The Use of Oral Feedback in Developing the Speaking Skills of Saudi EFL Students

Ali Nasser Zrair[*]

Abha College of Technology, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

This study attempted to identify the impact of oral feedback on enhancing the speaking skill of Saudi EFL students. Also, the study aimed to identify the learners' problems with oral feedback in their language classes and the learners' preferences of oral feedback. In order to achieve these goals, the researcher used the descriptive analytical approach and used the questionnaire as the data collection instrument. The study comprised a sample of (30) EFL Saudi male students in the preparatory year at King Saud university in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The findings of the study revealed that the students see that oral feedback has an important role in enhancing their speaking skill. The findings also revealed that the students have problems with regard to oral feedback such as the timing of giving the oral feedback by the teacher and the technique of oral feedback. Furthermore, the findings showed that the students prefer the oral feedback on their errors while speaking and prefer to get immediate feedback for their oral errors. The study recommended that teachers should provide the oral feedback to the students' error in a timely manner and with a consideration of the selected feedback technique.

Keywords: oral feedback, speaking skills, recasts, EFL, Saudi students

INTRODUCTION

Feedback plays a major role in language learning and in creating sound learning environment. The key role feedback has been the interest of researchers and linguists over the past decade since feedback is closely linked to the development of the language competence (Oliver & Mackey, 2003). The provision of immediate and corrective feedback to the students' performance has been stressed by many researchers (e.g. Sheen, 2006; Long, 2007; Mackey, 2007) due to its beneficial outcomes for the learners. In addition to written feedback, oral feedback was reported to play a central role in enhancing the learners' interaction and communicability in the classroom.

The different forms of feedback such as peer feedback or self-correction have profound effects on language teaching (Sheen, 2008). They allow the learners to speak and interact with their peers and with their teachers in the class in the manner that develops their ability to use the language (Mackey, 1999). According to Lyster et al. (1999), good feedback delivers useful insights and valuable information to the learners about their

learning. It promotes the feelings or self-esteem and motivation. Also, feedback helps bridge the gap between present and required performance (Krashen, 1982). On the other hand, the constructive and supportive feedback have been found to reformulate learning, correct wrong beliefs, nourish existing concepts, and push for further learning (Mackey & Gass, 2006).

The contribution of oral feedback to second language acquisition was reported by many researchers (e.g. Russell & Spada, 2006; Doughty, 2003). On one hand, oral feedback leads to explicit second language learning and had a great impact on the linguistic competence of the language learners (Krashen, 1982). On the other hand, oral feedback supports the promotion of implicit knowledge and have profound insights for second language learning (Lyster, 2004).

The effectiveness of certain kinds of oral feedback was also reported. For example, Nicolas et al (2001) informed that recasts, which are the reformulation of the learners' utterances involving the correct form, are considered the most significant and beneficial type of oral feedback since they allow the learners to cognitively recognize their committed errors after the utterance. Moreover, the other types of oral feedback such as altering the learner to the error, asking for clarification, eliciting the wrong sentence, and making a metalinguistic comment are most likely to add to the students' motivation and underpin their interlanguage (Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Leeman, 2007).

Oral feedback is the most common form of corrective feedback in EFL classes (Ellis, 2008). For instance, recasts are said to help the learners focus on the form and the meaning during the classroom interaction (Carroll et al., 1992). Eliciting the wrong utterances and asking for clarification are reported to be effective oral feedback strategies since they do not cut off communication and assist in developing the learners' communicative competence. In addition, Carroll and Swain (1993) reported that oral feedback is necessary for the learners to express themselves in a constructive manner.

Oral feedback is an effective learning strategy for EFL students (Faqeih, 2012). In EFL classrooms, the L2 learners normally commit linguistic errors and have difficulties in producing the language properly. The need for the learners to speak without interruption and to go on using the language form is necessary for their interaction continuity (Ellis, 2008). This indicates that the concept of oral feedback is linked to the overall concept of assessment as one of the means used to ensure the maximum attainable goals and objectives are achieved. Oral feedback is of great importance in the learning process, especially in speaking situations. Its importance stems from its employment in modifying wrong utterances and developing it for the better. It is also important in stimulating and motivating the students to speak without hesitation or fear to commit errors (Lyster, 2004). It helps the teacher to encourage the student to discover the correct responses and delete or cancel the wrong ones (Long, 2007).

