DOI: https://doi.org/10.61762/pjmhvol8iss1art001

PLATFORM - A Journal of Management & Humanities

Received: 26 May 2024, Revised: 11 June 2024, Accepted: 2 August 2024, Published: 30 June 2025, Publisher: UTP Press, Creative Commons: CC BY 4.0

A SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS' BELIEFS ABOUT ORAL CORRECTION FEEDBACK

Yanhong Wang*, Ong Shyi Nian, Komalata Manokaran

Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University Malaya, Malaysia

*E-mail: 15163037121@163.com

ABSTRACT

Many studies have been conducted on the motivation of second language acquisition, and the results of previous studies have revealed that the main factors are related to teachers. In the Chinese teaching and learning context, in-class interactions between teachers and learners play a vital role in the learning process, as learners have limited access to practising and utilising English. In contrast, fewer studies focus on students' perceptions and attitudes toward teachers' oral correction feedback. The current study aims to explore students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback (CF) in a secondary school in a developing region of China to help teachers and students communicate more effectively in language learning classes. The participants in this qualitative study are students from two courses at a High School in Heze City, Shandong Province, China. The researcher adapted a questionnaire to collect data from the convenience samples and analysed it through qualitative content analysis. This suggests that peers' critical remarks may enhance students' speaking skills. This study demonstrated that students' understanding of the purpose, meaning, and types of CF is crucial to understanding their preferences and improving their effectiveness.

***Keywords**: English, second language acquisition, bilingual, Chinese student, teachers' feedback strategy*

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Feedback is central to several models of second language learning and education (Ellis, 2009). Hattie and Timperley (2007) defined feedback as the information learners receive about their abilities or comprehension after completing a training session. Feedback might be favourable or unfavourable. Teachers' positive feedback on students' classroom responses helps them learn a second language comfortably and motivates them to continue learning. Teachers often pay less attention to positive comments, as second language learners commonly make mistakes in linguistic form (Ellis, 2009). When students make mistakes, teachers either use negative feedback to correct them or explicitly state the proper form in class, which makes negative feedback corrective input. As corrective feedback (CF) was increasingly used in language pedagogy, more researchers and educators studied it, leading to controversial findings about whether it is effective for language learners, what type of CF is best, which error type should be corrected, who should correct it, and what teachers and students prefer (Hendrickson, 1978; Chenoweth et al., 1983; Kirgoz & Agcam, 2015; Wiboolyasarin et al., 2020; Albiladi & Al-Ghamdi, 2022; Zembyska et al., 2022).

Problem Statement

Past research on CF has yielded conflicting results. Yoshida (2008) investigated the preferences for spoken CF among instructors and students teaching Japanese as a foreign language in an Australian classroom. Kirgoz and Agcam (2015) examined the views of Turkish ESL primary school teachers on CF. Sanavi and Nemati (2014) tested Iranian English language learners on six CF procedures for the IELTS writing test. Martínez Agudo (2015) investigated how Spanish English language learners perceive grammar teaching and CF in the class. Bao (2019) examined the views and behaviours of Chinese foreign language instructors. Schulz (2001) studied the perspectives of US and Colombian English language students and instructors.

The result demonstrates that these two settings are similar and cannot be generalised since they are both Western. Therefore, cultural background may affect instructors' and students' perceptions of remedial comments. The Chinese curriculum has included English for over four decades, leading to extensive research on CF in English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. Zhu and Wang (2019) conducted a comprehensive survey of 15 Chinese universities across 14 provinces. They examined the oral corrective feedback beliefs of 2,670 Chinese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students. However, research in developing areas where instructors and students lack proficiency and motivation is less extensive than in major Chinese cities. Teachers are the key motivators for second language learning. With less English practice and use, in-class interactions between professors and students are crucial in the Chinese education system. Therefore, instructors' and peers' corrective criticism in class may benefit Chinese students. According to Lyster et al. (2012), corrective feedback facilitates learners' acquisition and retention of information. Given its pedagogical significance, it is essential to investigate students' perceptions of spoken CF in English language classrooms, particularly within the context of developing countries such as China.

Objectives of the Study and Research Questions

Based on the aforementioned research gap, this study aims to explore students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback in a secondary school setting in a developing part of China to help teachers and students communicate more effectively in language learning classes.

The objectives of this study are:

1. To investigate how the students perceive oral corrective feedback.
2. To explore the students' attitudes toward the oral corrective feedback.

