Al-Farouk journal of sciences
Volume (2), Issue (5) (Nov, 2026)
ISSN: 3135-2359

مجلة الفاروق للعلوم
المجلد (2) العدد 5 نوفمبر 2026
عدد خاص بالمؤتمر العلمي الرابع للعلوم والتقنية
28-29 نوفمبر 2026 مصراتة – ليبيا
إدارة المعاهد العليا – وزارة التعليم التقني

Teachers' Perceptions of Corrective Feedback in English Speaking Classes among First-Year Undergraduates at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University

Prepared by: Sultan M. Elbori

Received: 29/7/2026 Revised: 20/8/2026 Accepted: 28/8/2026 Publication: 28/11/2026

Abstract

Corrective feedback is a significant part of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teaching because it assists learners identify errors and develop greater accuracy in their use of English. Though, the methods in which teachers offer corrective feedback may affect students' experiences and participation in classroom speaking activities. This research paper explores teachers' corrective feedback practices and students' perceptions of error correction at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University, Libya. The study involved 10 English language teachers with between 10 and 15 years of teaching experience and 10 students who participated in semi-structured interviews. Two research instruments were used: classroom observation and semi-structured student interviews. Classroom observation was intended to inspect how teachers corrected students' errors during classroom activities, while the interviews discovered students' experiences and perceptions of corrective feedback, including correction in front of classmates. The main goal of this study is to offer insight into how corrective feedback is applied and experienced in the university classroom. However, assumptions about students' attitudes and the effectiveness of certain feedback techniques must be based on the real observation records and interview replies. Subsequently the study does not report direct measurements of speaking performance before and after corrective feedback, it does not establish a causal effect on speaking proficiency. The results are proposed to inform suggestions for more constructive feedback practices and to identify areas for further research into corrective feedback in English language teaching.

Keywords: corrective feedback, speaking skills, English as a Foreign Language, classroom observation, student perceptions, Misurata University.

1.Introduction

Speaking is an important skill of learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL). It allows learners to share ideas, contribute in classroom discussions, and develop their capability to use the language in academic and real-life situations. Though, learners commonly make grammatical, lexical, and pronunciation errors while speaking. Instructors must therefore decide which errors to correct, when correction is more suitable, and in which way feedback can be delivered constructively.

The term Corrective feedback means that the responses that pay the learners' attention to their wrong misuse of a language and that their language production contains an error. In second language sessions, it may help students recognize imprecise forms and consider how to improve their language use (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Corrective feedback can take several forms, involving explicit correction, recasts, elicitation, explanation requests, and metalinguistic feedback.

Though error correction is generally used in language teaching, instructors may have dissimilar opinions about the most suitable ways. Some teachers choose to correct errors instantly, while others allow students to complete their utterances before providing feedback. Likewise, some teachers correct errors in front of the class, however others prefer individual discussions for difficulties requiring more detailed explanations.

These decisions are significant because speaking activities need learners to communicate while concurrently processing language. Feedback that is clear and constructive may help learners recognize and address errors. Though, the timing and manner of correction may also affect classroom communication and students' desire to join the session. Teachers consequently are required to consider both instructional aims and the classroom environment after choosing corrective feedback techniques.

At the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University, teachers' methodologies to corrective feedback offer a related topic for exploring English language teaching practices. The original research report describes interviews with instructors about their knowledges of correcting errors, their views on public correction, and their use of feedback during classroom instruction.

The current study concentrates on teachers' perceptions and reported practices. It does not try to establish experimentally whether corrective feedback improves students' speaking proficiency because the existing evidence does not include systematic measurements of speaking performance.

1.1. Research Problem

The basic research problem focuses on how English language teachers at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University, perceive and approach corrective feedback during English language session. Although instructors may identify the significance of correcting errors, they may vary in their decisions about which errors to address, whether to correct learners publicly, and whether to integrate feedback into lesson planning.

The original study also raises concerns about probable negative reactions to public correction. However, the available findings firstly describe teachers' views and reported experiences. Without clear proof from students, it is not possible to specify whether learners generally feel nervous or demotivated when their errors are corrected.

