

**The Effect of a Program Based on Oral Corrective Feedback on
Improving Secondary Stage Students' English language Speaking**

by

Faten Ibrahim Mohamed Ibrahim

Dr. Magdy Mahdy Ali

Professor of Curriculum and Instruction

Faculty of Education

Ain Shams University

Dr. Dalia Ibrahim Yehia

Lecturer of Curriculum and Instruction

Faculty of Education

Ain Shams University

فاعلية برنامج قائم على التغذية الراجعة اللفظية في تحسين مهارات التحدث باللغة الإنجليزية لدى طلاب المرحلة الثانوية

المستخلص

هدفت الدراسة الي تقصي أثر استخدام التغذية الراجعة الشفهية في تحسين مهارة التحدث لدي طلبة الصف الأول الثانوي، ولتحقيق هذا الهدف بنيت ثلاثة أدوات هم ١- إختبار قبلي وأخر بعدي لقياس مدي تأثير التغذية الراجعة علي تحسين مهارة التحدث لدي الطالبات ٢- مقابلة شخصية مع اثنان من معلمي اللغة الانجليزية لجمع المعلومات عن الطالبات وكذا معرفة طريقة أداء المعلمين في تطبيق التغذية الراجعة معهم، والتعرف علي أنواع التغذية الراجعة المستخدمة أثناء أداء الدرس. ٣- إستبيان للطالبات لمعرفة آرائهن في تطبيق التغذية الراجعة والوقت المناسب المفضل لديهن وكذا نوع التغذية المفضل لديهن. بالإضافة الي ملاحظة كل من المعلم والطالب. تكونت عينة الدراسة من (٩٠) من الطالبات ٤٥ للمجموعة الضابطة و٤٥ للمجموعة التجريبية من الصف الاول الثانوي بإحدى المدارس الحكومية التابعة لمديرية التربية والتعليم في القاهرة ، ولأغراض الدراسة تلقت المجموعة التجريبية المكونة من ٤٥ من طالبات الصف الاول الثانوي تغذية راجعة شفهية مصاحبة بأنشطة مختلفة ومتنوعة من أجل تحسين مهارة التحدث لدي الطالبات وتشجيعهن علي إتقان مهارة التحدث بينما لم تتلق المجموعة الضابطة أي تغذية راجعة أو أي أنشطة مصاحبة وذلك من أجل معرفة مستوي الطالبات دون إمدادهن بأي تغذية راجعة. وأظهرت نتائج الدراسة وجود فروق ذات دلالة أحصائية (0.05) تعزي لأثر التغذية الراجعة المصاحبة بأنشطة تنمية وتحسين مهارة التحدث لدي الطالبات وكانت الفروق لصالح المجموعة التجريبية، وهو مايطابق الدراسة الاستطلاعية، بينما لم تظهر المجموعة الضابطة أي تحسن في مهارة التحدث نظرا لعدم تطبيق التغذية الراجعة المصاحبة بأنشطة تنمية الأداء الشفهي لديهن وهذا يدل علي نجاح تكنيك التغذية الراجعة في تطور مستوي أداء الطالبات في مهارة التحدث.

الكلمات المفاحية:

The Effect of a Program Based on Oral Corrective Feedback on Improving Secondary Stage Students' English language Speaking

Abstract

The aim of the study was to investigate the impact of using oral corrective feedback in improving the speaking skill of first grade secondary students, to achieve this goal three tools were built:

The first tool was pre/posttest to measure the impact of using oral corrective feedback on improving students' speaking skill. The second tool was an interview with two of English teachers at the same school to collect information about the students and to know the way by which the teachers run the oral feedback with their students during the class time. In addition, to know the most preferable types to use with their students. The third tool was conduction students' questionnaire which convey their opinions of the feedback, which type they prefer most, and the preferable time to receive the technique, in addition to the observation for both teacher and students.

The study sample consisted of (90) first –secondary students in one of Cairo schools belonging to the Directorate of Education. For the purpose of the study, two groups were used, one as a control group and the other as an experimental group where the control group did not receive any feedback to realize their speaking levels without providing them with feedback and to know the impact of using and applying this technique in improving this skill, while the experimental group received the oral feedback accompanied by a variety of speaking activities to improve and develop students speaking skill and their performance. Thus, to prove whether oral feedback technique has an impact in improving students speaking skills or not.

