



Exploring the Use of Oral Corrective Feedback Among Indonesian University Students

Meidita Maharani Putri¹, Irma Savitri Sadikin²

¹⁻²Study Program English Language Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Esa Unggul, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: meiditamaharaniputri@gmail.com

Abstrack. This study investigates the use of oral corrective feedback (OCF) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms among Indonesian university students, with a particular focus on lecturers' preferences and students' perceptions. The research addresses three main aspects: the types of errors that are corrected, the strategies of OCF employed, and the timing of feedback delivery. A qualitative case study design was adopted, involving classroom observations, semi-structured interviews with lecturers, and open-ended questionnaires distributed to students. Data from these instruments were analyzed separately and then triangulated to ensure credibility and validity. The findings reveal that lecturers mainly prioritize correcting phonological and grammatical errors, as these are perceived to directly influence students' communicative competence and overall speaking performance. Among the six OCF types proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), recast and repetition emerged as the most frequently used strategies. These approaches were favored by lecturers as they corrected learners subtly while minimizing the risk of embarrassment and maintaining the flow of communication. Furthermore, lecturers applied both immediate and delayed feedback depending on the classroom context and learning objectives. From the students' perspective, OCF was generally viewed positively, as it contributed to raising awareness of errors and fostering speaking improvement. Students particularly appreciated feedback strategies that respected their confidence and speaking flow. Overall, the study underscores the importance of aligning teacher practices with student preferences to maximize the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback in EFL learning contexts.

Keywords: EFL Classroom; Indonesia; Lecturer Preferences; Oral Corrective Feedback; Speaking Skills.

I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The use of English language by EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners in Indonesia is limited in everyday life; therefore, many EFL learners still have major obstacles with their speaking proficiency. Natasia & Angelianawati (2022) highlighted that speaking is one of the most difficult skills a language student has to face. Similarly, Rahman et al., (2024) state that speaking English can be incredibly difficult, particularly for students. Unlike reading and writing, which can be practiced individually, speaking requires real-time language processing, spontaneous interaction, and confidence all of which place cognitive and emotional demands on learners. This makes speaking particularly challenging. The classroom is frequently the main location for exposure and practice because English is not widely utilized in everyday situations.

In addition, grammar-based teaching approaches continue to be the most common, despite educational policies placing a greater emphasis on communicative ability (Safitri & Nurcholis, 2025). It is frequently argued that this emphasis on teaching grammar is limiting students' capacity to communicate effectively in real-world situations. While grammatical accuracy is important, focusing solely on it may prevent learners from engaging in meaningful and spontaneous communication. In communicative competence, mastering a language

involves more than just understanding its grammatical structures; it also includes knowing how to apply them correctly in various communication settings (Mohammadi & Yousefi, 2019). According to a study conducted by Mohammadi & Yousef (2019) there is a connection between grammar teaching and oral corrective feedback; choosing the appropriate grammar instruction method requires matching it with suitable feedback strategies. Therefore, it is essential to critically examine the role of grammar in EFL teaching and how it aligns with communicative goals. It is also supported by Solikhah (2016) who suggests oral corrective feedback should focus on grammatical errors or areas where students have shown difficulties.

According to Lemma (2023) providing oral corrective feedback on students' spoken language is a key component in teaching English as a second language. Yet, much of the research to date has primarily concentrated on how teachers deliver oral corrective feedback or on students' general preferences (Laeli & Setiawan, 2019). A separate investigation by Muslem et al. (2021) which utilized questionnaires, looked at how students perceived the feedback, specifically whether they felt it contributed to their learning. However, the study tends to rely solely on student perspectives and does not fully explore classroom realities. Observation conducted by Bao & Wang (2023) shows that a teacher used delayed feedback, as it could disturb or slow the pace of the instruction. Thus, not aligned with A study done in a Turkish university by Öztürk (2023) that suggested delayed feedback might be less effective in improving pronunciation compared to immediate correction. Zhu & Wang (2019) in their study shows more positive attitudes and strong preferences from the students for immediate corrective feedback over delayed corrective feedback. What is notably missing is research that investigates the reasons behind lecturers' choices of specific oral corrective feedback strategies, and student attitudes towards the oral corrective feedback given. The pedagogical intentions guiding these decisions remain largely underexplored.

