Learners' Anxiety and Their Perceptions Toward Oral Corrective Feedback in ESP-Speaking Class

Roro Millatu Al Ghaniy[*]**, Mirjam Anugerahwati**
Universitas Negeri Malang, Jl. Semarang No. 5 Malang, Jawa Timur, 65145, Indonesia
*Corresponding author, Email: roromillatu@gmail.com

Abstract: This research aimed at investigating learners' anxiety levels and perceptions toward Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) in ESP-Speaking class. Survey research design was used to investigate ESP learners' anxiety levels and their perceptions toward OCF. One hundred and forty one learners were involved as the research participants. Furthermore, two closed-ended questionnaires namely Foreign Language Classrooms Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) and the learners' perceptions toward OCF were used to collect the data. The findings of this study revealed that majority of nursing learners experienced moderate anxiety level. Furthermore, majority of the learners, regardless their anxiety, perceived OCF positively.

Keywords: learners' anxiety; learners' perceptions; oral corrective feedback; ESP-Speaking

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk meneliti tingkat kecemasan dan persepsi mahasiswa terhadap Masukan Korektif Lisan *(OCF)* di kelas *ESP-Speaking*. Seratus empat puluh satu mahasiswa semester dua keperawatan dilibatkan sebagai partisipan penelitian. Selanjutnya, dua kuesioner yaitu *Foreign Language Classrooms Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)* dan persepsi mahasiswa ESP terhadap *OCF* digunakan sebagai instrumen penelitian. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa mayoritas mahasiswa keperawatan mengalami tingkat kecemasan sedang (44 persen) di kelas *ESP-Speaking.* Terkait dengan persepsi terhadap *corrective feedback* lisan, mahasiswa. sepenuhnya mendukung pemberian *corrective feedback* lisan.

Kata kunci: kecemasan mahasiswa; persepsi mahasiswa; masukan korektf lisan; kelas ESP-Speaking

1. Introduction

The interest of working in the international hospitals among Indonesian learners has been growing significantly. The data confirmed that 91% of 1,407 nursing learners have gained interest in working overseas (Efendi et al., 2020). Winning an honor to work abroad is in fact a complex process. It obviously requires Indonesian nurses to pass series of tests. Regrettably, since 1996, the passing rate of Indonesian nurses has been dismal, with only around a quarter of all applicants passing (Sismiati & Latief, 2012). This happens because the English mastery of Indonesian nurses is still low. In fact, English mastery, particularly speaking, has become one of the most important qualifications for working in the international hospitals. The results of need analysis conducted by Sismiati & Latief (2012) confirmed that the capacity to speak orally in English is one of the qualifications for graduates of nursing schools who want to work in foreign hospitals. Nevertheless, most nursing schools in Indonesia provide less speaking training during their studies. In addition, the majority of the materials taught in nursing schools emphasize reading rather than speaking.

Being aware of this phenomenon, Language Center, University of Muhammadiyah Malang has designed a course English for Specific Purposes (ESP) which includes Speaking as one of the compulsory subjects. The course is specifically designed in accordance with the learners' needs. Although the course is created based on the learners' needs, most ESP learners, however, face

serious challenges in the actual practice of learning speaking. As one of ESP lecturers in Language Center, University of Muhammadiyah Malang, the researcher herself frequently discovers that the majority of her learners have low classroom participation while joining the speaking class. This circumstance is deeply regretted since classroom participation one of the most important aspects in foreign language learning success. One of the issues that prevent learners from actively participating in speaking class is anxiety. Foreign language anxiety, according to Rodriguez & Abreu (2003) refers to situation-specific anxiety stemming from one-of-a-kind nature of formal foreign language study, particularly in low self-appraisal of communicative abilities in that language. Tanveer (2008) highlighted that when speaking in front of an audience, foreign language learners frequently experience anxiety, apprehension, and uneasiness. These feelings can negatively affect learners' communication skills in the target language as they hinder learners to speak. In line with this, Brown (2004), A. Gani et al. (2015), and Yalçın & İnceçay (2014) confirmed that learners with anxiety issues appear to have more difficulty concentrating and grasping educational goals than other learners, resulting in poor performance and achievement.

As anxiety makes it difficult for learners to concentrate, it potentially instigates them to produce errors. In speaking class, the researcher frequently detects a large number of errors in grammar, phonology, vocabulary usage, pragmatics, and discourse produced by the learners. Although errors in speaking are expected because English is not the learners' native language, these errors must be corrected. Brown and Rodgers (2002) also claimed that the learners' errors in using the target language should be corrected. One alternative that can be used in correcting learners' error in speaking is by implementing Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF). OCF is in general divided into two broad categories, namely reformulations and prompts (Lyster and Ranta, 2007 in Lyster et al., 2013). Recasts and explicit corrections are included in reformulations. Elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and repetition are all examples of prompts. The implementation of OCF in speaking instruction is crucial as it not only capable of fixing the errors but also improving learners' speaking skills.