The following research questions specify the objectives:

1. How do students perceive oral CF?
2. What are the attitudes of the students toward oral CF?

Significance of the Study

Researchers differ from previous studies on the perceptions of instructors and students regarding using CF. Yoshida (2010) used classroom observation, audio recording, and recall interviews to examine instructors' and students' attitudes toward CF. However, the findings suggest that teachers overestimate students' right-form awareness based on their reaction to CF, leading to miscommunication between students and instructors. This research investigates students' attitudes toward spoken CF in the classroom, allowing instructors to better understand learners' perspectives and adjust their teaching practices for enhanced English language learning. Apart from the instructional value, the researcher expects that students may develop a learner-centred classroom by expressing their thoughts, particularly in a Chinese teacher-centred classroom with a long-standing Confucian culture.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Related Studies about the Definition of CF

In an ESL or EFL classroom, students and instructors engage in a modelled target culture using language (Ananda et al., 2017). According to Ananda et al., teachers can motivate students by offering positive and CF on their incorrect speech. Many researchers agree that CF provided by instructors or peer learners to those who use an incorrect second language in writing or speech is crucial in second-language classrooms. According to Li (2013), CF is a teacher's or peer's reformulation or prompting of a foreign language learner's inaccurate speech. Jin (2012) noted that CF in Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (SCT) suggests that students become active rather than passive knowledge receivers through teacher-student interaction, where they participate in problem-solving and learn to solve problems independently. Therefore, this study examines students' perspectives on classroom CF.

Related Studies about Types of CF

Both written and spoken forms can deliver CF on various language skills, including speaking and writing. The classifications vary between written and conversational situations. Written CF comprises three categories: direct, indirect, and metalinguistic kinds of correction (Ellis, 2009). In oral contexts, the researcher is aware of several taxonomies of CF. Ranta and Lyster (2007) discovered six forms of corrective input in their research on teacher-student interactions in French language classes, subsequently categorising them into two main groups: reformulations and prompts. Reformulations

include two kinds of remedial feedback: recast and explicit correction. In both instances, teachers provide learners with the goal language form corresponding to their erroneous speech. Prompts include four categories: elicitation, metalinguistic cues, clarifying inquiries, and repetition. Instructors use several CF systems to signal learners to self-repair their errors instead of relying on reformulations. Ranta and Lyster's (2007) categorisation, together with extensive research on CF, led Ellis (2009) to propose a comparable taxonomy for CF that encompasses two distinguishing categories: explicit and implicit (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994). Input-providing versus output-prompting CF (Lyster, 2004; Ellis, 2006).

Related Studies of Oral CF

According to Spada (2013), L2 instruction in second language learning uses oral CF as a pedagogical tool. Over the last fifty years, considerable research has been conducted on the function of vocal CF in second-language classrooms. The primary subjects pertain to the efficacy of language development, the most effective CF strategies, the types of errors warranting correction, the identity of the corrector, the timing and frequency of corrections, and the preferences of students and teachers (Wiboolyasarin et al., 2020).

Related Studies about the Effectiveness of CF

Numerous experimental studies have demonstrated that CF enhances students' English language acquisition in the classroom. Rassaei (2013) examined the responses of 75 Persian EFL learners to explicit correction and recast CF methods. The participants were divided into three groups: explicit, recast, and control, with no remedial feedback. The experimental group outperformed the control. Guo and Yang (2018) examined scores from a pretest, an immediate test, and a later test to investigate how CF aids EFL learners in learning the third-person singular form, ensuring the control group was treated fairly. The findings are favourable, according to Rassaei (2013). Most studies revealed that CF improves second language acquisition; however, others found conflicting results. A survey by Tavakoli and Zarrinabadi (2016) compared the effects of implicit and explicit CF on learners' willingness to communicate. The explicit group outperformed the implicit and no-feedback groups, which were similar. The contextual aspect and limited survey size (96 Iranian EFL learners split into three groups) make this conclusion challenging to generalise.

Related Studies about the Effectiveness of Different Types of CF

Most scholars support using CF in teaching, but there remains uncertainty over the most effective technique to help instructors employ it more effectively in language pedagogy. Luo et al. (2022) examined implicit, explicit, and mixed teaching and CF for 120 junior high school students in English pronunciation lessons. Through a test and questionnaire survey, they discovered that blended teaching and feedback improved students' pronunciation abilities the most, while explicit feedback also worked and implicit feedback did not. This clinical trial of CF efficacy focuses solely on the aspect of pronunciation. Zembyska et al. (2022) observed instructors and students at varying levels of English proficiency in the classroom, administered questionnaires, and conducted surveys. The findings showed that student proficiency determines the CF effectiveness. B1 students prefer elicitation, B2 students prefer repetition, and C1 students prefer metalinguistic hints. This research enables second language instructors to examine individual oral CF disparities. Roothooft (2014) asked 10 EFL instructors about Spanish oral CF. Research indicates that recasting, explicit correction, and elicitation are the most commonly used methods. The instructors believe these methods might be effective because they disrupt conversation and raise concerns about students' emotional responses. Luo et al. (2022), Zembyska et al. (2022), and Roothooft (2014) are interested in the best oral CF. A similar writing instruction study was conducted by Albiladi and Al-Ghamdi (2022) and Bal (2022). Bal (2022) conducted empirical research with 6th-grade students to compare the effectiveness of different types of CF. He found that most students believe indirect correction feedback in writing is most useful because it helps learners discover and correct errors, leading to permanent learning skills. Albiladi and Al-Ghamdi's study on writing CF allows learners autonomy and participation in writing courses; however, the sample students believed that direct or explicit feedback is better for quick feedback. In a quasi-experiment involving 186 Iranian IELTS test takers, Sanavi and Nemati (2014) found that reformulation is the most effective cognitive feedback strategy in writing classes. The preceding research has found

various feedback strategies beneficial for educational second-language skills in diverse contexts.