Although oral corrective feedback (OCF) has been widely discussed in the field of English language teaching, not much of the research has discussed the lecturer perspective, with relatively little attention paid to how OCF is used in university-level classrooms. As mention in the previous study of Muslem et al. (2021) Bao & Wang (2023) Öztürk (2023) Zhu & Wang (2019) this leaves a noticeable gap, particularly when it comes to early-semester students who are still developing their speaking skills and confidence. At this stage, learners are often more vulnerable to the emotional and cognitive impacts of feedback. As a result of Alfiani (2023) study, speaking anxiety for a freshman student was largely due to internal psychological factors, poor linguistic ability, and classroom situations. Which makes it important to understand not just the types of feedback used but how and why lecturers choose

them. Therefore, this study aims to address that gap by taking a closer look at how OCF is applied in speaking classes for lower-semester students and how both teachers and learners experience that feedback during active learning situations.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a *qualitative case study* design to explore oral corrective feedback (OCF) in an EFL speaking classroom, focusing on lecturer preferences, classroom implementation, and student responses. The study is conducted at a private university in Tangerang with one lecturer and 13 students selected through purposive sampling. Data collection takes place from June to July 2025 over three classroom meetings (approximately 360 minutes) during regular speaking sessions. The participants are involved voluntarily, and their identities are anonymized using initials to ensure confidentiality. Data are gathered through classroom observation, a semi-structured interview with the lecturer, and an open-ended questionnaire for students.

The data collection process involves observing classroom interactions without researcher participation, supported by video recording and field notes to capture occurrences of OCF. After the observation sessions, a semi-structured interview is conducted to explore the lecturer's preferences regarding error types, feedback strategies, and timing. Subsequently, students complete an open-ended questionnaire distributed via Google Forms to capture their responses toward OCF. All data are analyzed qualitatively through categorization of OCF types Lyster & Ranta (1997) and error types Bao & Wang (2023), thematic coding of interview data based on relevant frameworks, and classification of student responses into cognitive, affective, and conative aspects (Hidayah, 2019; Argüelles et al., 2019). Finally, triangulation is applied to ensure the validity of findings by comparing results from all instruments.

III. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Teacher's Preferences In Implementing Oral Corrective Feedback

This section presents the findings related to the teacher's preferences in applying oral corrective feedback within the university English language education speaking classroom. A single English lecturer participated in the research, and the data were gathered through a semi-structured interview via Google Meet. It was noted that the teacher demonstrated a supportive attitude toward oral error correction, stating that it plays a crucial role in helping students understand and remember the correct target language forms. Such correction is seen as essential to ensure students do not continue making the same mistakes over again. The teacher

acknowledged the role of oral corrective feedback, and she also responded to questions about how she prefers to implement it. Her preferences were classified into three main aspects: (1) the specific errors to be addressed, (2) the types of feedback methods used, and (3) the timing of giving corrections

Types Of Errors That Should Be Corrected By The Lecturer

The first aspect that is being addressed from the interview is the teacher's preferred type of error made by the student that should be corrected. The interview also covers whether it is important to any error that should be corrected. Based on the interview, the lecturer is being asked about which types of errors should be corrected. The selection of errors covers grammatical, phonological, and lexical. As a result, the lecturer prefers to correct. The result from the interview shows that the teacher prioritises two error types that include: (1) phonological error and (2) grammatical error. The teacher argues that pronunciation should be corrected first, followed by grammar, because both significantly impact the listener's ability to understand and the overall clarity of communication. This is aligned with.

“As for me, I tend to focus on pronunciation first. Because if the pronunciation isn't clear, then we, as listeners, including their friends, will have difficulty understanding. Besides the phonological aspect or pronunciation, of course, grammar is also important. Because, like I said earlier, as conversation partners or listeners, we naturally need things to be clear. When a student or speaker speaks with good phonology or correct pronunciation and proper grammar, we as listeners can easily understand what is being conveyed. For example, like the difference between 'I eat' and 'I ate', that's a clear distinction. So, from that, we can see that pronunciation and grammar can change the meaning. So, in my opinion, it's very, very important to provide corrections like that”.

Correcting phonological pronunciation errors first, as unclear pronunciation can hinder comprehension not only for the teacher but also for fellow students. Grammar errors are also considered important, as they affect the clarity and meaning of communication. The teacher emphasizes that both pronunciation and grammar are crucial, since mistakes in either area can change the meaning of a sentence.

