Journal of Language Pedagogy and Innovative Applied Linguistics
December 2025, Volume 3, No. 2, pp: 45-55
ISSN: 2995-6854

Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback to the Speaking Proficiency of ESL Students

Rahima A. Cabunto[1], Glyn G. Magbanua[2]
Principal author, University of Southern Mindanao, Philippines[1]
Corresponding author, University of Southern Mindanao, Philippines[2]

Abstract
The study sought to determine the effectiveness of explicit corrective feedback on the speaking proficiency of ESL students. To answer this, a quasi-experimental pre-test post-test non-equivalent group design was employed, with two sections of AB English students from the University of Southern Mindanao assigned to control (n=28) and experimental (n=37) groups. In assessing each group's proficiency in the pre-test and post-test, the study used English Score, a free mobile application developed by the British Council. The experimental group received 10 corrective feedback sessions to address speaking errors the respondents committed in the classroom. The data gathered in this study was analysed using t-tests and Mann Whitney U test. Results indicate that corrective feedback is effective, with participants in the experimental group showing significant improvement compared to the control group after the intervention. However, the degree of improvement observed in the experimental group was only comparable to that demonstrated by the control group.
Key Words: *Corrective Feedback, ESL, speaking proficiency, quasi-experimental, control group, experimental group.*

Paper/Article Info

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Magbanua, G., & Cabunto, R. (2025). Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback to the Speaking Proficiency of ESL Students. Journal of Language Pedagogy and Innovative Applied Linguistics, 3(2), 45-55. https://doi.org/10.1997/2qvnvr35

** Corresponding Author*
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1997/2qvnvr35

Arizona, USA

Introduction

In the Philippines, English serves as the second language (L2), and the ability to express oneself effectively in a second language is deemed vital yet challenging for language learners, as it necessitates mastery of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and coherence. According to Separa et al. (2020), most English as a second language (ESL) learners encounter significant difficulties in articulating their views and perspectives due to their poor grammar competence, anxiety, lack of vocabulary, and inadequate exposure to spoken English. Despite several years of instruction in English, a number of students still struggle to express themselves effectively. Nurmiati (2017) pointed out that students may encounter difficulties in acquiring proficiency in speaking L2, resulting errors in their language use. Thus, in the classroom, teachers must provide feedback to help students correct their errors. It is one of their responsibilities as a language teacher to assist students in developing oral skills so that they can express themselves clearly and effectively in the target language (Jeyasala, 2014).

Corrective feedback (CF), described by researchers and scholars as the provision of information to rectify learners' errors, has been recognized as a potentially effective method for enhancing both writing and speaking proficiency among learners, particularly in terms of grammar. As Khunaivi and Hartono (2015) stated, the feedback provided by teachers could be seen as a valuable input for students to enhance their English Language Proficiency (ELP). It can be provided in oral or written form and includes various types, including positive, negative, immediate, delayed, explicit, and implicit (Tesnim, 2019). If ESL learners receive no feedback from their teacher, they may become confused and accept errors as correct, which can lead to a phenomenon called fossilization. However, the beneficial effect of CF as a method for teaching language has been a topic of debate among researchers, and the extent to which it can improve learners' speaking proficiency is still unclear (Magbanua & Provida, 2023).

Over a period of four decades, studies about the ineffectiveness of CF continue to be published. In the 1980s through his Input Hypothesis, Krashen (1982,1985) denied any identified beneficial effects of CF on Second Language Acquisition (SLA). He contended that CF is not only ineffective but also possibly detrimental because it blocks the flow of speech that may give understandable input. Also, according to him, no amount of CF can compensate for a lack of motivation to learn the language. Aside from Krashen, Truscott (1996) conducted an analysis of three studies and concluded that correcting errors was ineffective, and should not be used in language learning. He argued that improving learner's proficiency is a complex process, and simply correcting their errors is akin to transferring information. Learning a language in this sense oversimplifies the learning process and assumes that students passively receive and absorb all information provided by a teacher. Zilberman (2023) also provided backing to this perspective. In his article, he argued that simply understanding errors is not enough to guarantee error-free communication in the future. He claimed that recognizing and repairing errors made in spontaneous communication requires different cognitive processes. Even if students can recognize their errors, they might not yet have the automaticity to avoid making them in subsequent communication.