Despite its benefits in correcting learners' errors and improving their speaking skill, prior studies have reported that providing OCF in speaking instruction is arguable. Some research showed positive attitudes towards the implementation of oral corrective feedback (Khunaivi & Hartono, 2015; Suryoputro & Amaliah, 2015; Solikhah & Surakarta, 2016). These investigations indicated that OCF can successfully reduce target language errors while also preventing fossilization. Furthermore, it provides a number of benefits for the development of speaking abilities, including increased awareness of errors, motivation to engage in conversation, grammar and pronunciation, and vocabulary. Additionally, OCF provided by the teachers can help the learners improve their speaking skills. However, it is important to emphasize that teachers should not provide feedback to learners while they are speaking, as this may interfere with their performance.

On the contrary, other previous studies showed negative views toward OCF. Ellis (2013) proved that while it is vital to correct learners, it is also considered as potentially dangerous because it might harm learners' openness to learning. In addition, Brown (2007, p. 274) stated that too much negative cognitive feedback drives learners to reduce their communication attempts, whereas too much positive feedback causes errors to go uncorrected. In parallel to this view, Calsiyao (2015) reported that over-correction of errors may damage learners' self-confidence and future performance, whereas too little or no error connection may lead learners

to believe that they did not make any mistakes while using the target language. If this happens, the errors made by the learners may persist for a long period, resulting in error fossilization. Furthermore, corrective feedback might cause learners embarrassment, anger, inhibition, and a sense of inferiority (Truscott 1999 as cited in Sa'adah et al., 2018).

Additionally, Krashen (1982, 1985) affirmed that corrective feedback has the potential to harm L2 learning by increasing anxiety, increasing affective filters, delaying the ability to assimilate comprehensible material and hence reducing L2 learning ability. In line with this, Swain and Lapkin (1995) noted that corrective feedback in oral communication classes might potentially cause anxiety if learners are ignorant of the goal of corrective feedback. However, if learners and teachers are clear about what they are doing and what the goal of corrective feedback is, it may have a beneficial impact on learners' perceptions of corrective feedback, reduce anxiety and so enhance L2 acquisition (Ellis, 2009 in Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). The prior statements lead to the conclusion that learners' anxiety in oral communication classes can be potentially raised as the result of corrective feedback employed by the teachers. Thus, doing a study on learners' anxiety and its relationship with corrective feedback is significant.

Formerly, numbers of researchers have studied about learners' language anxiety and oral corrective feedback. Zhang & Rahimi (2014) found that, independent of their level of anxiety, both groups held identical ideas about CF and greatly preferred getting frequent CF in English oral communication classes after learning about the purpose, relevance, and varieties of CF. Furthermore, Rassaei (2015) discovered that low-anxiety learners profited from both metalinguistic feedback and recasts although metalinguistic feedback had a greater impact on their progress. On the other hand, recasts benefited high-anxiety learners significantly more than metalinguistic corrective feedback. In parallel to Zhang & Rahimi (2014), the results of the study conducted by Martin & Valdivia (2017) revealed that participants in both high- and low-anxiety groups valued corrective feedback since it allowed them to improve their future speaking tasks. In addition, Fadilah et al. (2017) discovered freshman and sophomore learners agreed that the learners' errors should be treated. In addition, either freshman or sophomore learners shared similar perspectives on the types, methodologies, and providers of error correction. Moreover, a research lead by Geçkin (2020) found out that female learners experienced of higher anxiety levels than male participants. This research also found that learners saw feedback as an important part of the learning process, particularly when it came to major and individual errors, and that they rated the teacher's corrective feedback more highly. She added that teachers need to be selective in providing a feedback so that learners' anxiety can be reduced.

The previously mentioned researches clearly confirmed that there were some studies which investigated learners' anxiety and integrated it with OCF. However, they mostly focused on learners' anxiety and their beliefs on the implementation of OCF in foreign language classes (Zhang & Rahimi, 2014; Martin & Valdivia, 2017). Besides examining the learners' beliefs toward OCF, the prior studies also concentrated on examining the distinctive preferences of OCF Fadilah et al. (2017) along with its impact on learners' across their anxiety levels (Geçkin, 2020). They have not yet explored the learners' anxiety levels and their perceptions toward OCF. In fact, investigating learners' anxiety levels and their perceptions about oral corrective feedback is vital as it enables teachers in selecting effective feedbacks that suit the leaners' levels of anxiety. Consequently, by employing the appropriate feedbacks, learners will be less anxious and at the same time, their speaking skill will be improved. From the aforementioned statements, it can be

undertaken that it is significant to investigate learners' anxiety level and their perceptions towards the use of oral corrective feedback.