Related Studies of Preferences and Beliefs about CF

Sociocultural theory promotes learner-centred classes for second language learning. Actively participate in providing and receiving CF as language learners. Thus, educators and researchers carefully consider the views of instructors and students on CF. CF beliefs are most investigated in terms of the sorts of CF they favour, the mistakes to correct, the time to fix, the frequency, and the corrector. Phuong (2022) polled 10 experienced EFL professors at a Vietnamese university on pronunciation comments. The instructors prefer rapid feedback on individual faults over delayed feedback on student errors. After interviewing 36 English instructors from various classes at a Turkish primary school, Kirgoz and Agcam (2015) disagree. Most mistakes, particularly misinformation and phonological errors, should be rectified promptly. However, some instructors believe that delayed feedback is more effective, and 33% say that peer learners should correct and teachers should provide aid when students are unable to do so. The most common ways to give CF are explicit correction, recast, and repeat, with elicitation, clarification requests, and metalinguistic signals used less often. Roothooft (2014) used an open-ended questionnaire and classroom observation to compare instructors' views and practices. According to the study, instructors assume the most common CF methods are explicit correction, recast, and elicitation, although actual practices differ. Results from the preceding research in various circumstances are subject to debate. Schulz (2001) conducted grammar teaching and CF studies in Colombia and the US to see whether cultural variations affect instructors' and students' CF beliefs. The study surveyed 677 foreign language students and 122 instructors in Colombia, 824 foreign language students, and 92 teachers in the US.

Additionally, studies on students' CF preferences or views and comparisons of instructors' and students' perspectives contribute to the academic results of CF. Second-language learners prefer specific correction for pronunciation issues, followed by grammatical and lexical faults (Yang, 2016). Elicitation and repetition are ineffective for all mistakes, but recasting is the second most effective method. It stated that only Confucian pupils prefer unambiguous spoken correction, while middle-level learners prefer phonological clarification. Task, process, and self-regulation feedback are better for language development than self-feedback (Mandouit & Hattie, 2023). Teacher and peer CF and learners' judgments of the corrector were contrasted by Mahvelati (2021). Like Albiladi and Al-Ghamdi (2022), Mahvelati found that PCF improves more than TCF. However, students dislike it due to concerns about trust, grades, and the difficulties it presents. The researcher knows of a few Chinese CF studies. Zhu and Wang (2019) conducted an extensive survey of 2,670 Chinese university English as a foreign language (EFL) students to examine their beliefs. The results revealed that learners prefer metalinguistic explanation and explicit correction for CF. Repetition, explanation, and elicitation are frequent out-of-prompt CFs. Students prefer instant CF over delayed CF. Zhu and Wang concur with Mahvelati that although learners accept peer correction, PCF cannot have the same impact as TCF. Recast is dominant in L2 learning classrooms (Lee, 2013; Kartchava & Ammar, 2013). Lee (2013) found that learners prefer precise and quick corrections, but teachers do not believe all mistakes should be corrected, which contradicts the results above.

Related Studies of Other Languages as a Second Language

Bao (2019) compared the beliefs of Chinese foreign language instructors. They believe quick is the least utilised CF and recast the most. Phonological faults should be repaired first, followed by grammar and lexical errors. Instructors in Japanese language schools employ recast, elicitation, and metalinguistic feedback, and students prefer to reflect on and rectify errors before instructors do so (Yoshida, 2008). A modest yet in-depth study by Yoshida (2010) included two instructors and seven students in Australian Japanese language courses. It showed that students' responses to CF do not indicate fault recognition, and instructors overestimate students' capacity to recognise correct forms. In a Thai language environment, Wiboolyasarin et al. (2020) studied 99 students from diverse cultural backgrounds, including those from China, Japan, and Korea. Like Yoshida (2008), recast is commonly used, whereas students prefer precise correction. Asian students prefer individual correction through explanation and repetition, whereas Japanese students prefer the opposite approach.

After reviewing the related studies, the researcher found that recast and explicit correction are mainly used and preferred in classroom interactions; instant feedback is selected; the teacher corrector is inclined, but the peer corrector is also effective; frequency should be higher; and all errors should be corrected for students, but teachers cannot correct all in limited time. A CF study in various circumstances typically yields contradictory results. Individual characteristics, linguistic aspects, cognitive processing, impact, instructional constraint, and cultural perception may influence learners' CF efficacy preferences (Yang, 2016). Most research uses questionnaires, experiments, interviews, and classroom observation. The present study employed a questionnaire to assess students' perceptions of oral CF in a small, developing city secondary school in China due to time and work constraints outside China.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Participants

This study employed 101 participants (51 female and 50 male) from two classes of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students in Grade 2 of a Secondary school in China. The ages of the participants are ranked from 13 to 14. They all learned English for seven years, as in the Chinese context, English is typically taught as a foreign language from Grade 3 in Primary school. They were chosen as convenience samples because the researcher's friend works as a teacher at a secondary school.