The results of the study showed significant differences (0.05) attributable to the impact of feedback associated with a variety of different speaking activities which were in favor of the pilot group. While the control group did not show any improvements in the students speaking skill which is a clear evidence attributable to using the oral corrective feedback technique.

Keyword: Oral corrective feedback ,Speaking

Introduction

In all the world, learning a second language means mastering the language's four skills (reading, writing, speaking, and listening). Yet, speaking is regarded as the most significant skill among the other four skills. (Maroua, 2016).

According to (Jabel, 2019) the main aim of teaching a language is to help learners to use that language effectively and accurately in communication. However, not all language learners are able to communicate efficiently in English owing to loads of difficulties they may encounter.

According to (Dewi R. &., 2016) Speaking is one of the main language skills that English foreign learners have to master due to its importance for communication. It is very important for learners to be able to speak the English language as it is the most commonly accepted language in the world. (Garg, 2015)

(Muhsin, September 2015) states that problems in teaching and learning English as a foreign language (TEFL) relates to both teachers and learners. These problems are relatively affected by teaching methods (Lochana, 2006) states that most EFL teachers teach language by lecturing and focusing on grammatical rules instead of language use. It is much more effective to teach language from context and meaning (Ellis, 2003). Teachers often provide insufficient opportunities for learners to practice English. to make the matter worse, both teachers and learners use their mother tongue through English classes.

Likewise, according to (Ela, 2017) learning speaking reinforces new vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, and enhances learners' self-confidence. It also promotes listening, reading and writing skills (Baker, 2003). Accordingly, the vast majority of second and foreign language learners study the language with the aim of their oral proficiency. (Ur,

2006). Since Egyptian students have limited opportunities to use the target language outside the classroom, they may need more opportunities to put their language learning in use in real life. (Astia, 2018) stated that teachers must establish positive affect among students to facilitate successful language learning (Magilow, 2005) The positive effect derives from a variety of teachers' behaviour, including humour, encouragement, personal interest, and a natural use of language. In teaching L2, it is important to respond towards learners' speech production as one of different ways to demonstrate the teacher's attention towards students. Feedback is an important thing in English Communicative Teaching Learning Activities. Meanwhile these activities the learners somehow involved in an interaction which provide them opportunities, desires and purposes to empower the students to be in touch with language they learn. This English classroom interaction will lead the students to exert all their efforts towards the target language. Along with these activities, teachers are allowed to indicate the students' errors of incorrectness of language output, that is technically known as corrective feedback. (Lightbown, 1999).

Hence, oral corrective feedback plays an important role in learning / teaching process.

Relevant literature reveals that there is "a growing consensus among the majority of researchers concerning the significance of the role played by negative evidence (corrective feedback) in the process of SLA". (El Tatawy, 2002) & (Loewen, 2004) are with the idea that the role played by oral corrective feedback in the English classroom cannot be ignored, according to (Al-Faki, 2013). (Mozaffari, 2011) said, with the emergence of communicative approach, error correction underwent a radical shift (Russell, 2009) CLT advocates created a balance between what audio linguists and cognitivists do and suggested that errors must be viewed as

evidence of students' linguistic development, and not as a sin to be avoided. Finally, the reason why the researcher chose this area for the study is the fact that it is rarely addressed in education, even though it is one of the most difficult and challenging area in SLA. (Vilcek 2014)

Statement of the Problem

The problem is that the EFL first year secondary students are poor speakers, which hinders them from speaking fluently and correctly. This may be attributed to making some mistakes such as: mispronunciation, grammatical mistakes, lack of vocabulary, and therefore they decide not to speak because of the embarrassment, they repeat the same error each time because of the inappropriate feedback they receive from the teacher. Thus, this study seeks to use oral corrective feedback to enhance their ability to speak English fluently and correctly.

Research Questions

Therefore, this study seeks to find an answer to the following main question:

1-What is the effect of using oral corrective feedback on improving secondary students speaking skill? To answer the above main question, the following sub-questions will be answered:

A-What is the secondary students current level of EFL English speaking?

B- How do teachers in secondary schools correct their students' oral mistakes? **C-** How many times teachers correct their students' mistakes?

D-What are the features of the oral feedback program designed for developing secondary students' oral fluency? **E-** Which approach do teachers find most useful? **F-** Do teachers use different ways depending on the errors made by their students? **G-** What is the appropriate time for providing oral feedback during an oral performance?