Despite the importance of oral feedback in developing the language, especially the speaking skills of EFL students, it is one of the understudied issues in EFL Arabic contexts. Furthermore, the attention to the use of oral feedback in the Saudi EFL setting is not parallel with the significance of the oral feedback as a strategy to enhance the students'

speaking skills. Therefore, this study attempts to examine the use of oral feedback in developing the Saudi EFL students' speaking skills in order to get useful insights about the importance, problems, and preferences that relate such concept in the language learning class.

Statement of the Problem

Speaking skill is one of the complicated skills for Saudi students (Al-Enzy & Jesudas, 2016). The use of traditional methods of teaching and evaluation have resulted in poor proficiency level for Saudi EFL students (Aljumah, 2011). On the other hand, a number of studies of Saudi Arabia revealed that oral feedback is not well considered in Saudi EFL classes. For example, Faqeih (2012) reported that oral feedback is not a common practice in Saudi classrooms and that the students do not get the sufficient corrective feedback for their oral errors. Also, Mustafa (2012) concluded that the Saudi students do not get a corrective feedback in the appropriate manner that enhances their proficiency development.

Basically, Saudi EFL students do not get the productive oral feedback from the teachers and they do not get the due feedback that they expect from their teachers (Al-Enzy & Jesudas, 2016). Furthermore, Al-Saleh (2018) revealed that Saudi learners vary in their priorities of oral corrective feedback strategies and this must be considered by the teacher. Generally, it is found that most EFL teachers provide students with written feedback only which is not considered as the only way for learning (Grami, 2005). Teachers just provide written feedback which leads to students' frustration. AlKhatib (2015) reported that Saudi teachers do not provide positive feedback to their students.

Therefore, the practices of oral feedback in Saudi EFL context are not made according to the best practices of the theory. This results in major hindrances to the effective language learning. Based on the significant role of oral feedback in developing the speaking skills of EFL students, this study examines the oral feedback in the Saudi context and its relation to the development of speaking skills. To the researcher's best knowledge, this is a pioneer study in the Saudi EFL context since oral feedback was under-researched, especially with preparatory year students at King Saud University in Riyadh city. The study fills an academic gap by introducing the practices, problems, and students' preferences of oral feedback in Saudi EFL classrooms.

Research questions

This study aims to answer the following questions:

1. How do the Saudi EFL students perceive the use of oral feedback in the development of their speaking skills?

2. What are the Saudi EFL students' problems with oral feedback in their language classes?

3. What are the Saudi EFL students' preferences of oral feedback in their language classes?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Oral Feedback

Feedback is one of the most essential terms in the learning and educational contexts. Feedback is a general term used in many fields, but it is commonly referred to as corrective feedback when it is used in the classroom setting. Roberge (1992) defines feedback as "a judgement made to the performance of the individuals with the intention to bridge a knowledge or skill gap" (p. 5). Also, Lyster (2004) defines feedback as "correcting or modifying the factors that lead to the correct outcome" (p.14). In learning contexts, corrective feedback is described as "the responses given to the learners to modify their errors". Brown (1987, p. 12) elaborates that corrective feedback is "the kind of remarks or input given to the learner, from any source, which bears evidence to the learner's linguistic errors".

Oral feedback has a fundamental role in inputs that the language teachers need to provide to the students in order to ensure second language growth (Corder, 1973; Ferris, 2002; Loewen, 2005). According to Leeman (2007), oral feedback in the classroom has three characteristics:

- *Reinforcing*: this characteristic is a key anchor in the role of feedback that reinforces learning. Researchers focused on this feature through immediate feedback in programmed learning seeing that the student's awareness of the validity of his response gives him a kind of reinforcement.

- *Motivational*: this characteristic is an important feature where feedback contributes to stimulating learners' motivation for learning, achievement, and excellent performance. Feedback makes the learner enjoy the process of learning, accept it eagerly, and contributes to the classroom debate which leads to modifying the behavior of the learner.

- *Informative*: this characteristic directs the learner to his performance, showing him whether the performance is well-established or not perfect to modify. It raises the level of attention of the learner to the important elements of the skill to be learned and increases the level of interest and motivation to learn. Therefore, it works to establish the meanings and links required, correct errors, adjust the wrong understanding, and contributes to help the learner repeat the behavior that leads to the desired results. This increases the learner's self- confidence and educational results.