Instruments

The researcher adopted a closed-ended and open-ended questionnaire, specifically the Corrective Feedback Belief Scale (CFBS) (Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). The sample of questionnaires is as shown in Table 1. The questionnaire comprises 24 items, consisting of 18 closed-ended and six open-ended questions, which are categorised into six parts. The different parts investigate the attitude, frequency, timing of CF, preference for each type of CF, errors that should be corrected, and the choice of corrector of the participants. The close-ended questions are on a five-point Likert scale, followed by an open-ended question in each part to elicit descriptions of the reasons for their choices. Alpha reliability for the CFBS questionnaire in the present study was 0.86,

Table 1 The sample of questionnaire

Dear classmates,
We are collecting information about learners' views on oral corrective feedback in English classrooms. We invite you to participate in our research and appreciate your assistance greatly. The purpose of this study is to investigate learners' opinions on the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback. We would greatly appreciate it if you could reply to the items in this questionnaire. The data collected through this questionnaire will be used for research on language classroom correction feedback. Participating in this study poses no risks or benefits to you. However, please refrain from writing your name on this questionnaire so that we can maintain the anonymity of the survey results.

Please carefully read each statement in the question and circle the option that best describes your feelings. There are no correct or incorrect answers, only those that are suitable for you. In open-ended questions, please express your thoughts or viewpoints as much as possible.

1. Your gender [MCQ]*
   Male
   Female

2. Your age [fill in the blank question]*

   _____

3. Your educational level [fill in the blank]*
   (Grade 2)

   _____

4. When I make a mistake, I hope to receive corrective feedback (such as providing self-correction prompts, telling me that I made a mistake, or correcting my mistake) [MCQ]*

   Very disagree ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Very agree

5. Can you explain your reasons for the answer to question 4? [Fill in the blank question]*

   _____

6. How often do you expect your teacher to provide corrective feedback on your oral errors? [Multiple choice question]*

   Never (0%) ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Always (100%)

7. Can you provide your reasons for the answer to question 6? [Fill in the blank question]*

   _____

8. When do you want to deal with your speaking errors? [MSQ]*
   Very ineffective, ineffective, generally effective, very effective
   Once an error occurs, interrupt my speech promptly
   Wait until I finish speaking
   After the event
   At the end of the class

9. What is the reason for choosing the answer to question 8? [Fill in the blank question]*

   _____

   Teacher: Where did you go yesterday?
   Student: I go to the park.
   How would you evaluate the following types of oral correction for this error? (10-16 questions)

10. Can you say it again? (Request for clarification) [MCQ]*

    Very ineffective ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Very effective

11. I go? (Repetition: The teacher emphasises students' grammar errors by changing their intonation) [MCQ]*

    Very ineffective ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Very effective

12. Go is the present tense, where you need to use the past tense.
    (Clear feedback: The teacher explains using grammar and provides the correct form) [MCQ]*

    Very ineffective ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Very effective

13. Yesterday, I... (Guided Correction: Guide students to correct their own mistakes and complete sentences) [MCQ]*

    Very ineffective ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Very effective

14. Really? What did you do there? (No feedback, the teacher did not provide corrective feedback on the student's mistakes) [MCQ]*

    Very ineffective ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Very effective

15. How do verbs change when we talk about the past? (Meta language feedback: The teacher provided prompts or clues without specifically pointing out the error.) [MCQ]*

    Very ineffective ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Very effective

16. I went to the park (Re casting: The teacher repeats the student's words in the correct form without pointing out their mistakes) [MCQ]*

    Very ineffective ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Very effective

17. Can you explain the reason for the choice of questions 10-16? [Fill in the blank question]*

    _____

    How often do you expect to receive corrective feedback for the following types of errors? (Questions 18-22)

18. Serious oral errors that may lead to misunderstandings among the audience. [MCQ]*

    Never (0%) ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Always (100%)

19. Less serious oral errors that do not affect the audience's understanding. [MCQ]*

    Never (0%) ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Always (100%)

20. Common oral errors. [MCQ]*

    Never (0%) ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Always (100%)

21. Uncommon Speaking Errors [MCQ]*

    Never (0%) ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Always (100%)

22. My personal mistake. (Mistakes that other students may not make) [MCQ]*

    Never (0%) ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Always (100%)

23. Can you write down your reasons for choosing questions 18-22? [Fill in the blank question]*

    _____

    Which type of person should correct students' mistakes (24-26 questions)