In general, the previous studies and the contemporary research share several things in common. First, EFL learners were involved as the context of the research (Zhang & Rahimi, 2014;Khunaivi & Hartono, 2015; Rassaei, 2015; Solikhah, 2016; Fadilah et al., 2017; Martin & Valdivia, 2017; Geçkin, 2020). Second, the learners' anxiety levels are discussed (Zhang & Rahimi, 2014; Rassaei, 2015; Martin & Valdivia, 2017; Geçkin, 2020). Nevertheless, this current research is to some extent distinctive in terms of the subject of the study. First, this research involved nursing learners who learn English for Specific Purposes (ESP) in one private university in Malang as the participants of the study. Conversely, the majority of the previous studies involved senior English department and non-English department learners who take general English course (Zhang & Rahimi, 2014; Rassaei, 2015; Fadilah et al., 2017; Sa'adah et al., 2018; Geçkin, 2020). Second, this study investigates ESP learners' anxiety level and their perceptions toward oral corrective feedback. On the other hand, the prior studies mainly examined the correlation between corrective feedback and foreign language anxiety (Rassaei, 2015), learners' preferences for oral corrective feedback (Fadilah et al., 2017) and learners' beliefs towards oral corrective feedback (Martin & Valdivia, 2017; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). Therefore, in this study, the researcher would like to explore the learners' level of anxiety and their perceptions towards oral corrective feedback.

2. Method

This study employed survey research design for a variety of reasons. First, the study's primary goal was to describe learners' perceptions. Creswell (2012, p. 376) stated that survey research is often used to describe a population's views, beliefs, habits, or attributes. He further added that survey study is useful for determining individual perspectives on policy issues as well as providing relevant data for evaluating programs in educational institutions like schools and universities. Particularly in this study, a cross-sectional survey was used to quantitatively analyze and compare learners' perceptions toward oral corrective feedback in a spoken instructional context across the different level of foreign language. In cross-sectional survey, the data are generally collected at one point in time (Creswell, 2012, p. 41). Second, this research involved a group of people selected through random sampling in collecting the data. Creswell (2012, p. 381) mentioned that random sampling is commonly used in survey research. This sampling technique necessitates the researcher selecting a sample that is representative of the population so that statements or inferences can be made about the population as a whole. Latief (2019) further affirmed that since the population involved in survey research is commonly large, random sampling technique is significantly required.

This study was conducted at University of Muhammadiyah, Malang, Indonesia. The target populations of this study were second semester EFL learners who had taken ESP course in University of Muhammadiyah Malang. There were 217 associate and undergraduate learners in Nursing Department specifically involved as the accessible population of this study. As the accessible populations were too big to get measured, the sampling procedure was then employed. The sample size for this study was calculated using the following formula based on Slovin (1960, as mentioned in Fadilah et al., 2017).

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N\,(e^2)} \tag{1}$$

Based on the previous formulae, *n* is the sample size, *N* denotes to the population size, which is 217 learners, and *e* denotes the level of significance (.05 or 5% of the current research). Using the Slovin's formula, it was discovered that 141 learners were considered as the minimal sample of this study. Close-ended questionnaires were employed to collect the data. Two closed-ended questionnaires namely Foreign Language Classrooms Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) adapted from Horwitz et al. (1986) and learners' perceptions toward OCF adapted from Katayama (2007, p. 83-85) and Zhang & Rahimi, (2014, p. 436-437) were specifically distributed to all participants in an online format via Google forms. The data gained from the questionnaires were then analyzed in many stages. As the data were in the form of learners' responses, the first step of conducting the analysis is by checking the responses of the two questionnaires that had been submitted by the learners. Next, the responses of the questionnaire measuring the level of learners' anxiety were scored using 5-point Likert Scale. Later, the learners were divided into three categories: low anxiety, moderate anxiety, and high anxiety. After measuring the levels of anxiety, the data regarding learners' perceptions toward oral corrective feedback were examined by exploring the responses from the questionnaire. After the scores from both variables were entered to the tables, they were examined using the descriptive statistics analysis. Next, the data from the two variables were quantitatively analyzed by calculating it using Statistical Package and Social Software (SPSS 22). The calculation includes the percentage of respondents answering each item provided in the questionnaires.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Results

The results of the data analysis are described in this section. It is primarily constructed in accordance with the aspects being studied namely anxiety level and perceptions toward oral corrective feedback. Specifically, the results for perceptions of oral corrective feedback are presented in four sub headings namely the necessity of oral corrective feedback, provider of oral corrective feedback, the types of errors to be corrected, and the techniques of oral corrective feedback.

3.1.1. ESP Learners' Anxiety Levels

From the responses of language anxiety questionnaire, the learners were then classified into three levels of anxiety namely (1) Low Anxiety, (2) Moderate Anxiety, and (3) High Anxiety. In order to level out the distribution, learners whose anxiety scores were below 99 were categorized as having low anxiety. Then, those whose anxiety scores were between 99-132 were classified as experiencing of moderate anxiety. Meanwhile, those whose anxiety scores were above 132 were sorted as undergoing high anxiety. As a result, 60 learners were placed in low anxiety group, 62 learners in the moderate anxiety group, and 19 learners in the high anxiety group. The whole samples (N) of this research were 141 learners major in Nursing. The distribution of ESP learners based on their anxiety levels is presented in table 1.