Since the last decade however, research results have taken an interesting turn towards the opposite. Among these are Ahmad et al. (2013) whose findings indicated a close relationship between corrective feedback and academic achievement of students in secondary schools citing higher examination scores and deeper understanding of concepts among other positive results of CF. Similar results were noted by Mahmoud (2018), citing remarkable effects, in a meta-analysis of seven theses and 20 research papers exploring the effects of CF on ESL students' motivation, achievement and performance. Patra et al. (2022) likewise found out in an experimental study conducted among 76 students that corrective feedback positively affected the academic performance of students.

To shed light on the contrasting results of studies on the effect of corrective feedback to the communication skills of the students, this study aimed to determine the effectiveness of explicit corrective feedback (ECF) on the speaking proficiency of AB English students. To achieve this, the study determined the speaking proficiency of participants in both the control and experimental groups in the pre-test and post-test. Secondly, it measured the difference in speaking proficiency between both groups before and after the intervention. Lastly, it measured the mean difference between the pre-test and post-test means of both groups to identify the overall speaking achievement of the experimental group.

The findings of this study can contribute to the prevailing debate regarding CF's effectiveness in language acquisition, especially in terms of improving learners' speaking proficiency. Ultimately, the study's significance lies in its potential to contribute to the development of language teaching pedagogy, which can ultimately benefit language learners in their quest to achieve proficiency in a second language.

Theoretical Framework

This study drew upon the Output Hypothesis proposed by Swain (1985), and the Scaffolding theory proposed by Vygotsky (1930).

The Output Hypothesis of Swain (1985) posits that language production, or output, plays a crucial role in language acquisition. It suggests that through output, learners are able to notice gaps in their own knowledge and make adjustments to improve their language proficiency. In the context of language learning, this theory emphasizes the importance of actively engaging in speaking activities to develop a deeper understanding of the language.

Building upon the Output Hypothesis, Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of scaffolding provides a framework that supports learners in their language development. This theory is related to the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and it posits that students will learn quickly when collaborating with others who have a wider range of skills and knowledge than they currently have. These individuals often referred to as the "scaffolders." According to Yetman (2020), ZPD represents the gap between learners' current language proficiency and their potential to acquire higher-level language skills. By providing appropriate support and challenges within their ZPD, instructors can help students progress in their language development especially on grammar. As (Gottsäter, 2018) said, scaffolding enables students to understand grammatical structures they did not understand before.

As the ESL learners actively engage in speaking activities provided in the classroom, instructors can identify their ZPD and provide tailored support and challenges to help them bridge the gap between their current proficiency and their potential for higher-level language skills. This may involve providing corrective feedback (Saito, 2013), designing language tasks that suit individual learners' needs, and fostering collaborative learning environments

When CF is integrated within the scaffolding process, students' language output can be reinforced as they become aware of gaps in their language production. Through the guidance and support provided by scaffolders, learners can actively adjust their language output based on the feedback received, leading to improvements in their speaking proficiency.

Methodology

The study utilized a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest non-equivalent comparison group design with two groups of ABEnglish students who have been pre-assigned to their respective sections, as respondents. To eliminate potential bias, the researcher drew lots in order to determine the control and experimental groups. Prior to the intervention, the respondents in both the control and experimental groups were provided with an orientation about the study and were asked to sign an informed consent. Although all of the students became part of the intervention, only the data from those who voluntarily signed up for the study were gathered and analyzed.

The respondents were then individually guided to take the pre-test using their mobile phones. Screenshots of the results were kept for documentation. To protect the respondents' identities, individual results were kept confidential and only a summary of the groups' performance was published.

Lessons during the sessions were designed to maximize opportunities for oral interaction among the participants. Among the activities incorporated were group discussions, oral presentations, and interactive question-and-answer sessions during lesson discussions. Participants' errors during these activities were observed, documented by the researcher, and submitted to the teacher for explicit oral correction according to the conditions set in the implementation of CF (Ellis, 2009).

After the sessions, both groups took the same speaking proficiency test (Post-test) to determine whether the intervention improved their performance and whether the experimental group performed more significantly than the control group. The same process and condition during pre-test was followed. The confidentiality of the participants was upheld, and the results were presented in aggregate form to protect their privacy.

In analysing the gathered data, this study used paired t-tests, independent t-tests, and Mann Whitney U test. Paired t-tests were used to determine the difference between the speaking proficiency of both experimental and control groups before and after the intervention. On

the other hand, independent t-tests were used to measure the difference between the average pre-test score of the control group and the experimental group. It was also used to assess the difference between their overall pre-test post-test mean score while Mann Whitney U test was employed to compare the mean of post-test score of both group to determine if the intervention was effective. The level of significance was set at $\alpha = 0.05$ to determine statistical significance.

