Teachers' Perceptions about the Use of Oral Explicit Corrective Feedback in Teaching Writing to EFL Learners

Perceptions des Enseignants sur l'Utilisation de la Rétroaction Corrective Explicite Orale dans l'Enseignement de l'Ecriture aux Apprenants d'Anglais Langue Etrangère

Meryem Guendouze,*

LarbiBen M'hidi University-
Oum El Bouaghi (Algeria)
meryemguendouze84@gmail.com

Madjda Chelli

Mentouri University-
Constantine(Algeria),
madjda.chelli@umc.edu.dz

Date of receipt:04-07-2025	Date of revision: 04/11/2025	Date of acceptation: 10-12-2025

Abstract

The current study aims at investigating teachers' attitudes towards the use of oral explicit corrective feedback in teaching writing to EFL students. More particularly, it attempts to investigate teachers' views on how to use corrective feedback in teaching writing and which type oral or written) is more appropriate in this particular teaching/ learning context. In order to achieve this objective, a questionnaire was administered to a selected sample of university teachers. The findings reveal a strong preference for providing corrective feedback, with a marked inclination toward oral explicit forms. Moreover, the study sheds light on teachers' attitudes regarding the perceived effectiveness of oral feedback in fostering students' writing proficiency, ultimately suggesting directions for pedagogical practice and curriculum development.

Keywords:

Oral explicit corrective feedback; Teaching writing; EFL learners.

Resumé

La présente étude vise à examiner les attitudes des enseignants vis-à-vis de l'utilisation de la rétroaction corrective explicite orale dans l'enseignement de l'écriture aux apprenants d'anglais langue étrangère (EFL). Plus précisément, elle cherche à explorer les points de vue des enseignants sur la manière d'utiliser la rétroaction corrective dans l'enseignement de l'écriture, ainsi que sur le type de rétroaction (orale ou écrite) le plus approprié dans ce contexte d'enseignement/apprentissage particulier. Pour atteindre cet objectif, un questionnaire a été administré à un échantillon sélectionné d'enseignants universitaires. Les résultats révèlent une forte préférence pour la fourniture de rétroaction corrective, avec une nette inclination pour les formes orales explicites. De plus, l'étude met en lumière les attitudes des enseignants quant à l'efficacité perçue de la rétroaction orale dans le développement des compétences rédactionnelles des étudiants, suggérant en fin de compte des pistes pour la pratique pédagogique et l'élaboration des programmes.

Mots clés

Rétroaction corrective explicite orale ; l'enseignement de l'écrit ; apprenants d'anglais langue étrangère.

*Corresponding Author:

1. INTRODUCTION

In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings, writing is a fundamental skill that enables learners to express complex ideas, engage in academic discourse, and participate in global communication. The importance of this skill has always been recognized for decades. For this reason, writing is not considered merely a means of communication but also a tool for learning, thinking, and organizing knowledge

(Raimes, 1983). This highlights the crucial role of writing in language learning, emphasizing its significance in developing fluency, accuracy, and critical thinking skills which are essential for academic and professional success. In the same framework, Hyland (2019) claimedthe role of writing in developing not only the ability to communicate in the foreign language but many other competences in the learners.According to him, "writing remains a critical skill for EFL learners, serving not just as a medium of communication but as a catalyst for language development, critical thinking, and learner autonomy" (p. 2).

Unlike speaking, which often benefits from immediate feedback and contextual cues, writing requires a deeper understanding of language structures and conventions. Therefore, teaching writing in EFL contexts is not merely about language instruction but also about empowering learners to become effective communicators in diverse settings. This can be appropriately achieved through the implication of the different practices of feedback by EFL teachers and then learners.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Teaching Writing

Writing instruction in EFL classrooms plays a crucial role in developing both learners' linguistic competence and critical thinking skills. Scholars have often emphasized the importance of writing in communication. According to them, writing transcends the mechanical production of words and symbols; it involves the coherent arrangement of ideas according to established conventions. Thus, writing cannot be viewed as just a group of words and letters that are conventionally organized and used for specific purposes. In this context, Byrne (1988) stated that "writing is clearly much more than the production of graphic symbols, just as speech is more than the production of sounds. The symbols have

to be arranged, according to certain conventions, to form words, and words have to be arranged to form sentences" (p.1). Consequently, writing allows students to organize their thoughts, reflect on their learning, and engage with a variety of text types.