24. Classmates [MCQ]*

    Very disagree ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Very agree

25. Teacher [MCQ]*

    Very disagree ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Very agree

26. Myself [MCQ]*

    Very disagree ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 Very agree

27. Can you explain your reasons for choosing questions 24-26? [Fill in the blank question]*

Table 2 The CF strategies

CF Strategies	Descriptions	Examples
Recast	The teacher reformulates all or part of the student's incorrect expression with the correct form without explicitly pointing out the incorrect part.	S: I went to the cinema to see the movie yesterday. T: I went to the cinema to see the movie yesterday.
Repetition	The teacher repeats the student's error with stress to highlight the mistake.	S: She wants to take a break. T: She WANT? S: She wants to take a break.
Explicit correction	The teacher identifies the error, points it out, and provides the correct form.	S: I like swimming. T: No, not swim. I like swimming.
Elicitation	The teacher tries to prompt the students to correct themselves.	S: Yes, this dish is very salty. T: This dish is very...?
Clarification request	The teacher pointed out that the student's expression was not clear enough and asked the student to rephrase it, but the teacher did not directly indicate what was wrong with the expression.	S: How much do you spend on the bag? T: Sorry? Can you repeat it?
Metalinguistic feedback	The teacher provides linguistic information about the student's spoken expression but does not indicate the correct form.	S: That girl is so beautiful. T: Beauty is a noun.

respectively, indicating that the internal consistency of the instruments is acceptable.

Data Collection and Analysis

In the current study, the researcher adopted Lyster and Ranta's (1997) classification, which categorised CF strategies into six types (recast, explicit correction, repetition, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, and clarification request) after communicating with the instructors of the research participants about the CF practice in teaching and learning process. The description and examples of specific types of CF strategies are shown in Table 2.

The participants were informed about the CF strategy types and ensured they thoroughly understood the examples. They were then asked to respond to the questionnaire papers distributed by the teacher and the researcher. After collecting all the questionnaire papers, the researcher analysed the descriptive statistics and report. The questionnaire targets students in the second grade of a secondary school. One hundred one valid questionnaires were received, resulting in a 100% questionnaire validity rate. The ratio of genders is approximately 1:1. The demographic details are as shown in Table 3. The questionnaire was analysed using IBM SPSS 22. This study's quantitative data did not show why students prefer a specific type of correction feedback. Researchers who advocate for mixed-methods research note that qualitative follow-up data can help better understand the results. In contrast, the quantitative study alone cannot provide adequate information and explanation (Creswell & Clark, 2007; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). This study employs a qualitative analysis of the questionnaires.

Table 3 The demographic information of the research participants

Gender		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	50	49.5	49.5	49.5
	Female	51	50.5	50.5	50.5
	Total	101	100.0	100.0	

Ethics

Before the researcher collected the data, participants and their parents were informed that the survey aimed to investigate students' opinions about CF for the researcher's master's research project. The researcher also ensured the information would be anonymous and confidential, without any risks or benefits. If participants feel uncomfortable answering the questionnaire, they can stop anytime. After getting their consent, the researcher started collecting the data. So, the participants' responses to the questionnaire were voluntary.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section represents the descriptive statistics for the six attitudinal constructs: students' attitudes toward correction feedback, frequency of correction feedback, timing of correction feedback, learners' preferences for correction feedback types, Errors that should be corrected, and the choice of the corrector.

The Attitude Toward Correction Feedback

According to the Q4 and Q5 results, it is evident that most students hope to receive CF when they make mistakes. 86.14% of students chose "agree," while 13.86% selected "strongly agree" as shown in Table 4. The primary reason students seek CF is to improve themselves: they believe that receiving CF enables them to identify and address their shortcomings, ultimately leading to progress. Correcting mistakes is conducive to self-development and realising personal value. At the same time, students believe that timely notification is essential. In Q5, the following interview transcription reveals the recurring themes and most common reasons why the students like to receive CF:

"I believe that mistakes must be corrected and cannot be ignored. Teachers or friends need to fix my mistakes promptly. This fosters self-development and the realisation of personal values".

Table 4 Descriptive statistics for the responses to Q4

Choice		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very much agree	14	13.9	13.9	13.9
	Agree	87	86.1	86.1	100.0
	Total	101	100.0	100.0	

Frequency of Correction Feedback

According to Q6 and Q7, 68.32% of students believe that it is necessary to provide CF on oral errors frequently, 12.87% of students believe that it is essential always to provide CF on oral errors, and 18.81% of students believe that it is necessary to provide CF on oral mistakes occasionally (Table 5). This suggests that students desire timely CF, yet they hope not to be interrupted frequently during their speech. Students who expect to receive frequent or constant CF believe correcting at any time and place can immediately affect and enhance accuracy. However, some students have also expressed that teachers correcting too frequently can undermine confidence and negatively impact oral expression, suggesting that corrections should not be too frequent. Teachers should correct this slowly and gradually. In Q7, the following descriptive statistics reveal the recurring themes and reasons for the frequency of correction feedback:

"I prefer that corrections can be made at any time to achieve immediate results. A timely reminder is needed to avoid detours".

