language (L2) learners.

Corrective feedback (CF) is important in second language (L2) learning, and a large body of research has examined its function in L2 acquisition. Corrective feedback is helpful for L2 acquisition, according to the findings of these studies, which have been compiled into several reviews and meta-analyses (Cheng & Yan, 2022; Cheng & Zhang, 2022; Nassaji, 2016; Nassaji & Kartchava, 2021). Additionally, they have demonstrated that different kinds of feedback have various degrees of effectiveness and that different factors, such as the type of feedback, the kinds of errors, and individual learner differences, may influence their usefulness (Nassaji, 2016; Li, 2018). For instance, Li and Vuono (2019) reviewed studies on oral and written corrective feedback carried out over the last 25 years and found differences in the application and impact of the two types of feedback in the classroom.

Furthermore, oral corrective feedback (OCF) itself is the response given by teachers or other discussion partners to language learners whose output is inaccurate, non-target-like, inappropriate, or confusing (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2021). Here, they receive an oral cue from the teacher that something is wrong with what they stated, either expressly or implicitly, during the presentation process. Six main categories of oral CF were found in Lyster and Ranta's groundbreaking work from 1997: elicitation, clarification requests, explicit correction, recasts, and metalinguistic signals. The six types of feedback can be divided into two categories: input-providing vs. output-prompting and implicit vs. explicit. The former is based on whether the learner's attention is explicitly brought to the error, while the latter is based on whether self-repair is encouraged (Li & Vuono, 2019; Nassaji & Kartchava, 2021). These types of feedback have various degrees of effectiveness.

Who gives the feedback—teachers, fellow students, or native speakers—also affects how effective it is. For instance, Mackey, Oliver, and Leeman (2003) discovered that while native speakers gave more feedback than other students, students were more likely to give feedback to one another in a way that promoted uptake or repair (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2021). In this case, we focused on teacher feedback. According to Nassaji & Kartchava (2021), teachers must consider the role of CF in their classrooms, such as providing extensive or intensive CF for all errors or targeting only a few. They must strike a balance between providing sufficient CF without reducing learner motivation and autonomy. They must also decide when to provide feedback, whether immediately or later, depending on the teaching context. The type of feedback used should be best suited for the learners, such as recasts and prompts being most effective during communicative exchanges or explicit CF at a later point.

Views of OCF are worthy of further investigation since this field of study can shed more light on the (in)congruence between teachers' and students' beliefs. Teachers can then use this knowledge to improve the effectiveness of their OCF provision. A variety of studies conducted in a variety of circumstances have shown varying results about the beliefs of teachers and/or students regarding OCF types. Jin & Ruan's (2023) study highlighted the role of students' self-assessment in shaping their reception of feedback,

emphasizing the importance of feedback aligning with individual expectations. This study, while insightful, primarily focused on general perceptions without considering the specific cultural and educational settings of Indonesian universities. Meanwhile, Ha et al. (2021) explored the beliefs of EFL teachers and students regarding oral corrective feedback but didn't specifically delve into Indonesian academic contexts. Consequently, there exists a gap in understanding how Indonesian cultural and educational norms intersect with students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback in academic speaking classes.

Van Der Kleij & Adie's (2020) research emphasized the disparities between teachers' perceptions of feedback effectiveness and students' actual perceptions of its utility. While this study highlighted the importance of feedback perception, it also pointed to understanding the direct impact of these perceptions on practical implementation and actual improvement in speaking abilities within academic settings. While Jin & Ruan (2023) stressed the importance of feedback aligning with expectations, the specific influence of these aligned or misaligned perceptions on actual academic performance, especially within Indonesian university contexts, remains unexplored. Therefore, a deeper investigation into the correlation between students' attitudes towards feedback and their subsequent improvement in spoken language proficiency within Indonesian academic speaking classes becomes crucial. Thus, this study signifies the need to bridge the gap between perceptions and tangible outcomes to better understand the practical implications of feedback attitudes on academic performance, aligning directly with this research's aim to investigate students' attitudes toward teachers' oral corrective feedback during presentations in academic speaking class. Thus, this study will address "How are the students' attitudes toward teachers' oral corrective feedback during presentations in academic speaking class?" as a research question.

