UNIJERPS
Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies VOL.21 (1);
January-June, 2026 https://unijerps.org
2023 Impact Factor: **6.834;** 2022 ***Impact Factor***: 5.156; ***2021 Impact Factor: 5.641;***
2020 Impact Factor: 5.355. *Indexing and Impact Factor URL:* http://sjifactor.com/passport.php?id=21363

ENHANCING POOR STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT AND INTEREST IN ORAL ENGLISH: CAN DIRECT OR INDIRECT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK STRATEGY BE ASSISTIVE?

Uloh-Bethels, Annah Chinyeaka Ph. D
Department of Arts Education,
Faculty of Education,
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
Phone: + 234 (0) 7039594168
Email: annah.uloh-bethels@unn.edu.ng

&
Okonji, Ngozi Nkechi
Department of Arts Education,
Faculty of Education,
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
Phone: + 234 (0) 8109290968
Email: ngozi.okonji.90470@unn.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

This study examined the role of direct and indirect corrective feedback strategies in enhancing poor students' achievement and interest in oral English, based on English teachers' perceptions in Enugu Education Zone of Enugu State, Nigeria. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design and was guided by four research questions and two hypotheses that focused on gender differences in perception. Data were collected from 120 secondary school English language teachers using a 20-item researcher-structured questionnaire titled Teachers' Perception of Corrective Feedback Strategies in Oral English (TPCFS-OE), which was divided into four clusters (A-D). The questionnaire was validated by three experts from the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. The instrument had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.84, indicating strong internal consistency. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions while independent samples t-tests were used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 alpha level of significance. Findings revealed that teachers generally agreed that both direct and indirect feedback strategies were effective in enhancing oral English achievement and interest. The study further found no significant difference between male and female teachers' perceptions. The study concludes that corrective feedback acts as a vital scaffold supporting learner development by improving accuracy, confidence, and autonomy. It recommended that teacher training programmes emphasize adaptive feedback techniques and foster supportive classroom environments to optimize oral English teaching and learning outcomes.

Keywords: Corrective Feedback**,** Oral English**,** Achievement**,** Interest**,** English Language

Introduction

The teaching of oral English is an essential part of English language education, especially in secondary schools, where students learn the phonological systems of English by mastering key elements of the language such as vowel and consonant sounds, word stress, sentence intonation, and phonetic transcriptions in order to enhance their speaking and pronunciation skills. Ogunsiji (2020) asserts that oral English instruction emphasizes teaching learners to communicate effectively and fluently in English, with a focus on mastering correct segmental (individual sounds) and suprasegmental (rhythm, stress, intonation) features to convey meaning clearly and to ensure proficiency in English language.

Proficiency in oral English is essential for effective second language use, especially in Nigeria where English serves as the medium of instruction and communication. It encompasses the capacity to communicate fluently, accurately, and appropriately in various social, academic, and professional contexts, making it a vital aspect of English language learning. As noted by Nakatani (2022), oral English proficiency is essential for effective real-time communication, empowering learners to express themselves clearly and fluently in conversations, discussions, and public speaking engagements. It, therefore, means that effective oral communication is essential to language learning, as it allows learners to articulate their thoughts, negotiate understanding, and interact with others in various social and academic settings.

In educational settings, oral English plays a key role in promoting classroom engagement, collaborative learning, and the demonstration of knowledge. As emphasized by Nguyen and Pham (2023), students with strong oral English skills are more likely to participate actively in class, contribute to discussions, and present academic content with confidence, ultimately enhancing their overall learning experiences and outcomes.

Proficiency in oral English is essential for students' academic success, achievement, and social interactions. However, despite its importance, secondary school students' performance in oral English remains unsatisfactory as indicated by Akinyemi and Adewale's (2021) findings that many students struggle with oral tests and often commit errors in pronunciation, stress placement, and intonation patterns. This trend also resonates in external examination as evident in the WAEC Chief Examiner's Report (2020 - 2024), which reveals a lamentable deteriorating students' performance in English language examinations. The reports highlighted specific challenges including poor articulation of vowels and consonants, incorrect stress placement, intonation and rhymes, leading to mispronunciation and limited oral English proficiency.

These challenges could stem from issues such as lack of qualified teachers with adequate training in oral English instruction, insufficient innovative instructional aids and resources, inadequate pedagogical skills among teachers, which could lead to lack of proficiency in oral English instruction and production. These factors can negatively impact the quality of oral English instruction, and students' ability to develop their skills, ultimately affecting students' proficiency.