Results and Discussion

Control Group Proficiency Level before the Intervention. After thoroughly analyzing the speaking proficiency of the control group before the intervention, it was found that 15 out of 28 participants (53.57%) attained a B1 ranking or Intermediate level (300-399), 6 (21.43%) reached a B2 ranking or Upper Intermediate (400-499), 4 (14.29%) were classified as A1 beginners (100-199), and 3 (10.71%) fell into the A2 Elementary level category.

As illustrated in Table 1, the majority of participants exhibited a B1 level of proficiency. According to the CEFR, learners at this level can comprehend the main ideas of familiar interactions encountered in various contexts such as school, work, and leisure. Additionally, learners at this proficiency level can produce simple, interconnected texts on topics of personal interest.

Considering that English is a second language in the Philippines, B1 level proficiency, however, according to Magbanua and Provida (2023), is quite low compared to the expected proficiency for ESL learners especially college students majoring in English who already are at their final year in the academe. Their claim aligns with an earlier result of a study conducted by Gabriel (2018) which found out a lower-than-expected performance in English among Teacher Education students in a higher education institution in the Philippines. The result of the present study likewise aligns with the statement of Tan (2018) citing that Filipino graduates on the average, fall short of their expected proficiency level in the CEFR, where A1 represents primary users, and C2 represents proficient users. This implies that the majority of Filipino students, including those majoring in English, are at a low level of proficiency (Gabriel, 2018). Thus, it is considered that before the intervention, majority of subjects in the control group had a low level of proficiency.

On the other hand, 21.43% of participants attained a B2 proficiency level, which is considered adequate for tertiary-level students. B2, classified as the upper intermediate level of English in the CEFR. At this level, learners can confidently assert, "I am a proficient English speaker." At this stage, students can function independently in diverse academic and professional environments in English.

However, an alarming result was that there were 7 (25%) who were at the Elementary (A2) and Beginner (A1) levels. Kurtz (2023) explained that A1 and A2 both represent basic users of English. They typically have a limited vocabulary and understanding of grammar, and they tend to use simple sentence structures and basic language functions to communicate. However, those students who were at the A2 level of proficiency are slightly more advanced than A1. At this level, learners are still relying on basic familiar and personal subject matter to assist with language understanding and production while at the A1 level, learners typically use isolated and formulaic phrases. Also, they use pausing and rephrasing only occasionally.

Table 1. Speaking proficiency of the control group before the intervention

Level	Frequency (n=28)	Percent (%)
Advanced (C1)	0	0.00
Upper Intermediate (B2)	6	21.43
Intermediate (B1)	15	53.57
Elementary (A2)	3	10.71
Beginner (A1)	4	14.29
Mean	335.61	
Level	Intermediate (B1)	

Experimental Group's Proficiency Level before the Intervention. As observed in Table 2, the mean average of the experimental group before the intervention (335.62) was almost the same as the mean average of the control group (335.61). Twenty one (56.76%) out of 37 respondents reached the B1 level, 10 (27.02%) acquired the A2 level, and 6 (16.22%) were at the B2 level.

As presented, majority of the participants' proficiency were also at B1 level. These participants cannot produce language for long stretches of time without pausing to rephrase or search for expressions or vocabulary (Kurtz, 2023). Considering that only 6 (16.22%) reached the upper-intermediate level, this implies that just a few participants were confident when speaking, and the majority were still striving to produce longer utterances.

Furthermore, 10 (27.02%) of participants were classified as basic users. They could only communicate in simple way with basic words and phrases (Kurtz, 2023). This suggests that these participants were

struggling to express their thoughts clearly and in a more complex way. Also, they just possessed limited vocabulary and grammar knowledge, thereby impacting their fluency and communication. This low proficiency level is particularly concerning for tertiary AB English students.

Morallo (2018) compared the English-speaking proficiency of Filipino and Thai students and observed that the English-speaking skills of Filipino college graduates is lower than the proficiency target set for high school students in Thailand. The result was confirmed by Tan (2018) when he explained that the level of English-speaking skills of Filipino college graduates was at B1, lower than the B2 target for Thai high school graduates. An alarming aspect of Tan's study was that graduates of Bachelor of Science in Education majoring in English, who participated in the research, scored comparably to proficiency levels of Grade 2 and Grade 5 students in the United Kingdom and United States. Considering that the participants of this study were also graduating English major students, the result of their performance means their oral performance in English is poor, similar to Pascua's findings in 2019 where the participants in the experimental group had poor English proficiency at the beginning of their study.