Types of Oral Corrective Feedback That Should Be Used

The second aspect is the teacher's preferences in oral corrective feedback that is used in the classroom. Based on the interview, the teacher prefers two types, which include: (1) recast and (2) repetition. The result also shows that the reason for choosing this approach helps students feel more comfortable because they are corrected indirectly, without being openly told they made a mistake. It also prevents embarrassment in front of their peers.

“Okay, so the one that I use the most often is recast, that’s the most frequent. And then the one you mentioned earlier, number 5, I think sometimes, for example, when a student says something like “Can you repeat again?” because sometimes the students speak with a low voice or unclear pronunciation, then that’s when I ask them to repeat. Because in my opinion, by using that kind of approach, it really works, even without explicitly pointing out the mistake. For example, if a student says “she goes to school” (with a mistake), the student will automatically repeat what I’ve said or what I corrected. I think with this recast method, students don’t really notice that they’re being corrected, so they don’t feel embarrassed in front of their friends. And sometimes, I also ask students to repeat the correct word. So, the correct words can form a kind of repetition that helps them internalize it in their minds”.

Timing In Giving The Oral Corrective Feedback

The last aspect in the section on teacher preference in oral corrective feedback is timing. Based on the interview, the lecturer uses both immediate feedback and delayed feedback depending on the context. Immediate feedback is given when a student makes a critical error that disrupts communication or causes confusion for the listener and peers. This helps ensure clarity and understanding during the interaction. On the other hand, delayed feedback is preferred during activities like presentations or short conversations, where the focus is on fluency and confidence. By providing feedback afterwards, the teacher avoids interrupting the flow of speech and helps students maintain their concentration.

“Actually, it depends on the context. So, for really important mistakes, let's say, those that interfere with communication or make it difficult for me as the listener to understand. I will give immediate feedback. Because those kinds of errors can confuse, not just for me, but also for their classmates. However, if a student is presenting or delivering a speech, or during a conversation, let’s say a short conversation like introducing themselves in front of the class, I prefer to give feedback later or delay it. I usually provide feedback through the e-learning platform or in the submission section, or sometimes I give general feedback at the end. That way, it doesn’t interrupt the flow or the process of the conversation, and it also doesn’t break their concentration. So, they can stay focused on delivering what they want to say”.

The Implementation of Oral Corrective Feedback In the Classroom

This section presents the types of oral corrective feedback that are frequently used by the lecturer during learning in the English language course. The data was collected from classroom observation. This study involved one lecture that was being recorded. The classroom observation consists of three meetings and is approximately 360 minutes. Based on Lyster & Ranta (1997) theories, in this present study, the oral corrective feedback frequency is counted as a whole, three meetings, and not per meeting.

Table 1. Distribution of Error Types

No	Error Types	Total
1	Grammatical	6
2	Phonological	16
3	Lexical	4
	Total	26

Based on the observation data, a total of 26 student errors were found and categorized based on Bao & Wang (2023) framework: (1) phonological, (2) grammatical, and (3) lexical. The most common were phonological errors that appeared 16 times (62.96%), which showed students' trouble with pronunciation. Grammatical errors appeared 6 times (22.22%). The least common were lexical errors that appeared 4 times (14.81%). These findings show that students had the most difficulty with pronunciation, followed by grammar and vocabulary.

Table 2. Distribution of Oral Corrective Feedback Types

No	Oral Corrective Feedback Types	Total
1	Recast	11
2	Explicit Correction	4
3	Clarification Request	3
4	Repetition	6
5	Elicitation	2
	Total	26

In terms of oral corrective feedback, there were 26 teacher responses based on Lyster & Ranta (1997) framework of six types: recast, explicit correction, clarification request, repetition, elicitation, and metalinguistic clue. The most frequently used was recast, with 11 times of appearances (42.31%). Repetition was used 6 times (19.23%), explicit correction occurred 4 times (15.38%), clarification requests appeared 3 times (11.54%), and elicitation was used 2 times (7.69%). However, the metalinguistic clue type was not used at all (0%) in the observed data.

Discussion

In this section, researchers discussed the results of lecturer preferences in implementing oral corrective feedback. Moreover, the current study discusses the implementation of oral corrective feedback in the speaking classroom among Indonesian university students. The result of the study is linked with the research question in chapter 1, which is divided into components: (1) Lecturers' preferences in implementing oral corrective feedback, (2) The implementation of oral corrective feedback in the classroom, (3) Students' responses to the use of oral corrective feedback in the EFL speaking classroom.