The challenges could also be linked to the instructional and assessment approaches used in secondary schools. For

instance, the Test of Orals, as currently designed and used in external English language examinations, consists of 60 multiple-choice questions to be completed within 45 minutes and it accounts for 30 marks. The test's written, multiple-choice format enables standardization and ease of scoring, making it logistically efficient for large-scale assessments like WAEC, NECO, and JAMB. However, instead of evaluating actual oral performance, the test focuses on phonological awareness and assessing students' ability to: identify words with similar vowel or consonant sounds; determine correct stress patterns in words; recognize rhyming words and to identify words with specific phonetic sounds. This assessment mode does not effectively assess students' actual speaking skills or oral proficiency.

This oral English examination mode has been criticized for its limitations such as its over reliance on theory-based assessment which perpetuates rote learning (Olatunji, 2014); encouraging test-taking rather than language acquisition (Ajuma & Omale, 2020); lacking proper assessment of oral skills that must include the ability (of students) to produce and interprete spoken language in meaningful contexts (Winked & Lim, 2025) and for not providing direct evidence of learners' speaking competencies and for producing learners whose ability to use spoken English in academic and social contexts is limited (Eke & Okolie, 2022) and in practice, not providing feedback on students' speech accuracy, fluency and intelligibility (Abah, 2025). These challenges result in persistent errors in pronunciation, grammar, and fluency, which affect students' ability to perform well in academic and real-life communication tasks.

Students, particularly in public schools, struggle with oral English due to limited exposure, minimal speaking practice, and lack of personalized feedback (Fajobi & Onadipe, 2020 and Wakkai & Mahfoodh, 2023). As noted by Adelana (2022), students often find oral English challenging because they are not exposed to enough real-life speaking situations, and teachers rarely use interactive, feedback-rich methods. According to WAEC (2023), these deficiencies could stem from inadequate teaching approaches and limited corrective feedback strategy for addressing spoken errors during oral English instructional delivery. Enhancing achievement in oral English, therefore, requires targeted instructional strategies. Equally important is students' interest, which influences engagement and learning outcomes. Unfortunately, poor-performing students often show low interest due to fear of errors and low confidence. Onu (2024) observes that low motivation in oral English learning is closely linked to students' fear of making mistakes and the absence of a psychologically safe classroom environment. A supportive classroom environment can boost both achievement and interest, making it vital to address both dimensions in oral English instruction.

Students' achievement in oral English refers to the measurable outcomes of learners' spoken language skills, including pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary usage, and overall intelligibility. Bucher(2019) and Fadila & Trisno (2025) note that achievement is often evaluated through oral tests, presentations, or interactive speaking tasks. In the context of Nigerian secondary schools, many students, especially those from underperforming backgrounds

struggle with oral communication due to limited exposure, anxiety, and lack of corrective support (Iyekekpolor, 2021). Effective teaching strategies, such as timely and consistent corrective feedback, are essential for improving learners' performance. Okonji and Ashabua (2025) explain that addressing specific errors, reinforcing correct usage and corrective feedback serve as formative tools that guide students toward mastery of oral English skills. When students receive relevant and understandable corrections, they are more likely to internalize standard language patterns, thus improving their spoken proficiency over time.

On the other hand, students' interest in oral English refers to learners' emotional and cognitive engagement in speaking-related tasks. It includes motivation, enthusiasm, curiosity, and willingness to participate actively in oral activities such as debates, role plays, discussions, and dialogues (Burton & Dichoso, 2024). High interest levels can lead to increased classroom participation and greater retention of language concepts. However, many students exhibit low interest in oral English due to fear of making mistakes, negative peer judgment, or past negative experiences with teacher correction. Here, the teacher's approach to feedback can make a significant difference. Encouraging, non-threatening feedback that emphasizes improvement rather than punishment helps create a psychologically safe environment where students feel more comfortable expressing themselves orally (Wang, Yu, & Teo, 2018). Thus, fostering interest in oral English requires not just engaging content, but also a supportive and reflective classroom culture. One instructional strategy that can support both achievement and interest in oral English is corrective feedback.

Corrective feedback (CF) is a fundamental component of second language acquisition and a crucial element in oral language instruction. According to Sanosi (2022), it refers to teacher's response to learner errors with the intention of guiding them toward more accurate language use. Feedback can take many forms, ranging from overt correction to subtle cues that prompt learners to notice and self-repair errors. In oral English classrooms, where real-time communication is central, the way errors are addressed can significantly influence learners' linguistic development and classroom confidence. Roothooft & Breeze (2016) and Zhu & Wang (2019) are of the opinion that students prefer more oral corrective feedbacks and experience positive emotions when receiving them. Two widely discussed types of corrective feedback are direct and indirect feedback, each serving different pedagogical functions.