Aims

The general purpose of this research is to consider the role of feedback as an efficient and constructive tool that supports learners to develop their speaking performance. Therefore, this research aims at: - Improving EFL Learners 'oral speaking skill by providing them with oral corrective feedback.

Significance of the study

This study is expected to show the central role that feedback plays during the learning process, how teachers help students to correct their errors and improve their oral speaking skill in different oral activities.

- Encouragement EFL teachers to use feedback as a tool to correct students' errors in Oral tasks.

- And to motivate students to develop their speaking skill.

This study is significant for both teachers, students and for researchers as well as follows:

For Teachers: **1-**They could create activities such as discussions, speeches, and role playing. **2-**They could create different types of research tools such as observations, interviews, and questionnaires. **3-**They could determine which type of the oral feedback can be beneficial for their students. **4-**They could give more time and space to learners to speak more than a teacher.

For students: **1-**The use of oral corrective feedback might help students to acquire a language they need to use as the target language in interaction. **2-**They need to negotiate for meaning which is of great value when communicate with each other. **3-**Students could give each other oral feedback while communicating in order, for instance to clarify something. **4-**This study enables students to express themselves, their feelings, opinions, ideas, hopes, and exchange knowledge with others.

For the researcher: 1-The researcher gets invaluable experience that can be used to enhance speaking and learning quality in other situations and provide information.

Limitations

This study has some limitations; they are as follows:

There are some factors caused the speaking problems such as: lack of general knowledge. - lack of speaking practice, and fear of making mistakes. -Lack of words usage and grammar practice. - Low motivation and law participation. - Reading laziness, and shyness. - Less dictionary usage, nervousness, fear of criticism.

Literature Review

Maroua (2016). Defined speaking as the means that enables people to communicate with each other, so as to express their thoughts, feelings, and points of views. Likewise, (Dewi R. &., 2016) stated that speaking is one of the essential communication and added that he has found a lot of similarities and obstacles encountered by the learners in speaking English such as being afraid of making mistakes or being laughed at by their peers. Beside that they are not confident enough to express their feelings or ideas owing to having no vocabulary and that they feel boredom because of the traditional teaching learning activities. Correspondingly, In (Sakale, 2019) language is described as the mean of communication of human being in its organized combinations so as to express thoughts and feelings. For most people, Learning and language are obtained through hearing and expressed by speaking, as without language, there will not be learning. (Wicaksono, 2016). Following that, (Putra, 2020) in his paper stated that, speaking skills are essential part of the curriculum in teaching the language. According to him he said that (Luoma, 2009) Speaking is considered one of the four skills which should be mastered in learning the language. Speaking is

productive language skill like writing. The productive language is called the process of thinking. When people want to say something and convey information they need to communicate. (Harryudin A., 2018)

Research Method

In order to investigate the research hypotheses that claims that oral corrective feedback affects positively on students' speaking performance, a descriptive method has been conducted. A classroom action research (CAR) was used in this study as the method. The current study utilized true experimental and control group to examine whether using the oral corrective feedback technique is effective in enhancing students' proficiency in speaking the English language. To assess the participants' progress in speaking the language, a pre/posttest was administered to measure the effectiveness of the program whereas the satisfaction questionnaire was used beside the teachers' interviews to collect information about their opinions of their students' levels in performing speaking skill and the teachers' opinions of the feedback technique, with observing both of the teachers and the students as well. To add validity and reliability to the findings there was a teacher' interview after implementing the program to recognize their attitude to the program and if they found the program beneficial.

Participants

The participants were selected based on several pre-identified characteristics. The learners are students in the first year secondary school for girls. The researcher has got the whole students approval to guarantee that they were willing to participate in this research. In addition, the researcher demonstrated the objectives and the expected outcomes of this research.

The consent allowed the researcher to enter the respective classrooms and observed the teachers teaching in an authentic classroom situation. The subjects of this study were all female students, two female teachers and a male one. The duration for each activity was approximately thirty-five minutes. After that, the researcher informed the participants about the process and obtained their consent and all of them volunteered to participate in the study. The researcher met the subjects three times a week from 9:00 AM to 11:45 AM with a 15- minute break in between. All the participants had smart phones.