Furthermore, Krashen (1985) and Gass & Selinker (2008) reported that the teachers should be keen to provide oral feedback in EFL classes for the following reasons:

1. Confirming the validity of the performance or the desired behavior, taking into account the repetition of the correct answer from all the students. This allows to confirm the desired leaning outcome needed by the teacher.

2. The teacher provides information that can be used to correct or improve performance, which is known as corrective feedback.

3. Directing the student to himself discover the information that can be used to correct or improve performance.

Types of Oral Feedback

Oral feedback is mainly used for the purpose of error correction and error treatment (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Different types of oral feedback can be used, but it depends on the nature of the error, the level of the student, the learning context, and the time available (Bailey, 1996). According to Mackey & Gass (2006), the below types of oral feedback can be distinguished:

1. ***Explicit correction:*** this kind of oral feedback refers to the explicit condition of the correct form. The teacher gives the correct form and clearly points out that what the student said was incorrect (e.g. "Oh, you mean" —"You should say").

2. ***Recasts:*** include the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's sentence, minus the error (e.g., S: you must to ask him, T: you must ask him).

3. ***Clarification requests:*** show to the learners either that the teacher has misunderstood their utterance or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way and that a reformulation is necessary (e.g., excuse me, pardon?).

4. ***Metalinguistic feedback:*** involves giving either comments, information, or questions related to the soundness of the student's utterance without directly providing the correct form (e.g., you need to have a simple form of the verb after modals).

5. ***Elicitation:*** can be made by either asking the student to make a completion, asking the student a question, or asking the student to reformulate his utterance.

6. ***Repetition:*** it means that the teacher repeats the student's erroneous utterance. Mostly, the teachers adjust their intonation to highlight the error (e.g., have to go?).

Oral Feedback & Speaking Skills

Speaking skill is one of the major language skills. It is called a productive skill where the speaker is engaged into producing an utterance to express his or her ideas to the recipients (Leki, 1991). The mastery of speaking skill is necessary for EFL students to have communicative competence (Nicola et al., 2001). According to Lee (1997), speaking skill involves being aware of sound discrimination, pronouncing words properly, having a good knowledge of rhythm and intonation, and having the ability to express one's ideas in a clear manner.

Ferris & Roberts (2001) reported that the speaking skill is associated with the ability to use the proper language in the proper situations. Language is the primary tool to convey the message using the proper language. Furthermore, the speaking skill has an important role to play in mastering material, shaping ideas, and developing critical thinking skills

(Lee, 1997; Cathcart & Olson, 1979; Robb et al, 1986; Wright, 1987; Vigil & Oller, 1976; Debot, 19960).

Also, the communicative approach has stressed on the students' need to use the language in authentic situations and to interact in the daily life situations using the target language (Crème & Lea, 1997; Scott, 1996). Language is a social act and it involves the students' engagement in social activities that allow the students to speak, write, listen and read in the target language (Ferris, 2003, Lech, 1994). Here, the teaching practices should focus on using all the language skills in the learning process (Ferris, 2002).

Via oral feedback, the students get opportunities to practice the skills of speaking during their communication with others (Xiang, 2004; Gower et al., 1995; Walter, 1995). So, they become comfortable to speak freely without the hesitation to make mistakes. On the other hand, the students can develop their abilities to take decisions themselves through correcting their errors whether through their teacher or their peers (Byrne, 1986; Kayi, 2006).

Empirical Research

Many studies were conducted to elicit the impact of oral feedback and corrective feedback on the learners' proficiency in language classes. A good number of studies have distinguished between direct and indirect feedback strategies and investigated the extent to which they facilitate greater accuracy (Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998; Lalande, 1982; Robb, Ross & Shortreed, 1986). Direct or explicit feedback occurs when the teacher identifies an error and provides the correct form, while indirect strategies refer to situations when the teacher indicates that an error has been made but does not provide a correction, thereby leaving the student to diagnose and correct it.

On the other hand, the studies by Lee (1997) and Ferris and Roberts (2001) did have control groups which received no corrective feedback and found that corrective feedback groups significantly outperformed the no-feedback groups. Robb et al. (1986) found that there were no significant differences between the group given coded feedback and the group not given coded feedback.

Feedback is one of the topics that was rarely investigated in the Saudi ESL context at all levels. Very few studies have tackled oral feedback effectiveness especially on oral interaction. For example, Faqeih (2012) investigated the effectiveness of error correction during oral interaction of English L2 learners in the United Kingdom and Saudi Arabia. It examined the effects of two types of oral corrective feedback (CF), recast and metalinguistic information, during oral production tasks on the learning of English modals (will, can and must). The results suggested that both metalinguistic information and recasts can be beneficial for the development of English modals, though effectiveness was influenced by the outcome measures used, the length of time between intervention and test, and the context (UK and SA). Recast and metalinguistic information were generally found to be beneficial in most measures regardless of contexts.

