
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHERS' CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK (CF) AND SPEAKING PRACTICE ON UNDERGRADUATE LANGUAGE LEARNERS' SPEAKING ANXIETY (SA)

Altaf Hussain

Ph.D. Scholar,

Department of English Linguistics and Allied Studies, NED University of Engineering & Technology, Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan.

Email: altaff93@gmail.com**Najeeb us Saqlain**

Associate Professor,

Department of English Linguistics and Allied Studies, NED University of Engineering & Technology, Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan.

Email: najeebsaqlain@neduet.edu.pk**Hira Khadim**

M.S Scholar,

Department of English Linguistics and Allied Studies, NED University of Engineering & Technology, Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan.

Email: hirakarain@cloud.neduet.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

The number of the English Language users is expanding quickly around the globe due to the irrefutable importance of the English language. This is because of a number of educational and economic benefits associated with it contributing a great deal to World Englishes. Despite English has been taught, till degree level, as a compulsory subject, learners face difficulties in the basic four-fold language skills such as listening, reading, writing and speaking. The present study focuses speaking anxiety of English learners. Investigating the impact of speaking practice and corrective feedback on listening anxiety, it measures levels of speaking anxiety of Pakistani undergraduate students before and after the speaking practice and corrective feedback. One hundred and fifty undergraduate students of a public college participated in this study. Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety Scale (FLSAS) developed from (Horwitz et al., 1986) by Zulfiqar (2022) was adopted to answer the research questions. Mean scores and effect size were also calculated. Pearson

correlation was run to check the correlation of pre and post-speaking data. There was a statistically significant decrease in scores of speaking anxiety (before speaking practice and corrective feedback ($M= 3.0762$, $SD=0.45947$) and after practice ($M= 2.1885$, $SD=.41059$; $t(149) = 19.276$. $p=.000$ (two-tailed). The mean decrease in speaking anxiety score was 0.88.77% with a 90% confidence interval ranging from 0.78 to 0.95. The eta squared statistic 0.69 indicated a large effect size.

KEYWORDS

Corrective Feedback, Second Language Speaking Anxiety, Speaking Practice

INTRODUCTION

The information which is received by the learners in the process of their language learning is called feedback. The feedback is very important in language learning and teaching because of its powerful influences in English Language Teaching and Learning (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). According to Eraut (2007), the feedback given unintentionally or intentionally plays a vital role in the whole process of language learning. The researchers have explored two kinds of feedback such as formative and summative feedback given either orally or in written form with a variety of benefits in the world of language learning and teaching. The summative feedback is the part of evaluation received by the learners towards the end of a course whereas learners receive formative feedback continuously during the learning process which helps them in what to do next (Lee, 2017). The corrective feedback (CF) being an essential and inescapable component of language learning and teaching makes learners to notice the forms of the targeted language that can influence language learning performance of learners (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Varnosfadrani & Basturkmen, 2009). Increasing learners' motivation and developing their language learning autonomy, the feedback especially its corrective form has the prime objective to brush up learners' accuracy and fluency. The teachers, for instance, in the case of the feedback on learners speaking, guide learners in the use of strategies to improve speaking such as self-correction, buying time or checking understanding which may assist them better than the corrective feedback on their ungrammaticalities. Research also suggests that feedback on vocabulary and pronunciation problems may be more essential because these aspects not only contribute to breakdowns in communication but also lead to greater learning gains (Lyster et al, 2013). In the field of foreign and second language research, unlike oral feedback written corrective feedback (CF) has been the most contentious topic. The researchers had enthusiastically taken part in a debate on the influence of written corrective feedback (WCF) on language learning and teaching. More than 300 research studies have been published including meta-analyses, review literature, and primary studies. It is very surprising that researchers are not unanimous whether the written form of corrected feedback is useful or not. If not, then how can it be made effective and useful.

Anxiety has been report having both facilitative and debilitating effect on language learning skills such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing. According to Afshar and Hamzavi (2014), speaking and listening skills have been reported as the main reasons of foreign/second language anxiety. Even out of these two anxiety-inducing aspects speaking leads all the rest in language learning skills (Sutarsyah, 2017). There are many things associated with the speaking anxiety. There are certain classroom-related variables like the activities that need the learners to speak in front of their teachers, and calssfellows. The classmate's regular laughter when they commit a mistake, or stern approach of instructors in error correction contribute speaking anxiety to a great extent. The contemporary research focusses the speaking anxiety and the outcomes establish the fact that all levels of students no matter they are at primary, intermediate or tertiary level students they have speaking anxiety when they communicate with their peers or teachers orally (Gkonou, 2014). The exposure to targeted language matters a lot as it decreases foreign or second language anxiety to the fullest. That's why ESL learners in the country where English is the main language do not have higher level of language learning anxiety than the ESL or EFL learners in the countries where there is no appropriate exposure to the targeted language. This explicitly depicts that the use of language in real life situations through exposure is the right suggestion to reduce the language anxiety among the learners. There is no encouragement for the self-confidence of the students as the debilitating impact of washback contributes to this psychological issue called anxiety (Furaidah et al., 2015).