Table 5 Descriptive statistics for the responses to Q6

Choice		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Usually (80%)	69	68.3	68.3	68.3
	Sometimes (50%)	19	18.8	18.8	87.1
	Always (100%)	13	12.9	12.9	100.0
	Total	101	100.0	100.0	

Timing of Correction Feedback

In Q8, students were asked to select their preferred timing for correction feedback. According to questions 8 and 9, the average score for dealing with oral errors after students finish speaking is the highest, at 4.55, indicating that most students hope the teacher can provide feedback after speaking. The average scores at the end of the activity and the end of the classroom are 4.27 and 4.29, respectively. The average score for interrupting speech immediately once an error occurs is 3.56 (Table 6). Students want their mistakes to be corrected periodically. Zarei et al. (2020) found that emergent feedback had the most positive impact on EFL learners' learning motivation, contrary to this study's findings.

Some participants said that interrupting me immediately would undermine my confidence in speaking.

"I would become more nervous, say bad things, and would not dare to talk actively in class in the future. It would be better to wait until I finish speaking or give me feedback after the activity".

Some others suggested waiting until the end of the class or activity to make corrections so you can have a summary and make better improvements.

In summary, most students believe that interrupting immediately will undermine their confidence in oral expression and affect it, leaving space and time for error correction. Therefore, attention should be paid to students' emotions and effective teacher-student interaction, and efforts should be made to correct errors based on the actual situation.

Table 6 Descriptive statistics for the responses to Q8

Choice	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
If an error occurs, interrupt me promptly	2	5	3.56	.899
Wait until I finish	3	5	4.55	.655
After the event	2	5	4.27	.615
After the class	2	4	4.29	.668

Preference for Correction Feedback Types

From questions 10 to 16, it can be seen that students' favourite way to correct oral language is repetition, with an average score of 4.51, followed by Recast and Metalinguistic feedback, with average scores of 4.31 and 4.24, respectively clear feedback, guide error correction and no feedback share the same level of average score. The least preferred method was asking for clarification, with an average score of only 3.94 (Table 7). Students believe that by repeating this method to guide them in making corrections and the teacher's inspiring corrections, they can learn to think independently and achieve rapid mastery. The students surveyed did not want their speaking problems to be pointed out, as they believed it would embarrass them and undermine their self-confidence. This is consistent with our traditional understanding of Chinese people. Chinese students often refrain from expressing themselves in public. If they receive negative feedback, it will further damage their self-confidence. The most preferred way of providing correction feedback is for the teacher to repeat the student's error with emphasis on highlighting the mistake or to provide linguistic information about the student's spoken expression without explicitly providing the correct form.

The following are typical answers to open questions:

"I think it is more critical for me that the teacher gives some error hints and clues for correction. If the teacher gives me wrong information directly, it will affect my confidence. It is best to give clues so that I can find out".

Table 7 Descriptive statistics for the responses to Q10-16

Choice	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
10. Ask for clarification	3	5	3.94	.341
11. Repetition: The teacher emphasises a student's grammatical errors by changing her intonation.	3	5	4.51	.770
12. Clear feedback: The teacher explains it grammatically and gives the correct form.	3	5	4.13	.462
13. Guide error correction: Guide students to correct their errors and complete the sentences.	3	5	4.14	.708
14. No feedback: The teacher does not give CF to students' mistakes.	1	5	4.01	.768
15. Metalinguistic feedback: The teacher gives hints or clues without specifically pointing out the error.	3	5	4.24	.650
16. Recast: The teacher repeats the student's words in the correct form without pointing out the student's errors.	2	5	4.31	.596

However, the students supporting explicit correction feedback had a different view:

"I do not like speaking in class because I'm anxious about whether the sentences I said are OK. I thought the teacher's clear guidance would reduce my doubts and problems in future speeches. If I don't understand why I'm wrong, stress will always be with me".

Errors that Should be Corrected

From Q18 to Q22, it can be seen that the most serious oral errors students want to be corrected are those that do not affect the audience's understanding, with an average score of 4.22. This is followed by personal errors (mistakes that other students may not make), with an average score of 4.16 (Table 8). Following Yang (2016), learners in the Confucian cultural sphere prefer precise correction for oral errors, while intermediate-level learners prefer clarification requests.

Many transactions emphasise the importance of correcting errors, as oral communication questions must be accurate; otherwise, it can cause significant embarrassment in social situations.

"If I have any grammatical errors, I hope the teacher will point them out".

Furthermore, students do not wish that teachers could correct common speaking errors. Some students said that teachers often mention common mistakes when explaining.

"I can learn from them when the teacher comments on others, but it is challenging to identify my problems. So, I hope the teacher can point out my problem".