The first component, one lecturer from the English-speaking course, is being interviewed about her opinion and preference on implementing oral corrective feedback in the lesson. The answers from the lecturer were divided into 3 points: (1) Types of errors that should be corrected, (2) Types of oral corrective feedback preference and (3) Timely feedback preference. At the first point, the lecturer is asked about the types of errors that the lecturer corrects using oral corrective feedback. The answer shows that phonological errors and grammatical errors become the lecturer's preference. The lecturer explains that she corrects the phonology for pronunciation. The lecturer argues that if the pronunciation is unclear, then everyone, including the peers, will find it difficult to understand. This is in line with Silpachai et al. (2024) stated in second language learning that oral corrective feedback aims to help learners reduce pronunciation errors, and without it, their language patterns may become fixed and automatically bad. The lecturer then explained that grammatical errors can make communication unclear and difficult to understand. This is in line with Tarigan et al. (2023) study that students expect to have their grammar errors corrected so they can recognise their error patterns and produce utterances appropriate to their language proficiency. From the classroom observation, the data show that the lecturer did in fact correct phonological errors and grammatical errors.

The second point in the types of oral corrective feedback is, lecturer's preference in the lesson. The lecturer mentioned recast and repetition. The reason she chose this type of oral corrective feedback because it allows students to be corrected indirectly without feeling embarrassed, as they often repeat the corrected form naturally, while repetition helps students correct the words by saying them again. This is in line with Solikhah (2016) study that recast emerged as the most frequently used feedback type, applied 66 times (26.83% of total feedback). The reason is recast, providing the correct form directly without interrupting the flow of communication or causing embarrassment. In repetition Khasawneh (2023) language teachers should use examples and repetition, as well as explanations, to help students learn

enough useful English vocabulary for different contexts. The data from the observation shows that recast and repetition appear in oral corrective feedback implementation.

For the third point in terms of timing, the lecturer prefers immediate and delayed feedback depending on the context. In terms of timing, the lecturer uses both immediate and delayed feedback depending on the situation. Immediate feedback is given when a critical error disrupts communication or confuses, ensuring clarity during interaction. Delayed feedback is used for activities like presentations or short conversations to avoid interrupting fluency and concentration. This is in line with a study conducted by Ha et al. (2021) shows that immediate feedback improves short-term accuracy by helping learners correct mistakes instantly and avoid reinforcing errors, while delayed feedback enhances long-term retention by allowing learners to maintain fluency during the task. Both methods complement each other in supporting accuracy and fluency in language learning. Another study from Fu (2020) report that both immediate feedback and delayed feedback types contributed equally to inquire into the second language development.

The second component is the implementation of oral corrective feedback from the classroom observation. The data result of lecturer error types preference in correcting oral corrective feedback shows that lexical errors appear in the process, so it's not only phonological and grammatical. This is not aligned with the interview. The result from the interview on implementing oral corrective feedback shows that the lecturer prefers recast and repetition. However, in the current study, the data show that not only does recast and repetition occur, but also explicit correction, clarification request, and elicitation. This is not in line with the current study, although certain oral corrective feedback types are preferred, the results do not fully align with those preferences.

The third component of student attitudes resulted in 3 different points: (1) cognitive, (2) affective, and (3) conative. The first point is where students ask about their opinion when the lecturer uses oral corrective feedback during their speech in English. Cognitively, all students appear with a positive response to the lecturer's oral corrective feedback use. Students confirm that it helps them become aware of the mistake and make corrections. Rochma (2023) & Nurjanah et al. (2024) highlighted that feedback types such as explicit correction, recasts, and metalinguistic clues promoted awareness while respecting students' speaking flow and confidence. It shows that choosing the feedback types that promote awareness is crucial for maintaining their cognitive engagement with oral corrective feedback.

The second point is very important because of its relation to students' feelings after receiving the oral corrective feedback from the lecturer. The students were asked if they liked

or disliked the oral corrective feedback from the lecturer when they were speaking. All students confirm the feelings of liking because they can now correct the mistakes that they made in their learning. moreover, students feel happy when the lecturer performs oral corrective feedback to them. This is in line with a study conducted by Roothoof and Breeze (2016) that students expressed positive affective responses: most reported feeling happy and grateful when they were corrected by the teacher. Lastly, a study from secondary education in Turkey by Yakışık (2021) address related to student emotions about OCF; student reported largely positive feelings about being corrected by the teacher.