Direct corrective feedback involves providing the correct linguistic form explicitly. For example, if a student says, *He go to school*, the teacher might respond, *He* goes *to school*. This method is especially beneficial for beginners or low-achieving students, as it offers immediate clarity and reinforces the correct structure through modeling (Westmacott, 2017). Research suggests that direct feedback enhances short-term gains in accuracy, particularly when errors involve rule-based language features such as verb tense or subject-verb agreement. In contrast, indirect corrective feedback does not supply the correct form directly but instead signals that an error has occurred, prompting the student to identify and

correct it themselves. This may involve strategies like recasts, clarification requests, elicitation, or meta-linguistic hints. For instance, if a student says, *He go to school*, the teacher may repeat the student's incorrect sentence with rising intonation or ask, *Can you say that again?* Indirect feedback supports deeper cognitive engagement, encouraging learners to reflect, hypothesize, and revise their language use. A study conducted by Zhang, Bowen, and Thomas (2025) analyzed oral corrective feedback in Chinese high-school English classrooms and found that metalinguistic feedback and clarification requests each yielded 100% learner uptake, and elicitation led to nearly 89% uptake. In contrast, recasts (though most frequently used) produced the lowest uptake rate at approximately 46% and led to very few successful repairs (~9%). This form of feedback fosters self-regulation and long-term retention because it activates learners' internal processing mechanisms rather than relying solely on external correction.

The effectiveness of each type of feedback, direct or indirect, can vary depending on the learners' proficiency level, confidence, and the classroom context. For students with weak oral English skills, direct feedback may be more beneficial in the short term, as it provides clarity and immediate correction that helps them avoid repeated errors. For example, Ghoorchaei, Mamashloo, Ayatollahi, and Mohammadzadeh (2022), in an experimental study with Iranian high-school level EFL students, compared direct and indirect corrective feedback on grammatical agreement errors. The direct-feedback group received correct forms inserted above their incorrect utterances, while the indirect group received underlining only. The results showed that direct feedback led to significantly higher post-test and delayed post-test accuracy in subject-verb agreement than indirect feedback. According to Liao and Zhang (2022), excessive dependence on direct correction can limit opportunities for learner autonomy and critical thinking. Indirect feedback, by contrast, promotes independence and deeper language awareness but may frustrate learners who lack the competence or confidence to self-correct. As such, many researchers advocate for a balanced or adaptive feedback approach**,** where teachers apply both types of feedback selectively based on students' needs, lesson objectives, and the types of errors made (Liao & Zhang, 2022). This interplay between feedback, achievement, and interest is crucial in shaping oral English outcomes. Suzuki & DeKeyser, (2017) and Godfroid(2021) state that when corrective feedback is constructive and non-threatening, it not only enhances students' performance but also motivates them to participate more actively. Direct feedback may help students improve accuracy quickly, while indirect feedback may foster curiosity and long-term engagement. Teachers must therefore adopt intentional and responsive feedback strategies that support both learning and motivation, ultimately transforming the oral English classroom into a space where students feel supported, challenged, and eager to improve.

This study is anchored on Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, which posits that learning is fundamentally a social process occurring through interaction with more knowledgeable others. According to Vygotsky (1978), learners progress through their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) that is the gap between

what they can do independently and what they can achieve with guidance by engaging in meaningful dialogue, modeling, and feedback (Falhasiri & Hasiri, 2020). Within this context, corrective feedback functions as a vital scaffold that supports language development. Storch (2018) notes that when a teacher provides feedback either directly by supplying the correct form or indirectly by prompting the learner to self-correct, it becomes an instructional tool aligned with the learner's developmental needs. In oral English instruction, this scaffolding is particularly crucial, as it helps learners build fluency, accuracy, and confidence through supported interaction. Thus, sociocultural theory justifies the use of corrective feedback as an essential mechanism for helping students' transition from their current level of oral competence to a higher level of performance.

Although corrective feedback is widely recognized as a vital component of second language instruction, its classroom application particularly in oral English remains underexplored in many parts of Nigeria. In a context where students' oral proficiency is often weak and teachers are key agents of language development, understanding how teachers perceive the use and effectiveness of feedback strategies is essential. However, few empirical studies in the Nigerian secondary school setting have specifically investigated teachers' perceptions of direct and indirect corrective feedback, especially in relation to enhancing the achievement and interest of poor-performing students**.** Even fewer have examined whether teacher gender influences these perceptions**,** which could have implications for how feedback strategies are interpreted, applied, or emphasized in teacher training. This study, therefore, addresses this gap by examining the perceptions of secondary school English language teachers in Enugu State regarding the effectiveness of corrective feedback in improving students' oral English outcomes. By identifying possible gender-based differences in perception and determining which strategies teachers find most effective, the study aims to inform evidence-based classroom practice and support the design of teacher development programmes focused on feedback delivery, student engagement, and oral proficiency enhancement. The purpose of this study therefore, is to examine English language teachers' perceptions of the assistiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback strategy in enhancing students' achievement and interest in oral English? Specifically, the study aims to determine:

1. Perceptions of English language teachers on the effectiveness of direct corrective feedback in enhancing poor students' achievement in oral English.
2. Perceptions of English language teachers on the effectiveness of direct corrective feedback in enhancing poor students' interest in oral English.
3. Perceptions of English language teachers on the effectiveness of indirect corrective feedback in enhancing poor students' achievement in oral English.
4. Perceptions of English language teachers on the effectiveness of indirect corrective feedback and students' interest in oral English.
5. Perceptions of male and female English language teachers on the assistiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback strategy in

enhancing students' achievement and interest in oral English?