On the other hand, writing activities can reinforce vocabulary acquisition and grammatical accuracy, contributing to overall language proficiency. Celce-Murcia (2001) clarified this and explained how acquiring writing became more than necessary for EFL learners to produce academic texts like essays, research projects and dissertations. Effective writing instruction not only supports language but also prepares learners for academic and professional challenges, where written communication is often essential.

2.2 Explicit Corrective Feedback

Explicit corrective feedback involves directly indicating errors and providing the correct forms. This immediate and transparent approach helps learners recognize and understand their mistakes. This type of feedback is particularly beneficial in EFL writing instruction, as it addresses specific linguistic issues and promotes accuracy. Studies have shown that explicit feedback significantly enhances writing performance and can lead to substantial improvements in learners' writing skills, especially when combined with opportunities for revision (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010).

2.3 Oral versus Written Feedback

Both oral and written feedback have unique advantages in EFL writing instruction. Oral feedback allows for immediatespoken clarification and interactive discussions, fostering a deeper understanding of writing issues. It can be particularly effective during writing conferences or peer review sessions. Written

feedback, on the other hand, provides a permanent record that students can revisit, facilitating self-paced learning and reflection. Combining both modalities can cater to diverse learner preferences and enhance the overall effectiveness of feedback (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

2.4 Oral Explicit Corrective Feedback in Teaching Writing

Implementing oral explicit feedback in EFL writing instruction can create a supportive environment where learners feel comfortable discussing their writing challenges. Through guided conversations, teachers can address specific errors, model correct usage, and encourage students to articulate their thought processes. This interactive approach not only clarifies misunderstandings but also promotes learner autonomy and confidence. Furthermore, oral feedback sessions can be tailored to individual needs, making the writing instruction more personalized and effective (Ferris, 2003).

2.5 The Role of Feedback in Improving Students' Writing

Feedback is integral to the writing process, providing learners with insights into their strengths and areas for improvement. In EFL contexts, where learners may have limited exposure to the target language outside the classroom, feedback becomes even more critical. It guides students in refining their writing, understanding language nuances, and developing self-regulation strategies. Research indicates that timely and constructive feedback can significantly enhance writing quality and learner motivation (Keh, 1990).

3. Methodology

3.1 Aim of the Study

This study seeks to explore EFL teachers' perceptions regarding the usefulness of feedback in writing instruction. More particularly, it investigates their

perspectives on the effectiveness of oral explicit corrective feedback in improving students' writing skills. It also seeks to compare the perceived benefits of oral versus written explicit feedback in the development of writing proficiency among EFL learners to determine whether oral or written feedback is more suitable for this specific teaching and learning context.

3.2.1 Research Questions

This research paper is intended to answer the following questions:

1. What do teachers think about the usefulness of oral explicit corrective feedback and how they perceive it?
2. What are EFL teachers' perceptions of this type of feedback on students' writing?
3. Which type of explicit corrective feedback -oral or written- is considered more beneficial to learners and for the learning process as far as the written skill is concerned?

3.3 Population and Sampling

The population of this study consists of sixty-nine teachers of the Department of English in Oum El Bouaghi University. For the sample, forty-five teachers were randomly chosen on the condition that they were teaching or had already taught the writing module.

3.4 Tool of Research

In order to carry out the present work, the method we opted for is the teachers' questionnaire. It was administered to forty-five teachers in the Department mentioned above. It was in fact sent to all of them via email. Unfortunately, some of them did not respond to the questionnaire quickly. After several reminders, we ended up with forty teachers answering it.

3.5 Description of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire, which constitutes the core of this research, is made up of nine (9) questions. They vary between multiple choice, yes/ no and open-ended questions. The participants were sometimes asked to justify their answers in order to better explain their ideas and to defend their opinions. In the last question, teachers were invited to provide suggestions and comments on the topic.

4. Analysis and Discusssion of the Results

4.1 Analysis of the Results

Q1: Do you provide students with corrective feedback when teaching writing?

This question is the starting point of the whole research. It aims at knowing whether teachers use this essential tool in writing classes.