Table 2. Speaking proficiency of the experimental group before the intervention

Level	Frequency (n=37)	Percent (%)
Advanced (C1)	0	0.00
Upper Intermediate (B2)	6	16.22
Intermediate (B1)	21	56.76
Elementary (A2)	10	27.02
Beginner (A1)	0	0.00
Mean	335.62	
Level	Intermediate (B1)	

Control Group's Proficiency Level after the Intervention. As shown in Table 3, significant insights emerge regarding the scores of the control group. One participant (3.57%) reached the advanced level of proficiency. However, the majority of participants, 15 (53.57%), remained at the B1 level. Additionally, 7 participants (25%) moved to the upper-intermediate level, while 4 (14.28%) stayed at the A1 level, and 1 participant (3.57%) was categorized as A2.

The mean average increased from 335.61 to 370.00. This result suggests that despite the absence of assistance or treatment for control group, there was still improvement in their speaking proficiency compared to their proficiency before the intervention.

Table 3. Speaking proficiency of the control group after the intervention

Level	Frequency (n=28)	Percent (%)
Advanced (C1)	1	3.57
Upper Intermediate (B2)	7	25
Intermediate (B1)	15	53.57
Elementary (A2)	4	14.28
Beginner (A1)	1	3.57
Mean	370.00	
Level	Intermediate (B1)	

Experimental Group's Proficiency Level after the Intervention. As illustrated in Table 4, none of the subjects in the experimental group reached the C1 level after the intervention. However, 21 (56.76%) acquired upper intermediate, 15 (40.54%) were intermediate (B1), and 1 (2.70%) stayed at elementary level. Furthermore, the mean average increased from 335.62 to 400.49. Consequently, it is clearly evident from the results that the majority of participants experienced an increase in proficiency, advancing to another level. The majority achieved upper-intermediate proficiency, with only 1 participant remaining a basic user, compared to the pre-intervention assessments where many were at the B1 level, along with several at a basic level.

This result closely aligns with the findings of Tesnim's (2019) study, which aimed to enhance students' grammatical accuracy through explicit Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF). The results revealed that some of the EFL students who participated succeeded in overcoming their grammatical errors in the post-test and showed varying degrees of improvement. However, despite receiving corrective feedback, some did not exhibit significant improvement. As shown in Table 4, there were also participants who had a B1 level of proficiency before the intervention and remained at B1 after it. Additionally, similar to the results of this study, there was also one participant in Tesnim's (2019) study who did not show any change in their oral production.

Table 4. Speaking proficiency of the experimental group after the intervention

Level	Frequency (n=37)	Percent (%)
Advanced (C1)	0	0.00
Upper Intermediate (B2)	21	56.76
Intermediate (B1)	15	40.54
Elementary (A2)	1	2.70
Beginner (A1)	0	0.00
Mean	400.49	
Level	Upper Intermediate (B2)	

Difference in Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Control Group. To determine whether there is a difference between the proficiency of the control group

before and after the intervention, a dependent t-test was used. As shown in Table 5, the mean difference in the average score of the control group before (M=334.61, SD=76.10) and after [M=370.00, SD=93.00, t(27)=1.86] the intervention is 34.39. The p-value associated with this difference is 0.074, which is greater than the 5% level of significance. This suggests that although there is a minimal increase in the mean speaking proficiency score from the pre-test to the post-test among the control group participants, this difference is not statistically significant. This implies that the control group's speaking proficiency did not improve after the intervention.

This result is consistent with the result identified in the study of Nhac (2021), in which the control group score in the post-test is also higher compared to their pre-test score but the rate was not considered significant because the p-value shown was higher than 0.05.

Table 5. Test of significant difference in the proficiency of the control group before and after the intervention

Group	n	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value
Post-test	28	370.00	76.10	34.39	1.86ns	27	0.074
Pre-test		335.61	93.00				

ns-not significant at 5% level

Difference in Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group. On the other hand, to assess the progress of the experimental group, their mean score before and after the intervention was also compared using dependent t-test. As shown in Table 6, the difference between the mean average score of the experimental group during the pre-test (M=335.62, SD=62.60) and the post-test [M=400.49, SD=45.49, t(36)=6.48] is 64.87. The p-value associated with this difference is (p=.001<0.05), which means that the observed difference in the mean scores between the pre-test and post-test is statistically significant at the 5% level. This result indicates that the participants of the experimental group showed a significant improvement at the end of the intervention. It is therefore assumed that the provision of explicit corrective feedback was effective.