1. Method

3.1. 2.1. Participant

To gain a representative and comprehensive understanding of the OCF-related attitudes of a population ($n=68$), the study focuses on graduate students in the English department at a university in Central Java, Indonesia. This study thus employs probability sampling, with a representative sample of ($n=23$) individuals selected, specifically students in their first and second semesters. The participants came from various ages, ranging from 20 to around 40 years old. Several of them already work as teachers or staff in private institutions, while most of them are full students. This deliberate selection aims to capture insights from those in the early stages of their graduate studies, providing a nuanced perspective on their experiences. Participants will be invited to partake in the research through a survey instrument designed to explore various aspects, including demographic information, academic interests, and challenges encountered during their studies. The chosen survey method enables the collection of quantitative data through closed-ended and Likert scale questions. The survey will be administered online, ensuring flexibility for participants. assurances will be upheld throughout the study. The findings from this sample are anticipated to offer valuable insights into the characteristics and experiences of early-stage graduate students within the English department, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of this specific academic cohort.

This selective selection tries to capture the views of early-stage graduate students, providing varied perspectives on their experiences. Participants will be requested to participate in the study via a survey instrument designed to explore various information, such as personal information, academic interests and attitudes toward the OCF. The survey

approach adopted allows for the collection of quantifiable data via closed-ended and Likert scale questions. The questionnaire will be administered online, giving participants greater freedom. Ethical considerations will be maintained throughout the investigation. Moreover, this sample's findings are expected to provide useful insights into the characteristics and experiences of early-stage graduate students in the English department, leading to an in-depth comprehension attitude towards oral corrective feedback during academic speaking class.

3.2. 2.2. Research Design

This study utilizes a quantitative descriptive research design with a sample survey approach to investigate graduate students' attitudes related to the teachers' oral corrective feedback during presentations in academic speaking classes. In particular, descriptive research is simply studying the phenomenon of interest as it exists naturally; no attempt is made to manipulate the individuals, conditions, or events (Metler, 2016). Whereas, the survey using questionnaires will be chosen to summarize the characteristics of different groups or measure their attitudes and opinions toward some issues (Ary, et.al., 2006). It is primarily a quantitative research technique where a sample, or sometimes the entire population, is given a survey or questionnaire to describe their attitudes, perspectives, behaviours, experiences, or other aspects of the population (Creswell, 2006; Metler, 2016). aligned with Marteens (2005) descriptive survey can simply describe the characteristics of the sample at one point in time (Mertler, 2016). Hence, to provide insights from the early phases of their academic speaking class experience, a probability sample technique was used to select 23 participants, specifically those in their first and second semesters.

Furthermore, this study aims to seek the attitudes of university students related to oral corrective feedback. Thus, an online survey questionnaire using a Likert scale with closed-ended questions for quantitative analysis serves as the primary data collection instrument. This survey, administered online, ensures flexibility and accessibility for participants. Therefore, descriptive statistical methods, including frequencies and summary statistics, will be employed to analyze quantitative data. In particular, throughout the research, ethical principles such as getting informed consent and maintaining anonymity will be upheld.

3.3. 2.3. Data Collection Technique

For the data collection, this recent study uses a directly administered questionnaire with 6 items in total that will be given to a group of students assembled at a certain university for a specific purpose related to OCF.

NO	Statements	Scale			
		Very Good	Good	Not Good	Bad
	When you make a mistake in class, you think it's . . . if the teacher..				
1	. . . ignores it, doesn't correct it at all.				
2	. . . indicates there's a mistake but doesn't actually tell you what's wrong, so you have to work it out for yourself.				

3	. . . says what was wrong and tells you what the right version is.				
4	. . . says what was wrong and gets you to say the correct version yourself.				
5	. . . says what was wrong and gets someone else to say the correct version.				
6	. . . explains why it was wrong, what the rule is.				