Mustafa (2012) employed informal conversational interviews and semi-structured individual interviews to capture the Saudi students' opinions about the feedback they receive, and about their perceptions on what constitutes helpful feedback. The findings

suggest that the Saudi students do not think highly of the feedback, and that the feedback they desire is markedly different from what they receive. The students mentioned several impediments to feedback. From a socio-cultural perspective, the feedback practices do not adhere to the best practices of the theory, resulting in major hindrances to the students' learning development.

Grami (2005) investigated a number of Saudi university level ESL students' perception of written feedback they receive from their teachers using structured questionnaires. The most outstanding finding obtained from the study is that Saudi ESL student writers at KAAU by all means desire and expect feedback from their writing teachers. It also shows that students do believe that they benefit a lot from such feedback. This can be easily noticed through their high responses means which certainly show solid evidence that they appreciate error-feedback.

Based on the above literature, it can be said that oral feedback is an effective strategy for developing the learners' proficiency. The oral feedback literature showed much evidence on its effectiveness on developing EFL fluency. However, the Saudi context has witnessed less attention in oral feedback studies and their effectiveness on THE students' speaking skills. The concept of oral feedback is still not well-articulated for both teachers and learners in the Saudi context.

METHOD

Research design

The current study uses quantitative and qualitative methods that describe and analyse the use of oral feedback in developing the EFL students' speaking skill. The study design constructed here is based on the study questions formulated. These questions were raised from the researcher's observation and from the literature.

Subjects

This research comprised a sample of (30) male students in the preparatory year at King Saud university in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The preparatory year students study a full English course as part of their academic program. The selected students were regular students enrolled in second semester of the academic year 2018-2019. The native language of the participants is Arabic and their second language is English. The language levels of the participants range from intermediate to upper intermediate.

Instrumentation

In order to achieve the goals of this study, the researcher used the questionnaire as the main data collection tool. The researcher prepared a questionnaire about the use of oral feedback in enhancing speaking skill. The questionnaire is composed of (30) statements, distributed on (3) sections. The first section is about the students' perceptions of oral feedback in developing speaking skills, the second sections is about the students' problems with oral feedback, and the third question is about the students' preferences of oral feedback. The researcher prepared the questionnaire based on the relevant literature and previous studies that tackled oral feedback in English language learning.

The researcher distributed (30) questionnaires and got fully-answered (30) responses. The rating scale used in this questionnaire is Likert scale that has five ratings "strongly disagree", "disagree", "not sure", "agree", and "strongly agree".

The researcher verified the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. Validity refers to the degree to which a study accurately reflects or assesses the specific concept that the researcher is attempting to measure (Robson, 1993). The researcher achieved the face validity of the questionnaire by submitting it to a number of experts and requesting their opinions on the suitability of the questionnaire to the research objectives. More than half of the experts conveyed that the questionnaire is suitable for what it is designed to measure.

Reliability is the extent to which an experiment, test, or any measuring procedure yields the same result on repeated trials (APA, 1985). In this research, the researcher has used Cronbach's Alpha coefficient to assess the reliability of the questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the entire questionnaire items was 0.772. The questionnaire is then considered a reliable tool. The results are shown in the below table:

Table 1. Cronbach's Alpha for questionnaire reliability

Sections	N	Cronbach's Alpha
Students' Perception of oral feedback	17	0.688
The problems related to oral feedback	15	0.804
Students' preferences of oral feedback	8	0.822
Total	30	0.772

Statistical Tools

In order to achieve the objectives of the study and to analyze the collected data, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software is used. The following statistical tools were used in the research:

- *Cronbach's Alpha*: to ensure the reliability of the research instrument, i.e. the questionnaire.

- *Percentage & Frequency*: to identify the characteristics of the research sample and to categorize the responses of its members to questionnaire items.

- *Arithmetic Mean*: to arrange the items according to importance to study results.

- *Standard Deviation*: to demonstrate how much dispersion from the average exists in the respondents' responses.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

This part presents the results of the study. It demonstrates the results of the field study in terms of the subjects' responses to the items of the questionnaire. Also, it presents a discussion to the research findings. The results of the study are presented and discussed according to the research questions:

The Findings of the First Question

How do the Saudi EFL students perceive the use of oral feedback in the development of their speaking skills?