The result is comparable to the result of the study conducted by Nhac (2021) where the participants in the experimental group showed significant improvement specifically in their grammar and vocabulary.

These findings of this study are in line with the arguments of several scholars, suggesting that corrective feedback (CF) can have a positive impact on students' speaking accuracy. They also corroborate the claim made by Yu et al. (2021) that the effectiveness of corrective feedback depends greatly on its implementation, including the type and timing, which in this study was oral and explicit. This study, along with Nhac (2021), demonstrates that explicit correction and prompts like metalinguistic feedback are indeed effective in helping students produce accurate grammatical utterances, as they provide students with the opportunity to identify errors and understand the appropriate grammar rules. Other studies with similar findings, such as those conducted by Zohrabi and Ehsani (2014) and Koşar and Bedir (2014), also support the idea that CF can enhance grammar acquisition.

Table 6. Test of significant difference in the proficiency of the experimental group before and after the intervention

Group	n	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value
Post-test	37	400.49	45.40	64.87	6.48*	36	<.001
Pre-test		335.62	62.60				

*-significant at 5% level

Difference in Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Control and Experimental Group. Table 7 shows that the control and experimental groups had the same speaking performance in the pre-test. As illustrated, the mean score of the Experimental group (M=335.62, SD=62.60) is slightly higher than that of the control group (M=335.61, SD=93.00). However, the difference is only 0.01, while the p-value is 0.999, which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that both groups were homogeneous and comparable at the start of the study. In other words, there was no significant difference in their speaking proficiency. Thus, the null hypothesis in this study, stating that there is no difference in speaking proficiency in English between the control and experimental groups before the intervention, cannot be rejected.

This result mirrors that of Afraz et al. (2017), whose study's aim was to improve the speaking proficiency of female Iranian students through public aids. The p-value of the mean score for both the control group and the experimental group before the intervention in their study was 0.931, which is greater than 0.05. Hence, the participants in their study were also found homogeneous. This finding determined the appropriate statistical tool used to treat the data.

The same context was observed in Al-Garni and Almuhammadi's (2019) study which revealed that both the experimental and control groups had pre-test results

centered around the median rating of 3.0, suggesting that their speaking proficiency before the intervention was comparable.

Table 7. Test of significant difference in the proficiency of the experimental and control group before the intervention

Group	n	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value
Experimental	37	335.62	62.60	0.01	0.00075 ns	63	0.999
Control	28	335.61	93.00				

ns-not significant at 5% level

Difference in the Post-test Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups. Post-test was administered to all participants in both the experimental and control groups to measure the difference of their speaking achievement. Upon analysing the post-test scores of both groups using the Shapiro Wilk, it was revealed that the difference in the post-test scores of the experimental group was not normally distributed.

As shown in Table 8, the value of experimental group's data during post-test is 0.032, while the control group is 0.122. One of the assumptions of the Shapiro-Wilk test is that if the p-value for a certain group's data is higher than 0.05, it indicates that the data follows a normal distribution. Conversely, if the p-value is lower than 0.05, the data is not normally distributed. If the data is not normally distributed, t-tests should not be used. This indicates that the control group's data is normally distributed because (p 0.122>0.05). On the other hand, the data of experimental group is not normally distributed because the (p 0.032<0.05).

Hence, to address the objective 8 of this study, the Mann Whitney U test was used. This test is a non-parametric method used to assess differences between two independent groups that are not normally distributed (McClenaghan, 2022). However, in this post-test comparison, only the experimental group showed non-normal distribution.

Table 8. Test of Normality on the pretest, posttest, and the differences

	group	**pretest**	**posttest**	**difference**
Shapiro-Wilk p	Experimental	0.354	0.032	0.205
	Control	0.145	0.122	0.837
		Both Normal	Experimental is not normal Control is normal	Both Normal

The Mann Whitney U test reveals (see Table 9) that the improvement of the experimental group was significant at the 5% level. The median of the experimental group (Mdn=413.00, n=37) was significantly larger than that of the control group (Mdn=380.50, n=28). Hence, it can be assumed that the experimental group significantly improved compared to the control group. Thus, the provision of explicit corrective feedback was effective.

This result aligns with the findings of Zohrabi and Ehsani (2014), who investigated the effectiveness of implicit and explicit corrective feedback in enhancing the grammar accuracy of Iranian EFL learners. Their study revealed that while both types of corrective feedback can improve grammatical accuracy, explicit corrective feedback is notably more effective than implicit feedback. This demonstrates that explicit feedback is indeed an effective approach for improving students' grammatical accuracy.