Table 2.1 Questionnaire Instrument developed by Penny Ur (1999)

These will also follow the survey technique from Ary et al. (2006), which involves six key processes. It begins with planning, where a research question is formulated based on the survey method and informed by a literature review. The next steps include defining the target population, selecting a representative sample through probability sampling, constructing the data-gathering instrument, which is questionnaires, conducting the survey with field testing and user training, and finally, processing the collected data through statistical analysis, interpretation, and reporting of findings. Therefore, this study, intended to obtain a questionnaire, served as the instrument to investigate the learners' attitudes regarding oral corrective feedback.

The questionnaire was divided into two sections: six 4-point Likert-scale items in the attitudes portion proposed by Ur (1999) which can be seen in table 3.1, and five items in the background knowledge section as the respondents' information acquired by the researcher. The questionnaire was carefully planned, implemented, and analyzed in accordance with the fundamental guidelines for questionnaire construction from Ary et al. (2006) to produce accurate and valid information. However, due to the validity and reliability data, one of the questionnaire items was dropped out, which is item number two.

3.4. 2.4 Data Analysis

Due to the quantitative approach used in this study, the data were obtained from a survey that were analyzed using a simple frequency distribution performed by SPSS 25. Moreover, the questionnaire items were established by Ur (1999), yet the robustness of the data were also assessed. The sample size ($n=23$) was analyzed using SPSS 25. After dropping out one item, the Cronbach alpha for the questionnaire was .81, indicating very good reliability for the scale (Field, 2013; Pallant, 2013). Continuously, the descriptive statistics in each category were calculated.

Furthermore, the frequency distribution, according to Ary et al. (2006) is a systematic arrangement of individual measures from highest to lowest. By using this technique the researcher can summarize the data using three indexes known as the measure of central tendency that offer a single index which serves as a representation of the average value across a whole set of measures. Whereas, the three types of those statistics indexes are as follows: the mean, an interval (or ratio) statistic; the mode, a nominal statistic; and the median, an ordinal statistic that considers the rankings of scores

within a distribution but not the size of the individual scores (Ary, et al., 2006). While, in this research it will interpret the data one by one per item.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1.Result

In this study, an in-depth analysis of descriptive statistical frequency parameters was conducted to assess the performance of individual learners across five specific items, of which the Cronbach alpha for the questionnaire was .815, which is presented in Table 3.1 as follows:

Table 3.1 The Reliability Test Output

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,815	,830	5

Furthermore, the researcher performed frequency statistics using SPSS 25 to analyze the data, and the results of this analysis are presented in Table 3.2 in an ordered manner. To simplify the interpretation of the data, the Likert scale, which included four response possibilities ranging from "very good, good, not good, and bad," is used to streamline the interpretation of the data. The data analysis indicates compelling evidence that, as a collective, Indonesian college students display a highly favorable attitude toward the use of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF). The term "favorably disposed" underscores that the majority of participants not only convey agreement with OCF but also showcase a notable level of attitudes and preference for this corrective method employed during oral language activities.

Accordingly, the data analysis reveals compelling insights into the perceptions of Indonesian college students regarding Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF). The overall mean score of 3.18 suggests a generally positive and elevated average level of agreement among participants on the Likert scale. This prevalence of the highest ratings suggests a robust consensus among participants in expressing a positive evaluation of OCF. However, there are still many different interpretations of each item. Nevertheless, this study observes that positive attitudes among students have substantial implications for instructional practices. It implies that integrating OCF into language teaching strategies can be highly effective in the Indonesian college context. The elevated mean and mode values underscore a widespread attitude of acceptance and preference for OCF, indicating that students are not merely receptive but actively value and benefit from the feedback provided during oral language learning activities.