The examinations in vogue which measures only learners' reading and listening skills result in a counterattack. It causes teachers to deviate from productive skills in the language teaching. In order to uplift then results of the learners' course objectives have been altered by some institutes. For serving this purpose even course content is overhauled as well. Asian EFL learners incline towards a teacher-centered approach having certain characteristics compliance, passivity, and reflectiveness and the teachers, on the other hand, show robust expertise of course content delivering the course content methodically and logically and also respond to learners' inquiries proficiently (Loh & Ang 2020). Diaab (2016) affirms the lack of interactive tasks in prescribed textbooks. It is not feasible to carry on with communicative activities in the classrooms with a large number of students and the teachers are under duress to teach enough text in a limited class time as no time is left for further interactive oral task (Ayu, 2019). Nevertheless, there are various commonly identified causes of the varying causes of ESL learners' speaking anxiety include the lack of proficiency, the feeling of being assessed and analyzed while interacting in the targeted language with their peers and teachers. Furthermore, what contributes learners-induced language anxiety in speaking skills are a number of factors such as fear of being judged unfavorably, expectations, assumptions and self-perceived incompetence.

The past studies report that anxiety has a powerful influence on language learning motivation. Motivation an inordinately influencing factor in second language learning and teaching. A target language cannot be learnt properly if the learners are not motivated intrinsically or extrinsically (Dörnyei & Csizer, 2005). The lack of interest and enthusiasm would never let him/her invest the required effort and time for learning the language and the personality fat of the individuals are also very important in the connection (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994; Dewaele & Furnham, 2000; Ortega, 2009; Sheen, 2010). For example, the introverted learners have been found to have less self-confidence and then extraverted learners thus have not a good fluency and eloquence (Dewaele & Furnham, 2000). The learners afflicted with high level of speaking anxiety do not perform well in stressful learning environments (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994). There a bulk of renowned studies in the field which has reported the impact of these factors on second learning (Lee, 2013; Schmidt, 1996; Dörnyei & Csizer, 2005; Dewaele & Furnham, 2000; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994). revealed the influence that learners' language proficiency level had on their perceptions of effective CF (Oladejo, 1993; Kaivanpanah et al., 2012). However, the contemporary research studies lack in providing an explicit and wide-ranging understanding of the multifaceted process of how learners' perceptions of CF is influenced by individual differences. Undoubtedly, there is a great need for the investigation and how their perceptions of CF and L2 learning further interact with each other.

Teaching is actually an art and so does providing effective and meaningful feedback. ELTs (English Language Teachers) should must know all kinds of feedback and their influence on language learning and language anxiety. By understanding the role and the impact of corrective feedback on learners' language learning performance, educators are able to provide appropriate and effective feedback in order to increase their motivation in learning which eventually leads to good performance. Language anxiety has been a major concern of the researchers in the world. In order to explore the impact of second or foreign language anxiety on the performance of the students, many studies have been conducted (Aida, 1994; Chen & Chang 2004; Chriswiyati & Subekti, 2022; Gardner, 2001; Gkonou et al., 2017; Horwitz et al., 1986; Jiang & Papi, 2021). Pakistani scholars have recently demonstrated a remarkable commitment to the topic of English language speaking anxiety. The research focuses on ESL reading and writing anxieties like other language skills. The studies have measured levels, impacts of language anxiety on the learner's performance and causes of reading and writing anxieties (Ahmed et al., 2017; Dar & Khan, 2014; Fareed et al., 2021). A number of studies has been conducted in Pakistan with focus on speaking anxiety (Adeel, 2011; Dar & Khan, 2014; Gopang, et al., 2015; Javed et al., 2013; Raja, 2017). However, in Pakistan, such sort of study has not been carried out to explore the impact of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' speaking anxiety and their language learning motivation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Corrective feedback (CF) has thoroughly been a matter of great concern for the linguists over the years. According to them, language teachers correct the learner through their feedback when learners' utterances are erroneous (Ellis, 2017). CF has been reported as having positive and negative impact on the learning of a language. Bearing the paramount significance of its positive evidence in mind especially in language learning and teaching, some renowned researchers interrogated the negative evidence of the CF in language learning and teaching (Krashen, 1982; Schwartz & Griffin 1993; Truscott, 1999). Krashen (1982) claimed the uselessness of CF in the improvement of the speaking skills. Schwartz and Griffin (1993) hold the same opinion as they report the CF having superficial and temporary impact in language learning. They further deny its significant part played the improvement of language learning and teaching. Truscott (1999) holding the most negative and critical opinion towards CF claims that it is harmful for students' 'language learning so it must be avoided as it results in students' anxiety. Ellis and Sheen (2006) elaborated showed implicit and explicit feedback having positive and negative evidence simultaneously. On the contrary, many studies have investigated the positive impact of CF and its vital role played in second language learning and teaching (Ellis, 2006; Ellis et al., 2006; Li, 2010; Lyster et al., 2013).