Table 9. Test of significant difference in the proficiency of the experimental and control group after the intervention

Group	n	Median	Mann Whitney U	p-value
Experimental	37	413.00	378.00*	0.032
Control	28	380.50		

*-significant at 5% level

Difference of the Pre-test and Post-test Mean Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups. As shown in Table 9, the mean difference between both the control and experimental groups did not differ significantly. An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the means of their pre-test and post-test results. The results revealed that there was no significant difference between the pre-test and post-test mean score of the experimental group (M=64.87, SD=60.80) and the control group (M=34.39, SD=97.80) because the p-value was 0.064, which is greater than 0.05. This implies that the increase in the speaking proficiency of the experimental group, although significant, is not substantially different from the improvement of control group. Therefore, the null hypothesis in this study, stating that there is no significant difference in the mean difference between the control and experimental groups, cannot be rejected. This result is similar with the findings of Al-Garni and Almuhammadi (2019) and differs from the result identified in the study of Afraz et al. (2017).

In Al-Garni and Almuhammadi (2019) study, the effect size of CLT was minimal. Despite the experimental group scoring higher, the difference in performance

between the experimental and control groups was not substantial.

One reason behind the small effect of corrective feedback in their study and in this current study is that the intervention lasted for a short period of time (10 sessions). If the intervention had lasted for at least 6 months or more, and the students had frequently engaged in speaking activities and received corrective feedback thrice a week, clear effectiveness of corrective feedback might have been obtained.

On the other hand, the findings identified in the study by Afraz et al. (2017) showed that the p-value resulting from the comparison of the mean scores in the pre-test and post-test of all subjects in the control (14.95) and experimental groups (18.30) was .000, which is less than 0.01. This indicates that the experimental group demonstrated a significant improvement compared to the control group.

Table 10. Test of significant difference in the mean difference in the proficiency of experimental group and the control group.

Group	n	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value
Experimental	37	64.86	60.80	30.47	1.54 ns	63	0.064
Control	28	34.39	97.80				

ns-not significant at 5% level

Conclusion and Recommendations

The findings of this study revealed that both the control and experimental groups exhibited an overall speaking proficiency level of B1 or Intermediate before the intervention. This classification, drawn from the mean scores of each group (see Tables 1 and 2). This level, according to Tan (2018), is lower than the B2 proficiency of high school students in Thailand and is comparable to that of 5th or 6th-grade students in the United States and United Kingdom (Palma et al., 2020).

After the intervention which consist of 10 sessions, both control and experimental group's speaking proficiency improved based on the difference of their pre-test and post-test results. However, the improvement in the experimental group's speaking proficiency was significant at 5%, while the progress of the control group was minimal and not significant according to the t-test.

However, upon comparing the mean differences between the pre-test and post-test results of both groups (see Table 9), no significant difference was observed. Considering that the control group's speaking proficiency improved even without the treatment, it can be assumed that the improvement showcased by the experimental group, although statistically significant, may not be solely attributed to the treatment or corrective feedback; other influencing factors may have contributed to their scores. Hence, it can be assumed that there's a possibility that the contribution of corrective feedback to the experimental group's speaking progress may be quite minimal or not necessarily substantial.

Hence, this study further recommends exploring additional factors that may contribute to speaking proficiency beyond corrective feedback. Possible option for future research could include investigating the frequency and duration of exposure to English language environments of English major students outside of the classroom. Furthermore, conducting a more in-depth examination of the effectiveness of corrective feedback would be beneficial. Extending the intervention beyond 10 sessions would allow for a clearer assessment of its effectiveness. The future researcher could also investigate the effectiveness of other types of teaching approaches, such as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Task-Based Approach (TBA) etc. in improving speaking proficiency in the Philippine context.

References

[1]. Ahmad, I., Saeed, M., & Salam, M. (2013). Effects of corrective feedback on academic achievement of students: Case of Government Secondary Schools in Pakistan. International Journal of Science and Research, 2(1), 36-40.

[2]. Al-Garni, S. A., & Almuhammadi, A. (2019). The effect of using communicative language teaching activities on EFL students' speaking skills at the University of Jeddah. English Language Teaching, 12(6), 72. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n6p72

[3]. Afraz, S., Taghizade, L., & Taghinezhad, A. (2017). The usefulness of pictorial Aids in developing female Iranian Intermediate EFL learners' speaking proficiency. International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 6(1), 38. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.6n.1p.38

[4]. Bao, R., & Wang, H. (2023). A comparison between the preferences for oral corrective feedback of teachers and students of Chinese as a second language. Frontiers in psychology, 14.