Table 3.2 The Statistical Descriptive Statistic Output

INSTRUMENT		The teacher ignores it, and doesn't correct it at all.	The teacher says what was wrong and tells you what the right version is.	The teacher says what was wrong and gets you to say the correct version yourself.	The teacher says what was wrong and gets someone else to say the correct version.	The teacher explains why it was wrong, what the rule is.
N	Valid	23	23	23	23	23
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3,43	3,74	2,96	2,17	3,61
Median		4,00	4,00	3,00	2,00	4,00
Mode		4	4	3	2	4
Std. Deviation		,662	,449	,767	,650	,656
Variance		,439	,202	,589	,423	,431
Skewness		-,767	-1,167	-1,246	-,177	-1,496
Std. Error of Skewness		,481	,481	,481	,481	,481
Range		2	1	3	2	2

Moreover, the relatively low standard deviation of around 0.676 indicates a degree of consistency in the participants' responses, with data points closely clustered around the mean. This suggests that the positive attitudes towards OCF are consistently shared among the participants, contributing to a cohesive and reliable pattern in their assessments. From a practical standpoint, educators may find that incorporating OCF into their teaching methodologies aligns well with the attitudes and preferences of Indonesian college students. This positive reception has the potential to enhance the overall language learning experience, contributing to more effective language acquisition and skill development.

The General Student's Attitudes Towards Oral Corrective Feedback

The frequency output shows an important aspect of students' attitudes towards ungiven feedback, where a notable majority of 52.2% voiced a negative perspective. This percentage corresponds to 12 out of 23 students who explicitly communicate their dissatisfaction with the absence of feedback. These students primarily use the word "bad," clearly indicating their disapproval of unspoken feedback.

Table 3.3 The students' Attitudes to Un-given Feedback

When you make a mistake in class, you think it's . . . if the teacher ignores it, doesn't correct it at all.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Scale Valid	Good	2	8,7	8,7	8,7
	Not Good	9	39,1	39,1	47,8
	Bad	12	52,2	52,2	100,0
	Total	23	100,0	100,0	

This finding underscores a distinct preference among students for feedback in their learning environment. The significant percentage of students expressing discontent with ungiven feedback suggests a strong desire for active engagement and acknowledgment in the educational process. In essence, more than half of the participants convey a clear dislike for being overlooked or not receiving feedback. From an instructional standpoint, this insight holds meaningful implications. It indicates that students value and actively seek feedback as an integral component of their learning experience. Educators may find it advantageous to take these preferences into account when designing teaching strategies and implementing feedback mechanisms. Recognizing the students' desire for constructive input and acknowledgment becomes crucial in creating an engaging learning environment.

Table 3.4 The Student’s Attitudes toward Explicit OCF

When you make a mistake in class, you think it’s . . . if the teacher says what was wrong and tells you what the right version is.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Scale Valid	Good	6	26,1	26,1	26,1
	Very Good	17	73,9	73,9	100,0
	Total	23	100,0	100,0	

The data highlights that a large majority of students strongly prefer explicit feedback when it comes to Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF). Specifically, 73.9% of the participants express highly positive views, with 17 students choosing "very good" and an additional 6 students opting for "good." This indicates a clear and enthusiastic preference among students for receiving straightforward feedback on their oral language performance.

These findings suggest that students genuinely want and appreciate clear corrections from their teachers. The overwhelming preference for the "very good" category indicates a strong desire for explicit feedback. The additional six students choosing "good" further support this positive trend, showing a broad acceptance of explicit OCF among the participants. From a teaching standpoint, this data emphasizes the importance of providing explicit feedback in language instruction. It indicates that students not only desire but value direct and specific feedback on their oral language skills. Teachers may find it helpful to be explicit in pointing out errors and offering constructive input, aligning with the preferences of the majority of students.

Table 3.5 The Student’s Attitudes toward Implicit OCF

When you make a mistake in class, you think it’s . . . if the teacher says what was wrong and gets you to say the correct version yourself.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Scale Valid	Bad	2	8,7	8,7	8,7
	Not Good	1	4,3	4,3	13,0
	Good	16	69,6	69,6	82,6
	Very Good	4	17,4	17,4	100,0
	Total	23	100,0	100,0	

The next category of item is implicit feedback. The data reveals a significant aspect of students' attitudes toward implicit Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF), indicating a noteworthy preference for this form of feedback. The majority of respondents, comprising 69.6% of the participants, chose the label "good," with 16 out of 23 students expressing

positive sentiments. This suggests that students appreciate the feedback provided implicitly, although it's important to note that their overall preference leans toward explicit feedback. However, it is clear from the frequency table that the students chose a variety of attitudes, so these attitudes do not accurately reflect the overall data.