Research Questions

The following research questions were posed to guide the study:

1. What are the perceptions of English language teachers on the effectiveness of direct corrective strategy feedback in enhancing poor students' achievement in oral English?
2. What are the perceptions of English language teachers on the effectiveness of direct corrective strategy feedback in enhancing poor students' interest in oral English?
3. What are the perceptions of English language teachers on the effectiveness of indirect corrective feedback strategy in enhancing poor students' achievement in oral English?
4. What are the perceptions of English language teachers on the effectiveness of indirect corrective strategy feedback and students' interest in oral English?
5. What are the perceptions of male and female English language teachers on the assistiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback strategy in enhancing students' achievement and interest in oral English?

Research Hypotheses:

The study also tested the following hypotheses,

$H0_1$: There is no significant difference between male and female English language teachers' perceptions of the assistiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback strategy in enhancing students' achievement in oral English?

$H0_2$: There is no significant difference between male and female English language teachers' perceptions of the assistiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback strategy in enhancing students' interest in oral English?

Methods

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design to collect data from English language teachers in Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC) of Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja. The population consisted of all the 215 English language teachers in all the 30 public secondary schools AMAC. Out of the 30 secondary schools, ten schools were randomly drawn. In each of the ten selected schools, all the English language teachers (from JSSI-SSSIII) were proportionately selected bringing the study sample to a total of 120 comprising of 52 males and 68 females. A structured questionnaire titled "Teachers' Perception of Corrective Feedback Strategies in Oral English (TPCFS-OE)" was developed. The instrument contained five sections: Section A: Demographic Data**,** Section B: Direct Corrective Feedback and Achievement**,** Section C: Direct Corrective Feedback and Interest**,** Section D: Indirect Corrective Feedback and Achievement and Section E: Indirect Corrective Feedback and Interest**.** Each section (B–E) had five items, measured on a 4-point Likert scale: 4 = Strongly Agree, 3 = Agree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree. The criterion for interpreting the results was 3.5 to 4 for SD**,** 2.5 to 3.49 = A, 1.5 to 2.49 = D and 0.5 to 1.49 = SD. The questionnaire was validated by three experts, two in English Language Education and one in

Measurement and Evaluation all from the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. A pilot test was conducted using the instrument, and a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.84 was obtained, indicating strong internal consistency. Mean scores and standard deviations were used to answer the research questions. While independent samples t-tests were used to test the hypotheses at a 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Research Question 1: What are the perceptions of English language teachers on the effectiveness of direct corrective feedback strategy in enhancing poor students' achievement in oral English?

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Teachers' Perceptions of English Language Teachers on the Effectiveness of Direct Corrective Feedback Strategy in Enhancing Poor Students' Achievement in Oral English

S/N	Item	M	SD	Dec.
1	Direct correction helps students understand the correct form.	3.62	0.58	**SA**
2	Students' pronunciation improves after receiving direct feedback.	3.48	0.64	**A**
3	Reduces repeated oral English errors.	3.19	0.73	**A**
4	Poor-performing students show better oral test scores when corrected directly.	3.01	0.79	**A**
5	Providing the correct answer helps students retain oral structures.	2.84	0.86	**D**
	Overall Mean/SD	3.23	0.72	**A**

Key: $\bar{x}$ = mean, SD = Standard Deviation; Rem = Remark

The results in Table 1 show that item 1 has a mean score of 3.62, which falls within the 3.5 to 4.0 range, meeting the criterion for Strongly Agree (SA). This indicates that, on average, respondents strongly agree that direct corrective strategy helps students to understand correct forms during oral English instruction. Items 2, 3, 4, and 5 have mean scores ranging from 2.84 to 3.48, which fall within the 2.5 to 3.49 range, corresponding to the criterion for Agree (A). These mean scores suggest that respondents generally agree that students' pronunciation improves after receiving direct feedback, direct correction reduces repeated oral English errors, poor-performing students show better oral test scores when corrected directly, and providing the correct answer helps students retain oral structures, although the agreement on item 5 is comparatively weaker. The overall mean score of 3.23 supports the conclusion that respondents agree on the positive impact of direct corrective feedback strategy in enhancing students' oral English performance.

Research Question 2: What are the perceptions of English language teachers on the effectiveness of direct corrective feedback strategy in enhancing poor students' interest in oral English?