[5]. Brown, D. (2014). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. Language Teaching Research, 20(4), 436–458. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814563200

[6]. Chania, S., & Amri, Z. (2019). An analysis of students' grammatical errors on speaking at sea debate at English department of faculty of languages and arts of Universitas Negeri Padang. Journal of English Language Teaching, 8(4), 515-521. https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v8i4.106239

[7]. Chehr Azad, M. H., Farrokhi, F., & Zohrabi, M. (2017). The effects of the corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' speaking accuracy and breakdown fluency. Journal of Language Horzons, Alzabra University 1(2),107129.

[8]. Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: a case study of university students from Mainland China. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y

[9]. Damaiyanti, S. (2021). Grammatical errors made by students in speaking English. Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 2(2), 15–22. https://doi.org/10.18860/jetle.v2i2.11945

[10]. DeKeyser, R. (2015). Skill acquisition theory. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (eds.), Theories in second language acquisition. New York: Routledge, 94–112.

[11]. Dewi, R. S., & Hasnah, Y. (2022). Students' grammatical errors made in speaking English at English department in UINSU. English Teaching and Linguistics Journal (ETLiJ), 3(1), 57-60. http://dx.doi.org/10.30596%2Fetlij.v3i1.8011

[12]. Ellis, R. (2009). The differential effects of three types of task planning on the fluency, complexity, and accuracy in L2 oral production. Appl. Linguist. 30, 474–509. doi: 10.1093/applin/amp042

[13]. Elsaghayer, M. (2014). Affective Damage to oral corrective feedback among students in Libyan secondary schools. IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME), 4(6), 74–82.

[14]. Fadhila, H., Fauziati, E., & Haryanti, D. (2013). Errors in speaking English made by students of English department of Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta (Thesis, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta). http://eprints.ums.ac.id/25152/

[15]. Fidan, D. (2015). Learners' preferences of oral corrective feedback: An example of Turkish as a foreign language learner. Educational Research and Reviews, 10(9), 1311-1317.

[16]. Fungula, B. N. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in the Chinese EFL Classroom. (Degree Project). Karlstads Universitet. Retrieved from http://www.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:693017/FULLTEXT01.pdf.

[17]. Hartono, D., Basthomi, Y., Widiastuti, O., & Prastiyowati, S. (2022). The Impacts of Teacher's Oral Corrective Feedback to Students' Psychological Domain:A Study on EFL Speech Production. Cogent Education, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2022.2152619

[18]. Van Ha, X., Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classroom: A teaching and learning perspective. Heliyon, 7(7), e07550. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550

[19]. Jeyasala, V. R. (2014). A prelude to practice: Interactive activities for effective communication in English. Alternative pedagogies in the English language & communication classroom, 164-170.

[20]. Kawasaki, J. (2020). The do's and don'ts of error correction in English. Retrieved from https://bridge.edu/tefl/blog/error-correction-teaching-english/

[21]. Kartchava, E. (2019). Chapter 5: Nonverbal behaviour and corrective feedback. In Noticing oral corrective feedback in the second language classroom: Background and evidence. Lexington Books.

[22]. Kalaja, P., Barcelos, A. M. F., & Aro, M. (2017). Revisiting research on L2 learner beliefs. In Routledge eBooks (pp. 222–237). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315676494-14

[23]. Krashen, S. (1982a). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. New York: Pergamon Press Inc.

[24]. Krashen, S. (1985b). The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications. London: Longman.

[25]. Koşar, G., & Bedir, H. (2014). Strategies-based instruction: A means of improving adult EFL learners' speaking skills. International Journal of Language Academy, 2(3). http://oaji.net/articles/2014/505-1411382239.pdf

[26]. Khunaivi, H., & Hartono, R. (2015). Teacher's and Student's Perceptions of Corrective Feedback in Teaching Speaking. English Education Journal, 5(2), 14-20.

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

[28]. Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (2013). Counterpoint Piece: The case for variety corrective feedback research. Studies in second Language Acquisition, 35(1), 167-184. Retrieved from http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_,doi:10.1017/S027226311200071X

[29]. Magbanua, G. & Provida, J.T. (2023). Proficiency, anxiety, and corrective feedback preferences among ESL learners. Modern journal of studies in English language teaching and literature. 5(1).