Table 1. ESP Learners' Distributions Regarding Their Anxiety Levels

Grade	Anxiety Levels	f	%
Freshman	Low Anxiety	60	42.6
	Moderate Anxiety	62	44.0
	High Anxiety	19	13.5
Total		141	100

In summary, the results of Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scales (FLCAS) suggest that the majority of ESP learners in Nursing department, University of Muhammadiyah Malang have low and moderate anxiety. Meanwhile, only few learners suffer from high anxiety.

3.1.2. ESP Learners' Perceptions toward Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class

In general, the results revealed that learners with low anxiety (32 percent) either agreed or disagreed with the implementation of OCF in ESP-Speaking class. Meanwhile, majority of the learners with moderate anxiety (33 percent) and high anxiety (30 percent) perceived OCF positively. In addition, the learners' perceptions were then specifically explored based on four main aspects namely, necessity of oral corrective feedback, provider of oral corrective feedback, types of errors to be corrected, and methods of oral corrective feedback.

3.1.3. Necessity of Oral Corrective Feedback

The first aspect investigated regarding ESP learners' perceptions toward oral corrective feedback in speaking class is the necessity of OCF. The data of the present study revealed there is clearly a massive agreement related to learners' willingness of receiving OCF. 58, 60, and 58 percent of the ESP learners experiencing low, moderate, and high anxiety strongly wanted their lecturers correcting the oral errors they made in speaking English. 28, 29, and 32 percent of the learners agreed if their lecturers correct their errors in speaking English. A smaller number of the learners (10 and 11 percent) neither agreed nor disagreed if the lecturers provide corrections for their errors in speaking English. Only three learners with low anxiety level showed their disagreement regarding oral corrective feedback. The previous results proved that majority of ESP learners regardless their anxiety levels willingly received OCF whenever they made errors in speaking instruction. This means that the learners perceived OCF as an imperative aspect in the process of learning ESP-Speaking.

3.1.4. Types of Errors to be Corrected

The second aspect studied regarding the ESP learners' perceptions toward OCF is the type of errors to be corrected. The data reported that majority of ESP learners desired their lecturers to correct all oral errors they made when speaking English. There were 40, 60, and 79 percent of the ESP learners across their anxiety levels strongly agreed to receive corrections for all errors they made in speaking English. 42 and 29 percent of the learners with low and moderate anxiety levels agreed if all of their errors in speaking English were corrected. Only a few numbers of learners with high level of anxiety (5 percent) agreed to receive corrective feedback for overall errors they made in speaking English. In addition, 15, 11, and 16 percent learners with neither agreed nor disagreed if teachers correct the whole errors they produced in speaking English. Meanwhile, there were merely three percent learners disagreed to receive corrective feedback for the entire oral errors they made.

Furthermore, although the learners eagerly received corrective feedback for all oral errors in speaking, they correspondingly wanted to obtain corrective feedback in the certain domains such as grammar, phonology, vocabulary usage, pragmatics, and discourse. The data revealed that 43 percent of low anxiety learners and 37 percent of moderate and high anxiety learners wanted their grammar errors to be sometimes corrected. For phonological errors, a huge number of learners (50, 42, and 47 percent) wanted their errors in pronunciation, accent, and intonation to be sometimes corrected. For errors in vocabulary usage, a massive number of learners (42 percent) with all levels of language anxiety wanted their vocabulary usage errors

to be sometimes corrected. Furthermore, a huge number of learners (53, 44, and 37 percent) sometimes wanted to receive correction for the use of inappropriate expression in speaking. Lastly, for discourse errors, numerous learners (53, 48, and 42 percent) despite their anxiety levels sometimes wanted to receive corrections for their errors in discourse.

3.1.5. Provider of Oral Corrective Feedback

The third aspect studied in the perceptions of ESP learners about oral corrective feedback is the provider of oral corrective feedback. The data revealed that most ESP learners with low, moderate, and high anxiety levels (40, 32, and 26 percent) valued peers-correction. 28, 31, and 32 percent of the learners neither agreed nor disagreed to peers-correction. Next, 17, 26, and 37 percent of the learners strongly agreed to receive corrections from their peers. A smaller number of the learners showed their disagreement to the item. Exactly 7 and 8 percent of learners disagreed to receive correction from peers, while 8, 3, and 5 percent of the learners with low, moderate, high anxiety levels strongly showed their objection toward peers-correction.

3.1.6. Types of Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques

The learners' perceptions for oral corrective feedback techniques are the final part being investigated. The data reported that 17, 29, and 11 percent of ESP learners with low, moderate, and high anxiety levels rated recast very effective. Moreover, correcting oral errors using explicit correction was rated very effective by majority of ESP learners (57, 65, and 58 percent). Furthermore, elicitation was rated very effective by 27, 37, and 21 percent of ESP learners with low, moderate, and high anxiety levels. Next, clarification request was rated very effective by 23, 29, and 11 percent of the learners. Finally, repetition in which the teachers emphasize the learners' errors by changing his/her voice was rated very effective by 17 and 26 percent of the ESP learners with low, moderate, and high anxiety. 15, 16, and 21 percent of the learners valued repetition effective.