The third is that the conative component of students' attitudes toward oral corrective feedback is strongly positive. Almost all student reported feeling motivated after receiving feedback from their lecturer. Students expressed that the feedback helps them correct mistakes, build confidence, and improve their performance in the future. Several students highlighted that such corrections are essential during the learning process. It is in line with AlGhafri et al. (2023) study of Omani EFL students, which found that oral corrective feedback (OCF) plays a motivating force in their learning. Students reported that OCF also increased their awareness of errors, encouraged self-correction, and boosted their confidence to participate in class. Another study related to motivation, Mahara and Hartono (2024) indicates that students see oral corrective feedback as a tool to help them motivate themselves to speak English.

Thus, semi-structured interviews conducted by teachers and open-ended student responses indicate that they value oral corrective feedback as an important tool in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) speaking classes. Teachers view it as essential for addressing errors, maintaining clear communication, and supporting student progress, while students see it as beneficial to recognise errors, build confidence, and stay motivated to improve. Overall, their perspectives highlight the role of oral corrective feedback not only in correcting errors but also in encouraging active participation and fostering continuous learning.

The final result of this study suggests important implications for English foreign language teachers. The lecturer's focus on phonological and grammatical errors shows the need for accuracy, while the observation of lexical corrections highlights teachers' flexibility in responding to students' needs. Although the lecturer preferred recast and repetition in the teaching, classroom practice showed otherwise; explicit correction, elicitation, and clarification requests occurred. It indicates that different feedback types are necessary depending on the context, as supported by (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). The use of both immediate and delayed feedback reflects a balanced approach that supports accuracy without disrupting fluency (Ha et al., 2021; Fu, 2020).

Furthermore, students responded positively in cognitive, affective, and conative aspects, showing that oral corrective feedback not only raises awareness of errors but also motivates and builds confidence, consistent with (Rochma, 2023; Nurjanah et al., 2024). Muslem et al. (2021) reported that students viewed oral corrective feedback positively when it did not embarrass or interrupt them. Similarly, Rochma (2023) emphasized the value of explicit and delayed feedback, while Nurjanah et al. (2024) highlighted preferences for metalinguistic, recast, and repetition feedback, showing the importance of respecting learner emotions and fluency. Overall, this study reinforces that oral corrective feedback should be seen as more than error correction; it is also a tool for supporting students' participation, motivation, and continuous learning in EFL speaking classrooms.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study shows that the lecturer's preferences for oral corrective feedback (OCF) focus on correcting phonological and grammatical errors, mainly using *recast* and repetition to maintain communication flow and avoid student embarrassment, with feedback delivered either immediately or delayed depending on classroom conditions. However, classroom practice reveals a more flexible approach, as various feedback types such as explicit correction, clarification requests, and elicitation are also used to address phonological, grammatical, and lexical errors. From the students' perspective, OCF is positively received across cognitive, affective, and conative aspects, as it helps them identify and correct mistakes, increases enjoyment, builds confidence, and encourages active participation. Overall, although lecturers may have preferred strategies, actual implementation is more varied, and OCF is viewed by students not only as error correction but also as motivation in language learning.

Future research should involve more lecturers from different universities to generate broader and representative findings on oral corrective feedback (OCF). This is important because lecturers may differ in teaching styles, classroom contexts, and feedback preferences, so including a larger diverse sample will make results generalizable and reliable. It is important to explore students' perspectives in depth, how different types of feedback affect learners with varying proficiency levels and learning styles. By examining these differences, researchers can better understand which OCF strategies are most effective for specific learner groups and how feedback can be tailored to support language accuracy and learner motivation.