Procedure

The procedures of this research represented in cycle 1, and cycle 2. Each cycle involves planning, acting, observing, then reflecting and evaluating. (Efrizal, 2021). The intervention lasted for 6 weeks. The researcher conducted the pre-posttest for both groups but after that the control group did not receive any feedback nor speaking activities that may enhance students' performance or affect the final results to assure the validity and reliability when applying the program. After conducting the pretest for the two groups, only the experimental group was received the appropriate oral feedback through a variety of interesting speaking activities to improve students' proficiency and help them feel relaxed to be able to participate effectively in the program. The classroom teacher helped in both explaining and observing and writing down her notices on her students' performance and participation on a rotational basis with the researcher. At the end of the program the researcher conducted a posttest for both groups which demonstrated a noticeable result between the groups in favor of the experimental group and then there was a post –interview to the classroom teacher to know how useful the program was. Finally, the results proved that oral corrective feedback was an effective technique teacher should commit to using it at the correct time and in the

right way with the most preferable type that satisfy the students' need. The results also proved the difference between the two groups (experimental vs control group) in relation to using the oral feedback for improving students' level and for a deeper understanding.

Data Analysis

To analyze the results of the pre-posttest and delayed posttest T- test was run to compare the pre-test and post-test scores in the experimental group, post-test and delayed post-test scores in the experimental group, as well as pre-test and delayed post- test scores in the control group.

Since there were two groups of students –experimental and control group, the T test was used to investigate the difference between the two groups in terms of using the oral feedback and its effect in improving students' levels in the sub-skills of pronunciation, vocabulary, Fluency, Grammar, and comprehensibility. Comparisons were made between the results for the secondary students in the experimental group and control group for the pre-posttest and post-test and delayed post-test for the experimental group only. The experimental group had somewhat higher scores in the post-test after conducting the first week of the treatment which indicate to the effectiveness of the program despite having few sessions with feedback and different speaking activities.

Independent-samples T-test Results of the Differences between the control group and the experimental group on the post Application of TSP in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, grammar and comprehensibility.

<i>Group</i>	Post-Control		Post 1- Experimental		Unpaired t-test	
	Mean	SD	M	SD	t	P
<i>Pronunciation</i>	10.07	2.40	12.33	2.567	4.463	<0.0001*
<i>Vocabulary</i>	10.56	2.211	12.60	2.526	4.085	<0.0001
<i>Fluency</i>	10.78	2.704	12.73	2.553	3.527	0.0007*
<i>Grammar</i>	11.40	2.767	12.60	2.588	2.125	0.0182*
<i>Comprehensibility</i>	11.58	3.216	13.31	2.566	2.826	0.0029*

Table 1

The experimental group students' speaking proficiency improvement in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, grammar, and comprehensibility, as presented by their scores on each item compared to the students on the control group, is displayed in table 1 above, the mean score of each item on the experimental group students' post-test 1 is higher than that of the control group where ($M=12.33 > 10.07$ for pronunciation; $M=12.60 > 10.56$ for vocabulary; $M = 12.73 > 10.78$ for fluency; $M=12 > 11.40$ for grammar; $M=13.31 > 11.58$ for comprehensibility. Further analysis showed that the students improved mostly in pronunciation (M difference= 2.26) whereas grammar witnessed the less improvement (M difference= 1.2). Moreover, the results revealed that using the oral corrective feedback resulted in a statistical significant improvement in all aspects of speaking proficiency.

Independent –Samples T-Test Results of the Differences in the Mean Scores between the Control Group and the Experimental Group on the Post Application of TSP.

<i>Group</i>	Mean	SD	t	P
<i>Post-Control</i>	53.27	9.557	5.038	<0.0001* S
<i>Post-1 Experimental</i>	63.58	9.857		

Table 2

By the end of the experiment, the TSP was administered on the sample to test the first hypothesis of the study. This hypothesis predicted statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group on the post application of TSP in favor of the experimental group. An independent samples t-test was used to compare the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group on the post application of TSP. The results displayed in Table 2 showed a statistically significant difference in the score for the

experimental group ($M=63.58$, $SD= 9.857$) and the control group ($M=53.27$, $SD=9.557$); $t(5.038)$, $p = <0.0001$ in favor of the experimental group. These results showed a positive effect of the application of Oral Corrective Feedback approach on improving the students' speaking proficiency and the difference between the two groups is due to the implementation of the OCF.