Selective error correction and group work assist pedagogical approaches in decreasing EFL/ESL anxiety among the students. According to Uysal and Aydin (2017), error correction forms a two-step process such as the recognition of learners' errors and highlighting of the errors. The main purpose of this two-way procedure is to let the learners obtain the necessary information so that the error may properly be fixed. The teacher can provide a platform of learning by arranging different activities in pairs, trios or in groups in the light of feedback so that the speaking anxiety of the learners may be reduced (O'Donnell & Hmelo-Silver, 2013). Such exposure towards language while taking part in the activities where interaction with experienced peers plays a vital role in learners' knowledge developments and language skills. According to Zulfikar and Aulia (2020), subject matters are discussed in Group work with their peers collaborating one another which motivates the learners to use language without any intimidation. Trang et al., (2013) conducted an autobiographical study regarding growth of EFL anxiety in learners. Forty-nine university students were the respondents of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale. The outcome of the study revealed the start of the student was very enthusiastic. Their enthusiasm dwindled to decline with the passage of time. The enthusiasm was replaced by anxiety that kept on increasing from their high school. Different causes of language anxiety such as curriculum design, classroom interactions, evaluation methods, and teaching methodology were found in this study. Aichhorn and Puck (2017) conducted a case study foreign language anxiety in Australia. They found that EFL anxiety affected

every participant who was non-native. Lee (2016) elucidated the link between the corrective feedback in a study after surveying and interviewing 60 master's-degree learners in ESL context. The author studied the impact of teachers' corrective feedback given orally to learners in the case of language anxiety. It was found that the corrected feedback received by the learners having high level of anxiety had facilitative impact by decreasing EFL anxiety to its minimum.

In Pakistani context, ESL Learners face a number of problems which are hindrances in learning listening, speaking, reading and writing skills. First of all, Zaki and Dar (2012) pointed out that teaching-learning process is the main obstacle in English language learning. Secondly, Product based examination system plays havoc by encouraging rote learning as the focus of the students is scoring high grades instead of skills development (Coleman, 2010; Zaki & Dar, 2012). Thirdly, the utilized material in language teaching learning in Pakistan is not good enough to serve the purpose (Bajwa, 2021). Fourthly, it is the fear of others criticism which makes learners reluctant to speak English. Bajwa (2021) recommends a non-stop mechanism of updating language materials to expose learners completely to language learning environment as it has been repeatedly observed that Pakistani ESL learners fail to communicate eloquently in real life situations (Gopang et al., 2018; Malik et al., 2020).

The contemporary researchers are taking keen interest in conducting studies Language anxiety all over the world. To explore the impact of second language anxiety on the learners' performance, the research has been conducted (Aida, 1994; Chen & Chang 2004; Chriswiyati & Subekti, 2022; Gardner, 2001; Gkonou et al., 2017; Horwitz et al., 1986; Jiang & Papi, 2021). A number of studies focusing on speaking anxiety have been conducted in Pakistan (Dar & Khan, 2014; Gopang, et al., 2015; Javed et al., 2013). In Pakistani EFL learning, poor speaking skills is due to the lack of exposure to speaking in class and in real-life situations, though it is taught as a compulsory subject till degree classes and is official language too.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

To find the impact of corrective feedback and speaking practice on Speaking Anxiety

To find the speaking anxiety levels of undergraduates before and after the corrective feedback and Speaking practice

To determine the relationship between speaking anxiety before and after the speaking practice Corrective Feedback (CF)

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. To what extent does corrective feedback (CF) and speaking practice affect the Speaking Anxiety (SA) of Pakistani ESL intermediate College?

2. What are levels of Speaking Anxiety (SA) of Pakistani ESL undergraduate College

students before and after speaking practice and Corrective Feedback (CF)?

3. What is the relationship between speaking anxiety before and after the speaking practice Corrective Feedback (CF)?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Participants

The recent research was conducted in a government college in Karachi. One hundred and fifty undergraduate students were the respondents of this study. All the participants studied English as a compulsory subject in the first year of Associate Degree program recently introduced, instead of BA, B. Com and BSc. Belonging to the diverse educational and cultural background, most of the participants were 18–20 years old.