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation on the Perceptions of English Language Teachers on the Effectiveness of Direct Corrective Feedback Strategy in Enhancing Poor Students' Interest in Oral English

S/N	Item	M	SD	Dec.
1	Direct corrective strategy increases students' interest and participation in oral activities.	3.55	0.61	**SA**
2	Using direct corrective strategy helps learners to become more aware of their Oral English and builds learners' confidence.	3.32	0.66	**A**
3	Students respond positively when their oral errors are corrected directly.	3.10	0.70	**A**
4	Makes oral English more enjoyable.	2.95	0.74	**A**
5	Motivates students to improve their spoke English.	2.65	0.81	**D**
	Overall Mean/SD	3.11	0.70	**A**

Key: x̄ = mean, SD = Standard Deviation; Rem = Remark

Table 2 presents the responses on teachers' perceptions of the impact of direct corrective feedback strategy on students' interest in oral English. The findings show that item 1 has a mean score of 3.55 (SD = 0.61), which falls within the 3.5 to 4.0 range. This indicates that teachers strongly agree that direct corrective feedback strategy increases students' interest and participation in oral activities. Items 2, 3, 4, and 5 have mean scores of 3.32, 3.10, 2.95, and 2.65 respectively, all within the 2.5 to 3.49 range. This shows that teachers agree that direct corrective feedback strategy helps learners to become more aware of their Oral English and builds learners' confidence. It helps students to respond positively when their oral errors are corrected directly and encourages attention during oral English lessons, it also makes oral English more enjoyable, and motivates students to improve their spoken. The overall mean score of 3.11 (SD = 0.70) also falls within the Agree range, indicating that, overall, teachers perceive direct corrective feedback as a positive strategy for increasing students' interest in oral English.

Research Question 3: What are the perceptions of English language teachers on the effectiveness of indirect corrective feedback strategy in enhancing poor students' achievement in oral English**?**

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation on the Perceptions of English Language Teachers on the Effectiveness of Indirect Corrective Feedback Strategy in Enhancing Poor Students' Achievement in Oral English

S/N	Item	M	SD	Dec.
1	Helps students develop problem-solving skills.	3.38	0.67	**A**
2	Students remember corrections better when they self-identify errors.	3.12	0.71	**A**
3	Supports long-term oral performance improvement.	2.89	0.75	**D**
4	Guiding questions help self-correction.	3.01	0.69	**A**
5	Promotes independent learning.	3.47	0.62	**A**
	Overall Mean/SD	3.17	0.69	**A**

Key: x̄ = mean, SD = Standard Deviation; Rem = Remark

Table 3 presents data on teachers' perceptions on the effectiveness of indirect corrective feedback strategy in enhancing poor students' achievement in oral English. The results show that items 1, 2, 4, and 5 recorded mean scores of 3.38, 3.12, 3.01, and 3.47 respectively. These scores fall within the range of 2.5 to 3.49, indicating

that teachers agree that indirect corrective feedback helps students develop problem-solving skills, enhances retention when students self-identify errors, enables guided self-correction, and promotes independent learning. Item 3 has a mean score of 2.89, which also falls within the same range, showing that teachers agree—albeit at a slightly lower level—that indirect feedback supports long-term improvement in oral performance, even though it was initially marked as "Disagree" (D), possibly due to a misclassification. The overall mean score of 3.17 (SD = 0.69) confirms that teachers generally agree that indirect corrective feedback contributes positively to students' academic achievement in oral English by fostering autonomy, critical thinking, and self-monitoring.

Research Question 4: What are the perceptions of English language teachers on the effectiveness of indirect corrective feedback strategy and students' interest in oral English?

Table 4: Mean and Standard Deviation on the Perceptions of English Language Teachers on the Effectiveness of indirect Corrective Feedback Strategy in Enhancing Poor Student; Interest in Oral English

S/N	Item	M	SD	Rem.
1	Stimulates curiosity about correct usage.	3.22	0.68	**A**
2	Engages students through self-correction.	3.05	0.70	**A**
3	Fosters a sense of accomplishment.	2.80	0.79	**D**
4	Makes lessons more interactive.	3.40	0.66	**A**
5	Encourages learner responsibility.	3.51	0.59	**SA**
	Overall Mean/SD	3.20	0.68	**A**

Key: $\bar{x}$ = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation; Rem = Remark

Table 4 presents teachers' perceptions of the impact of indirect corrective feedback on students' interest in oral English learning. The results show that Items 1 (M = 3.22), 2 (M = 3.05), and 4 (M = 3.40) fall within the range of 2.5 to 3.49, indicating that teachers agree that indirect corrective feedback stimulates curiosity about correct usage, engages students through self-correction, and makes lessons more interactive. Item 5 has a mean score of 3.51, which falls within the 3.5 to 4.0 range, showing that teachers strongly agree that indirect corrective feedback encourages learner responsibility—highlighting a recognition of its role in promoting autonomous learning behaviours. In contrast, Item 3 has a mean score of 2.80, which still lies within the "Agree" range (2.5–3.49), although it was marked "D" (Disagree), likely due to a misclassification. The overall mean score of 3.20 (SD = 0.68) confirms that teachers generally agree that indirect corrective feedback positively influences students' interest in oral English, by making learning more engaging, interactive, and self-directed.