The prevalence of "good" choices reflects a considerable inclination among students to receive correction in a manner that doesn't overtly point out errors. Rather than actively think about what is wrong, students seem to prefer being informed directly. These preferences suggest that although students are open to implicit correction, there is a pronounced preference for the clarity and directness provided by explicit feedback. It's worth highlighting that this finding adds a layer of complexity to the students' preferences regarding corrective feedback. While they show an overall positive inclination toward implicit OCF, the majority still gathered towards the more direct and explicit approach. This understanding is crucial for educators seeking to tailor their instructional strategies to meet the various preferences of their students. From a teaching perspective, recognizing this preference is essential. While incorporating implicit feedback may align with a portion of students' preferences, it's crucial to balance this approach with explicit feedback to ensure clarity and understanding. This approach acknowledges the diverse ways in which students absorb and respond to corrective input, contributing to a more effective and inclusive language learning environment.

Table 3.6 The Student's Attitudes toward Peer OCF

When you make a mistake in class, you think it's . . . if the teacher says what was wrong and gets someone else to say the correct version.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Scale Valid	Bad	3	13,0	13,0	13,0
	Not Good	13	56,5	56,5	69,6
	Good	7	30,4	30,4	100,0
	Total	23	100,0	100,0	

The data presents an interesting viewpoint on students' perceptions of peer Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) and identifies a clear preference trend. The distribution over the three scales offers important information about how students view peer correction. Remarkably, just 13% of students—or 3 out of 23—selected the term "bad" to express a negative opinion. This implies that some students can be hesitant or uneasy of accepting constructive criticism from their peers. On the positive end, 7 students, constituting 30.4%, expressed a favorable view with the label "good." This indicates that a considerable portion of the participants are open to and appreciate correction from their peers during oral language activities. However, the most striking aspect is the majority opinion, with 13 students out of 23, amounting to 56.6%, expressing a negative sentiment with the label "Not Good." This signals a clear tendency among students to be hesitant or unwilling to receive corrective feedback from their peers.

The findings underscore a clear trend, indicating that a significant majority of students may feel uneasy or hesitant about receiving corrective feedback from their peers. This reluctance could be attributed to potential feelings of embarrassment or a prevailing belief that their classmates might not be as reliable as teachers in delivering accurate feedback. This insight is crucial as it provides insight on the challenges associated with peer feedback in the language learning context. From a teaching perspective, these findings carry substantial implications. It becomes imperative to recognize and respect the

preferences and comfort levels of students in the focus of peer feedback. While some students might be receptive to criticism from their peers, the general consensus suggests that the majority of students have a strong preference for and willingness to engage with teacher-provided feedback. This information underscores the importance of carefully navigating the dynamics of peer feedback within the language learning environment. Teachers should take into account strategies that foster a supportive and respectful environment and be aware of the potential discomfort students may experience when receiving feedback from their peers. Furthermore, it highlights the continued significance of the teacher as a trusted and reliable source of corrective guidance, emphasizing the need for a balanced approach that respects and aligns with students' preferences in the feedback process.

In essence, these findings serve as a valuable reminder for educators to tailor instructional practices, acknowledging the attitudes of students towards peer feedback. Creating a positive and conducive learning environment involves recognizing and adapting to these preferences, ensuring that the feedback process is effective, respectful, and aligns with the comfort levels of the majority of students.