<i>Group</i>	Mean	SD	t	P
<i>Pre-Control</i>	50.60	9.394		
<i>Pre-Experimental</i>	50.84	10.08	0.1190	0.4528 ns

Table 3

It can be seen from the table above that the students' speaking proficiency was approximately the same, between the control group and the experimental group in the pre-assessment, as none of them had received oral feedback nor any speaking activities to make a difference between them. Accordingly, we find that the mean score in the control group was 50.60 and the mean score in the experimental group which was so similar to this result was 50.84, and the t-test was 0.1190, and P 0.4528 NS which refers to non significant results between the unpaired groups.

Result

Descriptive Statistics

By the end of the experiment, the TSP was administered on the sample to test the first hypothesis of the study. This hypothesis predicted statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group on the post application of TSP in favor of the experimental group. An independent samples t-test was used to compare the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group on the post application of TSP. The results displayed in Table 4 below showed a statistically significant difference in the score for the experimental group ($M=63.58$, $SD= 9.857$) and the control group

($M=53.27$, $SD=9.557$); $t(5.038)$, $p = <0.0001$ in favor of the experimental group. These results showed a positive effect of the application of Oral Corrective Feedback approach on improving the students' speaking proficiency and the difference between the two groups is due to the implementation of the OCF.

Independent –Samples T-Test Results of the Differences in the Mean Scores between the Control Group and the Experimental Group on the Post Application of TSP.

<i>Group</i>	Mean	SD	t	P
<i>Post-Control</i>	53.27	9.557	5.038	<0.0001* S
<i>Post-1 Experimental</i>	63.58	9.857		

Table 4

Independent-samples T-test Results of the Differences between the control group and the experimental group on the post Application of TSP in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, grammar and comprehensibility.

<i>Group</i>	Post-Control		Post 1- Experimental		Unpaired t-test	
	Mean	SD	M	SD	t	P
<i>Pronunciation</i>	10.07	2.40	12.33	2.567	4.463	<0.0001*
<i>Vocabulary</i>	10.56	2.211	12.60	2.526	4.085	<0.0001
<i>Fluency</i>	10.78	2.704	12.73	2.553	3.527	0.0007*
<i>Grammar</i>	11.40	2.767	12.60	2.588	2.125	0.0182*
<i>Comprehensibility</i>	11.58	3.216	13.31	2.566	2.826	0.0029*

Table 5

The experimental group students' speaking proficiency improvement in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, grammar, and comprehensibility, as presented by their scores on each item compared to the students on the control group, is displayed in table 5 above, the mean score of each item on the experimental group students' post-test 1 is higher than that of the control group where ($M=12.33 > 10.07$ for pronunciation; $M=12.60 > 10.56$ for vocabulary; $M = 12.73 > 10.78$ for fluency; $M=12 > 11.40$ for grammar; $M=13.31 > 11.58$ for comprehensibility).

Further analysis showed that the students improved mostly in pronunciation (M difference=2.26) whereas grammar witnessed the less improvement (M difference= 1.2. Moreover, the results revealed that using the oral corrective feedback resulted in a statistical significant improvement in all aspects of speaking proficiency.

<i>Group</i>	Mean	SD	t	P
<i>Pre-Control</i>	50.60	9.394		
<i>Pre-Experimental</i>	50.84	10.08	0.1190	0.4528 ns

Table 6

It can be seen from the table above that the students' speaking proficiency was approximately the same, between the control group and the experimental group in the pre-assessment, as none of them had received oral feedback nor any speaking activities to make a difference between them. Accordingly, we find that the mean score in the control group was 50.60 and the mean score in the experimental group which was so similar to this result was 50.84, and the t-test was 0.1190, and P 0.4528 NS which refers to non significant results between the unpaired groups.

<i>Group</i>	Mean	SD	t	P
<i>Pre-Experimental</i>	50.84	10.08		
<i>Post 1-Experimental</i>	63.58	9.857	15.54	<0.0001 S

Table 7

From the table above, we can see that the mean score in the pre-experimental group is 50.84, as they still did not receive any feedback or little nor speaking activities, while in post 1 experimental, the results showed some improvement after having feedback on their mistakes and also applying a variety of speaking activities, so the mean score moved forward to become 63.58, the t-test between the two paired groups is 15.54 and P is <0.0001, or less than 0.05, which refers to the progress happened in the students' speaking proficiency level.