The Choice of the Corrector

From Q24 to Q27, we can see that students most want teachers to correct their mistakes, with an average score of 4.76, and they least like classmates to correct them, with an average score of only 3.89. Most students said classmates can correct each other, but it is less convincing than the teacher's correction. Self-correction is also considered acceptable, scoring 4.33 (Table 9). In Confucian culture, respecting teachers and the Tao is a highly valued concept. Confucian culture places great emphasis on the status and role of teachers. Influenced by China's rich Confucian culture, which spans thousands of years, students often view teachers as authoritative sources of knowledge, expecting them to lead the teaching process and provide constructive feedback. Students can correct each other, but it is less convincing than the teacher's correction. Self-correction is also possible. It is also important to increase efforts on error correction mechanisms and self-regulation. Students' apparent preference for teacher feedback can be attributed to the dominant role of teachers in the English learning context in China. Another reason is that some of their teachers are native English speakers, and their English pronunciation and expression are standard. The students trust the teachers' abilities and want more opportunities for their teachers to correct their mistakes.

Common opinions went like this:

"The teacher's correction is excellent. Other people's corrections are not as correct as the teacher's correction. You should also correct yourself".

Table 8 Descriptive statistics for the responses to Q18-22

Choice	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
18. Serious speaking errors that may cause problems for the audience to understand.	2	5	3.96	.445
19. Less serious oral errors that do not affect the audience's understanding.	2	5	4.22	.965
20. Common speaking errors.	2	5	3.92	.542
21. Uncommon speaking errors	2	5	4.03	.818
22. My personal mistake. (Mistakes other students may not make)	3	5	4.16	.703

Table 9 Descriptive statistics for the responses to Q24-26

Choice	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
24. Classmates	3	5	3.89	.398
25. Teachers	3	5	4.76	.493
26. Myself	3	5	4.33	.585

Students who prefer correcting by themselves said that errors in self-perception are more likely to be taken seriously.

"I reflect on myself and look for areas for improvement. In the process, I can gain experience in thinking and remembering the mistakes more deeply. This also reinforces self-monitoring".

CONCLUSION

This study investigates secondary school students' perceptions of spoken corrective feedback (CF) in a Chinese-speaking context to enhance English language learning. Students view CF as vital for improvement, preferring it to be delivered after speaking or post-class to avoid damaging confidence. They favour feedback types like repetition, recasting, and metalinguistic cues that support self-directed learning without embarrassment. Teacher corrections are preferred over peer feedback due to the cultural respect for teacher authority rooted in Confucian values. Students also emphasise correcting major errors over minor ones. While the study offers insights into culturally responsive and reflective teaching practices, its limitations include a narrow age group and diverse cognitive levels. Future research should consider performance-based evaluations and explore broader demographics using methods like classroom observation, recorded speech, and interviews to deepen understanding of students' responses to CF.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank Ju Ye County No. 1 High School in Heze City, Shandong Province, China, for providing the opportunity to conduct the research at the institution.

REFERENCES

Albiladi, W. S., & Al-Ghamdi, M. (2022). Feedback Techniques in English Writing Course: Exploring English Language Learners' Perceptions and Experiences. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *16*(4), 12-26.

Aljaafreh, A. & J. Lantolf. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the Zone of Proximal Development. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 465-483.

Ananda, D. R., Febriyanti, E. R., Yamin, M., & Muin, F. (2017). Students' preferences toward oral corrective feedback in speaking class at English Department of Lambung Mangkurat University, Academic year 2015/2016. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *7*(3),176–186. https://doi:10.17507/tpls.0703.03.

Baker, A., & Burri, M. (2016). Feedback on second language pronunciation: A case study of EAP teachers' beliefs and practices. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *41*(6), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n6.1.

Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes: Teachers' beliefs versus their practices. *System,* 82, 140–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.004.

Burri, M. (2023). Comparing L2 teachers' practices with learners' perceptions of English pronunciation teaching. Profile: *Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, *25*(1), 129–145. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v25n1.101156.

Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalisations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 357-366.

Chenoweth, N. A., Day, R. R., Chun, A. E., & Luppescu, S. (1983). Attitudes and preferences of ESL students to error correction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *6*(1), 79–87. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100000310.

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2015). Pronunciation fundamentals. *Language Learning & Language Teaching*. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.42.

Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & Z. Dornyei (Eds.), Themes in SLA Research. AILA, 19, 18–41. Amsterdam: *John Benjamins*.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 63, 97–107.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054.

Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2013). Exploring Language Pedagogy through Second Language Acquisition Research. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203796580

Lee, E. J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System, 41*(2), 217–230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.022.

Faqeih, H. I. (2015). Learners' attitudes towards corrective feedback. Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences, 192, 664–671. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.101

Bal, G. N. (2022). EFL students' perceptions of the effectiveness of corrective feedback on their written tasks. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, *37*(3), 1116–1129. https://doi: 10.16986/HUJE.2021068382.

Guo, X., & Yang, Y. (2018). Effects of corrective feedback on EFL learners' acquisition of third-person singular form and the mediating role of cognitive style. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *47*(4), 841–858. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-018-9566-7

Hamed Mahvelati, E. (2021). Learners' perceptions and performance under peer versus teacher corrective feedback conditions. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *70*, 100995. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.100995.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hendrickson, J. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research and practice. *Modern Language Journal, 62*, 387–398. https://doi.org/10.2307/326176

Hentasmaka, D., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2021). Peer feedback uptakes and outcomes across EFL students' proficiency levels: A study at tertiary education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction, 14*(3), 271–286. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14316a.