Another problem regarding the relation between corrective feedback and speaking development. Although former research has examined the possible benefits of oral corrective feedback, the present study does not involve direct measurements of changes in students' speaking skills. Its results must therefore be interpreted as a sign about teachers' perceptions rather than proof of teaching effectiveness.

Therefore, the research problem is to understand teachers' reported approaches to corrective feedback and the considerations that affect their decisions in the classroom.

1.2. Research Questions

This research answers the following questions:

How do English language instructors at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University, report correcting students' language errors?

What are teachers' perceptions of correcting students' errors in front of their colleagues?

Under what conditions do teachers report using individual consultations to address students' language difficulties?

How do instructors report integrating corrective feedback into their lesson planning and classroom instruction?

These questions are intended to match the interview topics described in the original report. They concentrate on information that can be explored through teachers' accounts more than on results that would require direct measurement of students' speaking performance.

1.3. Research Objectives

The objectives of this research paper are:

To describe teachers' reported methods to correcting students' errors.

To inspect teachers' views concerning public correction in English language classrooms.

To explore teachers' reported use of individual consultations for persistent language difficulties.

To examine whether teachers describe corrective feedback as a planned instructional activity or a reply to classroom situations.

2.Literature Review

2.1. Definition of Corrective Feedback

The term corrective feedback is considered a s a kind of instructional response that shows that a learner's language production involves an error or needs modification. It may offer the correct form directly or motivate the students to identify and correct the error independently.

In this matter, Lightbown and Spada (1990) participated in research regarding the role of corrective feedback in second language learning. DeKeyser (1993) also contributed by investigating error correction in relation to grammatical competence and oral performance

Corrective feedback is not only to recognize mistakes. Depending on its form, it may also help learners recognize and notice linguistic variations, considering their language choices, and utter more clear expressions. However, the impact of a particular technique may depend on the instructional context, the target language feature, and the learner's characteristics

and outcomes.

These studies offer a theoretical foundation for examining corrective feedback in language education. Though, results from preceding research cannot establish that a particular strategy improved speaking proficiency among the students at Misurata University. Such a conclusion would need evidence collected from the learners in the current research setting

The study was held at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University, Libya. The study concentrated on English language teaching and the way corrective feedback was provided during classroom activities.

3.3. Participants

The study consisted of 10 English language teachers and 10 students at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University. The teaching experience for the teachers is between 10 and 15 years in teaching the English language. Their professional experience was related to the investigation because it provided a chance to examine corrective feedback practices among teachers with substantial classroom experience.

The number of students who participated in semi-structured interviews was 10 students concerning their experiences and perceptions of corrective feedback. They were studying in the first year. The students' responses were intended to offer a learner perspective on how teachers corrected errors and how students understood these practices.

3.4. Research Instruments

Two instruments were used to collect data: classroom observation and semi-structured student interviews.

Classroom observation

Classroom observation was used to investigate how teachers responded to students' errors during English language lessons. The observation focused on the types of errors corrected, the ways feedback was provided, whether correction occurred publicly or individually, and the environment in which teachers intervened.

The main aim was to describe teachers' observable feedback practices in the classroom. The observation results should be reported separately from participants' opinions collected through interviews.

Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 students to examine their experiences and perceptions of corrective feedback. This instrument allowed the researcher to ask readymade

questions while providing opportunities for students to clarify their answers in greater detail.

The interviews concentrated on students' experiences of being corrected, their point views about correction in front of classmates, and their perceptions of different feedback approaches.

3.5. Data Collection Procedure

The researcher used classroom observation to investigate corrective feedback during English language sessions at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University. The observations focused on teachers' responses to errors and the environment in which correction occurred. Moreover, semi-structured interviews were held with 10 students to explore their experiences and opinions concerning corrective feedback. Using these two instruments allowed the researcher to examine classroom practices alongside students' accounts of their learning experiences.

3.6. Data Analysis

The data should be analyzed according to the instrument from which they were gathered.

Classroom observation data can be ordered into groups describing teachers' corrective feedback practices, including the kinds of feedback used, the timing of correction, and whether errors were addressed publicly or individually.