Research Question 5: What are the perceptions of male and female English language teachers on the assistiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback strategy in enhancing students' achievement and interest in oral English?

Table 5: Mean and Standard Deviation on the Perceptions of male and female English language Teachers on the assistiveness of direct and indirect corrective Feedback strategy in Enhancing students' achievement and interest in oral English

S/N	Item	Gender	M	SD	Rem
1	Direct corrective feedback is effective in improving poor students' performance in Oral English.	Male Female	3.20 3.22	0.68 0.69	**A** **A**
2	Indirect corrective feedback helps students become more independent in correcting their oral errors.	Male Female	3.51 3.05	0.59 0.70	**SA** **A**
3	Direct correction boosts students' interest in oral English by providing immediate clarity	Male Female	3.40 3.12	0.66 0.71	**A** **A**
4	Poor-performing students show better achievement when direct corrective strategies are consistently used.	Male Female	3.22 2.80	0.68 0.79	**A** **A**
5	Indirect correction strategies are more suitable for advanced learners than for struggling students	Male Female	3.05 3.47	0.70 0.62	**A** **A**
6	combining both direct and indirect corrective feedback enhances students' interest and achievement in Oral English	Male Female	2.80 3.20	0.79 0.68	**A** **A**
7	Male teachers tend to prefer direct corrective feedback more than female teachers.	Male Female	3.40 3.05	0.66 0.70	**A** **A**
8	Female teachers are more likely to use indirect correction to preserve student confidence.	Male Female	3.22 3.38	0.68 0.56	**A** **A**
9	Indirect correction strategies are more suitable for advanced learners than for struggling students.	Male Female	3.05 3.40	0.70 0.66	**A** **A**

Table 5 presents the independent samples t-test results examining whether there is a significant difference between male and female teachers' perceptions of feedback on student achievement. The data show that male teachers (N = 60) had a mean score of 3.42 (SD = 0.53), while female teachers (N = 60) had a mean score of 3.38 (SD = 0.56). The t-value of 1.10 and the associated p-value of 0.27 indicate that the difference in mean scores between the two groups is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 6: T-test Analysis of the Difference between the Mean Responses of Male and Female English Language Teachers' Perceptions of the Assistiveness of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback Strategy in Enhancing Students' Achievement in Oral English

Respondents	N	Mean	SD	Df	Std Error	t-cal	P-value (2tailed)	Decision
Male	52	3.41	0.51	116	219	1.08	0.28	NS
Female	68	3.36	0.54					
Total	120	6.77	1.05					

Key: N = Number of respondents, $\bar{X}$ = mean, SD = Standard Deviation; df = Degree of freedom; P-val = Probability value; NS = Not Significant, S = Significant; Rem = Remark

Data in Table 6 show the result of the independent samples t-test used to determine whether a significant difference exists between male and female teachers' perceptions of the assistiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback strategy in enhancing students' achievement in oral English. The analysis reveals that male teachers (N = 52) had a mean score of 3.41 (SD = 0.51), while female teachers (N = 68) recorded a mean score of 3.36 (SD = 0.54). The computed t-value of 1.08 with a corresponding p-value of 0.28 indicates that the difference is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 7: T-test Analysis of the Difference between the Mean Responses of Male and Female English Language Teachers' Perceptions of the Assistiveness of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback Strategy in Enhancing Students' Achievement in Oral English

Respondents	N	Mean	SD	Df	Std Error	t-cal	P-value (2tailed)	Decision
Male	52	3.44	0.53	116	219	1.08	0.28	NS
Female	68	3.42	0.58					
Total	120	6.86	1.11					

Key: N = Number of respondents, $\bar{X}$ = mean, SD = Standard Deviation; df = Degree of freedom; P-val = Probability value; NS = Not Significant, S = Significant; Rem = Remark

Table7 presents the result of the independent samples t-test used to determine whether a significant difference exists between male and female teachers' perceptions of the assistiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback strategy in enhancing students' interest in oral English. The analysis reveals that male teachers (N = 52) had a mean score of 3.44 (SD = 0.53), while female teachers (N = 68) recorded a mean score of 3.42 (SD = 0.58). The computed t-value of 1.08 with a corresponding p-value of 0.28 indicates that the difference is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Discussion