<i>Group (N=45)</i>	Mean	SD	F	P
<i>Pre-Experimental</i>	50.84	10.08	146.6	<0.0001* S
<i>Post 1-Experimental</i>	63.58	9.857		
<i>Post 2-Experimental</i>	83.00	6.533		

Table 8

From the table above, the results showed that the mean score in the pre-Experimental group, was 50.84 as the students' speaking proficiency level was still low before having any feedback and training them to speak, to express their ideas, while after having post test 1, their speaking proficiency level had changed and they showed some progress but were still in need of further activities to achieve better progress, that is why after implementing the feedback technique, the speaking test result in cycle two explained that the students' speaking got better progress in different aspects and that the feedback technique has improved their sub-skills such as fluency, grammar, vocabulary or pronunciation

Progress

The participants' speaking performance was assessed in five aspects pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, grammar and comprehensibility. to make it easy to calculate the results. Each sub skill of the five was rated by two raters who had experience in rating speaking skills according to the criteria of each type so that the test reliability was maintained. Table 9 below presents the comparison between the two unpaired (control and experimental) groups on the pre application of TSP.

<i>Group</i>	Mean	SD	t	P
<i>Pre-Control</i>	50.60	9.394	0.1190	0.4528 ns
<i>Pre-Experimental</i>	50.84	10.08		

Table 9

It can be seen from table 3 that there is no difference between the two groups on the pre application of TSP.

Intervention Effectiveness

In the total graph on the TSP; it can be seen that there is an obvious progress between the pre-test and post-test and delayed post-test in the experimental group whereas there is no clear difference between the unpaired groups (experiment vs control group) in the pre-test as both of them did not receive any treatment, and there is a clear progress between pre-test and post-test 1 and between post-test 1 and post-test 2 or delayed post test in the experimental group which ascribe to applying the oral feedback technique with the many activities that encourage students to speak freely and give them time to think to be able to answer correctly. The OCFB technique has proved that it is very important for teachers to be aware of their students needs and their problems inside and also outside the class, teachers should encourage students to speak and help them to understand their questions and make that easy by giving them the appropriate amount of feedback when necessary taking into consideration the importance of not making them afraid of them, encouraging them to ask and to answer as well. Oral corrective feedback is not only important for students for deeper understanding and having the ability to ask and answer but also it is very important for teachers themselves to know their weaknesses in the way they teach and to prepare themselves well to move their students to next levels and achieve progress.

Discussion

The statistical results given in the previous section show that there were significant gains in students' performance in the post-test and delayed post-test when compared to the pre-test and there was significant difference between the post-test and delayed post-test thanks to using the oral feedback. On the other hand, there was no difference between the two groups (experimental and control) group in the pre-test. While there was a clear difference between the two groups in the post-test as the control group did not have any treatment. These findings suggest that the students'

skills have developed a better understanding in somewhat all the sub-skills as improving in some skills like grammar may need much time to be improved, the results showed that students are keen to be corrected to improve their levels and also showed that some sub-skills need time to change. Therefore, it might be said that the students' improvements in the post –test was the result of the new teaching method into the learning situation and their continuing progress that was shown in the delayed post-test proved that that technique is effective in changing students' levels in speaking the language.

Overall trend of speaking performance

While using English for expressing the ideas used to be difficult, uncomfortable and mundane, the convergence of the feedback technique with speaking activities and teachers' awareness to students' needs and caring for their understanding; encourage students to practice their speaking competence in a more meaningful way. The results of this experiment showed that, to a certain degree, the students' ability to speaking had improved. Except for the descriptive statistics in tables, which showed little difference in some sub-skills. Both groups (experimental vs control) gained similar scores in the pre-test which showed little difference. While the groups showed much difference in the post-test as a result of applying the new technique of oral feedback. From the post-test 1 and delayed post-test we can see better results which means that learners benefited a lot from that technique.