Jin, L. (2012). Sociocultural theory-guided college-level Mandarin Chinese hybrid course design. IALLT *Journal of Language Learning Technologies, 42*(1), 30–50. doi:10.17161/iallt. v42i1.8501

Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & AL-Shammari, H. (2020). Examining the Effect of Listening Strategy Instruction on EFL Iraqi Learners' Listening Anxiety. https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/h27rg.

Kartchava, E., & Ammar, A. (2013). Learners' beliefs as mediators of what is noticed and learned in the language classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *48*(1), 86–109. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.101.

Kirgoz, Y., & Agcam, R. (2015). Teachers' perceptions on corrective feedback in Turkish Primary Schools. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, *192*, 574–581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.096.

Lee, E. J. (2013). 'Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students.' *System, 41*(2), 217–230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.022

Li, S. (2013). Oral corrective feedback. *ELT Journal*, *68*(2), 196–198. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct076

L., P. C. V., & Creswell, J. W. (2007). The mixed methods reader. *Sage Publications*.

Luo, Z., Shao, X., & Wareewanich, T. (2022). Effects of blended, explicit, and implicit instruction on EFL learners in English pronunciation class under emerging technology. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, *17*(17), 232–246. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v17i17.34065.

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 399–432.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2012). Oral corrective feedback in Second language classrooms. Language Teaching, *46*(1), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444812000365.

Mandouit, L., & Hattie, J. (2023). Revisiting "the power of feedback" from the perspective of the learner. *Learning and Instruction,* 84, 101718. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2022.101718.

Martínez Agudo, J. de. (2015). How do Spanish EFL learners perceive grammar instruction and corrective feedback? *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, *33*(4), 411–425. https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2015.1061890.

Nhac, T. -H. (2022). Oral corrective feedback preferences in English lessons: Learners' and teachers' perspectives. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *11*(3), 1643–1655. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.11.3.1643.

Park, H.S. (2010). 'Teachers' and learners' preferences for error correction.' *California State University*. https://scholars.csus.edu/esploro/outputs/graduate/Teachers-and-learners-preferences-for-error/99257831138801671

Phuong, T. T. (2022). Feedback on pronunciation: Vietnamese EFL teachers' beliefs and practice. *SAGE Open*, *12*(3), 215824402211266. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221126612.

Ranta, L. & R. Lyster (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral language abilities: The Awareness–Practice–Feedback sequence. In R. DeKeyser (ed.), Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*, 141–160.

Rassaei, E. (2013). Corrective feedback, learners' perceptions, and Second language development. *System*, *41*(2), 472–483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.05.002.

Roothooft, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System*, 46, 65–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.012.

Sanavi, R. V., & Nemati, M. (2014b). The effect of six different corrective feedback strategies on Iranian English language learners' IELTS writing task 2. *SAGE Open*, *4*(2), 215824401453827. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014538271.

Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and Corrective Feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, *85*(2), 244–258. https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00107

Spada, N. (2013). Corrective feedback (oral). In P. Robinson (Ed.), The Routledge Encyclopaedia of Second Language Acquisition (pp. 139–142). *London: Routledge.*

Tan, F. D., Whipp, P. R., Gagné, M., & Van Quaquebeke, N. (2018). Students' perception of teachers' two-way feedback interactions that impact learning. *Social Psychology of Education*, *22*(1), 169–187. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-018-9473-7

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. *Sage Publications.*

Tavakoli, M., & Zarrinabadi, N. (2016). Differential effects of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *12*(3), 247–259. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2016.1195391.

Wiboolyasarin, W., Wiboolyasarin, K., & Jinowat, N. (2020). Learners' oral corrective feedback perceptions and preferences in Thai as a foreign language tertiary setting. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *16*(2), 912-929. Doi:10.17263/jlls.759344.

Yang, J. (2016). Learners' oral corrective feedback preferences in relation to their cultural background, proficiency level, and types of error. *System*, *61*, 75–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.08.004.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, *17*(1), 78–93. https://doi.org/10.2167/la429.0.

Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, *94*(2), 293–314. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01022.x.

Zarei, M., Ahour, T., & Seifoori, Z. (2020). Impacts of implicit, explicit, and emergent feedback strategies on EFL learners' motivation, attitude, and perception. *Cogent Education*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2020.1727130.

Zembyska, M., Romanova, Y., & Chumak, N. (2022). ESL students' perceptions of error correction techniques in oral production: A level-based approach. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.29038/eejpl.2022.9.1.zem.

Zhang, L. J., & Rahimi, M. (2014a). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes. *System*, *42*, 429–439. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.01.012.

Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: A large-scale survey. *Language Awareness*, *28*(2), 139–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755.