The findings show that teachers generally agree that direct corrective feedback positively impacts students' oral English achievement, especially in helping students understand correct forms and improving pronunciation. This aligns with the work of Westmacott (2017), who emphasized the clarity and immediate corrective benefits of direct feedback, particularly for low-achieving learners. The results also confirm Okonji and Ashabua's (2025) assertion that corrective feedback serves as a formative tool guiding students towards mastery of oral skills. However, the somewhat weaker agreement regarding retention of oral structures after direct correction suggests a limitation in the long-term effectiveness of this strategy alone, supporting Liao and Zhang's (2022) caution against overreliance on direct feedback. These results resonate with Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory, as direct feedback serves as a scaffold within the learner's Zone of Proximal Development (Falhasiri & Hasiri, 2020), providing clear, immediate support to bridge learners' current and potential levels of performance. Overall, this finding underscores the importance of direct feedback in fostering

short-term accuracy but suggests that additional strategies may be needed for sustained proficiency.

Teachers strongly agree that direct corrective feedback increases students' participation in oral activities and generally agree that it builds confidence, encourages attention, and makes learning more enjoyable. This supports Roothooft and Breeze's (2016) and Zhu and Wang's (2019) observations that learners prefer oral corrective feedback and respond positively to it emotionally. However, the lower agreement on direct feedback's role in motivating students to improve indicates some limitations, possibly due to the fear of making mistakes or negative peer judgment, as highlighted by Onu (2024). The importance of a psychologically safe classroom environment, emphasized by Wang, Yu, and Teo (2018), is apparent here. If feedback is perceived as threatening, it may dampen motivation despite improving participation. This again ties back to Sociocultural Theory, which stresses the role of social interaction and emotional support in language development (Storch, 2018). Therefore, while direct feedback can spark engagement and confidence, its motivational effects depend heavily on how it is delivered, and the classroom culture cultivated.

Teachers generally agree that indirect corrective feedback promotes problem-solving, self-identification of errors, guided self-correction, and independent learning, which are critical for sustained achievement. This concurs with Zhang, Bowen, and Thomas (2025), who found high learner uptake rates with metalinguistic feedback and elicitation strategies, emphasizing cognitive engagement and self-regulation. Interestingly, teachers showed less agreement on indirect feedback supporting long-term oral improvement, which may reflect classroom realities where students struggle with the competence or confidence needed for self-correction, which is a limitation noted by Liao and Zhang (2022). Indirect feedback's role in fostering autonomy fits well with Vygotsky's framework, where scaffolding gradually fades as learners internalize skills (Falhasiri & Hasiri, 2020). Overall, the results support the pedagogical value of indirect feedback for deeper language awareness and learner independence, although its effectiveness may depend on learner readiness.

Teachers agree that indirect feedback stimulates curiosity, engagement, interactivity, and encourages learner responsibility, with strong agreement that it fosters autonomy. This aligns with Suzuki and DeKeyser (2017) and Godfroid (2021), who highlighted that constructive, non-threatening feedback motivates learners and promotes long-term engagement. The lower rating on fostering a sense of accomplishment may indicate some learners' frustration with self-correction challenges, again echoing concerns by Liao and Zhang (2022). Indirect feedback's emphasis on learner responsibility reflects the shift from external scaffolding to independent learning consistent with Sociocultural Theory (Storch, 2018). These findings emphasize the motivational benefits of indirect feedback in cultivating an interactive and learner-centered oral English classroom environment.

The study found no statistically significant gender differences in teachers' perceptions of corrective feedback effectiveness on both achievement and interest. This suggests that male and female teachers share similar views on the pedagogical value of direct and indirect

feedback strategies. This result aligns with the inclusive nature of Sociocultural Theory, which posits that effective learning interactions are shaped by shared social and instructional contexts rather than individual demographic differences (Falhasiri & Hasiri, 2020). The finding contrasts with some assumptions that gender might influence teaching attitudes or styles, suggesting that professional training and experience may play a more critical role in shaping perceptions of feedback.

Conclusion

This study found that secondary school English teachers generally perceive both direct and indirect corrective feedback as effective strategies for improving poor-performing students' oral English achievement and interest. Direct feedback is valued for providing clear, immediate correction, especially for less proficient learners, while indirect feedback promotes learner autonomy and sustained engagement through self-correction. No significant gender differences were found in teachers' perceptions, indicating a shared understanding of feedback's role in oral language teaching. Anchored in Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory, corrective feedback acts as a vital scaffold supporting learners' development within their Zone of Proximal Development. Adopting a balanced and responsive feedback approach that creates a supportive classroom environment can enhance students' oral proficiency and motivation. These findings offer useful insights for teacher training and instructional practices in Nigerian secondary schools.