Table1: Sample of the Study

Associate Degree	Number of participants
Associate Degree in Arts	85
A Degree in Commerce	70
Total	150

Instrument

Employing a quasi-experimental design, a quantitative framework is used in this study. The study was conducted at a government degree college in Karachi Pakistan. One hundred and fifty undergraduate ESL learners were the participants. These participants are selected purposively as the sample of this research on the ground that these ESL learners still displayed anxiety and poor oral proficiency. The number of participants was chosen by using GPower, a renowned software which calculates the sufficiency of the sample size in consonant with the number of dependent and independent variables.

Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety Scale (FLSAS) developed from (Horwitz et al., 1986) by Zulfiqar (2022) was used to measure the anxiety levels. The FLSAS consists of 12 items and each item is to be answered on a five-point Likert-type scale. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the Listening Anxiety questionnaire calculated for this study was 0.98. in order.

Procedures

The researchers collected the Data for this research study in two phases. First of all, the questionnaire by developed by Zulfiqar (2022) was administered before listening practice. The intervention period of speaking practice and teachers' corrective feedback in spoken and written form lasted for four weeks. Every day two sessions (50 minutes each) of speaking practice through role plays and responding to audio and

video were conducted six days a week as Sunday is normally a holiday at public colleges. After the intervention period of four weeks, the data was recollected to see the impact of speaking practice and corrected feedback on the writing anxiety of the students. The speaking skills practice included listening to audio and video recordings, which was followed by listening comprehension questions and then responding to them verbally.

Analysis

The purpose of this study is to find the impact of corrective feedback and speaking practice upon speaking anxiety so the researcher analyzed by administering paired sample t-test for two tailed data, eta square, and Pearson correlation as per the strong recommendations of Pallant (2007). Sample t-test for two tailed data is the best way to check this impact the mean score for pre and post data. Further the effect size of the intervention was checked by calculating effect size through eta square statistics. Pearson correlation was also administered to further authenticate the result by checking the correlation.

DATA ANALYSIS

Findings of this study are grouped into three categories such as the impact of speaking practice and corrected feedback on the speaking anxiety, factor wise levels of pre and post speaking practice and corrected feedback and the correlation of pre and post data.

Paired-Sample T-Test

Table 2: Paired Samples Means

Pair	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	3.0762	150	0.45947	.03021
Pair 2	2.1885	150	.41059	.09594

Table 3: Paired Samples Test Difference

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	90% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	sig. (2 tailed)
				lower	upper			
pair 1	.88775	.54988	.04499	.77674	.95417	19.276	149	.000
pair 2								

The researchers administered Paired-Sample t-test in order to assess the impact of speaking practice and corrective feedback on listening anxiety. A significant decrease has been observed in scores of pre speaking practice and corrective feedback anxiety (before speaking practice and CF (M= 3.0762, SD=0.45947) and after practice (M= 2.1885, SD=.41059; $t(149) = 19.276$, $p=.000$ (two-tailed). The mean decrease in

speaking anxiety score was 0.86 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.78 to 0.95. The eta squared statistic 0.69 indicated a large effect size.

Levels of Speaking Anxiety

Table 4: Criteria for levels of speaking anxiety

Level of Speaking Anxiety	Rule	Range
High level of SA	Average score minus standard deviation before the intervention	2.61 and above
Moderate level of SA	The scores between low and high level of anxiety	1.77 - 2.60
Low level of SA	Average score minus standard deviation after the intervention	1.77 and below

After the data analysis, the findings of in the levels of speaking anxiety were divided into three levels: high level of speaking anxiety, moderate level of speaking anxiety and low level of speaking anxiety. The participants' low, moderate and high levels of anxiety were measured through their choices in response to the Likert-scale Levels of speaking anxiety decided as per rules given below in table 4.

Table 5: Levels of Speaking Anxiety before Listening Practice

Level	Range	Percentage of Respondents
High level of SA	2.61 and above	92.66%
Moderate level of SA	1.77 – 2.60	7.33%
Low level of SA	1.77 and below	0.0%

As per findings of the data analysis before speaking practice and corrective feedback, 92.66% of the respondents were afflicted with a level of speaking anxiety, 7.33% of the participants were witnessed with moderate level of speaking anxiety and 12% of the participants were found having faced low level.

Table 6: Levels of Listening Anxiety after Listening Practice

Level	Range	Percentage of Respondents
High level of SA	2.61 and above	11%
Moderate level of SA	1.77 – 2.60	77%
Low level of SA	1.77 and below	12%

The speaking practice and corrective feedback had a magical influence on the speaking anxiety of the participants. The number of respondents having high level of anxiety dropped down to 11% only. This reduction was further added to moderate and low

level of anxiety as the number of 7.33% participant increased to 77% and 12% participants had no or low level of anxiety. This dramatic decrease of participants from high level of anxiety indicates the positive impact of speaking practice and CF on speaking anxiety.