3.2. Discussion

The purpose of this section is to discuss the research findings by comparing them with the findings by of prior studies and related literature. It is organized mostly in accordance with the aspects being studied namely, ESP learners' anxiety levels and their perceptions toward oral corrective feedback. Particularly for learners' perceptions of oral corrective feedback, the discussion is divided into several aspects such as the necessity of oral corrective feedback, provider of oral corrective feedback, types of errors to be corrected, and techniques of oral corrective feedback.

3.2.1. ESP Learners' Anxiety Levels

The findings of this research revealed that 42.6 percent (60 learners) had a low level of speaking anxiety, 44 percent (62 learners) encountered moderate level of speaking anxiety, and 13.5 percent (19 learners) experienced high level of anxiety. The levels of anxiety reported in this study are consistent with the findings of Erdiana et al. (2020) and Luo et al. (2020) investigations among EFL learners. Erdiana et al. (2020) reported that majority of EFL learners (59 percent) experienced moderate anxiety. This means that those learners gained anxiety score between 99 and 132. Luo (2014), like Erdiana et al. (2020), stated that the majority of EFL learners in China had moderate anxiety. Those learners also scored between 99 and 132 on the anxiety scale.

Moreover, although the majority of the learners experienced moderate anxiety, their scores regarding the levels of anxiety are different to one another. The different levels of anxiety scores generally rely on the circumstances that make them anxious while joining the speaking class. Zhipping and Paramasivam (2013) as cited in Erdiana et al. (2020) affirmed that learners experience anxiety when speaking English in certain situations, one of which is when they are shy to speak in front of a large group of people and are afraid of negative evaluation or comment from teachers and their peers. ESP learners, in particular, experienced anxiety when speaking English without preparation, which was compounded by other factors such as fear of communicating in front of their peers, nervousness, self-comparison, fear of making mistakes or performing incapability, and fear of failing the test in this study.

3.2.2. ESP Learners' Perceptions toward Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class

In general, the results of the survey revealed that the majority of learners with low, moderate, and high anxiety viewed OCF positively. The discussion of the learners' perceptions toward OCF is then specifically alienated into three aspects, namely the necessity of oral corrective feedback, the provider of oral corrective feedback, types of errors to be corrected and preferred oral corrective feedback techniques.

3.2.3. Necessity of Oral Corrective Feedback

The findings from revealed that the entire learners despite their anxiety levels strongly wanted their lecturers to correct the oral errors they made in speaking English. The learners' positive perceptions toward oral corrective feedback in the current study are constant with the results of the studies amid EFL learners lead by Katayama (2007), Zhang & Rahimi (2014), Martin & Valdivia (2017), and Fadilah et al. (2017). The result of the study conducted by Katayama (2017) revealed that 92.8 percent of the learners mostly agreed to receive corrective feedback for their speaking errors. In line with this, Zhang & Rahimi (2014) discovered that majority of EFL learners regardless their anxiety levels were in favor of receiving corrective feedback in oral communication classes. Furthermore, Martin & Valdivia (2017) similarly discovered that a greatest number of the learners in the low and high anxiety groups (100 and 88 percent, respectively) responded "strongly agree" or "agree" for the statement "I want to receive corrective feedback when I make mistakes". Finally, Fadilah et al. (2017) likewise discovered that, despite their anxiety levels, the majority of freshmen and sophomore learners had a positive attitude toward corrective feedback, particularly oral input. None of the learners rejected corrective feedback.

One obvious explanation why EFL learners apart of their anxiety levels predominantly showed favorable attitudes toward oral corrective feedback is because it offers numerous benefits especially for the improvement of the speaking skill. The result of the study conducted by Katayama (2007) proved that providing corrective feedback to learners improves their accuracy in speaking foreign language. He also added that error correction is capable of raising learners' awareness of their errors. Moreover, error correction in general can help learners in learning foreign language.

3.2.4. Types of Errors to be Corrected

The types of errors in particular are divided into two categories, namely (1) errors from the point of communication, and (2) errors from several domains such as grammar, phonology, vocabulary usage, pragmatics, and discourse. In the case of errors to be corrected from the point

of communication, a huge number of ESP learners experienced low, moderate, and high anxiety agreed that "teachers should correct all oral errors that leaners make in speaking English." The finding of this study is coherent with the prior research result (Katayama, 2007, Tomczyk, 2013, and Fadilah et al., 2017) in which over half of the learners regardless their levels of anxiety still preferred to receive teacher feedback for all oral errors they made in speaking English. The positive attitude shown by the learners toward overall errors correction might be because this type of correction can improve their accuracy in speaking English. Besides, the correction of all errors is able to help learners in learning the target language. It is also capable of assisting learners to avoid repeating the same errors and enhance their language awareness. The prior statement confirmed the results of the studies conducted by Kim (2004); Li (2010), and Sheen & Ellis (2011). These studies proved that corrective feedback could assist the learners recognize inconsistencies in their interlanguage system and the target language. As a result, providing corrective feedback to learners can help them become more aware of the verbal errors they make when speaking English.