In order to answer this question, the researcher used the mean score and the standard deviation for the students' responses to the items of this question. The responses of the students were as follows:

Table 2. Responses to the First Question

S	Statements		SA	A	DK	D	SD	Mean	Std. D	Rank
1	My speaking errors in the English class are too much.	%	13.1	29.7	26.5	24.5	5.6	3.35	1.27	12
2	I benefit when the teacher corrects my English errors.	%	51.0	37.6	4.9	4.2	2.3	3.83	1.14	8
3	My speaking errors are due to my ignorance of the linguistic rules usage.	%	22.2	32.0	20.9	18.0	6.2	3.74	1.22	9
4	The correction of my errors helps me in language learning.	%	53.9	33.3	8.8	3.3	.3	3.27	1.35	14
5	I do not repeat the errors that my teacher corrects for me.	%	56.5	28.1	6.9	6.2	2.0	3.01	1.27	15
6	I listen carefully to my teacher when she corrects my oral errors.	%	23.2	29.7	31.7	12.1	3.3	2.56	1.31	16
7	I feel that the teacher is interested in correcting my oral errors	%	46.7	40.5	7.5	4.6	.7	3.71	1.13	10
8	The teacher explains to me the error I made in communication	%	43.1	32.4	15.7	4.6	4.2	3.35	1.25	13
9	Repeating the sentences after correcting them helps me in learning English speaking.	%	36.6	39.2	8.5	10.5	4.9	4.17	1.05	5
10	I pay attention to errors that the teacher corrected so as not repeat them in the next times.	%	49.0	32.7	10.5	6.5	1.3	2.20	1.21	17
11	The teacher corrects my oral errors immediately.	%	21.2	33.0	12.4	25.8	7.5	4.38	0.81	1
12	The teacher helps me understand my oral errors after correction.	%	35.0	32.7	16.0	12.4	3.6	4.31	0.98	2
13	Feedback helps in understanding the correct answer.	%	31.4	36.9	9.8	15.0	5.9	3.58	1.07	11
14	Feedback helps in remembering the correct answer in the next times.	%	24.5	25.2	13.1	27.5	9.8	4.28	0.84	3
15	Feedback encourages to search for the correct answer.	%	15.4	22.9	19.3	30.4	11.1	4.06	1.07	6
16	Feedback leads to make a comparison between the right and wrong answer.	%	11.1	17.3	10.8	37.6	22.9	3.92	1.15	7
17	Feedback by the teacher helps me correct my errors myself.	%	26.5	38.9	19.6	8.8	5.9	4.22	0.96	4
	Total Mean						3.64			

Table 2 shows that the participants' responses to *Saudi EFL students' perception of the use of oral feedback in the development of speaking skills* were high with an overall mean of (3.64). In other words, the students well perceive the role of oral feedback in enhancing their speaking skill.

The first question in the study aimed to identify the students' perspective of the impact of oral feedback on enhancing the speaking skill. The findings of this question revealed that the students see that the oral feedback helps them in language learning, the students benefit when the teacher corrects their oral errors, they know the correct answer immediately, they listen carefully to their teacher when he corrects their errors, and that they benefit from repeating the sentences after correcting them.

Also, the students did not highly estimate that the teachers are interested in correcting their errors, the teacher explains to them their errors, they do not repeat the errors after correction, they make errors because of their ignorance of the rules.

On the other hand, students see that English errors have an impact on the rate of their linguistic errors. They expressed that feedback helps them remember the correct answer in the following times, feedback helps them speak correctly, feedback helps them understand the correct answer, they care for the errors corrected by the teacher so as not to repeat them, and that feedback encourages them to search for the correct answer and compare the right and wrong answer.

Also, students highly estimated that the teacher helps them understand their errors after correction, teachers' correction help them correct their errors themselves, and that the teacher corrects their errors immediately.

These findings were supported by many researchers such as Mustafa (2012) and Mackey (2007). They confirmed that oral feedback helps students in language learning. Also, Lyster (2007) and Long (2007) support the findings of these study that students make errors due to poor knowledge of rules and that the teacher plays a key role in correcting oral errors.