Table 01: Teachers Using Corrective Feedback

Options	Subjects	Percentage
Yes	39	97.5%
No	01	2.5%
Total	40	100%

This table shows that the majority of the teachers in the sample provided their students with corrective feedback when teaching them writing (97.5 %). Only one (1) teacher responded to this question by "NO".

Q2: If yes, is it because:

This question, along with the next one, is intended to know teachers' reasons for using/ or not using corrective feedback. Their justifications in the first case are demonstrated in the table below.

Table 02: Teachers' Reasons for Providing Corrective Feedback

Options	Subjects	Percentage
Providing students with feedback is the teacher's responsibility.	04	10.26 %
Students need feedback to diagnose their errors and correct them.	06	15.38 %
Feedback is beneficial to students as it allows them to learn from their own mistakes and to understand better new elements.	03	7.69 %
Other reasons:	00	00 %
Answer 1+2	05	12.82 %
Answer 1+3	04	10.26 %
Answer 2+ 3	02	05.13 %
Answer 1+2+3	15	38.46 %
Total	39	100%

The table indicates that 38.46 % of teachers claimed that they provide learners with feedback for the three reasons presented by the researcher. 15.38 % of teachers said that they give feedback because students need it to diagnose their errors and correct them. However, 12.82 % of teachers opted for Answer 1+2. Moreover, 10.26 % of the participants opted for Answer 1 and the same

percentage of teachers chose Answer 1+3. Only three teachers (7.69%) claimed that feedback is beneficial to students as it allows them to learn from their own mistakes. Only two participants (05.13 %) opted for Answer 2+3, and no one of them offered another reason except those mentioned by the researcher.

Q3: If no, is it because:

Teachers' justifications for not providing learners with corrective feedback are demonstrated in the table below.

Table 03: Teachers' Reasons for not Providing Corrective Feedback

Options	Subjects	Percentage
Feedback is time consuming and teachers often suffer from time constraints.	01	100%
Feedback can embarrass the students , and it can discourage them .	00	00%
Correcting errors is the students' responsibility.	00	00%
Other reasons	00	00%
Answer 1+2	00	00%
Answer 1+3	00	00%
Answer 2+ 3	00	00%
Answer 1+2+3	00	00%
Total	01	100%

As it is mentioned before, only one teacher responded to the previous

question and s/he claimed that the reason for not providing students with corrective feedback is time constraints.

Q4: What are the different strategies / types of feedback you opt for in the classes of written expression?

The aim behind asking this question is to know which type/s of feedback is/are most used by teachers when correcting student's writing.

Table 04: Types of Feedback Used by Teachers

Options	Subjects	Percentage
Oral feedback	7	17.5%
Written feedback	5	12.5%
Explicit feedback	8	20%
Implicit feedback	1	2.5%
Other (please specify)	1	2.5%
Answer 1+3	15	37.5%
Answer 2+ 3	3	7.5%
Total	40	100%

As far as this question is concerned, 37.5% of teachers opted for oral feedback together with explicit feedback. 20% opted for explicit feedback, and 17.5% opted for oral feedback alone. Moreover, 12.5% of the participants said they use written feedback while 7.5% chose written feedback with explicit

feedback. Surprisingly, only one (1) teacher opted for implicit feedback and only one teacher suggested another type of feedback which is peer feedback.

Q5: In teaching writing, how often do you provide oral explicit corrective feedback to students?

This question seeks to find out how often this specific type of feedback is provided to students by the teacher.

Table 05: Frequency of Providing Oral Explicit Corrective Feedback

Options	Subjects	Percentage
Always	13	32.5%
Often	15	37.5%
Sometimes	9	22.5%
Rarely	3	7.5%
Total	40	100%

The participants' answers to this question are quite varied. Of the total number of participants, 37.5% stated that they often use oral explicit corrective feedback in their classes, while 32.5% said they always provide this feedback to their students. 22.5% said that they sometimes use it and only 7.5% said they rarely do so.

Q6: When you use oral explicit corrective feedback, do you

Through this question, we aim to discover how teachers use this type of feedback in their classes.