Furthermore, in the case of errors from several domains to be corrected a massive numbers of learners regardless their anxiety levels agreed to have their errors in grammar, phonology, vocabulary usage, pragmatics, and discourse to be sometimes corrected. These findings were surprisingly in contrast with the results of the previous studies conducted by Katayama (2007) and Fadilah et al. (2017). The contrast results between the present and the prior studies were generally caused by the diverse preferences among learners toward the frequency of receiving corrective feedback for the previous types of errors. While in other studies the majority of the learners wanted their teachers to always correct their errors in those five domains, in this research, however, the learners mostly preferred the teachers to sometimes correct those errors.

A huge preference to sometimes receive corrective feedback might be instigated by several reasons. First, the learners might feel uncomfortable whenever their errors were always corrected. Over-correction to the errors can be confusing and also potentially makes learners to feel inferior. If this continually happens, the learners will be unwilling to speak English and consequently their speaking skill will not be improved significantly. Other reasons why the learners were not in favor if their errors in the aforementioned domains always received corrections was because first it was not that necessary. They preferred to get teachers' correction on the errors that significantly inhibit the process of communication. In other words, if the errors in each of those domains did not delay the communication process, then it was not that compulsory to correct the errors.

3.2.5. Provider of Oral Corrective Feedback

The third aspect investigated concerning oral corrective feedback perceptions is its provider. According to the findings of a recent study, most of ESP learners major in nursing showed positive attitudes toward peer-corrections. There were 40 percent of low anxiety learners, 32 of moderate anxiety learners, and 26 percent of high anxiety learners were in favor of peer-correction. The findings of this research were consistent with the results from the previous studies (Katayama, 2017; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014, Fadilah et al., 2017, and Martin & Valdivia, 2017). Based on the results of Katayama (2007), it was discovered that there were significant number of learners (63 percent) who either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "I want my classmates to correct my oral errors in group work". Another study lead by Zhang & Rahimi (2014) revealed that number of learners with high anxiety (M=3.76) and low

anxiety (*M*=3.82) agreed to have peer-correction. Moreover, the finding of the study done by Fadilah et al. (2017) exposed that despite teachers' correction was highly preferred, the learners also viewed peer-correction positively. Martin & Valdivia (2017) also reported that a significant number of high anxiety (*M*=3.13) and low anxiety (*M*=3.15) learners positively viewed peer correction.

3.2.6. Types of Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques

The fourth aspect being discussed regarding oral corrective feedback is learners' perceptions toward the implementation of each type of oral corrective feedback techniques. The types of oral correction in this study are divided into five, namely: (1) recast, (2) explicit corrections, (3) elicitation, (4) clarification request, and (5) repetition.

According to the findings of the current study, ESP learners with low, moderate, and high anxiety generally viewed explicit correction as the most effective technique in correcting the oral errors. To be précised, there were 57, 65, and 58 percent of the learners experiencing low, moderate, and high levels of anxiety agreed that explicit corrections are very operative in fixing the verbal errors while speaking English. This result was consistent with the discoveries of the previous studies (Katayama, 2007; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014, Asnawi et al. 2017; Martin & Valdivia, 2017). Katayama (2007) proved that correcting errors using explicit feedback could assist learners in recognizing the errors and doing self-correction. This finding is consistent with Asnawi et al. (2017) who also indicated that providing explicit correction can help learners in comprehending errors and making the appropriate corrections. According to Ellis (2009), Ur (2006), and (Martin & Valdivia, 2017; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014) Maolida (2013), providing clear and visible feedback can help learners in noticing and correcting their errors. In addition, explicit feedback also had positive impacts in lowering their anxiety in speaking English (Martin & Valdivia, 2017; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014).

In the context of ESP-Speaking, the highest percentage of the learners choosing explicit correction was basically influenced by their English proficiency. Based on the researcher's observation, ESP learners major in nursing were generally in the beginner to lower-intermediate levels. Numerous nursing learners experience difficulties in speaking and understanding what other people say in English. Because of this matter, giving implicit correction would not work effectively as the learners found it tough to notice and identify the errors. When the learners hardly comprehend the teachers' corrections, they cannot revise their errors right away. If this continually happens, not only the learners' errors cannot be corrected but also their motivation and self-confidence in speaking English can be affected. Therefore, providing clear, explicit and noticeable corrective feedback would be effective in correcting the errors as learners were able to get the point of the corrective feedback and correct errors immediately.

4. Conclusion

The present study aimed at investigating ESP learners' anxiety levels and their perceptions toward Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) in speaking instruction. Specifically, the exploration of learners' perceptions toward OCF was divided into several aspects, namely: (1) the necessity of OCF, (2) types of errors to be corrected, (3) provider of OCF, and (4) techniques of OCF.

Regarding the first question about the ESP learners' anxiety levels in speaking instruction, a massive number of the learners (62) experienced moderate levels of anxiety. A smaller number of learners (60) encountered low levels of anxiety while 19 learners underwent high levels of anxiety. The classification of learners' anxiety levels was basically in accordance with Debreli & Demirkan (2016). They affirmed that learners whose average anxiety scores are <99 faced low anxiety levels. Those whose average anxiety scores are 99 to 132 suffered moderate anxiety levels while those whose average anxiety scores are >132 encountered high anxiety levels.