Student interview responses can be grouped into themes reflecting their knowledges and perceptions of corrective feedback. Possible categories include attitudes toward public correction, preferences for individual feedback, and perceived effects on classroom participation. These categories should be used only were supported by the actual interview responses.

7.Limitations of the Study .

This research paper has many limitations. First of all, it was held in only one educational institution which is the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University. For this reason, the results may not represent the experiences of English language teachers and students in other Libyan universities.

Secondly, the study contains a limited simple of 10 teachers and 10 students which may restrict the extent to which the results can be generalized to a wider population.

Thirdly, classroom observations capture teaching practices within particular lessons and may not represent every teacher's usual approach to corrective feedback.

Finally, without direct measures of speaking performance before and after an intervention, it cannot establish that corrective feedback caused improvements in students' speaking accuracy or overall proficiency.

Despite these limitations, the correlation between classroom observation and student interviews offers two complementary perspectives on corrective feedback: what teachers do in the classroom and how students define their experiences.

4.Discussion

The study investigates corrective feedback in English language classrooms at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University, through classroom observation and semi-structured interviews with 10 students. The participation of 10 English language teachers with 10–15 years of teaching experience offers an opportunity to examine classroom feedback practices and students' experiences.

Corrective feedback can help learners identify language errors and develop greater accuracy in speaking (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Nevertheless, the way teachers provide feedback may affect students' classroom experiences and willingness to participate. Public correction may be useful for addressing errors related to the whole class, while individual feedback may be

more appropriate for students who need additional explanation.

The relatedness of classroom observation and student interviews permits the researcher to compare teachers' observed practices with students' reported experiences. This comparison may help categorize whether specific feedback approaches correspond with students' preferences and concerns. Nevertheless, the assumptions must be based on the actual data collected rather than assumptions about students' reactions.

Though preceding research suggests that corrective feedback can help second language learning (Lyster & Saito, 2010), the current study does not directly measure improvements in speaking proficiency. Therefore, its results should be interpreted as proof about classroom practices and student perceptions rather than proof of the effectiveness of corrective feedback. Overall, the study highlights the importance of providing constructive feedback while considering learners' needs and classroom participation.

5.Conclusion .

This study investigated corrective feedback in English language teaching at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University, using classroom observation and semi-structured interviews with 10 students. The study involved 10 English language teachers.

This research paper explored teachers' perceptions and reported practices related corrective feedback at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University. The reported interviews recommended that the participating teachers considered error correction plays an important role regarding their professional responsibility, although they varied in their clarifications of which errors should be corrected and in which way feedback should be distributed.

Regarding the first research question, the teachers reportedly used error correction but varied in the extent to which they prioritized errors relevant to the instant lesson. Regarding the second question, two teachers expressed the view that correcting errors in front of classmates was satisfactory, although their views do not establish how students experienced public correction. Regarding the third question, the reported answers suggest that individual consultations may be considered valuable for determined difficulties. Regarding the fourth question, the report specifies that corrective feedback was often described as a response to errors as they occurred rather than as an obviously planned part of lessons.

These results offer a limited explanation of teachers' perceptions and reported practices. They do not establish students' general attitudes toward correction or demonstrate that corrective feedback improved speaking precision.

This survey hence supports the necessity of inspecting how teachers make decisions about feedback, while identifying that suitable practices may rely on the teaching environment and learners' requirements. The recommendations showed in this paper are proposed to guide reflection and future research; they should not be interpreted as interventions whose efficiency was experienced in the present study.

I highly recommend for a future research, researchers should record its participant and instruments, collect data explicitly from students, the y should also utilize a suitable scale to measure speaking performance as the main goal is to establish the effectiveness of the corrective feedback. this kind of research may offer a stronger basis for understanding how corrective feedback can support English language learning in the Libyan university context.

9.References

Chaudron, C. (1998). Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning. Cambridge University Press.

DeKeyser, R. M. (1993). The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. The Modern Language Journal, 77(4), 501–514.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12(4), 429–448.

Ellis, R. (1991). Grammaticality judgments and second language acquisition. Studies in .Second Language Acquisition, 13(2), 161–186

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

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32(2), 265–302.

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

Truscott, J. (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 55(4), 437–456.