Factor wise Levels of Speaking Anxiety

The researchers have divided the items of the questionnaire in five different categories called factors which contribute the speaking anxiety. These factors are: knowledge related factors, input related factors, output related factors, speaking strategy related factors, and process related factors.

Input Related Factors

Table 7: Input Related Factors of Speaking Anxiety before Speaking Practice and CF

Level	Range	Percentage of Respondents
High level of SA	2.61 and above	90 %
Moderate level of SA	1.77 – 2.60	10%
Low level of SA	1.77 and below	0%

Table 8: Input Related Factors of Speaking Anxiety after Speaking Practice and CF

Level	Range	Percentage of Respondents
High level of SA	2.61 and above	9%
Moderate level of SA	1.77 – 2.60	83.33%
Low level of SA	1.77 and below	7.66%

In the case of input related factors, the data analysis discloses great change in language speaking anxiety levels. The data before the intervention through speaking practice and corrective feedback shows that there are 90% participants afflicted with a high level of speaking anxiety which is significantly decreased to 9% participants after the speaking practice and corrective feedback of the teacher. Speaking anxiety in posttest as compared to the pretest.

Knowledge Related Factors

Table 9: Knowledge Related Factors of Speaking Anxiety before Speaking Practice and CF

Level	Range	Percentage of Respondents
High level of SA	2.61 and above	79.33%
Moderate level of SA	1.77 – 2.60	20.66%
Low level of SA	1.77 and below	0.0%

Table 10: Knowledge Related Factors of speaking Anxiety after speaking Practice and CF

Level	Range	Percentage of Respondents
High level of SA	2.61 and above	12.66%
Moderate level of SA	1.77 – 2.60	68%
Low level of SA	1.77 and below	19.33%

The significant impact of corrective feedback and speaking practice under the umbrella of knowledge related factors can vividly be observed. After the corrective feedback and speaking practice, there is a decrease of 67.33 % participants from high level of speaking anxiety. In posttest, due to the positive impact on the intervention, an increase of 13% participants having a high level of speaking anxiety as compared to the pretest.

Process Related Factors

Table 11: Process Related Factors of Speaking Anxiety before Speaking Practice and CF

Level	Range	Percentage of Respondents
High level of SA	2.61 and above	82%
Moderate level of SA	1.77 – 2.60	10.66%
Low level of SA	1.77 and below	7.33%

Table 12: Process Related Factors of Speaking Anxiety after Speaking Practice and CF

Level	Range	Percentage of Respondents
High level of SA	2.61 and above	76%
Moderate level of SA	1.77 – 2.60	20%
Low level of SA	1.77 and below	4%

In the case of process related factors, the listening practice and feedback influenced the speaking anxiety the least. There is only a decrease of 6% participants having high level of anxiety has been observed by the researchers. Certain negative impact of speaking practice and corrective feedback on speaking anxiety in process related factors of speaking anxiety have been witnessed too as the number of participants having a low level of speaking anxiety decreases instead of increases as the increase in; low level shows positive impact of speaking practice and corrective feedback on the speaking anxiety. An increase of 10.33% participants in moderate levels of speaking anxiety have been found too.

Speaking Strategies Related Factors

Table 13: Speaking Strategies Related Factors of Speaking Anxiety before speaking

Practice and CF

Level	Range	Percentage of Respondents
High level of SA	2.61 and above	90%
Moderate level of SA	1.77 – 2.60	10%
Low level of SA	1.77 and below	0%

Table 14: Speaking Strategies Related Factors of Speaking Anxiety after Speaking Practice

Level	Range	Percentage of Respondents
High level of SA	2.61 and above	22.66%
Moderate level of SA	1.77 – 2.60	62.33%
Low level of SA	1.77 and below	15%

The penultimate factor contributing speaking anxiety is second language speaking strategies. The analysis of the data reveals a significant decrease of 68% participants having high levels of speaking anxiety. There is thoroughly positive impact of the corrective feedback and speaking anxiety. An increase of 15% of participants have been found in the low level of speaking anxiety. Finally, there is also an increase of 52.33% has been noticed by the researchers in the moderate level of the speaking anxiety which is the result of decrease in participants having high levels of speaking anxiety. Like all other factors, the decrease in high levels of speaking anxiety and the increase in the low level of speaking anxiety display a positive impact of speaking practice and CF upon speaking anxiety. (For Details See Table 13 and 14 for descriptive statistics)