[30]. Morallo, A. (2018, February 8). Filipino graduates' English skills lower than target for cab drivers in Dubai, study says. Philstar.com. https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2018/02/08/1785840/filipino-graduates-english-skills-lower-target-cab-drivers-dubai-study-says

[31]. Nassaji, H. & E. Kartchava (eds.) (in press). The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in language learning and teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[32]. Nhạc, H. T. (2021). Effect of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral accuracy in English speaking lessons. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research/International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 20(10), 313–330. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.10.17

[33]. Nguyen, T. B., & Pham, V.P.H. (2014). The Effects of Communicative Grammar Teaching on Students' Achievement of Grammatical Knowledge and Oral Production. Journal of English language teaching. Vol. 7, No.6. doi:10.5539/elt. v7n6p74

[34]. Patra, I., Alazemi, A., Al-Jamal, D., & Gheisari, A. (2022). The effectiveness of teachers' written and verbal corrective feedback (CF) during formative assessment (FA) on male language learners' academic anxiety (AA), academic performance (AP), and attitude toward learning (ATL). Language Testing in Asia, 12(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00169-2

[35]. Pascua, R.M. (2019). The effects of cooperative learning methodology on the oral proficiency of third year students of Pitogo High School.

[36]. Pratama, Y. P., Sartika, D., & Asmara, R. (2022). Students' errors in speaking descriptive text. Journal of English Education Program, 3(2). https://doi.org/10.26418/jeep.v3i2.54431

[37]. Pham, T. K. D. (2015). Different forms of corrective feedback and their effects on L2 students' writing accuracy: A case study. Asian Journal of Educational Research, 3(1).

[38]. Quinn, P. G., & Nakata, T. (2017). The timing of oral corrective feedback. In Routledge eBooks (pp. 35–47). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315621432-4

[39]. Ratnawati, & Sulastri, S. (2018). The Correlation between Students' Simple Past Tense Mastery and Their Ability in Translating Narrative Text Problems Faced by Students in Applying Grammar On Speaking Skill at Aba Umi Students 2017/2018. Inspiring, 1(2), 71–86. https://doi.org/10.35905/inspiring.v1i2.841

[40]. Separa, L.A, Generales, L.J, & Medina, R.J. (2020). Situational speaking difficulties of English as second language learners in the Philippines. Journal of Southeast Asian Studies, Vol. 25(1). Doi: https://doi.org/10.22452/jati.vol25no1.8

[41]. Simamora, N. J. (2016). Activities to promote speaking class. Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 46-47. Retrieved from: https://ejurnal.methodist.ac.id/index.php/metholangue/article/download/1251/969

[42]. Solikhah, I. (2016). oral corrective feedback in speaking class of English Department. Lingua, 13(1), 87-102. http://dx.doi.org/10.30957/lingua.v13i1.14

[43]. Swain, M. (1985). "Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development". In Susan M.Gass and Carolyn G. Madden, eds. Input in second language acquisition, 235–253. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

[44]. Tesnim, O. (2019). Oral Corrective Feedback and Its Impact on Learners' Speaking Skills: Tunisian EFL Students as a Case Study. International Journal of Language and Linguistics. Vol. 7, No. 3, 2019, pp. 138-149. doi: 10.11648/j.ijll.20190703.15

[45]. Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. Language Learning, 46, pp. 327–369.

[46]. Unsal Sakiroglu, H. (2020). Oral corrective feedback preferences of university students in English communication classes. International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES), 6(1), 172-178.

[47]. Wahyuni, S. (2017). The effect of different feedback on writing quality of college students with different cognitive styles. Dinamika Ilmu Vol. 17 No. 1. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.21093/di.v17i1.649

[48]. Williams, R., Pringle, R., & Kilgore, K. (2019). A Practitioner's Inquiry into Vocabulary Building Strategies for Native Spanish Speaking ELLs in Inquiry-Based Science. Research in Science Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-019-9848-6

[49]. Yu, W. (2022). Explicit vs. Implicit Corrective Feedback: Which is More Effective? Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220401.123

[50]. Zilberman, A. (2023). Why is corrective feedback is ineffective? https://elearningindustry.com/why-is-corrective-feedback-ineffective

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

[52]. Zohrabi, K., & Ehsani, F. (2014). The role of implicit & explicit corrective feedback in Persian-speaking EFL learners' awareness of and accuracy in English grammar. International Conference on Current Trends in ELT. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98, 2018-2024.