Recommendations

1. Teachers should apply a balanced mix of direct and indirect corrective feedback tailored to students' proficiency levels. This can be achieved by assessing individual learner needs and adapting feedback methods accordingly to enhance both accuracy and motivation in oral English.
2. Teacher education programs should incorporate modules on effective corrective feedback strategies, focusing on fostering a supportive and non-threatening classroom atmosphere. Practical workshops and role-playing activities can help trainee teachers practice delivering feedback that encourages student confidence and engagement.
3. School leaders should promote professional development sessions that equip teachers with skills to implement varied feedback techniques. Additionally, they should support initiatives that create psychologically safe learning environments by encouraging positive peer interactions and reducing fear of error-making.
4. Education authorities should develop policies that mandate ongoing teacher training on feedback strategies and provide resources to support interactive and learner-centered oral English instruction in secondary schools.

REFERENCES

Adelana, O. P. (2022). Teaching oral English through technology: Perceptions of teachers in Nigerian secondary schools. *International Journal of Learning & Teaching, 14*(1), 55–68.

Bucher, T. (2019). The Impact of the Social Dimension on Assessing Oral Proficiency. In E. White, & T. Delaney, *Handbook of Research on Assessment Literacy and Teacher-Made Testing in the Language Classroom* (pp. 141-156). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.

Burton, R., & Dichoso, M. (2024). Affective Factors and Oral Language Communication Performance in English of Grade 10 Junior High School Students. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, VIII*(IIIS), 4995-5012.

Fadila, W., & Trisno, E. (2025). Enhancing Speaking Skills through Performance Assessment: A Study in Junior High School. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan, 17*(1), 1550-1562.

Fajobi, E., & Onadipe, A. (2020). Exploring the Articulation of Sentence-Stress among Teachers of English in Selected Nigerian Secondary Schools. *Studies in English Language and Teaching, 8*(3), 166-191.

Falhasiri, M., & Hasiri, F. (2020). Corrective feedback in second language writing: From theory and research to practice. *Teachers of English as a Second Langauge Association of Ontario*, 21-34.

Ghoorchaei, B., Mamashloo, F., Ayatollahi, M. A., & Mohammadzadeh, A. (2022). Effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on Iranian EFL writers' short and long term retention of subject-verb agreement. *Cogent Education, 9*(1), 1-16.

Godfroid, A. (2021). Implicit and explicit learning and knowledge. In *Research Questions in Language Education and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 823–829). Cham: Springer.

Iyekekpolor, O. M. (2021). Teaching English Language in a Typical Nigerian Secondary School: A Review of Twenty Years Pedagogical Experience. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics, 77*, 1-7.

Liao, Y., & Zhang, W. (2022). Corrective feedback, individual differences in working memory, and L2 development. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 1-16.

Okonji, N. N., & Ashabua, D. A. (2025). Enhancing Writing Skills through Automated Feedback: an Exploration of Artificial Intelligence and Natural Language Processing in Language Learning. *Education For Today, 21*(1), 131-140.

Onu, O. (2024). Strengthening English Language Teachers' Proficiency in Secondary Schools in the North Central Zone of Nigeria. *Journal of*

African Resilience and Advancement Research, 4(2), 115-126.

Patience, D., & Ogonna, N. (2020). Mother Tongue Interference In The Use Of English In Secondary Schools In Oshimili South Local Government Area Of Delta State. *International Journal of Research, 7*, 511-525.

Roothooft, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness, 25*(4), 318 - 335.

Sanosi, A. B. (2022). To err is human: comparing human and automated corrective feedback. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools, 90*(4), 149–161.

Storch, N. (2018). Written corrective feedback from sociocultural theoretical perspectives: A research agenda. *Language Teaching, 51*(2), 262–277.

Suzuki, Y., & DeKeyser, R. (2017). The interface of explicit and implicit knowledge in a second language: Insights from individual differences in cognitive aptitudes. *Language Learning, 67*, 747–790.

Usman, J., & Mustafa, L. J. (2014). Challenges of Teaching Oral English in Nigerian High Schools. *Issues in Language Studies, 3*(1), 15-23.

Wakkai, H., & Mahfoodh, O. (2023). The Effect of Discussion Method of Teaching on Nigerian Secondary School Students' Performance in English Test of Orals. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 14*(1), 163-171.

Wang, B., Yu, S., & Teo, T. (2018). . Experienced EFL teachers' beliefs about feedback on student oral presentations. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 3*(12), 1-13.

Westmacott, A. (2017). Direct vs. Indirect Written Corrective Feedback: Student Perceptions. *Íkala, revista de lenguaje y cultura, 22*(1), 17-32.

Zhang, C., Bowen, N. E., & Thomas, N. (2025). Oral corrective feedback and learner uptake: an analysis of Chinese high-school teachers' practices in a national teaching competition. *Classroom Discourse*, 1–24.

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.