Table 3.7 The Student’s Attitudes toward Metalinguistic OCF

When you make a mistake in class, you think it’s . . . if the teacher explains why it was wrong, what the rule is.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Scale Valid	Not Good	2	8,7	8,7	8,7
	Good	5	21,7	21,7	30,4
	Very Good	16	69,6	69,6	100,0
	Total	23	100,0	100,0	

The data reveals a compelling insight into students' responses regarding metalinguistic Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF), showcasing a notably positive attitude. The majority of respondents, 16 out of 23 students, provided a favorable response, with a substantial percentage of 69.6 selecting "very good." This signifies a strong tendency among students to respond positively to metalinguistic correction, where they not only receive feedback but also gain insights into why a correction is necessary in linguistic terms. Henceforth, the significant prevalence of "very good" responses indicates that students are highly receptive to the idea of understanding the linguistic aspects behind the corrections. This aligns with the nature of metalinguistic feedback, which not only highlights errors but also encourages students to think about and comprehend the linguistic principles underlying those errors.

This finding indicates that students are not only responsive to correction but actively appreciate being guided to understand the linguistic part of their language use. The emphasis on the "why" behind the correction implies that students value a comprehensive and analytical approach to language learning. Metalinguistic OCF, in this context, serves as a valuable tool for broadening students' understanding, going beyond simple correction to provide a more profound insight into language structures and rules. From an instructional standpoint, this data highlights the effectiveness of incorporating metalinguistic feedback into language teaching strategies. It aligns with students' responses and demonstrates the potential for this approach to enhance their comprehension of language rules. Educators can leverage metalinguistic OCF as a means not only to correct

errors but also to deepen students' understanding, fostering a more robust and informed language learning experience.

3.2. Discussion

In examining students' attitudes toward oral corrective feedback (OCF), our study both builds upon and extends insights from existing literature. A comparative analysis with studies, such as Jin & Ruan (2023) revealed a shared emphasis on the alignment of feedback with individual expectations. However, our study took a further step by placing these findings within the specific cultural and educational context of Indonesian universities. This localized approach provides a nuanced understanding of how OCF attitudes manifest in this distinctive setting.

Similarly, while Ha et al., (2021) exploration of EFL teachers' and students' beliefs added valuable insights, our study addressed a crucial gap by concentrating specifically on the Indonesian academic context. This focused approach yields a detailed understanding of how students in Indonesian universities perceive and respond to OCF, contributing meaningfully to the broader discourse on feedback attitudes. Acknowledging the relevance of Van Der Kleij & Adie's (2020) research on disparities between teachers' and students' perceptions, our study aimed to unravel not just these disparities but also the direct impact of perceptions on practical implementation and tangible improvement in speaking abilities within Indonesian academic settings. The overarching implication drawn from this comparative analysis is the presence of a substantial gap between perceptions and tangible outcomes regarding attitudes toward OCF. While prior studies emphasize the importance of alignment with expectations, our research presented deeper, seeking to understand how these perceptions intricately influence academic performance, particularly within Indonesian university contexts.

Moving forward, to enhance the comprehensibility of data on attitudes toward OCF, a wide-scale survey is recommended. This approach offers a holistic view, allowing for a more thorough understanding of the numerous factors shaping students' perceptions. Additionally, incorporating qualitative methods, such as interviews or observations, could significantly improve the robustness of the data, and reveal the deeper insights of students' attitudes and also provide a richer context for interpreting survey results. Importantly, this study not only contributes to the existing body of knowledge on students' attitudes toward OCF but also emphasizes the imperative for future research to explore the contextual and practical implications of these attitudes within specific academic settings, particularly Indonesian universities.

2. 4. Conclusion

This study sought to investigate the attitudes of Indonesian college students toward teachers' oral corrective feedback during presentations. Employing a quantitative methodology, the research conducted an in-depth analysis of descriptive statistical frequency. The questionnaire, with a robust Cronbach alpha of .81, utilized a Likert scale to streamline data interpretation. The overall findings indicate a highly favorable attitude among Indonesian college students towards Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF). The average of all mean items score was 3.18 on the Likert scale suggests a general positivity and elevated agreement level. This positive disposition is further substantiated by the prevalence of the highest ratings, indicating a robust consensus among participants.