Concerning the second research question about ESP learners' perceptions toward OCF, the learners experiencing low, moderate, and high anxiety levels viewed that OCF was essential in correcting their errors in speaking instruction. To be specific, 58, 60, and 58 percent of learners with low, moderate, and high levels of anxiety wanted their teachers to fix their errors in speaking English. The learners mostly showed favorable attitude toward OCF was mainly because it offered numerous benefits. According to Katayama (2007), corrective feedback is essential in assisting learners to improve their accuracy in speaking foreign language. This feedback is also capable of raising learners' awareness of their errors. Furthermore, giving corrective feedback generally helps learners learning foreign language.

In terms of the types of errors to be corrected, notwithstanding their anxiety levels, the majority of ESP learners agreed that the lecturers should correct all errors they made in speaking class. Precisely 40, 60, and 79 percent of learners experiencing low, moderate, and high anxiety levels agreed to the statement that "lecturers should correct all oral errors that learners make in speaking English." This finding was in line with the studies conducted by Katayama (2007), Tomczyk (2013) and Fadilah et al. (2017). The positive views shown by the learners regarding the aforementioned statement was because they believed that overall correction was able to help them improving their accuracy, raising their awareness toward the errors as well as learning the target language. Consistently, Kim (2004), Li (2010), and Sheen & Ellis (2011) reported that overall correction is capable of assisting learners to recognize inconsistency between their interlanguage system and the target language.

ESP learners wanted their errors in multiple domains to be corrected, in addition to receiving corrective feedback for their overall errors. The findings of the present study reported that learners wanted the grammar, phonology, vocabulary usage, pragmatics, and discourse errors to be corrected on occasion, independent of their anxiety levels. This finding was in contrast with the prior studies lead by Katayama (2007) and Fadilah et al. (2017). The results of the previous researches reported that despite their anxiety levels, the learners strongly agreed if their grammatical, phonological, lexical, and pragmatics errors to be frequently corrected. These differences were quite common among researches. This was particularly due to the fact that the learners had their diverse preferences toward the errors that should be mostly corrected. Besides, frequently correcting errors in those domains might lead to over-correction that can potentially make learners uncomfortable and confused. In line with this statement, Krashen (1982, 1985) discovered that corrective feedback can be harmful in L2 learning as it is capable of raising L2 anxiety, increasing affective filters, deterring ability to process intelligible data, and subsequently decreasing L2 learning ability. In addition, Krashen (1998) affirmed that corrective feedback can potentially hinder the acquisition as it triggers anxiety, increase the affective filter and restrain L2 learning.

Furthermore, for the provider of OCF, the learners showed positive attitudes toward peer-corrections. Exactly 40, 32, and 26 percent of low to high anxiety ESP learners were agreed to receive corrections from their peers when they made oral errors in speaking English. This finding was in consistent with the prior studies conducted by Fadilah et al. (2017), Martin & Valdivia (2017), Zhang & Rahimi (2014), and Katayama (2007). The learners mostly valued peer-correction positively since it is capable of improving their ability in recognizing errors (Cohen, 1975, p. 419 in Katayama, 2007). Besides assisting learners in recognizing the errors, peer-correction is able to provide a positive feeling and advantages for subsequent learning (Tsang & Tsai, 2007). However, it should be noted that the peers who give corrections have sufficient knowledge in linguistics. According to Ellis (2009, p. 7), peer-correction works effectively if the learners have sufficient knowledge in linguistics system such as errors recognition, identification of errors, and correction of errors.

Moreover, regarding the types of OCF techniques, a massive number of the ESP learners across their anxiety levels viewed explicit correction as the most effective technique to correct learners' errors. In addition, elicitation was the second preferable technique in this study. Elicitation generally requires learners to complete the sentence that contain errors. Implementing this type of technique is able to help learners noticing that they make errors and directly revising them. Next, recast was the third favorable technique to correct learners' errors in speaking. This technique is applied by repeating the learners' utterances in the correct form without pointing out their errors directly. By doing this, learners can notice their errors and revise them with the correct form. On the other hand, clarification request and repetition were the least favorable technique in this study. The two techniques are in general more implicit compared to the prior three techniques. As these techniques focus on giving learners with implicit correction, they might have a difficult time to understand the corrective feedback given using clarification request and repetition. When the technique of corrective feedback is hard to comprehend, it might trigger learners' anxiety. They can feel inferior as they are not capable of identifying and correcting the errors right away. The previous statements probably became the main reasons why most of the learners were not in favor of receiving corrective feedback using clarification request and repetition techniques.