From a pedagogical perspective, oral feedback is an important component of form-focused instruction and it is advocated as effective for L2 teaching (Long, 2007) and that feedback provided through verbal interaction can facilitate L2 learning by connecting form and meaning. When provided in response to errors during communicative interaction, oral feedback provides an opportunity for learners to pay attention to form as it relates to their intended meaning (Grami, 2005).

The Findings of the Second Question

What are the Saudi EFL students' problems with oral feedback in their language classes?

In order to answer this question, the researcher used the mean score and the standard deviation for the students' responses to the items of this question. The responses of the students were as follows:

Table 3. Responses to the Second Question

S	Statements		SA	A	DK	D	SD	Mean	Std. D	Rank
1	I use the Arabic language too much in the English class.	%	25.2	29.7	11.8	19.9	13.1	3.34	1.39	2
2	The teacher corrects the oral errors without helping me to understand the errors.	%	8.2	15.7	17.6	35.6	21.9	2.52	1.23	10
3	The teacher embarrasses me when I make an error.	%	7.8	11.4	11.4	31.0	37.6	2.20	1.28	13
4	I feel frustrated when the teacher corrects my oral errors.	%	6.9	15.0	16.0	32.0	29.4	2.38	1.24	12
5	The teacher does not encourage me to correct my errors myself.	%	9.5	14.1	20.9	35.9	19.0	2.59	1.22	9
6	I do not want to know the correction of my oral errors.	%	4.6	7.2	8.8	35.6	43.1	1.94	1.11	14
7	I feel frustrated when I repeat the same error.	%	16.3	32.0	17.3	16.7	17.3	3.13	1.35	4
8	I do not want to speak so as not to make an error.	%	21.2	21.9	12.4	25.2	18.0	3.03	1.44	6
9	I am not used to getting my speaking errors corrected.	%	11.1	17.0	20.6	29.7	21.2	2.67	1.29	7
10	I do not feel that my teacher is interested in speaking error correction.	%	8.8	11.8	19.6	30.4	29.4	2.40	1.26	11
11	The teacher does not correct many of my oral errors in the class.	%	9.8	16.0	21.6	29.4	22.9	2.60	1.27	8
12	I need much time to think of my speaking errors.	%	15.7	29.7	27.5	18.0	9.2	3.25	1.19	3
13	The teacher pays more attention to the vocabulary, spelling and grammatical errors than the speaking errors.	%	15.0	21.2	32.4	18.0	13.4	3.07	1.24	5
14	The teacher corrects the speaking errors during the exercises than the activities.	%	24.5	29.4	27.8	10.1	8.2	3.52	1.20	1
15	I get confused when the teacher corrects my errors during speaking.	%	4.6	7.2	8.8	34.6	42.1	1.92	1.10	15
	Total Mean						2.70			

As shown in table 3, the responses to the items of this are moderate with a mean score (2.70). In other words, the students mentioned that there are some problems related to oral feedback in their language classes in general.

The findings of this question showed that students have the following problems in oral feedback in language classes:

- The teacher corrects the speaking errors during the exercises than the activities.

- Students use the Arabic language too much in the English class.

- Students need much time to think of my speaking errors.

- Students feel frustrated when they repeat the same error.

- The teacher pays more attention to the vocabulary, spelling and grammatical errors than the speaking errors.

- They do not want to speak so as not to make an error.

Also, the students revealed that they have the following problems in oral feedback with a lesser degree:

- The students get confused when the teacher corrects their errors during speaking.

- The students do not want to know the correction of their oral errors.

- The teacher embarrasses the students when they make an error.

- The students feel frustrated when the teacher corrects their oral errors.

- The students do not feel that their teacher is interested in speaking error correction.

The above mentioned findings confirm the past studies that reported that EFL students have linguistic and emotional problems with regards to their errors in the class. This corresponds with Leeman (2007) and Grami (2005) who revealed that students feel reluctant to participate in the class as they fear to be embarrassed by their teachers. Also, this is supported by Ammar and Spada (2006) who confirmed that the key reason beyond EFL students' oral errors is the overlap between their target language and their mother tongue.

Findings of the Third Question

What are the Saudi EFL students' preferences of oral feedback in their language classes?