Implication of the study

Teachers should choose instructional interventions that differed the most from other instructional activities. So, it is essential for teachers to choose and implement an appropriate method and the right technique to help improve teaching learning process to be successful. The teacher should teach her/his students that she should not be the only source of knowledge, she should urge them to increase their knowledge by all

means, search the information by using dictionaries or using the internet and teach them how to find the information. Distances should be eliminated between them in order that students not feel embarrassed or feel any anxiety to ask or answer any questions. Teachers should create interesting activities which inspire students to be active, collaborative and creative. In accordance with the above mentioned conclusion, it is shown that oral corrective feedback is effective and has a vital role in improving students speaking proficiency, break the psychological barriers that prevent them from speaking and encourage them to be better, change their passive behaviour and be positive listeners.

Finally, the students admitted that using oral corrective feedback by their teacher helped them to be aware of their errors, and that they became motivated to improve their speaking skill, their pronunciation and also their grammar input enhanced to a great extent, and that their vocabulary enriched as well.

Suggestions

Some researchers have suggested that teachers generally put into practice their beliefs about OCF (Bao, 2019). while others have found more complex relationships between beliefs and practices (Sephehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2018). For instance, Basturkmen (2012) found that even though teachers may claim not to use OCF or avoid it, their practice suggests that most do, to varying degrees and using various types, depending on their goals. An overall conclusion of these studies is that cultural context may affect teachers' preferences for using different OCF types. Also, (Lyster et al, 2013). propose oral OCF as a facilitator reinforcing oral skills for the target linguistic form in the input. After conducting the research results, the researcher would like to propose the following points for the benefit of:

-Students: It was recommended by the researcher to train the students by giving them a

Speaking period at least once a week as an open discussion in whatever they want to ask about, by so doing:

There will not be neither anxiety nor shyness, and will increase their knowledge to a great extent, accordingly, they will improve gradually and achieve a great level.

-Teachers: In addition, it was recommended by the researcher for the teachers to be trained by making English sessions for creating better teachers, correcting pronouncing mistakes, making presentations individually since this can improve the teacher's levels and create the spirit of competition.

- Schools: The school management should be mindful to the students needs, and provide all possible facilities that can help improve and activate students to change to a better level.

-Researchers: It is recommended by the researcher that other researchers should conduct action research technique which proved to be effective and knowing that learners are in need of more cycles as it makes great improvement and change the teaching learning process. **Finally**, it is proved that oral corrective feedback through action research can contribute to teaching learning process and improve the students' speaking skill.

Recommendations

Based on the study results, the researcher presents the following recommendations:

Teachers are recommended to adopt and employ relevant oral feedback techniques in correcting students' errors taking into consideration students' age, their needs, interests, and their linguistic proficiency levels.

-Implementation of oral feedback should be integrated within an overall plan of the whole curriculum and its results should be evaluated within this overall perspective as well.

References

- Abbad, Aziza. (1988). An Analysis of communicative Competence features in English Language Texts In Yemen Arab Republic, PhD Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urban-Champaign.
- Acevedo, N., (2022). 5 Incredibly Effective Speaking Strategies.
- Adil, M., (2022). Problems Faced by Students in Speaking English Language.
- Agudo, J.D.M. (2013). An Investigation into how EFL Learners emotionally respond to teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback.,
- Aicha, B., (2016). The Role of Teacher' Feedback in Improving Students' Speaking Skill,
- Al Hosni, S., (2014). Speaking Difficulties Encountered by Young EFL Learners.
- Al-Faki, I., (2013). Techniques Used by Teachers in Corresponding Students' Oral Errors in an Omani Boys School.
- Alafifi, A., (2020). The Effect of Using Professional Learning Community (PLC) to Enhance the Faculty of Education English Department Student-teachers' Oral Performance.
- Ananda, D., (2017). Students Preferences Toward Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class at English Department of Lampung.
- Anggoro, I., (2013). Corrective Feedback Found in Speaking Class at the English Department of Muhammadiyah University School.
- Aparajeya, (2016). Lack of Communication between Teachers and Students.
- Astia, M., (2018). Corrective Feedback in English Classroom.
- Ali, E., (2023). Using Multimedia Composing Program to Develop EFL University Students' Functional Writing Performance and Decrease their Anxiety.