REFERENCES

- Alfiani, W., Nurkamto, J., & Supriyadi, S. (2023). "I get blank when start talking": An exploration towards sources and strategies of non-English freshmen's Anxiety in ESP Speaking Program. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 11(3), 719–734. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v11i3.7690>
- AlGhafri, M., Mirza, C., & Gabarre, C. (2023). Students' attitudes towards oral corrective feedback: A case study from Oman. *Arab World English Journal*, 14(3), 406–417. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no3.26>
- Argüelles, L. G., Méndez, E. H., & Escudero, M. D. P. (2019). *EFL Teachers' Attitudes Towards Oral Corrective Feedback: A Case Study*. 21(1), 107–120.
- 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(March). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1112136>
- Fu, M. (2020). *Research Article*. 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263120000388>
- Ha, X. Van, Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: A teaching and learning perspective. *Heliyon*, 7(7), e07550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550>
- Ha, X. Van, Tan, L., & Phu, B. (2021). Heliyon Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: A teaching and learning perspective. *Heliyon*, 7(7), e07550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550>
- Hidayah, M. I. (2019). *The influence of students' mastery of idiom on their writing skill of descriptive essay*. 1–64. <https://eprints.walisongo.ac.id/id/eprint/11204>
- Laeli, A. F., & Setiawan, S. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in speaking class: Its frequency, students' perceptions, and preference. *Exposure: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 8(2), 257–269. <https://doi.org/10.26618/exposure.v8i2.2785>
- Lemma, B. (2023). Types and nature of oral feedback given by teachers on students' speech. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 11(3), 419. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v11i3.8269>
- Mahara, A. D., & Hartono, D. (2024). *The effect of corrective feedback to Improve students' motivation in speaking skills: A Perspective From EFL Learners*. 7, 42–53.
- Mohammadi, M., & Yousefi, M. H. (2019). *Iranian EFL teachers and learners' perceptions of grammar instruction and corrective feedback*.
- Muslem, A., Zulfikar, T., Astilla, I., Heriansyah, H., & Marhaban, S. (2021). *Students' perception toward oral corrective feedback in speaking classes*: 5(4), 244–259.
- Natasia, G., & Angelianawati, L. (2022). Students' perception of using storytelling technique to improve speaking performance at SMPN 143 Jakarta Utara. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*, 8(2), 282–292. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v8i2.4063>
- Nurjanah, L., Rahmaningtyas, H., & Yaniafari, R. P. (2024). Examining students' oral corrective feedback preferences for improving speaking proficiency. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 11(1), 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v11i1.29020>
- ÖZTÜRK, Y. (2023). The effect of delayed and immediate oral corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation in emergency distance education. *Neşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi*, 13(1), 573–587. <https://doi.org/10.30783/nevsosbilen.1230037>
- Rahman, A., Hamid, M., Farich Hizbana, A., Halik, N., & Budianto, L. (2024). University students' perspective on English speaking challenges: A descriptive study. *Jet Adi Buana*, 9(01), 13–27. <https://doi.org/10.36456/jet.v9.n01.2024.8763>
- Rochma, A. F. (2023). Corrective oral feedback on students' errors in speaking courses. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning (JETLE)*, 4(2), 125–135. <https://doi.org/10.18860/jetle.v4i2.20442>

- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, 25(4), 318–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580>
- Safitri, W., & Nurcholis, I. A. (2025). *An analysis of teaching methods used by Eenglish Teachers at SD Negeri 22 Kota Bengkulu. Correspondence Email : Abstract The purpose of this research is to analyze the teaching methods employed by English teachers at SD Negeri 22 Kota Bengkulu. The study a.* 05(01), 32–40.
- Saleem Khasawneh, M. A. (2023). Factors affecting the improvement of speaking skills among Jordanian EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(6), 1559–1568. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1406.14>
- Silpachai, A., Neiriz, R., Novotny, M., Gutierrez-Osuna, R., Levis, J. M., & Chukharev, E. (2024). Corrective feedback accuracy and pronunciation improvement: Feedback that is 'good enough.' *Language Learning and Technology*, 28(1), 1–16.
- Solikhah, I. (2016). Oral corrective feedback in speaking class of English department. *LINGUA: Journal of Language, Literature and Teaching*, 13(1), 87. <https://doi.org/10.30957/lingua.v13i1.14>
- Tarigan, K. E., Stevani, M., Ginting, F. Y. A., Prayuda, M. S., Sari, D. W., & Lumbanraja, B. (2023). Oral corrective feedback and error analysis: Indonesian teachers' beliefs to improve speaking skill. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(6), 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n6p140>
- Yakışık, B. Y. (2021). *EFL learners' preferences and emotions about oral corrective feedback at secondary education in Turkey: Are there gender and grade-level differences?* 6(1), 103–122.
- Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: a large-scale survey. *Language Awareness*, 28(2), 139–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755>