In order to answer this question, the researcher used the mean score and the standard deviation for the students' responses to the items of this question. The responses of the students were as follows:

Table 4. Responses to the Third Question

S	Statements		SA	A	DK	D	SD	Mean	Std. D	Rank
1	I prefer oral correction for my errors.	%	35.3	45.4	14.1	3.6	1.3	4.10	0.87	3
2	I prefer written correction for my errors.	%	26.8	34.3	21.6	13.7	3.6	3.67	1.12	8
3	I prefer that the teacher corrects my errors immediately when I speak.	%	30.7	41.2	12.4	11.4	3.9	3.84	1.11	6
4	I prefer that the teacher corrects my errors after I finish speaking.	%	51.3	35.9	7.5	4.2	0.3	4.35	0.82	2
5	I prefer that the teacher corrects my errors after finishing the activities.	%	52.9	35.3	8.5	2.6	.7	4.37	0.80	1
6	I prefer that the teacher corrects my errors after the end of the lesson.	%	36.6	32.4	15.7	12.1	2.9	3.88	1.12	4
7	It is preferred that errors are corrected during group work.	%	30.7	39.9	15.7	10.8	2.6	3.86	1.06	5
8	I prefer that my teacher and my colleagues correct my errors.	%	34.0	30.7	22.5	9.5	3.3	3.83	1.10	7
	Total Mean						3.98			

Table 4 shows that the research sample responses to *preferences of oral feedback in languages classes* are high, with an overall mean of (3.98).

The findings of this question showed that students prefer that the teacher corrects all of their errors, they prefer written correction for their errors, they prefer that the teacher corrects their errors immediately when they speak, they prefer errors to be corrected during group work, and that the teacher and colleagues correct the errors, and that they prefer oral correction for their errors.

A significant result therefore was that most students find oral feedback to be a positive emotional experience once applied using relevant procedures. For example, when the students were asked if they preferred to be corrected every time they made a mistake or only when the mistake was important. Most students did not favor every error to be corrected, in keeping with the findings from Doughty and Varela (1998), Lyster (2002), and Révész (2002).   Other items asked if the students preferred to be corrected privately or in front (so to speak) of the class. Most students preferred to be corrected in as a group and not individually. This result receives support from Truscott (1999) and Han (2002) who affirm that students may feel embarrassed during oral feedback. A related item asked if the students preferred to be corrected immediately or after class, many students reported a preference for delayed correction which again strengthens the students' responses concerning the affective impact of oral feedback.

CONCLUSION

The study showed that oral feedback is a valuable technique for developing the Saudi EFL students' speaking skill. There is an indication that effective oral feedback can be achieved through striking a balance between making errors clear to students and correcting them in a relevant manner that does not cause embarrassment, feat, or feelings of discomfort. On the other hand, it is shown that the students have problems with regard to oral feedback such as the timing of giving the oral feedback by the teacher and the technique of oral feedback. Furthermore, the findings showed that the students prefer the oral feedback on their errors while speaking and prefer to get immediate feedback for their oral errors

The Carefully-provided oral feedback is beneficial in helping students promote their learning of language. Specifically, oral feedback plays an important role in raising students' awareness of their linguistic problems and thus has an impact on their interlanguage systems.

Delimitations

This study is limited to the investigation of use of oral feedback in developing the speaking skills of Saudi EFL students. In particular, the practices, problems, and students' preferences of oral feedback are explored. The study focuses on Saudi male students who study English as a foreign language in the preparatory year at King Saud University, Riyadh city. The study uses the questionnaire as a data collection tool and is conducted during the second semester of the academic year 2018-2019.

Recommendations

Based on the study results, the researcher presents the below recommendations.

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

2- 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.

3- Curriculum designers, teacher-trainers and textbook writers should make use of oral feedback as means of developing students' oral skills. Teachers' books should include instructions on procedures of applying relevant oral feedback techniques and procedures.

REFERENCES

Al-Enzy, M., & Jesudas, R. (2016). Productive Oral Feedback – A Successful Tool in English Language Teaching. *IRA International Journal of Education and Multidisciplinary Studies, 4(2),* 317-322.

Aljumah, F.H. (2011). Developing Saudi EFL Students' Oral Skills: An Integrative Approach. *English Language Teaching, 4(3),* 84- 89.

Al-Saleh, N. A. (2018). *The Impact of Positive and Corrective Feedback via Showbie on Saudi Students' English Writing*. Master Thesis. Al Imam Muhammad ibn Saud Islamic University, College of Languages and Translation, Department of English Language and Literature, KSA.

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28,* 543 – 574.

Brown, H. D. (1987). Principles of Language Learning. NJ: Prentice Hall.

Byrne, D. (1986). *Teaching Oral English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carroll, S. & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15,* 357 – 386.