- Alice., Y.W., (2002). Form – focused Remedial Instruction: an empirical Study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*.
- Bahadorfar , M., Omidvar, R., (2014). *Technology in Teaching Speaking Skill*.
- Baker, J., Westrup, H., (2003). *Essential Speaking Skills: A handbook for English Language Teachers*. London:VSO.,
- Bao, R., (2019). *Oral Corrective Feedback in L2 Chinese Classes: Teachers' belief versus their Practices*.
- Bell,J., (2010). *Doing Your Research Project. A guide for first –time Researchers in Education*.
- Bouzar, S., (2019). *Issues in Teaching Speaking to EFL Learners*.
- Brookhart, S., (2008). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*.
- Brown, G.A., Yuke, G. (1983). *Teaching the Spoken Language*.
- Center,E., (2022). *Formative VS Summative Assessment*.
- Cheng, H.F., Dornyei, Z., (2007). *The Use of Motivational Strategies in Language Instruction. The Case of EFL Teaching in Taiwan. Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*.
- Creswell, J., (2014). *Research Design qualitative, quantitative, and mixes methods approaches*.
- DeBoer, B.B. (2007). *Effective Oral Language Instruction: A survey of Utah k-2 teacher self- Reported Knowledge*.
- Dewi, D. (2016). *Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class*.
- Dewi, R., Armadi, A. (2016). *Using Communicative Games in Improving Students Speaking Skills*.
- Efrizal, D., (2021). *Improving Students' Speaking Through Communicative Language Teaching Method at Mts Ja- alhaq Sentot Ali Sasa Islamic Boarding School*.
- El Tatawy, M., (2002). *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition*.

- Ela, Abuoul., (2017). The Effect of Using a Program Based on English Digital Stories on Enhancing First-Year College Students' Speaking Skills at Zewail University of Science and Technology.
- Ellis, R., (2003). Task-based Language Teaching and Learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis., R., Loewen, S., Erlam, R., (2006). Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Language Grammar.
- Elsaghayer, M., (2014). Affective Damage to Oral Corrective Feedback among Students in Libyan Secondary Schools.
- Eltayeb, M., Mustafa, N., (2015). Problems of Teaching and Learning Spoken English in Sudan.
- Fabbri, Ph., (2022). Challenges with Communication in the Classroom for teachers.
- Fajariyah, D., (2009). Improving Students' Speaking Proficiency Using Games. A classroom Action Research on the Eight Grade Students.
- Firwana, S.S. (2010). Impact of Palestinian EFL Lecturers' attitudes toward Oral Error on their Students' Attitudes and Choice of Error Treatment Strategies.
- Frey, N., Fisher, D., (2011). The Formative Assessment Action Plan: Practical Steps to more Successful Teaching and Learning.
- Gamlo, N., (2019). EFL Preferences of Corrective Feedback in Speaking Activities.
- Gantenhammer, D., (2015). 12 Fun Speaking Games for Language Learners.
- Garg, S., Gautman, A. (2015). Learning English can Change your Life for the better.
- Golda, L., (2019). Accuracy and Fluency towards English Proficiency.

- Ha, X., Nguyen, L., Hung, B., (2021). Oral Corrective Feedback in English as a foreign Language Classroom: A teaching and Learning Perspective.
- Harmer, J., (2001). Coursebooks: a human, Culture, and Linguistic Disaster?
- Harmer, J. (2007). The Practice of English Language Teaching.
- Harryudin, A., Jamilah, S., (2018). Teachers' Difficulties in Teaching Speaking Audio Visual Aid for Autistic Students.
- Hedge, T., (2000). Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom.
- Heigham-Crocker, R., (2009). Qualitative Research in applied Linguistics: A practical Introduction.
- Hendrickson, J., (1978). Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching: Recent Research and Practice.
- Hopkins, David., (1992). A teacher Guide to Classroom Action Research. Great Buckingham.
- Hoxhalli, E., (2021). Activities that Promote Speaking in the Classroom.
- Hunt, J., (2022). For Teachers: What are the Barriers to Effective Communication in the Classroom.
- Iron, A., (2008). Enhancing Learning Through Formative Assessment and Feedback.
- Jabel, K., (2019). Communication Difficulties Faced by Undergraduate Libyan Students.
- Jarkasi, Imam., (2007). Corrective Feedback in the English Class.
- Jenkins, S., (2019). The Importance of Corrective Feedback.
- Kannan, M., (2019). The Importance of Listening Skills in Language Teaching: An Observation
- Kemmis, Stephen, MC. (1990). The Action Research Planner.
- Khunaivi, H. Hartono, R., (2015). Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of Corrective Feedback In Teaching Speaking.