Table 06: The Way Teachers' Use Oral Explicit Corrective Feedback

Options	Subjects	Percentage
Address the student individually regarding his/her own mistakes?	16	40%
Address the whole class explaining the mistake and providing feedback to all students?	24	60%
Total	40	100%

As it is shown on the table above,16 teachers claimed that they address the student who makes the error individually trying to identify the mistake and to correct it. However, 24 teachers said that they address the whole class identifying the mistake, explaining it and providing feedback to all students.

Q7: Regarding writing, do you agree that students respond better to oral feedback?

Asking this question is very crucial to the study because it attempts to see to what extent oral feedback could be more beneficial to learners in order to improve their writing.

Table 07: Students' Response to Oral Feedback

Options	Subjects	Percentage
Strongly agree	18	45%
Agree	12	30%

Neutural	**9**	**22.5%**
Disagree	**1**	**2.5%**
Strongly disagree	**0**	**00%**
Total	**40**	**100%**

The majority of the participants either strongly agreed (45%) or agreed (30%) with the statement above. Moreover, 22.5% of the participants expressed their neutrality regarding the same statement. Only one teacher expressed his/her disagreement, and no teacher opted for the last suggested option which is Strongly disagree.

Q8: How effective do you think oral explicit corrective feedback is for improving students' writing?

This question is meant to reveal teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of oral explicit corrective feedback in improving students' writing.

Table 08: The Effectiveness of Oral Explicit Corrective Feedback in Improving Students' Writing.

Options	Subjects	Percentage
Very effective	**17**	**42.5%**
Effective	**15**	**37.5%**
Neutural	**8**	**20%**
Not effective	**0**	**00%**

Total	**40**	**100%**

As the tabulated answers show, 42.5% of the participants confirmed that this type of feedback is very effective whereas, 37.5% declared that it is effective. Eight teachers (20%) remained neutral about the idea but no teacher selected the last option (not effective).

Q9: Please feel free to add any comments or further suggestions related to the subject.

Out of the 40 participants who answered the questionnaire, just 15 teachers responded to this question. Six teachers expressed their thanks and admiration for the topic and for relating the use of oral feedback to teaching writing. The majority (13) said that they find oral explicit corrective feedback beneficial for the teaching of writing and it helps the learners to better acquire the writing skill. Some of these teachers highlighted the effectiveness of this strategy as it helps them to save time in the class. Two teachers mentioned that they did not use it systematically but according to them; it would be very interesting to apply it in the future. Some of them stated that this strategy should be implemented appropriately in the writing curriculum and even highlighted a few significant points about it.

4.2 Discussion/ Interpretation of the Results

The analysis of the questionnaire reveals a strong consensus among EFL teachers about the importance of providing corrective feedback when teaching writing. Nearly all respondents (97.5%) confirmed that they offer corrective feedback to their students, mainly because they perceive it as a teacher's

responsibility and because students need feedback to diagnose and correct their errors. This result aligns with findings from Hyland (2019) and Bitchener & Ferris (2012), who emphasized the role of feedback as an essential pedagogical tool in writing instruction.

A significant majority of teachers also believe in the effectiveness of oral explicit corrective feedback. More than two-thirds of the teachers (70%) reported using it frequently ("always" or "often"), suggesting that oral explicit feedback is not only accepted but also systematically integrated into writing instruction practices. This supports the idea that oral feedback provides immediate correction and clarification, which can enhance students' understanding and retention (Ellis, 2009).

When examining how teachers deliver oral explicit corrective feedback, a notable majority (60%) preferred addressing the whole class, rather than individual students. This could suggest that teachers find value in generalizing common errors to benefit all learners simultaneously, possibly due to time constraints or classroom management considerations.

Regarding students' response to oral feedback, the findings were highly positive:

75% either strongly agreed or agreed that students respond better to oral feedback.

80% of teachers found oral explicit feedback either "very effective" or "effective" in improving students' writing.

This highlights a strong teacher perception that oral explicit corrective feedback enhances students' engagement, understanding, and writing performance. It also indicates that this mode of feedback is considered highly motivating and clarifying,

reducing the affective filter that often blocks language acquisition (Krashen, 1982). Moreover, some qualitative comments from teachers reinforced the view that oral feedback is beneficial, but a few teachers noted that it should be systematically implemented and carefully adapted to the curriculum. This suggests that while oral explicit feedback is valuable, its impact can be maximized when used strategically rather than randomly.