Breaking down the specific findings, the majority of students displayed a pronounced preference for explicit Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF), with 73.9% responding positively. This tendency points to a strong respect for teachers' straightforward and honest correction. Although there was a general trend toward explicit correction, pupils did show a positive tendency toward implicit OCF. Students appeared reluctant or uneasy when it came to receiving Peer Oral Corrective criticism, which suggests that they would much rather receive criticism from teachers. On the other hand, students were very enthusiastic about the Meta-linguistic Oral Corrective Feedback, giving it a Very Good grade of 69.6%. This affirmative reaction suggests that students have a strong propensity to accept meta-linguistic correction and value new perspectives on linguistic subtleties.

These results highlight the need of matching teaching tactics to student preferences and have important ramifications for instructional practices. Given the general acceptability and preference that has been noted, incorporating OCF into language instruction is probably going to be quite successful. The study helps close the gap between perceptions and observable results while offering detailed insights into every aspect of spoken corrective feedback. In the context of language learning, it highlights the complex relationships that exist between students' attitudes and the real-world effects that spoken corrective feedback can have on academic performance.

References

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2006). *Introduction to Research in Education*. Cengage Learning: United States.
- Cheng, X. L., & Yan, L. (2022). Student engagement with teacher written feedback: Insights from low-proficiency and high-proficiency L2 learners. *System*, 109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102880>
- Cheng, X. L., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). Teachers helping students improve their writing in English as a foreign language (EFL) through written feedback: The case of native and nonnative English-speaking teachers' beliefs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.804313>
- De Grez, L. 2009. *Optimizing the Instructional Environment to Learn Presentation Skills*. (PhD thesis, University of Gent).
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Gedamu, A. D., & Gezahegn, T. H. (2022). TEFL trainees' attitude to and self-efficacy beliefs of academic oral presentation. *Cogent Education*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2022.2163087>
- Ha, X. V., & Nguyen, L. T. (2021). Targets and Sources of Oral Corrective Feedback in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms: Are Students' and Teachers' Beliefs Aligned? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697160>
- Hattie, J., and H. Timperley. 2007. "The Power of Feedback." *Review of Educational Research* 77, (1): 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>.
- Jin, X., & Ruan, Z. (2023). University Students' Perceptions of Their Lecturer's Use of Evaluative Language in Oral Feedback. *Linguistics and Education*, 78, 101-233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2023.101233>

- Li, S. (2018). What is the ideal time to provide corrective feedback? Replication of Li, Zhu & Ellis (2016) and Arroyo & Yilmaz (2018). *Language Teaching*, 53(1), 96–108. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s026144481800040x>
- Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback.. *System*, 84, 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006>
- Lyster R, Ranta L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1):37-66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Mackey, A., Oliver, R., & Leeman, J. (2003). Interactional Input and the Incorporation of Feedback: An Exploration of NS-NNS and NNS-NNS Adult and Child Dyads. *Language Learning*, 53, 35-66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00210>
- Mertler, C. A. (2016). *Introduction to Educational Research*. SAGE Publications: California.
- Nassaji, H. (2016). Anniversary article Interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: A synthesis and analysis of current research. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 535–562. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816644940>
- Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2021). *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. Cambridge University Press: England.
- Nassaji, H., Bozorgian, H., & Golbabazadeh, E. (2023). Teachers' stated cognition and its relationship with oral corrective feedback practices in EFL classrooms. *System*, 113, 102993. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.102993>
- Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual*. McGraw-Hill Education: United Kingdom.
- Ur, P. (1999). *A Course in Language Teaching Trainee Book*. Cambridge University Press. United Kingdom.
- Van Der Kleij, F., & Adie, L. (2020). Towards effective feedback: an investigation of teachers' and students' perceptions of oral feedback in classroom practice. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 27(3), 252–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594x.2020.1748871>
- Van Ginkel, S., Gulikers, J., Biemans, H., & Mulder, M. (2015). The impact of the feedback source on developing oral presentation competence. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(9), 1671–1685. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1117064>
- Živković, S. (2014). The Importance of Oral Presentations for University Students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n19p468>