Carroll, S., Swain, M., & Roberge, Y. (1992). The role of feedback in adult second language acquisition: Error correction and morphological generalizations. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *13,* 173 – 198.

Cathcart, R. & Olson, J. (1979). Teachers' and Students' Preference for Correction of Classroom Conversation Errors. *TESOL, 76, 2*, 22-40.

Corder, H. D. (1973). Introducing Applied Linguistics. New York: Penguin Book Ltd.

Creme, P. and M. R. Lea. (1997). *Writing at University*. Philadelphia: Open University Press

De Bot, K. (1996). The psycholinguistics of the output hypothesis. *Language Learning, 46*, 529- 555.

Doughty , C. J . (2003). Instructed SLA: Constraints, compensation, and enhancement . In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.),*The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 256 – 310). Oxford: Blackwell.

Ellis , R. ,& Sheen , Y. (2006). Re-examining the role of recasts in L2 acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28,* 575 – 600.

Erlam, R., & Loewen, S. (2010). Implicit and Explicit Recasts in L2 Oral French Interaction. *Canadian Modern Language Review.*

Faqeih, M. (2012). The effectiveness of error correction during oral interaction: experimental studies with English L2 learners in the United Kingdom and Saudi Arabia. A published Doctoral thesis, University of York.

Ferris, D. R. (2002) *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2002). Treatment of error in second language student writing. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to Student Writing.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D. R., Chaney, S. J., Komura, K., Roberts, B. J., & McKee, S. (2000). Perspectives, problems, and practices in treating written error. In Colloquium presented at International TESOL Convention, Vancouver, B.C., and March 14–18, 2000.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (1998). Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? Journal of Second Language Writing, 10, 161–184.

Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (2008). Second Language Acquisition. An introductory course. (3rd edition.) NY: Routledge Taylor and Francis group.

Gower, R., D. Phillips & S. Walters (1995) *Teaching Practice Handbook.* Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Grami, G.M. (2005). The effect of teachers' written feedback on ESL students' perception: a study in a Saudi ESL university-level context. Annual Review of Education, Communication and Language Sciences, 2.

Kayi, H. (2006). Teaching Speaking: Activities to promote speaking in a second language. *TESOL, 6, 4*, 70-85.

Krashen, S. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. London: Longman.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.

Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. Modern Language Journal, 66, 140–149.

Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for college-level teaching. System, 25, 465–477.

Leech, G. (1994). Students' Grammar – Teachers' Grammar – Learners' Grammar in Grammar and The Language teachers, edited by Martin Bygate, Alan Tonkyn and Eddie Williams. Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.

Leeman, J. (2007). Feedback in L2 learning: Responding to errors during practice. In R. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language* (pp. 111 – 137). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leki, I. (1991). The Preference of ESL Students for Error Correction in College-level Writing Classes. *Foreign Language Annals, 24,* 180-203.

Loewen, S. (2005). Incidental focus on form and second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27* (3), 361-386.

Long, M. H. (2007). Recasts in SLA: The story so far. In M. H. Long (Ed.), *Problems in SLA* (pp. 75 – 116). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lyster , R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19,* 399 – 432.

Lyster, R.,& Rasta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37-66.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2006). Pushing the methodological boundaries in interaction research: An introduction to the special issue. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28,* 169 – 178.

Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development: An empirical study of question formation in ESL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*, 557-587.

Mackey, A. (2007). *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mustafa, R. (2012). Feedback on the Feedback: Socio-cultural Interpretation of Saudi ESL learners' opinions about writing feedback. *English Language Teaching*, *5*, (3).

Na, Z. (2003). A Study of High School Students' English Learning Anxiety. *Asian EFL Journal, 9*, (3).

Nichola, H., Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning, 51,* 719 – 758.

Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 83–93.

Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research. In J. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133 – 164). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Scott, V. M. (1996) *Rethinking Foreign Language Writing.* New York:Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Sheen , Y. (2008). Recasts, language anxiety, modified output and L2 learning . *Language Learning, 58 ,* 835 – 874.

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake . *Language Teaching Research, 11*, 361 – 392.

Vigil, N. A.,& Oller, J. W. (1976). Rule fossilization: A tentative model. *Language Learning*, 26, 281-295.

Wright, T. (1987) *Roles of Teachers & Learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Xiang, W. (2004) Encouraging self-monitoring in writing by Chinese Students, *ELT Journal,*58(3), 238-246.