Output Related Factors**Table 15: Output Related Factors of Speaking Anxiety before Speaking Practice and CF**

Level	Range	Percentage of Respondents
High level of SA	2.61 and above	88%
Moderate level of SA	1.77 – 2.60	12%
Low level of SA	1.77 and below	0%

Table 16: Output Related Factors of Listening Anxiety after Speaking Practice and CF

Level	Range	Percentage of Respondents
High level of SA	2.61 and above	22%
Moderate level of SA	1.77 – 2.60	77.33%

Low level of SA	I.77 and below	0.66%
A decrease of 66% participants has been found in the number of participants with high level of speaking anxiety which shows positive impact of intervention on the speaking anxiety. The slightest increase of 0.66 % in the number of the participants with low level of speaking anxiety indicated that the reduction of the participants with a high level of anxiety has piled up in the number of participants with moderate level of speaking anxiety. This implies that the participants need more speaking practice and corrective feedback so that the number of respondents with a low level of anxiety may be increased. (See Table 15 and 16 for descriptive statistics)		

The Relationship between Pre and Post Levels of Speaking Anxiety:

Table: 17: Paired Samples Correlations

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Anxiety before practice & Anxiety after practice	150	-.338	.000

Table: 18: Correlations in Levels of Speaking Anxiety
Correlations

	KRF_ AFTER	PRF_ AFTER	ORF_ AFTER	LS_ AFTER	IRF_ AFTER	IRF_ BEFORE	KRF_ BEFORE	PRF_ BEFORE	ORF_ BEFORE	LS_ BEFORE
KRF_ AFTER	1									
PRF_ AFTER	0.086	1								
ORF_ AFTER	0.477**	0.221**	1							
LS_ AFTER	0.617**	0.115	0.514**	1						
IRF_ AFTER	0.655**	0.249**	0.587**	.687**	1					
IRF_ BEFORE	-0.038	0.133	0.064	-0.093	-0.023	1				
KRF_ BEFORE	-0.117	0.028	-0.195*	-0.114	-0.066	0.445**	1			
PRF_ BEFORE	-0.100	-0.135	-0.108	0.035	0.007	-0.138	-0.080	1		
ORF_ BEFORE	-0.097	-0.055	-0.071	-0.131	-0.040	0.023	-0.150	0.091	1	
LS_ BEFORE	-0.061	-0.075	-0.022	-0.009	0.008	0.507**	0.475**	-0.026	-0.064	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

KRF: Knowledge Related Factors

PRF: Process Related Factors

ORF: Output Related Factors

LS: Listening Strategies

IRF: Input Related Factors

In order to check the correlation of the pre and post data, the researchers administered paired sample correlation. The correlation result -0.338 indicates the negative correlation that the increase in speaking practice and corrective feedback decreases the listening anxiety. For the authentication of this relationship, the researchers administered Pearson correlation.

The relationship between the anxiety measured before the speaking practice and the anxiety measured after the speaking practice and CF was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient. The test was performed to ensure no violation of assumptions of normality, linearity, homoscedasticity and above all to check the kind of relationship between the scores of the pre and post data. There was strong negative correlation between factors are such KRF, PRF, ORF, LS, and IRF having values of $r = -0.117$, $n = 5$; $r = -0.135$, $n = 3$; $r = -0.071$, $n = 9$; $r = -0.009$, $n = 6$; and $r = -0.023$, $n = 10$ respectively.

DISCUSSION

The current research was conducted to investigate the effects of Pakistani ESL undergraduate students' second language speaking practice and teachers' corrective feedback on second language speaking anxiety. In the answer to the first research question "To what extent does corrective feedback (CF) and speaking practice affect the Speaking Anxiety (SA) of Pakistani ESL intermediate College?", the researchers find that there is significant influence of speaking practice on second language speaking anxiety. The results and findings indicate factor wise impact of corrective feedback and listening practice on the speaking anxiety. In the answer to the second research question "What are levels of Speaking Anxiety (SA) of Pakistani ESL undergraduate College students after speaking practice and Corrective Feedback (CF)?", the researchers have reported very interesting outcomes. There has been a significant decrease of 80% in the number of the respondents with a high level of anxiety. In the answer to the last research question "What is the relationship between speaking anxiety before and after the speaking practice Corrective Feedback (CF)?", the researchers after administering paired sample correlation and Pearson correlation and the results show the negative correlation which explains that the increase of speaking practice and corrective feedback results in the decrease of the speaking anxiety.

The levels of speaking anxiety have been affirmed by the responses of the participants to the adopted questionnaire. The subtraction of standard deviation from mean score before the speaking practice and corrective feedback shows the range of a high-level speaking anxiety and the subtraction of standard deviation from mean score after the speaking practice and corrective feedback speaking practice resulted in 6% decrease of participants in high level of speaking anxiety which shows a positive impact of speaking practice and corrective feedback on speaking anxiety.