In accordance with the results of this study, several implications are proposed. First, mastering English speaking skill for Indonesian nurses is especially important as it is capable of enlarging their opportunities to work in the international hospitals. However, because English is not spoken as a first language in our nation, learning to speak is exceptionally difficult. Since it is difficult, lots of EFL learners often feel anxious to utter ideas and thoughts in English. This feeling of anxiety can potentially trigger learners to make verbal errors. However, in order to avoid fossilization and improve learners' speaking abilities, these errors should be addressed. Second, although correcting oral errors in grammar, phonology, vocabulary usage, pragmatics, and discourse is necessary, the lecturers however do not need to frequently give corrective feedback to the learners. This is because always correcting learners' errors in the aforementioned domains could make the learners feel inferior and think that they kept messing up with their speaking. As a consequence, the learners are unwilling to speak and their anxiety increases. Instead of correcting errors in those domains, the lecturers can select which errors that significantly interfere with the process of communication. Third, as giving corrective feedback can raise learners' anxiety, the lecturers need to apply the appropriate techniques in giving corrections based on the learners' anxiety levels. This can be executed by firstly identifying the learners' anxiety levels and secondly exploring their perceptions toward the

techniques of corrective feedback using instruments like questionnaires, interviews, and observations. It's important to remember that language learning is a complex and continuing process, so teachers cannot expect their corrective feedback to immediately improve learners' speaking skills. In fact, improvement takes time and it needs consistent feedback to achieve it. Besides feedback, the lecturers also need to provide chances for learners to practice the correct forms so that their speaking skill can be significantly improved and those forms can be a part of their inter language system.

References

Asnawi., Zulfikar, T., Astila, I. (2017). Students' perception of oral corrective feedback in speaking classes. *English Education Journal* (EEJ), 8(3), 275-291.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principle and classroom practice*. New York: Pearson Education.

Brown, J. D., & Rodgers, T. S. (2002). *Doing Second Language Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Calsiyao, I. S. (2015). Corrective feedback in classroom oral errors among Kalinga-Apayo State College students. *International Journal of Science and Humanities Research*, 3(1), 394-400.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research - 4th Edition*. Boston: Pearson.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3-18.

Erdiana, N., Daud, B., Sari, D. F., & Dwitami, S. K. 2020. A Study of Anxiety Experienced by EFL Students in Speaking Performance. *Studies in English Language and Education*. 7 (2), 334-346.

Fadilah, A. E., Anugerahwati, M., & Prayogo, J. A. (2017). EFL students' preferences for oral corrective feedback in speaking instruction. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 5(2), 76-87.

Gani, S. A., Fajrina, D., & Hanifa, R. (2015). Students' learning strategies for developing speaking ability. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 2(1), 16-28.

Geçkin, V. (2020). Do gender differences affect foreign language anxiety and preferences for oral corrective feedback?. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, 13(3), 591-608.

Horwitz, E., Horwitz, B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70, 125-132.

Khunaivi, H., & Hartono, R. (2015). Teacher's and student's perceptions of corrective feedback in teaching speaking. *English Education Journal*, 5(2), 14-20.

Katayama, A. (2007). Students' perceptions toward corrective feedback to oral errors. *Asian EFL Journal*, 70, 125-132.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications, New York, NY: Longman.

Luo, H. (2014). Foreign language anxiety: A study of Chinese language learners. *Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages*, 15, 99-117.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19 (1), 37-66.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46, 1-40.

Maolida, E. H. (2013). A descriptive study of teacher's oral corrective feedback in an ESL young learners classroom in Indonesia. *K@ta*, 15(2), 117-124.

Martin, S., & Valdivia, I. M. (2017). Students' feedback beliefs and anxiety in online foreign language oral tasks. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 14(18), 1-15.

Rassaei, E. (2015). Oral corrective feedback, foreign language anxiety and L2 development. *System* 49, 98-109.

Rodríguez, M. & Abreu, O. (2003). The stability of general foreign language classroom anxiety across English and French. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 365-374.

Sa'adah, L., Nurkamto, J., & Suparno. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: Exploring the relationship between teacher's strategy and students' willingness to communicate. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(2), 240-252.

Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning.* New York, NY: Springer.

Sismiati & Latief, M. A. (2012). Developing instructional materials of English oral communication for nursing schools. *TEFLIN Journal*, 23 (1), 44-59.

Solikhah, I. (2016). Oral corrective feedback in speaking class of English department. *Lingua*, 13(1), 87-102.

Suryoputro, G., & Amaliah, A. (2016). EFL students' responses on oral corrective feedbacks and uptakes in speaking class. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(5), 73-80.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: a step towards second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 16, 635-641.

Tanveer, M. (2007). Investigation of the factors that cause language anxiety for ESL/EFL learners in learning speaking skills and the influence it casts on communication in the target language. Scotland: University of Glasgow. Unpublished PhD dissertation, 5, 1-3.

Tomczyk, E. (2013) Perceptions of oral error correction on learners' abilityto write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 255-272.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 255-272.

Yalçin & İnceçay (2014). Foreign language speaking anxiety: The case of spontaneous speaking activities. *Procedia-Social and Behaviorial Science*, 116, 2620-2624.

Zhang, L. J., & Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes. *System*, 42, 429-439.

Zhipping, D., & Paramasivam, S. (2013). Anxiety of speaking English in class among international students in a Malaysian university. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(11), 1-16.