Finally, the relatively high number of teachers remaining neutral in certain responses (around 20% in Q7 and Q8) indicates that while oral explicit feedback is positively perceived, more empirical evidence or structured training might be necessary to convince all teachers of its consistent benefits.

5. Conclusion

The findings of this study reveal that EFL teachers overwhelmingly recognize the importance of corrective feedback in writing instruction. With 97.5% of the respondents affirming their use of feedback, it is clear that teachers view it as an essential part of the writing process, primarily to help students identify and correct their errors. A significant portion of the participants (70%) reported frequently using oral explicit corrective feedback, suggesting a strong belief in its pedagogical effectiveness. Most teachers preferred addressing the whole class when providing feedback, possibly to maximize instructional time and to generalize common writing issues for collective learning. Moreover, a large majority of teachers (75%) agreed or strongly agreed that students respond better to oral feedback, and 80% considered oral explicit feedback either "very effective" or "effective" in improving writing skills. These results align with Hyland's (2019) assertion that feedback fosters critical thinking and autonomy in writing development. However, the noticeable number of teachers expressing neutrality

indicates a need for more structured training or guidelines on how to best implement oral feedback strategies. The qualitative comments further support the idea that oral explicit feedback is beneficial but should be systematically integrated into the writing curriculum to maximize its effectiveness. Overall, the study highlights the positive perceptions of oral explicit feedback among EFL teachers and points toward practical recommendations for enhancing its use in academic settings.

6. Bibliography List :

Bitchener, J & Ferris, D.R. (2012), Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing, Routledge.

Bitchener, J & Knoch, U. (2010), The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation, Applied linguistics, 31(2), 193–214.

Byrne, D. (1988), Teaching writing skills, Longman: London.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2001), Teaching English as a second or foreign language, Heinle & Heinle: United States of America.

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

Ferris, D. R. (2003), Response to student writing: Implications for second language students, Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2004), Genre and second language wriing, University of Michigan: Ann Arbor.

Hyland, K. (2019), Second Language Writing, Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K & Hyland, F. (2006), Feedback in second language writing, Language Teaching, 39(2), 83–101.

Hyland, K &Hyland, F. (2019), Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues, Cambridge University Press.

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation . ELT Journal, 44(4), 294–304.

Krashen, S. (1982), Principles and practice in second language acquisition, Pergamon Press Inc.

Raimes, A.(1983), Techniques in teaching writing, Oxford University Press.

7. Appendix

Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear teacher,

You are kindly invited to take part in this research work by completing the following questionnaire. Please put a tick ( ) in the corresponding box (es) and make full statements whenever necessary. Your contribution will be very much appreciated.

Mrs. GUENDOUZE Meryem
Department of English
Faculty of Letters and languages
Larbi Ben M'hidi University

1. Do you provide students with corrective feedback when teaching writing ?
   - Yes
   - No
2. If yes, is it because:
   - Providing students with feedback is the teacher's responsibility.
   - Students need feedback to diagnose their errors and correct them.
   - Feedback is beneficial to students as it allows them to learn from their own mistakes and to understand better new elements.
   - Other reasons:

.....

.....

3. If no, is it because:
   - Feedback is time consuming and teachers often suffer from time constraints.
   - Feedback can embarrass the students , and it can discourage them .
   - Correcting errors is the students' responsibility.

- Other reasons:

.....

.....

4. What are the different strategies / types of feedback you opt for in the classes of written expression?

- Oral feedback
- Written feedback
- Explicit feedback
- Implicit feedback
- Other (please specify):

.....

.....

.....

5. In teaching writing, how often do you provide oral explicit corrective feedback to students?

- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely

6. When you use oral explicit corrective feedback, do you

- Address the student individually regarding his/her own mistakes?
- Address the whole class explaining the mistake and providing feedback to all students

7. Regarding writing, do you agree that students respond better to oral feedback?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral

- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

8. How effective do you think oral explicit corrective feedback is for improving students' writing?

- Very effective
- Effective
- Neutral
- Not effective

9. Please feel free to add any comments or further suggestions related to the subject.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....