Four different ways were employed by the researchers to observed the impact of speaking practice and corrective feedback upon the speaking anxiety. These tests are such as Paired sample t-test as recommended by Field et al. (2019) and Pallant (2007) to check the difference made by the speaking practice and corrective feedback. The mean score before and after the intervention exhibited the significant difference between the pre and post data which was further confirmed by calculating eta square value (Pallant, 2007). The researchers followed the benchmark set by Cohen (1988), speaking practice and corrected feedback showed large effect on speaking anxiety. The negative correlation in the t-test exhibits that the increase in speaking practice and CF decreases the speaking anxiety which is further endorsed by factor wise Pearson correlation.

The current study conducted at public sector college in Karachi Pakistan to check the impact of speaking practice and corrective feedback on the speaking anxiety, the levels of second speaking anxiety and the relationship between the levels of second language anxiety. The findings of the study have revealed the significant impact of language speaking practice and corrective feedback on second language speaking anxiety of undergraduate Pakistani ESL students. The majority of the respondents were found having high levels of speaking anxiety which was dramatically reduced after the second language speaking practice and corrective feedback. The negative correlation of the pre and post data reinforces the positive impact of speaking practice and corrective feedback on second language speaking anxiety.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study is limited to undergraduate level students at the selected government college. Only one instrument was employed for the collection of the required data for this study. There is a big scope for conducting more studies on this topic at different levels such as primary, and secondary and intermediate levels by employing case studies or mixed method research approach to fill the gap lies in the research. The researchers, in the future studies, may employ different and more instruments to collect data, preferably, checklist, open-ended questionnaires observation and interview.

REFERENCES

- Adeel, A. (2011, May). A study of anxiety among the Graduation Learners of English as a Foreign Language in Pakistan. In *1st International Conference on Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, Sarajevo. 2011*.
- Ahmed, N., Pathan, Z. H., & Khan, F. S. (2017). Exploring the causes of english language speaking anxiety among postgraduate students of university of balochistan, pakistan. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(2), 99-105.
- Aichhorn, N., & Puck, J. (2017). "I just don't feel comfortable speaking English": Foreign language anxiety as a catalyst for spoken-language barriers in MNCs. *International Business Review*, 26(4), 749-763.
- Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *The modern language journal*, 78(2), 155-168.
- Ayu, M. (2019). Interactive activities for effective learning in overcrowded classrooms. *Linguists: Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 4(2), 1-6.
- Bajwa, M. S. (2021). English Language Learning Materials Development Policy of Pakistan: Provisions and Execution. *Journal of Educational Research*, 24(1), 152.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 education, 33(4), 403-422.
- Chen, T. Y., & Chang, G. B. (2004). The relationship between foreign language anxiety and learning difficulties. *Foreign language annals*, 37(2), 279-289.
- Chriswiyati, E. P., & Subekti, A. S. (2022). Indonesian L2 learners' listening anxiety and socio-affective listening strategy: A survey study. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 9(2), 32-45.
- Coleman, J. (2010). *A case study of the responses of two mainstream primay teachers in a non-metropolitan area to the refugee English Language Learners in their classe* (Doctoral dissertation, Australian Catholic University).
- Dar, M. F., & Khan, I. (2014). Oral communication apprehension among undergraduate engineering students in Pakistan. *Journal of Education & Social Sciences*, 2(2), 144-153.
- Dewaele, J. M., & Furnham, A. (2000). Personality and speech production: A pilot study of second language learners. *Personality and Individual differences*, 28(2), 355-365.
- Diaab, S. (2016). Role of Faulty Instructional Methods in Libyan EFL Learners □ Speaking
- Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2005). The effects of intercultural contact and tourism on language attitudes and language learning motivation. *Journal of language and social psychology*, 24(4), 327-357.
- Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 28(2), 339-368.
- Ellis, R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in L2 classrooms: What we know so far. In *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 3-18). Routledge.
- Eraut, M. (2007). Learning from other people in the workplace. *Oxford review of error correction on learners' performance. System*, 37(1), 82-98.
-

-
- Fareed, M., Khan, I., & Akhtar, H. (2021). The Causes of English Writing Anxiety among Pakistani ESL Students: Perceptions of Teachers and Students. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9(1), 21-27.
- Furaidah, F., Saukah, A., & Widiati, U. (2015). Washback of English national examination in the Indonesian context. *TEFLIN Journal*, 26(1), 36-58.
- Gardner, R. C. (2001). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. *Motivation and second language acquisition*, 23(1), 1-19.
- Gkonou, C., Dewaele, J. M., & Daubney, M. (2017). 12. Conclusion. In *New Insights into Language Anxiety* (pp. 217-223). Multilingual Matters.
- Gkonou, C. (2014). The sociolinguistic parameters of L2 speaking anxiety. *Classroom-oriented research: Achievements and challenges*, 15-32.
- Gopang, I. B., Bughio, F. A., & Umrani, T. (2015). Foreign language anxiety and intercultural communication sensitivity. *ELF Annual Research Journal*, 17, 93-106.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1986). Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. *Tesol Quarterly*, 20(3), 559-562.
- Javed, M., Eng, L. S., Mohamed, A. R., & Sam, R. (2013). Comparative study of the Pakistani and Indonesian student's anxiety towards the English language learning. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 18(11), 1563-1572.
- Jiang, C., & Papi, M. (2022). The motivation-anxiety interface in language learning: A regulatory focus perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 25-40.
- Kaivanpanah, S., Yamouty, P., & Karami, H. (2012). Examining the effects of proficiency, gender, and task type on the use of communication strategies. *Porta Linguarum: revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras*, (17), 79-94.
- Krashen, S. (1992). The input hypothesis: An update. *Linguistics and language pedagogy: The state of the art*, 409-431.
- Lee, D. H. (2013, June). Pseudo-label: The simple and efficient semi-supervised learning method for deep neural networks. In *Workshop on challenges in representation learning, ICML* (Vol. 3, No. 2, p. 896).
- Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Singapore: listening anxiety and listening comprehension of Iranian EFL learners: Does proficiency make a difference? *Issues in Language Teaching*, 3(2), 261-237.
- Loh, R. C. Y., & Ang, C. S. (2020). Unravelling Cooperative Learning in Higher Education: A Review of Research. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 5(2), 22-39.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language performance. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, 1(2), 143-152.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language learning*, 44(2), 283-305.
- Malik, S., Qin, H., & Ahmed, K. (2020). Quantitative Analysis of the Foreign Language Anxiety: Chinese and Pakistani Postgraduates in Focus. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume*, 11.
- Namaziandost, E., Razmi, M. H., Ahmad Tilwani, S., & Pourhosein Gilakjani, A. (2022). The
-

-
- impact of authentic materials on reading comprehension, motivation, and anxiety among Iranian male EFL learners. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 38(1), 1-18.
- O'Donnell, A. M., & Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2013). Introduction: What is collaborative learning?: An overview. *The international handbook of collaborative learning*, 1-15.
- Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error correction in ESL: Learner's preferences. *TESL Canada Journal*, 71-89.
- Ortega, L. (2009). Studying writing across EFL contexts: Looking back and moving forward. *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research*, 232-255.
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*. Routledge.
- Raja, F. (2017). Anxiety level in students of public speaking: Causes and remedies. *Journal of education and educational development*, 4(1).
- Schmidt, F. L. (1996). Statistical significance testing and cumulative knowledge in psychology: Implications for training of researchers. *Psychological methods*, 1(2), 115.
- Schwartz, S., & Griffin, T. (1993). Comparing different types of performance feedback and computer-based instruction in teaching medical students how to diagnose acute abdominal pain. *Academic Medicine*, 68(11), 862-4.
- Soodmand Afshar, H., & Hamzavi, R. (2014). The relationship among reflective thinking, listening anxiety and listening comprehension of Iranian EFL learners: Does proficiency make a difference? *Issues in Language Teaching*, 3(2), 261-237.
- Sutarsyah, C. (2017). An analysis of student's speaking anxiety and its effect on speaking performance. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, 1(2), 143-152.
- Trang, T. T. T., Baldauf Jr, R. B., & Moni, K. (2013). Investigating the development of foreign language anxiety: An autobiographical approach. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(7), 709-726
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of second language writing*, 8(2), 111-122.
- Uysal, N. D., & Aydin, S. (2017). Foreign Language Teachers' Perceptions of Error Correction in Speaking Classes: A Qualitative Study. *Qualitative Report*, 22(1).
- Varnosfadrani, A. D., & Basturkmen, H. (2009). The effectiveness of implicit and explicit writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of second language writing*, 19(4), 207-217.
- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Peer feedback in second language writing (2005–2014). *Language Teaching*, 49(4), 461-493.
- Zaki, S., & Dar, M. F. (2012). Reflections on the local ELT context: The teaching learning objectives and the obstacles. In *English Language and Literary Forum* (Vol. 14, pp. 1-12).
- Zulfikar, Zulfikar, and Cut Tarri Aulia. "Exploring Acehnese EFL College Students' Perceptions on Collaborative Writing." *Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra* 12.2 (2020): 171-180.
-